





UCSB LIBRARY
X-18425



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. IX.

List of Contributors to Volume IX.

- REV. J. MORDAUNT BARNARD, M.A.
REV. W. EMERY BARNES, D.D.
VERNON BARTLET, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR W. H. BENNETT, M.A.
REV. ARMSTRONG BLACK.
F. C. BURKITT, M.A.
WILLIAM CANTON.
REV. ARTHUR CARR, M.A.
REV. PROFESSOR T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
VEN. ARCHDEACON DIGGLE, M.A.
LATE PROFESSOR HENRY DRUMMOND.
REV. PROFESSOR G. G. FINDLAY, M.A.
REV. J. MONRO GIBSON, M.A., D.D.
PROFESSOR A. N. JANNARIS, M.A.
REV. M. KAUFMANN, M.A.
REV. ANGUS M. MACKAY, M.A.
PROFESSOR W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L., LL.D.
REV. PRINCIPAL A. ROBERTSON, D.D.
PROFESSOR GEORGE L. ROBINSON, Ph.D.
REV. CANON ARMITAGE ROBINSON, D.D.
REV. T. G. SELBY.
GEORGE AUGUSTUS SIMCOX, M.A.
REV. JOHN WATSON, D.D.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

W. ROBERTSON NICOLL, M.A., LL.D.

FIFTH SERIES.

Volume IX.

London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCIX.

BUTLER & TANNER,
THE SELWOOD PRINTING WORKS,
FROME, AND LONDON.

STUDIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

SOCRATES relates of Eunomius that he composed a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in seven books, but, "though he spent many words, failed to seize the gist of the Epistle." Many words have been spent by better men since then upon the same task, and if complete success has not even yet been obtained, the gist of the Epistle is perhaps clearer now than it was. The following papers will attempt to focus some results of the process upon such vital elements of the problem as seem as yet incompletely solved. Their aim will be to grasp a few determining conceptions, the result of years of thought upon the Epistle, round its leading difficulties; and where questions not ripe for an answer arise, at any rate to attempt a statement of the exact problem involved.

I.

To sift preliminary questions such as are dealt with in "Introductions" is outside my present purpose.¹ The questions, who? when? where? to whom? why? what? open up, in reference to our Epistle, exceptionally wide fields of inquiry.

I lay down, therefore, in order to define my position on introductory questions, that this Epistle forms the last of the second or controversial group of St. Paul's Epistles,

¹ Where many good Introductions exist, it may suffice, without invidious exclusiveness, to name those prefixed to the two best commentaries in English—perhaps in any language—namely, that of Dr. Gifford, and the recent admirably complete one by Dr. Sanday and Mr. Headlam.

that it was written before the passover of 58,¹ that the last two chapters, and the final doxology, were from the first part of the Epistle, that the names in chapter xvi. belong to the Roman Church, and not to the Ephesian. I hold that St. Paul wrote with some knowledge of the condition, history, and composition of the Roman Church; that the latter was originally formed by the agency of Christian Jews, but that these were now greatly outnumbered by Christian Gentiles; that the Epistle, intended, as it appears to be, for readers Gentile by blood, but largely Jewish in their ideas and in their religious training, is a good index to the composition of the Roman Church at this time; that, in fact, at Rome as elsewhere, the large body of proselytes—uncircumcised but devout persons who worshipped the one God, attended the synagogue, kept the moral law, and studied the Scriptures—had furnished in great numbers the first recruits to the Christian society.

I assume that Romans is an expansion, in more systematic and less controversial form, of the position taken up by St. Paul in his controversial letter to the Galatians. I do not assume, but read straight out of St. Paul, that he regarded the whole success or failure of his work for Christ as hanging upon the thorough saturation of Gentile Christendom with the principles upon which he had fought the Galatian Judaizers; that by "his gospel" he meant something which other apostles might doubtless admit, but which it was given to him alone to fully understand and aggressively affirm. With Ramsay I assume that the evangelization of the Roman world as such was an object consciously before his mind and deliberately planned; if so, it is not much to assume that he knew that to influence the Christians of Rome was to influence the Christians of

¹ Without prejudice to a reconsideration of the whole chronological question in the light of Mr. C. H. Turner's researches in *New Dictionary of the Bible*, s.v. Chronology.

the Roman world. I assume that he knew that the Roman Church, Jewish in its religious training, was yet untouched by that anti-Pauline spirit which had begun to show itself there (too late for success) by the time St. Paul wrote from Rome to Philippi.

I assume, then, that in this Epistle St. Paul aims at giving the Gentile Christianity of the future its doctrinal foundation and principles of life; and you will, if you have followed me so far, hardly need to ask why this Epistle was addressed to "all that were in Rome, beloved of God." The Epistle, then, is the first deliberate attempt at a systematic statement of doctrine, the first book of Christian theology. It differs from the theology of later times, firstly, by being the work of one who had seen the Lord, had received a direct personal mission from Him, "not by man nor through man," and who spoke as His specially chosen interpreter or "instrument," *σκεῦος ἐκλογῆς*. In speaking of "theology" in the Epistle, we must remember always that it is unique, and stands above theology.

But it also differs from later theology in its treatment. It is not a discussion in abstract or scientific form. It is dialectical rather than systematic in its structure, and has close reference to problems which pressed hard upon St. Paul—and doubtless in part on his readers—but which are no longer pressing questions with ourselves. These problems arise out of St. Paul's Jewish antecedents and surroundings. Had he written with less constant reference to them, his words might have been more easily and directly applicable to the purposes of the modern student or preacher; but they would have lost that nervous vigour and freshness of passion, that intense personal energy, which give them "hands and feet" to arrest and penetrate the reader of every age.

In this Epistle the principles which underlie the life of Christians, principles to be found in germ in the words of

our Lord, but left by Him to be unfolded by His Spirit through His "chosen instrument," first found permanent expression. The Epistle is their record for all time, and to it the faith and the theology of the Church must ever come back to renew their youth.

II.

The essence of the gospel is Life; and it is the Christian Life—what it presupposes, what forces sustain it, in what it issues—that this Epistle enables us to understand.

In chapter xv. 19 St. Paul speaks of himself as preaching "in the power of signs and wonders, in the power of the Spirit." The Epistle thus confronts us with the most direct possible testimony to Christian miracles—that of the person who worked them. The Christianity of St. Paul is miraculous; to reject miracle is to discredit St. Paul as a witness to what our religion originally was. All admit that Christianity "has produced the greatest change that has ever been known in the world, with reference to moral standard and moral practice." If it is worth while to be a Christian—to hold and to teach this religion, unique in its power over life and conduct—it is surely worth while not to miss the secret of its power. If we are not to miss it, we must make sure that ours is the Christianity which originated this power—the Christianity of the apostles—above all of St. Paul—above all of the Epistle to the Romans.

Our age is somewhat shy of miracle; the idea is in the air that miracles are a kind of dead weight which Christian faith has to carry, but which encumbers its intellectual appeal, and must not be allowed to enter into its essence. The idea that miracles can prove doctrine, however incredible, and that Christianity is primarily a body of doctrine, to be accepted not so much on its evident merits, but simply because of its miraculous proofs, is more alien

to the mind of our age than to that of any age before. The idea of a gospel without doctrine, and depending on no miracle, is attractive to many minds; but such a gospel would not have overcome the world.

At any rate, belief in miracle safeguards the central core of Christian faith—faith in a God of love. That God is love is the last word, the highest utterance, of religious conviction. If we believe in miracle, we *must* believe in a *personal* God. Without miracle, the idea of God gravitates towards the impersonal; and an impersonal God is at any rate not a God of love.

This thought underlies the argument of Mozley in his seventh Lecture on Miracles, which I think contains as true and penetrating an estimate of the Epistle to the Romans as is anywhere to be found.

The Epistle to the Romans, he says, is a prophecy, that is, a claim *for Christian doctrine*, the doctrine of the Incarnation and Atonement of the Son of God,—that it is a wholly new motive power in the sphere of the moral life. It predicts, so to speak, of this truth that it will prove to be a force “able to lift man above the power of sin, the love of the world, and the lust of the flesh.” God was by “this transcendent act of mediation, this mystery transacted in highest heaven,” reconciled to man, “pardoned him, and sent him forth anew on his course, with the gift of the Holy Spirit in his heart.” This was not the work merely of a new and higher moral code, “for men do not do right things because they are told to do them”; nor of a new example, for “the force of example has a natural tendency to wear out.”

And this prophecy has been fulfilled. St. Paul’s “high view of human nature” has been verified. St. Paul took a high view of human nature not founded on empty idealism, but upon the profoundest insight into man’s guilt and misery. Mahomet took a sagacious view of human

nature, but a low one. His religion, a religion without Incarnation or Atonement, rests on the perception that men can be counted upon to do two things for the glory of God—"to transact religious forms, and fight." These duties are severely insisted upon, while "within the sphere of common practical life, where men's great trial lies," Mahomet shows "d disdainful laxity."

Nothing, I say, could be truer than all this, or more directly relevant to the central meaning of our Epistle. But on one point I would supplement Mozley's statement by way of caution. To "believe in" Christ, to St. Paul, involves belief of doctrine and fact; you cannot have one without the other. But it is not in the *doctrinal assent*, as such, that the central act of faith, the central motive to action, consists. Faith is essentially trust *in a person*. "Abraham believed God," "hoped against hope," and the spiritual son of Abraham, the Christian believer, surrenders himself, in the act of faith, to Christ. The character of God, revealed in Christ, mirrors itself in the spirit of man, and transforms him "into the same image." Faith is in a person; belief of fact and of doctrine is implied, but does not in itself constitute faith as understood by St. Paul.

III.

The theological part of the Epistle extends from chapter i. 15 to the end of chapter xi. Its main divisions are three. The Theology of Redemption (i. 16-v.), the Theology of the Christian life (vi.-viii.), the Theology of History (ix.-xi.).

I will briefly sketch out the contents of each division.

The theology of redemption falls into two main parts, which are gathered up and contrasted in chapter v. 12-21—namely, the "wrath of God" (i. 18-iii. 20), and the "righteousness of God" (iii. 21-v. 11).

The *wrath of God* is the correlative of man's *need* of redemption. "First comes the statement that the world up to that moment had been, morally speaking, a failure." A moral creed was there, but it stopped short at enunciation. Among Jews and Gentiles alike the facts are the same "knowledge without action." The utmost that the knowledge of right could do for man was to confound him with a sense of utter self-condemnation. The natural yearning for communion with God—"Tu Domine fecisti nos ad te"—could only increase his misery by making him feel his impotence to make the first step, to undo the shameful past, to cross the inexorable barrier set up by his own sin.

And this self-condemnation was but the perception of an awfully real fact: the wrath of God,—revealed in all its fearful intensity, not only upon the careless Gentile, but upon the privileged Jew, whose privilege (none the less real because of his apostasy, iii. 1-8) only heightened his personal guilt.

But God's earliest dealings with men—His self-revealed character, had not only led men to fear His holiness, but had also from the first led men to look upon Him as a Saviour; His long series of mercies to His people had led them to look forward to something in the future, some deliverance more final, more complete, more marvellous than His mighty works of old. God was pledged to redeem, and God was righteous.¹ The Old Testament revelation had led men to hold to the righteousness of God as containing the promise of salvation; the gospel declares it as an accomplished fact. And the universality of the wrath of God before Christ only brings out that redemption, when it came, was the sole outcome of the righteousness of God, and not in any degree the achievement of man.

¹ This subject will be dealt with in a future paper.

God's *righteousness* has as its correlative the *fact* of redemption.

The redeeming work of Christ then, wherein God appears as 'righteous and making-righteous' (iii. 26.), humbles man even more completely than did the antecedent revelation of wrath. Their boast is shut out, not (only) by a law of works, but (even more completely) by a law of faith. The privilege of the Israelite has no place in the sight of God.

And this strange result, so far from revoking the word of God in the Old Testament, is really its fulfilment. This gospel of faith, this levelling of privilege, was preached before the Law, before any characteristic institute of Judaism was ordained. The whole story of Abraham—the boasted father of Jewish privilege—makes this clear (chap. iv.)

Well then, my readers, the apostle concludes, let us all make this gift of God our own. Peace with God is ours, founded on the certainty of God's love for us, a certainty created in our hearts by the Spirit of God Himself, but no mere subjective certainty, for actual recorded fact speaks plainly to us of that love, a love transcending all probable limits of human devotion. We can trust God to complete what He has begun, and live in joyful hope, however the appearances of life are against us.

True, the experience of history so far has been that of a world-wide heritage of death and sin, but the act of weakness which bequeathed that heritage to man has now been superseded by an act of Divine power fraught with the promise of righteousness and life to all who receive the abundance of its grace (v. 12-19).

In this great two-fold division of human history, how subordinate a part was played by law! It forms the last episode of the heritage of death, aggravating the disease in order to intensify man's want of the remedy (v. 20).

St. Paul has done half his work, and what he has done is more than half of the whole. He has shown that the wall of sin no longer shuts out the soul from God, that access to God is ours, that the Christian life is made possible.

But it remains for him to place the Christian life itself before our eyes, and this he does in the second great section. And, first of all, he takes it in the concrete (vi). The two-fold question, "Shall we sin?" (vv. 1, 15), at first sight answers itself: no one would say that the Christian is to sin. But the weight of the question really turns on the *reason why*. These chapters (vi.-viii.) give us the fundamental principles of Christian ethics. And, first of all, he shows us that "the grace wherein we stand," which he has hitherto viewed negatively as justification, *i.e.* forgiveness of sin, is on its positive side union with Christ. If we were united to Him by baptism, the rite resembling His death, we shall further be united with Him by something corresponding to His resurrection, *viz.*, a new vital energy—*καινότης ζωῆς*. Only we must realize this: allow the new life of Christ to wield our limbs, for we are no longer under an external compulsion, but instinct with an indwelling force—not under law, but under grace.

Our obedience to the will of God will be not *less* complete for this reason, but *far more*. If (he continues) you seem to take what I have said as a paradox, I will make my meaning plain by an unworthy metaphor. You have to choose between slavery and slavery. Nay, you have made your choice; you have renounced slavery to sin. Well, then, you are slaves of righteousness, slaves of God. You cannot, if you look back on the past, repent your choice. You are dead in Christ; and when a person dies, he passes out of the control of law. You, then, in dying with Christ, died to the law, and are alive to Christ alone (vi. 15-vii. 4).

St. Paul passes from the concrete picture of the Christian life to the consideration of the forces which are at work in it (vii. 5–viii.) He employs the method of difference, comparing the pre-Christian life *at its very best, i.e.* as lived under Divine law, with the Christian life—the old life under the Letter with the new life in the Spirit. This contrast is tersely stated in vii. 5, 6; then life under law is characterized in vii. 7–25; and life in the Spirit in chapter viii. In viii. 12 *sqq.* the question asked in vi. 1, so far as it needs an explicit answer, is finally answered.

I postpone any detailed consideration of these wonderful chapters to another paper, nor shall I more than glance at the contents of ix.–xi. Their connection with the general argument of the Epistle may be best seen if we consider how they are anticipated in iii. 1–8. That this is so can be readily proved. The rejection of Israel, then, was a fact which apparently collided with the main thought of the first section—the righteousness of God. As we shall see later on, the righteousness of God was, to St. Paul, above all God's consistency with, or truth to, His revealed character and purpose. And the absolute levelling of Jew and Gentile, especially the *levelling down* of the Jew to the position of the Gentile as the object of God's wrath, had the look of a revocation of express promise—the going back upon God's own covenant. Was, then, God a "covenant-breaker"? *μη γένοιτο.* Yet to St. Paul the difficulty was a very real one, and had to be explained. His fundamental explanation is found in ix. 6–29 and xi. 1–10, viz., that the proper party to the Divine covenant, the true heir to the promises, is not Israel after the flesh, but the believing few, or, rather, all who by their faith prove themselves true sons and heirs of Abraham (cf. chap. iv.), and that this has been made plain by God all along. But there is the equally important thought that the calling in of all nations, without which the Divine promises from

Abraham downward would not be satisfied, nor the truth of God really maintained—that the calling in of the Gentiles would have been impossible but for the rejection of the Jews. “By their fall, salvation had come to the Gentiles” ; their *unrighteousness* had *established* the righteousness of God (iii. 5). This is the great paradox of the third section, upon which I may say something later on. Still, even with St. Paul, τὸ συγγένης τοι δεινὸν ἢ θ' ὄμιλία, blood is thicker than water, and he will not surrender the hope of the ultimate conversion of the apostate people, consecrated as they are by the root whence they had sprung.

I omit any detailed account of the practical portion, full as it is of points of high interest, and return to some difficulties in the first section.

IV.

St. Paul starts by characterizing the gospel as δύναμις θεοῦ εἰς σωτηρίαν παντὶ τῷ πιστεύοντι, and that, because in it is revealed God's righteousness.

The revelation of God's righteousness to man, then, is man's salvation; the gospel which reveals it is God's power exerted for that purpose.

The fact of such a revelation is explained by its need. Apart from the gospel, and the Divine promise of the gospel, there is only a revelation of God's wrath.

Here we meet a difficult series of questions. Firstly, what is meant here by God's wrath? and when and how is it revealed?

The close correlation between *salvation* and *wrath* appears below, chap. v. 9: ἡ ὀργὴ there is spoken of as future. And this is an almost technical use of the term in St. Paul; it has everywhere an express or tacit reference to the “day of wrath” (see Sanday's note on i. 18), and the words ἀποκαλύπτεται ἀπ' οὐράνου (axiomatic present as in 1 Corin-

thians iii. 13), coupled with the language of ii. 5, seems to fasten us here to an eschatological reference. But, then, how does something only to be revealed at the last day prove, antecedently to Christ, man's need of redemption? The answer seems to be that while the "unveiling" of God's wrath takes place on the day of wrath, the certainty that it will be unveiled is a *present* certainty. That God hates sin, and will terribly punish sinners, is known even to Gentiles (i. 32; cf. the definite article in Acts xxiv. 25), and certainly to Jews. That this day of wrath was near at hand was still St. Paul's belief when he wrote this Epistle; but meanwhile the judicial blindness of the heathen world (i. 28) was at once a climax of guilt and a premonition of the wrath to come.

The wrath of God is to be revealed, then, against all men who "hold" the truth in unrighteousness. Of these there are two classes: those whose sense of right and wrong has become so degenerate that they even applaud sin in others, and those who uphold a strict moral standard in theory, but deny it in practice. The latter class hold the primacy of guilt; and they are, practically, none other than the Jews.

That intellectual homage to God's will, the exultant cherishing of the law, could not raise the soul from the death of sin, we shall learn from vii. 7-25. But the comparatively high level of moral effort there described must have been exceptional even among Jews. What was true of the best was truer still of the average. The Jews were, tested by their average practical morality, *σκεύη ὀργῆς* (ix. 22), fully ripe for destruction, *τέκνα ὀργῆς* (Eph. ii. 3), even like the rest of the world, like those "sinners of the Gentiles" on whom they looked down from their imagined pedestal of privilege.

There is an apparent,¹ not a real, contradiction here with

¹ Ritschl's disparagement of Ephesians partly turned on this supposed difficulty.

the covenant relation with God which had certainly belonged to Israel as a whole, and which in its fulness applied to the nucleus, which had always existed, of "Israelites indeed." Whatever its meaning (and this question may be discussed in another connexion), the status of the Israelite, as member of a society to which God had, as it were, pledged Himself by covenant, did not in the least exempt him from the *δικαιοκρισία* (ii. 5) of God. If Israelites were in a state of grace *before* Christ, they were so by virtue of faith—a faith which was virtually faith in Christ (*e.g.* Abraham, iv. *sub fin.*). But no claim of descent, or privilege, or circumcision, gave any man a position of privilege before the tribunal of God. In the day when, "according to my gospel," God shall judge the hidden things of men, possession of the law will only aggravate the guilt of its infraction.

By "my gospel," St. Paul does not, I think, mean simply "*the* gospel"—simply what he taught in connexion with the older apostles. The phrase occurs, both in chapter ii. 16 and in the doxology, xvi. 25, in a "universalist" context. In the latter place the reference is to the universality, *εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, of the gospel blessings; in the former to the irrelevance of Jewish privilege ("hearing of law") in the day when God shall judge the secret things of man. In 1 Timothy i. 11 the reference to the Pauline view of the law is clear. In 2 Timothy ii. 8 the reference is no longer specific. But the distinctive *content* of St. Paul's gospel is strictly involved in Galatians ii. 7. His gospel is *ἄλλο* though not *ἕτερον* (*ibid.* i. 7): he preached what the older apostles preached (1 Cor. xv. 11; 2 Tim. ii. 8), but with an added, and specially revealed, insight into all its consequences, with reference to Jewish law, Jewish privilege, and the righteousness of faith.

V.

The Jew is ἀναπολόγητος because he had knowledge and law. The same is true of the Gentile. He, too, had knowledge (i. 20 *seq.*); he, too, had a law. In ii. 14, 15, St. Paul argues that such practical morality as existed among Gentiles shows, by its coincidence with the precepts of the Jewish moral law (τὰ τοῦ νόμου), that the function (ἔργον) of that law is discharged, in their case, by the commandment written in their hearts. In this sense, "natural" morality corresponds to perfected Christian ethics (2 Cor. iii. 3), and both, alike, are in contrast with the Jewish system. Such phenomena among Gentiles are, of course, to St. Paul, fragmentary and exceptional (chap. i.); but they exist. The gospel restores the shattered life of natural ethics, not by enforcing the letter, but by superseding it, and giving life to φυσικὴ ἀρετὴ by the Holy Spirit. Κυρία ἀρετὴ, the dream of Aristotle, is made a reality, καθάπερ ἀπὸ κυρίου πνεύματος.

But there are passages which seem to go beyond this, and speak of "the law" as having reigned over *all* men, even Gentiles, before Christ—*e.g.* vii. 1-4. What St. Paul says of the Law as a preparatory stage, as the last and darkest episode of the reign of sin, gathers greatly in force if we understand him not to be merely analysing the religious history of the Jew, but that of mankind as a whole. In what sense, then, were the Gentiles under *the* law? in what sense could Gentiles be said to have died to the law through the Body of Christ?

To former proselytes such language was not wholly surprising. *They* would feel its applicability to themselves. St. Athanasius¹ speaks of the Law and Prophets as "not sent for the Jews alone, but as a holy school of the knowledge of God and the conduct of the soul for all the world."

¹ *De Incarn.* xii. 5.

And the proselytes were only the most conspicuous example of the widespread direct influence of Judaism as a moral creed. Moreover, without such *direct* influence, the moral *creed* of classical antiquity was a high one. Profanity, unfilial treatment of parents, murder, uncleanness, theft, slander, even coveting (*e.g.* in the superb reply of the Oracle to Glaucus son of Epicydes, in Herodotus) all these things were as unsparingly condemned by Greek and Roman morality as by the ten commandments. True, the practical morals of the Gentile world were flagrantly at issue with their moral creed. But, then, so were those of the Jews. The difference was of degree only. In both cases alike the moral law pressed on man from without, and its clear utterance provoked wilful disobedience: "when the commandment came, sin awoke to life, and I died." "Nitimur in vetitum semper, cupimusque negata."

The great difference there was not moral but religious. The Jew was intent upon righteousness in God's sight; his religion had a moral aim, though a false one. The Gentile had no moral aim in his religion; his religion sat more lightly on his conscience than that of the Jew. This very fact made him easier to teach: he had simply to learn—the Jew had first to *unlearn*.

But to St. Paul, so far from being the exclusive privilege of the Jew, the law, regarded in respect of its moral content, viewed as a standard of morality, was precisely that which the Jew and the Gentile had in common. In a sense the Gentile was *ἀνομος*, the Jew *ἔννομος*. But the difference was apparent rather than real. As a factor in religious education, the experience of the impotence of law (*τὸ ἀδύνατον τοῦ νόμου*) to regenerate the moral life was an experience not Jewish only, but common to all men everywhere.

*THE PROBLEM OF FOREIGN MISSIONS.*¹

IT has for a long time seemed to me that missionary facts, and the missionary problem generally, are susceptible of more special—may I say more scientific?—treatment than they usually receive; and the large size of the field which it has fallen to me to see is favourable to that methodical survey of the whole which is denied even to the missionary, for he represents but a single field.

There are two ways in which men who offer their lives to their fellow-men may regard the world. They mean the same thing in the end, but you will not misunderstand me if I express the apparent distinction in the boldest terms. The first view is that the world is lost and must be saved; the second, that the world is sunken and must be raised. According to the first, the peoples of the world are looked upon as souls—souls to be redeemed; the second thinks of them rather as men—men to be perfected; or as nations—nations to be made righteous. The first deals with a sinner's *status* in the sight of God, the second with his *character* in the sight of men. The first preaches mainly justification; the second mainly regeneration. The first is the standpoint of the popular evangelism; the second is the view of evolution.

The danger of the first is to save the souls of men and there leave them; the danger of the second is to ignore the soul altogether. As I shall speak now from the last standpoint, I point out its danger at once, and meet it by adding to its watchword, evolution, the qualifying term, Christian. This alone takes count of the whole nature of man, of sin and guilt, of the future and of the past, and recognises

¹ [This is an address delivered at the opening of the session in the Free Church College, Glasgow, in November, 1890. The manuscript has been kindly put at our disposal, and it seems suggestive enough to deserve a permanent form.—ED. EXPOSITOR.]

the Christian facts and forces as alone adequate to deal with them. The advantage of speaking of "the Christian evolution of the world," instead of, or, at least, as a change from, "the evangelization of the world," will appear as we go on. By making temporary use of the one standpoint, I do not exclude the other; and if I ignore it from this point onward, it is not because it is not legitimate, but simply because it is not the subject.

Nothing ought to be kept more persistently before the mind of those who are open to serve the world as missionaries than the great complexity of the missionary problem; and nothing more strikes one who goes round the world than the amazing variety of work required and the almost radical differences among the various mission fields. In the popular conception the peoples of the world are roughly divided into black and white, or Christian and heathen, and the man who designates himself for the mission field makes a general choice, taking the first opening that comes, and considering but little in his decision that there are many shades of black, and innumerable kinds of heathen. But it is just as absurd for a man to choose in general terms "the foreign field" and go abroad to rescue heathen, as for a planter to go anywhere abroad in the hope of sowing general seed and producing general coffee. The planter soon finds out that there are many soils in the world, some suited to one crop and some to another; that seed must be put in for each particular crop in one way and not in another; that he requires particular implements in each case and not any implements, and that the time between sowing and reaping, and even between sowing and sprouting, is an always appreciable and very varying interval. The mission field has like distinctions. Some crops it is mere waste of time to try to plant in one place; the specialist's business is to find out what *will* grow there. Some crops will not

and cannot come up in one year, or in ten years, or even in fifty years; it is the specialist's business to study scientifically the possibilities of growth, the limitations of growth, the impossibilities of growth. It is irrational also for the missionary to carry the same message, or rather the same *form* of message, to every land, or to think that the thought which told to-day will tell to-morrow; he must rotate his crops as God through the centuries rotates the social soil on which they are to grow. To every land he must take, not the general list of agricultural implements furnished by his college, but one or two of special make which possibly his college has never heard of. Above all, when he reaches his field, his duty is to find out what God has grown there already, for there is no field in the world where the Great Husbandman has not sown something. Instead of uprooting his Maker's work and clearing the field of all the plants that found no place in his small European herbarium, he will rather water the growths already there and continue the work at the point where the Spirit of God is already moving. A hasty critic, when these sentences were spoken, construed them into a plea for building up Christianity upon heathenism. The words are "what God has sown there," and "where the Spirit of God is already moving." The missionary problem, in short, so far from being a mere saving of promiscuous souls with a few well-worn appliances, is a most complex question of Social Evolution.

Let me illustrate the necessity of further specialization in regard to missions by reference to the three or four very different fields which I have just visited. As examples of what might be called a scientific classification of missions, one could scarcely pick any more typical than Australia, the South Sea Islands, China, and Japan. I include Australia among mission fields, and I might with it include

both British Columbia and Manitoba, because none of these countries can provide as yet for its own evangelization.

I. *Australia.* The missionary problem, or the mission churches problem, in these colonies is to deal with a civilized people undergoing abnormally rapid development. Australia is a case of prodigiously active growth in a few directions under most favourable natural conditions for nation-making. It is what a biologist would call an organic mass of the highest possible mobility, of almost perilous sensitiveness to prevailing impressions, with feeble safeguards to conserve its solid gains, and few boundary lines either to shape or limit other growths. The orderly progress here is complicated mainly by one thing, a continuous accretion of outside elements—due to immigration—which creates difficulties in assimilation. The chief problem of Christianity is to keep pace with the continuous growth; the immediate peril is that it may be wholly ignored in the pressure of competing growths.

II. *The South Sea Islands*, of which the New Hebrides are a type, lie exactly at the opposite end of the scale. Growth, so far from being active, has not even begun. Here are no nations, scarcely even tribes. The first step in evolution, aggregation, has not yet taken place. These people are still at zero, they are the Amœbae of the human world. There is no complication here of unassimilated elements introduced by immigration, but a serious opposite difficulty—depletion due to emigration to other countries, and to other causes which vitally affect the whole future problem. As to religion here, the field is altogether open, for there is none at all.

III. *China.* Midway between the South Sea Islands and the Australian colonies, this nation, as every one knows, is an instance of arrested development. On the fair way to become a higher vertebrate, it has stopped short at the crustacean. There are two complications: the amazing

strength of the exoskeleton—the external shell of custom and tradition, so hardened by the deposits of centuries as to make the evolutionist's demand for mobility, *i.e.* for capacity to change, almost non-existent. Secondly, which directly concerns Christianity, there is a very powerful religion already in possession. These two complications make the missionary problem in China one of the most delicate in the world.

IV. If the South Sea Islands are the opposite of Australia, China, in turn, finds its almost perfect contrast in *Japan*. One with it in stagnation and isolation from external influences during three thousand years, almost within the last hour Japan has broken what Mr. Bagehot calls its "cake of custom," and so sudden and mature has already been its development that it is, at this moment, demanding from the Powers of Europe political recognition as one of the civilized nations of the world. This is an entirely different case from any of the preceding. It is the insect emerging from the chrysalis. From the Christian standpoint, the case is unique in history. Its own religion was abandoned a few years ago, and the country is at present looking for another.

Even this rough classification will serve to show how far from simple the missionary question really is, how the problem varies from place to place, how different the equipment for each particular field, how wise the mind which should know where to strike in, how responsible the hand which would finger these subtle threads of human destiny at all, or move among the roots of national life, which God alone has tended in the past. To the Christian evolutionist these differences are educative. They mark different stages in the coming of the Kingdom of God on earth, none of them in vain, all of them to be allowed for, some perhaps to be reset in the superstructure Christianity would build upon them.

Suppose now the Churches had compiled a classification on some such lines of all the mission fields of the world, it would serve two practical purposes. In the first place, it would be the duty of the would-be missionary to go over that list, and select from it the exact kind of work to which he was most suited. In this way the missionary staff would be differentiated with more exactness than at present. Each man, also, having made his choice, would further equip himself along particular lines, and become a specialist at his work. In the second place, and what is just now of even more importance, it would make it possible for some men to be missionaries, and these among the best men entering the Universities, who see no room for them at present in the foreign field. Some men with such a review before them might see at once that there was no place for them in missionary work at all; but others, and I believe, a larger number than have ever been attracted by this career, would find there something open to them—would find in a service which they had looked upon, perhaps, as somewhat limited and narrow, something which, when looked upon in all its length and breadth, was large enough and rich enough in practical possibilities to make them offer to it the whole-hearted work of their lives. To-day, certainly, some of the best men do go to the foreign field; but the reason why more do not go is not indifference to its claims, but uncertainty as to whether they are exactly the type of men wanted, *i.e.*, in plain language, uncertainty as to whether the cut of their theology quite qualifies them to be the successors of Carey or Williams. These men feel orthodox enough, of course, to be clergymen at home, but they have a secret sense that their views might be scarcely the thing on Eromanga. The missionary theology—it is useless disguising it—is supposed to be a very special article, and a kind of theological modesty forbids some of our strongest men from

considering it conceivable that they should ever aspire to be missionaries. Now this feeling is very real, but I am convinced that it is very ignorant—ignorant of the changed standpoint from which scores of our missionaries are even now doing their work, ignorant of the world's real needs, ignorant of the hospitality which they would receive from many at least of the officials of most of the Mission Boards. And yet these Boards are not wholly guiltless of having made it appear, or permitting it to continue understood, that only those of a certain type need look for welcome at their doors. I am not referring to any particular Church; but I do not think the mission committees of the world have ever worded their advertisement for men in language modern enough to include the class of whom I speak. I am not arguing for free-lances, or budding sceptics, or rationalists being turned loose on our mission fields, but for young men—and our colleges were never richer in them than at this moment—who combine with all modern culture the consecrated spirit and the Christ-like life; for men who are too honest to go under false pretences to a work which, though they be not yet specially enthusiastic for it, they are entirely willing to face, there ought to go forth a new and more charitable call. It ought at least to be understood that what qualifies to-day for the leading Churches at home ought not to disqualify for the work of Christ abroad, but that there is for Christian men of the highest originality and power a career in the foreign field at least as great and rational as that at home. Indeed, so far from such men feeling as if they were not wanted in the foreign field, or at the best that their presence there could but be tolerated by the Mission Boards, I am sure the committee at least of some Churches not only want these men to-day, but scarcely want anything else.

First, always, in opening a new mission field comes the splendid work of the pioneer, the old missionary pioneer

of the Sunday-school picture books, who stands with his Bible under the stereotyped palm tree, exhorting the crowd of impossible blacks. These we have had in most fields now, and their work must still and always continue. But next we have these same men in settled charges, founding congregations, and planting schools, and carrying on the whole evangelical work of the Christian Church. But next, among these, and gathered from these, and in addition to these, we require a further class not wholly absorbed with specific charges, or ecclesiastical progress, or the inculcation of Western creeds, but whose outlook goes forth to the nation as a whole; men who in many ways not directly on the programme of the missionary society will help on its education, its morality, and its healthy progress in all that makes for righteousness. This man, besides being the missionary, is the Christian politician, the apostle of a new social order, the moulder and consolidator of the State. He places the accent, if such an extreme expression of a distinction may be allowed, not on the progress of a Church but on the coming of the Kingdom of God. He is not the herald but the prophet of the Cross.

Of course every missionary who nowadays sets out for a foreign field acquires beforehand some general idea of the lie of things in the country to which he goes; but what is needed is more than a general idea. The Christianizing of a nation such as China or Japan is an intricate, ethical, philosophical and social as well as Christian problem; the serious taking of any new country indeed is not to be done by casual sharpshooters bringing down their man or two here and there, but by a carefully thought out attack upon central points, or by patient siege, planned with all a military tactician's knowledge. We have at present, and, as already said, we shall always need, and they will always do their measure of good, devoted men of the sharp-shooter order who aim at single souls; but in addition to these the

Kingdom of God needs men who work with a wider vision—men prepared by fulness of historical, ethnological, and sociological knowledge to become the statesmen of the Kingdom of God.

Let me spend what time remains in briefly expanding the classification already given—partly to illustrate better what I mean, but especially to furnish a few materials to help those whose eyes, when they think of their future life, sometimes turn towards distant lands.

I begin with the New Hebrides—mainly because least is known about them. The New Hebrides mission represents a class of missions differing so essentially from those of the third and fourth classes—China and Japan—that anyone who was taught to regard it as a typical mission work would be completely misguided; and for some men at least a mission work of this order would be almost the last thing they would throw themselves into. For what are the real facts? The New Hebrides are a group of small islands, a few about the size of Arran, a very few others two or three times as large, the whole of no geographical importance. They are peopled by beings of the lowest human type to the number of probably not more than 50,000, so that they are of no political importance. This does not refer to the islands but to the people. The islands themselves are of so great political importance at the present moment that the allegiance of Australia to England would tremble in the balance if there was any suspicion that the Home Government would hand them over to France. The population may be over or under that here stated. I have taken my figures from authorities on the spot, but any approximation to the numbers of inhabitants on these partially explored islands must be a guess. Whether we regard their quality or quantity, they can never play any appreciable part in the world's story; and the question which would immediately rise in the mind of the man who looked at the world from

the standpoint of evolution would be the direct one: Is it really worth while sending twenty first-rate men to till this vineyard which can never contribute anything of importance to mankind? If it be replied, But is it proved that they will not? the answer is a sad one. A closer study of these islands shows that instead of increasing their population, these are dying fast. On the first which I visited, Aneityum, when the missionaries reached it, there were some thousands of inhabitants. To-day there is a bare four hundred of depressed and sickly souls. The children are swept away by the white man's epidemics almost as soon as they are born, and the missionaries tell you that the total doom of this island may be a matter of some score years. The very church which was built for the islanders in better days has had to be cut in two, and even the portioned half is now too large; and a small chapel is to be built to hold the remnant of this once noble flock. It is a dismal story, but it is more than likely that it will be repeated in time to a greater or less extent, not only throughout this group, but throughout the whole of the unchristianized South Sea Islands. At New Caledonia I found the depletion of population even more appalling; and though here and there an island may escape, the ultimate prospect is almost total obliteration. This being so, what man who entered the mission field from the standpoint from which I speak, what man who wished his work, however small, to contribute to the permanent evolution of the world, would choose the New Hebrides for his mission field? No man would. Yet is the inference then to be drawn that this mission is a mistake? There is a book by an accomplished clergyman called *Wrong Missions to Wrong Races in Wrong Places*. Is its thesis, when it answers this question in the affirmative, correct? I should be the last to say so, though its warning is a true one. For, as we have seen, there are missions and missions; and this mission belongs to a type which ought

to be more clearly defined and acknowledged. In the evolutionary branch of missions it has simply no place at all—no place at all. It is a mistake from first to last. But it does not belong to this class, and is not to be judged by its standards—perhaps by higher ones. It belongs to the Order of the Good Samaritan. It is a mission of pure benevolence. Its parallel is the mission of Father Damien on the Leper Island. Who shall say that there are not, and will not always be, men among us who see that kind of mission, men who have no intellectual apprehension of evolution, but who possess the pitiful heart? or who will say that the day will ever come when the leaders of the wider movement will grudge such men to the lost places of the earth?

I cannot leave this subject without paying my passing tribute—may I say my homage? for tribute they need not—to the missionaries of the New Hebrides themselves. From a recent biography which all of you have read, you know something of the difficulties of their work. You remember the description of the Island of Tanna, the remoteness of its position, the strangeness of its language, the fierceness of its people; you remember how daily the savages sought the missionary's life, and how after years of facing death in a hundred forms he was driven from their shores with scarcely a single convert for his hire. Last June, sailing along Tanna, I tried to land near Mr. Paton's deserted field. With me was one of the missionaries who has now gained a footing on another part of that still cannibal island. As we neared the shore, a hundred painted savages poured from out the woods, and prepared to fire upon us with their guns and poisoned arrows. But the missionary stood up in the bow of the boat and spoke two words to them in their native tongue. Instantly every gun was laid upon the beach, and they rushed into the surf to welcome us ashore. No other unarmed man on this earth could have landed there. It meant that the foundation stone

of civilization upon Tanna was already laid. Every island was once like Tanna; some are like it still. But on one after another the cannibal spirit has been already conquered; schools are planted everywhere; and neat churches and manses gleam through the palm trees, and signify to the few ships which wander in those seas that here at least life and property are safe. At Eromanga I went to see the spot on the beach where Williams fell. Hard by were the graves of his murdered successors, Mr. and Mrs. Gordon. Their almost immediate successor, Mr. Robertson, is there to-day, his large church and beautiful manse within a stone-throw of the place where these first martyrs died; his leading elder the son of the cannibal who murdered Gordon. This monster left three sons; they are all elders of the Church, and life is as safe throughout that island to-day as in England. For the first year of their life in Eromanga Mr. and Mrs. Robertson lived in a bullet-proof stockade. They left it only under cover of night for a few yards and on few occasions, once to bury their firstborn babe. For a year they never saw a European. Their work was to let the people look at them. Their message was to be kind. By-and-by acquaintance was picked up with one or two natives; the circle of influence spread, and after years of extraordinary patience and self-denial, their lives again and again hanging by a thread, they won this island for civilization and Christianity.

On another island, where the missionary two years ago used to see the smoke of the cannibal feasts from his doorstep, the natives brought me their spears and bows and poisoned arrows. "We do not need them now," they said; "the missionary has taught us not to kill."

I have no words to express my admiration for these men, and, may I say, their wives, their even more heroic wives; they are perfect missionaries; their toil has paid a hundred times; and I count it one of the privileges of my life to have been one of the few eye-witnesses of their work.

As to the calls of this field for more men, I must add this. It is a proof of the sound sense of the New Hebrides missionaries, that they are pretty unanimous in agreeing that, considering the needs of the rest of the world, they have already a quite fair portion of workers. The staff, of course, could be doubled or trebled to-morrow with great advantage, but the missionaries do not ask it. With their present resources and the number of native teachers who are in training, they hope in time to cover these islands with mission stations by themselves. I confess these are the least greedy missionaries I ever heard of.

I am sorry that, owing to the shortness of my visit to China, I should feel it a pure presumption to say almost anything about this, the greatest mission-field in the world. What I can offer is but a surface impression, and I warn you beforehand it is little worth. From the old standpoint the work in China seems to be splendid; men and women from every Christian Church in the world are busy all over the land, and small congregations of native Christians are springing up everywhere along their track. The industry and devotion of the workers—Roman Catholic, Episcopalian, Congregational, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, and a host of others—is beyond all praise, and there is not one of the missionaries who will not tell you he is encouraged, that he sees some fruit, and that the future is full of hope. There seems to be great care, moreover, in the admission to the Churches of native Christians, and the belief in education and in medical missions is widely rooted. But from the ideal of a Christian evolution, there remains very much to criticise—happily less in the direction of commission than of omission. This band of missionaries—I speak not of this society or of that, for the work of each separate society is compact enough in itself, but of the army as a whole—is no steady phalanx set on a fixed campaign, but a disordered host of guerillas recruited from all denomina-

tions, wearing all uniforms, and waging a random fight. Some are equipped with obsolete weapons, some with modern armament; but they possess no common programme or consistent method. Besides being confusing to the Chinese, this means great waste of power, great loss of cumulative effect. This, of course, is inevitable at first, and it is not the sin of the missionaries, but of Christendom; and, after the late Shanghai conference, there is more than a hope that even this in time may be remedied. But what one would really like to see in addition to greater concentration, would be a more serious reconsideration of the manner of approach and the form of message most suited to the Chinese mind, and nature, and tradition, and some further contribution to the question how far its form of Christianity is to be Western, or how far a Chinese basis is possible or permissible. These questions might be left to adjust themselves but for one most serious fact: the converts in China, in the majority of districts, are almost exclusively drawn at present from the lower classes. There are exceptions, but the educated classes as a whole, the merchants and the mandarins, remain, I understand, almost wholly untouched. There is something wrong if this be the case. And leaving the present machinery to do the good work it is doing among the poor, I would join with the best of the missionaries in arguing for a few Rabbis to be sent to China, or to be picked from our fine scholars already there, who would quietly reconnoitre the whole situation, and shape the teaching of the country along well-considered lines—men, especially, who would lay themselves out through education, lectures, preaching, and literature to reach the intellect of the Empire. That some men are aiming at this, and doing it splendidly, we are already well aware. It is the direct policy of many missionaries and even of whole societies. But it is these missionaries themselves who are

crying out for more of it. Men will not take the trouble to enquire what some of these societies are really aiming at and really doing, and, in ignorance of either, they regard the whole missionary work as a waste of time and money. The things also which one hears of missionaries, in talking with the business men of the Eastern ports: the contempt, the charges of inefficiency, impracticableness, and general uselessness, are enough to make any traveller, not well on his guard, renounce the mission cause for ever. These impressions are reimported into this country by ninety out of every hundred men who return home from the great commercial houses of the East, and they build up a public opinion against foreign missions most wanton and most false. As a rule these critics have never had ten minutes' serious talk with a missionary in their lives. If they had, they would find two things. First, that there were some missionaries a thousand times worse in folly and incompetence than they had ever imagined; and, secondly, that there were others, and these by far the greater majority, than whom no wiser, saner, more practical, could be found in any of the business houses of the world. It is men of this latter class, and not merely the passing traveller, who are calling out to-day for more scientific work and more rational methods in the mission field. They are perfectly aware that the evangelization of China is not a mere carrying of the Gospel to illiterate and heathen savages; and that perfect knowledge both of the modes of thought of the people and of the true genius of Christianity are needed to direct a campaign that will be permanently effective there. The missionary who is an educationalist, who has some scientific and philosophic training, who knows something of sociology and political economy, and who will apply these in Christian forms to China, is the man most needed there at the present hour. For it is to be remembered that this is a case of arrested

motion, and that the most natural development, perhaps the only possible one, certainly the only permanent one, will be one which is a continuation of that already begun rather than one entirely abnormal and foreign.

It was new to me, though I ought to have known it before, that the Chinese, instead of looking up to Europeans, regard them as a most inferior and even barbaric people—clever, certainly, in a few directions, but with no sort of authority to instruct a *Celestial*. In most mission fields the missionary has a platform simply in the fact that he is a white man, that he came in a steam ship, and wears a hat; but the Chinaman has no such hallucination. He listens to a European missionary much as a London crowd would listen to a Red Indian—half curious, half amused, but wholly contemptuous as to his pretension to teach him anything. It is the deliberate opinion of many men who know China intimately, who are sympathetic with missionaries, who are even missionaries themselves, that half of the preaching, and especially the itinerating preaching, now being carried on throughout the Empire is absolutely useless. Some go so far as to say that it even does harm, that its ignorance and general quality make it almost an impertinence. In New York I met an influential Christian layman, who had just returned from a visit to China, where his son was a missionary, and he assured me that he meant to devote this entire winter to opening the eyes of the American Churches to the futility and falseness of method of much that was being done—being done in perfect good faith—by worthy men and worthy women, to convert the people of China. I cannot verify this criticism; I merely record it. But at a time when the loud cry for hundreds of more laymen to pour into China is sounding over this land the warning ought at least to be heard. I go further. This call is frequently uttered in such terms as to take almost an unfair advantage of a certain class of Christians

—uttered with a harrowing importunity and sensationalism of appeal which, when it falls upon a tender conscience or an excited mind, makes it seem blasphemy to decline. The kind of missionary secured by this process, to say the least, is neither the wisest nor the best, and China not only needs to be protected from these men, but they need to be protected from themselves and from those who, in genuine but unbalanced zeal, appeal to them; protected by sober statements from sober men, who love the work of God, and the souls of men not less, but who understand both better.

I pass now to a country where the situation is more delicate still. Japan is the most interesting country in the world at this moment. The past never witnessed a birth of a civilized nation so remarkable, so orderly, so sudden. Within the lifetime of all of us the Japanese were a wholly unilluminated race. They kept their doors shut against outside influence of every kind. No foreigner could even enter the land. To-day all is changed. They sent envoys to France, who brought back law; others to Germany, who gave them a military organization. From England they borrowed a navy; from America a system of national education. From the civilized world in general they imported a most perfect telegraph and postal system, railways and tramways, the electric light, Universities, technical colleges, and, within the last few months, Houses of Parliament and a vote. The Japanese have set themselves up, in short, with all the material and machinery of an advanced and rising civilized State—all the material except *one*. They have no religion. As was inevitable, heathenism has been abolished, and, as already said, the people are in the unique position at present of prospecting for a religion.

Now this last fact having become somewhat known, Japan to-day presents the spectacle of having already

within its borders representatives from every Church in Christendom prospecting for converts. Even the politicians being fairly agreed—and this in itself is most striking—that some sort of religion is necessary, these representatives are eagerly listened to, and get a perfectly honest chance.

The noblest building in the capital of Japan is the Cathedral of the Greek Church. Roman Catholics are there, Unitarians are there, Episcopalians of different degrees of height and Presbyterians of different degrees of breadth, and Methodists of different degrees of heat, and Baptists and Independents, and Theosophists and Spiritualists, and every sect and church and denomination under heaven. The issue will be one of the most interesting events in ecclesiastical history. For there is no favouritism and no prejudice. When the result is known, it will be the purest possible case of the survival of the fittest.

One cannot at all say at present who has it. It will be some sort of Christianity; probably not now the Roman Catholic or the Greek; and what makes the situation so extremely interesting and the hour so overwhelmingly important, is that every Christian man, and every Christian book, and every Christian stroke of work that are given to Japan have an immediate and almost palpable influence upon this problem. Such is the mood and such is the malleability of this nation at the present hour, that if a Christian of great size arose to-morrow, either among the Japanese themselves or among the European missionaries, he could almost give the country its religion. If there be here one prophet, or half a prophet, or even the making of half a prophet, let me assure him that there is no field in the world to-day where, so far as man can judge, his best years could be lived to so great a purpose.

With the mention of two more facts, I am done with Japan. You are aware that the work of the missionaries has been so successful that there are already thousands upon

thousands of Christian converts in the country. Very many of these know English as well as we do, and many are perfectly read in every form of modern European literature, and as able and as cultured as the picked men in our Universities. The man among these men whom I found was most regarded as a leader of thought among the Japanese Christians made to me this striking statement: "We have got," he said, "our Christianity almost exclusively from the missionaries, especially from the American missionaries, and we can never thank them enough. But after a little we began to look at it for ourselves, and we made a discovery. We found that Christianity was a greater and a richer thing than the missionaries told us. Perhaps they themselves were *second-handed*. At any rate, we must henceforth look at it for ourselves. We want Christianity, not perhaps necessarily a Western Christianity." His next sentence was expressed with some hesitation and much delicacy, but it meant this—"In the past they have helped us much; but . . . they may now . . . go."

In justice to the missionaries, let me say that one or two of the few whom I met were quite aware that this feeling existed towards some of them; and they also knew its cause; others knew that the Japanese were beginning to think them *de trop*, but they attributed it to conceit, and to the general anti-English reaction lately set in in all departments. But all were agreed that the Japanese church could not yet be left to stand alone. What exactly my critic would have replied, or rather how exactly he would have qualified by further statement [of his meaning, may possibly be inferred from the other circumstances which I wish to name. It happened in Tokio that I had the privilege of addressing some thirty or forty Japanese Christian pastors. At the close I asked them if they had any message they would like me to take home with me to the Churches here or in

America. They appointed a spokesman, who stood up and told me, in their name, that there were two things they would like me to say. The one was, "Tell them to send us one six thousand dollar missionary, rather than ten two thousand dollar missionaries." But the second request went deeper. I again give the exact words—"Tell them," he said, "that we want them to send us no more doctrines. Japan wants Christ."

I trust the narrative of these two facts will not be taken as a reproach to the missionaries. If they represent a true feeling, it is rather to their lasting honour that in a few years they should have taught the native Christians to see so far. Of the actual mission work in Japan I can say nothing, for I was only a few days there. But if I were to judge from the Japanese converts whom I met, I would question whether any mission work in the world had ever produced fruit of so fine a quality. How deep it is, how permanent it is, remain for the test of time to declare; but the immediate outlook, though disheartening possibly to individual missionaries, seems to me one of the richest hope and promise.

HENRY DRUMMOND.

QUESTIONS.

AT the urgent request of the Editor, I began to string together a few suggestions, or rather questions, about the interpretation of passages in the New Testament, which have been scattered over many publications; and, further, at his special wish, some disconnected impressions of some of our great scholars, now passed away, are interwoven, just as they rose to my mind and slipped to the tip of the pen.

I. The riches hid below the surface of the earth belonged to the Emperor. All quarries were managed and worked by his own private officers for his private purse. Every block that was quarried was inspected by the proper officer,

and marked by him as approved.¹ Our knowledge of the subject has been for the most part derived from blocks actually found in Rome, and which, therefore, were choice blocks sent to the capital. But at the Phrygian marble quarries there have been found many blocks, which had been cut, but not sent on to Rome. These are never marked as approved; and some of them bear the letters REPR, i.e. *reprobatum*, "rejected." These were considered as imperfect and unworthy pieces, and rejected by the inspector.

This explanation, which passes under my name, was published in the *Mélanges d'Archéologie et d'Histoire* of the French School of Rome, 1882; but I am glad to take the opportunity of giving the credit where it is due. It was suggested by that excellent scholar, the late Father Bruzza; but, as the proof-sheets of my paper passed through his hands, he did not allow the acknowledgment to stand in print. It was he who perceived that this custom of testing, and sometimes rejecting, blocks for building purposes was connected with the words of St. Peter, "the stone which the builders rejected," ii. 7.

These words (derived from *Psalms* cxviii. and applied to himself by Christ, *Matthew* xxi. 42) are quoted by Peter in his speech to the Sanhedrin *Acts* iv. 11. But in *Acts* he uses the verb ἐξουθενέω, "to despise and regard as valueless," while in the *Epistle* he uses the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω, "to test and reject." It is an interesting point that the former is the more accurate translation of the Hebrew word, while the latter is the word used in the Septuagint.² Why should Peter sometimes use the one word and sometimes the other? The view is, apparently, held by some that Luke is here translating from a Hebrew authority, and that he is responsible for the rendering. But Luke can hardly have been ignorant of the Septuagint rendering; and it is improbable that on his own authority he should have

¹ *Probante*.

² See Hort's notes on 1 *Pet.* ii. 4 and 7.

selected a different word. On the view which I have maintained of Luke's character as an historian, I feel bound to think that he chose the verb because Peter used it; and, therefore, Peter addressed the Sanhedrin in Greek. But further, Peter must have been thinking of the Hebrew text of *Psalms*, and have rendered the Hebrew word direct into Greek.

May we not infer that the change of verb in the Epistle corresponds to a change that occurred in Peter's mind and circumstances in the interval between *Acts* iv. 11 and *1 Peter* ii. 7? He had become more Græcized; he now used the Greek Bible in place of the Hebrew (or at least in addition to it), and he recognised that the verb ἀποδοκιμάζω, "to reject after actual trial," though not a strictly accurate rendering of the Hebrew word, corresponded better to the actual customs known to those whom he addressed.

Further, may this progress towards Greek and Western ways and speech be taken as a proof that Peter did not go away to the East, and direct his work to the city of Babylon? Had that been the course of his life, there could have been no such progress as is evinced in this little detail and in many more important ways.

It is satisfactory to see that Dr. Hort decisively rejected that most perverse of ideas—that this Epistle was written from the city of Babylon. They who hold such a view, however great they may be as purely verbal scholars, stamp themselves as untrustworthy judges in all matters that refer to the life and society of the Empire. The Jew who wrote this Epistle must have lived long amid the society of the Empire; and he could never have acquired such a tone and cast of thought, if he had spent his life mainly in Palestine and Mesopotamia.

II. The variation in the power and success of missions in different countries is obvious to the most casual observer. Missionary work does not radiate steadily forth from a

centre. It moves along the lines of least resistance, and its course is determined by many conditions, which the historian must study and try to understand, while the men who are actually engaged in the work obey them, or are compelled by them, often without being fully conscious of them.

Now, let us apply this to the book of Acts. One of the most striking features in the book is the apparently restricted view that is taken of the spread of Christianity. We read of the way in which it was carried north to Antioch, and then north-west and west to the South-Galatian cities, to Macedonia and Achaia, to Asia, and to Rome; and when we have crossed the limits of the land of Rome, and approach the city,¹ the brethren come forth many miles to welcome us, and convoy us into the midst of an already existing Church in Rome. The news has reached the heart of the Empire long ago.

There is no reasonable possibility of doubting that Christian missionaries went in other directions and by many other paths than those described in Acts. We can trace the activity of nameless missionaries in many places, *e.g.* in *Acts* xi. 19, in *Acts* xxviii. 15. Among them we must class the Judaizing missionaries who troubled Paul, in South Galatia, in Rome, and probably everywhere. These unknown workers doubtless tried literally to "go forth into all the world."

The question is whether we are to class the silence of Luke about almost all this mass of active work among the "gaps," which so much trouble many scholars, or whether we should not rather look to discover some reason for his silence? It is plain that, in Luke's estimation, all the other missionaries sink into insignificance in comparison with the one great figure of Paul. They become important

¹ Οὕτως εἰς τὴν Ῥώμην ἤλθομεν *Acts* xxviii. 14, and εἰσῆλθομεν εἰς Ῥώμην xxviii. 6. On the distinction between these two phrases, which with singular blindness the commentators still persist in regarding as exactly equivalent, see *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 347.

in proportion as they agree with his methods, and are guided by his spirit. When they differ from him, they become secondary figures, and disappear from Luke's pages.

Was Luke's vision restricted in this way merely because he was dazzled by the brilliancy of Paul? Or may he have had some better ground to stand on? One may speculate on these alternatives in an abstract way; but the more profitable method is to seek for some concrete facts on which to found an hypothesis. Some facts bearing on the subject are, I think, furnished by the distribution of second and third century Christian inscriptions in central Asia Minor. Elsewhere it is pointed out that these inscriptions fall into three groups, clearly marked off from one another both by geographical separation and by style and character, pointing to "three separate lines of Christian influence in Phrygia during the early centuries."¹ . . . "It seems beyond question that the first line of influence spread from the Aegean coastlands, and that its ultimate source was in St. Paul's work in Ephesus, and in the efforts of his coadjutors during the following years; while the second originated in the earlier Pauline Churches of Derbe, Lystra, Iconium, and Antioch." The third belongs to the northwest of Phrygia; and, by a remarkable coincidence, to the country which Paul traversed between Antioch and Troas (*Acts* xvi. 6-8).

We possess only one document long enough to show anything of the spirit of these early Churches, the epitaph which a second century presbyter or bishop² wrote "to be an imperishable record of his testimony and message which he had to deliver to mankind"; and it mentions (besides the main truths of his religion) the ever-present companionship and guidance of Paul. It has survived to bear

¹ *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, pt. ii. p. 511.

² *Op. cit.* p. 722 ff., where the voluminous literature of the subject is described,

witness that the Churches of Central Asia Minor continued to look to Paul as their pattern and their guide more than a century after his death.

Must we not take these facts as a sign that, so far as Asia Minor is concerned, Luke perceived the truth? It was the influence of Paul's spirit, acting directly or through his followers and pupils, that was the really powerful force in the country. Everything else becomes insignificant in comparison. So Luke thought: and so the facts bear witness.

Further, may this not have been the case elsewhere? Perhaps Luke perceived the essential facts, and recorded them. Perhaps it was only in the Roman world that men's minds were ready for the new religion. If that religion came "in the fulness of time," was not that "fulness of time" wrought out by the unifying influence of Roman organization, and by the educating influence of Greek philosophical theory, so that it was only within the circle of these influences that the Church grew? May it not be the case that the pre-Pauline Church in Rome was re-created by Paul, and acquired its future form and character from him; and that thus the historian is justified in leaving it unmentioned until it came forth to welcome him? Certain it is that Christianity was made the religion of the Roman Empire by Paul, and by Paul's single idea; that Luke's mind, as he wrote, was filled with that idea; and that he fashioned his history with the view of showing how that idea worked itself out in fact. Hence after A.D. 44 all other missionary work, except what sprang from Paul, was unimportant in his estimation.

Is it so certain as many seem to hold that Luke's conception was inadequate? Would any extra-Roman spread of Christianity have been permanent? Would even the non-Pauline propagation southward towards Egypt (which may be assumed as certain) have been successful and last-

ing, had it not been reinforced by the Pauline spirit? Is not the case of Apollos in *Acts* xviii. 24 ff., really a typical one, as Luke evidently considered it?

A phrase which often occurred to me when, as an undergraduate, I was studying Greek philosophy for the schools, bears on this. As I tried to understand the character of those later systems in which the earlier and more purely Greek thought, when carried by the conquests of Alexander into the cities of the East, attempted to adapt itself to its new environment by assimilating the elements which the East had to contribute and which the Greek mind could never supply, the expressions often rose to my lips that these were the imperfect forms of Christianity, and again that Paul was the true successor of Aristotle.

The phrases were probably both caught from some source that I was studying (though I was never conscious of having read them); and, if so, I should be glad to learn where they occur. At the time, in 1875-76, the writers who most influenced me were T. H. Green and Lightfoot. To both I owe almost equally much, though in very different ways. My debt to Green is similar to that of many Oxford students; though I never heard him lecture, and only twice or thrice was so far honoured as to be allowed to talk with him. The quality in Lightfoot's work that most impressed me was his transparent honesty, his obvious straining to understand and represent every person's opinion with scrupulous fairness. In him I was for the first time conscious of coming in contact with a mind that was educated, thoughtful, trained in scholarship, perfectly straight and honest, and yet able to accept simply the New Testament in the old-fashioned way, without refining it into metaphysical conceptions like Green, or rationalizing it into commonplace and second-rate history like my German idols. The combination had previously seemed to me impossible in our age, though possible at an earlier

time; and its occurrence in Lightfoot set me to rethink the grounds of my own position.

III. Why is Peter silent about Paul, when he is writing to so many of the Pauline Churches? This question is briefly touched by Hort; and, while saying nothing positive, he obviously inclines to the view that Paul was dead. He explains away the obvious remark, that some reference to the recent death of their great founder would seem imperatively demanded from Peter in writing to the Churches, by the supposition that the "sad tidings of Paul's death had been already made known to the Asiatic Christians by their Roman brethren or by St. Peter himself."¹

But is it not clear in this Epistle that the writer is clad with authority, as the recognised head to whom the Pauline Churches looked for guidance and advice in a great crisis? The writer evidently speaks with full and conscious deliberation, because he feels that a serious trial awaits the Churches, and that he is the person to whom they look. That is distinctly inconsistent with the idea that Paul was living; and we need not doubt that that was the argument which weighed with Hort, and made him place the letter after Paul's death. The authority which Paul exercised over his Churches, and the discipline on which he laid such stress, would be violated, if another stepped in to address and comfort and encourage them, without a word of apology or explanation, without even a reference to Paul. That would be the act of a rival and not of a friend; but it seems to me beyond all question that Peter was the most cordial and hearty supporter of Paul among the older apostles, and the one with whom Paul felt most kinship in spirit. Especially is it clear that the author of this Epistle, whoever he was, must have been in the most cordial relations with the Pauline policy.

But is this letter conceivable even after Paul's death,

¹ Hort, *First Epistle*, p. 6.

except at some considerable interval? An analogy will help us in this question. Paul's silence about Peter in the letters to and from Rome is, in my estimation, a conclusive proof that Peter had never been instrumental in building up the Church of Rome, until after the last of these Epistles was written. Similarly, Peter's silence about Paul is to me conclusive that Peter was now the recognised successor to Paul's position in relation to the Asian Churches; ¹ that he is not simply putting himself into that position without a reference to his dead friend; but that he can look back over a lapse of some years, during which his standing had become established, and Paul's followers, Silas and Mark, had attached themselves to the company and service of his successor. So Rev. F. Warburton Lewis pointed out to me.

That is not wholly inconsistent with the theory that First Peter was composed before the apostle suffered under Nero, if Paul suffered in 62 or even in 64, provided that Peter survived till 67 or so. But, for my own part, I can see no ground for believing that Paul died before 66 or even perhaps 67; and in that case the life of Peter must have lasted into the time of Vespasian, as no persecution can have occurred while the wars of the succession absorbed Roman attention.

IV. Now that Hort has laid down with a precision characteristic of himself, and with a decisiveness and finality that is almost rare in his work, the principle that the Churches of Asia Minor are classified according to the provinces of the Roman Empire, and not according to the non-Roman national divisions, and has stated positively and unhesitatingly that the Pauline Churches in Phrygia and Lycaonia ² were classed by St. Peter as Churches of

¹ What ground is there for the general view that Peter was older than the Saviour, and much older than Paul? It might be argued that he was younger than Christ, and nearly of an age with Paul.

² Hort, *First Peter*, pp. 17, 157 ff.

Galatia, it is to be hoped that the progress of study will no longer be impeded by laboured attempts to prove that it was impossible or inaccurate for Paul to class them as his Churches of Galatia, or by equally futile attempts to prove that the name Galatia was never applied to the great Roman Province of central Asia Minor, stretching across nearly from sea to sea. It will remain as one of the curiosities of scholarship that in this last decade, after these points had long been taken as settled by all historical students, so many distinguished theologians, after casting a hasty glance into the antiquities of Asia Minor, should print discussions of the subject proving that that which was could not possibly have been.

But if Peter, as Hort declares, classed Antioch, Iconium, Derbe, and Lystra among the Churches of Galatia, must not Paul have done the same thing? Is it likely that First Peter, a letter so penetrated with the Pauline spirit, so much influenced by at least two Pauline epistles, composed in such close relations with two of Paul's coadjutors, Silas and Mark, should class the Pauline Churches after a method that Paul would not employ?

Further, Hort lays down as a matter of certainty that Asia throughout the New Testament means the Province, therein contradicting the recent ideas of Professors Blass and Zahn. Must we not then take Galatia in Paul on the same analogy, and admit that when he wrote to the Churches of Galatia he included among them all Churches within the bounds of the Province?

It has just been said that Hort speaks on this subject with a decisiveness and finality that is not so common in his work. It is characteristic of him, rather, never to reach decisiveness. He seems always to have been keenly conscious how much subjectivity is liable to be admitted into the judgment of the most careful, cool, and mature scholar, and to have often shrunk from feeling confident

in his own best proved conclusions. One of our best scholars told me in a different connexion a story which illustrates this quality. Speaking of the authorship of second Peter, he said he had once spoken to Hort on the subject. Hort replied somewhat to this effect: My first impulse is to say that the same hand which wrote the first epistle could not have written the second. But, then, my second impulse is to doubt whether I can be right in thinking so.

Was it not this quality, which is closely connected with his love of perfect truth and his unwillingness to leave the smallest trace of error in his work, that prevented him from writing more, and deprived us of much that we had almost a right to expect from his admirable scholarship, his wide range of knowledge, and his clear judgment? He that is never content till he has risen superior to the weakness of humanity, who is unwilling to print anything till he has purged it of the minutest trace of error, will write little. But, worse than that, it is very doubtful whether he will ever write his best. While he spends his time polishing up the less important details, he sometimes loses his grasp of the essential and guiding clue. Truth will not wait to be wooed, after we shall have finished the accessories. We must press forward, when the goddess allows a glimpse of her face to be visible for a moment; it will be veiled again immediately; it may be never again unveiled to the too cautious seeker. He who attempts the pursuit must be content to arrive bearing the stains and mud and dust of travel; and, if he is too careful to avoid soiling his feet, he is less likely to reach his aim.

It seems a sort of retribution on the man, whose too delicate and overstrained love of perfection deprived the world of the work it had always expected from him, that his manuscripts should be published after his death by the piety of his pupils—a piety so reverent that they apparently

shrink even from the thought that anything in his work could need correction. For example, in his too short edition of the opening chapters of First Peter, there is an essay on the provinces of Asia Minor. It was written, apparently, in the year 1882, for I see no reference to anything not accessible in that year. Hort was lecturing on the Epistle as late as 1887; but it may be doubted if he did anything at this essay during the intermediate years. He evidently studied carefully the inscriptions bearing on this subject, while preparing the essay; but he studied them in 1882, and shows no knowledge of several inscriptions which (with Mommsen's commentary on them) would have materially modified his statements on some points. The essay is, indeed, remarkably accurate, considering when it was composed. It is, of course, founded on Marquardt's *Römische Staatsalterthümer*; but it tacitly avoids several of his mistakes, and shows an admirable tact in selecting what was permanent and true in the views current at that period. There are few statements that could have been called erroneous at that time;¹ but, surely, there might have been found among his pupils some one who would take the trouble to look over at least the parts of the Berlin Corpus that have been published since Hort's death, and mingle sufficient courage with his piety to correct (or at least to omit) the statements which the progress of discovery has shown to be inaccurate. Thus, for example, the old statement (founded on Dion), that Claudius instituted the province of Lycia-Pamphylia in A.D. 43, appears on p. 162, though the difficulties of this view are plainly stated. It is now established by Mommsen's commentary on a recently discovered Pamphylian inscription that Pamphylia was a distinct procuratorial province for some time later, then

¹ I quote one to justify the criticism. On p. 162, note 3, he ascribes to the organization of the East by Pompey in B.C. 64 the gift of parts of Pamphylia to Amyntas, which was really made by Antonius in 36.

was connected with Galatia for a short time, and at last was united to Lycia by Vespasian.

But enough of the ungrateful task of pointing out faults ! Yet it is regrettable that Hort's work should be treated with such undutiful dutifulness ; and that English scholarship should be exposed to the just criticism of the foreigner, that it seems to be ignorant that some errors have been eliminated between 1882 and 1898 and that these should not appear any longer in print under the patronage of an honoured name.¹

V. Lightfoot has not been slow to notice the remarkable vividness, and (as one might almost say) the personality of the address to the Church of Laodicea, Rev. iii. 15 ff., and he brings out point after point with admirable skill. His remarks might be paraphrased in these words : " Thou sayest, I am rich, and have need of nothing [puffed up as thou art with the consciousness that after the destructive earthquake of A.D. 62, thou couldst decline all help from the Imperial Treasury, which even the greatest cities have sought in similar circumstances, and canst boast that thou hast recreated thy greatness with thy own riches]." And again, " I counsel thee [not to be content with taking the gold of thy bankers, who are a leading factor in the money market of the world ; but] to buy of me gold refined by fire, that thou mayst become rich, and [not the black, glossy Laodicean garments, the manufacture of which makes thee famous over the whole world, and the clothier of the Roman Empire ; but] white garments that thou mayst clothe thyself."

But the next point he has omitted : " I counsel thee to buy of me eyesalve." Surely here the advice is as pertinent

¹ In i. 7 Hort sees that an adjective is needed, and is inclined to accept the poorly-attested reading *δοκιμον*. Why should not an editor indicate that Deissmann has discovered the adjective *δοκιμος*, and thus justified Hort's inclination in an unexpected way.

and personal as in the other points. Now there was a medicine called "Phrygian powder," used by ancient physicians to cure weakness of the eyes. Further, there flourished at Laodicea one of the most famous medical schools of antiquity, which "began that strange system of heterogeneous mixtures, some of which have only recently been expelled from our own pharmacopœia." Finally, the name "Phrygian" was liable to be used in the sense of "Laodicean," because that city was nearest and most familiar to the Greek world; thus, for example, Herodes Atticus spoke of the famous orator, Polemon of Laodicea, as "the Phrygian."¹

Must we not, then, conclude that the message to Laodicea continued: "and [I counsel thee to buy of me, not the vain Phrygian powder that is prescribed and concocted by the famous physicians of thy school of medicine, but] eyesalve to anoint thine eyes, that thou mayst see."

W. M. RAMSAY.

"THE BURDEN OF DUMAH."

ISAIAH XXI. 11, 12.

THE days of the prophets were, in spiritual things, the brave days of old. No nation but the Hebrew ever had a succession of such men. Other nations had their poets and philosophers and heroes; the Jews alone had their prophets. They were more than the philosopher and the poet, and different from the hero who battled with circumstances and grappled with destiny. They were much more than men who merely foretold the future. They struck with strokes of cleavage sheer down through the confusion and unrest of their age, and they laid bare the essential

¹ *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, part i., pp. 52, 44.

order and divine plan of things. They appealed to men to fulfil the divine purpose expressed therein, and they demanded that the nation should stand to its duty as if face to face with God. They were interpreters of God's way and will—*first*; they were seers, men who saw into the future—*afterwards*. Their insight gave them their foresight.

Isaiah is in this chapter shown to us as a typical prophet. A grievous vision has been given him. The King of Assyria had sent out a foe to invade the country. Night—deep, dark midnight—was over the land; and Isaiah stood on Mount Zion while all around the darkness circled. To him, standing on his solitary rock, all the confused and uneasy thoughts of the people seemed to be gathered; just as, in a tempestuous night at sea, birds of far and wandered wing flutter to and beat against the lonely lantern of the lighthouse. To him there, the silence of the night had voices and the darkness gave signs. From the wilderness of the sea, from the valley of vision, from Arabia and from Tyre, voices of complaint seemed to come to him; and from Dumah—the land of silence, the region of rock and fastness in which Edom had his hiding-place—came this call, unlikely and unexpected, doubling itself through the darkness, "Watchman, what of the night?"

This is a question which all the ages take up and put. It has almost lost the note and tone of the finite, so universal has it become. It has been hallowed by the long use which the centuries have made of it. It sounds to us like the deep solemn voice of humanity's loneliest heart. It is the call of those who are waiting, waiting for some better thing, more than they that watch for the morning. We have all heard it; and we have all, in perplexity and darkness, asked it ourselves, "What of the night?"

The Church of God is always asking this question, raising it from among the groans and travail pains of the new

creation; and the sons of God ask it, groaning within themselves, as they wait for their adoption. There is agony in the words; they are a sort of cry. The anxiety is as to when the light shall prevail over the long darkness and be for ever divided from it, and when, after the turmoil and confusion of this formative period which we call Time, there shall be new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Because the church so distinctly knows of some better thing, and that "when the morning appeareth," she counts the watches, and says, "What of the night?"

The same cry, more vague and not so hopeful, comes from the human heart at times without anything of the religious sentiment in it. The soul of man is here, amidst mysteries and shadows, ever on the outlook for something clear and limitless like itself. Finding it nowhere, it still beats about, ever renewing the search. Circumstances and events always, sooner or later, chill and perplex and depress our higher thought and feeling—just like night. Our dreams are sometimes the best things in our life. Men may ensconce themselves in any security or comfort they please, or may devote themselves to some noble life task, or may seek their rest in a philosophy or a philanthropy, or in a Church which seems to them to know and love the truth; but ere long they will be heard calling aloud in disappointment and uncertainty like those who have lost their moorings and are adrift in the darkness. And when men can do no more and have to die, their last word to the grim old sentinel, as the great darkness fills their eyes, is, "Watchman, what of the night? Watchman, what of the night?"

As this question is put in every age, so to every age there is given some man of prophetic spirit who seeks to answer it. We may call him prophet, preacher, sage, or poet; but he takes up speech, and maintains a deep, solemn dialogue

with his age. He talks with the human soul when other voices are silent. People go to him by night, when others are asleep and when lighter cares are left, and they ask him the things that men speak about when they are dying. The prophet's larger thought is awake and astir, environing the lesser interests of life as the sea the land; and his voice is not loud, as when waves beat the shore, but it yearns as when the sea draws its great breath and heaves, holding the mystery of the stars in its deep reflection. And there are always some in every age to whom the word of a prophet is precious; some who feel that he holds the outposts and knows the secrets and has the keys, and whom his voice inspires even when his words are hard to understand. It gives security and strength, in all uncertainty and change, to know that some one of large, far eye is on the alert and outlook, like a watchman on the frontier or a warder on the walls. It is a comfort to have some one to call to in the dark. The prophet's office is for all time. There is a grand succession in his ministry in the house of human life. Both the Church and the world depend in crisis on the man of insight; the man who sees into the life of things; the polar, primary man, whom hearts in emergency instinctively discover, and to whom they call, "*Watchman, what of the night?*"

The reply of the prophet to this voice of the midnight is one for all the ages. He epitomises history, and foretells the future when he answers, "The morning cometh and also the night." For there is a rhythm everywhere here on earth. Things vary and alternate. We have day and night, summer and winter; we sleep and we wake, we have youth and age, we live and we die. Tides ebb and flow; moons wax and wane; the flowers have yearly their resurrection and their death. "The morning cometh and also the night."

Nations rise and fall. Greece cultivates the garden, and

Rome breaks down all her hedges; Rome builds walls, and the Goth scales them; patriots purchase liberty, and by-and-by the people throw their liberty away. And thus, in human history, the continual variation and alternation go on. "The morning cometh and also the night."

The Church goes down into Egypt, and she is ransomed; again, she is bound with fetters and borne to Babylon. She has palmy days, and then days of adversity. She knows revival, and soon reaction and depression follow. Her Reformation grows to rationalism, her noblest Puritanism to prudishness and politics. The church of the parish falls cold and dead, and the chapels become the centres of spiritual light and life; anon the chapel is made the club-house of petty interests in the village, and life and work revive in the church. The dawn of civilization seems to break on heathen Africa when the pioneer missionary touches its shore, and ere long civilization casts darker shadows there than those of heathendom's midnight. So true it is that "The morning cometh and also the night!"ⁱ

And so it is in individual life. There comes reaction after energy; we feel relaxed and unstrung after the effort of our highest purpose; and depression treads quickly after exaltation. We sing on the heights, and then cry out of dark depths; we leap on the hills, and then are broken in the place of dragons. We set out in the morning on pleasant paths, and we are lost and entangled in gloomy thickets before the noon. So it is all too true; sadly, sorely true! It has been, and still is, as Isaiah said of old, "The morning cometh and also the night."

This answer of the prophet might seem, to him who called out of Seir, as cheerless as it was equivocal. The reply does not seem serious; it was baffling and blinding, as if the prophet took a handful of the darkness and flung it back into the eyes of the half-awakened sleeper.

But there was wonderful method and meaning in his giving Seir such an answer. Seir was a place of security apart. Its inhabitants had only a remote, we may call it a curious or speculative, interest in the struggle of the land with Sargon and Sennacherib. That place of security had become a place of silence and sleep, or at most a withdrawn region of dreamy-indifference; and Seir was only turning in his dream and speaking drowsily when he said, "What of the night?" So Isaiah is impatient and abrupt with him. He replies not only, "The morning cometh and also the night," but he adds, "If ye will enquire, enquire ye." As if to say, "If that be all you have to ask, that is all I have to answer." It was a craven question; it was the voice of a sluggard; for Seir was a deserter and a coward while he thus *enquired*. Certainly not a soldier, he was hardly a man worth an answer. If he had the spirit of manhood and heroism, he would arise and stand forward and *act*. It was no time to sit apart and speculate. It was a time of crisis. The night was pregnant with great issues. The Church was in the throes of a great struggle. It was a poor business to be calling from a safe distance, "What of the night? What of the night?" So Isaiah hits this sleeper in the side, as the angel smote the sleeping Peter. He says, "Awake, thou that sleepest! Shake off thy dreamy sloth! Leave thy easy bed! Come out into the black night that hurtles with storm and war! Come down from up there, and take your side and your place with us here! Be a man, be a hero in the great contest! Turn ye! Come!"

This is the burden of Dumah. It is short, incisive, and peremptory. Isaiah takes but a momentary aim, but it is straight and unerring; then with a sudden, swift flash, he lets go in the dark and strikes at indolence and indifference. He is in a noble passion, and he hits hard; he deals his long blow home, and has hit to the quick.

Selfish Seir has got his word once and for all, and it is the Word of God to all time against indolence and sloth.

There is a quaint, old-world ring about all this; yet things are not now so unlike what they were in Isaiah's time as to make this example and his word of no importance or moment to us. The great contest in which Israel and Assyria ranked long ago, and which Isaiah and Sargon led, is not yet fought out. Of it from age to age the words are true—

"Its rear lay wrapped in night; but breaking dawn
Roused the long front and called the battle on."

Might now, as then, rises up against right; the Lie lays at the Truth, and the Truth must lay at the Lie, and the sons of men resist the sons of God. And plenty of people may be heard calling out of snug studies and from refined seclusion, "What of the night? When is the long fray to cease? When is the Church going to put down all the evil, to house the poor, to convert the heathen, to put in order the confusion, and finish the work she has in hand? When is the new day to dawn on the old, unruly night?"

To the old question there is only the old answer, "The morning cometh and also the night," unless we add also the sharper and more personal word, "If ye will enquire, enquire!" But this is not a matter of mere enquiry; it is a thing of bone and muscle, of sweat and blood. "Come you over and help us! Stand forth and take your place in our ranks! Return! Come!" Perhaps this sharper word is sometimes needed and justified. For the men of only speculative concern in the world's great problems are often unreasonable; they who have laid aside practical work for criticism are frequently unkind; and often the fruitless workers are they who have spun the finest theories. The great problems of life will not admit of theoretical solution, but only of practical; they will not

solve at a distance, or on paper; they will yield only when men come very near them, throw themselves upon and close with them in lean, bare grips. They demand the energy of a man's whole nature, the effort of the will, and the agony of the heart, as much as, even more than, the power of the brain. The saviours of the world go about amidst its evil doing good; they lay their own hands on the sick; they themselves anoint the eyes of the blind; they lose their own life.

What light, then, does this old-world Hebrew word throw upon the world around us to-day, and upon present-day duty? Not very much on the *world*, but very bright and clear light on *duty*. Now, as then, in all that is momentous and of chief concern to the world, the signs are perplexing. They baffle the most earnest when they try to interpret them. Some say the world's full day is dawning, and some that the darkest night is not yet past. The day is known unto the Lord; and, when He is making all things new, the evening and the morning are one day. But to us "The light is not clear nor dark; not day nor night." None of us can say much more of things than Isaiah said of old, "The morning cometh and also the night." Our age has the great old problems to grapple with. No leal-hearted Hebrew had a distincter or more personal duty because an army was in the land than we, because evil and misery and wrong are in our Christian country, and ignorance and superstition and cruelty in the world. We do not want men to burden the prophets with the cry, "What of the night?" or to swing round and slow the advancing chariot by hanging on listlessly behind. The man we need is he who is as faithful in the lingering night as in the breaking day; who has never a thought of despair or fear, and who "never doubted clouds would break." Even though the signs of our times were more uncertain than they are, and the tokens of life more

troubled, we must not lose either faith or hope. No man who believes in Christ can have an element of pessimism in his heart, or dare say of any past, "The former times were better than these." *On the whole* the world must be going right; and God, whose thousand years are as one day, is reconciling all things unto Himself, and making them new and better in Christ. It has not yet been proved that evil can ever succeed; we deny the victory to any evil One; we claim the victory for Christ, and we fight in hope. The progress is steady in spite of all the seeming reversals and defection. The Church in the world is as faithful and brave as ever she was; and, certainly, the world around has a larger life and a wider love than ever before.

Still, though all things are destined to good and will come to a perfect end, every age and every Church has its own difficulty and danger. "Do you ask me," said Savonarola, "what will be the end of the conflict? I answer 'Victory'; but if you ask me in particular, I answer 'Death.'" The glory of life on the earth is its struggle, its rising up and rousing itself, its standing forward and battling with the confusion and darkness. It is only thus that a life here can be made divine, and be equipped for eternity; out of weakness being made strong, just as it waxes valiant in this great fight.

"Glory of virtue, to fight, to struggle, to right the wrong—
Nay, but she aimed not at glory, no lover of glory she :
Give her the glory of going on and still to be."

Long as our round earth turns and moves, long as this life is the arena and scene where the evil meets the good, so long shall it be true "The morning cometh and also the night." And it will be only when that which is perfect is come and the day known unto the Lord is fulfilled, that these words will pass into those of later prophecy: "There shall be no night there." ARMSTRONG BLACK.

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

XXXVIII. THE ARGUMENT FROM LAW AND CUSTOM.

In several of the preceding sections, xxiii.—xxxiv., an argument is drawn out, which, unless it can be overthrown, is in its single self conclusive against the North-Galatian theory. It has been shown, in case after case, that Paul appeals to a condition of law and society of well-marked character; that this condition is not Roman, but emphatically Greek in type; and more particularly that it presents the form which Greek law and manners assumed in the countries governed by the Seleucid kings. We have shown that in North Galatia such a state of law could not have existed, both on the general ground that there was no opportunity for it to establish itself, and on the definite evidence quoted from Strabo, Gaius, etc., that a totally different and inconsistent state of manners existed. The latter side of the proof might be strengthened by evidence still unquoted; but I refrain from wearying the reader with too much detail. The opinion of Mitteis has been quoted (see note on p. 441) that North Galatia is marked off from the surrounding countries by its distinct and peculiar body of customs and law, western in type, not Greek or Anatolian. Mitteis is the highest authority on such a point: he has made it his special study. He is confirmed by Mommsen, wherever Mommsen has expressed his views. Their opinion constitutes an argument that must be refuted before the North-Galatian theory becomes admissible. Further, Mitteis is wholly unprejudiced as regards this question. As has been pointed out, although several passages in the letter strikingly illustrate and are illustrated by the arguments in his great work, he never refers to it as an authority.

It may perhaps be said in reply that Paul is speaking from his own experience in Cilicia and Syria, those centres of the Seleucid kingdom, and draws his illustrations and examples, not from the society and law familiar to his readers in their own land, but from those of the country which he knew best. They that urge such a reason are not likely to be convinced by any argument. Paul's power over his Churches lay in his sympathy with those whom he addressed, and he projected himself into their circumstances and their minds; he did not expect that they should disconnect themselves from all that was familiar to them, and should understand illustrations drawn from a society that was strange to them. Even as he writes, the words are forced from him. "I could wish to be present with you now, and to speak in a tone of praise and thankfulness, instead of reproof" (iv. 20). But the intense wish to be with them enabled him to write as if he were among them; and he would never have used the language of a law and society that was alien to them.

XXXIX. WAS THERE A LETTER FROM THE GALATIANS?

The occasion which produced the Apostle's letter to the Galatians was, beyond all doubt, the arrival of a messenger, who reported the state of things in the Galatian Churches. According to the theory already stated, the messenger was probably Timothy, who either had been sent direct from Corinth on a mission to his native land, or had come along with Paul from Corinth (*Acts* xviii. 18) and had landed at Ephesus, and thence gone up to Pisidian Antioch and his own home at Lystra. In either case he rejoined Paul at Syrian Antioch, and brought with him grave intelligence.

But, whoever the messenger was, there can be little doubt that he brought with him a letter, or a series of letters, from the Galatian Churches. Possibly, each Church separately wrote to its founder. It is not probable

that any of Paul's Churches ever allowed a messenger to go from them to him without a letter.

Yet the first three and a half chapters do not appear to be couched in the form of a reply to a letter. These chapters refer as a whole to subjects which one can hardly fancy any of the Galatian Churches venturing to discuss with their spiritual father in the controversial way that is implied, for they are represented as dissenting from him and almost as resisting him.

Moreover, the usual forms of a letter, after the address which occupies the first five verses, are conspicuously absent (see § iii.).¹ Paul plunges at once into a matter which we cannot imagine that any of the Galatians would venture to state directly to him, viz., the charge that he had been inconsistent with himself in the teaching imparted on his two visits, and that he was a time-server. From this he is led into a historical retrospect, which gradually changes into a series of vehement appeals designed to revivify among his readers the feelings with which they had received his first preaching to them.

But, in the last two and a half chapters, after Paul has given vent to the strong and irrepressible emotions which demanded instant expression, and which made him in this one instance write the whole letter with his own hand,² his writing assumes a tone more like that of an ordinary letter, and he uses various expressions which seem to take up and reply to words or explanations or questions addressed to him directly (*i.e.* in the form of a letter) by the Galatians. After observing these traces of a letter from the Galatians, we shall see that probably some expressions, even in the earlier chapters, may take their form from that letter.

¹ On these forms see Prof. Rendel Harris's suggestive article in the September number of this magazine.

² See vi. 11, where I must agree with Zöckler and dissent from Lightfoot. That is one of the test passages for the right understanding of the Epistle.

The attempt to trace the character of that letter is peculiarly liable to lead one into subjective and even fanciful speculation. It is not given to every one to judge with the sure intuition of Prof. Rendel Harris. One runs the risk of fancying one sees in the Epistle what is only the creation of one's own imagination.

XL. TRACES OF THE GALATIAN LETTER.

The letter or letters of the Churches, as we might say *a priori* with perfect confidence, must have taken an apologetic and explanatory tone. They would say that they felt the need of some help and guide and assistance as they struggled along the difficult road towards Christian perfection (iii. 3, compare § xix.); and they found it in the Law. To this Paul refers in the words v. 21, "Tell me, ye that desire to be under the Law."

Besides the argument in chapter iii. 2 ff., designed to show the unreasonableness and absurdity of looking to the Law for help in perfecting what had been begun by faith, Paul proceeds in chapter v. 13 ff. to show how, in practice, the effect of faith was gradually perfected in the character. He fully sympathized with the difficulty which the Galatians felt, and their need of some help and guide in the hard upward path; and he points out that love must be their guide and helper. The "lusts of the flesh" were strong and dangerous; and the Galatians looked to the Law to be their guide and tell them what to avoid and what to do. In answer to their statement that they need a guide, Paul points to the power which will eradicate these lusts, by substituting for them stronger motives of action.

Perhaps also the Galatians had explained that, while they found some of the ceremonial of the Law helpful, they did not think that everything in the Law was necessary for them. They wished to cut themselves off from the heathen

society around them by a marked and irrevocable step; they considered it advisable to have some outward sign and symbol of their new profession; and they found such a sign in the Jewish rite of circumcision. To adopt that rite would profit them in their Christian life; but they would not feel bound to adopt everything in the Judaic Law. Now consider the emphasis with which Paul urges in v. 2 f., that "if ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing. I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision that he is a debtor to do the whole Law. Ye are severed from Christ, ye who would be justified by the Law"; and again how he insists, iii. 10, on the curse pronounced against those who do not continue in all things that are written in the Law. These expressions may probably be designed to cut at the root of the explanatory apology of the Galatians. No one can make the Law his guide and standard of life only in part: he must follow it all in all, or look to some totally different guide.

Again, it is pretty certain that the apparently awkward and disjointed character of iv. 12, 13, springs from the fact that Paul is catching up the phrases used by the Galatians in their letter. "I beseech you, brethren, set yourselves free as I am from the slavery of ritual, for I made myself as a Gentile like you in order to preach to you.¹ You say truly in your letter that you 'do not wrong' me,² but are fully conscious of your duty towards me, although you are making some changes in your attitude towards the doctrine which I preached. I bear you witness that you did not in the past 'wrong me' or act unkindly to me. On the contrary, as you know well, you treated me more like a

¹ On the thought in Paul's mind as he says this, see footnote on the following page.

² Lightfoot says about these words: "Possibly the true explanation is hidden under some unknown circumstances to which St. Paul alludes." In our view the circumstances lie in the use of the words as an explanation and justification of their changed view by the Galatians.

messenger of God,¹ when your inherited ways of thought would naturally have made you regard as an accursed person one who was afflicted like me; and you would have put at my service whatever was dearest to you, had it been possible to benefit me thereby. But I do not admit your explanation that you 'are not wronging' me now; you are so. What is the reason? Evidently you now regard me as an enemy, that you are treating me so. Is it because I spoke the truth to you during my last visit, and warned you of some faults which existed among you, that you now look on me as an enemy?"

Again, it is highly probable that the Galatians mentioned the extreme zeal and interest that the Judaistic missionaries had shown in their welfare, and used the word *ζηλοῦσιν*. That suggested the play on that word, iv. 17 ff.: "They 'take a lively interest in' you (*ζηλοῦσιν*), as you say, but they do not do this in a right way. In reality, they desire to make you think that you are outside the pale of Jewish pride and birth and privilege, in order that you may admire and envy (*ζηλοῦσιν*) them who are within the pale. It is not true zeal for your interest that prompts their action. It is their deep-seated Jewish pride, which refuses to regard you as really their brethren,² which will not put you on an equality with them, which desires to mislead you into thinking the Jews a superior caste by virtue of birth."³ Now I regret my absence from you, and my inability to show you my zealous interest in you; and I should think

¹ It is quite possible that one or all of the Churches had actually referred in their letter to their deep respect for Paul as a messenger of truth to them in their errors.

² Paul is leading up to this when he begins the paragraph by calling them "brethren," and telling how he had made himself on a perfect equality with them, iv. 12.

³ Moreover that was really the case under the old Diatheke: the Jews then did occupy a specially favoured and superior position; and this privilege they desired to maintain under the new Diatheke (cf. v. 2, 4), whereas Paul would now place Jew and Gentile on an equality.

it a good thing that there were always some one present with you to take such interest in you (provided it were done in a good way), and that you should not be dependent on my presence for a true friend. My own children, I would I were present with you now, and were speaking to you in the old tone of affection on both sides, and not in the tone you have forced on me; for I am troubled about you."

When the last words are regarded in the proper light, it is plain that Paul is not prompted to them by any special impossibility, which prevents him from hurrying off on the moment to see them, and that he is not explaining that he cannot go to see them at present. He merely says: "I would that I could have been present now with you, using a very different tone towards you from what I have to employ in this letter."

W. M. RAMSAY.

LITURGICAL ECHOES IN POLYCARP'S PRAYER.

FEW among the records of the early Christian Church have exercised a greater fascination than the letter in which the Church of Smyrna recounts to the Church of Philomelium the story of the arrest and martyrdom of St. Polycarp. Thousands who have never read the letter itself are familiar with the martyr's answer when, as the price of his release, he was bidden by the magistrate to curse Christ: "Eighty and six years have I served Him, and He hath done me no wrong; how then shall I blaspheme my King who hath saved me?"

As to the precise date of the martyrdom, and of the letter which describes it, there has been much controversy. The Chronicle of Eusebius makes a reference to this martyrdom, and also to those which took place at Vienne and Lyons, in a note appended to the year 167 A.D. But critics are

generally agreed in deducing the date of St. Polycarp's death from the notes of time which are supplied by the famous letter, and in fixing it accordingly in 155 or at latest in 156. The letter itself, which claims to be written by eye-witnesses, is regarded as having been despatched soon afterwards—at the most, after an interval of a few years only.

The dignified Prayer, or rather Thanksgiving, which the martyr utters after he has been bound to the stake, has a special interest, to which, as far as I am aware, attention has not hitherto been directed.

I cite the whole section in which it occurs, following for the most part Bishop Lightfoot's translation:—

“So they did not nail him, but tied him. Then he placed his hands behind him and was bound to the stake, like a noble ram out of a great flock for an offering, a burnt sacrifice made ready and acceptable to God, and looking up to heaven, he said:

“Lord God Almighty, Father of Thy beloved and blessed servant Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the knowledge of Thee; God of angels and powers and of all creation and of all the race of the righteous, who live before Thee: I bless Thee, for that Thou hast counted me worthy of this day and hour, to receive a portion in the number of the martyrs in the cup of Thy Christ, unto resurrection of eternal life both of soul and body in the incorruptibility of the Holy Spirit. May I be received among these before Thee this day, as a rich and acceptable sacrifice, as Thou didst prepare and reveal it beforehand, and hast accomplished it, Thou that art the true God that cannot lie. Because of this, and for all things, I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee, through the eternal and heavenly High Priest, Jesus Christ, Thy beloved Servant, through whom to Thee with Him and the Holy Spirit be glory both now and for the ages to come. Amen.

“And when he had offered up the Amen and finished the prayer, the firemen lighted the fire.”

In the last sentence of this noble Prayer the words, “I praise Thee, I bless Thee, I glorify Thee,” recall at once the familiar language of the *Gloria in Excelsis*. Bishop Lightfoot has quoted as a parallel the form in which that ancient Hymn is given in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, where

we find the unusual addition of the phrase, "through the great High Priest." But he has not gone further in the direction of illustrating the Prayer from liturgical sources. Yet I believe that the path is worth pursuing, and that it may lead us to the observation of some interesting parallels, which may be of importance alike for the criticism of the Letter itself and for the history of the beginnings of liturgical worship.

In order to understand the liturgical phraseology of St. Polycarp's prayer, it is necessary to say a few words about a series of documents, which contain Church ordinances on an ever-expanding scale from the end of the second down to the fifth century.

Beginning with the latest date, we have a large volume of eight books, entitled *The Apostolic Constitutions*. Criticism has in recent years cut the binding of this ponderous tome, and separated off its more ancient elements. The discovery of the *Teaching of the Apostles*, and its publication in 1883, greatly assisted the process. It was seen that this document had been to some extent used in books i.-vi., and almost completely embodied in book vii. But it is book viii. that specially concerns us now. This book, which is placed at the close of the fourth century, has embodied large parts of an *Egyptian Church Order* of the beginning of the fourth century. The *Egyptian Church Order* is preserved to us in Coptic and in Ethiopic, and it in its turn is found to be a composite book. It has embodied an ancient Greek book, preserved to us now only in an Arabic translation, and known as the *Canons of Hippolytus*. Whatever may be thought of the authorship of this book, it can hardly be doubted that it must be placed not much, if at all, later than the end of the second century. It gives directions for the ordination of Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, for Baptism, the Eucharist and the Agape, and throws much light on the early life of the

Church. It has been published, together with the corresponding portions of the other documents, by Achelis in Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen* (1891).

It is to the Prayers contained in one or other of these documents that our attention will now in large measure be directed. They are of the greatest moment for the history of the Liturgies, forming as they do an intermediate step between the *Teaching of the Apostles* and the *Epistle of Clement* on the one side and the earliest of the formal *Greek Liturgies* on the other.

We may now consider the Greek words of the Prayer in three sections. I shall underline the words to which I would call special attention.

I. Κύριε ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ καὶ εὐλογητοῦ παιδὸς σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ, δι' οὗ τὴν περὶ σοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν εἰλήφαμεν ὁ θεὸς ἀγγέλων καὶ δυνάμεων καὶ πάσης κτίσεως, παντός τε τοῦ γένους τῶν δικαίων, οἱ ζῶσιν ἐνώπιόν σου· εὐλογῶ σε ὅτι κατηξίωσάς με, κ.τ.λ.

1. Near the close of the Eucharistic service described in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (viii. 14) we find a Prayer which begins thus: *Δέσποτα ὁ θεὸς ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ πατὴρ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου τοῦ εὐλογητοῦ παιδὸς . . . εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι ὅτι κατηξίωσάς ἡμᾶς μεταλαβεῖν τῶν ἁγίων σου μυστηρίων, κ.τ.λ.* Parallel to this we have in the *Egyptian Church Order* (Achelis, pp. 59 f.): "Lord Almighty, Father of the Lord and our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thank Thee that Thou hast," etc.¹

Here we observe a difference between these two forms of the same Prayer: the Greek has preserved, while the Egyptian has lost, the title *ὁ παῖς σου*, "Thy servant," as applied to Christ. Now it is a matter of great interest to note that this old Messianic title, "the Servant" of Jehovah, is re-

¹ I add here a parallel from *Acta Theclæ*, c. 24: Πάτερ, ὁ ποιήσας τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν, ὁ τοῦ παιδὸς τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ σου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ πατὴρ, εὐλογῶ σε ὅτι ἐσωσάς με ἐκ πυρός, ἵνα Παῦλον ἴδω.

peatedly found in the very earliest liturgical forms that have come down to us, although in the formal liturgies of the Greek Church it seems to have entirely disappeared.

The particular prayer from which I have just quoted is not found in the *Canons of Hippolytus*, but a comparison of the different columns of Achelis, pp. 44, 46, 113, leaves no doubt that the title *ὁ παῖς σου* occurred in the earliest form of other prayers there given, though the tendency to remove it is manifested again and again.

We naturally recall the Prayer of the Apostles in the Acts (iv. 27, 30), and such passages as the great Messianic section which begins with Isaiah lii. 13, together with the opening words of Isaiah xlii. as quoted by St. Matthew (xii. 18) of our Lord.

But I do not think that it has been sufficiently recognised that the title perpetually recurs in primitive eucharistic formulæ. Thus, for example, in the *Teaching of the Apostles* (chaps. 9, 10) we have three remarkable thanksgivings, in each of which this title is found.

Chap. 9. For the Cup: *Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ἁγίας ἀμπέλου Δαβὶδ τοῦ παιδός σου, ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.* Here the use of the title in the same context for David makes it necessary to render the word by "servant" and not, as is often done, by "son."

Chap. 9. For the Bread: *Εὐχαριστοῦμέν σοι, πάτερ ἡμῶν, ὑπὲρ τῆς ζωῆς καὶ γνώσεως ἧς ἐγνώρισας ἡμῖν διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου.*

Chap. 10. Here we have the title twice more: *διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ παιδός σου* and *διὰ τοῦ παιδός σου.*

It is noteworthy, moreover, among other marks of difference which show that these thanksgivings are wholly independent of the rest of the *Didaché*, that this title occurs nowhere else in the book.

Let us now turn to the *Epistle of Clement to the Corin-*

thians. The long Prayer with which St. Clement closes has been generally regarded as containing the germs of much that is found fully developed in the Greek Liturgies. Its points of contact with the thanksgivings of the *Didaché* are likewise deserving of notice. Thus at the outset we have the petition that God will "preserve unbroken the number that hath been numbered of His elect in all the world" (Clem. Rom. i. 59)—words which may be compared with the requests for "the gathering together of the Church" in the *Didaché*. Then follow these remarkable words: *διὰ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ ἐκάλεσεν ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ σκότους εἰς φῶς, ἀπὸ ἀγνωσίας εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν δόξης ὀνόματος αὐτοῦ*. Moreover we read lower down in the same chapter: *διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τοῦ ἡγαπημένου παιδὸς σου, δι' οὗ ἡμᾶς ἐπαίδευσας,¹ ἡγιάσας, ἐτίμησας*. And at the close of it: "Let all the heathen know that Thou art the only God, and Jesus Christ is Thy servant (*ὁ παῖς σου*), and we are Thy people and the sheep of Thy pasture."

The triple repetition of the title in this great liturgical passage is the more noteworthy from the fact that it does not occur in any other part of Clement's Epistle.

Moreover, both in the *Didaché* and in Clement it is found in close connection with the same thought, that God has given us "knowledge" (*γνώσις, ἐπίγνωσις*) through His servant. In the Prayer of St. Polycarp the same connection is strikingly marked: *δι' οὗ τὴν περὶ σοῦ ἐπίγνωσιν εἰλήφαμεν*. It is interesting to add to these three parallels a fourth from the *Epistle to Diognetus* (chap. 8): *Ἐπεὶ δὲ ἀπεκάλυψε διὰ τοῦ ἀγαπητοῦ παιδὸς καὶ ἐφάνερωσε τὰ ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἡτοιμασμένα, κ.τ.λ.*

Before we leave this title we may note that it is of frequent recurrence, not only in the early prayers found in the documents brought together by Achelis, but also in

¹ Is this a play upon *παιδὸς*?

other parts of the *Apostolic Constitutions* than those with which he deals. But we see a constant tendency to eliminate it, and again and again we find as its substitute the title *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*. This latter fact in itself deserves attention.

2. I have not noticed any close parallel to the phrase, "The God of angels and powers and of all the creation," though it has a decidedly liturgical ring. But the next words, "and of all the race of the righteous, who live before Thee," may have much light thrown on them from early forms of prayer. "The righteous" is an expression which is used several times in the Greek Liturgies for the saints of the Old Testament: e.g. *Lit. of St. James* (Swainson, p. 292, also pp. 263, 283; Brightman, p. 57), *τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, πατριάρχων, δικαίων*. That this is the meaning here—or, at least, a large part of the meaning—is plain from the addition "who live before Thee," which takes us back to our Lord's answer to the Sadducees when He speaks of the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as the God of the living: "for all live unto Him."

Now, in the prayer used at the consecration of a Bishop (Achelis, pp. 42 ff.) we read in the opening address to God: *ὁ προορίσας [τὸ] ἀπ' ἀρχῆς γένος δίκαιον ἐξ Ἀβραάμ*; or, as the *Egyptian Church Order* gives it: "Thou who from of old hast foreordained the race of the righteous from Abraham." Possibly we ought to restore *γένος δικαίων* (for *γένος δίκαιον*) in the Greek. The passage is found, but in an evidently corrupt form, in the *Canons of Hippolytus*.

II. Εὐλογῶ σε, ὅτι κατηξίωσάς με τῆς ἡμέρας καὶ ὥρας ταύτης, τοῦ λαβεῖν μέρος ἐν ἀριθμῷ τῶν μαρτύρων ἐν τῷ ποτηρίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ πνεύματος ἁγίου ἐν οἷς προσδεχθεῖν ἐνώπιόν σου σήμερον ἐν θυσίᾳ πίονι καὶ προσδεκτῇ, καθὼς προητοίμασας καὶ προεφανέρωσας καὶ ἐπλήρωσας, ὁ ἀψευδὴς καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεός.

1. The word *κατηξίωσάς* occurs so frequently in Thanksgivings in the Greek Liturgies that it is needless to give references for it. In the older forms of prayer we have several parallels; one has been given already from the Thanksgiving after the Communion (Achelis, p. 59); compare also Ach., p. 98, *Can. Hipp.*, at the Laying on of Hands after Baptism, and p. 112, at the Offering of First-fruits; and further, at the Invocation (Ach., p. 54, *Ap. Const.* viii. and *Egypt. Ch. Order*), *εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι δι' αὐτοῦ ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσάς ἡμᾶς ἐστάναι ἐνώπιόν σου καὶ ἱερατεύειν σοι.*

More especially with the words "this hour" in Polycarp's Prayer we may compare *Lit. of St. Mark* (Sw. p. 4, Br. p. 113): *Εὐχαριστοῦμεν καὶ ὑπερευχαριστοῦμέν σοι . . . ὅτι . . . ἤγαγες ἡμᾶς ἕως τῆς ὥρας ταύτης, ἀξιώσας πάλιν παραστήναι ἐνώπιόν σου, κ.τ.λ.*; and the Prayer in *Lit. of St. James* (Sw. p. 244, Br. p. 43): *Ὁ πάντων θεὸς καὶ δεσπότης ἀξίους ἡμᾶς ἀπέργασαι τῆς ὥρας ταύτης, κ.τ.λ.*¹

2. With the words *ζωῆς αἰωνίου κ.τ.λ.* it may be worth while to compare *Lit. of St. Mark* (Sw. p. 53, Br. p. 134): *ἵνα γένωνται πᾶσιν ἡμῖν τοῖς ἐξ αὐτῶν μεταλαμβάνουσιν . . . εἰς ἐπανανέωσιν ψυχῆς, σώματος καὶ πνεύματος, εἰς κοινωνίαν μακαριότητος ζωῆς αἰωνίου καὶ ἀφθαρσίας. . . .* The strangeness of the order "soul, body, and spirit"

¹ With the words, "To receive a portion in the number of the Martyrs in the cup of Thy Christ," it is interesting to compare a passage of Origen (*Hom. xix. in Jerem.* § 14): "What I mean is this: often in our prayers we say, *Θεέ παντοκράτορ, τὴν μερίδα ἡμῶν μετὰ τῶν προφητῶν δός· τὴν μερίδα ἡμῶν μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου δός· ἵνα εὐρεθῶμεν καὶ μετ' αὐτοῦ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.*" I find in the *Lit. of St. Mark* (Sw. p. 42, Br. p. 129): *δός ἡμῖν μερίδα καὶ κληρὸν ἔχειν μετὰ πάντων τῶν ἁγίων σου*, but I have no parallel to give to the actual words of Origen. The use which he makes of the prayer is to emphasize the futility and even the blasphemy of its utterance by those who are unwilling while on earth to share the sufferings of the Prophets and Apostles. His silence about the Martyrs might lead us to suppose that for their "portion" the Church could hardly dare to pray. But at the actual moment of his suffering Polycarp can thank God that He has counted him worthy to receive a portion in the number of the Martyrs in the cup of Christ.

suggests that *καὶ πνεύματος* is a later interpolation (cf. *καὶ πνεύματι* in the next prayer, introduced, perhaps, to complete the parallel with 1 Thess. v. 23).

3. The phrase *ὁ ἀψευδῆς καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεός* is only half accounted for by Titus i. 2, *ὁ ἀψευδῆς θεός*. We find a closer parallel in the Prayer at the Ordination of a Deacon (*Ap. Const.* viii., Ach. p. 65): *Ὁ θεός ὁ παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἀληθινὸς καὶ ἀψευδῆς*.

III. Διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων σὲ αἰνῶ, σὲ εὐλογῶ, σὲ δοξάζω, διὰ τοῦ αἰωνίου καὶ ἐπουρανίου ἀρχιερέως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἀγαπητοῦ σου παιδός, δι' οὗ σοι σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ πνεύματι ἀγίῳ δόξα καὶ νῦν καὶ εἰς τοὺς μέλλοντας αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.

1. With the first words compare *Egypt. Ch. Order* (Ach. p. 113): "We praise Thee, O God, for this and for all else, wherewith Thou hast benefited us."

2. We have already referred to the form in which the *Gloria in Excelsis* is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. The actual words are these (vii. 47): *Αἰνοῦμέν σε, ὑμνοῦμέν σε, εὐλογοῦμέν σε, [εὐχαριστοῦμέν σε,] δοξολογοῦμέν σε, προσκυνοῦμέν σε, διὰ τοῦ μεγάλου ἀρχιερέως, κ.τ.λ.* Compare also *Clem. Rom.* i. 61, *σοὶ ἔξομολογοῦμεθα διὰ τοῦ ἀρχιερέως καὶ προστάτου τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, δι' οὗ σοὶ ἡ δόξα, κ.τ.λ.*

3. But perhaps the most curious of all the verbal coincidences is that which meets us at the close in the words, "by whom to Thee with Him and the Holy Spirit." The collocation of words here is unfamiliar and even startling to our ears. Yet we find it no less than seven times in the *Canons of Hippolytus* and the *Egyptian Church Order* (Ach. pp. 47, 57, 58, 59, 60, 67, 99). Where Greek parallels to these Prayers are given, the phrase is always corrected into some such phrase as *δι' οὗ σοὶ δόξα* or *μεθ' οὗ σοὶ δόξα*. But I find it still surviving in one place in the *Liturgy of St. Mark*, namely, in the Thanksgiving which begins, "It

is very meet and right. . . ." There we read (Sw. p. 30, Br. p. 126): Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ δι' οὗ σοι σὺν αὐτῷ καὶ ἀγίῳ πνεύματι εὐχαριστοῦντες προσφέρομεν, κ.τ.λ. In the Ethiopic Liturgy it is constantly preserved, and is quite the regular form of the doxology.

The illustrations which have been here brought together place it, I think, beyond all doubt that the Prayer of St. Polycarp, whether it be the actual utterance of the Martyr, or whether it be only put into his lips by the martyrologist, is full of echoes of the liturgical language of the Church. I shall not enter upon the interesting questions which are raised by the observation of these parallels. I will only note that we have found them in almost every case among the earlier rather than among the later formulæ. I commend them to the attention of students alike of the Martyrdoms and of the Liturgies of the early Church.

J. ARMITAGE ROBINSON.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

I.

THE FIRST AND THE LAST AND THE LIVING ONE.

REV. I.

THE Book of Revelation is in many respects a tempting one to the expositor. It has not only the attractiveness of that which offers in any measure to lift the veil from the unknown future, but the advantage of being in the highest degree imaginative and pictorial, while it abounds in passages which reach the loftiest pitch of inspired ecstasy. On the other hand, it so bristles with difficulties that modest men are slow to encounter them, especially as its glowing pages have often been perverted so as to pander to vulgar curiosity, and sometimes made to minister to the most unhealthy excitement, in the hands of those who profess

to map out all the future and fix a precise date for the end of the world.

There is happily a fair agreement now among serious students of the book as to the principles on which it should be interpreted. No exposition could now obtain a hearing which was open to the fatal objection that it put an interpretation on the words which would empty them of all meaning to those to whom they were specially addressed. Of what possible use could it be to these persecuted saints of the first century to be supplied in advance with the history of Napoleon Buonaparte, or of any other great man who was to come into the world so many centuries after they were dead and buried, or to be furnished with *data* from which they might learn that the world was to come to an end in 1866, there or thereabout?

Modern critics have been prone to bring down the dates of the different scriptures; but in the case of the Apocalypse the tendency of critical investigation has been to assign it to an earlier period than had been supposed. A generation ago it was almost universally assumed that the Apocalypse was written by the Apostle John at an advanced age, some time during the persecution under Domitian. Now there seems reason to believe that it was earlier by more than a quarter of a century, and that the Emperor whom the writer would have specially in mind would be not Domitian, but Nero, and (what is of far greater importance) that Jerusalem and the temple were still standing, though within a year or two of their overthrow. Since the earlier date has been largely accepted, some interpreters of ability have worked out the theory that the destruction of Jerusalem, with the events leading up to and immediately following it, is the sole burden of the prophecy, and therefore that it was all fulfilled within the limits of that generation. This, however, is surely an inadequate explanation of those magnificent passages which the instinct

of the Church in all ages has assigned to the consummation of all things for their full realization ; but it is exceedingly interesting to find how closely the main drift of the prophecy adapts itself to the theory referred to, a fact which may well lead us to raise the question whether this was not the primary application of the greater part of it.

But there seems no reason to suppose that this immediate reference exhausts the significance of these marvellous visions. Does not St. Peter remind us that what was revealed to the prophets of the Old Testament was not for themselves alone, but for us (1 Pet. i. 11)? We may expect, therefore, that this great Seer of the New Testament, while ministering immediately to those who were exposed to the storms of the passing time, will have visions and revelations of God which are of continuous application to those who shall be exposed to similar trials till time shall be no more.

Not only must we put ourselves in the position of the writers and the first readers of the Apocalypse in order to interpret it aright, but we must read it in the light of the imagination. This great poem of the New Testament must be read in the poetic spirit. It is "of imagination all compact"; for it gathers up in a marvellous way the imagery of the older prophets and seers, so that there is scarcely a poetic utterance in all the Bible which does not find some echo here. Yet it is not a book of echoes. It has its own originality throughout. The borrowing is like that of all great poets, like that of Shakespeare, Wordsworth, Tennyson. You see the relation to the old ; but it is a re-creation, with a new beauty all its own. We must be careful, then, that we do not, with our prosaic Western minds, so interpret the details of this vision as to impoverish its great poetry into very poor prose.

It should be an exercise in music as well as poetry ; for there are few books in the whole range of the world's

literature which equal this in the music of its words; and this is all the more remarkable in view of the blemishes in style, and even solecisms in grammar, which the Greek scholar recognises in reading the original. We all know that many of its passages are of such surpassing beauty that they have been taken up by the best musical composers, and made the vehicle of some of their loftiest flights. One need only refer to the closing passages of Handel's *Messiah* as a palmary instance. If we read the book not only in the poetical but in the musical spirit, it will go singing through our souls as a divine oratorio, in which the leading images of all the inspired poets and prophets of the Bible are combined in a grand finale.

We speak of it advisedly as a finale. It is almost certain that it was not the last book of the Bible in the order of production, just as it is generally agreed that Genesis, in the form in which we have it, was not the first. But it is surely clear that the hand of God is to be recognised in the fact that the Scriptures, as finally collected, make such a wonderfully harmonious whole, advancing from the Apocalypse of Creation at the beginning to the Apocalypse of Redemption at the end; and we certainly shall not go wrong if we take with us, as one of the suggestions for the intelligent reading of it, the remembrance that it is the grand conclusion of the oracles of God which begin with "the generations of the heavens and the earth," and end with "the Regeneration," the "new heavens and new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness."

The English of the Greek word Apocalypse, and of the Latin word Revelation, is Unveiling. Of what? Of the future? Not primarily. It is the unveiling of the Unseen. At the beginning of the book we hear John saying: "I was in the Spirit on the Lord's Day," and then going on to describe how he heard the voice of his old Master, and saw

Him in the glory of His resurrection. That was no unveiling of the future. It was an unveiling of the Unseen, the unseen Christ, present there and then. Again, when, after the letters to the Churches, we come to the more strictly prophetic part of the book, how is it introduced? "After these things I saw, and, behold, a door was opened in heaven," and through the open door he saw the Throne of God. This, again, was an unveiling, not of the future, but of the unseen.

The object of this revealing was to strengthen faith and nourish patience amid the many tribulations of the time. This is indicated in the beginning, where John introduces himself to the Christians to whom he is writing as "their brother and companion in the tribulation and kingdom and patience of Christ"; and it reappears more than once, as in chapter xiii. 10: "Here is the patience and the faith of the saints"; and again (xiv. 12): "Here is the patience of the saints: here are they that keep the commandments of God and the faith of Jesus." Faith sees the kingdom of God in the heavens; patience is needed to wait for its coming on earth. The one is the obverse, the other the reverse of the gold coin of the kingdom of God. Faith turns heavenward, Godward, face to face with the Unseen; patience is the earthward side, calmly confronting the tribulation of the time. It will help us not a little in our expository sketches to keep in mind this plain, practical bearing of the entire Apocalypse.

We may accept *vv.* 1-3 as the title-page, and *vv.* 4-7 as the dedication, including a salutation which breaks out into a doxology, and ends with a general announcement of the main subject of the book. Let us here note in passing the supreme importance attached to the person of Christ. The Revelation is to be the unveiling of Jesus Christ (*v.* 1); the salutation is indeed from Father, Son, and Holy Ghost;

but the name which is emphasized and dwelt upon is the name of Jesus Christ (*v.* 5); the doxology is "to Him that loveth us and loosed us from our sins by His blood"; and the great event of the future is, "Behold *He* cometh with clouds." Jesus Christ is all and in all.

After this introduction begins the great oratorio, with the striking of two chords, one major and dominant, the other minor; the one the chord of faith, the other the chord of patience. Listen first to the note of triumph: "I am the Alpha and the Omega, saith the Lord, the God,¹ which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty." This is the great triumphant note of the exalted Christ which goes sounding on through all the book. The other is the minor tone of suffering humanity, giving the key-note of patience: "I, John, your brother and partaker with you in the tribulation and kingdom and patience which are in Jesus, was in the isle that is called Patmos, for the word of God and the testimony of Jesus Christ."

Now we are to follow the process by which John's prison was broken—not its walls, but its roof—so that, though he was still confined to his lonely rocky isle, there was conferred on him the freedom of the City of God. It is the morning of the Lord's Day, and he is looking wistfully across the waste of waters and thinking of the poor sheep in those hunted Churches of the mainland which were so dear to him. Fain would he be among them; but the "unplumbed, salt, estranging sea" is all around him, and there is no means of crossing it, not even of sending a

¹ This is the marginal reading of R.V., which is not only well supported by the authority of early MSS., but more in accordance with the context. The reference in the beginning of *v.* 4 is certainly to the Father; but after the mention of the name Jesus Christ, attention is concentrated on Him throughout *vv.* 5-7, so that it is natural to take the Lord Jesus as the speaker here, especially as it is unquestionably He who in *v.* 18 speaks of Himself as the First and the Last and the Living One. See also xxii. 13.

letter. As he sadly paces the shore, he suddenly hears a voice behind him: "What thou seest, write in a book, and send it to the seven Churches; unto Ephesus, and unto Smyrna, and unto Pergamos, and unto Thyatira, and unto Sardis, and unto Philadelphia, and unto Laodicea." Looking in the direction of the voice, he saw, by "the light which never was on sea or land," (for he was "in the Spirit,") seven golden lamps, of which he no doubt would have given some description, as did the prophet Zechariah on a similar occasion, had not his whole heart and soul been engrossed with the central Figure in the midst of them.

Who is He? He is a Being of surpassing glory, and yet He has "a human air," He is "one like unto a son of man," aye, like unto *the* Son of Man. He is transfigured in celestial light, as in that great day on the Mount; but the heart which throbs beneath that breast, the spirit which flames from out those eyes, the soul which utters itself in that voice, is the same as in the happy days of long ago. It is the same Jesus. He disappeared from Olivet, He reappears in lonely Patmos. He is clothed in the long robe of the priest, to show that He has power with God; and the golden girdle marks Him as the King to show that He has power with man. "And His head and His hair were white as white wool, white as snow, and His eyes were like a flame of fire, and His feet like unto burnished brass, as if it had been refined in a furnace; and His voice as the voice of many waters." This is evidently an impressionist picture. The first impression was one of joyful recognition of the Son of Man on whose bosom the beloved disciple had so often lain; but as he gazes, the glory dazzles him; the priest merges in the king; the Son of Man is lost in the awe-inspiring Judge. The Son of Man—the Judge: did not Christ Himself associate these two together? The time is coming when the beloved disciple

shall record it in his Gospel: "The Father . . . gave Him authority to execute judgment, because He is the Son of Man." This is to be largely an apocalypse of judgment; so we shall not be astonished at the note of awfulness in the description of the Son of Man, as He appears to tell the things which must shortly come to pass.

"Who shall stand when He appeareth?" Even the beloved disciple could not, "so terrible was the sight." He had indeed no reason to fear; but the suddenness of the unveiling was too much for him. "And when I saw Him, I fell at His feet as dead." The "great voice as of a trumpet" had startled him; but, so long as he only heard, he had strength to turn and stand and look; it was when he saw he fell. "I have heard of Thee," said Job, "by the hearing of the ear; but now mine eye seeth Thee; wherefore I abhor myself and repent in dust and ashes." "And He laid His right hand upon me, saying, Fear not." That touch and these words must have recalled the memorable day when Peter, James, and this same John, having seen their Master's glory on the mount, "fell on their faces and were sore afraid; and Jesus came and touched them, saying, Arise, be not afraid." Yes, this Son of man, with eyes like a flame of fire, and a voice like the sound of many waters, and His face like the sun shining in his strength, is the very same at heart—as tender, as gentle, as compassionate—as in the old days when, with eyes like ours, and a voice like ours, and a face like ours, He went in and out among the people, and ate with publicans and sinners, and poured out His soul unto death upon the cruel cross.

Awful times are coming; men's hearts will soon be failing them for fear; the horrors of judgment which are about to be disclosed are only faintly foreshadowed in the description of the Judge; but to the true disciple there comes the word, "Fear not." Two reasons are given why

he should have no fear. The first is, "I am the First and the Last and the Living One." Love is the primal force; Love is the ultimate goal; Love is the presiding genius of life's mystery. I, Jesus, am the First and the Last and the Living One. This is the clear, strong note which we shall hear sounding and resounding throughout this book in the ear of faith.

What, then, of these awful horrors? See how the saints of God are falling before the sword of the cruel tyrant, *Is Love reigning? Is it not rather Death? Listen again: "I was dead." Dost thou fear death now? Death had its seeming triumph over Me. Was it a triumph? "Behold, I am alive." Perhaps to die again? Nay; "Behold, I am alive for evermore."* It seems to you that Nero has the keys of death. He can say, Let this man be wrapped in wool and pitch, and burn as a torch in my garden; let that woman be thrown to the lions in the amphitheatre—has he not the keys? Nay; "*I have the keys of death and of Hades.*" Have patience therefore. You must suffer awhile; but it is that you may be glorified together with Me.

Here is the secret of the martyr courage. Here is the faith and the patience of the saints. Give a man a true apocalypse, and he is indomitable.

J. MONRO GIBSON.

ST. JOHN'S CREED.

I JOHN v. 18-21.

We know that whosoever is begotten of God doth not sin;
But He that was begotten of God keepeth him, and the
Evil One doth not touch him.
We know that we are of God;
And the whole world lieth in the Evil One.
But we know that the Son of God is come;
And He hath given us an understanding, that we may know
the True One,
And we are in the True One,—in His Son Jesus Christ.
This is the true God, and eternal life;
Little children, guard yourselves from the idols.

THIS concluding paragraph of the Epistle is the seal of the Apostle John set upon the work of his life now drawing to a close; it is, in effect, a seal set upon the entire fabric of the apostolic doctrine and testimony, by this last survivor of the Twelve and the nearest to the heart of Jesus. Extracting the essential part of the confession, the three short sentences introduced by the thrice repeated *We know*, we have briefly St. John's Creed, in three Articles:

We know that whosoever is begotten of God doth not sin.
We know that we are of God.
We know that the Son of God is come.

In other words, "I believe in holiness"; "I believe in regeneration"; "I believe in the mission of the Son of God." Here we find the triple mark of our Christian profession, the standard of the authentic apostolic faith and life within the Church—in the recognition of our sinless calling, of our Divine birth, and of the revelation of the true God in Jesus Christ His Son. These are great things

for any man to affirm. It is a grand confession that we make who endorse the manifesto of the Apostle John ; and it requires a noble style of living to sustain the declaration, and to prove oneself worthy of so high a calling.

Observe the manner in which these assertions are made. Not, *We suppose, We hope, We should like to believe*—in the vague, speculative, wistful tone common in these days of clouded faith ; but *We know, we know, we know!* Here is the genuine apostolic note, the ring of a clear and steady and serene conviction, the *πληροφορία* and *παρρησία* of the Christian consciousness. St. John speaks as a man sure of his ground, who has set his foot upon the rock and feels it firm beneath his tread. He has tested and handled at every point the things of which he writes, and he *knows* that they are so. This is the kind of faith that, with just right, conquers the world,—the faith that derives its testimony immediately from God, and carries its verification within itself (*vv.* 4-13). The faith behind the creed of St. John's old age is that of an experimental and reasoned certainty ; it is the trust and affiancance of the whole man—heart, intelligence, will—by a living process directly and apprehensively grounded upon and built into the realities of God and Christ.

Observe, moreover, the order in which the three statements run. It is the regressive or analytic order—the opposite to that of our dogmatic creeds—the order of experience and not of systematic doctrine, of practice not of theory, the order of life and nature rather than of science and theological reflexion. St. John's mind here travels up the stream, from the human to the Divine, from the present knowledge of salvation to the eternal counsels and character of God out of which our being and salvation sprang. This is precisely the line of reasoning which, in a majority of cases, religious conversion takes. The tree is known by its fruits ; the moral demonstrates the meta-

physical ; supernatural lives vindicate supernatural beliefs ; the image of God in godlike men attests, against all conceivable weight and certitude of intellectual preconception, the existence of its Father and Begetter. Thus the argument of the Epistle mounts to the summit from which it first descended, and concludes with "that which was from the beginning." In its system of thought, "the true God" and the "eternal life" are the beginning and the ending, the fountain at once and sea of finite being. The possibility of a sinless state for the believer is rooted in the certainty that he is a child of God ; and this certainty is derived in turn from the sure knowledge that the Son of God is come in human flesh, that the very God, the Life of life, is made known in Him and brought into fatherly relations with mankind.

Let us consider these three Christian axioms in their relative bearing, and under the light in which the apostle sets them and the purpose to which he applies them in this place.

1. The first article, then, in St. John's experimental creed is this : "We know that every one who has been begotten of God (*πᾶς ὁ γεγεννημένος ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ*) does not sin." It is as much as to say, "I believe in holiness ; in its reality, in its possibility, in its necessity for a Christian man."

Considered from the practical side, this is the first of all our religious beliefs in its importance. This is the vital issue of all the creeds, and the test of their reality to us. The whole Nicene Confession is worth nothing to a man who does not believe in holiness. Intellectually, historically, he may understand every phrase and syllable of that sublime document, and assent to it, from first to last, without misgiving ; but it is all a dead letter to his mind, the expression of a purely abstract and disinterested and inoperative persuasion, like his conviction, for instance, that

the moon is uninhabited. What the man does not believe in he will not worship, he cannot admire nor seek after. There is no unbelief that cuts quite so deep as this, that disables one so utterly from every spiritual exercise and attainment. The cynic, the scorner, the sceptic as to moral excellence, the man who tells you that saints are hypocrites and religion is cant—there is no man further from grace than he; there is none more narrow-minded and self-deceived, and miserable in his ignorance, than the denier of the divine in man. He is the ally and abettor of him who is named "the accuser of the brethren," whose art and craft it is to blight all true aspirations, to destroy that faith in goodness and longing after purity which find in Jesus Christ their refuge and strength. Alas for the man who can see only the tares in God's wide wheat-field! who has no eye but to count the spots and wrinkles and such like things upon the face of the Church which is his mother! With such an ideal as ours, it is an easy trade to play the censor; it is ignoble to plead the defeat of others, who at least have made some struggle, in excuse for our own passive surrender to evil. The one effectual reproof of inconsistent profession is a profession more consistent.

Those who know anything practically about the Christian religion know that it means holiness in sinful men, that it makes for goodness and righteousness and truth in every possible way, that the Gospel assimilates us to its Author just so far as we obey it. And, with the moral history of the world behind us, we know that no other force has wrought for the cleansing and uplifting of our common nature like this. No other agency or system that can be named has produced the high and genuine and thorough goodness, the love to God and man, the purity of heart, the generosity, the humbleness and patience, the moral energy and courage which "our faith" can summon into court on its behalf. Never have these excellencies been

forthcoming under any other *régime* in anything to compare with the quantity and the quality in which they are found within the kingdom of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Its host of saints, of all lands and times, are the testimonial of the Gospel; its credentials are "written not with ink" nor "on tables of stone," but "on hearts of flesh" and "by the Spirit of the living God."

Such evidence Christ Himself proposed to give of the truth of His doctrine; by it He invites the world to judge of His claim. The verdict will be awaited in confidence by those who have the earnest of it in themselves. *Sin* is the great problem of the age, and of all ages—the heart-problem, the race-problem; and Jesus Christ has shown Himself competent to deal with it, under the most various and most crucial conditions. After these eighteen centuries of Christian experiment, despite the humiliating failures of the Church's history, we can say, with a confidence in some sense greater than that of the apostolic age, "We believe in holiness; we know that for the children of God there is victory over sin."

The whole Epistle is, in fact, a reasoning out of this position, an argument upon the necessary connexion between faith in the Son of God and an unsinning life in the believer: "These things write we unto you, that ye sin not" (ii. 1). At the outset the apostle, asserting that "God is light, and in Him is no darkness at all," drew from this definition the sharp conclusion that, "if we say that we have fellowship with Him and walk in darkness, we lie and do not the truth." Especially in chap. iii. 1-9, the duty of sinlessness in Christians is laid down, with its grounds and motives; the apostle goes so far as to say that the child of God "*cannot* sin, because he is begotten of God"—"because His seed abideth in him." This is the subjective reason for a life of freedom from sin: the soul is charged with a living, germinal principle coming from

the nature of God Himself, to which sin is impossible. This "seed," lodged in the Christian man, communicates to him also a relative *non posse peccare*,—a potency identified in iii. 24 with *the Holy Spirit*. But in the text before us another objective reason is alleged for the same necessity, a reason kindred to the former: "He that was begotten of God keepeth him (the one begotten of God), and the Evil One toucheth him not (*οὐχ ἄπτεται αὐτοῦ, layeth not hold of him*)." The expression *ὁ γεννηθεὶς ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ* is unique as applied to Christ; unless, to be sure, we should follow Drs. Blass¹ and Resch in reading, with Irenæus, Tertullian, Ambrose, Augustine (*qui . . . natus est*), and the newly discovered Syriac palimpsest, the *singular* in John i. 13, *ὃς* (scil. *ὁ λόγος*) . . . *ἐκ Θεοῦ ἐγεννήθη. Αὐτόν*, not *ἐαυτόν*, is clearly the true pronoun in this place; and the antithesis of perfect and aorist participles (*γεγεννημένος, γεννηθείς*) unmistakably marks out *two* contrasted persons. His alliance with Jesus Christ, the incarnate sinless One (John i. 14, Luke i. 35, Matt. i. 18, 2 Cor. v. 21: the aorist, *γεννηθείς*, must be understood of the historical birth of our Lord), brings to the redeemed man this marvellous security: "I give," He said, "to My sheep a life eternal; and they shall never, never perish; and none shall snatch them out of My hand" (John x. 28). His great warfare with wrong had for the Lord Jesus at all times the glow and passion, and concrete reality, of a personal hand-to-hand encounter. The conflict between the Divine and the sinful, the Spirit and the flesh within the man, is at the same time a contest over the man between Christ and the Evil One, between the Good Shepherd and "the wolf," who "snatcheth and scattereth"

¹ *Philology of the Gospels*, pp. 234 ff. The saying of Matt. i. 20, addressed to Joseph, *τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν ἐκ πνεύματος ἔστιν ἄγιον*, is really parallel to 1 John v. 18, and to John i. 13 (upon the reading of Blass), since it ascribes the origin of Jesus to no human but to a Divine begetting.

God's flock. Our safety, as St. John conceives it, lies in the watchful eye, the strong arm and prompt succour, of Him who, while He was with His disciples, "guarded them in the Father's name," and who is our unseen Keeper, abiding with the flock, the Shepherd and Bishop of souls "always, unto the world's end" (John xvii. 12, Matt. xxviii. 20, 1 Pet. ii. 25).

It is God's specific property in men that Christ is set to guard; on that, while Jesus Christ liveth, the enemy shall lay no hand. "Satan asked to have you, that he might sift you"—yes, sift you indeed he shall, but "as wheat," which comes out of the sifting without one grain of the good corn lost! The God-begotten keeps the God-begotten—the firstborn His many brethren; and who may limit or qualify the possible integrity of that preservation? "I ascend unto *My Father and your Father*": what a oneness of family interest, a pledge of fellowship and championship lies in that single word! Christ guarantees to the faith of His brethren by all the resources of His spiritual kingdom, by the blood of His passion and by the rod of His strength, a true quittance and full defence from sin. To "touch" them, the enemy must first break through the shield of Christ's omnipotence.

But is the Apostle quite clear and firm upon this point of the sinlessness of Christian believers? The offspring of God, he says in *v.* 18, "sins not"; and yet a moment ago he had said (*v.* 16), "If any man see his brother (manifestly, a Christian brother) *sin a sin* not unto death," making provision for this very lapse and opening to the delinquent the door of restoration. The same paradox startles us in the first verse of chap. ii.: "I write, that ye may not sin"—as though, with better instruction and a proper understanding of the Christian's calling, sin would be out of the question; and yet in the same breath, "And if any man sin!" What can be more trenchant, more peremptory and

logically final, than the dictum of chap. iii. 6: "Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not; whosoever sinneth hath not seen Him, neither knoweth Him?" If this maxim is to be applied with dialectical rigour, then the Christian man must be assumed to be, from the moment of his regeneration and onwards, without faltering or exception, a sinless and blameless man, and he who is found otherwise is proved unregenerate. This kind of hard, hide-bound logic has played havoc in theology; it is not at all to the Apostle's taste. He throws out his paradox, and leaves it; he thrusts upon us the discrepancy, which any tyro who chooses may ride to death. The contradiction is in the tangled facts of life, in the unsolved antinomies of everyday Christian experience. The verbal incongruity is softened, in a way, by the fact that (in iii. 6 and 9, for example, as compared with ii. 1) the Greek verbs asserting sinlessness are in the *present* tense implying continuance, use and wont, while those admitting the contingency of sin in the believer stand in the *aorist* as indicating an occurrence or isolated fact—an incident, not a character. But the inconsistency of statement is still there, and has its counterpart, only too obviously, in the life of the soul and the Church.

The principle, however, is not surrendered because it is contradicted by unworthy facts; it is only by the true principle that the contradictory can be corrected and overcome. The law of Christian holiness is no induction from experience; it is a deduction from the cross and the Spirit of Christ. St. John admits, and deals with, the abnormal fact of conscious and post-regenerate sin in a child of God; he does not for a moment *allow* it. All sin, even the least, is unnatural and monstrous in a child of God, and must be regarded with a corresponding shame and grief; it excites a deadly repugnance in the Holy Spirit which he has from God. However grievously prac-

tice may belie our moral ideal, that ideal may on no consideration be lowered in accommodation to the flesh. We dare not put up with the *necessity* of sin; the instant we do so we are lost. Christianity can make no concession to, no compromise with, the abominable thing, without stultifying itself, and denying its sinless, suffering Lord. "You know that He was manifested, that He might *take away* our sins; and sin in Him there is none" (iii. 5). Sin is that which has no right to be, and Christ's mission is God's declaration that it shall not be.

2. We come to the second article of St. John's creed, implicit in the first—his doctrine of *the new birth*. It is the man who "is *begotten of God*" that "sinneth not." Those who "know that they are *of God*" have learnt the secret of holiness, and hold the clue to its hidden paths of righteousness and peace.

Taking human nature as it is, reading human history as it was and must have continued to be apart from the coming of Christ, the assurance of our text is altogether irrational. Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean, or make saints out of the men described in Romans i.? "The whole world lieth in the Evil One." Knowing myself as I do (the *αὐτὸς ἐγώ* of Rom. vii. 25), the resurrection of the dead is less incredible than that I should live an unsinning life. Every one who has measured his own moral strength against the law of sin in his members has been compelled to groan with Saul of Tarsus, "O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me?" But then he was able instantly to add, "I thank God [it is done], through Jesus Christ our Lord! . . . The law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made me free from the law of sin and death." We "must," as Jesus said, "be born anew"—born over again, from the Divine spring and original of our being. When this was said to Nicodemus, the master of religious lore and the experienced man of the

world, he took it for a useless apophthegm, a figurative way of saying that the thing was impossible. You cannot recall to its pure fountain the river turbid with the filth of a hundred shores; you cannot restore the human race to its cradle of innocence in Paradise, nor send the grey and world-worn man back to his mother's womb. To declare that we "must be born again"—that reform, amendment is useless, and only regeneration will save—is to bid us despair. The astounding message of Jesus was not that men must, but that they *can* be born over again.

The process is hidden in the workings of God. It is mysterious, in the same sense in which all the deepest things of life, and the nature of the human spirit, are so. Every man is, at the bottom, an enigma to himself; the most critical movements of his soul are those he is least able to explain. When psychology has taught us everything, it has really settled very little. *How* a man is "born of the Spirit," "begotten of God," transformed—whether slowly or suddenly—from a doubter into a full believer, from a lover of sin into a lover of holiness, from a worldling into a conscious child of the Almighty, is an inscrutable secret. We shall never construct a perfect science of salvation, nor reach the ultimate rationale of a man's conversion to God. But the event itself, and its moral and material effects, are plain to observation. Such new births of men and of peoples are the master-facts of biography and history. "The manifestation of the Spirit" and His "fruits," the outcome of the interior, spiritual action of Christ upon human society, is visible enough for those who care to see. "Thou hearest the sound thereof"—as you know the wind is astir by the thunder of the waves on the beach, by the crashing of the forest trees, though you may shield your own face from the blast. In those great seasons when the winds of God are blowing, only the deaf can doubt that there has come on the human

spirit some fresh afflatus, a breath from the eternal shores, a throb, a tide, a "mighty rushing" in the spiritual atmosphere, that pulsates from some vast and unseen source. At such times multitudes of men, who lay morally dead as the bones in Ezekiel's valley, stand up a living army of the Lord. Whole communities at certain epochs have been inspired with a sudden heroism of faith, that shines through the records of the past with superhuman light; and the secret of their courage and their victory lay in the conviction, "Deus vult," "The Lord is on our side." But whence this wind comes or whither it goes, in what treasuries it is hidden, how, or where, or upon whom it may next descend, "thou canst not tell."

The apostle would have all Christian men cherish habitually the thought that they "are of God," and live in its strength. They must dare to vindicate their celestial birth and destiny; they must learn to believe in the supernatural within them, in their own redeemed, Christ-given manhood, and to assert its moral rights. The old lofty motto, *Noblesse oblige*, has its fit application here: high birth demands high bearing. The son of God, the brother and fellow-heir of Jesus Christ, what has he to do with dabbling in the mire of sin?—he "cannot sin, because he is born of God"—what have God's priests and kings to do with the shabby tricks and mean expedients of a mercenary ambition, with the compliances and servilities of those who crook the knee to the god of this world and wait upon his favours? Remember whose sons you are, and by the Spirit of the Father that is in you maintain the honour of your name and house, amidst a world that lies in the Evil One. Such is the application that St. John virtually makes of his doctrine concerning the New Birth.

It is a splendid, but it is an awful thing to say, "We know that we are of God." It is to be conscious that the hand of God has been laid upon us, to have felt the breath

of the Eternal pass over our spirit to awaken and transform. It is to know that there is a power working within us each, at the root of our nature, that is infinitely wiser and stronger and better than ourselves; a Spirit planted in our hearts which comes directly from the being and the will of the Living God our Father, and links us individually to Him. To *know* this is to hold a distinction immeasurably above all earthly glory. It is to be charged with a principle of righteousness that can dissolve every bond of iniquity, that treads down worldly fear and pleasure, and makes us, living or dying, more than conquerors.

3. The third is the fundamental article of St. John's belief; it is the all in all of his life and of his world of thought. This last is not, like the other two articles, the declaration of a personal experience, but of a grand historical and cosmic event: "We know that *the Son of God is come!*" - Perfect holiness and conscious sonship to God date from the advent of the Son of God, whose "blood cleanses from all sin,"—"the Son" who "makes us free," that we may be "free indeed" (i. 7; John viii. 36).

The sum of this Letter, in its practical aim, is "that ye sin not"; the sum of its theology is "that Jesus is the Son of God" (v. 5). St. John's Christology and ethics blend in the experience that Christians are in Jesus Christ themselves sons of God. Within this circle lies the entire secret of the new life and the new world of Christianity. This specific faith in the filial Godhead of Jesus is no mere fruit of doctrinal reflexion, no late-developed theologumenon of some Johannine school; the writer heard the tidings, unless his memory deceives him, at his first acquaintance with Jesus, from the Baptist, the master of his youth, on the banks of the Jordan (John i. 29-34). From that day to this he has known, with an ever-growing apprehension of the fact, that *the Son of God is come*, that He has arrived and is here in this world of men.

He has come to the world and has mixed among men, "and the world knew Him not, His own received Him not"; its "princes crucified the Lord of glory" (John i. 11; 1 Cor. ii. 8); for all His coming, "the world" still "lies in the Evil One." That we, out of all mankind, should know it is no merit of ours, but a grace: "He hath given us understanding, that we should know" Him, and God in Him. (Here the verb is *γινώσκωμεν*, not the *οἶδαμεν* of the three great assertions; for our knowledge of God is in the making,—not the ascertainment of a definite fact, but the apprehension of an infinite reality). "This is the only place in which *διάνοια* occurs in St. John's writings; and generally nouns which express intellectual powers are rare in them" (Westcott). The phrase has a unique significance. The apostle does not write, "He has given us a heart to love Him"—that goes without saying—but "an *understanding* to know." It is a right comprehension of the advent that is implied, the power to realize what is behind the phenomenal fact, the discernment of the veritable God (*τὸν ἀληθινόν*) in the Son whom He sent. This *knowledge of God* in Christ is the bed-rock of Christianity. St. John's creed is that of the sound intellect, as well as of the simple heart. It claims our intelligence (given for this end), our studious and discriminating thought, without which it cannot win our deeper homage. St. John has done well to tell us that *διάνοια*, no less than *πνεῦμα* and *ἀγάπη*, is the gift of Christ (cf. iii. 1, 24). His truth calls for the service of the understanding, while His love elicits and kindles the affections.

The object of the knowledge which the Son of God brings is "the True¹ One,"—*i.e.* God Himself, the Real, the

¹ *Τὸν ἀληθινόν*, a word distinctive of St. John, occurring nine times in his Gospel, thrice in this Epistle, and ten times in the Apocalypse; five times only in the rest of the New Testament. It signifies truth of being, *verity*; while *ἀληθής* signifies truth of statement, *veracity*.

Living, in contrast with dead, false "idols" (cf. 1 Thess. i. 10); this God Jesus shows to the world. To glorify the Father, not Himself, was the end of Christ's coming, pursued with unswerving loyalty; the apostle would have misinterpreted his Master had he stated things otherwise, or given this name of "the True," in such a connexion, to any other than Him to whom the Son Himself ascribed it—"the only true God" (John xvii. 3). He repeats the confession of Jesus for his own last sentence of testimony: "This is the true God, and (here, in this knowledge, is) eternal life." This supreme knowledge comes from without to ourselves; [it is truth disclosed to us, not evolved within us or reflected from our own ideas. But it does not stop there; if we truly apprehend it, then it apprehends us in turn, absorbing us into itself, into Him whom it reveals; so that "we are in the True One," since we are—and so far as we are—"in His Son Jesus Christ."

Dogmatic theology, greedy of proof-texts, has made out of the last clause of verse 20 an affirmation, superfluous after all that the Apostle has said and foreign to this passage, of the proper Deity of Christ. What St. John has to do is to seal his Letter with the assurance to his once pagan readers that now, beyond doubt, they hold and grasp the *very God* in Christ, and are no longer mocked with vain idols and phantoms of blessedness; they are no more, as in heathen days, *ἐλπίδα μὴ ἔχοντες καὶ ἄθεοι ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ* (Eph. ii. 12). In this faith well may they, as they surely can, *guard themselves from idols*. No other, no slighter faith will save pagan or Christian, the plain man or the theologian, from the idols of his own imagining.

They know that the Son of God is come by "the witness in" them, "the Spirit He has given" (v. 10; iii. 24, etc.), by their "anointing from the Holy One," by their own changed life and character, by "the true light" that "shines" on all things for them (ii. 5-8, 20; iii. 14, 19;

iv. 16 f.). He has not come to "the world" as to some material *κόσμος*, a mere foothold in space and time; but in truth to that temple and inner centre of the world, the individual heart. When Christ comes to "dwell in the heart by faith," He has come indeed; then at last the Son of man has where to lay His head, and to build His throne. Those *know* that He has come who have so "received Him," to whom accordingly He "has given right to become children of God, those that believe in His name" (John i. 12; Eph. iii. 17, 19).

The man thus redeemed by the Son of God carries in his heart the pledge of his Redeemer's world-wide victory. It is no limited, personal salvation that St. John conceives in these large outlines. He has just spoken of "the whole world" (*ὁ κόσμος ὅλος*, the world *as a whole*, in its collective nature and structure) as "lying in the Evil One"—in the domain and under the hand of Satan.¹ The expression recalls the scene of the Third Temptation of our Lord (Matt. iv. 8-11; Luke iv. 5-8), when the devil showed to Jesus from an exceeding high mountain "all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them"—in the midst of it at Rome, the ostensible lord of the nations, Tiberius Cæsar, the most Satanic ruler known to history, with his angel's face and fiend's heart; and the usurper dared to say, seeming to say truly, "All this is delivered unto *me*, and to whomsoever I will I give it!" But listen to Jesus and He shall speak: "All things are delivered unto *Me*, of My Father," "All authority is given unto Me, in heaven and upon earth!" Which, pray, of those two counter-claims

¹ Ἐν τ. πονηρῷ κείται: "The phrase answers to the εἶναι ἐν τ. ἀληθινῷ that follows, and to the characteristic Pauline ἐν Χριστῷ. Cf. iii. 24; iv. 15. The connexion shows beyond question that τῷ πονηρῷ is masculine, and the converse of κείται ἐν τ. πον. is given in John xvii. 15, ἵνα τηρήσῃς ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ. A close parallel to this expression is found in Sophocles, *Ced. Col.* 247, ἐν ὑμῖν ὡς θεῶ κείμεθα τλάμονες" (Westcott).

is legitimate? which of those rival masters is finally to dominate the earth?

“The world lieth in the Evil One”: so it was, beyond all question, in the apostle’s day, under the empire of Tiberius, of Nero, of Domitian; and such is the case to a very large extent at this modern date. “But (δέ) ¹ the Son of God is come!” Against all the evils and miseries of the time, against the crimes and ruin of the ages, as against our personal guilt and impotence, there is that one fact to set; and it is sufficient. He has come to “destroy the works of the devil,” to “root out every plant which our heavenly Father had not planted”; and Christ is doing this, through the hands of His servants, upon a wider scale and with more fruitful and visible results than ever before. He will not fail nor be discouraged, until the work of uprooting and replanting is complete. “The strong man armed keepeth his goods in peace,” till there comes “the stronger than he”; then there is a stripping and a spoiling.

The Son of God has not come into this world to be defeated. He did not fare forth upon a generous but doubtful adventure, nor sit down to the siege without first counting the cost. He has set His imperial foot down upon this earth, and He will not draw it back. Its soil has been stained and stamped with His blood; the purchase mark is ineffaceable. He has lifted up before all the nations the banner of His cross, which floats a victorious ensign over seas and continents; and to Him shall the gathering of the peoples be.

GEORGE G. FINDLAY.

¹ How is it that the Revisers failed to restore this antithesis? Dr. Westcott, of course, notes it, and makes much of it: “The third affirmation is introduced by the adversative particle (ὁδ. δέ). There is—this seems to be the line of thought—a startling antithesis in life of good and evil. We have been made to feel it in all its intensity. But, at the same time, we can face it in faith.” St. John uses δέ but seldom as compared with καί, and never without distinctive meaning.

*A HISTORICAL COMMENTARY ON THE EPISTLE
TO THE GALATIANS.*

ADDITION TO SECTION XL.

THROUGH a mistake on my own part, I allowed this section to be printed without the improvements which I intended to make, thinking it was not to appear till February. The insertion of the following sentence at the end of Section XXXIX., p. 60, will be enough to make clear my intention.

In order to test the idea that St. Paul's expression in this Epistle was influenced by the terms of a letter from the Galatic Churches, we must suppose for the moment that the idea is true: accordingly in Section XL. all that can be advanced in its favour is brought together. Thus in the succeeding sections the truth or error of the idea will be tested more easily.

Perhaps the fact that the first three and a half chapters obviously spring from the report of a delegate, and not from a letter of the Galatians, may seem to many to constitute a proof that the whole Epistle should be taken in the same way; and it must be conceded that nothing in the Epistle imperatively demands that such a letter lay before Paul as he wrote. The knowledge which he shows of the Galatian desires and aims may quite well have been gained from the report of a trusty messenger like Timothy. The strongest argument in favour of a letter, and the one which suggested the idea to me, is contained in v. 2 f. (fully discussed in p. 60 f.): Paul would hardly urge that they who adopt part of the Law are bound to adopt the whole Law, except in answer to a plea that they wished to adopt only part. They who are bent on complete acceptance of the Law will not be deterred by an argument that if they begin they must go through to the end. The confident assumption that their aim was limited seems more likely

to be founded on their own statement than on that of a messenger.

XLI. ST. PAUL'S VISITS TO THE GALATIC CHURCHES.

Nowhere are the immediate personal relations between Paul and the Galatic Christians so minutely described as in the verses iv. 12 ff. Here, therefore, is the suitable place to collect the evidence which the Epistle affords as to the previous connexion between them. The following points have been generally accepted as naturally following from the words used by the Apostle. It is better to avoid disputed points as far as possible; and therefore I would concentrate attention chiefly on the facts on which Lightfoot and Zöckler are agreed; for they may be taken as specially good representatives of the general opinion in Britain and Germany on the interpretation of all details in the text.

Paul had already visited the Galatic Churches twice, and distinguishes between his first and his second visit,¹ iv. 13, "I preached the Gospel to you the former time" (marginal reading of Revised Version).

It might seem sufficient that Lightfoot and Zöckler are agreed in this interpretation. But the point is occasionally disputed, and Prof. Blass² has recently added his weighty authority to the opposite view—viz., that τὸ πρότερον here merely means "at a former time." Lightfoot's note seems to me to show beyond question the fallacy of this view, which he carefully considers and dismisses. His argument is elucidated and confirmed by the two following considerations.

(a) On the opposite side 1 *Timothy* i. 13 is quoted as a case in which Paul uses τὸ πρότερον in the sense of

¹ On the sense of τὸ πρότερον see Lightfoot's note. Zöckler assumes the same sense without discussion (pp. 69b, 113).

² *Grammatik des N.T. Griech.*

“formerly.” Lightfoot, however, sees what escapes his opponents—that this is not a parallel case. In 1 *Timothy* i. 13¹ τὸ πρότερον materially influences the meaning of the whole sentence; it means “previously, but not at the time in question”; and the sentence would not be correct if τὸ πρότερον were omitted. Thus the adverb expresses a direct and emphatic contrast between the earlier and the later time.

Now, it is impossible to understand that in Galatians iv. 13 τὸ πρότερον indicates such a contrast as in 1 *Timothy* i. 13. It would be absurd to translate “You know that it was because of bodily disease that I preached the Gospel to you at a former, but not at a later, time.” This would be meaningless, except as distinguishing two visits.

Suppose now that Prof. Blass is right, and that the verse only means, “You know that it was because of disease that I preached to you at a former time.” The adverb here might be omitted, and the meaning would be as perfect and complete as it is when the adverb is expressed. Is this characteristic of Paul? Is it even permissible? For my own part I cannot admit that in this letter a single word is used in an otiose and useless way. Τὸ πρότερον must have a marked and distinct sense—all the more so because it occupies the emphatic position at the end of a clause. As Lightfoot says, “it is difficult to explain the emphasis,” except by interpreting “the former of my two visits to Galatia.”

The only objection to this is that it is true Greek; and some scholars have made up their mind that Paul and Luke were quite unable to distinguish between a comparative and a superlative.

¹ Πιστὸν με ἠγήσατο, θέμενος εἰς διακονίαν, τὸ πρότερον ὄντα βλάσφημον: “he counted me faithful, appointing me to his service, though I had previously been a blasphemer.” Paul had ceased to be a blasphemer before he was appointed. If τὸ πρότερον were omitted, the meaning would be that he was appointed while still a blasphemer.

(b) Again, if we take τὸ πρότερον here in the bare sense of "formerly," we must infer that Paul had preached the Gospel to the Galatic Churches only once. It would be absurd in itself, and is wholly irreconcilable with the historical narrative in *Acts*, that Paul should claim to have preached twice by reason of bodily illness. Here he distinctly refers to one definite occasion, one definite visit, on which sickness was the reason why it came about that he evangelized.¹ Therefore, either he had only once before "preached the Gospel" to the Galatians,² or he must make some distinction between the two visits; and use words referring only to one of them; and the distinction can lie only in the adverb τὸ πρότερον. Sickness was the cause on the former occasion, but not on the second.

We know from *Acts*, alike on the North and the South Galatian theory, that Paul's words can only refer to the first visit, for his second visit was planned with the firm resolve and intention to preach to those Churches. Why struggle to avoid the obvious truth, that τὸ πρότερον has its plain and natural sense of "the former of two occasions?"

Assuming, then, that in iv. 13 Paul indicates that he had twice visited the Galatic territory, we ask whether any further references occur in the Epistle to the two visits and to the relations between him and the Galatic Christians on each occasion.

On the first visit the reception given the Apostle and his gospel by the Galatians was extraordinarily kind, cordial, and even enthusiastic. "Ye received me as an angel of God, even as Christ Jesus." They were hardly satisfied

¹ Notice the aorist εὐηγγελισάμην.

² Mr. Vernon Bartlet takes this view, placing the composition of *Galatians* at Antioch in the interval between Paul's return from Pamphylia and his visit to Jerusalem in *Acts* xv. 3 ff. He thus avoids one difficulty; but τὸ πρότερον remains idle and unnecessary. According to Zöckler, the same date was advocated by Calvin, and by some German scholars.

with treating him as an ordinary human being: they regarded him as a special heaven-sent messenger. They congratulated themselves on their happy lot in that Paul had come among them (iv. 15).

On the second visit the reception had not been so absolutely cordial and enthusiastic. Twice in this letter¹ he refers to the fact that he is now repeating warnings and reproofs which he had already given: "as we said before, so say I now again" (i. 9): "I testify again to every man that receiveth circumcision that he is a debtor to do the whole Law" (v. 3). These former warnings would not have been given unless Paul had felt they were needed. Moreover the words of iv. 16, "Am I become your enemy because I tell you the truth?" must refer to free exhortation, not unmingled with reproof, during the second visit. Paul feels that there has already come into existence a feeling amongst the Galatians that he has been holding them back from what is best for them; and he regards this as due to former plain speaking on his part, which can only be the language used by him during the second visit.

It is, however, also clear that, on the whole, the second visit was a successful one. "Ye were running well" (v. 7), proves that; and moreover the Epistle as a whole indubitably implies (as all interpreters are agreed) that the bad news which elicited the letter had come to Paul as a complete surprise. He left them running, apparently, a good race in the proper course; and the first news that he received (after a certain interval had elapsed) was that disaffection and change were rapidly spreading, and that his own Churches were moving rapidly in a retrograde direction.²

¹ As Zöckler, p. 73, points out.

² Lightfoot, p. 25 (who puts *Gal.* late, and near *Rom.*) admits (as he was bound to do) that Paul at Ephesus was in regular correspondence with the Galatic Churches. This would be quite inconsistent with the idea that a schism

A certain interval had elapsed between the second visit and the Epistle, so that he can contrast their conduct in his absence and in his presence.¹ The length of interval needed will be estimated variously by different persons according to their conception of the possible scope of the words "so quickly" in i. 6.² There came emissaries (doubtless from Jerusalem ultimately) not long after Paul's second visit; and these produced a marked effect, which spread rapidly from congregation to congregation. But the change began some time before Paul heard of it; and he did not learn about it till it was well advanced.

At the same time, while Paul, during his second visit, was speaking very freely on a tendency towards Judaism which was already perceptible in the Galatic Churches, he also used words or performed acts which were taken by some persons as equivalent to an admission (1) that he regarded circumcision (implying, of course, observance of the Law as a whole) as incumbent either on Christians generally, or at least on those who were to attain a position of importance and responsibility in the Church; (2) that he was only a messenger and subordinate of the original and leading apostles in Jerusalem.

The former of these two misconceptions is clearly referred to in v. 11, "If I still preach circumcision, why do the Judaistic party persecute me?" and it led to the further misrepresentation that Paul was insincere in these words or acts, and used them only to curry favour with a party which was so powerful that he shrank from offending it openly (i. 10). See Section VI. p. 17 ff.

The second misconception obviously underlies the whole

had begun, and was progressing shortly after he left Galatia, for he would have learned what was going on in the churches (see section v. p. 413).

¹ "*Doch scheint nach Gal. iv. 18 seit des Apostel's Abreise aus Galatien immerhin einige Zeit vergangen zu sein*"; Zöckler, p. 72 *ad fin.*

² See above, section v. p. 411 f. Lightfoot's view that the interval is to be measured from the first visit seems not justifiable.

argument in chapters i. and ii., and has already been considered in Section VI. p. 19.

Probably no one will maintain that these misconceptions were caused by Paul's words and acts during his first visit. The Epistle, as a whole, from first to last, bears on its face the plain intention to bring back the Galatic Christians to their first frame of mind. "They began spiritually, they seek to complete their religious course by physical ritual." On this see Section VI. p. 17.

The historical inferences from the Epistle as to Paul's relations to the Galatic Churches are, then, clear. His first visit had been one of unclouded and brilliant success, calculated to give extraordinary encouragement to the non-Jewish Christians everywhere. A new step had been taken, and it was entirely confirmed by the manifest signs of God's favour. God had "supplied to them the Spirit; He had wrought miracles among them"; and all this had resulted, not from their "performing any part of the Jewish ritual," but purely from "the willing hearing which comes of faith"¹ (iii. 2 and 5). That was the confirmation which had defended Peter's action in the case of Cornelius: "The Spirit fell on all them which heard the word: and the champions of-circumcision were amazed because that on the Gentiles also was poured out the gift of the Holy Spirit (*Acts* x. 44, 45).

Now at what point in the narrative of Acts does such a stage of the great question naturally fall? Here we have a Gentile province, in the heart of Asia Minor, evangelized; and at once the Divine Spirit, by manifest, indubitable, external signs—signs which were clearly displayed to the senses of every onlooker—is imparted to them and recognised generally as dwelling among them. It is obvious that this is the precise stage which was made

¹ This is Lightfoot's rendering. Zöckler similarly, "*Aufnahme der evangelischen Predigt im Glauben.*"

known by Paul and Barnabas to the Christians of Phœnicia and Samaria, when they "declared the conversion of the Gentiles, and caused great joy to all the brethren" (*Acts* xv. 3). It was an epoch-making step; and, if this step in advance resulted soon afterwards in those Galatic Churches retrogressing into Judaism, the blow to Paul's gospel would have been most severe and probably fatal. The very importance of the step, the joy that it caused to the non-Hebrew Churches, made the possible defection of those Galatic Churches a crisis of the gravest character. From *Acts* we see what an epoch-making step was taken when the South-Galatian Churches were converted. From the Epistle we gather what a serious crisis it was to Paul when the Churches of Galatia showed symptoms of schism. Why suppose that the Churches in South Galatia are not "Churches of Galatia"? Why try to make an artificial separation? It is answered that Paul could not call his Churches in South Galatia by the title of the "Churches of Galatia." Yet it is admitted that only a very few years later Peter summed up these Churches in South Galatia among his Churches of Galatia. If Peter used about A.D. 64¹ the Roman system of classifying these Pauline Churches according to the Province in which they were situated—the invariable method of the Church in all later time—why could not Paul classify his own Churches in that way about 53-57? Whether is it more likely that Paul the Roman would employ the Roman principle from the first, or that Peter the Palestinian would substitute the Roman principle for Paul's non-Roman system? But this is a digression.

Now, as to the second visit, we have seen that during it there were some signs of trouble: the ideal harmony that reigned between Paul and his Galatian converts on the

¹ Our argument here is directed against scholars who admit that date: for my own part, I think that Peter wrote about 80.

first visit was not maintained on the second. At what point in the narrative of *Acts* are the complications of that visit most naturally to be placed?

The answer cannot be for a moment doubtful. In *Acts* we have a picture of the Church as it passed through the stages of this struggle; and the second Galatian visit clearly harmonizes with the stage described as resulting from the apostolic council. Every feature of the second visit, shown in the Epistle, is either expressly attested or natural and probable in Paul's second journey through South Galatia (xvi. 1-5).

1. With the constant stream of communication between Syria and the West that poured along the great route, it is practically certain that the struggle in Antioch would rouse some echo in the South-Galatian Churches. There was a considerable Jewish population in that country; it was influential, politically, socially, and, above all, as regards religion;¹ many of the pagans had long been to some degree under the influence of Jewish ideas. There were Jews in the new Churches, though the mass were converted pagans.

It is natural and probable that some tendency towards Judaic ceremonies should exist from beforehand among many of the converts: indeed, it was inevitable that this should be so. They had of old been influenced by the impressive character of the Jewish faith; they heard the Gospel first in the synagogue; and Paul's arguments were regularly drawn from the Jewish Prophets and Law. This produced a tendency which Paul had to warn them against on his second visit; and the man who had just come from the conflict in Jerusalem and Antioch would not be slow to warn them of the possible dangers of that tendency.

2. Paul's words and acts on the second visit had

¹ On this point see my *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia*, ch. xv., The Jews in Phrygia.

created the impression that he regarded circumcision as a duty. Lightfoot fully recognises¹ that this impression was due to Paul's action at Lystra in his second journey, *Acts* xvi. 2, and that this affords an argument in favour of the South-Galatian theory. He circumcised Timothy. The act was seized on by his enemies, and was certainly open to misconstruction.

3. His words and acts on that second Galatian visit had also been construed as an attempt to please men. Such, too, was sure to be the case on his journey in South Galatia, *Acts* xvi. 1-5. It was natural that one who was loyally carrying out a compromise and going as far as possible in the hope of conciliating the Jews should thus be misunderstood. His action to Timothy was easily set in that light. The action can be defended; but every one must feel that it is one of those acts which need defence, not one whose propriety is obvious and indisputable.

4. His conduct on the second visit further suggested that he was merely a messenger and subordinate of the apostolic leaders in Jerusalem. Similarly, on his journey in South Galatia, he actually appeared as a messenger, and "delivered them the decrees for to keep, which had been ordained of the apostles and elders that were at Jerusalem" (*Acts* xvi. 4): the misinterpretation referred to in the Epistle was quite natural as a corollary from that action.

5. The second visit was successful in its issue: Paul seemed to have eradicated the dangerous tendencies. That also was the case with the second journey through the Churches in South Galatia; "the Churches were strengthened in the Faith" (*Acts* xvi. 5). The words read as if they were an explanatory note on the Epistle to the Galatians. And that is the character of the narrative of *Acts* as a whole, when the South-Galatian theory is

¹ See his note on v. 11, p. 206. See also his remarks on p. 29.

applied. The facts recorded in the History fit the Epistle: the Epistle is elucidated throughout by the History.

Now, let any one attempt to do this for the North-Galatian theory. It is admittedly impossible. The one authority does not fit the other. The events and emotions recorded in *Acts* xvi. do not suit the first visit, those recorded in *Acts* xviii. do not suit the second visit, as these visits are alluded to in the Epistle. The North-Galatian theory ends in that pathetic conclusion, the refuge of despair, that the most striking fact about the History of Luke is "the gaps" in it. And the inevitable inference from that theory—an inference drawn by all its adherents—is that the author of that History, the intimate friend and companion of Paul, was not acquainted with the Epistles of Paul or the real facts about the Galatian Churches.

He who judges from *Acts* must expect that the South-Galatian Churches would play an important part in the struggle for freedom on one side or on the other; and that is so as the South-Galatian theorists read the Epistles of Paul.

But on the North-Galatian theory, the Churches whose foundation is heralded by Paul to the Phœnician and Samaritan Christians as so important a step towards freedom disappear at once from history: they play no part in subsequent events, except that Paul pays a passing visit to some of them¹ in (xvi. 1-5): though they lie on the main track² of communication by land between East and West, yet they participate in no further stage of the great struggle: their action is never referred to by

¹ It is explicitly maintained by some North-Galatian theorists (and is obviously forced on any who try to work that theory into a geographical possibility) that Paul went north from Iconium, without going westwards as far as Pisidian Antioch).

² Except Lystra, which was ten or twelve miles off the track in a retired glen.

Paul either as a pattern or an encouragement to his other Churches: his first-born spiritual offspring,¹ whose birth was celebrated by him as an encouragement to distant peoples, is never alluded to by him in writing any of the letters that have come down to us. The place they might be expected to fill is said to be taken by a different group of Churches in the northern part of the same Province.

One further inference from the Epistle as to the relations of Paul and the Galatians remains. It is evident (as Zöckler, p. 73, rightly points out) that, when Paul was writing, the schism was not yet completed. It was only in process (i. 6). The whole of Paul's appeal in the Epistle is directed to prevent a process which is going on, not to undo what has already been completed. The "little leaven is leavening the whole"; but it may be removed in time to prevent the worst and irretrievable consequences; especially (as Zöckler emphasizes) the Galatians had not yet accepted circumcision. Paul says: "If ye receive circumcision, Christ will profit you nothing" (v. 2). Contrast this with iv. 10, "ye are observing days and months"; and it is clear that the latter step has been taken, and the Jewish ceremonial is commonly observed, but the more serious step has not yet been made.

Is it not clear, then, that Paul's appeal succeeded? The letter fulfilled its purpose of rekindling the old feelings of the Galatians. Paul's confident expectation, v. 10, was justified. The letter is, as a whole, the work of one who had full confidence in his power over the minds of his people, his children. It is not written by one who was destined to find that they had passed beyond his influence. If Paul had made such a miscalculation of his power with these Churches, he would never have achieved his mar-

¹ Compare *Gal.* iv. 19.

vellous success. He knew, as he wrote, that he could move at will the Galatian people.

Acts completes the natural result of the Epistle: soon after, the effect was confirmed by Paul's personal presence¹ among these Galatians: he went through Galatic Lycaonia and Galatic Phrygia in order from first to last, "stablishing all the disciples" (*Acts* xviii. 23).

The great struggle was won; the religion of the first Roman province on the road to the west was determined as free and non-Judaistic; and that meant that the religion of the Roman Empire was determined. Can we doubt that this struggle was critical and decisive? If Paul had been vanquished in the first Province that he entered, and in the first Churches that he founded, he would have been vanquished definitely; but the first great victory made the remaining stages easier. It is obvious that the Church in Corinth passed through the same struggle, but that it surmounted it far more easily. So with the Churches of Asia. They were distinctively free and Pauline in character; and it is evident that the Galatic struggle was practically conclusive for them.

Taken in conjunction with later evidence, we can thus make some steps towards a picture of Christian and Jewish-Christian history in Asia Minor. But on the North-Galatian theory the issue of the Epistle remains as obscure as the Churches to which it was addressed. The Churches are created to receive the Epistle. After it is received they vanish, and leave not a trace behind.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Accompanied, as I believe, by Titus: *St. Paul the Trav.*, p. 285.

THE LATE PROFESSOR DRUMMOND AND
HIS CRITICS.

THE fortunes of Drummond's *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* have been not a little curious. Its brilliance of style and suggestiveness of thought were enthusiastically appreciated from the first, and as a consequence the book passed through numerous editions, and became everywhere the subject of discussion. But the theory which it sought to establish has neither been widely accepted nor adequately valued. This may be accounted for, in part, by the fact that it made its appeal to two different classes of mind—the religious and the scientific, neither of which could appreciate more than half the book. The typical man of science—agnostic, or indifferent on religious questions—paid little attention to the theological aspects of the work, and contented himself with pointing out that its science, if popular, was neither original nor profound—a criticism which is true, but, as we shall see, not at all to the point. The typical religious critic, on the other hand—well versed in literature, perhaps, and an expert in theology—was a little chary of adopting wholesale the latest doctrines of science, and was incapable of viewing the whole subject from that scientific standpoint which is necessary to its full appreciation. While loud in his praises of the book, therefore, the critic of this type did not commit himself to the acceptance of its thesis any more than did his scientific *confrère*. Drummond, consequently, is now held up to us as an ineffectual thinker, as a man who possessed, indeed, great spiritual gifts and marvellous powers of exposition, but who missed his vocation when he endeavoured to make any serious contribution to theological truth.

The latest writer to insist on this view of Drummond is Prof. George Adam Smith in his recent *Life*. While full

of hearty admiration for his friend's character, he treats his claim to have established the main theory of *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* in the most cavalier fashion. He asserts: "Drummond's *a priori* argument from the principle of continuity was a huge *petitio principii*." Of a contention which lies at the root of the demonstration attempted by Drummond the Professor disposes summarily with the dictum, "Emphatically this is not true." "Drummond," he declares, "has simply begged the question," with more to the same effect. Prof. G. A. Smith's ability as a literary critic is so great that many will give to these unsupported statements a weight which in no way attaches to them. But surely any one at all imbued with the scientific spirit will see that here the Professor has passed beyond those wide boundaries within which he is an expert, and is laying claim to an authority in another man's sphere to which he has no title. Take this confident statement, for example: "The fact that the forces of spirit life are different from those of the physical life makes the presupposition very strong that, though the Lawgiver be the same, the laws in the two spheres are equally different." In face of the fact that the physical and intellectual in man are so closely allied as to be interdependent, and that the intellectual and spiritual faculties are also intimately united, it is surely an extraordinary assumption to make that while mind and matter are governed by one set of laws, spirit is governed by laws totally different. What a strange chaos would thus be created in human personality! Indeed, as one critic has already pointed out, by his insistence on the wide gulf which separates the natural and the spiritual, Prof. Smith comes perilously near asserting an absolute dualism in the universe. Drummond's theory, so far from being obviously untrue, as the Professor asserts, seems to many minds absolutely self-evident. Nature's uniformities are so

unvarying, her sequences so unbroken, her forces so identical amid all diversity of manifestation up to the very limit of the seen and temporal, that it is difficult indeed to suppose that they do not persist unchanged when they pass beyond our sight. No doubt one's opinion on this subject depends, to a large extent, on previous intellectual training. A student whose education has been mainly literary will tend to take the one view, and he whose education has been mainly scientific will almost inevitably take the other. But to say of that opinion with which he does not agree, "Emphatically it is not true," is very like that begging the question of which Prof. Smith accuses Drummond.

It is not necessary, however, to put either of these opinions out of court without investigation. Let it be granted that it is equally conceivable, *a priori*, that the spiritual laws are totally unlike the natural laws, or that they are parallel to them and operate in a similar manner. If the first is true, it will certainly be a misfortune to theology; in that case it is vain to look to nature for any confirmation of the truth of revelation, and we must be content with such evidence for religious truth as may be found in literary criticism of the Scriptures or in the testimony of human instinct. If the second theory is true, on the other hand, we may expect to find, on examination, that revelation and nature bear the same hall-mark, or in other words, that the Power that made the world and the Spirit that inspired the Scriptures are one and the same. We must not allow ourselves to be biassed in the least, however, by these considerations. The rival theories must be put to the test of facts, and by the testimony of these alone must be accepted or rejected. What evidence, then, can be adduced in favour of Prof. Smith's theory? I know of no fact, certainly of no body of facts, alleged in support of it. But is there no evidence in support of the second theory? One does not require to think to find such

evidence, it lies to one's hand on all sides. I take the first commonplace illustration that presents itself. As regards the natural and physical man, the following statements are indisputable: much depends upon his parentage; if he comes of a strong and healthy stock, he will tend to be himself strong and healthy: much depends, too, upon his environment; his continuance in health will be promoted by good food, suitable clothing, sanitary surroundings, and the rest; and if these be denied, his health will suffer even if originally endowed with a robust constitution: his physical aptitude, again, will depend upon his perseverance in practising any difficult feat he is desirous of accomplishing; actions which at first put a great strain upon him will, when often repeated, become easy, and at last he will perform them quite unconscious of effort, as the accomplished pianist dashes off a difficult piece of music. Now when we turn to man in his spiritual capacity, do we find that a totally different set of laws comes into operation? No, the spiritual laws are precisely similar and parallel. Heredity will determine the man's spiritual outfit just as it does his physical; environment will nurture or stunt the soul just as it will the body; and every one knows that practice makes virtue easy just as it makes fingers cunning, so that isolated acts oft repeated become habits, and habits long persevered in pass into character, which is virtuous or sinful impulse acting spontaneously, and unconscious of itself. It is true we are told that to apply the word "law" in the ordinary sense to all this is to use language loosely; there is no law, but only observed sequences. But to the Christian who believes that God operates always and everywhere this does not affect the argument: it is enough that it can be shown that God's providence acts in a precisely similar and parallel manner in the natural sphere and the spiritual, and that is all that Drummond meant when he postulated "natural law in the spiritual world." Now the

illustration here used does not stand alone; I have taken it, as I have said, almost at random. Examine life at any point, and you will find similar correspondences. Assuredly, then, this theory is not to be annihilated by any mere *ex cathedrâ* utterance, such as "Emphatically this is not true."

The charge that Drummond's argument was "a huge *petitio principii*" can be refuted without much difficulty. His method of investigation was strictly inductive and scientific. How did Darwin establish his theory of evolution? He was not its absolute originator: his grandfather, Erasmus Darwin, and others had observed certain facts which pointed that way, and these were sufficient to suggest the theory as a possible one. Darwin did not, of course, at once assume its truth. He used it as a working hypothesis, and not till he had patiently examined an enormous mass of facts, and found them to be in harmony with it, did he propound his theory to the scientific world. Precisely similar was the manner in which Drummond carried out his investigation. He was not the absolute originator of the truth that spiritual law is similar and parallel to natural law; indications of this truth were abundant before his day. In the New Testament itself they are very numerous. When Christ said, for example, "Whosoever hath, to him shall be given, and he shall have more abundance: but whosoever hath not, from him shall be taken away even that he hath,"¹ who can fail to see that He was drawing attention to the fact, that Providence, in the enriching or impoverishing of souls, acts by much the same methods as in the apportionment of earthly riches? Or who can read the Parable of the Sower, and not perceive that the spiritual seed is like the natural in its dependence upon the quality of the soil into which it falls, in the nature of its growth, in the impediments to which it is liable?

¹ Matt. xiii, 12.

From the Gospels and Epistles alone, a formidable amount of support could be found for Drummond's theory, and this evidence could not be dismissed as mere analogy; the correspondences are so persistent and minute that no other terms but "parallel and similar" will describe them. But of course the evidence is not confined to the New Testament. There probably has never been a thoughtful preacher who has not at some time or other hit upon one of those striking resemblances between things spiritual and things natural which irresistibly suggest Milton's words:

What if Earth,
Be but the shadow of Heav'n, and things therein,
Each to other like, more than on Earth is thought?

All that Drummond has done is to bring the theory into clearer light, and to illustrate it with a number of facts, most of them derived from the physical sciences. To speak of Drummond's demonstrations as an "*a priori* argument" is therefore unfair. His theory was not the arbitrary creation of his own imagination; it was originally suggested by facts, and now stands supported by evidence of a very varied and interesting character. Admirers of Drummond may justly claim that it holds the field, and that the arguments on which it is built have never been met or refuted. Before his book can justly be spoken of in such terms as Prof. G. A. Smith has used it must be shown either that its science is unsound, or that its treatment of the spiritual facts of our nature is not to be relied upon. The charge that the science of the book is not original or profound has sometimes been adduced as though it discredited the theory. But to advance original scientific research was no part of Drummond's object in writing *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*. To illustrate his theory and carry conviction to the class of readers for whom

he wrote, he needed facts which were well known and beyond dispute. It is just the commonplace nature of his materials which renders his theory unassailable from the scientific side. And from the religious side I do not know that his arguments are open to serious challenge. If any one thinks they are, let him justify his faith by his works, and produce proof; let him begin on the Parable of the Sower, and show that our Lord, when he uttered this parable, was dealing not with spiritual facts but with fanciful analogies; and after that he will need to explain away many other passages in the New Testament before he arrives at Drummond's scientific illustrations. So long as neither science nor religion can convict Drummond of grave inaccuracy in his facts, and so long as no evidence is offered in support of the rival theory that the spiritual laws are totally different from the physical laws, it is absurd to treat Drummond's work as a thing of no value. Rather may we claim that *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* is a successful attempt to apply the method of Butler's *Analogy* to the great body of scientific knowledge which in Butler's day existed only in a rudimentary form; and we may hope that it may yet come to be as serviceable to theology in our time as was Butler's great work to the generations which immediately succeeded him.

Drummond's *Ascent of Man* has suffered much in the same manner and from the same causes as his earlier work. It was the late Mrs. Lynn Linton, I think, who derided this book as commonplace because a passage could be found in Darwin and in Herbert Spencer in which the presence of "the struggle for the life of others" was vaguely recognised as a factor in evolution. The absurdity of this criticism must be recognised by every fair-minded student. Drummond certainly never laid claim to absolute originality—if indeed absolute originality can be said to exist in our world at all. But of what use were those two obscure passages in

Darwin and Spencer to the Christian Church? What is undoubted is that in the evolutionary theory as originally enunciated the struggle for the survival of the fittest dwarfed all other conceptions. It loomed large not only in scientific works but in magazines, reviews, and religious addresses; few quotations had become more trite in sermons than

Nature red in tooth and claw with ravine.

Unquestionably this doctrine as it stood alone had a tendency to obscure the truth that God is love, and constituted a very serious difficulty to many thoughtful minds. The service which Prof. Drummond rendered the Christian Church when he gave its proper prominence to the vicarious principle in nature, to the "struggle for the life of others," can hardly be overrated; he wove, as it were, a silver strand into the dark web of fate; he helped us to see in the blackest shadow a proof that somewhere the light is shining. I am convinced that should the Church lightly discard the two great truths which Drummond offers her in these books, she will have thrown away weapons which will become every day more necessary to her as the teachings of science spread and are adopted as the common faith of mankind.

ANGUS M. MACKAY.

CHUZA.

THE inevitable separation of studies in these days of specialization carries with it the danger that important contributions to knowledge may be overlooked by the student whose work touches, without covering, many fields of enquiry. The textual critic of the New Testament has been stimulated lately by Prof. Blass. The Orientalist has been cheered by Mr. Stanley Cook's *Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*.¹ But few, too few, textual critics are in any sense Orientalists, and there is a danger that evidence derived from Semitic epigraphy may be neglected by those who approach Biblical questions from the side of classical scholarship.

I am not going to attempt a review of Mr. Cook's admirable and useful compilation. It does not profess to give original results, but it gathers together, with full references, the work of many scholars on Aramaic inscriptions of every kind. A glance down the glossary shows at once which Aramaic proper names that occur in the Bible have hitherto been found on contemporary monuments. We find, amongst others, Gashmu—*Gūshāmu* "the Arabian" (Neh. vi. 6), Aretas—*Hārītha* (2 Cor. xi. 32), Malchus—*Mālīchu* (John xviii. 10),² and Chuza.

Chuza brings us to Prof. Blass, who has lately brought forward a theory about this name in his interesting and deservedly popular book on the *Philology of the Gospels*. He says (Eng. trans., p. 152) :

There is a personage mentioned by Luke, who may be unknown to some of my readers, a man by name Chuzas, steward to Herod, the Tetrarch, and husband to Joanna, who was one of the women accompanying Christ (see Luke viii. 3). The name, of course an Aramaic

¹ Cambridge, 1893.

² Cook, p. 73, six lines from bottom, for vol. 7, read vol. 6.

one, does not occur anywhere else. Now, if we scrutinize our Latin witnesses very carefully, we find in *l* (an old Latin version of the seventh century, existing in Breslau and published by Prof. Haase) instead of *Chuzæ*, *Cydiae*. This is a very ancient Greek name; there was one Cydias a lyric poet, and another an Attic orator, mentioned by Aristotle, and another a painter from the island of Cythnus, and so on. How does the Latin copyist come by that name? By chance? Impossible. By correction? Still more impossible. I say he came by it in the simplest way in the world, by tradition, which goes back to Luke himself. That man had two names, one Aramaic and one Greek, of somewhat similar sound, which he had adopted as more convenient for the cultivated and educated circle in which he lived: just as other Jews, as early as in the time of the Maccabees, transformed their name of Jesus into Jason, and as modern German Jews called Aaron prefer to call themselves Arthur. Luke must originally have written: "Of Chuza, who was also called Cydias"; but, when copying first for readers in Syria and Palestine, he left out the Greek name, and, when copying again for Roman readers, he left out the Aramaic one. There cannot be a more simple solution of a puzzling problem, which, if you attempt in any other way, you will find insoluble.

Elsewhere (p. 243) Prof. Blass tells us that "if you are to suspend a hundredweight, you must take a rope and not a thread." But what sort of a rope is *l*? It is a seventh-century MS., giving the Vulgate text in St. Matthew and St. Mark, a mixed text in St. John, while in St. Luke it presents a fairly pure "European" text of the Old Latin. But it very rarely gives us a valuable reading unsupported by other Latin evidence, being in this respect quite unlike *k* or *e*, or the quotations of St. Cyprian. It would be extraordinary if *l* should have preserved the name Cydias uncorrupted, when every other authority has adopted the peculiar and unfamiliar Chuza.¹ The other "singular" readings of *l* hardly inspire confidence: few, I suppose, will care to follow its scribe in making the Nativity take place at *Bethel* instead of at *Bethlehem* (Luke ii. 4, 15).

¹ The spellings of this name in our Latin MSS. are very varied: we have, for instance (the word being in the genitive case), "cusae" *e*, "chuse" *a*, "chuzac" *b, c, q*, while most codices of the Vulgate have "chuzæ."

Prof. Blass appears to hold that a scribe's error or thoughtless emendation of a Semitic name could not produce a striking or plausible result. But he has overlooked the most remarkable case of all. In Mark xv. 35 *k*, by far the best MS. of the Old Latin, has *Helion uocat* instead of *Heliam* (or *Helian*) *uocat*. If we were to adopt Prof. Blass's methods here, they might take us very far indeed. Are we to suppose that the exclamation of Christ gave rise to two misunderstandings, one Aramaic and one Greek, of somewhat similar sound, so that the Jews thought He called for Elijah, while the Gentiles understood it as an appeal to Phœbus, whose rays had been so mournfully withdrawn? Are we to go on to declare that Luke (in translating St. Mark's Gospel, as Prof. Blass says he did) must originally have written both misunderstandings, but when copying first for readers in Syria and Palestine he left out the Greek name, and when copying again for Roman readers he left out the Aramaic one?

It is ill jesting with a sacred subject, but it is difficult to treat some of Prof. Blass's arguments seriously, and the success—the otherwise deserved success—of his book makes some note of caution necessary. Every one must feel that the variation between *helian* and *helion* in Mark xv. 35 rests only upon a scribe's error, though it is just conceivable that the confusion originated in Greek—*i.e.* between Ἡλίαν and Ἡλιον.¹ But *Cydia* and *Cuza* (or *Chuzæ*) in Luke viii. 3 are scarcely more unlike, palæographically, than *Helion* and *Helian*. "C" and "Ch" are practically interchangeable in Latin MSS. of the Gospels; in fact, the only other proper name in St. Luke that

¹ Cf. Mark ix. 49 in *k*. While speaking of *k* (the Bobbio Gospels) I must take the opportunity of protesting against Prof. Blass's remarkable statement (p. 81), that B and *k* are much nearer together in Matthew than in Mark. A glance at the tables of readings which Dr. Sanday has collected at the end of his edition of *k* (O. Latin Bible Texts, ii.) is enough to show that this is not the case.

begins with χ , viz. "Corazain" (Luke x. 3), is so spelt in *l*, with "c" not "ch." On the other hand, "Cydiás" in Greek is spelt *Κυδίας*, and κ and χ are not generally confounded. Then, again, "u" and "y" not unfrequently interchange: *k* has "Zabulon" for *Ζαβουλὼν* in Matthew iv. 15, but in verse 13 it has "Zabylon." Finally "di" is a well-recognised equivalent for "z"; I need here only refer to Rönsch, *Collectanea*, p. 21, who cites *baptidiator, iudaeidiare, exorcidiare*.

But some of my readers may feel that there still remains the difficulty that "the name [Chuza], of course an Aramaic one, does not occur anywhere else." Here comes in the evidence to which attention is called by Mr. Cook's *Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions*. Who was the Chuza whose name is actually found? The answer is, that Chuza was the father of a man called Ḥayyân, whose descendants erected the largest and finest of the great rock-cut tombs at El-Ḥegr in Arabia.¹ These people, though they moved in a circle sufficiently "cultivated and elevated" to possess a magnificent family mausoleum in the Grecian style, as fine as the well-known rock tombs of Petra, were not ashamed of their grandfather's name, and their inscription runs—

לחין בר כוזא אחרה

"To Ḥayyân, son of Kûzâ, his posterity (have erected this tomb)."

Here "Chuza" is quite correctly spelt, just as the name is written in Luke viii. 3 in all the Syriac versions. We do not know the exact date of the inscription, but we shall not be very far wrong in placing it in the first century A.D. or B.C.

¹ El-Ḥegr is the modern Madâin Sâlih on the Pilgrim Route, rather more than half way from Akaba to Medina.

My readers will, no doubt, have guessed the final step to which all the evidence points. Chuza is a real name, but it is not found again in Greek, because it is not a Jew's name but a Nabatean's. There is no evidence that Chuza was a Jew, whatever his wife may have been, and a "steward" to the Herodian family may very well have been of foreign origin, like the Herods themselves. If Chuza was of a Nabatean family, that would explain his having a Nabatean name, which we should no more expect to find again in Greek literature than 'Auida, or Ma'na, or Gusham.

But though all this serves to illustrate St. Luke, and to confirm the historical probability of the existence of Chuza, we must avoid suspending our hundredweights by a thread. My object is simply to point out that the name Chuza has actually been found, independently of Luke viii. 3; and that it is unnecessary to postulate two separate editions of the Gospel, issued by the evangelist himself, in order to explain the irregular spellings in which this name occurs in Latin MSS.

F. C. BURKITT.

THE NATIVITY: AN OUTLINE.

THE perusal of Prof. Ramsay's scholarly monograph, "Was Christ born at Bethlehem?" will doubtless suggest to many readers, as it has suggested to the present writer, the interesting task of reviewing the details recorded in the Gospels of the birth of our Lord. Apart from the main thesis of his book—the historic credibility of St. Luke—Prof. Ramsay's pages are so illuminative, so quickening in their stimulus, that it is scarcely possible for any one to rise from such a study without feeling that the story of the Nativity has been brought before him with more vivid actuality and clearness than it had ever been before. In spite of all that has been acquired by recent research and criticism, an atmosphere of vagueness and indecision rests on the opening chapter of the popular *Lives of Christ*. In the present state of controversy this is perhaps inevitable; indeed, it may be that human scholarship may never succeed in filling in with certitude the lacunæ which baffle industry and ingenuity in the ancient documents that have come down to us.

There are few things more strange and perplexing than these lacunæ. At the close of his sketch of the labours and crucifixion of Christ, Graetz stands at a loss before the remarkable fact "that events fraught with so vast an import should have created so little effect at the time of their occurrence at Jerusalem, that the Judæan historians, Justus of Tiberias and Josephus, who related to the very smallest minutiae everything which took place under Pilate, never mentioned the life and death of Jesus." But how much stranger, in our way of thinking, are those silences in the Gospel narratives regarding details, the remembrance of which, one cannot but believe, ought to have been as precious to the first Christians as the recovery of them would

now be to ourselves. When they see fit, the Evangelists can particularize with a significant minuteness—witness the “much grass” and the “green grass” which incidentally mark a season of the year, and help to throw light on a chronological problem—yet they omit from their story those two dates to which in every human life the heart of the bereaved survivor clings with tender remembrance. They tell us neither the year nor the day on which our Lord was born; they tell us neither the year nor the day of His Passion on the tree. No phrase slips from their pens to portray His earthly aspect to us: we cannot say whether He was “fairer than the children of men,” or whether He had “no form nor comeliness—no beauty that we should desire Him.” Whether in an age when portraiture was a familiar art any attempt was made by a devoted follower to secure a memorial of His lineaments, we can only conjecture; but if at any time a likeness of His humanity existed, painted on face-cloths for the dead, inscribed on glass or precious stone, pictured in mosaic, it has been lost to the world. When we reflect, too, how easy and natural it was among an unchanging Oriental people with long memories to preserve the tradition of the “holy places,” how can we account for the uncertainty which renders the identification of so many places associated with His presence, His miracles, His death, little better than conjectural? The Jerusalem of the days of Pilate may lie deeper beneath the wreck of war than the London of the Roman occupation, but fire and sword are not a sufficient explanation of even that portion of the problem.

It is all so strange, so alien to our natural feelings, so unlike what we imagine would have been the case with us, that we are bewildered till the question slowly shapes itself in our consciousness: What has been withheld from our knowledge is unnecessary; what if a Divine purpose was at work in the minds and hearts of the early believers, when

so much was allowed to lapse into oblivion and doubt? What if a wise Providence, conscious of the fetishism, the materialistic grossness, the superstition inherent in human nature, diverted attention from the natural and mortal details of the Saviour's life on earth, that men might the more easily fix their faith and hope on the risen and living Christ? All these silences and obliterations of memory seem to find their explanation in the words of St. Paul, whatever may have been the precise meaning he himself attached to them: "Even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more."

Turning to the story of Bethlehem, it seems possible, without presumption, to recognise some symptoms of the operation of that Divine purpose in the remarkable diversity of opinion as to the date of our Saviour's Nativity. Far away back in the past the early Eastern Church founded a great feast equivalent to our Christmas; but it was a purely spiritual commemoration, and all considerations of historic literalness had been set aside. It was the festival of the Epiphany, and the date was the 6th of January. How completely it was raised above all reminiscences of the natural and earthly existence of our Lord is proved by the fact that it was the memorial not of a single, but of a four-fold Manifestation. In this one feast were included the Nativity, *i.e.* the epiphany of Christ in the semblance of mortal flesh; the appearance of His star or His manifestation to the Gentiles; His epiphany as the beloved Son in the baptism in Jordan; and the unveiling of His divinity as Lord of the elements when He changed water into wine at the marriage feast at Cana.

In the Western Church the observance of Christmas Day on the 25th of December has been traced as far back as the fourth century. That it was fixed at that time of the year with a view to counteract the unspeakable orgies of the ancient Roman *Saturnalia* has been somewhat short-

sightedly cast in the teeth of the Church of Rome; for be the results of controversy what they may on this special point, this at least is certain, that the selection of that date as the date of the Nativity of the Divine Babe "in the winter wild" has done more to Christianize the Western and Northern world than any one act in the history of Ecclesiasticism. Try to conceive what the world has owed during fifteen centuries to that vision of Bethlehem; picture the pity of heart that has been awakened, the benevolence that has spent itself in practical charity, the feuds that have been assuaged, the estrangements that have been set right by the influence of the "blessed time," the suffering and destitution that have been solaced and relieved, the spiritual lukewarmness that has been touched with coals from the altar; and try to conceive what our Northern winter would have been had the Festival of the Crib been assigned to a season of sunshine and flowers. It would now be impossible for us to realize that Christ was born in any month but one associated with snow lying deep, and bitter winds, and holly whitened with frost, and the cold straw of the manger warmed with the vaporous breath of gentle animals. Our good-will and warmth of feeling at Christmastide may be in some measure stimulated by physical cold and a sympathetic imagination, but these too may be numbered among the many ways in which God fulfils Himself.

Strangely enough the Nativity has been assigned to eight out of the twelve months of the year—December 25, February 1, April 5, 21, and 22, May 20, August 1, and more vaguely to September and October. Most of the popular modern writers appear to have adopted the 25th December, but in the presence of Prof. Ramsay's argument it is difficult to resist the conclusion that our Lord was born in one of the months of the Jewish summer. For consider the fact that it was in obedience to the edict directing the Jews to

enrol themselves, "every one in his own city," that Joseph and Mary undertook the journey from Nazareth to Bethlehem. These tribal gatherings for enumeration must have necessitated very careful arrangements, so that the population might be spared as much hardship and inconvenience as possible, and that agricultural work should not be interfered with. On the one hand, the dangers and delays of winter travelling would imperil the success of the census; on the other, reaping and harvesting would occupy the favourable portion of the year from April to July. Prof. Ramsay accordingly concludes that, if due weight be given to these considerations, "we may say with considerable confidence that August to October is the period within which the numbering would be fixed."

Without referring to another argument derived from the incidence of the "priestly periods," which suggests the 1st August as the probable day and month of the enrolment, it is interesting to note that the one clue to the season of the year indicated by St. Luke is in complete accordance with this August-October period: "And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flock by night." The flocks are sent out after the Passover, and brought in about October; in other words, this night-pasturing belongs to the hot season, when the sheep are indisposed to feed by day. It has indeed been objected that it is not certain that all sheep were brought under cover at night during the winter, and that these Bethlehem flocks were probably destined for Temple sacrifices, and may have lain out all the year round, seeing that they are mentioned as being in the fields in February, when the average rainfall is nearly at its heaviest. As, however, there does not appear to be any evidence that they did actually lie out in December, the presence of the shepherds "in the field" may fairly be regarded as confirming the period indicated as most suitable for the taking of the census.

But how if there were no such census—if St. Luke in an uninspired moment had set down a statement which may be described, and indeed has been described, as a complication of blunders in the first important episode in his record?

Now it came to pass in those days, there went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus that all the world should be enrolled. This was the first enrolment, made when Quirinius was governor of Syria.

What evidence is there that Cæsar Augustus issued a decree for a census of "all the world"? Even had such a census been decreed, how could it have extended to Palestine, which was not a portion of the Roman Empire? The first and only census and valuation of Palestine made by the Romans was carried out about A.D. 6-7, and is recorded by Josephus. Obviously St. Luke transferred this census, with the officer Quirinius who directed it, to a period from nine to twelve years earlier than its true date. What value, therefore, can we be expected to attach to the testimony of a historian who "imagined that Christ was born 'in the days of Herod the king' during a census held about ten or eleven years after the death of Herod?"

These are the chief questions and assertions to which Prof. Ramsay's monograph offers an answer so clear and so cogent that, if it does not establish St. Luke's historic credibility to demonstration, it establishes at least the presumption that in important statements he is accurate, and that we have as sound reason for counting on his trustworthiness as on that of any other great historian whose statements may occasionally stand beyond verification. It is impossible in this place to indicate the range of Prof. Ramsay's contention, the force of which lies in the massing of details. The recent discovery of census papers in Egypt gives countenance to the declaration that Augustus was engaged in an enrolment of the empire. The peculiar form

of tribal registration in Palestine is explained by the peculiar relationship of Herod and the kingdom to Augustus and the empire. That Quirinius held the *hegemonia* of Syria at the time specified is shown to be perfectly credible. I pass lightly from these matters, to which justice can be done solely by reading the book itself, and turn to the interesting point of the year to which the Nativity is assigned.

From a laborious examination of all the available historic evidence outside St. Luke, it is shown that the late summer of 7 or 6 B.C. are the only periods left available for this census. "Luke, however, gives additional information about the Saviour's life, which affords reasonable confidence that 6 B.C. was the year of Christ's birth." Here, too, the reader must refer to Prof. Ramsay for the series of ingenious calculations which justify his conclusion.

If we should find here sufficient proof to warrant us in regarding the date of the Nativity as falling somewhere between August and October in the year 6 B.C., shall we suffer any loss in natural sentiment or in spiritual devotion? There seems to be little reason to suppose so. The ancient Epiphany of the Eastern Church was, as has been pointed out, a commemoration freed from associations of historicity and literal anniversary. With ourselves the solemnity of the Crucifixion and the Christian joy of the Resurrection suffer no detriment or disparagement from the movable character of their observance.

Much has been written about the Star in the East and the adoration of the Magi; but these incidents, which are so closely associated with the birth at Bethlehem, do not seem to me to have been regarded by the ordinary layman, or indeed by many of the clergy, with that attention which one would naturally expect to find bestowed on them. To judge from the beautiful representations of artists and poets, one would suppose that comparatively few Christians had read the texts of St. Matthew and St. Luke with the intelli-

gence, the realistic imagination which they deserve. In how many of the pictures of famous artists do we not find the Magi—those mysterious regal strangers from the East—offering their costly gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh to the radiant Babe cradled in the manger? Turn to the poets, and over and over again the lowly cattle-shed is the scene of the worship of the far-travelled, star-led wanderers. In Longfellow's poem they ride in through the gate and guard, and find nowhere any light save in the stable of the inn :

And cradled there in the scented hay,
In the air made sweet by the breath of kine,
The little Child in the manger lay;
The Child that would be King one day
Of a kingdom not human but divine.

Mrs. Browning describes the same scene, with the horned faces of the dumb kine turned "towards the newly born." Even Archbishop Trench speaks of these strange pilgrims as possible representations of Israel's scattered race sent to claim their part and right "in the Child new-born to-night." Yet if the record of St. Luke be read with that of St. Matthew, it is quite obvious that a seclusion of forty days—the term of Mary's "purification according to the law of Moses"—and the presentation of the Child in the Temple at Jerusalem must have preceded the visit of the Wise Kings, for was not their visit instantly followed by the flight into Egypt? It is true that in the cavern beneath the Church of the Nativity at Bethlehem one is shown the place where the Magi knelt and paid their homage; but is it conceivable that those forty days of purification were spent in the rude shelter to which Mary was driven by the overcrowding of the inn? The travellers of the tribe of David who had come up for the census must have long since returned home, and it is a reasonable conjecture that in the city of David there were tribeswomen who were hospitable

enough to welcome the young mother and her Babe under their roof. When the Magi came, they found the Child and Mary, not in the stable, or cave, or the "strawy tent" of the poet, but in "the house." The phrasing in the first verse of the second chapter of St. Matthew does not in any way signify that the visit of the Magi was closely connected with the Nativity. The words "Now when Jesus was born" are more literally rendered, "Jesus having been born"; and it is worth noticing that while it was a *brepchos*, a new-born babe, whom the shepherds found in the manger, it was a *paidion*, a little child, who was presented in the Temple nearly six weeks later, and a *paidion* to whom the Wise Men offered their homage.

To how many myriads of children has the mysterious apparition of those Kings of the East and their guiding star been a marvel and a delight! Yet I wonder for how many of us was any attempt made to realize any of the incidents of their story. Pictures and poems had taught us that there were three of them, but no one ever told us that no number is stated, and no kingship is mentioned in the text. We could not discover anything about their personality, though we fancied them stately and grey-bearded. No one ever described to us their journey from the unknown region towards the dawn whence they had come. Our attention was not even directed to what they told Herod.

Herod privily called the wise men, and learned of them carefully what time the star appeared . . .

Then Herod . . . sent forth and slew all the male children that were in Bethlehem and in all the borders thereof, from two years and under, according to the time which he had carefully learned of the wise men.

They had seen His star then, not "in the East," but "in its rising,"¹ a year and more² before their arrival.

¹ *The Expositor's Greek Testament*. Matt. ii. 2 n.

² "According to the time learned of the wise men" may not imply that the star appeared two full years before; but see later.

How did it happen that they had set out so late, or taken so long a time on their journey? We never had occasion to perplex our elders by asking the question—a question which indeed no one can answer, though it seems interesting to point out that, if the Magi came from a great distance, six months, a year, or even eighteen months, may have been by no means an excessive length of time for the preparations for their journey and the journey itself.

Expedited by the power of Artaxerxes, Ezra took four full months to go from Babylon to Jerusalem. Are the Magi likely to have had similar facilities? They would, no doubt, have travelled more rapidly than the funeral car of Alexander, with its ornaments of massive gold, which it took eighty-four mules more than a year to draw from Babylon to Syria; but that slow procession nevertheless suggests the possibilities of the weary progress and the many delays incidental to ancient travelling in the East. Unfortunately Josephus has given no particulars of the journey of Queen Helen of Adiabene, on the banks of the Tigris, to Jerusalem fourteen years after the Crucifixion; but the journey is spoken of as a serious undertaking, which required "vast preparations," and her son escorted her "a great way." Towards the close of the thirteenth century, when the Persian Khan Arghun sent to China for a wife, the small fleet which conveyed the Princess Kukachin took twenty-one months to reach Ormuz. The Khan had died in the meantime—so had 600 of the mariners—but the lady continued her journey, and married his successor. At the speediest it is improbable that the Magi exceeded the ordinary caravan rate—from twelve to sixteen miles a day. Could we but divine their starting-point, we might trace their probable route along the immemorial trade roads; but though that is impossible, sufficient has been said to throw some explanatory light on the long interval between

the "uprising" of the sacred star in the East and their appearance in Jerusalem.

Regarding the character of that marvellous star speculation has exhausted itself in fruitless conjecture. The guiding light may have been a miraculous phenomenon, a rare planetary conjunction, one of those amazing conflagrations called "new stars"; all we are told is that they saw it in its rising, that it went before them, that it stood over the spot where the young child was, and that a period of little less than two years had elapsed between their first sight of the star, and the hour in which they "rejoiced with great joy."

Now if our Lord was born between August and October in the year 6 B.C., the star of the Magi must have been visible in the previous year, 7 B.C. And here we are met by a remarkable astronomical coincidence, which, if it cannot furnish a solid basis for a chronological argument, is at least supremely interesting. In May, October, and December of B.C. 7 there was a conjunction of the planets Jupiter and Saturn in the constellation of Pisces, and a mediæval Jew has put on record the tradition (which may have been derived from the star-lore of the Chaldeans)¹ that the conjunction of these two planets in Pisces is a sign of the coming of the Messiah. These conjunctions were followed in March B.C. 6 by a conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn and Mars, which must have presented a singularly brilliant and beautiful appearance in the crystalline air of Eastern skies, and which could not have failed to excite the imaginations of seers who attributed the destinies of men and nations to the "shining rulers" of the night.

If we understand the word "star" to mean a single luminary, these coincidences lose something of their impressiveness; but, even so, Kepler has left us a curious

¹ *Dictionary of the Bible*: Chronology of the New Testament, C. H. Turner. (T. & T. Clark.)

conjecture which carries with it the authority of his reputation. Just as the conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn in 1604 culminated in the conjunction of Jupiter, Saturn and Mars in 1605, and was associated with the sudden appearance of a new star, so, he surmised, the exactly similar conjunctions in the years 7 and 6 B.C. were associated with the phenomenon of a new star, and this new star was the celestial light which guided the Magi from the East. The new star that appeared in October, 1604, and faded away till it vanished in January, 1606, was of singular splendour. At its period of maximum brilliancy it outshone the glory of Jupiter, and "sparkled with the colours of the rainbow, like a many-faceted diamond." If one may venture to speak with some of the confidence of ignorance, it seems so little probable that there should be any connection between a conjunction of planets and the appearance of a *nova*, that one is slow to adopt the suggestion that, because a new star accompanied the conjunctions of 1604 and 1605, therefore a new star accompanied those of the years 7 and 6 B.C. Indeed, one might risk the audacity of hinting that, if a new star emphasized the brilliant conjunctions of 1604-5, it is more in keeping with the law of chances that a new star did not emphasize those of 7-6 B.C. Apart, however, from this speculation, and apart from the question whether the word "star" may be legitimately taken to mean a constellation or a grouping of planets, the coincidence of these conjunctions with the actual time of Christ's birth is a matter of deep interest.

And as to the flight into Egypt—does any one, in telling or reading the story, trouble himself to trace on the map the route taken, probably through the hills to Hebron, and thence perchance westward to the coast and the Gaza road?

At this point, again, one is struck at the way in which historical data appear to confirm the assignment of the

Nativity to the period August–October of the year 6 B.C. It may be taken as practically certain that Herod died about March, B.C. 4. Between the date of his death and that of the Nativity allowance must be made for the age limit fixed for the massacre of the Innocents, and for the sojourn of the Holy Family in Egypt. If the year 5 be tentatively allotted to the sojourn, and the last days of the year 6 to the flight, we have the years 6 and 7 as the two years in the course of which the Innocents were born.

Again, supposing the Magi to have reached Jerusalem after the presentation in the Temple—say about November, B.C. 6¹—and to have reported to Herod that the sign of the Messiah first appeared in the heavens in the May of the preceding year (7 B.C.); and supposing the savage king to have determined to make security doubly sure by putting the age limit of the massacre some months on the safe side—then here once more we should have the same approximate arrangement of dates and events.

Happily we do not need to attach any importance to these curiously interesting conjectures and calculations. In the vision of faith they count for nothing. It matters not whether Christ was born in December or an earlier month, in this year or in that. Still they do appeal to the realistic imagination in us all; and if they help to bring home to us more vividly the ever-beautiful and touching story of the birth of the Saviour of the world, the time spent on them has been well and wisely used.

WILLIAM CANTON.

¹ One is strongly tempted to ask whether, in fixing the 6th January for the feast of the Epiphany, the early Eastern Church did not adopt the traditional, or perhaps even the actual, date of the visit of the Magi. We have seen that at least forty days must have elapsed between the Nativity and their arrival, but a much longer time may have intervened. The 6th January, as the date of their arrival in Bethlehem, would fall in with the time arrangement sketched out above.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

II.

THE SEVEN LAMPS.

REV. II., III.

At the close of the last sketch we saw John the Divine just recovered from his prostration. He had been so overpowered by the unveiling of the glory of his exalted Lord that he had fallen at His feet as dead; but the touch of the pierced hand, and the reassuring words in the well-known voice had restored him. Hitherto he had scarcely noticed the golden lamps in the midst of which the Lord was standing, so absorbed was he in the central glory. Now he is asked to look at them, and see in them the symbols of the Churches which were so much in his heart in these lonely days.

The number of the Churches named is seven, though there must have been more in Asia; but seven, being the number of completeness, stood for them all, and indeed for the entire Church of Christ. Remember that John was "in the Spirit," so we are here in the region of the ideal. This poem of the Apocalypse, like other poems, starts from the actual that it may rise into the ideal. It names the particular Churches struggling amid difficulties and discouragements; but by making them just seven the seer lifts us into the region of the ideal, and suggests the thought that the vision and the prophecy are not to be limited to the particular Churches named, but extended to the whole Church of God. The number seven carries with it moreover the thought of unity. The seven are viewed as one, just as the seven spirits before the throne (i. 4) are not separate entities, but the one Spirit of God considered in the multiplicity and totality of His operation. But observe the kind of unity we are taught to

look for in the New Testament Church—not a single unity as in the old covenant, when the Church was represented by one golden candlestick, but a multiple unity: there are seven golden candlesticks now, a fact which plainly suggests that just as the number seven applied to the Spirit of God represents the variety of His operation, so as applied to the Church of God in New Testament times it represents the diversity of its administration. St. Paul distinctly tells us, “There are differences of administration, but one Spirit.” And what was revealed to the mind of the Apostle to the Gentiles is set in vision before the seer of Patmos in the seven golden candlesticks. Is it not quite evident from this it was never intended that the New Testament Church should be one vast organization under a single outward administration according to the Roman and High Anglican idea? Our unity is not to be outward and mechanical, but inward and spiritual. As the late Dean Plumtre puts it, the number seven indicates “unity developed in diversity and yet remaining one.” We may be and may remain Episcopalians, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists, Methodists, Friends: we may be many outwardly and yet one inwardly, one in spirit and in truth.

Clearly also no one of the seven has the monopoly of the Divine Presence, or of the grace of the Spirit. All are alike in the sight of God. Some Church must be mentioned first; but the Church of Ephesus, which has the honour, is reminded in the very first breath that it has no privilege which the others do not equally share: “To the Angel of the Church in Ephesus write: These things saith He which holdeth the *seven* stars in His right hand, He that walketh in the midst of the *seven* golden candlesticks.” Wherever Christ is, there is the Church; wherever the Church is, there is Christ.

The lamps are golden, and all burn with a clear and steady light. Here again we are evidently in the region of

the ideal. When we pass to the real, as we do in the epistles which follow, what a difference! How the fine gold has become dim, mixed with brass and iron and clay! and how feeble and pitiful and flickering the light, in some cases serious danger that the candlestick may be removed out of its place. Ephesus has left her first love; Pergamos is honeycombed with heresy; Thyatira is disgraced with immorality; Sardis has only a name to live; Laodicea is positively repulsive with lukewarmness and self-sufficiency. And they are all searched by these eyes which are like a flame of fire, and to each of them there comes that voice which is as the sound of many waters, "I know thy works." Yet the Holy One bears with them, and stays with them, and acknowledges them as His (think of His patience and long-suffering!), and, when he shows them in vision to their exiled apostle, uses as their symbols seven golden lamps all burning with a steady flame. "A bruised reed shall He not break, and the smoking flax shall He not quench."

It is the same God who said of old to the father of the faithful, "If I find in Sodom fifty righteous within the city, then will I spare all the place for their sake," and permitted the number, in answer to his servant's pleading, to be reduced to forty-five, to forty, to thirty, to twenty, to ten. "There are a few names even in Sardis which have not defiled their garments"; and these few names are the salvation of the Church; these few names keep for it a place among the seven golden candlesticks in the midst of which the Son of Man is walking.

It is the same Jesus who in His great intercessory prayer said of His disciples to His Father, "They have kept Thy word," though they had grieved Him so often and disappointed Him so much. These eyes, which are as a flame of fire, look beneath the outward appearance and read the heart. The hypocrisy of a Judas cannot escape them; but just as little can the loyal-heartedness of all the rest.

Who or what are the Seven Angels of the Churches? We are often told that angel means bishop or pastor; but if John meant this, why did he not say it? And does it not seem that the attempt to identify the angel with an individual man is wholly at variance with the poetical structure of the book? Consider how angels meet us at every turn of these visions, and they never mean men. There is an angel of the waters (xvi. 5), an angel of the fire (xiv. 18), an angel of the abyss (ix. 11), four angels of the four winds (vii. 1), and so on. Now surely the seven angels of the Churches are to be interpreted in the same way as these other angels. Clearly the angels of the Revelation have the same position and function in the poem of the Apocalypse which in a modern poem would be assigned to spirits. A modern poet would say the spirit of the waters, the spirit of the winds, and so on, as for instance in Shelley's *Arethusa*, where he speaks so beautifully of the spirit of the waters, and in *Prometheus Unbound*, where the different spirits introduce themselves in this way:

As the birds within the wind,
As the fish within the wave,
As the thoughts of man's own mind
Float through all above the grave;
We make these our liquid lair,
Voyaging cloudlike and unpent
Through the boundless element:
Thence we bear the prophecy
Which begins and ends in thee.

They are part of the machinery, so to speak, of the vision. We must remember that nature in the poet's view is not dead, but alive; not soulless, but soulful. There are some who speak as if Wordsworth first taught us effectually to recognise thought and feeling and life in what men call the inanimate creation; but even Wordsworth himself did not

strike that high note more distinctly or emphatically than the poets of the Bible, who speak of the joy of the heavens, and the gladness of the earth, the mountains and the hills breaking forth into singing, and all the trees of the field clapping their hands. The high spiritual view of the heavens and the earth and all that are in them is as characteristic of the poets of the Bible as it is of any of the moderns. Let it not be forgotten that John was in the Spirit. The whole action of the book is in the region of the Spirit. How appropriate then that he should be asked to write not to the Churches themselves, the actual congregations of people living in these cities of Asia, but to their representatives in the spiritual sphere, the spirits of the Churches as we would say, the angels of the Churches as he said. The seven golden lamps were the symbols of the Churches as outward organizations, but each of them was regarded as a unity having a soul, and it was this soul or spirit of the Church which was spoken of as the angel of the Church. These angels or spirits of the Churches were set forth under the symbol of seven stars.

We come now to the messages to the Churches, the great object of which is to summon them to faithfulness and patience and endurance to the end in the days of fiery persecution. Happily they are all quite familiar and stand in much less need of exposition than any other part of the Apocalypse. I shall therefore confine myself to some general characteristics.

1. While it is the same exalted Son of Man who addresses all the Churches, He is revealed in a different aspect to each. After the full revelation of His glory set forth in the great vision of the first chapter, at sight of which the beloved disciple fell as dead, we have it broken into parts in the second and third chapters. Ephesus sees one part, Smyrna another, Pergamos another, and so on ;

and it is only by putting them all together that we have the whole. Moreover it will be found that in each case the description of the glory of Christ, in so far as it is revealed to the Church, is appropriate to the message which follows. For example, to the Church at Smyrna, which is to be tried by persecution unto death, it is, "These things saith the First and the Last which was dead and is alive again"; and to the Church in Thyatira, which is to be searched with the fires of Divine judgment, the message begins, "These things saith the Son of God, who hath His eyes like a flame of fire and His feet like unto burnished brass."

Should we not learn from this to be very modest in our judgment of those whose views of truth are not exactly ours? Let us not suppose that, because we are right, they are wholly wrong. May it not be that we see one phase, they another, of the glory and the grace of Him who is the Truth? And are not those persons and Churches really the most orthodox who are most willing to learn from others, and most ready to accept the special witness of each and all?

This lesson is not left to mere inference. There is an express summons to every one to listen, not only to what the Spirit of Christ has to say to His Church, but to what He will reveal to all: "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches." What a lesson to those bigoted people who imagine that God speaks only to Anglicans, or only to Presbyterians, or only to Wesleyans, and make up their minds that what is revealed to others and not to them is not worth listening to! Let us not be deaf to the voice of the Spirit, through whatever channels it reaches us. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith to the Churches"—to all the Churches, even to those which are as heretical as that of Pergamos, or as corrupt as that of Thyatira.

2. Each Church is judged, not by its creed, not by its

ritual, not by its orders, not by its standing in the community, not by its resources, but by its works. "I know thy works," are the solemn words with which all the messages begin. But the kind of works specially noted and commended are not those of external conduct, such as the paying of debts, the living a sober and industrious life, and showing a little kindness now and again to some friend or acquaintance. It does not need eyes like a flame of fire to see works of that kind. All this should go without saying in the case of Christian people. The works, the presence or absence of which is specially noted, are specifically Christian. Take the enumeration of the Thyatiran works as a specimen: "thy love, and faith, and ministry, and patience," each one going deeper than ordinary morality.

3. Most noteworthy is it also that the Churches afflicted with heresy or scandal are not by any means the worst in the sight of God. The world in such cases would see only what is bad, and judge by what it sees. But it is otherwise with these searching eyes. While the abuses and scandals of Pergamos and Thyatira are faithfully dealt with and rebuked, the good in each of them is as carefully noted and commended, and far severer condemnation is meted out to reputable Sardis, and rich and prosperous Laodicea. There was no heresy in Sardis, no controversy, no trouble of any kind as it would seem. But why was all so peaceful and serene? Because neither people nor Churches get into trouble when they are sound asleep; and all is quiet in the cemetery. The severest message of all is to Laodicea, a Church so prosperous that it thought itself in need of nothing, and yet had to be told that it was "poor and miserable and blind and naked and in need of all things," a striking contrast to the case of Smyrna, to which came the reassuring word, "I know thy poverty, but thou art rich." There seems to have been as little trouble of any kind in Laodicea as in Sardis; there was peace as well as

prosperity, but it was the peace of apathy and cold indifference. Any person in Laodicea might think as he pleased and do as he pleased so long as he did not violate the canons of respectability. "Neither cold nor hot," therefore worse than all. Heresy and schism are bad, but not so bad as apathy and death.

4. All through, mercy rejoices over judgment. We have seen how, even in the case of Churches where there was most to condemn, the Lord found much to commend, and eagerly took hold of it and made the most of it. Further, while those in a good condition spiritually are not left without a word of warning, those in the worst condition are not left without a word of encouragement. Even Sardis, with only a name to live, is recognised as not quite dead, and called upon to "be watchful and strengthen the things that remain that are ready to die"; and lukewarm Laodicea has the tenderest assurance of all: "Behold, I stand at the door, and knock: if any man hear My voice, and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and he with Me."

5. Each message closes with a great promise. All the seven are different, just as the seven descriptions of the risen Lord in the opening of the messages are different; and just as in that case, so in this we have to add all together to get an adequate idea of the exceeding greatness of the reward "to him that overcometh."

And here again it is worthy of note that the worse the Church the richer the promise. This seems strange at first; but a little thought will find good reason for it. The promise is not to the whole Church, not in any case. The whole Church shares in the revelation of Christ, in His word of appreciation, and encouragement, and warning, and rebuke; but when it comes to the final reward, it is not to the Church as a whole, but "to him that overcometh." It is a great misfortune to belong to a faithless or dead or

lukewarm Church ; but, God be thanked, that does not necessitate our being faithless or dead or lukewarm ; we may overcome ; and is it not reasonable that to him that overcometh under such serious disadvantage there should be accorded the highest honour and reward ?

6. While the Churches are dealt with as Churches, and each message is to the angel or the spirit of the Church as a whole, the final word in every case is to the individual. It will not be as Churches but as individuals that we shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ. It will not serve then to have belonged to the best Church in Christendom if thou thyself art overcome of evil ; rather will it increase thy condemnation ; nor will it be to thy prejudice that thou hast belonged to the very worst, if thou thyself hast been faithful and true ; rather will it be to thy everlasting honour in the great eternity. "He that hath an ear, let him hear what the Spirit saith unto the Churches."

J. MONRO GIBSON.

*HAS AMMINADIB IN CANTICLES ANY
EXISTENCE?*

THIS question must be taken in connection with Canticles vi. 12, vii. 2 [1], vii. 7. Bickell's most ingenious correction of vi. 12, vii. 2, reported by Budde, has probably drawn the attention of many students. Budde's own criticisms of this will also, I presume, have been respectfully considered. For my own part, I am sure that Grätz and Bickell are right in rejecting the enigmatical "chariots of my princely people" (so R. V.) or "chariots of Ammi-nadib" (R. V. marg.). שְׁמַתְנִי is, almost beyond a doubt, a corruption of שֵׁם אֶתֶן, and מִרְכַּבַּת a corruption of בַּת לֶךְ לְךָ; דְרֵי לְךָ [אֶתֶן] שֵׁם אֶתֶן occurs at the end of vii. 13.

This is all due to Bickell. I do not feel quite so sure that he has solved the mystery of לֹא יִדְעֵתִי נַפְשִׁי in vi. 12, but the words are certainly intrusive. I think too that he has certainly missed the true explanation of בַּת עַמִּי נָדִיב, vi. 12, and בַּת נָדִיב, vii. 2. On this point the student will refer to Budde, who has not perhaps seen to the heart of the problem, but rightly suspects that Bickell is almost too ingenious. From Bickell I turn to another scholar—Perles—who acutely groups these passages with vii. 7; he proposes to read in vii. 7, for אֶהְבֶּה בַּת עַמִּי נָדִיב, אֶהְבֶּה בַּת תְּעַנְיָנִים. This cannot be right; Amminadab (LXX.) or Amminadib (A. V.) has no existence. In vii. 7 we should almost certainly read בַּת תְּעַנְיָנִי; cf. Micah i. 16, בְּנֵי תְעַנְיָנֶיךָ; ii. 9, מִבְּנֵי תְעַנְיָה (Wellhausen's certain correction). But Perles's impression that vii. 7 is to be grouped with vi. 12 and vii. 2 is perfectly right, in my opinion. In the two latter passages we should read, for בַּת עַמִּי נָדִיב and בַּת נָדִיב, בַּת תְּעַנְיָנִי. Transposition and corruption account for the changed aspect of the phrase, ג=ב; ד=ו; מ=ת. There is one superfluous י; the older text probably was without this, for

LXX. has in vi. 12 *αμειναδαβ*, and in vii. 2 *θυγατερ ναδαβ*. The nett result is that in Canticles vi. 12, vii. 2, vii. 7 the reading of the (corrected) text should probably be,—

“ There will I give thee (the enjoyment of) my love ”
 (= vii. 13*d*).

“ How beautiful are thy steps in the sandals, O maiden
 in whom I have delight.”

“ How beautiful art thou, how pleasant, O maiden in
 whom I have delight.”

I am sorry for any one who regrets the loss of Amminadib ; for lost for ever Amminadib certainly is, whether the present solution of the problems of the text be adopted or not. But the pleasure which Budde's excellent commentary on Canticles must produce in all who read it will compensate for any passing disappointment.

Twenty years ago, the clue which Budde has so admirably used was in my own hands. I used it (in an unpublished work on the Old Testament) so far as to break up the Song of Songs into a moderate number of lyric passages, connected with the wedding of any country maiden ; so far Wetzstein's discovery led me, while the dramatic hypothesis was still in almost undisturbed possession of the field. Stade, however, was the first to express in print a conviction of the importance of Wetzstein's communication. And now that the German consul's clue has been so efficaciously handled by Budde, we may hope that opinion will finally gravitate to the new theory. A number of corrections of the text, however, still have to be made. In the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and the *Expository Times* for 1898-1899 I have indicated some of those which have struck me as probable. I have now ventured to add one more, remarking, before I lay down the pen, that the correction of Canticles vii. 7 connects itself with a correction offered, in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for Janu-

ary, 1899, of the preceding verse. The "purple" hair of the bride, in the tresses of which "the king is held captive," is indeed purely imaginary, or rather due to an ingenious attempt of a scribe to make some sort of sense out of a corrupt text. The correction offered has, in my opinion, a very high degree of probability, because it is supported by numerous parallels elsewhere. There is a wonderful amount of method and consistency in the errors of the scribes. It is this method, this consistency, which so frequently enables us to correct them, sometimes plausibly, sometimes probably, sometimes certainly. Budde himself having remarked, in his note on vi. 12, that "none of the possibilities mentioned is quite satisfactory; we must wait for help from some other quarter," I have thought it not inappropriate to mention my own solutions of a few of the difficulties which he himself recognises to be still unexplained. I feel sure that he will come over to Bickell's view about the "chariots" of vi. 12; the explanations cited by Driver (*Introd.*, 6th ed. p. 446) are indeed hopelessly wrong; and I hope that he may on consideration recognise the plausibility of my own engrafted view.

T. K. CHEYNE.

AGUR.

ONE may follow most critics (except Frankenberg, who edits the Proverbs in Nowack's *Handkommentar*), in separating Proverbs xxx. 5, 6 from the outspoken poem which goes before. A reader who saw how the poem might mislead the unwary, points, by way both of comfort and warning, to the all-sufficiency of revealed truth. It may still be a question whether vv. 7-9 belong to this devout scribe (or some kindred spirit), or whether they may after all be left to Agur. The latter is only half ironical when he bemoans his inferiority to the wise men of his day, who are so sure of their orthodoxy; and by contemplating His works in nature have attained such a satisfactory knowledge of God and possibly (as Canon Cheyne suggests) of the sons of God, who maketh His angels spirits and His ministers a flame of fire. There is no irony at all in 18. "There be three things which are too wonderful for me; yea, four which I know not." An agnostic is not necessarily an infidel. Agur did not profess to know God like the wise, or hope to delight in Him like the Psalmists; but he might have prayed quite consistently for an honest, wholesome human life, for truthfulness, reverence, and contentment, and deliverance from the temptations of riches and poverty.

Be this as it may, there is a close parallel between vv. 11-14 (which give, as Canon Cheyne observes, four marks of an evil generation) and v. 19. In both we have four nominatives following each other without a predicate. The predicate is duly supplied in v. 18. It was once to be found in v. 10 in some such form as this: "There are three generations which . . . yea, four which . . ." The missing words were so bitter that they reminded an ancient reader of the proverb (which he did not invent) which we read in v. 10 now. This proverb has no affinity

whatever with the context except as a protest against the dictum which it has suppressed. In this way it differs from *v.* 17, a sympathetic parallel added to illustrate *v.* 11, though now separated from it by accidents of transcription, and *v.* 20, appended in the right place by a reader who was reminded of a secret sin by the last of the secrets of nature enumerated in *v.* 19.

What, then, is the evil generation described in *vv.* 11-14? They are the false saints of orthodoxy, whom Agur judges far more severely than he judges the false wise, whom he would envy if he could believe in them. Here we find the earliest anticipation of the long strife between the Sons of the Wise and the 'Am Hartz, "the people of the land." At first it seems as if in *v.* 14 we had a description of the ungodly rich, who are heathens and infidels at heart; but then we should be forced to suppose that Agur is speaking not of one class viewed under four aspects, but of four distinct classes. Now, in *vv.* 12, 13 it is clear that we have two aspects of false self-righteousness. We have not far to look to find the same note in *v.* 11. Agur speaks of a generation who despise the first commandment with promise and think to inherit the blessing of Levi, "who said unto his father and to his mother, I have not seen him." While Ezra's reformation was being enforced (which must have taken a long time upon the whole, even if the crisis came as soon and passed as quickly as the Chronicler tells us), there must have been repeated cases in which the children conformed while the parents held back. Long before that Ezekiel had put the case of the righteous son of the sinful father, and sons of the stranger who were joined to the Lord would have a special temptation to despise parents who served the gods of their fathers; and converts who are often as offensive as renegades are sometimes, like renegades, influential. More generally those who grew up in the congregation sanctified by Ezra's covenant would be

tempted to despise those who lived and died outside—to say of them as the Psalmist said of sinners, “They are brought down and fallen. We are risen and stand upright.”

To return to *v.* 14, it was no easier in the days of Ezra than in the days of Hillel for a boor to be a sinfearer. A simple peasant could hardly manage, even before the scribes had made “a hedge for the law,” to observe all the many precepts literally. The fathers of those who devoured widows’ houses, and for a pretence made long prayers, gloated on the prospect, which, when they sat in judgment, they could do something to realize, that careless peasants who resented the burdens laid upon them should be rooted out of Israel. Agur had before his eyes a sanctimonious, Pharisaical *bourgeoisie*, who perverted the ideal of Isaiah lx.–lxii., which is an ever-expanding league of holy cities grouped round the Holy City, which is at once a sanctuary enriched by gifts and a great staple town enriched by trade, where the citizens rejoice to worship, while strangers stand and feed their flocks, and aliens are their ploughmen and their vine-dressers, the willing servants of a nation of priests. The ideal is certainly older than Nehemiah, for the promise that the walls of Zion shall be built by strangers (Isa. lx. 10) implies that they have not been rebuilt by native energy.

G. A. SIMCOX.

THE GENESIS OF DEUTERONOMY.

III.

II.—*The Claims of Criticism Examined.*

THREE important claims are made in substantiation of Deuteronomy's late origin; first, that it is a reformatory law code; second, that it depends upon the composite document called JE, but knows nothing of P; and third, that its literary influence is observable first in the prophecies of Jeremiah.

1. *That Deuteronomy is a reformatory law code.*—According to Wellhausen the kernel of Deuteronomy is “a programme of reform” for the reconstruction of the theocracy,¹ “designed for the reformation by no means of the cultus alone, but at least quite as much of the civil relations of life”;² aiming, not like Isaiah and the other prophets, to purify, simply, the high places, but to abolish them entirely,³ and intended “not to remain a private memorandum, but to obtain public recognition as a book.”⁴ In short the author of Deuteronomy was a reformer prescribing as the people's duty what he saw to be at variance with the people's practice;⁵ the book itself being the crowning work of the prophets,⁶ the legal expression of the second prophetic period of struggle and transition.⁷ These are the opinions of the leader, but none the less of all those who assign Deuteronomy to a late date.

Thus Kuenen makes Deuteronomy “the programme of a drastic reformation,” declaring that “it was not by accident, but in accordance with the writer's deliberate purpose, that it became the foundation and the norm of

¹ *Proleg.*⁴ 1895, p. 412. *Proleg.*¹ Eng. transl. 1885, p. 404.

² *Proleg.*¹ p. 487. ³ *Proleg.*¹ pp. 26, 23. ⁴ *Proleg.*⁴ p. 410.

⁵ *Proleg.*¹ p. 33. ⁶ *Israelitische u. jüdische Geschichte*,² 1895, p. 129.

⁷ *Proleg.*¹ pp. 33, 34.

Josiah's reformation." ¹ J. E. Carpenter says: "The book of Deuteronomy was a protest of the prophetic party of the seventh century B.C. against the connection of unspiritual and heathen elements with the worship of Yahweh"; also that it was "a programme of religious reform" . . . "cast into the mould of Mosaic legislation"; that "its writers no doubt believed that they were correctly representing the principles of Moses applied to their own time," but that "these principles were in fact the results of a long development—the outgrowth of Mosaic conceptions expanded, transformed and enriched by the experience of centuries"; ² Driver, ³ Duhm, ⁴ Kautzsch, ⁵ D'Eichtal, ⁶ and others, never weary of reiterating the same thesis, claiming that the book of Deuteronomy possesses more than mere latent, dynamic power capable of producing reform; that it was written with the avowed purpose to reform; and that, while it is Mosaic in the sense that Moses would have spoken thus had he been able to address the Israel of later times, yet Deuteronomy is particularly and essentially prophetic.

The fundamental reason for this conclusion is the remarkable manner in which the laws of Deuteronomy 12.–26. were executed by Josiah, King of Judah, in attempting to reform the nation (621 B.C.). The account of Josiah's reformation given in 2 Kings 22. 3 f. fulfils, it is claimed, the requirements of Deuteronomy "Schritt für Schritt." ⁷ And further, for Shaphan to have read the entire Pentateuch twice through in one day would have been impossible, whereas to have read the original book of Deuteronomy

¹ *Hexateuch*, Eng. transl. 1886, p. 218.

² *Modern Review*, iv. 1883, pp. 274, 411, 442.

³ *Deuteronomy*, 1895, pp. li., lii., liii.

⁴ *Die Entstehung des A. Ts.*—Rede zur Rektoratsfeier des Jahres 1897, p. 16.

⁵ *Abriss der Geschichte des alttest. Schriftums*, 1897, p. 56.

⁶ *Mélanges de Critique Biblique*, 1886, p. 92 f.

⁷ Kautzsch, *Abriss der Gesch.*, etc., p. 55. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xlv.

would not have required more than half an hour.¹ Accordingly the "book of the law" found by Hilkiyah in the temple (2 Kings 22. 8) must have been the kernel of Deuteronomy.

But to this oft-repeated inference several considerations are seriously opposed: (1) The fact that the book found was recognised as an *ancient* code which had been *disobeyed by the fathers* (2 Kings 22. 13), shows that in the seventh century there was already a tradition to the effect that long prior to that date a written law had been in existence which had been neglected. (2) According to 2 Kings 22. 2-9 (and criticism assumes the historicity of this and the following chapter), Josiah had begun to repair the temple *before* the book of the law was found. From which it is evident that the reformation of Josiah was not wholly due to the discovery of the temple law code; indeed that it was begun *prior* to its discovery. The Chronicler goes further, and states that it was after Josiah "had purged the land" of idolatry that the book of the law was found (2 Chron. 34. 8), which shows that in the Chronicler's days no special importance was attached to the finding of a law code as the *ground* for Josiah's reformation.² (3) 2 Kings 23. 9, on the critical hypothesis, was a direct violation of Deuteronomy 18. 6-8. According to criticism, in Deuteronomy 18. 6-8, the *priests* of the high places (whom the Deuteronomist calls "Levites") are allowed to come up to Jerusalem and minister in the name of the Lord, and also receive like portions to eat with their brethren. But in 2 Kings 23. 9, the historian declares that "the priests of the high places came *not* up to the altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat of the unleavened bread among their brethren."

¹ Kautzsch, *idem*, p. 56. Cf. Kittel, *History of the Hebrews*, i. 1895, Eng. transl. p. 59.

² Ewald, *History of Israel*, Eng. transl. vol. iv. p. 233, speaks of the discovery of Deuteronomy as the event which gave "the final impulse" to Josiah's reformation—a view similar to Keil's.

ren." Here is a flagrant violation, on Josiah's part, of the very law code which criticism claims so wonderfully moved the king to reform the cult of Jerusalem. Deuteronomy 18. 6-8 was confessedly never carried out.¹ On the new theory it is impossible to explain this anomaly. On the old, however, there is no disharmony, because Deuteronomy 18. 6-8, instead of being reformatory of the worship in the high places, simply prescribes what a sojourning *Levite* is privileged to do. The new theory creates thus a new difficulty which it is unable to explain. (4) The new hypothesis creates a still greater difficulty. For, if we hold, with Kautzsch,² that Hilkiyah was also himself surprised at his discovery (which would, of course, relieve him from being a party to the programme), then we lay ourselves open to the great and, in Kuenen's opinion,³ "fatal objection that it makes the actual reformation the work of those who had not planned it, but were blind tools in the service of the unknown projector." On the other hand, if, with Kuenen,⁴ we assume that Hilkiyah, or Jeremiah, or Shaphan, or any one else of the pious people of Josiah's age, planned the reformation and deliberately used this illicit method of deceiving the king into reform, then a much graver question arises as to the moral character of these men. (5) The new theory confuses the "finding" of the book of the law with the "publishing" of it. That it was published in 621 B.C., in the sense that it received the stamp of kingly authority, there is no question. But that it was published for the *first* time in Josiah's eighteenth year is quite a different question. The account in 2 Kings 23. 1 ff. records the "finding" of the book of the law and describes explicitly how the king bound himself and his

¹ So Wellhausen. *Isr. u. jüd. Gesch.*² 1895, p. 132; and Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xlv. n.

² *Abriss*, etc., p. 57.

³ *Hexateuch*, Eng. transl. pp. 219, 220.

⁴ *Idem*, p. 202.

people by oath to observe its commandments, but nowhere is there an intimation that it was then being published for the *first* time. That is an inference only. It is not even an implication. Just as Kittel's idea¹ that Shaphan read the entire book twice through in *one* day is only an inference. The account nowhere states that he read *the whole of it*, neither does it say that he read it *twice on the same day*. "Three or four leaves" may have sufficed to enable him to determine the character and importance of the roll, as in the case when Jehudi read Jeremiah's scroll to Jehoiakim (Jer. 36. 23).² Only on the theory that it was a *new* book is one justified in supposing that the entire scroll was read. (6) And further, it should be observed that neither Hilkiyah, nor Shaphan, nor Huldah the prophetess, nor even the king himself, in the account given in 2 Kings 22. and 23., ever once makes a quotation from the book which criticism alleges was the cause of so great a reformation, and which was then being published for the first time. The only passage alluded to in the account is by Huldah, who, in giving the king advice as to what policy he should pursue (2 Kings 22. 16), uses language similar to that contained in Deuteronomy 29. 27: but then Deuteronomy 29. is denied on all sides to have belonged to the original book of Deuteronomy.

Two important reasons remain for thinking that the book of Deuteronomy was written in order to reform, the first of which is *the centralization of the cultus in Jerusalem*. The claim is made that in 621 B.C., for the *first* time in the history of Israel's religion, an official attempt was made to centralize the worship of the nation at Jerusalem. This is *the thesis par excellence* of the new hypothesis. Wellhausen recurs over and over again to it as the chief tenant in his

¹ *History of the Hebrews*, i. pp. 53, 59.

² Cf. Sime, *Deuteronomy, the People's Book*, 1877, p. 19.

reconstruction of Old Testament history.¹ It is also claimed that this was the chief thought in the mind of the author of Deuteronomy. For example, he insists that Israel shall sacrifice only at the one place which God shall choose (cf. Deut. 12. 5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14. 23-25; 15. 20; 16. 2, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16; 17. 8, 10; 18. 6; 26. 2; 31. 11), which, in the words of Kautzsch, "was, of course, the temple in Jerusalem."²

On the contrary, several objections stubbornly oppose this view: (1) The whole theory is based upon the hypothesis that "Deut. 12 is a polemic against Exod. 20. 24."³ It is claimed that Exodus 20. 24 teaches a plurality of sanctuaries in the sense that it recognises the worship of Jehovah in the high places as legitimate. But this interpretation is doubtful on the ground both of exegesis and history. (a) *Exegetically*, Exodus 20. 24 belongs to a section of law (Exod. 20. 24; 23. 33), called "the book of the Covenant" (Exod. 24. 7), in which section the nation is addressed as an *individual* (note the 2 pers. sing.); and the command given to Israel is to build not "altars" in the sense of synchronous places of worship (for to worship at different places at the same time would have been quite as impossible for Israel as an *individual* nation, as for Israel as a single individual), but an "altar," so reads the text; and only "in all places where I record my name," a clause which is equivalent to, and synonymous with, the Deuteronomic expression "in the place which the Lord shall choose." This interpretation is the only one consistent with the book of the Covenant itself; for, in Exodus 23. 17, 19, all males in Israel are required, thrice every year, to

¹ *Der Ort des Gottesdienstes*, or, "The Place of Worship," is the heading of the first chapter of his *Proleg.* upon which he places the greatest emphasis.

² *Abriss*, p. 55. So Dillmann, iii. pp. 295, 612; cf. Wellhausen, *Proleg.*¹ p. 22, *Isr. u. jüd. Gesch.*² 1895, p. 31; and Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xlv. n., and many others.

³ Wellhausen, *Die Composition des Hexateuchs*,² 1839, p. 205.

appear before the Lord, and bring with them the firstfruits of the land "unto the house of the Lord thy God." This demands a definite centre, not a multiplicity of shrines.

(b) *Historically*. The tabernacle, as the home of the ark of the covenant, represented unity of sanctuary and worship in Israel from Horeb on. There could be but one sanctuary at any one time, for Jehovah's dwelling was before the ark in the most holy place. There was but one ark. The doctrine of Jehovah's omnipresence dates from a much later period. In Joshua 18. 1 it is declared that the tabernacle was set up at Shiloh; and we are already familiar with the incident recorded in Joshua 22. 11-34 (cf. 1. 8; 3. 3). During the period of the Judges Shiloh remained the centre of Israel's worship, as may be inferred from Judges 18. 31, and 21. 19; moreover, in a passage in the book of Jeremiah (7. 12; cf. 26. 6 and Ps. 78. 56-66), almost as old, according to criticism, as the kernel of Deuteronomy, there is the record of a tradition to the effect that in the time of the Judges, Israel's "house of God" was in Shiloh. We further learn that the temple of Solomon was built by a levy "out of all Israel" (1 Kings 5. 13), and intended for "the children of Israel" (1 Kings 6. 12, 13): dedicated in the presence of "all the tribes of Israel" (8. 1), as a centre towards which all Israel might pray (8. 41-43), and as the place where the Lord promised to abide (9. 3).¹ "No king after Solomon is left uncensured for having tolerated the high places."² The prophets of the eighth century *assumed*, as we have also already seen, that Jerusalem was the only legitimate place of worship. And as for Hezekiah's reformation (2 Kings 18. 4 ff.), it was quite as complete, and quite as permanent in its effects, as was that of Josiah; and the historical evidence for the one is, in the writer's judgment, as good as that for the other.³

¹ Cf. Baxter, *Sanctuary and Sacrifice*, 1896, pp. 5, 6.

² Wellhausen, *Proleg.*¹ p. 19.

³ There seems to be little real evidence to the contrary. There surely is no

So much for exegesis and history. Turning to the book of Deuteronomy itself, it is easy to show that the actual teaching of the author concerning the unity of sanctuary has been exaggerated. Deuteronomy does not teach the unity of worship as *opposed* to the then existing high places of *Israel*; the teaching of the book is rather this: Three times in a year *Israel* shall come up, not to the high places of the *Canaanites*, but to the place which God *shall* choose, and there shall they "rejoice" before the Lord (cf. 12. 7, 12, 18; 14. 26; 16. 11, 14, 16). The command, however, is expressly conditioned in 12. 10 by the Lord's first giving them rest from all their enemies round about. This fact, accordingly, may account for Samuel's having followed the law of *successive* altars in Exodus 20. 24 during the period of ark-captivity; and, on the other hand, for David's desire (2 Sam. 7. 1) to build God a house, "seeing the Lord had given him rest round about from all his enemies." There is nothing novel in the Deuteronomic code.¹ It does not insist any more than the other laws of the Pentateuch upon *all worship* being rendered at the central sanctuary; only that all burnt offerings, etc. (12. 5-13), shall be brought thither.² The stringency of the law is relieved in 12. 15, 16, according to which *Israel* are allowed to kill and eat flesh in all their gates. But most remarkable of all is Deuteronomy 27. 4-7 (cf. 11. 29), where it is actually *enjoined* that an altar shall be built between Ebal and Gerizim, and sacrifices offered thereon to *Jehovah*. This section, to be sure, is cut out of the original Deuteronomic kernel by criticism, but it is equally impossible to assign such an injunction to any period subsequent to 621 B.C.; for, as Vos correctly observes, "Deuter-

good *historical* reason for accepting 2 Kings 22. and 23. and discounting 2 Kings 18. 4 ff.

¹ Cf. Douglas, *Lex Mosaica*, 1894, p. 84.

² Cf. Kleinert, *Untersuchungen*, 1872, p. 86.

onomy emphasizes as much the permanence of the once established sanctuary as its unity.”¹

The remaining reason for thinking that Deuteronomy is a reformatory code is the alleged *restriction of the priesthood to the tribe of Levi*. According to criticism, prior to 621 B.C. any one could act as priest; in Deuteronomy the priesthood is restricted to the tribe of Levi; in Ezekiel to the sons of Zadok; in the Priestly document, after the exile, to the sons of Aaron. The classical passage in Deuteronomy on this point, on the basis of which criticism attempts to show that the code is reformatory, is chap. 18. 1-8. On the contrary, note, however, (1) that the author speaks of *some one* whom the Lord has chosen out of all the tribes to minister before Him, “him and his sons for ever” (v. 5); (2) that Jehovah’s choice of the tribe of Levi is already recorded in Exodus 32. 26-29, Numbers 8. 14 ff.; (3) that prior to the consecration of the Levites all the first-born in Israel had apparently acted in the priestly capacity (Num. 3. 12, 13); (4) that the Levites were appointed to serve in place of the firstborn (Num. 8. 18, 19); (5) that Korah and his company rebelled against the limitation of the priesthood to Levites (Num. 16. 1 ff.); (6) that the author of Deuteronomy apparently recognises that a tendency still exists in Israel for some to place themselves on a level with the priesthood, and accordingly for this reason restricts membership to that office to the tribe of Levi (Deut. 10. 8, 9). Further, that the book of Deuteronomy is not altogether silent as to the distinction between Levites and Levitical priests. “It is not true that the Deuteronomist teaches that every male member of the tribe of Levi is, by virtue of his birth, eligible to the priesthood. Not to speak of the Levites, who are often mentioned in a seemingly private capacity, there is in Deuteronomy 27. 9, 14, 12, a clear discrimination between

¹ Vos, *The Mosaic Origin of the Pentateuchal Codes*, 1886, p. 91.

the Levitical priests (cf. Josh. 8. 33), as pronouncing the blessings and the curses, and their tribe, which has its position with Simeon, Judah, Issachar, Joseph, and Benjamin, and which, with them, are to respond to the blessings spoken by their brethren. The representation here, then, is that the mass of the tribe of Levi are standing upon Mount Gerizim, while some of their brethren are acting as priests."¹ In other words, the book of Deuteronomy assumes that all priests must belong to the tribe of Levi, but it does not, explicitly or necessarily, teach that all Levites can be priests. As shown above, the true teaching of Deuteronomy seems rather to be this: not *all* but *only* the tribe of Levi shall be allowed to perform the priestly office. If the opposite is true, then the expression "unto this day" in Deuteronomy 10. 8, along with what stands in the same verse, is, on the part of the Deuteronomist, an historical anachronism.²

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

¹ Quoted from Curtis, *The Levitical Priests*, 1877, p. 23. Cf. Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, 1897, p. 286; Alexander, *Pulpit Commentary*, Deuteronomy, p. xxv.

² On the entire subject of the Priesthood cf. Baudissen, *Die Gesch. des A.T.'s Priesterthums*, 1889, espec. pp. 78 ff.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

I.

THE GRACE OF GOD.

IT was the mission of St. Paul to declare the gospel of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ to the nations, and none of his successors in this high office has spoken with such persuasive power. Any one differs from St. Paul at his intellectual peril, and every one may imitate him with spiritual profit. One therefore compares together the dominant note of the Apostle and of the modern preacher with interest, and one observes with concern that the characteristic modern strikes a lower key. St. Paul carried himself as an ambassador, charged with a commission by God and addressing subjects who had rebelled against their king; the preacher of to-day is rather a barrister pleading his case with an impartial and critical jury from whom he hopes to win a favourable verdict on Jesus Christ. The Apostle believed that he had received from God, by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, a divine message containing the terms of reconciliation and appealing to every man's conscience as a sinner; the modern has found in the religion of Jesus a reasonable discipline for the soul, and endeavours to convince his fellow-men of its excellent beauty. The Apostle was firmly convinced that if any man, Jew or Gentile, received his word and believed in Jesus Christ he would see the salvation of God,—such things as eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, nor have entered into the heart of man,—and that if he deliberately refused the obedience of Christ, he had missed the way of

life everlasting. From the standpoint of our age there is possibly an advantage with the believing Christian; he has a wider vision and a more inspiring ideal; there is certainly some disadvantage in being an unbeliever, he has denied himself the support of the most majestic of all religious traditions and the delicate enjoyment of the most graceful æsthetic emotions. The Apostle was intense, commanding, uncompromising, and he preached with overwhelming authority; the modern is diffident, suggestive, conciliatory, and he has no authority.

When we ask how the most modest of men personally—did he not declare himself less than the least of all saints?—and the most reverent of thinkers—did he not confess that the love of God passeth knowledge?—carried himself with such confidence, the answer is to be found in his high idea of the Christian faith of which he was an Apostle. With him Christianity was not simply the most lofty of living faiths, as it has become the fashion of to-day to regard it in our devotion to the study of comparative religion. St. Paul certainly had too generous a doctrine of God, and too profound a doctrine of humanity, to suppose that the nations had been left since the beginning with no light, and that their religions were only systems of devil worship. Not only was the faith of his fathers a distinct revelation of the Eternal, but throughout the race there was diffused a knowledge of God and of righteousness sufficient to guide honest men in their life and conduct. Between Gentile religions, however, and Christianity the difference was not in degree, but in nature. They were instructive and prophetic—the preparation for the final faith; but they were natural, with no element in them which was not within the range of human attainment. Christianity has been throughout, as regards its historical facts, within the range of human life; and, as regards its organized action, Christianity must work through human agents; but Chris-

tianity, in its inherent force, is beyond the natural and has its source in God. It draws its strength from the eternal springs; its sanctions come from Deity; and when St. Paul invited men to hear and obey the Gospel, he stood, in all his own weakness, upon the rock of ages, and he spoke against a background of the supernatural.

With him the supernatural was not the mere idea of physical force—a matter of material miracles, to which indeed St. Paul attached no importance, but the nobler idea of spiritual influence, on which he delighted to insist. St. Paul had an altogether persuasive and beautiful word for the supernatural, which he was never weary of using, and which the Church should count one of her chief treasures—the Grace of God. Supernatural is a scientific word, and moves in the sphere of the physical; grace is a religious word, and moves in the sphere of the spiritual. As St. Paul conceived it in his sane religious imagination grace was the goodwill of God which from past ages had rested on the human race as a purpose of salvation. As the thoughts of God are their own fulfilment, so that when He speaks it is done, this goodwill is not only benevolence, it is also benefaction. Through the centuries before Christ it was made manifest in patient longsuffering towards sin and ignorance, in gradual revelations of the Divine character, in evangelical promises which were embraced by believing souls, in visions of Messianic days full of hope and gladness, as well as in secret light, comfort, strength and cleansing. During the centuries which have followed Christ the Grace of God, stored in the person of the Lord and administered by the Holy Ghost, has poured into human souls, through the preaching of the gospel, through the sacraments of the Lord's Supper and Baptism, through many providences of joy and sorrow, and through the mystical fellowship of the soul with God. It has been a long procession of the divine riches—the

very fulness of God passing through the avenue of the incarnation into the life of the human race.

St. Paul was accustomed to dwell with even more tender recollection upon the grace of God as that grace rested upon the individual. From eternity, as he imagined, the goodwill of the Almighty had reached forward to a man who was not yet in being, and already it purposed great mercies for his soul. From the day of that man's birth the divine grace had pursued and encompassed him in the teaching of his mother and the example of his father, in the words of Scripture and in many deliverances in early years. One day that grace made a chief assault upon his soul, moving his conscience and his heart, leading him to repentance and to faith till that man became a new creature in Christ Jesus. From his birthday forward the same grace guided and instructed him, succoured and sanctified him, kept him from falling and changed him into the very character of the Son of God. During hours of darkness and the straits of human sorrow that grace was his comfort and his strength, and this grace of God was ever keeping his heart in the hope of life everlasting, and when at last, this favoured man, his last sin forgiven and his last fault removed, stands in the presence of God perfect it will be to the praise and the glory of the divine grace. All that this man has ever known and all that he has ever done of good, all that he is in character and power, has come from the grace of God. So that without grace he is nothing, to grace he owes all. Such, according to St. Paul, was the magnificence and the fruitfulness of the grace of God.

Should it be the case that little to-day is heard of the sovereign and almighty grace of God, this is due not to its withdrawal nor to the slackening of its tides, but rather to new modes of thought and an atmosphere alien to the supernatural. Between the mental attitude of our fathers and our own there is a great difference wherein it is sup-

posed that we have gained much in intelligence, but wherein it is possible we have lost much in faith. According to our fathers the supernatural was very near to us, on every side, till perhaps their faith passed into credulity and their reverence into superstition. They peopled the world with spirits till not only did the holy angels stand, as surely they did stand, near to the children of God, ministering to the heirs of salvation, but every awful or beautiful place in nature had its spirit of blessing or of danger. They heard voices that are not heard to-day, and received warnings to which we give no heed, and everywhere the unseen mixed itself with the seen, so that our fathers were the inhabitants of two worlds. It was easier in such a receptive state of mind to believe in God and to believe in His constant and blessed intervention in human life.

During our day the veil of mystery has been lifted and the frontiers of the supernatural driven back; we have been convinced by the arguments of physical science that nature through all her provinces is one, and that her laws are inflexible. It has been our endeavour to trace everything spiritual to a natural cause and to embrace within the visible universe all the mysteries of life. Is it wonderful that the impression has been left on men's minds that there is nothing real except that which is seen or can be discovered by the methods of science, and that the supernatural is a myth and an unreality? With this idea in the background of our minds we are not inclined to believe that God is ever acting on human souls and making Himself known in human life, and therefore we have not only for the largest part ceased to believe in what is called the miraculous, meaning thereby physical miracles, but we have also ceased to believe in the nobler miraculous, the effects and evidence of the grace of God. We have forgotten the goodwill of God because we have forgotten that He is a Will.

Should any person have been so saturated by the modern spirit that to him the idea of the divine intervention even for the salvation of his soul is incredible, then nothing can be more foolish or uncharitable than to scold and to denounce him, and especially nothing is more to be deprecated than offering to him, or rather forcing upon him, the brutal alternative between believing in the supernatural or surrendering the ideal of a holy life. If any one be unable to believe in God as a personal and beneficent will and in Jesus Christ as the revelation of God and the Saviour of the world, then he is suffering an immense loss, but an austere ideal still stands out before his soul. He can still respect himself and still serve his fellow-men. He can still appreciate righteousness and fight the good fight against sin. He can still possess his soul in patience, and await with courage the unknown future. His models in the natural virtues are such as may well strengthen and inspire any one, for they are Socrates dying bravely with nothing but a plank to carry him across the great sea to the new world, and Marcus Aurelius sadly speculating regarding the origin and end of all things, but ever doing his duty bravely and carrying himself purely in the battle of life. His, however, is an incalculable deprivation and a dreary outlook, for his conception of life is so much more hopeless than that which filled the heart of the Gentile Apostle with gladness, and touched all his life with a light that shone even when he was a chained prisoner and a candidate for martyrdom.

What conception of life can be more cheerless than to think of it as a huge piece of machinery into which one is cast at birth as a sheaf of corn between the teeth of the threshing-mill, through whose revolving drums and whirling wheels one is carried from stage to stage for seventy years, and from which what remains is cast at death into an unknown and dark chamber. What discourages and shakes one in this severe idea of life is the hopelessness of

repenting the past and regaining the years which have been lost. One has been caught in the hands of mighty law, and because one's father or one's great-grandfather has been a sinner, and because one in the days of his youth has sinned himself, then the sins of the far distant past are so entailed and fastened upon the will and heart that life can never escape from their malign influence, but must ever accomplish its predestination of evil. What availeth to fight when the issue is already settled? and what availeth to tell me of the inflexible majesty and the unerring certainty of the moral laws when I myself am their victim and their illustration? It is in such circumstances that even the firmest and most convinced believer in the reign of law is visited with what may be only a devout imagination, but what every one must hope is also an instinct—the hope of help from without.

Suppose that there be some other force in this spiritual creation than law, and that, indeed, law be not a force at all, but only the instrument by which a living will is working. Suppose that this will can assert itself—not by the subversion of law, but by the new application of law; not by ignoring any law, but by introducing some superior law. What one desires is that a springtime should come to one's life when upon the waste ground which has been covered with obscene rubbish and is haunted with every evil thing, the birds of the air shall drop the good seed, and the showers of heaven descend and water it, and the sunshine of heaven quicken it into being till the waste places be covered with green grass which not only covers the evil of the past, but changes that very evil into flowers and fruit. One looks upon his life as a foul and stagnant river which is running in the bottom of the channel and into which has poured the moral sewage of many years, and he must pray at times, whatever he may believe, that a springtide of that great ocean from which the

river came pure as a shower upon the mountain, and to which that river must return, would break through all barriers and rush up the unclean channel, filling it from bank to bank with pure and wholesome water in which the sediment of years will be changed and cleansed. This may be incredible, but this surely is to all men most desirable; and this really is the Pauline conception of the Grace of God.

What, however, if this most enticing image of religion—a reinforcement from God—be only a hope and a dream which filled the sensitive and mystic soul of St. Paul, but which has no reality in history or in life? If the grace of God be a fact, and God has intervened, then there ought to be evidence of so great an affair which would convince any reasonable mind and afford a sound basis for faith. There is such an evidence, and it is really twofold, standing, first, in the person of Jesus Christ; and second, in Christian experience. It is a fact, and one about which there can be no doubt, that at a certain date in the history of the human race, and when the race was falling into moral decay, a man appeared in Palestine who bore no signs of evil heredity, and was impervious to His decadent environments. For about three years He lived in the full light of criticism and hostility, and during that time He so carried Himself in word and in deed amid all the circumstances of ordinary human life, that not even His bitterest enemy was able to accuse Him of sin, and to this day His life remains the most perfect manifestation of spiritual grace. His influence also was so attractive and so irresistible that any sinful man or woman coming under its power, Mary Magdalene or Zacchæus, was lifted out of the former habit of sin and passed into a new atmosphere of virtue, and any person of high and pure character, a John or a Mary, rose to the full height of excellence, and the

soul opened as a flower of spiritual beauty. As we now study the life of Jesus, examining His motives, hearing His words, watching His actions, it comes with conviction to our minds that a new force has entered into human life and has begun to work unto salvation. With Christ as the Head and Spring, another race rises within the human race, like fresh blood coursing along the veins of a decrepit body, or like a healing process begun within the ravages of disease. There are now, if one may so say, two hereditary lines, the old and the new; and one passing from the old passes from the influence of the sin of himself and his fathers and passes into the spiritual atmosphere of Christ Jesus, so that old things pass away and all things are made new. As St. Paul journeyed from city to city of the Roman empire, then falling into corruption, and preached the evangel of the grace of God, amidst the moral ruins of cities so unspeakably corrupt as Corinth and Rome, little communities arose, not perfect yet in character and life, but not unworthy to be called by the name of saints. The same heredity has continued and asserted itself unto the present day, and is manifested beyond controversy as often as a man who has disobeyed and been punished by the eternal law of righteousness passes under the sway and enters into the fellowship of Jesus Christ. Grace is therefore not an imagination, however beautiful and fascinating, but it is an historical and objective fact contained in the biography of Jesus, and repeated endlessly in human history for eighteen centuries.

When one inquires whence Jesus came, and what is the unseen spring of His influence, then it is open for any person to say that He was simply an amazing phenomenon in ordinary life, and that His grace was simply an achievement of pre-eminent character. This is, however, an explanation which does not meet the

facts of the case, and places a strain upon reason which it can hardly bear. Since there never has been any parallel to this perfect sinlessness, never any parallel to this immense influence, one is rather convinced that wherever Christ came from it was not from within the race in which He originated this new strain, seen alike in the Jewish and Roman world, and that however Christ exercises His constant power it is something more than the power of example now eighteen centuries distant. Is it not the case that when one hears the Word of Jesus and considers His life, he discovers that the idea of God which is a part of the natural capital of his soul has suddenly been realized before his face, and that Jesus is at least the equivalent or spiritual value of God. He fulfils to our minds all that we have put into the idea of God, so that beyond Him nothing divine can be imagined. Is it not, therefore, reasonable to believe that when Jesus appeared in the midst of the human race, born of the Virgin Mary, God Himself had intervened and the very grace of God had appeared and become a resident power in human history.

Our second evidence for the reality of the divine grace is the experience of the Christian Church, and by that phrase we mean the experience of its different members, and especially of those who have made fullest trial of the Christ. Any one desiring certain information in a department of study will naturally seek it from its experts, and it is worse than folly to seek our evidence of the matters of religion from the students of science or of philosophy. The sure witnesses in this highest department are the saints, the men who have overcome sin and have attained unto holiness; and their testimony in all the ages regarding the influence which has redeemed their lives and made perfect their souls is constant and unhesitating. Whether we ask St. Paul or St. John, whether we ask

St. Bernard or John Calvin, it matters not to what school of theology or to what ecclesiastical province the witness belongs, he has one reply to our question. If I am not to-day as other men, sinful and disobedient, if I have to-day a quiet conscience and a clean heart, if I have been able to do any good thing in the world, and to help any human being, it is not due to myself. This good has been due from beginning to end to the grace of God; and if I ever attain unto the perfection of the heavenly kingdom, then to the same grace must be ascribed my achievement. This faith is the spirit of the prayers of the Christian Church and of her praise and of her theology and of her endeavours, and it is hardly to be believed that her experience of eighteen centuries has been one great delusion, and that in her own strength she has done those great marvels which she has always ascribed to the grace of God.

One may even leave this historical evidence and venture upon an appeal to the heart of the ordinary man who is not utterly frivolous, and who has had some experience of life. Is it not the case that he has from time to time realized that an influence has been pleading with him, and restraining him, which was separate from books, even the Bible, and from friends, even the best, and that in any great event of his life, when he rose to his height and did that which before he had hardly believed possible, he was inspired and moved by a power that was from above? Is not every faithful man also haunted with the fear lest he should suddenly be overcome by a fiery temptation, and in five minutes wreck the whole of his past life, and not only his own life, but the concerns committed to his charge, so that the pulpit, or the law, or medicine, or commerce, be almost hopelessly disgraced by his fall? It is in the moment of his unexpected achievement that a thoughtful man is most humble and reverent, for he knows

this was God. It is in the hour of spiritual anxiety that a man hears with unspeakable thanksgiving of a power so vigorous and so strong that it can restrain him even when the currents of temptation are running at their fiercest, and it is with a sense of great relief that one commits himself in all modesty and in the simplicity of faith into His hands, who is able to keep us from falling, and whose grace, as it is alone the source of all goodness, is also the one hope of spiritual preservation.

JOHN WATSON.

THE LEAVEN OF HEROD.

ST. MARK VIII. 15.

THE greatest work which any man accomplishes during his life on earth is the shaping and fixing of his own character. His outward life is as much subsidiary to this supreme result as scaffolding is to the structure which rises within it. The scaffolding is but for a time and seems to conceal its own purpose ; and it is only when it falls away that the building which it veiled stands forth to be seen and to remain. "As the ways of the mason are, so is existence"; for, when a man's life-work is done and all his activity and effort have ceased, his character will stand disclosed. Then shall be seen what he was making himself all the time that he went about his daily work and took his daily pleasure, and what he is to be for ever. The only lasting product of this whirling, hammering, noisy world, is *men*. What each one of us is toiling at, and will turn out at the last and get wages for, is—*himself*.

Life, therefore, is a momentous experiment for every one of us ; we are on our trial every day ; and "the way of life" must in essence be "living the right way." Man's most important book must be his book of life—the book which throws most light on his life and gives him most help in living it. Man has such a book. God has written it for him. It is the Divine handbook to human life. It has been given to teach men how to live. We call it our Bible, because, in motive and power and for help in life, there is none beside it.

The Bible is largely a book of biography. Much of it is a record and report of men, in varying ages and circumstances and of varying temperament, trying to find out the true way to live or wilfully and sadly neglecting it. We are in Scripture thrown, so to speak, into the company of the

evil and the good. We seem to know them awhile, as we know the people we meet and walk about with. And, at the end, our acquaintance with them is made impressive and solemn when they are called from our side, and when after hearing a great voice we see them, as they pass into shadow out of sight, go to right and left as when a shepherd divides the sheep from the goats.

This method of teaching life by the lives of others is always an admirable one. The great principles which affect men's lives for evil or good are in this way shown in operation and process; and this way of teaching is both fascinating and sure. We are taught without knowing that we are being taught; we are so taught that we cannot forget. But in Scripture this method has a power all its own. For, first of all, the central thing in Scripture is a life, a human life, *the* Life which the best voices of these latest ages call divine, and which men have agreed on as the standard of human perfection; and the turning of a few pages can thus at once set every life there written in the most searching light and in the most trying contrast. And, still further and more, there is a power like that of life itself in the biography of the Bible. There is no doubt about this; the Bible is in this respect quite different from all other books. It is quick. It is vital. It goes straight to those centres in us where life originates and takes direction and shape. This most real power in our Bible has in it a mystery; on ordinary terms it is inexplicable. We may not say less about it, and we cannot say more, than that the Spirit of God gives it this power. Without this "Spirit which quickeneth" the Bible would in all the larger reference and need of human life, be only dead and deathful letter. That Spirit "giveth life" in a very special degree to the record of the life of Jesus Christ, so that saints when they read the Gospels seem to know Him as if they had heard His voice, and touched His hand, and seen His face,

and had entered into a new relation and friendship in life. But the same Spirit in measure also "giveth life" to the Bible record of other lives. Jacob, Joseph, Balaam, Saul, David; St. John and St. Peter; Herod, Pilate, Judas—they all have died and are gone. But when we open the Bible we come into a place where they all are as when they actually lived—some of them there pacing to and fro with dark countenance, and some serene and content in the peace of God. The Bible thus in its biography becomes, by the side of our pilgrim life, an Interpreter's House to us. We go in and we see, and we wonder and we ask our questions; and the Holy Spirit is our Interpreter. He bears witness with our spirit. He reads the lives of others into our own.

The Bible, when showing us how men determine their own character, is faithful in recording the circumstances which influenced them. It is often both graphic and detailed in its record of a man's environment, keeping us while we read as much in remembrance of the events which befell him as of the motives which swayed him. Indeed the Bible was the first book to make any recognition of the law of heredity about which we hear so much nowadays. It recognises that men are born with a bias to good or to evil, for which they are not responsible—a bias which we cannot calculate but which God must estimate when He visits the iniquity of the fathers upon the children, and when He shows mercy unto thousands. At the same time this Book, above all books, lays each man's responsibility upon himself. Each man in its pages bears his own burden. He goes on in the midst of his complex circumstances, shaping and determining his own character; and then, when his time of probation is done, death comes and fixes it, that over it one last great word may be spoken—the word of "The Amen, the faithful and true witness." In this way the Bible in its portraiture would have us to read and learn of life.

The Herod who is mentioned in our text has his life written in the Bible's most characteristic way. The features of the life are made very distinct; and the surroundings and setting of the picture are minute and faithful. Wonderfully little is said about him, and yet wonderfully much! He came of a pedigree which had strong in it all the essentials of the Jew—prejudice, pride and power of passion. He was the son of a father who had had genius, which secured for him the title of Herod the Great. His father had lived in the thick of great events, and been a hero in courage and patriotism; and the son was sworn from his birth against the Romans, like another Hannibal. But the son was a poorer man all round than the father had been. The father had known noble rage and had been fired with a splendid passion for his country and its rights; but the son's spirit was of a diluted power, and he seemed capable of little nobler than selfish resentment. The father led the multitudes; the son feared them. The father could, in carrying out a policy, both harass the Romans and massacre innocents; but the son's plans could be determined "even to the half of his kingdom" by the wish of a girl whose dancing he liked, and his only courage was of kin with that of a cruel boy who will torture what he knows can do him no harm.

Riding under the lee of his father's greater life, and accepting as in his own favour all his father's influence and fame, this Herod seems to have been a weak, ill-equipped, vacillating young ruler. He had no great projects in life, either for good or evil. A creature of weak emotion rather than of strong motive, of impulse rather than of power, and in no sense a man either of purpose or of principle! He had in his nature just enough of sympathy to be dangerous and make him flexible—that kind of sympathy which puts a man at the mercy of those whom he meets at table and which leaves him most influenced by the last word; a

spoiled, silly nature, easily inflated by wine or flattery, weak in words and great in oaths,—a man who was little and mean even in his vices! What curious types and phases human nature sometimes assumes! obliging us, when we think of them, to carry our thoughts to levels of life inferior to the human; and, thinking of Herod, one can hardly help feeling, with a not pleasing reference in one's mind, that when off his guard, and when not led by any one of nobler instinct, the habits of his soul were low and his natural gait was to slink.

At the same time there was in this man a certain pleasantness and willingness which seemed to promise well at first, and which might throw any one off his guard. But beneath this demeanour lurked a stealthiness and a suddenness which would not attack as does the lion or the wolf, but which would bite and then flee, or would take advantage and torment, or might at any moment, while it fawned, snap at the hand that stroked. Well was he named "that fox"! A man with not a noble element in his nature! A man who needed always to be watched! A man in no sense formidable, and yet much to be feared as a malicious and silent foe! A man whose opportunity was another's weakness! The only man of whom Jesus spoke with contempt!

It will be admitted, for it is plain, that the natural chances of this tetrarch of Galilee were, on the whole, against him. His inherent powers were poor; his traditions were not of the finest; his upbringing was not of the best. The bias of Herod's nature was probably away from the good and towards the evil. What wonder if he was naturally selfish! And what wonder if, with his feeble brain, his selfishness turned away from ambition and grew to sensuality! And what wonder if, discovering his own weakness, he grew cunning and cowardly and cruel! Scripture seems to indicate all this in the circumstances

and environment of Herod, and to justify, from the lips of the Highest, this terrible analysis of his heart—so faithfully does it depict human life and all the complications and chances which are involved in the making of character! Surely such an one as Herod was needs great physicians if he is to be medicined and healed! So the most important part of the Bible's record of Herod's life is that which tells of the means which were put within his reach for help and healing.

Herod had two great opportunities. His life twice came to a great moral crisis, when he had to decide before his conscience and his God as to what he would do and be. Twice over the best influences of his age powerfully affected him, and each time such help was thrown to his hand that, had he only grasped it, he would have been rescued from himself and from sin. He would have stepped forth from all the entanglement of his own nature and his environment, and would have walked the world in newness of life. Herod was almost saved—*almost!*

The first of these opportunities was when he heard John the Baptist preach. His Jewish instinct carried him with the crowd to hear that great exponent of the Law and the Prophets. John was an austere preacher, hard on himself and hard on other people. He had a fitting pulpit, and fitting echoes for his stern voice, in deserts,

Where rocks were rudely heaped, and rent
As by a spirit turbulent;
Where sights were rough and sounds were wild,
And everything unreconciled.

He thence swayed the nation, and he might well sway this facile young ruler. And sway him he did! The influence of John over Herod was noticeable, and seems to have lasted long. It looked, indeed, as if he was to be permanently influenced; for, when he heard John, "he did many things and heard him gladly." And permanently

influenced by John, he was. Even after John was in his prison Herod feared him, "knowing that he was a just man and an holy, and he kept him safe." Yes, and after he was dead and Herod had seen his lifeless head, and when he knew that his headless body was in a grave, Herod could not forget or quite get over John the Baptist. It was one of the deepest facts of his memory that he had seen and talked with John. It was part of the indelible record of his soul. It was his nearest approach to being a new and true man, when John so moved him that he all but yielded to conscience and God.

Herod's first opportunity was thus singularly adapted to his case. John seemed as if made to suit and influence the young prince of Galilee. The kingdom of God came very nigh him. He was at the very gate of the way which would have led him to life. He had to repent and turn from one sin—one sin only; and he would have received the baptism of John. But John's baptism was "of repentance unto remission of sins"; and he said of that one sin, "It is not lawful," and he was stern and unbending; and he would not let Herod be. So Herod had to make a choice; he was forced to a decision. He had to put down either his sin or his saviour; and, as he preferred his sin, he shut John up in prison. He was fool enough to hear and heed the dreadful suggestion:

Kill thy physician and the fee bestow
Upon the foul disease!

How near and yet how far away! How easy and yet how hard! This not so dangerous youth, whom the preacher seemed to lead in a willing leash, is yet, for Herodias' sake, a great way from entering the kingdom of God. That fox, though he follows the Baptist, is not so tame as he looks. These feet, so lightly stepping, can turn; and that face, so narrow and sleek, can change;

and Herod can both hate and hurt in a moment. He resisted, and then cruelly resented and wronged, the holiest power that his earliest life knew; he silenced and crushed his best counsellor; he was, to change the figure, like a man who, when wind and wave were rising, struck down the pilot who stood at the helm to steer, and he gave himself to storm and wreck.

After Herod had first silenced and then slain the Baptist, he had one opportunity more. A place was given him for repentance. This was when he heard of Jesus. To Him the people were pressing from all the land. Gentle souls were seeking Him by night. Thoughtful hearts were longing after Him from under the contemplative shade of the fig tree at noon. Canaanites were calling for His help from across the boundaries of the country. Greeks were coming up from far away and seeking to see Him. Sorely stricken sinners were finding salvation and rest in Him; and all through the land His cry was ringing, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden." Herod, too, heard of Him, but he was troubled. There was a nameless dread in his secret soul that John might live again; and now he let out this foolish fear in foolish words. He could not suppress it any longer, when he heard of miracles and signs; "his passion is so ripe it needs must break," and he said, "It is John whom I beheaded." His palace halls had their Banquo ghost. John was to Herod—almost the last who wore the semblance of a Jewish crown—what Samuel was to Saul—the first whom Israel crowned. If, in an hour of madness and wreck, Saul was disturbed by the shade of Samuel, an old man covered with a mantle, long after the prophet was in his grave; so Herod was disturbed by John, clothed in camel's hair and girt with a leathern girdle. He had not been buried deep enough. He came up from the grave. He haunted Herod's life. He shook his gory locks at him. Herod saw him; he

knew him ; he had often had to say ere now, "It is John whom I beheaded."

The soil of this man's soul, in which he would not let the roots of true religion strike, must yield a crop ; and it is now weedy and rank and tangled with superstition and fear. The worse spirits are now entering into this house, at the doors of which the good spirits received rude dismissal ; and what may not the last state of this man be ? Still there was a chance for Herod. The "little grain of conscience made him sour." Because there was moral pain, there was moral life. The moral symptoms were not hopeless. The regret, the remorse were there ; the repentance might have come too. It was Herod's hour of visitation from the living God—his second, his greater, his last. Jesus was there before him, set for the falling or rising of this prince in Israel. One turn of his heart ! One holy resolution ! One word of desire ! and Herod had been saved ! But his good emotion was allowed to pass ; his softened heart grew hard again—harder than ever and hopeless—and he was keen and cruel as before. He dared out all his convictions ; he cut at all his spectre fears ; and it was doubtless true, as the Pharisees said to Jesus, "Herod would fain kill Thee."

These unquiet stirrings in Herod's breast were the last symptoms of a departing spiritual life. He ceased to be troubled about himself, and then he ceased to be troubled about Jesus. He was indeed "desirous to see Him of a long season," but this was out of mere curiosity ; he had the hope of seeing some miracle done by Him. This was a most melancholy stage for Herod to have reached. His fear had grown to indifference ; his indifference to the interest of curiosity, and that interest came out at the last in cool and deliberate cruelty. So much was this so that he was glad, exceeding glad, when, on the day of uncertain assize at the end, Jesus was sent to him by Pilate. We

cannot but feel that the hour when the meek Saviour, unprotected and alone, stood before this insolent, unfeeling creature was almost the most pitiable of all His humiliation. It was worse than being "brought to the slaughter," yet "He opened not His mouth." "Then Herod questioned Him in many words, but He answered him nothing." It is a sad, sore sight! It is not pain; it is torture! The Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world, badgered and baited by "that fox" of Galilee!

The true character of this miserable man was fully brought out then. All that had been bad in his past life reasserted itself there, accentuated to a higher power. Rapidly it developed, terribly but truly it all came out, in the near presence and under the silent power of Jesus. Could evidence be more complete of a man being dead while he lived, and of his being "judged already"? Herod was not caring enough about the matter now even to give the Saviour a trial; he did not take the trouble to condemn Him; guilty or innocent, what cared he? Having seen the man, having had his curiosity satisfied, he minded no more. And yet in wanton malignity one step further he did go. Sin is not only cumulative but infective; and as like himself his boon companions in the banquet hall had been when John was slain, so like him are his associates now when Jesus is before him. And "Herod and his men of war set Jesus at nought and mocked Him, and, arraying Him in a gorgeous robe, sent Him back to Pilate." Words could hardly tell a more touching tale. Too indifferent to condemn Him, too callous to give their helpless and inoffensive prisoner a trial, they made themselves merry awhile with Him, and when they had had enough of it they sent Him away!

This is the Bible's picture of Herod. It is not a pleasing portrait to study and display; and yet I think that for

every distressing word I have spoken there is a distressing line in the painting. Beneath and between such atrocious facts in a human life there must have been spiritual mood and motive subtler and darker than I have even tried to say. But, take it as I have said! Do we now with any distinctness realize the kind of man Herod was—selfish and cowardly, furtive, coarse, cruel? Can we at all clearly set him in the midst of his circumstances and see how these affected his character? Can we appreciate in any measure the opportunities he had of good and the havoc which he yet made of his moral nature when he so relentlessly chose evil? And can we understand how Jesus, so innocent and silent, was at the last a swift witness to the truth of his life and unearthed the true Herod, who so long had lurked under a somewhat smooth exterior? If so, what can we say about it all to ourselves and one another? The great word about it is said for us by the Great Physician of souls, "Take heed and beware . . . of the leaven of Herod."

Leaven was a mystery to the Jews. It worked out of sight; it ate its way in the dark; it never ceased till it made a full end. A dull, unlikely something was hid in the measure of meal, and it proved itself there a secret, silent force that first impregnated and then changed the whole. We, with our glasses and curious search, now know all about it; but that was all that they, to whom Jesus spoke, thought of it. The whole of the popular notion about it was summed up in the proverb "A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump": if they had any larger thought about it, it would be spiritual, not scientific.

A great physician is usually a great student and exponent of disease. In Herod Jesus detected disease of a most virulent kind. His was a typical case, so characteristic and appallingly complete in all its symptoms, that it is detailed in this book, and the malady is named to all time

from this conspicuous instance. It is called "the leaven of Herod." It never was more fell than in his life. It was at first but a spot, a speck, "the heinous freckle of the flesh"; but it grew from less to more, from little to much. From a small beginning it spread all through his nature, permeating even his soul and entirely prevailing over the good. Sin had eaten the god out of him, ay, and the man too. Even while he lived Herod was a man with a dead soul. The leaven of the Pharisees originates and begins to work in a high supercilious religiousness and strikes down until righteousness becomes self-righteousness, and morality becomes spiritual pride, and all the finer virtues of the character become hard and insensate, and spiritual life itself is strangled in a network of form and ceremony. But the leaven of Herod is the taint and fester of the lower nature spreading and prevailing, till even the higher and diviner nature in a man is involved, and his soul, invaded by the power of the flesh, becomes insensible to God and dead while he lives.

With more or less potency sin, in one or other of these forms, prevails in every age and nation of men. In the history of the world, under the forms and mummeries of religion nations and ages have lain dead and insensible to vital religion, whilst a Pharisaic zeal prevailed and would persecute to death those who would quicken and reform. Such nations and ages were full of the leaven of the Pharisees; they would have crucified the Christ. Not so in ours. Another spirit prevails now, and is amongst ourselves. It may be mild and "subtly inter-fused" with our life, but it conditions and affects us all. "The world is too much with us." Some seek the world's material wealth; some the treasures of the knowledge of it; some the passing pleasures which it affords our lower nature; some its pomp and power. Our interests are so great and our life on earth has so many comforts, that

we run the risk of being absorbed by these alone; and we have found, with the near vision of searching eyes, so much that is fascinating and rare in earth, and air, and sea, that we are forgetting, and almost losing the power, to see afar off. There is a wise measure and balance in all true life—a conserving of all the interests, a just regard to all the facts. If any interests supplant the highest interest, or any love the larger love, our diviner nature must get disordered and deadened. And, amidst so many material interests, does not a material spirit pervade our life? We must be on our guard; in contact with the ordinary life of our day, we may catch this spirit, we may get impregnated by this leaven. It may be in a finely cultivated form, but it is in essence and power an old leaven, “the leaven of Herod,” dulling, deadening our sense of God and eternity. We have almost come in some high quarters to that stage at which men would be glad to see Jesus Christ because they have heard many things of Him. They would like to see some miracle done by Him. They would like to question Him in many words. They would put His works to some scientific test. But would they ever think of doing Him reverence? Would they be earnest enough even to crucify Him? So we should be ever proving ourselves by our relation to the Truth and the true, to the good and the Best; we should be ever testing our spiritual vitality, lest subtly and insensibly the spirit of the world should be lowering the Divine life within us and laying us open to disease, in which there are the seeds of the second death—the death that comes after the first—the death that death reveals!

The point and power of this solemn word of divine warning are in the fact that in each of us there lie concealed the possibilities of becoming entirely different from what we now are—infinately better or infinitely worse.

The spirit of Herod will make each one of us, in our own place and according to our opportunity—a Herod; and, in the light of such a life as his, we may well “take heed and beware.” We may well scrutinize our life, lest some germ-filament of flesh has, in the war against the spirit, struck root and is sending its spores into our soul—the beginning there of decadence and death. But there is a more excellent way than merely to be on our guard against an infectious and subtle evil, and that is to be zealously and powerfully affected on the side of good because animated and sustained by its spirit. To be thus fortified and secured against the insidious and deathful spirit which was like leaven in the life of Herod, we should be filled with the Spirit of Christ. The Spirit of Christ and the spirit of Herod are contrary the one to the other; they cannot dwell together in the same life; they never can be equal powers. We ourselves determine which shall be ours—the spirit which through sin worketh to death, or the Spirit which through holiness worketh to life eternal. And God giveth the *Holy* Spirit to them that ask Him.

ARMSTRONG BLACK.

STUDIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

II.

THE RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD AND THE RIGHTEOUSNESS
OF FAITH.

THE Epistle to the Romans contains three great paradoxes, one in each of its main doctrinal sections. The paradox of the first section is justification by faith; the present paper may, it is hoped, contribute something toward its interpretation. The second section lays down the paradox that the Christian as such is not under law, but under grace. This will be the subject of a future paper. The third paradox is that of God in history (Rom. ix.—xi. and iii. 1-8); God's purpose is served even by man's sinful acts; by the fall of Israel salvation came to the Gentiles. It may be attempted, as a close to these studies, to consider this most difficult paradox of all.

I.

Before considering justification by faith, or, as St. Paul calls it, the righteousness of faith, there is an arduous problem to be dealt with. We must begin by considering the great difficulty of the Epistle—St. Paul's conception of the righteousness of God as the specific thing which the Gospel, and the Gospel alone, reveals. To understand what St. Paul meant by it, and how his conception of it supplies—as it certainly does in some way—the source of the righteousness accorded to sinful man in Christ—to understand this is to hold the key to this Epistle and to much else besides.

In the ordinary interpretation of the Epistle the righteousness of God appears as little more than a foil to His mercy. God redeems us—or accepts a ransom from His Son—in spite of His righteousness, that is, in spite of His strict

justice, which in itself only regards sinners as objects of punishment. This justice of God was not indeed unknown antecedently to Christ, but it was not fully realised. Only the stupendous fact that nothing short of the death of the sinless Son of God sufficed to win pardon for man taught us the full depth of God's just intolerance of sin. The death of Christ, then, not only did for us what we could never have done for ourselves—presented a perfect human obedience to God, carried the sins of our entire race into the holiest, and made them as though they had not been—but, in addition, it furnished man with an object lesson in the enormity of sin in God's sight, prevented our ever construing the pardoning mercy of God as easy indifference to guilt, manifested God as absolutely, rigidly just, in spite of His unrestricted amnesty to all who should believe in His Son—*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.*

Now the question is, not whether this is true, for in any case there is much truth in it, but whether it adequately corresponds to what St. Paul says of the righteousness of God as the specific and cardinal point of the gospel revelation. I think it can hardly be said to do so, even approximately. The gospel reveals the redemption of man by the atoning work of our Saviour: that is, the *εὐαγγέλιον*. If we regard that work primarily as the satisfaction, or the overcoming, of the strict justice of God by the work of Christ, then the *righteousness* (*i.e.* strict justice) of God is *assumed* by the gospel, not revealed, and what it reveals is not the justice of God, but the fact that His justice no longer bars the way to the pardon of the sinner. If we take the other ground indicated above, and find the revelation of God's righteousness, not in the fact of redemption, but in the safeguarding of that fact by a reminder of the conditions under which alone it was possible, then we identify St. Paul's cardinal revelation of the gospel with

what is, after all, a lesson to man, rather than "a mystery transacted in the highest heaven," with an exhibition of God's indignation against sin rather than a propitiation in the true sense of the word.

Once again, this ordinary interpretation misses the contrast, signally characteristic of this section of the Epistle, between the wrath of God and the righteousness of God. The two are contrasted as light and darkness; men lie under the wrath of God as in the valley of the shadow of death; and knowing only of His wrath, the *εὐαγγέλιον*, the joyful news which reveals the righteousness of God, strikes on them as the ray of a rising sun. The perfectly true and most necessary foil for the *εὐαγγέλιον*, the truth of God's hatred of sin, which most commentators on this Epistle find in the conception of God's righteousness, is really furnished by the conception of God's *wrath*. Man is already, before the gospel, confronted with this in its awful and solemn certainty; "the law worketh wrath"; man is arraigned before God as a culprit—*ὑπόδικος*—without a plea; the *εὐαγγέλιον* comes indeed as light into a dark place.

This is so evidently true that it has affected the exegetical tradition of the primary passage: chap. i. 17. It has been recognised as so impossible that St. Paul could have regarded the righteousness of God—understood as His punitive justice—as the specific revelation of the *εὐαγγέλιον*, the welcome message of Christ, that the great mass of interpreters have departed from the clear symmetry and parallelism of i. 16, 17, and have understood the phrase *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* in the latter verse, not of the righteousness of God, but of the new God-given righteousness (in effect the justification, the pardon) of man. This gives a sense simple, and in itself perfectly true. The gospel is the power of God unto salvation to whomsoever believeth, because in it there is revealed the pardon of man (the way

to favour with God, "a righteousness of God," R.V.), on the ground and condition of faith. This sense, I say, is most true. But is it the sense St. Paul meant to convey here? Does it really sound the depth of his meaning? I think not. The main ground for thinking that it does is, in the language of iii. 21, 22, *δικαιοσύνη δὲ θεοῦ διὰ πίστεως*, etc.; faith on man's part is the *instrument* (διὰ) of the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, i.e. this *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ* comes about by means of faith, which one could hardly expect to be said of *the righteousness of God*; and this consideration is fortified by such a passage as Philippians iii. 9 (A.V.). But yet the plain structure of the clear-cut clauses of i. 16, 17 has to be broken through if we are to rest satisfied with this plausibly easy explanation,¹ and other considerations throw a decisive weight into the scale. Chief among these is the fundamental Old Testament conception of the righteousness of God.

II.

The New Testament throughout presupposes a conception of God rather than builds a new conception from the foundations. In other words, it presupposes the Old Testament doctrine of God. The New Testament, of course, completes and advances upon the Old in this as in other respects. But unless we penetrate below the surface of the Old Testament, we can but imperfectly follow the meaning of the New.

It is characteristic, not only of St. Paul, but of our Lord, that they resolutely break with the Jewish traditional theology, and appeal from it to the Old Testament itself. This is conspicuous with respect to three fundamental Old Testament attributes of God—His holiness, His righteousness, and His "lovingkindness." Judaism rested upon

¹ See the article by Dr. Barmby, the lamented friend of the present writer, in the *Expositor* for August, 1896.

the idea of the *ceremonial holiness* of Jehovah, to which the ceremonial holiness of His worshippers must correspond. It conceived of God's *righteousness* as *retributive*, demanding legal righteousness on the part of His servants. God's lovingkindness (*hesed*, *pietas*) was construed in terms of national privilege, and its counterpart in the faithful was the fierce loyalty of the *hasidim*, the immediate spiritual predecessors of the Pharisees, "zealots for the law." Judaism, as a system of organized religious morality, was a remarkable phenomenon in the society of the ancient world. Judaism had grasped, in a very definite and narrow form no doubt, the leading Old Testament attributes of God, and that principle of reciprocity which brings each divine attribute into intimate relation with the personal religious life of the worshipper. But this relation, and the conception of God presupposed by it, was in each case brought within the ready apprehension of the scribe and his hearers, at the cost of being fatally narrowed and impoverished.

The great difference was that Judaism was stationary, while Old Testament religion was progressive. If the new revelation was to fulfil the promise of the old, Judaism must be set aside and continuity recovered with the religion of the Old Testament. And this was done.

The attributes of God in the Old Testament are not His abstract qualities, such as theology might deduce by analysing the idea of an absolutely perfect being. They are *revealed* attributes, *i.e.* in effect the concrete manifestations of the Divine character impressed upon the religious instincts of Israel by their *experience*—not by revelation in words, but by revelation in facts—"Our fathers have told us the mighty acts which Thou hast done in the time of old"; "I am Jehovah thy God, which brought thee out of the land of Egypt." To learn the Old Testament conception of God we must look for His char-

acter mirrored in the religious consciousness of Israel, as it was moulded by slow degrees throughout a long and varied course of history. The unchanging tenacity of Judaism is only the slowly-gained result of a long process; the clay was soft originally, and took impressions from everything it touched: "As the clay in the potter's hand, so are ye in My hand, O House of Israel." Now the sterner attributes of God are certainly conspicuous in the Old Testament. The fundamental conception here is that of His Holiness. That is the formula which throughout the Old Testament appeals to religious awe. To gather up briefly the result of much that might be said on this subject, the idea of holiness is in its rude germ correlative to the instinct of danger. The Divine Being, together with all persons and things standing in close relation with Him, is dangerous, may not be tampered with without peril. The burning bush, the burning mount of Sinai, the ark gazed at at Bethshemesh or rashly supported by Uzzah, the vessels and sacrifices of the sanctuary, all are "most holy," most dangerous if approached without the prescribed precautions. In this sense the men of Bethshemesh said, "Who is able to stand before this holy God Jehovah?"

This, I say, is the idea in its rude germ—a germ traceable in the history of religion all over the world, and persistent in all the Old Testament history of the conception of ceremonial holiness. But what was distinctive of the idea in its Old Testament form was the readiness with which it became the vehicle of ethical teaching.

The idea of Jehovah as morally holy, invested sin with the terrors of sacrilege. To dwell near Jehovah, or enter into reciprocal relation with Him, involved a moral demand (Ps. xv. 1, etc.); and when it is necessary to express most strongly the divine intolerance of sin and the certainty of punishment, it is the divine holiness that is appealed to: "He is an holy God, He is a jealous God, He will not

forgive your transgressions nor your sins" (Josh. xxiv. 19). The idea of *transcendence*, which is implicit even in the crudest conception of divine holiness, was from very early times conceived by the teachers of the chosen people as *moral* transcendence, demanding on the part of the worshipper not only ceremonial but moral conditions of approach—in a word, complete moral self-dedication (Josh. xxiv. 15, 21, 24; Lev. xix. 2).

There are passages in the Prophets where the idea of divine holiness reaches an even loftier level. The absolute transcendence of God will be shown not in His stern retribution, but in His unlooked-for mercies. "I will not execute the fierceness of My anger: I will not destroy Ephraim, for I am God and not man, the Holy One in the midst of thee" (Hos. ii. 9). "The Holy One of Israel, the Saviour" (Isa. xliii. 3; cf. lvii. 15 *seq.*).

But such passages are the exception. It is, on the whole, with the divine holiness that the divine wrath against sin, and the punishment of the sinner, are in the Old Testament organically connected. (Compare Amos ii. 7; Isa. i. 4, v. 24; Lev. x. 2, 3.) The divine "jealousy" and "holiness" are associated ideas (Josh. xxiv. 19 *supra*), and the "jealousy" of God is closely akin to His wrath against sin. The whole progress of Old Testament revelation shows the powerful part played by the conception of holiness, refined and spiritualized as it was by many channels of divine teaching, in vindicating and enforcing the sterner moral attributes of God.

On the other hand, there is that most profound and tender attribute of God, His mercy, lovingkindness, graciousness, mirrored in the holiness, loyalty, piety of His people (Ps. xviii. 25)—all synonyms for rendering the same Hebrew word, *ḥešed*, the quality *pietas*, *ḥašid* the concrete, *pious* the parental *pietas* of God, the filial *pietas* of His servants, the sure "mercies" of David, "thy holy

one" who is not to see corruption—words specially prominent in Prophets and Psalms, and which emphasize a *reciprocal* relation of God to His people—on His part, a character which has commanded unswerving trust; on theirs, a character instinct with personal devotion and trusting fidelity, true in the midst of apostasy, like the *hasidim* who fought under the Maccabees.

III.

Now the Old Testament conception of God as righteous has more in common with the latter than with the former range of ideas. It occurs almost exclusively in the Prophets and Hagiographa, never in the legal portions of the Pentateuch. Speaking generally, the punitive aspect of the divine righteousness occupies in the Old Testament a very subordinate place. We have the great punitive prophecy of Isaiah v. 16, etc., "God that is holy shall be sanctified in righteousness," where, however, the scourge is thought of as the necessary step to salvation. Again, the judicial righteousness of God is linked with His anger in Psalm vii. 9, 11. But punitive *righteousness* is most commonly coupled with the idea of "avenging" or delivering the innocent party to the cause (Ps. lxxii. 2, 4, xciv., xi., ciii. 6, ix. 4).

It is improbable that St. Paul, in his use of the expression "righteousness of God," can be building upon the very few Old Testament passages which link together what he is so strongly contrasting, namely, the divine righteousness and the divine wrath, especially as his language in Romans i. 16, 17 is demonstrably coloured by some of the much larger class of passages which present God's righteousness in a different and more characteristic light. To begin with, we find in passages like Jeremiah x. 24 (cf. Dan. ix. 16) God's righteousness *counteracting* His punitive

anger (see Ps. vi. 1, xxxviii. 1). In such cases punishment is merely subsidiary to a further purpose, which Jehovah pursues because He is righteous. This purpose is the ultimate salvation of His people—a purpose manifested in His “righteous acts” in the time of old (Judg. v. 11; 1 Sam. xii. 7; perhaps Ps. xxii. 21), and confirmed by each successive fulfilment of express or implicit promise. “Thou madest a covenant . . . and hast performed Thy words, for Thou art righteous” (Neh. ix. 8).

The generic idea of righteousness as a personal quality is that of conformity to personal obligations. The form which this conformity assumes depends upon the obligation in question, which in turn depends upon the position of the moral agent. A lawsuit, *e.g.*, aims at establishing the rights of the parties; the successful party comes out triumphantly *δίκαιος* (Ps. li. 4). The judge is the “avenger,” in one sense, of the law; in another sense, of the innocent or injured party (Ps. lxxii. 2, 4). Now God in Himself is subject to no “obligation” except that of His own inscrutable Being—that is His “Law.” But it has pleased Him to enter into relations with men, and to manifest a purpose and a will in regard to them. So far as this is true God has imposed an “obligation” upon Himself, to which, in virtue of His righteousness, He will adhere. Hence the relation of God to His people is represented in the Old Testament as a *covenant*, with the divine righteousness as its underlying principle, and the righteousness of faith (Rom. x. 6; cf. Hab. ii. 4) as its correlative, a conception to which St. Paul makes appeal as against the purely contractual relation of legal righteousness on man’s part, retributive righteousness on God’s part, to which Judaism had narrowed it down.

The righteousness of faith, as St. Paul perceived and claimed, finds utterance in the Old Testament; and its correlative, the saving righteousness of a God who differs

from all other gods in this one thing, that He will accomplish for them that wait for Him (Isa. liv. 4, R.V. ; 1 Cor. ii. 9; comp. lxiii. 1 with xlv. 20), occupies a place of great prominence in the Old Testament theology.

This is, I am convinced, the link which explains the prominent correlation, in the Prophets and Psalmists, of God's righteousness and God's saving power—a correlation which was certainly in St. Paul's mind when he wrote Romans i. 16, 17. . . . τὸ εὐαγγέλιον· δύναμις γὰρ θεοῦ ἐστὶν εἰς σωτηρίαν . . . Δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀποκαλύπτεται κτλ.: comp. Psalm xcvi. 2, ἐγνώρισεν κύριος τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ . . . ἀπεκάλυψεν τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ: also Isaiah li. 5, 8, lvi. 1, and numerous other passages, some already quoted. The correspondence of language has been long admitted. What is here contended is simply that it is based on a profound correspondence of *thought*, to which justice has yet to be done. This impression may be deepened by the consideration of many other passages, especially in the Psalms and Prophets, which tend to couple the divine righteousness with the divine *pietas* (*hesed*) and its cognate attributes (*e.g.* Ps. xxxvi. 10, xxxiii. 4, 5, xl. 10, lxxxix. 16, 17, cxliii. 1; Jer. ix. 24; Hos. ii. 19). Genesis xix. 19 (LXX.) is one of an interesting group of passages specially relevant to the associations attaching to *δικαιοσύνη* in Biblical Greek, which led to its being used in some cases to translate *hesed*.

The correlation thus amply manifest in the religious consciousness of prophet and psalmist, between God's righteousness and His saving grace, turns rather upon the truth of God as it appeals to faith than upon the exact nature of the salvation or deliverance looked for from time to time. The history of the latter exhibits a long ascent from deliverances mainly physical (though there is a moral side from the first, *e.g.* in the deliverance from Egypt) toward the hope for such deliverance as is assured in the

name Jesus (Matt. i. 21). But to St. Paul, *the faith* to which appeal was made was all along the same (Rom. iv. 17-24).

The prevalent interpretation of St. Paul's conception of God's righteousness—*e.g.*, in iii. 25, 26—explains it as that which constrains God to punish, His avenging justice. The view suggested in this paper is that St. Paul, influenced directly and consciously by the thought and language of the Old Testament, regarded the righteousness of God as that which pledged Him to save—not as though the inherent, abstract righteousness of God could necessitate His intervention for the salvation of man, but because God had from the first made Himself known to man as a Saviour, because His whole antecedent dealings with His people had tended to evoke trustfulness on man's part, were one promise of salvation, and only when that promise was carried out was His righteousness an accomplished fact—*εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα*, righteous *and* therefore righteous-making.

This question has yet to be fully thought out. Signs are not wanting that the prevalent interpretation of i. 17 will not maintain itself in the future.¹ And if so, the righteousness of God in that verse will not suffer itself to be divorced from the righteousness of God in iii. 25, 26. And if so, again, it will be necessary to satisfy St. Paul's conception of the righteousness of God, not as the obstacle redemption has had to overcome, but as the operative cause of our redemption—as the very core and central point of the gospel message, the *εὐαγγέλιον*. And this will, I think, be done by bringing to bear on St. Paul's thought a deep, wide, sympathetic induction from a critically, reverently read Old Testament.

¹ See, in addition to Dr. Barmby's paper already referred to, Dr. Sanday's discussion in his Commentary, and Häring's essay (Tübingen, 1896).

IV.

The direct purpose, then, of the redeeming work of Jesus Christ was, to St. Paul, not the overcoming, but the realisation of the righteousness of God; but that meant also the salvation, and therefore the righteous-making of man—*εἰς τὸ εἶναι, κτλ.*

How, then, do these two stand related? or rather, how is it that they are so closely related that St. Paul in his language seems at times to glide from one to the other without any consciousness that he is speaking of (what to us appear) two such very different things?

In i. 16, 17 the righteousness of God and the salvation of man are indissolubly connected; or rather the revelation to man of God's righteousness is his salvation. How so? The answer lies in the words *πάντι τῷ πιστεύοντι*, and again *ἐκ πίστεως*. The mere abstract speculative knowledge of God's righteousness in Christ, however deeply conceived, will not remove the cloud of God's wrath from the soul, will not justify man. The gospel is God's power unto salvation to whomsoever *believeth*; the righteousness of God is revealed, as the welcome message, only to those who approach God by the way of faith, *ἐκ πίστεως*; and *εἰς πίστιν*, the revelation comes *to faith*; where faith is not, it does not come at all.

St. Paul might have said, "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, etc.," because in it the *salvation* of God is revealed from faith to faith. But, true as that would be, it yet would not convey all that lies in the word "righteousness." Salvation might have been revealed from God suddenly, unprepared for, to a race who had experienced no previous dealing of God with them in the past; salvation is a divine act simply; there is no reciprocity about it. But the *righteousness* of God, as St. Paul received the idea from the Old Testament, was saturated

with the idea of reciprocity, of the faithfulness of God and the trust of man in close constant living response one to the other. The righteousness of God came home only to his pious loyal ones, to the faithful; to others it had no meaning (Ps. li. 14, lxxi. 15, 16; contrast lxix. 27). Again, while an unknown, unpledged God might conceivably save, to speak of such salvation as an act of righteousness implied a long past, the word was charged with the implicit prophecy and promise of the whole course of Israel's history.

Self-fulfilment of God's declared character, reciprocity as between God and man—these were the two thoughts, as it appears, most prominent in St. Paul's view of the gospel as the revelation of the righteousness of God. Of these two ideas, the first has been discussed; we turn to the second.

The Old Testament conception of God as righteous, as we have seen, has its full significance only when viewed in relation to the thoughts, expectations, feelings, which His people have learned to entertain about Him. Reciprocity clings about it, it has affinity with the conception of the divine "pietas," *hesed*, and through it with the idea of the *hasid*, the typical Old Testament saint. In the Old Testament the righteousness of God and the righteousness of the faithful are reciprocally correlated, and the medium of their correlation is faith—ὁ δὲ δίκαιος ἐκ πίστεως ζήσεται. St. Paul has seized a fundamental characteristic of Old Testament religion quite passed over by the Judaism of his day. And this Old Testament correlation of the righteousness of God with the righteousness of the faithful, in St. Paul's hands, becomes applied to the New Testament. *Faith* sees in the redeeming work of Christ the fulfilment of the divine promises, the complete self-realisation of the Divine Personality as it had impressed itself on the mind of inspired faith and of a prophet people, and, thus seeing it, it

becomes an impulse of self-surrender, of complete confidence in the forgiving, reconciling love of God, which transcends in its certitude of possession even the highest faith of the Old Testament saint.

V.

We have, then, as the revelation of which the gospel is the vehicle :

(1) The righteousness of God, and

(2) What St. Paul calls "the righteousness of faith," or "the righteousness which is of God 'upon' faith (Phil. iii. 9).

I have said, I think, quite enough to show that the latter is founded upon the former, that there is the closest correlation between them, and that faith is the medium of their correlation, *εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον καὶ δικαιοῦντα τὸν ἐκ πίστεως Ἰησοῦ.*

What I have hardly done more than hint at is the precise nature of this close link which unites them. How is it that the atoning work of Christ, viewed as the self-fulfilment of a God pledged, by His revealed character, to save, conveys righteousness to every soul that apprehends it by faith? That it does so, is St. Paul's unquestionable teaching. What he meant by this teaching—what, in other words, St. Paul meant by justification by faith—is a question which still confronts us.

St. Paul takes it as presupposed in his gospel (read *γὰρ* in iii. 28) that man is justified by faith without works of law. The latter two words are not a limitation of the statement—Luther's "durch den Glauben allein" was a quite allowable paraphrase. The works of grace are, it is true, not works of law. St. Paul *does not* say that man is justified without the fruits of the Spirit (*ἔργα χάριτος* is not a Pauline phrase). But such works, he clearly holds, follow justification, in the sense that justifying faith is pre-

supposed by them, not they by it. Only the link between the *δικαιοσύνη πίστεως* and the *δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ*, obscure in i.-v., is more apparent when we see the righteousness of faith *at work*. We then see that it is based upon the mediation of the Son—"faith of Jesus" takes the place of Abraham's "faith of God"—and it assumes the character of filial loyalty, a loyalty impossible except through recognition of the character of the Father.

"Justification by faith" is a hard saying, for the same reason that the other two paradoxes of this Epistle are hard sayings. All three alike seem to the superficial glance—nay, they have actually led men to think—that St. Paul regarded conduct as a matter of indifference in God's sight.

But here at least, as regards justification by faith, it is only a superficial study of St. Paul that can carry away any such impression. Only on the basis of his fearful arraignment of human sin, his lurid picture of mankind all alike under the wrath of God, is the fabric of justification by faith erected. *Χωρὶς ἔργων*—works are of no account—but why? Simply *because* God will—if St. Paul's gospel is true—search out the secret things of men, and judge them according to their works. Because conduct is of such absolute importance in God's sight, for that very reason, if man is to be reconciled with God, it must be on some ground irrespective of his doings—on the ground of faith alone.

St. Paul's doctrine of justification by faith alone may be expressed thus: Absolute forgiveness of sin to all who enter through Christ into the filial relation to God. Justifying faith unites man to Christ, and therefore, while not presupposing works, is charged with the promise and potency of a new life of practical righteousness. "This grace wherein we stand," the "righteousness of faith," has, with St. Paul, these two aspects:—

(1) Negatively, and in relation to the past, it is justification, *i.e.* forgiveness. The *ἀσεβής*, the utterly rebellious

sinner, by throwing himself upon Christ, is in God's sight righteous. His sin is treated as though it had never been.

(2) Positively, in relation to present and future, it is union with Christ, a new power to live in loyal fellowship with God. The two are sides of the same thing—one can be distinguished from the other, but they cannot exist apart. Only to those "in Christ Jesus," to those who by union with Him are set free from the law of sin, is there no longer any condemnation (viii. 1).

What then is this faith which unites man to God through Christ? or rather how is it conceived by St. Paul in this Epistle? I think the question is best handled by considering the *object* of faith as conceived by him. As to this, two widely different ideas have prevailed—that of *implicit faith*, distinctive of Roman Catholicism, and that of confidence in personal salvation, the doctrine which runs through many forms of Protestant revivalism.

On the theory of implicit faith the proper object of faith is simply doctrine, and that as revealed by Divine authority. Moreover, as it is impossible for the majority to accurately examine all doctrines, and test the evidence for their divine authority, it is enough that they should be convinced that what the Church teaches is divinely revealed, and not necessary that they should know in all particulars what the Church does teach. In the earlier middle ages it was regarded as incumbent, indeed, upon the *praelati*, the leaders of the Church, to know accurately the doctrines of the faith and their authority, but the masses were to be content with implicit belief in what the "praelati" put before them as the doctrine of the Church, without more than a vague knowledge of more than a very few particulars. Peter Lombard¹ supports this by Job i. 14: "Boves *arabant*, et *asinae pascebantur iuxta eos.*"

¹ Lib. iii. Sent. *Dist.* v. 25. The "boves" are the *praelati*, or working minds of the Church, the "simplices," the mass of the laity, correspond to the "asinae," who are content to browse beside them.

Under the influence of nominalism, in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, the scope of implicit faith became greatly enlarged. In the obviously nominalist (and probably anti-Hussite) story which Luther tells of the Doctor of Prague,¹ faith has become wholly merged in submission to ecclesiastical authority.

In post-Reformation times, the Jesuit doctrine of the *sacrificium intellectus* took its place as the ripe and logical application of the same idea of faith. I might in a different connexion attempt to show how this idea of faith, which thus becomes the mere submission of intellect to authority, hangs together with the Jesuit theology of the omnipotent Church, the "societas perfecta"; and how it carries with it inexorably the entire system of probabilism and Jesuit moral theology. But this is not our present question. The point is that it originates in a view of faith which, if it finds some points of contact with St. Paul, yet leaves out of account the characteristic Pauline conception of faith. Faith regarded as submission of the intellect to authority is a thing which can be, and is, exercised by masses of men irrespective of their moral character, and it does not demand a death to sin, or imply a new life. Those who adopt this view of faith must reject justification by faith as a paradox and nothing more. The "fides carbonarii," as Luther notices, does not carry with it forgiveness of sin, it could not fit in with the conception of ἡ ἐκ πίστεως δικαιοσύνη.

But what of revivalist faith? Does St. Paul teach that

¹ As a learned doctor of the University, overflowing with controversial learning, crossed the bridge of Prague, he met a charcoal-burner. He asked him, "What do you believe?" "What the Church believes," was the reply. "Ah, but what *is* it that the Church believes?" "The Church believes what I believe." "But, my good man, what is it that the Church and yourself believe?" "Why, sir, the Church and I believe the same thing." The doctor retired in disgust. But later on, when he came to his death-bed, and was asked by the priest in what faith he desired to die, his reply was, "In fide carbonarii." The doctor's conversation on the bridge betrays a touch of Hussite realism.

if you believe with emotional certainty that you personally are the object of God's saving grace, you are thereby justified? What St. Paul would miss here is, I think, the element of self-surrender, of absolute trust in God, as distinct from trust in a real or imagined condition of our own soul.

The object of faith with St. Paul is the love of God (Rom. v. 5), and not the certainty of our own conversion. "Abraham believed God," and to us also faith will be reckoned for righteousness, who believe on Him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead.

Faith, in Old Testament and New Testament alike, has close relation to the character of God as revealed by what He has done. Abraham "was fully assured that what God had promised He was able also to perform." Faith is not, to St. Paul, either belief of something or confidence in anything relating to our own mental state, but trust in a Person. That is its core and essence; trustful, filial apprehension of the character of God. It is therefore, in the first instance, *individual* in its character. Founded on the knowledge of what God has done for us (and here we have the source of the doctrinal side of faith), it raises each one who believes (*πάντα τὸν πιστεύοντα*) to direct individual dependence on God.

St. Paul taught justification by faith, and justification by faith is as vital to the Christian life, as portrayed by St. Paul, as is oxygen to the air we breathe. Without it, the Christian life and polity and worship sink back into legalism, drift away from the New Testament. He did not teach justification by faith as the only doctrine or principle of his gospel. Those who have tried to do so in later times have produced a moral narcotic, not the gospel of St. Paul. We cannot breathe pure oxygen. It is not air, but a poison.

A STUDY OF PSALM CXXXVII.

PSALM cxxxvii. ("By the waters of Babylon") must be described in point of interpretation as one of the more difficult of the Psalms. It is not merely that it contains words which have been diversely explained, *e.g.*, תוללינו ("They that wasted us," *v.* 3) and השררה ("That art to be destroyed," *v.* 8). The very structure of the Psalm is not so easy as it appears at first sight. According to the arrangement usually followed we get these divisions:

(a) 1-6. The faithfulness of the exiles in Babylonia to the memory of Zion.

(b) 7. A prayer against the Edomites for the part taken by them in the destruction of Jerusalem.

(c) 8, 9. A cruel beatitude on the destroyer of Babylon.

Three important difficulties are involved in this view of the structure of the Psalm.

(a) The prayer against Edom shows a brevity which is unlike the style of *vv.* 1-6, and a restraint which is alien from the passion of *vv.* 8, 9.

(b) Verse 7 interrupts the connection between *vv.* 8, 9, and the rest of the Psalm.

(c) We should expect that if the Psalmist turns in *v.* 8 from near Edom to far-off Babylon, he would make clear the transition (which would also mark the climax) by some such phrase as, "And *thou*, Daughter of Babylon." He does nothing of the kind.

Now these difficulties may be removed by accepting a supposition which may at first sight seem far-fetched, and yet is simple in itself. The phrase "Daughter of Babylon" is generally taken to be a phrase similar in kind to "Daughter of Jerusalem" (Isa. xxxvii. 22 *et passim*), *i.e.* as meaning "people of Babylon." But another explana-

tion has much to be said for it. The terms "Son," "Daughter," "Sister" may describe other relationships besides those of natural kinship. Ezekiel (xvi. 45, 46) calls Jerusalem, in effect if not expressly, the "Daughter of an Hittite" and "Sister of Sodom." Malachi (ii. 11) calls a foreign wife a "Daughter of a strange god."¹ Ahaz, again (2 Kings xvi. 7), describes himself as "Son" of Tiglath-pileser, in asking that monarch for the protection of a suzerain. The adherents of Athaliah (2 Chron. xxiv. 7) are called her "sons."

Judged by these passages, the "Daughter of Babylon" may (it seems to me) be the description of some power which *either* (1) had "moral" kinship with Babylon, *or* (2) was politically the dependent of Babylon, *or*, again (3), combined both characteristics. Such a power was *Edom*.

If, accordingly, we may take the words "O daughter of Babylon" (v. 8) as addressed, not to the population of Babylon, but to the Edomites mentioned just before (v. 7), three results follow: (1) The difficulties in the structure of the Psalm disappear; (2) a satisfactory explanation of *הַשְׂדֵדָה* (v. 8) can be given; (3) a significant phrase, which is usually treated as insignificant, receives justice (*אל הסלע*, "against the rock.")

To take the second point first, it may be said that if the "Daughter of Babylon" be *Edom*, the difficulty regarding *הַשְׂדֵדָה* disappears at once. According to the accepted view of the structure and reference of the Psalm, Babylon is threatened with destruction in v. 8, and yet in the same verse is described by the epithet *הַשְׂדֵדָה*, the most natural translation of which is "The Destroyed." If, however, it be *Edom*, Babylon's accomplice and "Daughter," who is menaced with future retribution, the epithet implying past punishment, "The Destroyed," can be given without hesi-

¹ I abstain from citing "Daughter of Belial" (1 Sam. i. 16) until some general agreement has been reached as to the meaning of "Belial."

tation to Babylon. Nay, does not the address gain in force, "O Edom, Daughter of Babylon the Destroyed! [thy turn comes next"]?

If we may thus dissociate the Daughter of Babylon from Babylon herself, and may attach the epithet to the "mother," we need no longer hesitate to see a reference in השְׂדוּדָה, "The Destroyed," to the destruction of the walls of Babylon and the slaughter of her chief inhabitants, after a terrible siege¹ by Darius Hystaspis (Herod. iii. 159). The Psalmist points to the punishment of the author of his country's ruin, and threatens Edom, the accomplice, with a like fate.

Passing on to the next point, may we not say that the vivid touch at the very end of the Psalm shows that the Psalmist is thinking of vengeance to fall on Edom and not on Babylon? He blesses the destroyer who dashes the enemy's children in pieces *against the Rock* (אל הסלע, πρὸς τὴν πέτραν).

Now this expression, "against the Rock," is not a mere detail of a phrase; rather it embodies the climax of the Psalm, and echoes back through the preceding verses. The phrase "dash in pieces" (Heb. נִפֵץ in *piél*) is complete in itself. In the remaining fourteen places in which it occurs in the Old Testament it has no finishing detail such as "against the stones" or "against the rock." A similar statement may be made regarding its synonym (רָטַשׁ in the *piél*), which occurs six times in the Old Testament. It is impossible, therefore, to read here "against the Rock" without feeling that some emphasis falls upon the phrase.

But if the expression be emphatic (cp. the arrangement of the verse in the R.V.), we must not be content with an explanation of it which is vague and almost tautological. A definite and telling reference is possible. In seven places

¹ Nöldeke (*Encycl. Brit.* "Persia") suggests the reign of Xerxes as the date of this siege.

of the Old Testament "Rock" (עֶלֶךְ, or "the Rock" = הַסֵּלֶעַ) is used as the name of a strong city of Edom, perhaps its capital, at any rate its representative stronghold. How forcible, then, is the last word of this Psalm, if we may explain the cruel beatitude of *v.* 9 as pronounced upon him who shall dash Edom's little ones in pieces against Edom's rocky fortress, now in the hands of Edom's enemy!

To return to my first point. If I have rightly understood the structure of the Psalm, it falls into *two* (not *three*) divisions:

(a) *vv.* 1-6. The wrongs done by Babylon remembered with a certain calmness, both because Judah has already returned, and because Babylon has been already chastised.

In contrast to this:

(b) *vv.* 7-9. The wrongs done by Edom remembered in wrath, and laid up for future reckoning.

A word must be added on the moral difficulty involved in the last three verses of the Psalm. These display exactly the spirit which our Lord rebuked in James and John when they wished to call down fire from heaven. Moreover they are not an inconsiderable part of the Psalm to be passed over with slight attention, but, indeed, colour the whole poem and abide in the memory, What are we to say of them?

In the first place, we may recall the pregnant saying of Origen (given on the title page of some editions of Butler's *Analogy*), to the effect that he who believes that Nature and the written Word come from the same Author must expect to find difficulties of the same kind in both. Hence if Nature sometimes appear to be cruel, it is not surprising if some sayings of the written Word appear cruel too.

But next it may be said, If Nature puts us on our trial in a moral sense, testing our faith (when Nature's riddle is

hard to solve) and our love (when her face is stern¹), may it not be one function of Scripture to test us in the same way?

Is it not possible that along with all the pure gold of the Psalter we have offered to us also this dross, that we may learn to refuse the evil and to choose the good? The Master Himself is reported to have said (Clementine Homilies iii. 61 apud Westcott, *Introduction to Gospels*, Appendix C): *For it is thy part, O man, to try my words as silver is tried before the money-changers.* God grant His people a pure conscience able to try His Word!

W. E. BARNES.

¹ Though Nature, red in tooth and claw,
With ravin, shrieked against his creed.

(*In Memoriam.*)

THE PASSOVER AND THE LORD'S SUPPER.

It is quite conceivable that the counsels of the Father might have determined that Jesus Christ should die at some other time than in the midst of the Passover celebration, and that some other part of the Jewish ritual should have been moulded into a permanent memorial of human redemption. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews sees in the impressive events of the great Day of Atonement a prefiguration of the sacrifice and priestly mediation of Jesus Christ in the presence of His Father, and the theology of sacramentarianism would have had stronger analogies to sustain it if the solemnities of that day had been adjusted to Christian uses and perpetually bound upon the Church of the future. From the very beginning of His ministry Jesus seems to have had a presentiment of the fact that His death was to link itself with the celebration of the Passover, and that the institution by which that death must be kept in perpetual memory amongst His elect people would bear a clear paschal imprint. The glimmering the Baptist had of the fact, when he described Jesus as the Lamb of God taking away the sin of the world, may have only confirmed our Lord's own forecasts upon the subject. It was at the Passover following the commencement of His public ministry that the first signs of mortal hostility appeared. The discourse on the bread delivered in the synagogue at Capernaum was delivered whilst the Passover pilgrims to Jerusalem were crowding the highways of Galilee, and the special occasion colours the similitudes in which Christ predicts His coming sacrifice. It was in obedience to the inward voice calling Him to His supreme act of obedience at the Feast, that He stedfastly set His face to go up to Jerusalem and spoke once and again of all that was to befall Him there. And on the eve of His death He felt a

constraint to celebrate the Festival with His comrades, and grafted the Holy Supper upon this primitive foundation rite of a redeemed Israel. Before He suffered, with desire He desired to eat the Passover with His disciples, finding therein solace, strength, courage, hope in the hour of His passion. Why did Jesus give the preference to this rite over others, and find in it a special fitness for the age-long celebration of His death? What was there in its history, analogies, and associations to lend itself to His purposes? Why did He transplant into the New Testament Church this solitary part of a ritual that was about to vanish away and make it a sign of His dying that should outlast the world?

It could not have been without significance to the mind of our Lord that this celebration with which His death was to be now and hereafter identified was older than the temple sacrifices. Whatever view may be held of the composite character of the Passover sections in the Book of Exodus, the great rite itself obviously took its rise on the borderline of two dispensations, and belonged equally to both. For the decease which He was to accomplish at Jerusalem Jesus tacitly claimed the double witness. His death was no accident of the after times. Some of its principles had been anticipated and foreshadowed in the foundation of the Jewish state. The first Passover was celebrated long before Levitical rites and offerings were prescribed. The ceremonies akin to it in some of the primitive religions of mankind seem to give colour to the idea that the impressive solemnity enjoined by Moses on the night of the Exodus was an adaptation of a pre-existing observance. Perhaps the Passover touched with its associations a world that was broader than the Jewish election, and had a catholic suggestiveness lacking in rites which had become entirely identified with the narrowness of the nation. Whether that may have been so or not, the paschal lamb

was a connecting link between the rude altars of the patriarchs and those on which the Levites offered their sacrifices to God, and spoke more impressively of those eternal counsels He was to fulfil by His death. There is an implicit appeal in our Lord's association of His death with the Passover to an authority dating back beyond that of temple or even tabernacle.

The Passover offering had a many-sided significance lacking in the sacrifices prescribed by the more elaborate code of later days. As the life of the race became more complex, and priests and sacrifices were multiplied, a tendency shows itself to differentiate the meaning of the various sacrifices, parallel to those divisions of function which take place in physiological evolution. Specific sacrifices represent the expiation and removal of sin, either in the individual or in the nation. Other sacrifices represent the consecration of the worshipper to God and His service; and yet other offerings which were eaten in the courts of the temple express devout and glad-hearted fellowship and communion with God. To find a rite for the observance of His followers that combined all these ideas in one, Jesus Christ had to pass by the offerings of the temple and to go back to the Passover. The blood sprinkled upon the door-posts, as an appeal to the destroying angel and a protecting sign, was perhaps a more impressive object-lesson of propitiation than any of the sin-offerings of the temple. It was to give emphasis to this aspect of the observance that the lamb in after centuries was slain in the temple courts where its blood could be presented to God. The Passover at the same time was a covenant of separation to God, and it was predominantly a Feast of grateful love and of reverent friendship with the Most High.

When instituting the Holy Supper, our Lord could not have been unmindful of the fact that the Passover rite of which it was an adaptation was a rite of the home rather

than of the temple. For the perpetual celebration of His redemptive death He desired the atmosphere of simplicity and love that suffuses the household rather than the pomp and frigidity and even corruption imported into the place that was once God's sanctuary. It was a sad and all but incredible thing that it should be so, yet as a matter of fact the worst part of Jewish life had the temple for its sphere of activity. Here was the stronghold of pride, greed, cruelty, cunning. It was an imposing scene of caste distinctions rather than of brotherhood and religious equality. The ideal conditions for the vivid, believing, heart-felt remembrance of his soul-ransoming sacrifice and compassion, were not those of pomp, rigour, spiritual terrorism, austere ceremonial; but tenderness, unfeigned simplicity, unsophisticated emotion. The circle in which the voice of childhood was allowed to speak, where ties of blood held the members of a household in gracious oneness with each other, where sympathy was as pure and perfect as nature could make it, was the circle most consonant with the spirit He wished to foster by the perpetual celebration of His death. The Passover festival was essentially that of the home, and at the Last Supper our Lord must have surely been casting forward a prophetic glance through the early generations of the Christian faith, and have foreseen that the New Covenant Passover, like its Jewish predecessor, would be the glad and reverent feast of the home rather than the imposing function of a stately ecclesiastical building.

If it had been the express intention of our Lord to affront and stultify the extreme sacramentarian, He could not have done it more effectually than by taking for the distinctive rite of the Christian faith an observance that in point of time preceded all official priesthoods. The Christian Passover fits in more gloriously with the common priesthood of all believers than could any sacrificial act in connection with the services of the temple that he might have adjusted

to Christian uses. When this festival of redemption from Egypt was founded, every home was theoretically a shrine of worship and every father a priest in his own family. It is said by many that there can be no valid sacrament unless bread and wine are consecrated and dispensed by one who is related through an unbroken outward series of ordinations to the apostles, and so endowed with the powers and prerogatives of a priest. How consciously or unconsciously Jesus Christ mocks this assumption when He transforms a Passover, which was originally slain within the home, and the authorised celebrant of which was the father in the midst of his own children, into the memorial of His death! If it be denied that the Lord's Supper must be interpreted by the analogies of the Passover, we attribute to the Lord an incongruous and a limping logic. The rite has no sacerdotal associations; and if any portion of the Passover narrative was edited by priestly influence, as the higher criticism contends, we only see how impossible it was for Jewish priests to find an indispensable place for themselves in the rules of the celebration. The question whose hands shall break the bread and bless the cup at this holy supper is one of expediency. As a rule the communities of Christ's disciples have thought it best to commit the administration into the hands of a separated ministry. That, however, is not of the essence of the sacrament. The man who claims that in virtue of his order he is the only dispenser of a valid sacrament forgets that Jesus Christ passed by the priests and their sacrifices. The sacerdotalist shows himself as contemptuous of the principles of true exegesis as he is of the rights and privileges of his fellow-believers. In the early Church the primitive custom of the Passover seems to have reappeared for a time, and the solemnity was presided over by the oldest and most honoured disciple.

The Passover was chosen as the basis of the great sacrament of human redemption because the participation in its

gladness was all but national in its breadth and comprehensiveness. The rite was more catholic than the genius of the Jewish worship for centuries. The stranger who sojourned amongst the Israelites, and for whom in after ages an inferior court of worship was provided in the temple, was to be one of the elect family and welcomed to this festival of redemption. Those who had defiled themselves by ill-timed breaches of the ceremonial law, and who would have been disqualified from entering for the time being into the tabernacle, might take part in the solemn and friendly feasting. The privilege was to be generous and all embracing. And this characteristic of the Passover was maintained to the very end, for it was the most numerously attended of all the Jewish feasts. It is true that the centralization of worship in Jerusalem, which of course was a part of the providential plan for the preservation of its purity, and the slaying of the lamb in the temple courts, tended to contract to some extent the numbers represented in the celebration, but it never ceased to be a festival which enlisted the great mass of the nation in its observance. Some of the sacrifices of the altar were for the offending individuals who had presented them, some were for the priests, and some for the collective nation. But every family kept the Passover, and it became a type of redemption upon the broadest possible scale. It must have comforted the heart of our Lord, as his thought went back to Egypt and he saw every family celebrating the great redemption that was working itself out through the hours of the midnight, or as He watched the vast Passover crowds in Jerusalem overflowing the streets and covering the slopes of Olivet, to think that the day should yet come when vaster crowds should know and honour and love their new Deliverer, from the least even unto the greatest. The Passover brought together the largest number of individuals to claim and consciously recognise their part in God's redem-

ing grace and power, and because of its sense of all-embracing victory, millennial gladness, universal salvation, was better fitted to become the distinctive and enduring symbol of redemption, and express the mighty hopes of Jesus as He stood on the threshold of His passion, than any of the sacrifices of the altar.

What a peculiar attractiveness the thought must have had for Him that the Christian no less than the Jewish Passover would yet become a festival of undivided families! In this aspect it was a sublime and soul-solacing prefiguration of His hope. Not many hours ago he had spoken of Himself as one of the divisive and upturning forces of human life, setting a household against itself and unwittingly bringing about within the family, feuds bitter as death itself. But He looked beyond that, and saw all the families of the earth gathering together in tender joy and unbroken concord to celebrate His redemptive compassions and enter through His death into a higher and more unbroken fellowship even than that of the home. The picture is not always and everywhere realized. A grey-headed father is sometimes the only representative of his family at the Paschal feast. A wife or mother obeys the Lord's last request, but her husband and her sons and daughters are in very different scenes. When unbroken families present themselves at the table of the Lord, His eye is turned upon them with a benign approval which seems to say, "It was that upon which My heart was set when I made the Passover the sacrament of My death." To the thought of Jesus Christ this Jewish rite was a prophecy and an earnest of the salvation of households. If we belong to His circle and yet absent ourselves from the feast, we belittle the solemnity and postpone His magnificent hope. Jesus chose the Passover for adaptation to the uses of His Church because it demands from all who belong to the true Israel a glad and undivided confession of faith and love.

The Passover too was the sign and seal of covenant friendship between the people and their deliverer. In the background possibly there was some faint survival of the old Semitic idea of blood-kinship through common food. Eating and drinking are more than the signs of fellowship, for there may sometimes be fellowship that is superficial and not determined by deep-hidden affinities of thought and life. Whilst the Paschal blood offered before God in the temple is assumed to take away sin, the flesh from which that blood was spilt consecrates the participant for God's indwelling, and makes him a part of the very temple life which is enshrining God. By contrite and believing reciprocity Jesus Christ assures His disciples in this solemnity that they will come into true communion with Himself and His Father, and possess His unchanging presence in their pilgrimage.

The original celebration of the Passover was with shod feet, girt loins and staff in hand, so as to be ready for the sudden midnight call. These features of the rite disappeared in the after ages of Jewish history, but the temper of expectancy they represented is stamped upon the Christian Passover, for the Lord's dying must be celebrated till He appear the second time without spot unto salvation. Possibly, like the Jews of the after centuries, we have allowed the spirit of expectancy to disappear, and our celebration looks only to the past and forgets the future; but faith and love are always expectant, and we keep but a maimed and defective Passover when we forget the eager outlook of those who are called to "show forth the Lord's death *till He come.*"

THOMAS G. SELBY.

ONLY LET US BE MINDFUL OF THE POOR.

GALATIANS II. 10.

It is generally assumed that in the words "only that we should remember the poor" reference is made to those for whom Paul later made collection, namely, "the poor of the saints that are at Jerusalem" (Rom. xv. 26). But if so, why does he not express this specific thought more explicitly, in order to make his meaning clear to his Galatian readers? Of course, if it be taken for granted, as it was by Lightfoot, that the subject of such a collection had already been brought before them when the epistle was written (c. 57-58), then the looseness of expression, though still strange and unparalleled, is at least defensible. But this situation itself is now challenged, and attempt must first be made to give the phrase a more natural exegesis on its own merits.

It is well known what a central place in the Jewish ideal of piety was at this time held by acts of mercy towards the poor. "Almsgiving," says *Ecclesiasticus*,¹ "will make atonement for sins." And this is the universal sentiment from his day to the time when a Christian preacher, in whom lived the more Judaic side of the Church's consciousness, could virtually echo the judgment of Tobit (iv. 9, 10; xii. 9), that "Alms doth deliver from death, and it shall purge away all sin; they that do alms and righteousness shall be filled with life." For the Homily known as *ii*.

¹ *Ecclus.* iii. 30. Full proof that this estimate was not the exception but rather the rule in later Judaism, will be found in Weber, *Jüdische Theologie* (the latest form of the *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*), §§ 61, 71, where the doctrine of Talmud and Midrash is set forth. The tendency to put alms in the place once occupied by more formal sacrifice, a tendency emphasized by the loss of the Temple, was no doubt already strong in Pharisaic circles, and outside Jerusalem quite generally, throughout the first century A.D. (See *Ecclus.* xxxv. 1-7, esp. v. 2).

Clement exclaims, "Almsgiving, therefore, is a good thing, even as repentance from sin. Fasting is better than prayer, but almsgiving than both. And love covereth a multitude of sins, but prayer out of the good conscience delivereth from death. Blessed is every man that is found full of these. For almsgiving lifteth off the burden of sin" (xvi. 4). Like sentiments are also found in *Barnabas* and *Hermas*.¹

Now while it is true that the New Testament estimate of almsgiving is free from the taint of legalistic merit and the exaggeration which marked contemporary Judaism and even reasserted itself in second century Christianity, still it accords like pre-eminence to this virtue as indicative of brotherly love, in keeping with its own essential spirit. Thus in the Sermon on the Mount Christ refers to it first, in developing the new Righteousness in formal antithesis to the old (Matt. vi. 1 ff.): while He bases a new doctrine of purity, in contrast to the Pharisaic, upon its typical worth² (Luke xi. 41; cf. xix. 8, the vow of *Zacchæus*). In the story of *Cornelius* we learn that alms were regarded as a prime element in that "righteousness" wherein this Gentile worshipper of Israel's God was held acceptable to Him (Acts x. 2, 4, 31). And as this is given as Peter's own estimate of alms, as a form under which a man of any nation could "work righteousness," it is

¹ *Barn.* xix. 10: "Thou shalt work with thy hands for a ransom for thy sins" (*i.e.* by alms). In *Hermas*, *Sim.* ii. 4 ff., there is an elaborate theory of the mutual dependence of the rich and poor, turning on the alms of the former and the prayers of the latter.

² The emphasis on mercy to the poor is very marked in Luke's Gospel, a phenomenon sometimes described as the "Ebionism" of Luke (see *Campbell, Critical Studies in Luke*, part ii.). As this is most marked in the sections peculiar to his Gospel, it probably goes back to a special Palestinian source used by him, and closely related to, if not part of, the source lying behind the picture of early Church life in Acts ii.-vi. But the idea is also very marked in the Judgment scene in Matt. xxv. 35-40, as well as in the Anointing scene at Bethany.

surely very pertinent to the matter in hand, namely, the fitness of the emphasis apparently laid by Peter, along with James and John, upon charity or almsgiving as a characteristic Christian grace. In this way Gentile believers could prove that their "free" faith was not a dead or fruitless faith, but produced a type of piety recognisable as at bottom identical with that fostered by aid of the Mosaic Law.

So viewed, the provision was one meant to ensure that in the sister mission one and the same "religion" was produced, the "pure religion and undefiled before our God and Father," which is "to tend the fatherless and widows in their affliction," and so, as it seems, "keep oneself unspotted from the world."¹ This solicitude for the poor among the brethren anywhere and everywhere is but the generalization of what we find in Acts ii.-vi., in what is incorrectly styled the "communism" of the primitive Jerusalem Christians.² To them the wonderfully fraternal attitude there reflected was an integral part of Messiah's religion, the practical sanctification of life, and the constant confession of His Lordship in denial of worldliness. And hence they can put forth mindfulness of the poor, not as one virtue among many, but as the touchstone of the

¹ James i. 27. The evidence of this Epistle is very marked, e.g. ii. 5, 6, iv, 4, 9, 10, v. 1, 5; and it is also very weighty as an index of the criteria of genuine piety current in the Jerusalem community. With this agrees the tradition (even if with heightening touches) regarding James' unworldly temper preserved in Hegesippus as cited by Eusebius (ii. 23).

² Compare the *Didaché*, iv. 5-8, a part almost certainly implying a prior Jewish basis and still partaking somewhat of its "interested" spirit in such things. But the last paragraph at least is typical of early Judæo-Christian piety: "Thou shalt not turn away from him that is in need, but shalt share all things with thy brother, and shalt not say that they are thy private property; for if ye are fellow-sharers in that which is immortal, how much more in things perishable." So, too, among the works of the "Way of Death" in v. 2 is "not pitying the poor man." Eusebius in his picture of primitive Evangelists (iii. 37) makes them, prior to their "going forth," distribute their possessions among the needy.

genuine tone of Messiah's *Ecclesia*. Men so living were morally purified from the hard, selfish, Gentile spirit. And nothing could show forth the new piety more manifestly than those occasions on which Gentiles might remember "the poor" among their Jewish brethren. Accordingly this view would put a fresh fulness of meaning into the Antiochene Famine Fund, and explain how Paul and Barnabas would be even eager to go up to Jerusalem to present it themselves, if it were indeed the firstfruits of the private understanding arrived at shortly before. But while I believe such to have been the case, I do not see in the words,¹ "which very thing was already a matter of special concern with me," any specific reference to this collection or any other. It seems rather to be an assertion that this was no new condition of Gentile membership in the Messianic *Ecclesia*—as Judaizers might insinuate—but a thing which had already, and from the first, been a prime point in Paul's teaching to his converts touching "the fruit of the Spirit" (cf. Gal. v. 22 f., vi. 2-6). He was as much in earnest for such "works" in a justified life, and in the power of a justifying faith, as James could be (Jas. ii. 14 ff.) To this his own example signally conformed (Acts xx. 34, 35); and the chief saying of his Master's which he has helped to preserve for us is that *makarism* of the generous spirit, which yields the palm of blessedness to

¹ As regards the grammar of the verse, Ramsay has elaborately discussed the careful way in which St. Paul uses his tenses throughout the historical summary in Gal. i. ii. (EXPOSITOR V. ii. 107 ff.) Verse 10 runs, *μόνον τῶν πτωχῶν ἵνα μνημονεύωμεν, ὃ καὶ ἐσπούδασα αὐτὸ τοῦτο ποιῆσαι*, which I would render: "Only let us make a practice of being mindful of the poor—which very thing I was already even forward to do." Nor can I see how the aorist suits his special view, that Paul was at this very moment *actually engaged in doing* such work. The imperfect, of "those actions which continued for a period but are not thought of as continuing at the moment of writing," would seem rather to be looked for. On my own theory, which also makes the change from the first person plural to the singular more natural, Paul simply records his then state of mind as a matter of fact.

him who gives.¹ How could Paul do other than hail with enthusiasm this aid to insisting on a duty which he esteemed a privilege? Henceforth in case of need he could cite the emphatic and expressed desire of his colleagues, the leading Apostles to the Jews. For in both missions there was from the first the common spirit, symptomatic of their religious unity, which responded to the exhortation: "But to be beneficent and to communicate forget not: for with such sacrifices God is well pleased" (Heb. xiii. 16).

I am quite alive to the excellent sense in many ways resulting from the specific reference which most see in "the poor," namely, to the believing poor of the Circumcision. Yet the more one considers the difficulties of reading so specific a meaning into the simple phrase "the poor," the greater they appear. The only possible apology for it, namely that the context suggests it, is neither convincing, as far as it goes, nor is it adequate. For the immediate antecedent is not the Jerusalem Church, but the Circumcision as the sphere of the original Apostolate.² Hence the reference cannot be

¹ See also the emphasis on communicating to a brother's need, in 1 Tim. vi. 17, 18; Titus iii. 14; also the marked reference to its place as a work of piety (1 Cor. xiii. 4).

² This would practically make "Ebionites" or "the poor men" almost a technical term for Judæo-Christianity as a whole even at this early date—a conclusion for which one is hardly prepared. On the other hand the alternative view, that regard for the poor was the most characteristic manifestation of true piety, gives the only reasonable account of the origin of the term "Ebionites," when once it did arise. For it is far easier to suppose that it was the chosen name of the Judæo-Christians in question than that it was a nickname. They felt towards poverty as did the early Franciscans, *poverello*, "the humble poor one," being only another aspect of *frater minor*, and each denoting a certain humble or meek type of piety (*religio*). This is just the attitude underlying the Epistle of James. And how natural that it should be so, once we recollect the guise in which Jesus of Nazareth Himself must have appealed to the imagination of natives of Palestine, where He would be remembered as emphatically the Poor Man, dependent upon the alms of others, "not having where to lay His head"! Like Master, like disciples. This must have been the Christian type *par excellence* to Palestinian Christianity; and it would have full sway once the primitive community was detached from the life of Jerusalem, where other influences would operate, and isolated in Peræa.

contextually narrowed to the former, but at best to the latter. But evidence is not to hand that Jewish Christians, as a class and apart from those in Jerusalem, ever received material aid from their Gentile brethren, save during the Famine.¹ And further, it remains open to grave doubt whether Paul would have expected the distant Galatian Christians to perceive so allusive a reference to the supposed special condition of the poor of the Circumcision. How easy it would have been to give some specific turn to the bare phrase "the poor," if such had been his meaning.² Again, does the sense traditionally given to the passage really fit into the course of the Apostle's argument? The usual reading of the phrase does not seem to fall in with the aim of the Epistle. For how would it support his *authority* to state that as a matter of fact he had been zealous to do what was suggested and had since shown it by initiating collections among his Churches for the "Jerusalem poor"? What is the point of the remark relative to his dialectic purpose? Had his object, for the moment, been to show the unity of spirit felt on his side in spite of the apparent diversity of his policy, then the observation would have been telling. As it is, it seems, on the current theory, quite gratuitous, if it does not afford the other side a fresh argument to prove subservience to the Jerusalem apostles to be his true and normal relation.

Even Paul felt the power of the humble estate in which his Lord had "lived as a beggar," to enrich men's souls (2 Cor. viii. 9).

¹ With the more restricted sense of "the poor" fall away also the Pauline references to actual collections among his Churches, which are the ultimate source of the traditional gloss "the poor of the Jerusalem Church": and the idea "the poor" is left in its native simplicity.

² Observe that the collection among the Galatians (1 Cor. xvi. 1) for the Jerusalem Saints, on the Third Missionary Journey, cannot here be used to clear up the phrase to the readers' minds, by those who, like Rendall, Zahn, and McGiffert, place *Galatians* before the Third Missionary Journey. But this opinion is the dominant one on the Continent and is likely to gain ground in England more and more.

Once more, is it not a strange and rather undignified request for the mother Church to make, if one supposes its Pillar Apostles making it and its offshoots a *permanent* charge on Paul's converts?

If, on the other hand, we take "the poor" without any limitation as between Jew and Gentile, then the request would be that Paul should instil into his converts the very genius of true piety as understood in certain Jewish circles and in the Judæo-Christian Church universally. For without going as far as the Rabbinic maxim, "Almsgiving is equivalent to all virtues," yet they surely believed, with James, that brotherliness is the parent of all virtues, even as "the love of money is root of all vices." It is at any rate suggestive that the shutting up of one's compassions towards a brother's need is taken by James, as later by John, as the best proof of a dead and formal faith (Jas. ii. 15-17).

If this, then, be the true meaning, namely, that it is a prime *moral guarantee that by different roads they are reaching the same type of fruitful piety in Christ*, then we can see why Paul is concerned to show that this was *not a new idea* for his Gospel, but that it simply voiced one of his most ardent aspirations in all his work; it was simply a fresh point of common understanding, and nothing more. And on the theory, that the visit of Galatians ii. 1-10 preceded that of Acts xi. 29, Paul soon had a splendid chance of proving his assurances of keenness in this cause (given probably as soon as the subject came up in conference), when he returned with the Antiochene Fund—possibly already in progress, and if so, doubtless mainly at his suggestion.

But while this may or may not be historically true, we cannot recognise in Paul's words to the Galatians any reference to it. His real point is that *no new lesson in the Gospel* came to him when the Pillar Apostles asked

guarantees that the poor anywhere and everywhere should have due attention from his converts, who, as trained under Gentile ideals, were open to some doubt on this point as compared with those who, even as Jews and nothing else, had viewed their fellows as "brethren" and been wont to act on this sentiment in relation to the poor.

VERNON BARTLET.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

III.

THE THRONE OF GOD AND OF THE LAMB.

REV. IV., v.

THE book of the Apocalypse is the result of the instructions given to John as recorded in chapter i. 19, "Write therefore the things which thou sawest, and the things which are, and the things which shall come to pass hereafter." The things he saw on that first day of unveiling are recorded in the first chapter—the vision of the exalted Christ and the ideal Church. "The things which are" appear in the second and third chapters, in which we see the Church as it is in stern reality, in the midst of its conflict with enemies without and within. The great vision which is now to open out before us, extending from the fourth chapter to the end of the book, will set forth "the things which shall come to pass hereafter."

We here enter, therefore, on the main substance of the Apocalypse, the way in which it is introduced indicating that there has been an interval between the former vision and this: "*After these things* I saw, and, behold, a door opened in heaven, and the first voice which I heard, a voice as of a trumpet speaking with me, one saying, Come up hither, and I will shew you the things which must come to pass hereafter." As in the former vision, so here, we are told, "Straightway I was in the Spirit." This introductory phrase is not again repeated throughout the whole book; so we may probably infer that the long series of revelations which occupy the rest of the book was continuous. Think what an ordeal this must have been, more severe by far than that which Daniel underwent, of which he said, "I Daniel alone saw the vision: . . . and

there remained no strength in me"; and again, "O my Lord, by reason of the vision, my sorrows are turned upon me, and I retain no strength." John, we remember, had a similar feeling of prostration when, on the first appearance of the Son of Man, "he fell at His feet as dead"; but from the time his Master's quickening touch had been laid upon him, he seemed to have sufficient strength to carry him through such an ordeal as perhaps no prophet of the Lord had ever undergone before.

"The things which must come to pass hereafter" are to be in the main dreadful. An ominous book or roll is to be unrolled, each of its seven seals when broken revealing some new and nameless horror. Out of the last seal will come seven trumpets, each with an awful blast of woe; later there will be seven thunders, none the less terrible that they are inarticulate; and finally there will be poured out seven vials or bowls of judgment, before the wrath of God can be said to be finished. Such is the awful outlook of the coming years.

Why should the heart of the seer and of the saints be burdened with such an awful disclosure? It is given in mercy, that they may not be taken by surprise, but prepared for what is coming; and that they may know that these tempests of wrath, though they may wrap the earth in gloom and shut out heaven from the sight of men, are after all only like successive wintry storms, which, though they cover the earth with desolation, are preparing it for a glorious spring, and though they may follow each other so closely and so long that winter seems to linger in the lap of May, are all leading up to the great summer of the year of God.

Perhaps the best way to picture to ourselves the situation is to think of the seer on some high promontory of his rocky isle (remember the invitation "Come up hither") looking out across the waste of waters to the nearest land

in sight. For the most part the intervening sea is dark with storm and tempest; but ever and anon the mists clear and the sun shines in full splendour on the hills beyond. The situation would be somewhat like that of Isaac Watts looking across Southampton Water as he wrote :

Sweet fields beyond the swelling flood
Stand dressed in living green;

only instead of the narrow strip of quiet waters we are to think of a gloomy stretch of angry sea.

If we think of the vision as coming somewhat in this way, we shall understand how it is that he seems again and again to see the end long before we reach the close of the book. This is quite inexplicable on the theory that we have in the Apocalypse a continuous history of the Church and the world; for why should we reach the great consummation in the 7th chapter, and again in the 11th, and again in the 14th and 15th, and again in the 19th, and when we reach the very end, find that we have been there already as many as five or six times before? The difficulty disappears when we think that just as the Throne of God is always above him, the great consummation is always before him; and that just as the storm passes, the land beyond is revealed, now in one aspect, now in another, but always the same land; so when the storm clouds of the seals have cleared, there is the sunny hill of God; and again when the trumpet blasts are over and when the thunders have uttered their voices, and when the vials have been poured out, the same mountain of the Lord appears, until at last it stands in full and clear sunshine, crowned with the shadowless City of God.

Bear in mind that the great object of the Apocalypse is to train the sorrowing saints to pierce with the eye of faith up through mist and cloud to the Throne of God,

and forward in hope and patience to the great consummation. It was, in short, to teach them in the darkest hour of trial and persecution to maintain the upward look of faith, and the forward look of hope and patience.

From this general view of what is coming we see how appropriate it is that this vision of the future should begin with a glimpse of the Throne of God. "Straightway I was in the Spirit, and, behold, there was a throne set in heaven." It needed a door opened in heaven to show that Throne—the door of faith; for the only throne in sight was that of Cæsar, the Roman Emperor, who then wielded the sovereignty of the world. And the Cæsar on it now is an infuriated beast, a very monster of iniquity, whose delight is to devour the saints of God. And, be it remembered, he had usurped the Throne of God as well; for this monster Nero is worshipped throughout the Empire as "the Divine Augustus"; and to all intents and purposes he seems invested with omnipotence. Like the tyrant of Daniel's vision, "whom he would he slew, and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he raised up, and whom he would he put down." Let the question be asked throughout the wide world, Who reigns supreme? A hundred million voices answer, Nero; but one in Patmos cries Nay: "The Lord reigneth; let the earth rejoice; let the multitude of isles be glad. Clouds and darkness are round about Him: righteousness and judgment are the foundation of His throne."

We cannot dwell on the details of this majestic vision. We can only note a few characteristics. Observe, first, the reverent reticence in speaking of God. There is no attempt to describe Him, no indication of form or mien or robe as in the vision of the Son of Man, only the general impression made upon the spirit-sense as of a clear flame-like glory, with perhaps the suggestion, "Our God is a consuming fire." On the other hand, the rain-

bow round about the throne suggests mercy; and the impression is heightened by the prevailing tint of emerald in the many-coloured bow. "And round about the Throne were four and twenty thrones: and upon the thrones four and twenty elders sitting," the full number of the patriarchs of the Old Covenant and the Apostles of the New. What a sight for eyes sore with weeping over the heart-break of the heavy tidings recently received that both Peter and Paul had fallen victims to the fury of the tyrant! Fallen? So it seemed; but look through the door opened in heaven, see them there enthroned. Oh! think not of the headless body, think not of the dishonoured corpse. Look up, look up! No blood-stains there; no signs of weakness or defeat: they are "arrayed in white garments; and on their heads crowns of gold." "Victims of Nero" are they? Say rather, "Kings and priests to God."

In this vision of the Throne there is only a passing hint of the terrible judgments which must intervene before the end. It is this: "Out of the Throne proceed lightnings and voices and thunders" (verse 5). Let the saints only remember this, that whatever seems darkest and most dreadful proceeds from that Throne, and they may "possess their souls in patience." The fires that issue from it are the fires of the Divine Spirit—cleansing, quickening fires; the sea which is before that Throne is no troubled sea whose waters cast up mire and dirt, but "as it were a glassy sea like unto crystal"; and the final result of all will be such as to evoke from the life of universal nature (as typified by the four living creatures, upward evolution suggested by the wings, fully developed intelligence by the innumerable eyes) the song of praise, "Holy, Holy, Holy is the Lord God, the Almighty, which was and which is, and which is to come," and from the Church of God as represented by the elders a tribute higher still, "And when the living creatures

shall give glory and honour and thanks to Him that sitteth on the throne, to Him that liveth for ever and ever, the four and twenty elders shall fall down before Him that sitteth on the throne and shall worship Him that liveth for ever and ever, and shall cast their crowns before the throne saying, Worthy art Thou, our Lord and our God, to receive the glory and the honour and the power: For Thou didst create all things, and because of Thy will they were, and were created."

So the vision of the Throne recorded in chapter iv. reaches its consummation without dwelling on the dark process by which it is reached. Is there then to be no explanation and no justification of the intervening process? It is to these dark intervening days that our minds are to be chiefly turned in the sequel: is there to be no light from Heaven to fall upon them? Is there nothing for it but blind acceptance of the inevitable, a dumb waiting through indefinite periods for a far-away end? Is there no key to "the riddle of this painful earth?"

"And I saw in the right hand of Him that sat on the throne a book written within and on the back, close sealed with seven seals." There is the riddle, but without a key. "And I saw a strong angel proclaiming with a great voice, Who is worthy to open the book, and to loose the seals thereof? And no one in the heaven, or on the earth, or under the earth was able to open the book or to look thereon." The riddle seems insoluble. No creature mind can fathom the counsels of God. "His way is in the sea, and His path in the great waters, and His footsteps are not known."

"And I wept much because no one was found worthy to open the book, or to look thereon." Who that has a heart at leisure from itself can fail to sympathise? There are those who can sit at ease in their comfortable drawing-rooms, unmoved by Armenian massacres, Stundist perse-

cutions, Jew baitings, Cretan wars, Greek disasters, Cuban atrocities. But this happily is not the mood of our times. Thoughtful people are compelled by the spirit of the age to suffer their share of the *Weltschmerz*, the world's agony; so we can well enter into the feelings of the seer when he wept much because no one could open the book. Is there no key to the dark mystery of Divine Providence?

“And one of the elders saith unto me, Weep not; behold, the Lion that is of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, hath overcome, to open the book and the seven seals thereof.” “Hath *overcome*”—note the word as correctly given in R.V. It is the same word that we have heard ringing through all the messages to the Churches, “To Him that overcometh.” Here then is the great Leader of those who overcome. And how has He overcome? How is it that He and He alone has been able to solve the riddle of the earth, to deal effectually with the dark problem of sin and suffering? Keep your eye upon the Throne and you shall see.

“And I saw in the midst of the throne and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the elders, a Lamb.” But did we not expect a Lion? A Lion gone up from the prey, having slain his enemies; for so we find it in the ancient prophecy which the elder evidently has in his mind. But when we look unto the Throne, instead of a Lion as it had been slaying, we see “a Lamb as it had been slain”! What meaneth this?

“It is by no breath,

Turn of eye, wave of hand, that salvation joins issue with death!
He who did most, shall bear most; the strongest shall stand the
most weak.”

Not a lion rampant, therefore, but “a lamb as it had been slain.”

Yet the lion-strength is there still, as indicated by the seven horns, and not lion-strength alone, but strength

Divine, for these seven eyes are "the seven spirits of God sent forth into all the earth." It is the strong Son of God, who was dead and is alive again, and is now enthroned, the marks of the Cross the insignia of His crown, all authority given unto Him in Heaven and in earth, sending forth His mighty Spirit in all the variety of His quickening, saving power.

"And he came; and he taketh it out of the right hand of Him that sat on the throne." If the one opener of the book is the slain Lamb, then the key of the mystery of God is sacrifice, and the Cross of Christ is the centre of the Universe. The central position of vicarious sacrifice as a law of universal life is only now in this nineteenth century beginning to be recognised as a great truth of science; but there it is in this ancient book of Revelation set forth with a literary and dramatic power which never has been and never can be surpassed. The book which had been close sealed with seven seals lies open before the Lamb as it had been slain, and this slain Lamb is in the midst of the throne, and abides there, so that henceforward we shall hear of "the throne of God and of the Lamb."

And now there is another burst of praise, louder, higher, grander than the first. The old song was good; the new song is better still. Our hearts were moved and thrilled as we listened to the praise of the great Creator (chapter iv.); they will beat faster and thrill with a deeper emotion as we listen to the chorus in praise of the great Redeemer (chapter v.). It is the same choir as before, but a new song. The old song had been addressed to "God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth": "Worthy art Thou our Lord and our God to receive the glory and the honour and the power; for Thou didst create all things, and because of Thy will they were, and were created." The new song is addressed to "Jesus Christ His only Son": "Worthy art Thou to take the book, and to

open the seals thereof: for Thou wast slain, and didst purchase unto God with Thy blood men of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation, and madest them to be unto our God a kingdom and priests; and they reign upon the earth."

And now the choir enlarges, for angels throng around, and still the strain upsoars: "And I saw, and I heard a voice of many angels round about the throne and the living creatures and the elders; and the number of them was ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands; saying with a great voice, Worthy is the Lamb that hath been slain to receive the power, and riches, and wisdom, and might, and honour, and glory, and blessing." And now the whole universe is awake, aflame with praise and adoration: "And every created thing which is in heaven, and on the earth, and under the earth, and on the sea, and all things that are in them, heard I saying, Unto Him that sitteth on the throne, and unto the Lamb, be the blessing, and the honour, and the glory, and the dominion, for ever and ever. And the four living creatures said, Amen. And the elders fell down and worshipped."

Could any one have imagined it possible that a passage on a theme so high, beginning in a strain so lofty, should not only be able to sustain itself through two whole chapters, but to rise higher and higher till the whole closes in such a climax of sublimity? Is there anything approaching it in the whole range of literature, ancient or modern? Can any one suggest another passage to put beside this matchless close? Let your imagination take hold of that throne of the universe: in the centre of it the great sacrifice, the Lamb of God that taketh away the sin of the world. Round about the throne are the four and twenty elders, and the four living creatures. There is the inner choir. Then there is the innumerable throng of angels; and their anthem soars above the other. Then

the universe to its very farthest bounds is stirred, and every created thing strikes in to swell the chorus, and the strain is higher still. Then come the responses from the inner choir, the living creatures answering "Amen"; while the four and twenty elders, ever close beside the Throne, with hearts too full to speak one word, fall down and worship. And the silence of the elders touches us more deeply than even the grand chorus of the universe.

J. MONRO GIBSON.

SOME RECENT OLD TESTAMENT LITERATURE.

THE second and concluding volume of Mr. Addis' *Documents of the Hexateuch*¹ contains the Deuteronomic and Priestly elements, each given separately, with a special introduction on each. In the latter the author states his present position as to the analysis, etc. He agrees with critics generally in rejecting Horst's view that the kernel of Deuteronomy was a consequence and not a cause of Josiah's reformation; and is inclined to date its composition as early as the reign of Manasseh. While holding that iv. 45-xi., as well as xii.-xxvi., xxviii., belongs to the original document, he concludes that i.-iv. 40 is a later addition, in spite of Driver's contention that it also belongs to the original "kernel." Outside of the Book of the Covenant and the Decalogue, Mr. Addis does not discover much Deuteronomic material in Genesis-Numbers. In the Priestly Documents special type is used to denote the Law of Holiness, otherwise no attempt is made to distinguish the strata of P, or of R^p.

A section is devoted to the theories of Stärk and Steuernagel on the sources of Deuteronomy xii.-xxvi. The laws, etc., in these chapters are sometimes in the second person plural, sometimes in the second person singular. Using this difference of address as a criterion of different authorship, Stärk and Steuernagel develop theories as to the sources of xii.-xxvi. which are alike highly complicated, and, at the same time, conflict seriously with each other. The literary history of Deuteronomy may very well be quite as complicated as these critics maintain; but their

¹ *The Documents of the Hexateuch*, translated and arranged in chronological order, with Introduction and Notes, by W. E. Addis, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford. Vol. II.: The Deuteronomical Writers and the Priestly Documents. London: D. Nutt. 8vo, pp. x., 485; 10s. 6d.

views could only be refuted or verified by an investigation as minute and exhaustive as their own; and we agree with Mr. Addis that, though "it is not incredible that a dozen hands have been at work, . . . we may well doubt the possibility of tracing these various elements."

Mr. Addis considers that in the original document there must have been some statement that Moses wrote down the law. This is very doubtful. There are points in the narrative in Kings which suggest that its author knew the whole history of the law-book. He does not tell us that it was found in the Temple, only that Hilkiah said he found it; and he never speaks of it as the Law of Moses, an omission which the chronicler noticed and carefully supplied. Probably, though the original law-book claimed the authority of Moses, it was perfectly understood that it had not been written by Moses.

Mr. Addis holds that, though Ezekiel knew some of the sources of the Law of Holiness, that code as a whole is dependent on Ezekiel, and therefore exilic; it had been incorporated into the Priestly Code before the latter was promulgated by Ezra. Further, like the present writer, he agrees with Holzinger and E. Meyer in holding that the Joshua portions had been separated from JED and P before the latter was combined by R^p.

The analysis is simply the necessary consequence of that in vol. i., where JE is removed; there is no difficulty in distinguishing D and P. Of course, on many details decisions are merely probable, and are largely due to the personal equation of the individual critic. One slight defect of the plan of the book is that it is often difficult to know where to find information as to editorial additions; sometimes apparently none is given, *e.g.* Joshua xxiv. 31. As to Joshua xxiv. 33, our author has most, if not all, critics on his side, yet we think that this verse, as well as the Eleazar clause in Deuteronomy x. 6, should be given to

one of the later priestly writers, whose other additions to Joshua and Judges refer to Eleazar and Phinehas. In an interesting note to Genesis xiv., Mr. Addis shows the grotesque absurdity of the statement sometimes made that archæology has upset the general results of criticism. If those who are anxious to maintain the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch as a whole really understood what Sayce and Hommel have written, they would know that their supposed advocates have surrendered all that is essential to their case.

Our book is clearly and carefully printed. We have only noticed two misprints: p. 21, line 5; p. 173, line 12.

Dr. King gives us a new translation, with notes, of Psalms i.-xli.¹ This work is written from a critical standpoint; the Davidic authorship is not insisted on; the speaker in many psalms is taken to be the community. But the notes, though not wanting in criticism, are mainly homiletic and devotional. Psalm xxiii. 1-3 is translated:—

YHVH is my Shepherd,
I can lack nothing!
In green pastures He maketh me lie down;
He gently leads me by the restful waters.
He restoreth my soul;
He guideth me in the right tracks; for His own Name's sake.

And there is this note: “‘*Shepherd.*’—In the Old Testament, when this title is applied to God, it is always as the Shepherd of the People, not of the individual soul.”

The author tells us that “The book is intended for the devotional use of the educated English reader, and for such of the clergy as are not afraid of reverent criticism”; and

¹ *The Psalms*, in Three Collections, translated, with notes, by E. G. King, D.D. Part I., First Collection (Pss. i.-xli.), with Preface by the Bishop of Durham. Cambridge: Deighton Bell & Co; London: Geo. Bell & Sons. 1898; pp. xii., 170, paper covers, quarto.

Dr. Westcott states in the preface that "Dr. King has made an original and suggestive contribution to the understanding of" the Psalter. He has also illustrated the fact that the spiritual value of the Old Testament is increased by the full recognition of "reverent criticism."

In the second volume of the *Cambridge Bible*, "Isaiah,"¹ Dr. Skinner brings a difficult task to a very successful conclusion. There is no padding in this book; the information is at once full, terse, and lucid. While regarding xl.-lv. as exilic, and inclining to assign the Servant passages to the same author as the rest of these chapters, Dr. Skinner sees great force in the arguments which have led Duhm and Cheyne to regard lvi.-lxvi. as post-exilic. There is a very complete and useful note on the "Servant of Jehovah," whom Dr. Skinner identifies with the ideal Israel.

Another important note deals with the meaning of "Righteousness." From its primitive forensic senses of the quality expected in a judge, the course of conduct which will stand the scrutiny of an impartial judge, and the legal status which results from a judicial sentence in one's favour, the word enlarged its meaning, till the righteousness of Jehovah came to mean trustworthiness, truthfulness in speech, steadfastness of purpose, consistency of purpose and method, especially in vindicating and saving Israel according to His covenant; while the righteousness of Israel meant that Israel was in the right as against the heathen, and also described the ideal social order, moral character, and religious standing of the true Israel, and the salvation by which these virtues were to be rewarded.

¹ *The Cambridge Bible*, Isaiah xl.-lxvi., Rev. J. Skinner, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Exegesis in the Presbyterian College, London. Cambridge: University Press. 1898, pp. lxi., 251, 8vo; 4s.

A Summary of the Psalms,¹ by the Rev. D. D. Stewart, M.A., Hon. Canon of Rochester, is intended to provide "a commentary on the Psalms for each morning and evening service, which may be prayerfully studied in about ten minutes before attendance at public worship." It is well suited for its purpose, and should "supply a want."

We have also received two volumes of Prof. Moulton's *Modern Readers' Bible*,² "The Psalms and Lamentations"; and vols. iv. and v. of the *Eversley Bible*, containing Isaiah to Lamentations, and Job to the Song of Solomon.³

W. H. BENNETT.

¹ London: Elliot Stock. 1898, pp. 139.

² Macmillan, 2s. 6d. a vol. Vol. i. contains Pss. 1-72; vol. ii., Pss. 73-150 and Lamentations.

³ Macmillan, 5s. a vol.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

II.

REPENTANCE.

IT has been a convention in Christian thought to strike a telling contrast between the mission of John the Baptist and the ministry of Jesus Christ, in which the mission is taken as temporary and the ministry as eternal; but it is possible to carry this contrast to a dangerous extreme. Of course it goes without saying that in a historical sense John was simply the forerunner of the Messiah, whose office was to close the prophetic succession and to herald the opening of the new dispensation. His was the voice of one crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord"; his was the figure of one preparing himself for the Lord. When the Messiah had come, and opened the Kingdom of God, the work of the Baptist was in appearance finished, and it only remained that this heroic servant should seal his selfless life by death—a martyr's death. After a spiritual sense, the message and service of the Baptist were not closed by the arrival of Jesus, and cannot cease till Jesus come the second time, without sin, unto salvation. Stripped of circumstances, it is his high duty to awaken the conscience when religion has degenerated into hypocrisy and irreligion has grown into corruption, to make tender the heart that it be as spring soil, clean and open, for the good seed of the Evangel. His function in the work of grace must be to level down the swelling mountains of pride, and to fill up the dark valleys of despair, that there may be

a smooth road for the chariot of Christ; and so long as there is a sinful man to be saved John will meet him carrying the rod of the Law, that his hearer may be ready for the Gospel. First, John, with his camel's hair garment and his leathern girdle, and then Jesus at the marriage feast; first the Prophet, with strong, merciless words, and then the gentle Galilean saying, "Come unto Me, all ye that labour and are heavy laden." A bodyguard of graces attend the Saviour, among which are Faith and Forgiveness and Holiness, Peace and Joy, but the grace which cometh first in the order of religious experience is stern and strenuous, the grace of the broken and contrite heart.

As we live in a day when this grace is very much a stranger, it is needful that we should identify her face, and make certain that godly sorrow is not a fancy of religious poetry. For that end, let the enquirer turn to the manuals of the soul and open what, after the Gospels, is the chief, not Augustine's *Confessions*, nor the *Imitation of Christ*, nor the *Pilgrim's Progress*, nor the *Saints' Rest*, although in each of those the mystery of the spiritual life is clearly set forth, but that book which is the heart of Old Testament Scripture. It is in the Psalms more than in any other place that we see the soul go out upon her "dim and perilous way" in search of her home in God. Among the Psalms there are seven, certain of which St. Augustine had hung before his eyes as he lay a dying, and which since the days of Origen have had a name and place of their own as the "Psalms of Penitence." As one reads the 6th, the 32nd, the 38th, the 51st, the 102nd, the 130th, and the 143rd, with their profound sense of the guilt of sin, their fear of the Divine displeasure, their unselfish longing for God's mercy, their passionate prayers for cleansing, one recognises the strength of Hebrew religion. Wherever the Old Testament saints failed, it was not in undervaluing sin. Whatever they did not know, they

understood penitence. Their massive strength of faith, which was not tossed by every wind of opinion, and their majestic conceptions of God, Who was to them the Rock of Righteousness, were rooted and grounded in that bitter, wholesome sorrow for sin which is the condition and earnest of true religion. It will be an evil day, and a calamity to the life of the Church, when this virile instrument of worship—the very epic of righteousness—gives place to hymns charged with beautiful emotion, but so destitute of ethical force that one could hardly have imagined that the Ten Words of Moses had ever been written.

It may be urged that this grace, in its pronounced and painful form, belongs to the period of the Law, and has no place under the Gospel; that its home is under the awful shadow of Mount Sinai, and that it ought not to live in the sunshine of Calvary. The child of the new dispensation is not a slave, but a son of God, who has been freely forgiven by the blood of Jesus, and is daily satisfied by His spirit. Unto him belong, as his birthright, the assurance of faith, the peace which passeth understanding, and the joy unspeakable, and not reproaches of conscience, and soreness of heart, and bitter humiliation. The agony of the Psalms does not befit those who have been brought near by the Cross of Jesus, and who stand complete in Him. This may be true, but it was not the experience of St. Paul, who was the champion of grace and the representative saint of the New Covenant. As he writes in his old age to his son Timothy, and exalts the gospel ministry, he is suddenly carried out of his course by an undercurrent of feeling, and magnifies the office of Christ, which is to save sinners, “of whom I am chief.” This is one of the most impressive utterances in the history of religion, whether you consider the writer or its date. He was not one who had played the fool in his youth before God and man, for he could declare that he had lived in good conscience all his days, by which

St. Paul intended that so far as he saw light he had always followed it, and so far as he knew righteousness he had always done it. His persecution of Christ in His disciples was only a pledge of his honesty and of his devotion to the will of God. It was this man of natural nobility and selfless character who wrote himself, not in affected humility, but in absolute sincerity, worse than the Philippian jailor and the evil livers of Corinth. Nor was St. Paul a recent convert, still ignorant of the mind of Christ, and young in grace, but one who for many years had been working out his salvation with fear and trembling, and in whom the readers of his life can trace the clear and convincing likeness of his Lord. With this career behind him, so honourable to himself as a Jew and as a Christian, the most honourable of Pharisees, the most gracious of apostles, St. Paul forgets his achievements and his attainments, and, as he instructs his son Timothy, remembers only his sin. As we catch this glimpse into the Apostle's heart, we begin to understand how St. Paul entered into the mystery of Christ's sacrifice, and realized the magnificence of the Divine Grace. According to his conception of sin was his conception of salvation.

Beside these passages of penitence, which soften the most majestic experiences of Bible religion, may be placed certain of later days, not unworthy of this high companionship. Towards the end of his life, than which none has been seen more perfect outside the Gospels, St. Francis d'Assisi wept so much over his sins that he injured his eyesight; but he would listen to no remonstrance. "I would rather choose to lose the sight of the body than to repress those tears by which the interior eyes are purified that they may see God." As George Herbert lay a dying he said, "I am sorry that I have nothing to present to my merciful God except sin and misery, but the first is pardoned, and a few hours will put a period to the latter." Francis Quarles, the author of the *Emblems*, expressed

great sorrow for his sins; and when it was told him that his friends conceived that he did thereby much harm to himself, he answered, "They were not his friends that would not give him leave to repent." And Bunyan learned "that none could enter into life but those who were in downright earnest, and unless they left the wicked world behind them, for here (in the narrow road) was only room for body and soul, but not for body and soul and sin." He writes, "I was more loathsome in my own eyes than was a toad, and I thought I was so in God's eyes too . . . I thought none but the devil himself could equal me for inward wickedness and pollution." One of the ablest men of his time used to say of Erskine of Linlathen that he never thought of God but the thought of Mr. Erskine was not far away; yet Principal Shairp informs us that in this holy man's last years all who conversed intimately with him were struck with "his ever-deepening sense of sin and the personal way in which he took this home to himself." Penitence is no monopoly or penalty of the Bible believers; it is one of the signs of true religion in every age. It is not the Pharisee, full of self-conceit and arrogance, who is nearest to perfection, but the penitent, despising and condemning himself, for the history of the Church shows that penitent is only another name for saint.

As this fine grace is almost an anachronism in our day—a survival of an obsolete state of mind—it is also necessary to distinguish repentance from its counterfeit, for all sorrow for sin is not unto life, and some is rather unto death. It happens often in life that a man flings the reins to passion and sins with a high hand in his youth. When years have come and gone, he awakes some day and calls himself a fool. The fruit has turned to ashes in his mouth, and the dregs of the cup are bitter. He wishes some one had warned him with strong words in his madness, and had restrained him by force. Had he been wiser then, he would have had

a stronger body and a more honourable position, and he could scourge himself for his blindness. This is bitter, gnawing regret, but it is not repentance.

Another man of nobler mind is in despair because he has quarrelled with the eternal law, and has been worsted. "What need I speak?" he says; "I must bear as best I can, and there is an end of the matter; I have deserved what I am enduring." There is here a sense of law and a sense of guilt; but this is not repentance, because there is in the man's mind no sense of God. Judas Iscariot broke his heart after his betrayal of Christ, and went out to die; he certainly felt more than selfish regret. His soul was filled with bitterness for the injury to Christ, but he did not repent, because if he had repented, he had turned unto the Lord, and had been the greatest monument of Divine grace. Regret may be only selfishness; remorse may be unbelief; repentance forgets self and trusts in God. What distinguishes repentance from every other form of sorrow is this: if it lays us in the dust, it is at the foot of the Cross and the throne of God.

It is necessary in our day to magnify this grace, because it has been depreciated, and is often counted little less than a religious hysteric. Various contemporary influences militate against this state of mind, and, indeed, have almost driven it out of the religious consciousness. A certain school of modern literature has done much to lessen the sense of conscience amongst men, and has done so after a subtle and attractive fashion. We have been taught in our time by one influential teacher, whose delicate thought and perfect style we have all admired, that the human mind of man passes through two moods. One is the Jewish, austere, ascetic, legal, wherein a man is concerned with righteousness, with guilt, with punishment. The other is lighter and more gracious, and had its origin in Greece, wherein a man is conscious of beauty, and perfect, divine, and har-

monious living. It may be natural to some people to play the Hebrew, but in that case he will neither be a happy nor an attractive person. It is natural for others to play the Greek, and to call for a full and free life; and one, therefore, might have no sense of repentance, and only show that he has entered into greater liberty, and has attained unto finer proportions in humanity. One also is haunted with the fear—but this must be said with great diffidence—that the evangelical type of religion in our day is not always meet for repentance. Is it not the case that the gospel has been preached very frequently on such unethical conditions, and with such dangerous liberality, that men have been moved not so much to repent of their sin as to grasp greedily at a cheap salvation? They have not learned to despise themselves because they have come short, but they have learned to escape from punishment. The great preachers of the past used to lay much stress upon what was called in ancient theological language “law work.” Richard Baxter and William Law first took men and women to Mount Sinai, and we are not prepared to say that they did not keep them too long under the shadow and sound of the awful Mount. It is just possible that some of their pupils tarried so long at Mount Sinai that they never escaped from the wilderness, and never saw the Land of Promise. It remains, however, a good thing either for a hard or for a shallow man, filled with selfishness and vanity, to stand before the black darkness, and to hear the thunder of the eternal law. It humbles his pride, and cleanses him from self-conceit, and this experience lays the foundation of a nobler and a stronger manhood. As all know who have read Bunyan’s *Grace Abounding*, none are so ready to welcome the Cross of Christ as those who have passed through the discipline of law. When a man comes to realize his own entire unworthiness, and his ingrained bias to evil, he understands the greatness of Christ’s achievement, and surrenders

himself with more absolute faith into the hands of his Saviour.

Whatever may be the reason, people are at any rate not much given to repentance to-day, and as a rule they are not at all ashamed of an unrepentant state of mind. They are apt to complain of Psalms written in a minor key of penitence, and refuse to sing hymns such as "Rock of Ages," where the sinner declares that he is foul and has no hope of cleansing save through the blood of Christ. What this person says—and he is a representative modern—is this: "I know the meaning of the English language, and I know the history of my own life. I am not going to tell lies at any time, and especially I wish to be truthful when I am worshipping God. I am not foul, and I am not going to say I am foul when I know that that would be a falsehood." This person is of course perfectly right in not singing songs of penitence when they would be a lie on his lips. There are undoubtedly a certain number of psalms which ought not to be sung by a person who is proud and self-righteous, just as there are a certain number of hymns regarding the future state which ought not to be sung by any person who is absolutely satisfied with this present world and has no longing whatever for Jerusalem the golden. Undoubtedly there is a great amount of hypocrisy and unreal sentiment in the conventional praise of our public worship, and it would be a good thing if people were so affected by a sense of honesty and the fitness of things that they were silent when a congregation is declaring its penitence and they are not penitent, or a congregation is longing to be with the Lord and they are desiring only to be in their offices. At the same time it ought to be pointed out to that person that if he is entirely satisfied with his condition this is no ground for pride, but rather a ground for humility. Suppose that some one is practising an art,

and you go into the room where the work is lying. You are shown the work, and as conversation proceeds you discover that the artist considers that he has touched perfection. Drawing and colouring are, in his opinion, altogether right, and you cannot discover that this person is able to distinguish between his work and that of Raphael. You do not on that account admire that person, or consider that he is likely himself to be a great artist. You are rather convinced that he will never touch even the lowest levels of perfection, because he is utterly unconscious of his own imperfection. After the same fashion, if any one considers that he has written so well that criticism gives him no information and chastens no fault, then it is certain that he has done his best work, and his best work is extremely bad. We admit in the sphere of art and literature that the depreciation of one's own work and a sense of its deficiencies are conditions of success. And yet this cultured modern will consider himself superior to the saints of the past and their successors of to-day, because they sing the 51st Psalm and the "Rock of Ages" with intense feeling and he has been raised above this experience. As a matter of fact this person is sealing his own doom and shutting himself out from the higher reaches of religion. A Pharisee is a very incomplete work of religion, and there are for him no future possibilities. You can finish a villa, such a villa as is erected by the modern builder, to the disgrace of the State and religion, within a few weeks, and it is not likely to last more than a few years. When we build a cathedral, nothing but the foundation is seen for years, and it may be that centuries will pass before that cathedral is finished. When it is finished, it stands a monument of human art and industry, and will remain unto all ages and after miles of those miserable buildings have passed again into their kindred dust. This is the differ-

ence between the cheap and flimsy character of the Pharisee and the strong but slow growth of sainthood; and the foundations of sainthood are laid in the broken and contrite heart.

Suppose, however, some person were to say, "I am not penitent, and I never have been penitent; the atmosphere of the day does not encourage this grace, and all my efforts to obtain it have failed. Can I create penitence? and is there any method by which a shallow, self-sufficient, self-righteous person can have his character deepened and his pride turned into humility?" Surely the first prescription is to turn to the Law of Moses, and it is an excellent arrangement by which the Ten Commandments are read every Sunday in a public congregation. Suppose a man take those commandments one by one, and, using each as a candle of the Lord, go into the holes and corners of his heart; suppose he sit down in quietness alone with his soul and say to himself in all honesty, "Am I perfect by the first commandment, and by the second, by the third, and by the tenth?" Suppose he take for a commentary on the commandments the Sermon on the Mount, and be not content until he be able to acquit himself not only because he has not done evil, but because he has not imagined evil, not only because his life is clean, but because his thoughts are pure. The commandments may not affect the conscience of some people, and they may be inclined to hold themselves not guilty by the Ten Words of Moses. For this person it would be a good thing to take his life and to lay it alongside the life of our Saviour Jesus Christ, comparing how the Lord spake and how He carried Himself, how we speak and how we carry ourselves. Perhaps the best thing that can be done with a person who is painting, and painting very badly, is not to criticise, and far less to be angry with him, but to place before him a

masterpiece of the great age, and then to leave the blunderer alone with perfection. If there be the faintest sense of art in him, this young painter will destroy all that he has done and will go away to begin in a better and more hopeful spirit because a humbler and more ambitious spirit. The impression of the master's greatness will give to the pupil a sense of his own littleness; and if it be hard for him to burn everything that he has done, yet one can encourage him with the hope that out of the fire will arise a new artist. The contrast between the life of our Master and our own is enough to humble even the most self-satisfied person, for although the linen of the Holy Table seems white when we hold it in our hands, it shows poorly beside the untrodden snow at the height of a great mountain. Saint Peter was one of the most self-sufficient of men and almost impervious to criticism, and yet one day the vision of the bright excellency of his Master came strongly upon him, and he saw in Jesus, with His peasant's raiment and His lowly habits of life, the very glory of God. Although there were times when Peter was prepared to advise the Master and to show Him His mistakes, this day he could only say, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord." Should it happen that we remain untouched by the Ten Words and by the life of the Holy Gospel, what else can be done for Pharisaic and religious pride? One other remedy remains; and if that fail, there is no hope that we can ever attain unto the grace of penitence. Let us take our way to the Cross of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ and there consider Him in His innocence and in His sufferings. If Christ living has not overcome the soul with a sense of His holiness and our sinfulness, then maybe Christ's dying, with our sins wound round His head as a crown of thorns, with our sins piercing His hands and His feet as iron nails, may break the hardest heart and

lay us in contrition at His feet. This humility is the beginning of salvation, for it is the condition and prophecy of forgiveness. The Christ before whom we lie in contriteness of heart has been raised up first on the Cross and then on the Throne, that with one hand He might give us repentance, and with the other the forgiveness of sins.

JOHN WATSON.

STUDIES IN THE CRITICISM OF THE PSALMS.

I. PSALM XXXIX.

I HOPE in this short series of papers to keep true to the principle which I have already expressed (EXPOSITOR, Aug., 1898, p. 81), that controversy is something to be avoided as long as possible by lovers of the Church and of truth. "I am quite unwilling"—may I quote from myself?—"to criticise Prof. Robertson," even now, when this courteous controversialist tempts me to a different course. To answer my opponent's belated criticism would not only be to acknowledge that such tardy refutation was quite admirable, but also to lead the public to suppose that a scholar could possibly live seven years without making progress. To my earlier critics I have already given such answer as was requisite, especially in *Semitic Studies, in Memory of Alexander Kohut*, published at New York in 1897;¹ later on I will again briefly refer to them. Besides, Prof. Robertson's position as an Old Testament critic is so peculiar that I should have had some difficulty in meeting him. I cannot help wishing that this honest, well-read, eloquent writer had put controversy aside, and offered his own reconstruction of the history of Jewish religion, or of

¹ See pp. 111-119 : *The Book of Psalms, its origin and relation to Zoroastrianism*. The essay referred to was written in Dec.-Jan., 1895-1896.

the progress of revelation, without embarrassing himself and others by disputing over theories which derive their validity from a point of view which he does not share. Perhaps, however, Prof. Robertson only puts forth his Croall Lectures as a prelude to a thorough study of the contents of the Psalter—an introduction to the religious thought of the temple poets. If this is his intention, I can only rejoice at it, and I think that he will thereby greatly increase the effectiveness of the better part of his criticism. For to investigate the date and origin of the Psalms requires a profound preliminary study of their contents; and if the readers of the Croall Lectures could be presented with such an introduction as I have described, they would perhaps be more fully persuaded of the soundness of his critical conclusions.

I am just now tempted into controversy from another side. Prof. Rothstein, according to an evidently careful report by Mr. Selbie in the *Expository Times* for December, 1898, has been drawing a broad distinction between those critics of the text who found their work on a critical study of the ancient versions and those who give the reins to their own subjectivity, and he appears from the report to find examples of both kinds of criticism in the recently published parts of Prof. Haupt's edition of the Old Testament. I cannot afford to take in all the theological magazines of the day, and I may perhaps have misunderstood Mr. Selbie. But, at any rate, there is a considerable probability that such a distinction will be drawn by others, and I feel a temptation to enter into controversy with such writers when they appear. Nevertheless I hope I shall be able to resist the temptation, because I should be unwilling to encourage those who are not altogether in sympathy with the newer school of textual criticism to express themselves with too much emphasis, and to protest too loudly against subjectivity. The Septuagint and Massoretic texts

show plenty of subjectivity, and in modern times it is our business to train and modify our subjectivities and make them mutually corrective. The newer school of textual criticism is by no means opposed to the older. It does not neglect the critical study of the versions and of the later or latest Hebrew language. But it superadds a fuller study of the habits and dangers of the scribes, and of those phenomena in the Hebrew text of the Old Testament and of the versions which can only be explained by the study of those habits and those dangers. The discovery of the Hebrew text of part of Ecclesiasticus has also opened up a new source of information as to the possibilities of corruption, and as to the means of healing it. By comparing this text with the Greek version, we see how incalculably great was the danger of misreading the text. We knew this before, indeed; but the relationship of the translator to the author of Ecclesiasticus makes the errors which the former has committed all the more striking. Of course, I do not assert that the Hebrew text now put before us is itself always correct. On the contrary, it is very often wrong. The groping way in which the scribe went to work in copying his original is strikingly shown in many of the marginal notes.

Need I say that those who belong to this newer school of criticism are by no means inclined to boastfulness? They are not even ready as yet to offer a detailed sketch of their principles. Not until several books of the Old Testament have been thoroughly revised from an advanced point of view will it become possible for some competent scholar to collect a sufficient variety of examples of the different kinds of textual corruption and of the corresponding kinds of correction. Without such a thoroughly adequate collection a sketch of principles would fail to illuminate the student.

The text of the Book of Psalms offers peculiar difficulties

to the critical student. It is in very many passages corrupt, and the Hebrew text presupposed by the Septuagint is nearer, probably, to our text of the Psalms than that presupposed by the Septuagint version of the prophets is to our text of the prophets. But the received text also offers some peculiar advantages, and notably this—that the psalmists very often repeat themselves, or copy from one another. It is time, therefore, that the Psalter should be studied with a special view to the correction of the text. Much preliminary work has no doubt been done, but it has not, I venture to think, been methodical enough. The most notable recent work which has been done on the Versions of the Psalter is that of Baethgen in the *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1882, pp. 405 ff., and 593 ff. It is excellent of its kind, and may serve as a model to young workers in the same line, and yet how little has been the result from it for the correction of the worst errors in the Psalter! Among the names of those deceased scholars who have tried other means of correcting the text, Grätz and Lagarde deserve special mention:

I hope that we shall soon be able to point to Dr. Briggs's work on the Psalter as a specimen of up-to-date criticism. Prof. Duhm will have less space at his disposal in Marti's series of commentaries, but he knows how to pack much that is fresh and stimulating into a small compass, and he does not belong to any narrow school of textual criticism. And I have myself worked very hard at the critical problems presented by the text, and I believe that I have in not a few cases solved them, and still oftener approached the true solution. I am convinced that few scholars realize either the extent of the corruption of the Massoretic text or the inadequacy of very many of the most plausible corrections of modern critics. I am also sure that those critics who approach my work from a similar point of view will often be able to make improvements in my works; and that I

shall myself find out much that is still wanting in it. I expect soon to bring my work to an end, and hope that by the combined efforts of critics who belong to the newer school the text of the Psalter may be so greatly improved that we shall understand the meaning of this most precious book very much better than before.

It is, however, not without hesitation that I now and then publish specimens of my results. The critical study of the subject, as I at least understand its principles and methods, is comparatively new. Most scholars are content with correcting the Hebrew text here and there by the help of the versions, or by making some very slight alteration in one or two letters. The simplicity of a correction is held to constitute a presumption that it is correct, and one frequently hears it objected to some "clever" correction that it is "not necessary." This line of procedure and this style of objection I am bound to say that I regard as mistaken; no one who has thoroughly realized the principles and methods of the newer textual criticism could be so easily contented, and so quick to believe in the general accuracy of the traditional text. The truth is that the versions, especially in the poetical books, presuppose a text which is not very different from our own, and probably has, upon the whole, even more faults than our own. And a simple correction is in more than half the number of instances of corruption inadequate. It may be added that the remark that this or that correction is unnecessary sometimes at least implies an inadequate respect for the Hebrew writers, and an imperfect regard for appropriate Hebrew style, and of the requirements of parallelism. I do not in the least disparage the attainments of the scholars whom I presume to criticise. Their textual criticism is at fault, not their learning nor perhaps their sense of style, and I am sure that when they have before them a few editions of Old Testament books, with texts

corrected upon the most modern critical principles, they will at once recognise the necessity and justice of those principles, and the virtual certainty of many of the results.

Interrupted at this point, I come upon a remarkable proof of the necessity for a more distinctly forward movement in textual criticism. I take up an important new work on the Story of Ahikar, of which that acute New Testament critic, Mr. Rendel Harris, is the principal author and editor. In the Introduction "certain strange things are brought to my ears" relative to a passage in Proverbs (Prov. xxxi. 1), which, most unfortunately, the writer uses in an uncorrected form of the text. He speaks as a pioneering critic, but pioneering critics ought not to be unaware of the results of their predecessors, and ought to begin by scrutinizing the text.¹ If such mistakes are possible for a real critic, what portentous errors must be committed every day by theological and other writers who are of a less critical turn of mind!

Before passing on to the detailed consideration of a psalm, I will venture to remind the reader that text-critical studies have an important bearing on the investigation of the origin of the Psalms. I hold with Frankenberg (*Sprüche*, Preface) that "a verse newly explained in a correct manner is worth more than all clever hypotheses and long disquisitions on date and authorship." It is, for instance, no longer possible to adopt Prof. Robertson Smith's dictum that the 139th Psalm is composed in a barbarous jargon, and therefore particularly late. There

¹ The title contained in Prov. xxxi. 1 is an editor's inference from a text which had already, it would seem, become corrupt. The same fate afterwards befell what the editor wrote. It is no new discovery that מְשֵׁנָה, "the prophecy," should be מְשֵׁל, "the wise poem" (Grätz). ל and נ were confounded as in לְבָן, Jer. v. 2; יבָּנָה (read יבָּלָה), Jer. xlvi. 18. It only remained for Bickell to point out that לְמוֹאֵל has come in from verse 4, which begins אֵל לְמַלְכִים. That לְמוֹאֵל is wrong appears from the absence of the article before מֶלֶךְ, Render, "Words (rules of life) for a king; a wise poem with which his mother instructed him."

are no doubt stylistic inequalities in the different psalms, but on the whole the result of my own studies discourages me from assigning many of the psalms to a very late period. The main conclusion of the book called *The Origin and Religious Contents of the Psalter* (1891) remains unshaken; there are not even plausible grounds for supposing any extant psalm, or any part of an extant psalm, to be pre-Exilic. And as long as we assume the point of view of most scholars in 1889 (the date of the delivery of my Bampton Lectures) as regards both the text and the interpretation of the text, there is strong reason for supposing that the Psalter contains a good number of Maccabæan psalms. But this has for some years past ceased to be my own point of view. None of the reviewers of my Bampton Lectures (to whom I wish I could offer thanks for more really useful criticisms) has been half as severe a critic of the details of my Lectures as I have been myself; and while much remains unshaken in both parts of the book, which is, I believe, a long way from being antiquated, much has to be modified, as those who have followed my recent utterances will easily understand. I will add that when Mr. Schechter has brought out his fresh fragments of Ecclesiasticus, all of us will then get precious light on the Psalter. Let no one exaggerate. The newly discovered Hebrew text of Sirach is in many passages very corrupt. We can, however, still draw some probable conclusions from it, and those conclusions appear to me adverse to putting many psalms as late as the probable date of Ecclesiasticus. But the hope which has been freely expressed that a retrogressive criticism may be initiated by Dr. Neubauer's and Mr. Schechter's discovery are doomed to disappointment. Both on text-critical and on exegetical grounds the criticism of the Psalter is bound to pass, and is passing, into a new stage, but that stage cannot be described by the epithet "retrogressive."

I now proceed to the study of one of the most plaintive psalms in the Psalter, if it is not rather a compound of two fragments of psalms, one of which is not plaintive but rather didactic in the same sense in which the 73rd Psalm may be fitly called didactic. As the text now stands, Psalm xxxix. is full of difficulties, such as we can hardly suppose to have existed when this psalm was originally used. These difficulties can be discerned pretty well in Dr. Driver's conscientiously faithful version in his *Parallel Psalter*. In v. 1 he gives, "I will keep a muzzle to my mouth, while the wicked is in my sight." In v. 2, "I was dumb in stillness, I was silent even from good." In v. 4, "Let me know how frail I am," but the Hebrew says (see note), "how ceasing I am." In v. 5, "Surely every man (though) standing firm, is altogether vanity." In v. 10, "By the hostility of thy hand I am consumed." In v. 11, "With reproofs for iniquity thou chastenest man, and like a moth makest his desirableness to melt away." To these inelegancies of expression we may add the very difficult transition from vv. 1-3 to v. 4.

Such are some of the existing phenomena which suggest the propriety of a close revision of the text. Let me now attempt to throw some light upon them. Perhaps the old Hebrew poem may shine out with somewhat more of its old radiance.

In v. 2 (I adopt the Hebrew numeration) Dr. Driver notes the parallelism between "keeping my ways" and "keeping a muzzle." The parallelism exists in M but not in G,¹ but it is due to corruption; the second אשמרה should be אשימרה (G ἐθέμη; so the keenest critics, beginning with Olshausen). The real parallelism is between "guarding my words" and "guarding my mouth"—parallelism of phrase and identity of idea. "My ways" can

¹ M=Massoretic Text, G=the Septuagint Greek.

only mean "my conduct" (1 Kings viii. 25). He who "guards his ways" is not solely anxious "not to sin with his tongue." דרך and דבר are pretty often confounded. Can there be any reason for retaining דרכי in the text? Read דברי (Grätz, Halévy). But why is the psalmist so much afraid of sins of the tongue? The traditional text says, because "the wicked is in my sight." Too vague a reason, surely. G had a better reading, "while the wicked stands (defiantly) before me" (G ἐν τῷ στυγῆναι), i.e., עמד for ער; cf. ער for עבר (1 Sam. ii. 5). Now as to the "muzzle." The word (מחסום) occurs nowhere else, and is highly unsuitable; in a passage like Psalm xxxii. 9 it might conceivably have stood, but not here. The supposed word has arisen through the transposition of the two parts of the word which the poet wrote. That word, as Mr. N. Herz was the first to see, is שִׁמְרָה (cxli. 3). Transposition was followed by corruption.

In v. 3 the Prayer-Book version has given us one of its oddest renderings, "I kept silence, yea even from good words"; so odd is it that it has become a humorous proverb (see, for instance, Mr. G. W. E. Russell's jocosely description of Sir William Harcourt, *Nineteenth Century*, February, 1899). A.V. falls, as too often, into unintelligibility: "I held my peace, even from good." Certainly, neither version promotes edification. Dr. Driver feels that he is in presence of a problem. He retains A.V.'s "even from good," but gives as a footnote, "Or, and had no comfort; Heb. away from good." And we are asked to believe that pious Jews of old read and sung such stuff! The evil lies deep, but not too deep to be detected. דוּמְיָה, rendered generally "in stillness," but by A.V. "with silence," though recognised by the lexicons, is, as I am prepared to show, wherever it occurs in M, due to corruption. In the present passage דוּמְיָה and מְטוּב are both undoubtedly miswritten for תְּמִיד; דוּמְיָה was either what is called a

to the original text. The lines are in what Prof. Budde calls the elegiac metre, though it is by no means confined to lamentations. I prefer to call it the halting metre, because the lines are divided by the cæsura into two unequal parts. The second part of each line is here given as a separate line, simply to please the eye.

- 2 I said, Let me guard my words
 That I sin not with my tongue;
 Let me put a guard on my mouth
 While the wicked confronts me.
- 3 I was dumb, I kept silence continually,
 But my pain awaked (the more).
- 4 For my heart was astounded,
 My reins were horror-struck,
 Then I broke into speech. *
- * * * *
- * * * * *
- * * * *

This is evidently a little fragment of a psalm on the difficulties caused to pious Israelites by the belief that righteousness was necessarily attended by prosperity, and wickedness by adversity; it is therefore to be grouped with Psalms xxxvii., xlix., and lxxiii. The close parallelism between verse 4 and lxxiii. 21 suggests that these psalms were not separated by a long interval in time. This question I cannot here investigate, but it is something to have established the existence of another composite psalm, and to have produced one more proof of the reality of the danger of scepticism in the Jewish Church. The rest of our 39th Psalm is still more interesting from a text-critical point of view. At first sight it seems in parts hopelessly corrupt. But I venture to believe that by the more consistent application of sound critical principles I have been able to get very much nearer the true text than any of my predecessors, and the result, in that portion of the psalm which is most deeply corrupt, is very interesting. This, however, I must

reserve for a second paper. How I wish that I could be privileged to open the eyes of a few readers to the treasures still buried in a misunderstood Psalter !

T. K. CHEYNE.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

IV.

THE SEVEN SEALS.

REV. VI., VII.

OUR subject this month is the opening of the seals. They are seven in all; and we shall find, as is often the case, that the complete number is made up of two series; one of four, the other of three. In Oriental symbolism four marked the earthly, three the heavenly; and in accordance with this we shall find that the first four seals show what is coming on the world, while the remaining three have their sphere for the most part within the veil.

We must keep before our imagination the Throne of God and of the Lamb as described in chapters iv., v. We have just been listening to the chorus of praise when the Lamb, alone found worthy to open the book, has taken it from the hand of God and is proceeding to break the seals.

As each of the four seals is broken, a voice like thunder is heard from one after another of the four Living Creatures addressed to the Lamb in the midst of the Throne. In each case it is the one word "COME." The force of this is quite lost in the Authorised Version, where it is rendered as if it were a mere invitation to the apostle to look at what is coming next: "Come and see." But when we follow the correct rendering of the Revised Version, we find it to be an invitation from the longing heart of creation in all its manifold life, as symbolised in these four Living Creatures

—an invitation from the whole of creation to Him who is coming to right its wrongs, to break its bonds, and to crown its highest aspirations.¹

All this can be accomplished only through terrible things in righteousness; yet the Living Creatures—each with six wings remember, in token of aspiration, and full of eyes without and within, to signify the highest possible intelligence—shrink not from the ordeal. “Behold He cometh with clouds.” “Yes,” they say; “even though it be with clouds, let Him come.” The first seal means war, for it is a horseman who rides forth; and the first Living Creature says “COME.” The second means slaughter, and the second Living Creature cries “COME.” The third is a black horse, and it means famine; yet the third Living Creature calls, “COME.” The fourth is a pale horse meaning death, and the fourth Living Creature, unappalled, calls out, “COME.” How impressive it all is! “Even so, come Lord Jesus,” however dark and mysterious and dreadful be the manner of Thy coming. Such is the high note of faith and hope sounded in thunder from the living creatures round the Throne. It is not that they regard with a light heart such terrible things as war, and sword, and famine, and death; it is that they can see through it all to the glorious consummation—the sufferings of the present time, however severe and prolonged, not to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed. These piercing eyes of theirs are looking forward to the manifestation of the sons of God.

It was the prospect of this great consummation that enabled the four living creatures to give the repeated welcome to the heavenly warrior and his terrible war horses.

¹ Cf. Rom. viii. 19-21 R.V.: “The earnest expectation of the creation waiteth for the revealing of the sons of God. For the creation was subjected to vanity, not of its own will, but by reason, of Him who subjected it, in hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.”

There cannot be war without bloodshed and famine and death ; the red, the black and the pale horses cannot be left out ; but forget not that the Leader is mounted on a white horse, and that He comes forth not only conquering but to conquer, conquering now under the first seal, when He seems to have the whole field to Himself, to conquer under the second, third and fourth seals, when the red horse shall have the field, when the black horse shall have the field, even when the pale horse Death seems to carry all before him. The rider of the white horse is the first ; He is also, we shall find, the last. The red, the black, the pale horses will have their day and cease to be ; but after they have passed quite from the scene, we shall still see the rider on the white horse. Look forward for a moment to chapter xix. 11 and following : "And I saw the heaven opened ; and, behold, a white horse, and he that sat thereon, called Faithful and True ; . . . and upon His head are many diadems. And He is arrayed in a garment sprinkled with blood : and His name is called the Word of God. And the armies which are in heaven followed Him upon white horses clothed in fine linen, white and pure. And He hath on His garment and on His thigh a name written, KING OF KINGS, AND LORD OF LORDS." The mighty conflict which is coming is His, and however dark may be its course, it is sure to end in glorious victory.

The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain ;
His blood-red banner streams afar ;
Who follows in His train ?

Such is the spirit-stirring call of the four seals.

We may not take time to show in detail how all these things did assuredly come to pass. They have been verified to the letter by extracts from the Latin historians, even to such details as the scarcity of necessaries, while luxuries were in superfluity, as strikingly set forth in verse 6 : "A

measure of wheat for a penny, and three measures of barley for a penny;¹ and the oil and the wine hurt thou not." For this most unusual state of things we have separate evidence both as regards Rome and Jerusalem, for Josephus refers to the reckless waste of wine and oil in the Temple while the people were starving in the streets; and in Rome, so acutely was it felt that the Emperor Domitian issued an edict for the restriction of vineyards and the extension of corn areas. Let this suffice for mere illustration. Full details are given in Dean Farrar's *Early Days of Christianity*.

We pass now from the four seals whose scene is earth to the three which carry us within the veil. The first of these is a vision of the "souls" of the martyrs who have perished and are perishing in the awful persecution. These are seen "underneath the altar." No altar has been mentioned in the description of the Throne; but we find references later on, first (ix. 3) to "the golden altar which was before the throne," and later (xiv. 8) to an altar which appears not to be immediately before the Throne, but some distance on the earthward side, and therefore probably corresponding to the altar of burnt offering in the outer court of the Temple. This then seems to be a projection in vision of the altar of sacrifice, with the familiar sight of the blood of the victims flowing down beneath it. In sacrifice "the blood is the life"; so as he sees it flowing he sees the lives of the martyrs as it were underneath the altar; and even as the blood of righteous Abel cried out for vengeance, so these *lives* (for such is the literal translation of the word "souls") cry to heaven with a great voice, saying, "How long, O Master, the holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?" Indeed a

¹ Not to be thought of as our penny; it was a whole day's wage; so it was to take the whole of what a man could earn in a day to buy a single measure of wheat, or three measures of barley, equivalent to prison fare.

lamentable cry. Surely it must bring speedy deliverance; but no: the persecution rages still, and the pale horse still holds the field. At this point the altar of sacrifice seems to pass out of view, and the thought of lives poured out on this side the veil is transfigured into that of lives redeemed in heaven. It becomes in the true sense a vision of *souls*, its sphere in the Unseen, and therefore no blood any longer in sight; but because the end is not yet, they are called to "rest in the Lord, and wait patiently for Him," "until their fellow-servants also and their brethren, which should be killed even as they were, should be fulfilled." So the killing must go on. The lamentable cry seems to pass unheeded. The blood of new victims still must flow on the altar of sacrifice. But of the consciousness of innocence no tyrant can deprive them, and as soon as they pass within the veil, see them arrayed in white! Nero may stain their earthly robes in the dust and blood of the arena, but "there is given them—to each one—a white robe" which he cannot touch; and so in their patience they will possess their souls. Such is the reading of the fifth seal.

When the sixth seal is opened, we see the answer to the lamentable cry for vengeance in the fifth. The darkness deepens. "On horrors' head horrors accumulate." The imagery of Joel and other great prophets of the Old Testament is freely used, but all former descriptions are exceeded in the awful picture of destruction and despair in which we see the cruel tyrants overwhelmed. This dreadful passage needs no exposition in detail. It is enough to read it through and let its storm clouds pass before the eye of our soul. "And I saw when he opened the sixth seal, and there was a great earthquake; and the sun became black as sackcloth of hair, and the whole moon became as blood; and the stars of the heaven fell unto the earth, as a fig tree casteth her unripe figs, when she is shaken of a great wind. And the heaven was removed as a scroll when it is rolled

up; and every mountain and island were moved out of their places."

All this is to take place on the earth; but it is not earth only as in the first four; heaven is opened too, opened not to John alone and to the saints of God, but opened to the tyrants and their cruel followers. They recognise now that these thunders and lightnings proceed from the Throne; and that is what fills them with despair; they even recognise that they proceed from the Lamb upon the Throne: "The kings of the earth, and the princes, and the chief captains, and the rich, and the strong, and every bondman and freeman, hid themselves in the caves and in the rocks of the mountains; and they say to the mountains and to the rocks, Fall on us, and hide us from the face of him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb: for the great day of their wrath is come; and who is able to stand?" What depth of meaning and of power in that extraordinary phrase, "The wrath of the Lamb." The wrath of the lion a strong man might well brave even though the next moment he should be torn in pieces; but the wrath of the Lamb, the wrath of injured, scorned, rejected love, love which has been patient and gentle and long-suffering, love which has given itself up to suffer and to die, for it is "a Lamb *as it had been slain*," love which is stricken through the heart with pain at the terrible compulsion which makes the wrath inevitable, who can stand up against that?

And now we come to one of those breaks in the storm cloud which reveal the Throne above and sunny shore beyond. True we are yet in the sixth seal; but the seventh, when it is unrolled, will be found to be itself a series of seven, the seven trumpets; and accordingly this sixth seal is dealt with as the last, and there is a holding back of what is coming when the seven trumpets of the seventh seal shall begin to sound.

The arrest is made by four angels (vii. 1): "After this I saw four angels standing at the four corners of the earth, holding the four winds of the earth, that no wind should blow on the earth, or on the sea, or upon any tree." Why this pause? To give time for the sealing of the saints.

We can well imagine that in the mind of the prophet and of his readers there might arise the fear that in such an awful catastrophe as that which has just been described, when not only the kings of the earth, but the great men, and every bondman and every freeman fled in terror, and not only so, but the mountains and islands were removed out of their place, and heaven itself rolled up as a scroll, even the righteous must be involved in the general doom. But "the Lord is mindful of His own." "Though the earth be removed and the mountains be carried into the midst of the sea," they need not fear, for "the foundation of God standeth sure, having this seal, the Lord knoweth them that are His." And the sealing follows, *on their foreheads*. It is to be an open secret.

First the roll of Israel is fully made up, as indicated by the round numbers of each tribe and of all the tribes "And I heard the number of them which were sealed, a hundred and forty and four thousand, sealed out of every tribe of the children of Israel. Of the tribe of Judah were sealed twelve thousand." And so of all the twelve. But though the numbers of Israel are fully made up, that vast company of 144,000¹ is small compared with the hosts which follow: "After these things I saw, and behold, a great multitude, which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes and peoples and tongues standing before the throne and before the Lamb, arrayed in white robes, and palms in their hands; and they cry with a great voice, saying, Salvation unto our God which sitteth on the

¹ As large and complete a number as the mind can well grasp; when the multitudes appear from every nation, all attempt to number them is given up.

throne and unto the Lamb." All the clouds are now rolled away, and the thunders are hushed, replaced by the mighty chorus of the triumphant saints. And now that the mist and the darkness are gone, there is the Throne of God in full sunlight, unveiled so completely that every movement is noticed in the pellucid air ; and accordingly John observes the movement towards him of one of the twenty-four elders—might it not be Peter, one of the latest victims of Nero's cruelty? As we are not told, perhaps we should not ask. The elder asks the question, "These which are arrayed in the white robes, who are they, and whence came they?" The apostle is too much overawed to attempt an answer. So the elder answers his own question, and in doing so gives us one of those exquisite glimpses into the future which are the crowning glory of this wondrous book. To appreciate it fully it is important to observe the present tense, not "These are they which *came* out of great tribulation," but which *come*. They are coming now. We should think of a procession of martyrs from Roman dungeons, past Roman scaffolds, through death's portals, on and up to the Throne of God. What a difference in the look of them as they go from earth and as they come to heaven! They are falling before the axe of Nero, they are burning in his gardens, they are torn in pieces by his wild beasts, they are dying in agony in multitudes, they are ruthlessly trampled down by the pale horse, whose name is Death—that is what men see, that is all that can be seen this side the veil ; but now draw the veil, come up hither and see what is happening on the other side. "These poor wretches," did you call them?—whom you saw going—watch them coming with the white robes and the triumphant palms! "These are they which come out of the great tribulation." And why are their robes so stainless? "They washed their robes, and made them white in the blood of the Lamb."

It is not their goodness, nor their courage, nor their constancy ; nor is it the suffering, so heroically endured, which affords the explanation :

I asked them whence their victory came,
 They, with united breath,
 Ascribed their conquest to the Lamb,
 Their triumph to His death.

And what are they doing now, and what is to be their future? "Therefore are they before the Throne of God ; and they serve Him day and night in His Temple ; and He that sitteth on the Throne shall spread His Tabernacle over them. They shall hunger no more, neither thirst any more ; neither shall the sun strike upon them, nor any heat : for the Lamb which is in the midst of the Throne shall be their shepherd, and shall guide them unto fountains of waters of life : and God shall wipe away every tear from their eyes."

J. MONRO GIBSON.

THE GENESIS OF DEUTERONOMY.

IV.

The Laws Peculiar to Deuteronomy.

HAVING now examined the main reasons assigned for thinking that Deuteronomy is a programme of reform, we wish at this point to offer two or three additional arguments to justify our rejection of this new view.

Our first is, that the laws *peculiar* to Deuteronomy possess no marked signs that they were written *with the intention to reform*.¹ Certain laws in the book of Deuteronomy, in all about twenty-five and wholly within the

¹ Cf. Bissel's article on "The Independent Legislation of Deuteronomy," in the *Journal of the Society of Bibl. Lit. and Exegesis*, June-December, 1883, pp. 67-89.

legal section of the code (chaps. 12.-26.), are not to be found elsewhere in the entire Pentateuch. In the strictest sense of the word, therefore, they are *peculiar* to Deuteronomy; and, other things being equal, ought to exhibit as well as, if not better than, any others the true character of the code. *Ex hypothesi*, they ought to partake of a practical and reformatory character, and, in a sense, be the most characteristic of all the laws contained in the Deuteronomic kernel.¹ If, however, these laws show only the *potentiality* to reform, and especially if, from the standpoint of the seventh century, they are confessedly without any very practical value, or are *ideal* only, then their alleged late codification in the interests of reform becomes a matter of great uncertainty.

But Wellhausen insists that as a code Deuteronomy is practical.² So Driver,³ Ryle,⁴ and many others. Indeed, it is hardly consistent to claim in one paragraph that the kernel of Deuteronomy was written as a last resort in order to reform a nation so deeply sunken in idolatry and sin that no other means seemed capable, and ascribed to Moses because every other prophetic method had failed, and then in the next paragraph to throw out, one after another, the majority of these twenty-five laws *peculiar* to Deuteronomy, as "taken from older (no longer existing) law-books," or, as being the "accepted applications of long-established principles," or, as "the formulation of ancient customs

¹ For an analogous use of this argument, but for a different purpose, cf. Gray, *Hebrew Proper Names*, 1896, pp. 194, 208 ff.

² He says (*Die Composition des Hexs.*² 1889, p. 205): "As a matter of course, Deuteronomy (like JE) has a much more practical and realistic character than Q (= P); the affairs of the world are naturally (except in chap. 20) treated as they exist, and not from the clouds, as Q."

³ Driver (*Deut.* pp. xxvi., xlviii.) speaks of the Deuteronomic laws as in the author's judgment "necessary for Israel to know," and "as simply a consequence of the more varied needs of society," etc.

⁴ Ryle (*Canon of the O.T.* 1892, p. 60), as a prophetic code, "adapted to the requirements of that later time."

expressed in Deuteronomic phraseology," or as "already known"; for this cuts the nerve of the foremost claim of criticism, which is that the kernel of Deuteronomy is a programme of reform. On the contrary, if Deuteronomy 12.-26. (which is the legal section) was written with the intention to reform, as criticism claims it was, then it is logically necessary to suppose that the laws *peculiar* to Deuteronomy 12.-26. would illustrate as well, or better than any other, the reformatory character of the code. Let us glance at these laws in their order:

1. *Deuteronomy* 13. 1-18—a law concerning seduction to idolatry. That such a law carries with it the *potentiality* to reform, and that, put into Moses' mouth, it harmonizes with the other utterances of the great lawgiver, is freely granted; the point at issue is, What called it forth in the seventh century? How account for the *form* of the law? It is clothed in *futures*, and *2nd person singulars*; gives an extraordinary reason, in *v.* 3, for a late author to put into Moses' mouth (*viz.*, "to prove Israel"); and is somewhat drastic for Josiah's age. Verses 15 and 16 (*Heb.* 16, 17) would, if put into execution, have blotted out of existence the remnant of Judah that then remained.

2. *Deuteronomy* 17. 8-13 (*cf.* 16. 18-20; 19. 17)—*the supreme tribunal composed of Levitical priests and judges.* This law is treated as "the accepted application of a long-established principle."¹ No one claims that it was actually codified in the interests of a reformation. The only use made of this law by criticism is to show, on the basis of 2 Chronicles 19. 8-11 (which, Kuenen and Driver allow, "deserves credit" as true history), that the book of Deuteronomy must be later than the time of Jehoshaphat, who, it is claimed, first created a supreme court. If this, however, is to be accepted on the authority of the Chronicler, then, on the same authority (2 Chron. 19. 3) we are

¹ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. lvi. n.

justified in arguing, *ad hominem*, that in Jehoshaphat's time "the groves" were taken away out of the land in the interests of centralization of worship. But this proves too much, and accordingly *v.* 3 is denied to the Chronicler.¹ Even *vv.* 8-13 in 2 Chronicles 19. prove too much,² for Jehoshaphat is declared to have appointed "Levites" and "priests" as judges; but in Deuteronomy 17. 9; 19. 17 (cf. 21. 5) these expressions are explained as late interpolations.³ On the authority of 1 Chronicles 23. 4; 26. 29, David, also, established judges (דִּבְרֵי שֹׁפְטִים).

3. Deuteronomy 17. 14-20—the law of the kingdom. Deuteronomy commanded the establishment of a bench of judges; it only permitted the founding of a kingdom. This fact in itself is obscure on the new theory, both laws being peculiar to the Deuteronomist. The latter law, criticism claims, was intended "to check the moral and religious degeneracy which the monarchy, as a fact, too often displayed,"⁴ and "to guard against admixture with foreigners and participation in foreign policy";⁵ hence reformatory. But here again certain facts point in the opposite direction; thus (*a*) the very first stipulation, that Israel shall not set "a stranger" over them as king, is quite opposed to a late date. There is not the slightest evidence that Israel or Judah ever wished to set "a stranger" over them as king.⁶ The motive of the law was apparently a religious one, which can best be accounted for in a time when Israel as yet had no kings. It is not enough to say, with Driver, that the

¹ *Introduction to Literature of O.T.* 5 edit. p. 494; 6 edit. p. 526.

² Cf. Kleinert, *Untersuchungen*, 1872, p. 141; also Bissel, *J. B. Lit. and Exeg.*, 1883, p. 67 f.

³ So Wellhausen, *Die Comp.*² p. 353, and Cornill, *Einleitung*,² 1892, p. 34.

⁴ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 210.

⁵ Robertson Smith, *OTJC.*² p. 365.

⁶ Cf. Delitzsch, *Zeitschrift für kirchl. Wissenschaft u. kirchl. Leben*, xi., 1880, p. 565.

nucleus of the law (v. 15) may be ancient, and that it has been expanded by the Deuteronomist, for such a law would have quite lost its value after the establishment of the House of David. (b) It is further stipulated that the king shall not multiply horses to himself or cause the people to return to Egypt for the purpose of multiplying horses (v. 16). This can hardly mean that Israel shall not participate in foreign policy with Egypt, as Robertson Smith infers;¹ for in that case it is difficult to understand the import of the final clause, "ye shall henceforth return no more that way" (v. 16b). Such a sentence is not the language of a reformer (cf. Deuteronomy 28. 68), but is well suited to the desert or Moab. At Kadesh-barnea Israel actually threatened to return to Egypt (Num. 14. 4; cf. Ex. 13. 17). As for "horses," Egyptian kings had horses in Moses' time, as well as the Assyrians in the seventh century. (c) The stipulation concerning the multiplication of "wives," "silver" and "gold" reminds one of Solomon, but quite as easily of Oriental monarchs in general. Kuenen² imagines that the author first borrowed his facts from the tradition concerning Solomon, and then warns Israel against the errors into which he fell. But there was no need, so far as history informs us, for such a warning in Josiah's age. Besides, if the Deuteronomist is here actually describing Solomon, and weaving into "an ancient law," which he wished to preserve, a picture of Solomon's folly by such a glaring anachronism, he surely proves himself a bungling literary artist as well as an unscrupulous reformer. Solomon was not different from other Oriental monarchs of early times. *E.g.* Amenhotep III. of Egypt, a king of the XVIII. dynasty (accordingly before the Exodus), took into his *harem* two wives of the daughters of the king of Babylonia; in consequence of which, through the introduction of new religious ideas by these marriages, his son

¹ *OTJC.* p. 365.² Kuenen, *Religion of Israel*, ii. 1882, pp. 33, 34.

and successor, Amenhotep IV., made an attempt to bring about in both Upper and Lower Egypt a reformation of the ancient Egyptian religion.¹ How such an event may have affected the people in Goshen is difficult to say. (*d*) But the chief point in this law still remains to be considered: "And it shall be when he sitteth upon the throne of his kingdom that he shall write him a copy of this law in a book out of that which is before the priests the Levites" (*v.* 18). A copy of what law? Deuteronomy? Quite impossible! (Cf. Deut. 31. 24-26.) No late writer, even on the critical hypothesis (except one after the exile), could have put such words into Moses' mouth intending to reform. Hence the very point of the entire law, which as a reformatory code would make it adapted to the needs of the seventh century, is *ex hypothesi* inexplicable. Most critics, therefore, assign this verse, wholly or in part, to a redactor of post-exilic times.²

4. *Deuteronomy* 18. 9-22, *law of the prophets*. This law is a warning against falling into the magic of the Canaanites (18. 9); plus a promise that a line of prophets will succeed Moses, accompanied by a test as to how true and false prophets may be distinguished. The form of the law is such, and its teaching is so admirably adapted to the needs of Israel on entering Canaan, that one wonders why any one should still claim for it a late origin. For example, all forms of heathen divination are condemned, and then the author adds (*v.* 14), "But as for thee, the Lord thy God hath not suffered thee so to do"; but this, on the new theory, must be false in face of what is stated

¹ Cf. Dawson, *Modern Science in Bible Lands*, 1888, p. 369. The same view is held also by Steindorff.

² So Wellhausen, *Die Comp.* ² p. 194; Cornill (*Einleit.* p. 34); Dietsel (*J. P. Theol.* v. p. 266A); cf. Holzinger (*Einleit. in den Hex.* 1893, p. 264). Driver (*Deut.* p. 212) passes over it in silence. For the true explanation of the "law of the kingdom," cf. Rosenberg, *Die Mosaische Echtheit der Königs-Urkunde im Deut.* 17. 14-20; *Dissertation*, 1867, pp. 26-28, 51, 55.

in 2 Kings 16. 3, 17. 17, 21. 6, 23. 10. The probabilities are, that a reformer of the seventh century would have omitted Deuteronomy 18. 14*b*. Moreover, the promise of a נָבִיא spoken of in *vv.* 15 and 18, which is probably to be taken, primarily, in a collective sense, is not so important to a nation which has already had its Elijahs and Hoseas, as to a people about to lose their first and only prophet. Besides, the test of true prophecy, in *v.* 22, is a very primitive one, and far below the teaching of Jeremiah 18. 7-10. A still further proof of the inappropriateness of this law to reform is obvious from the fact that criticism is more and more inclined to exclude it, wholly, or in part, from the original kernel of Deuteronomy.¹ On the other hand, it should not be lost sight of, that the case of Balaam was fresh in Moses' memory when Deuteronomy is purported to have been spoken.

5. Deuteronomy 19. 14—*removing a neighbour's landmark* (cf. 27. 17). The law is obviously primitive. No claim, indeed, has ever been made that it suits Josiah's age, or that it is reformatory; for such an encroachment upon a neighbour's rights was not uncommon from the earliest times.² The first portion of the verse, however, is employed by Kittel³ to show that, when this law was written, Israel were already in Palestine. But the second portion of the same verse shows quite as plainly that they were not yet in possession of Palestine. Besides, the landmarks spoken of are those which have been set up, not by their "fathers" (אֲבוֹת), but by "them of old time" (רֵאשִׁימִים), *i.e.* by the aborigines of Palestine. A strange expression for a late historian to use!

6. Deuteronomy 20. 1-20—the law of military service

¹ *E.g.* Cornill (*Einleit.* p. 34) rejects *vv.* 14-22. Wellh. (*Proleg.*¹ p. 403) speaks of *v.* 22 as "vague and unpractical."

² Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 234.

³ Kittel, *Hist. of the Hebrews*, i. p. 36.

(cf. 24. 5). The aim of this law is not to check barbarity in war, but to regulate the constituency of the army. The prime object is stated in the first verse, viz., that, with God on their side, they are not to fear. It is repeated in verse 4. The strong spirit of trustful confidence expressed in this law (especially in *vv.* 1-9), the presence and exhortation of the *priests* to the army before they enter into the engagement (*vv.* 2-4), but especially the utopian character of *vv.* 1-9, all bespeak its early origin. This is also recognised by criticism.¹ The latter half, too, of this law (*vv.* 10-20), is equally unsuitable to the seventh century. It prescribes what Israel shall do when warring (*a*) against foreigners outside of their own territory (*vv.* 10-15), and (*b*) against the inhabitants of Canaan, namely, the Hittites, and the Amorites, etc. (*vv.* 16-20). It is quite inconceivable that a late writer should have preserved such a law for its reformatory value; or, in a post-Davidic age, have made a discrimination of this sort between modes of foreign and civil warfare. Driver's suggestion that it is a law "in harmony with his philanthropic nature, which he desired to see revived," is hardly satisfactory, to say the least.² The law is obviously early.

7. *Deuteronomy* 21. 1-9 — *expiation of an untraced murder*. This law is also confessedly archaic;³ its object being to make atonement for innocent blood shed in an unknown way. Thus the city nearest to the body of the dead shall furnish a heifer to be slain in a rough valley by the priests, the sons of Levi, who are commanded to strike

¹ Thus Cornill (*Einleit.*, pp. 35 f.) and Wellhausen (*Die Comp.*² p. 194), reject it as not belonging to the original kernel of Deuteronomy. Driver (*Deuteronomy*, p. lxi.) also concedes that "the law of military service implies a simpler state of society than the age of the later kings."

² Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. lxi. Cf. Bissel's discussion of the assumptions underlying this statute (*e.g.*, Num. 1. 3, 26. 2, 31. 6). *Journal Bibl. Lit. and Exeg.* 1883.

³ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 241.

off its neck. But, if confessedly ancient, why revived in the seventh century? To this question no satisfactory answer can be given. To say, with Dillmann, that it is an older fragment, possessing the Deuteronomic stamp, is as unsatisfactory as the more recent attempts to place it wholly, or in part (on account of "the priests" mentioned in v. 5), after the exile.¹ The law is evidently not of a reformatory character.

8. *Deuteronomy* 21. 10-14—*treatment of female slaves*. This is a law defining Israel's rights when victorious in war over foreign nations. It is exceedingly primitive in its stipulations, is never claimed to be reformatory, and, indeed, is quite unsuited to the conditions of the seventh century. "The case contemplated is manifestly that of warfare with *foreign* nations, after Israel is settled in Palestine (v. 10, "when thou goest forth," etc.), not with the nations of Canaan, with whom no intermarriages are to be contracted (7. 3)."²

9. *Deuteronomy* 21. 15-17—*primogeniture*. This law secures the rights of the firstborn in cases of polygamy, when the firstborn is the son of the less beloved wife. It is based upon the patriarchal idea that the first son born inherited inalienable birthrights (cf. Gen. 24. 36, 25. 5, 31-34). The custom of the patriarchs is thus established by law in the interests of the nation, and, as far as Israel's history informs us, it was observed from Moses on. There is no proof whatever that the rights and privileges of primogeniture needed to be reinvested with kingly sanction in order to reform the prevailing customs of later times.

10. *Deuteronomy* 21. 22, 23—*the body of one hanged*. The reference is to criminals, who, having been put to death for sins worthy of death, are hung upon trees in order that their

¹ Cf. Wellhausen, *Die Comp.*² p. 353; Holzinger, *Einleit. in d. Hex.* p. 265.

² So Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 244.

bodies, exposed to public gaze, might become a terror to evil-doers. (Cf. Josh. 10. 26; 2 Sam. 4. 12.) In such cases the law provides that their bodies, thus exposed before the eyes of God and man during the day, shall at nightfall be taken down and buried, that the land be not defiled. How accurately this requirement was carried out in Israel, we have already seen from Joshua 8. 29, 10. 27, "both old passages."¹ And here again there is no historical reason for supposing that it was codified in Judah's crumbling era of decay. Hanging itself was an ancient Egyptian custom (cf. Gen. 40. 22).

11. *Deuteronomy* 22. 5—*sexes not to interchange garments*. According to Robertson Smith,² this is one of the many precepts in Deuteronomy which, though trivial and perhaps irrational to the modern eye, "disclose to the student of Semitic antiquity an energetic protest against the moral grossness of Canaanite heathenism." It is, accordingly, claimed by criticism that this is an ancient law which has been taken up and codified by the Deuteronomist. But the question still remains, Why by him? And to this no satisfactory answer has been given; certainly, not because there was special need of reform in this regard according to history.

12. *Deuteronomy* 22. 6, 7—*birds' nests*. This is one of the many humanitarian laws to be found in the book of Deuteronomy (cf. 25. 4). The same spirit, however, is shown in Leviticus 22. 27, 28. Here, if the eggs or the young ones are taken, the mother is to be let go free. Israel is thus to regard with sanctity the parental relation of birds, that it may go well with them as a nation, and that they may prolong their days. This is curious law to have received its present form at the hands of a reformer!

¹ Cf. Kleinert, *Untersuchungen*, p. 96 f. Also Holzinger, *Einleit. in d. Hex.* p. 299.

² W. Robertson Smith, *OTJC.*² p. 365.

13. *Deuteronomy* 22. 8—*battlements*. This is another of the laws contained in the Deuteronomic code which no one claims is either reformatory or necessarily late. The law contemplates the construction of stone houses with flat roofs. In building such houses the command is given to construct parapets on the roofs to protect one from falling off. Tent-life for Israel is evidently a thing of the past; for, at least, Reuben, Gad, and the half tribe of Manasseh are already settled in their possessions. Had the other laws of Deuteronomy been intended for a people who were destined to remain in the desert, such a law appearing among them would have been absurd; on the other hand, that such a law was deemed necessary after five centuries of settled life and experience in Canaan is equally unreasonable, and lessens the practicalness of the code as a whole.

14. *Deuteronomy* 22. 13-21—*slander against a newly married maiden*. Another of the laws peculiar to Deuteronomy, confessedly adapted to the customs of "a primitive-minded people,"¹ and bearing linguistic proof of its probable early codification (cf. the use of הַנְּעָרָה for הַנְּעָרָה in *vv.* 15 (twice), 16, 20, 21, *along with* the actual use of the feminine form in *v.* 19—its only occurrence in the Pentateuch).

15. *Deuteronomy* 23. 1-8 (Heb. 2-9)—*conditions of admittance into the theocratic community*. For example, it is stipulated that eunuchs, mutilated in the service of a heathen deity or otherwise; Amorites and Moabites to the tenth generation; Edomites and Egyptians to the third generation, shall not enter the congregation of the Lord. Certain features of this law, when treated as a unity, point to an early origin; thus, the command not to abhor an Egyptian, in *v.* 7 (Heb. 8), is far more practical in Moses' or Joshua's time than at any subsequent date; "a mixed

¹ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 255.

multitude" went up out of Egypt (Exod. 12. 38).¹ On the other hand, the strong antipathy for the Moabite, in v. 3 (4), shows clearly that the author was unfamiliar with the genealogy of David (cf. Ruth 4. 13-22); while the narrow exclusiveness of the entire law is opposed to the spirit of eighth-century prophets (cf. Isa. 2. 3; Mic. 4. 2).²

16. *Deuteronomy* 23. 15, 16 (16, 17)—*humanity to runaway slaves*. This is a law providing for fugitive slaves, who, in attempting to escape the merciless treatment of their masters, flee for protection to the land of Israel. To all such it is granted to dwell where they please. There is little doubt as to the antiquity of this law, or to its practical character, if given early. Surely to none would such a law speak with greater force than to those who had themselves just escaped from slavery. There is confessedly nothing reformatory about it.

17. *Deuteronomy* 23. 17, 18 (18, 19)—*against religious prostitution*. This law is aimed at the immoral and repulsive custom of the Canaanites prostituting themselves to their gods and goddesses, a law which has historically been violated ever since the time of Israel's conquest of Canaan. Compare, for example, the sensual and heathen practices of the Egyptians to-day, at Tan̄ta in the Delta. That this law was enforced by Josiah (2 Kings 23. 7), is no proof that it then first became a law. There were Sodomites in Rehoboam's time (1 Kings 14. 24); a little later Asa banished them from the land (1 Kings 15. 12), and those which remained, after his apparent enforcement of the law, his son Jehoshaphat removed (1 Kings 22. 46, *Heb.* 47). The law is reformatory, but there is no proof that it was called into existence for the first time in the seventh

¹ So Oettli, *Das Deuteronomium u. die Bücher Jos. u. Richter*, 1893, p. 17. Also Douglas, *Lex Mosaica*, p. 71.

² Geiger (*Urschrift*, p. 98 f.) is quoted by Dillmann, iii. p. 348, as rejecting this entire section as a post-exilic interpolation. So others.

century. The evidence just furnished would rather point to a much earlier date.

18. *Deuteronomy* 23. 24, 25 (25, 26)—*regard for and freedom to eat of one's neighbour's crop.* The passer-by may pluck grapes or grain as he crosses the property of his neighbour, but he is forbidden to carry away any in his vessel. The command is obviously rudimentary, and belongs to an earlier age than that of Josiah's reformation.

19. *Deuteronomy* 24. 1-4—a *special law in case of divorce.* This law prevents a man from taking back his divorced wife in case she has been meanwhile married to another man. The Mohammedan law of to-day, on the contrary, requires that the woman divorced shall have been married to some other man, and by him again divorced before her former husband can take her back. The date of the law is indeterminable, but it seems to assume the right of divorce prescribed in *Leviticus* 21. 7, 14, 22. 13; *Numbers* 30. 9 (10).

20. *Deuteronomy* 24. 16 — *individual responsibility.* "The fathers shall not be put to death for the children, neither shall the children be put to death for the fathers: every man shall be put to death for his own sin" (cf. *Jer.* 31. 29, 30; *Ezek.* 18. 20). Considerable stress is laid upon this law, as it emphasizes the idea of individual responsibility. But it is useless for those who believe in the Mosaic origin of the Decalogue (even its briefest form), to insist that the idea of individualism is of late birth. The Ten Commandments teach individual responsibility. Their language is that of the second person singular, "Thou shalt not." On the other hand, there is no necessary conflict between the clause, "visiting the iniquities of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me" (*Deut.* 5. 9), and the law before us; because, in the former case, the reference is

to the providence of God operating in society; whereas here we have a principle of administration in matters of state justice. Amaziah very possibly knew of this law (cf. 2 Kings 14. 6).

21. *Deuteronomy 25. 1-3—moderation in bastinado—forty stripes the maximum.* This mode of punishment was common in Egypt, and the frequent and excessive use of it there must have left a deep impression upon Israel. There is little or no reason for thinking that its origin among the Hebrews was late, or that clemency was desired in Josiah's age. The expression, "cause to lie down" (*v. 2*), would rather confirm one in the belief that the author had the Egyptian mode of punishment in mind.¹

22. *Deuteronomy 25. 4—threshing-ox not to be muzzled.* A humanitarian law, doubtless ancient, and adapted to all ages; showing, however, no traces of a reformatory character, or suited especially to the requirements of the seventh century.

23. *Deuteronomy 25. 5-10—levirate marriage.* This law is evidently based upon a very ancient patriarchal custom (cf. Gen. 38. 8-26), which required that an Israelite should marry his sister-in-law, in case she had no son, and raise up seed to his deceased brother; the motive being that his brother's name may not be lost in Israel (cf. *v. 6*). Here the duty is made obligatory; and for an example of its observance we need look no further than the book of Ruth (cf. chap. 4. 1 f.).

24. *Deuteronomy 25. 11, 12—modesty in women.* Mutilation is here enjoined for indecent conduct—a law much older than the seventh century, and illustrating the inhumanity of some of the Deuteronomic laws (cf. 19. 21).

¹ Cf. Wilkinson-Birch, 1878, i. pp. 305, 308, and Riehm's *Handwörterbuch des bibl. Alterthums*,¹ pp. 899, 914 (quoted by Driver); also Berger's *Criminal Code of the Jews*, according to the Talmud, Massechoth Synhedrim, 1880, pp. 122 f. (quoted by Bissel).

25. *Deuteronomy* 26. 12-15—*thanksgiving at the payment of the triennial tithe.* This is one of the most interesting of all the laws peculiar to the book of *Deuteronomy*. Its decisive characteristic lies in the expression, וְלֹא נָתַתִּי כִּמְנוּחַ לַמֵּת (v. 14), which very probably reflects the Egyptian custom of placing food on small tables in the grave with the dead, “for the use of the departed spirit in its journey to the underworld.”¹

These are the laws “peculiar” to *Deuteronomy*. So many of them are confessedly “ancient,” and so few really adapted to the requirements of the seventh century, that it is exceedingly doubtful whether the code as a whole was written with the *intention* to reform. On the other hand, even those laws *not* “peculiar” to *Deuteronomy*, and which have a counterpart in the other codes of JE or P (e.g. concerning cleanliness in the camp, leprosy, pledges, asylum for manslayer, slavery, tithes and the like), are so similar to these in character, that we dare not claim for them more than an inherent potentiality to reform.

Another reason for denying that the book of *Deuteronomy* was composed *in order to reform*, is the obvious fact that the *parenetic* portion is not intended to reform but to warn. The hortatory element in *Deuteronomy* is a conspicuous part of the book, and equally, or even more important, than the laws themselves.² Now the question here is not, Whom does the author represent Moses as exhorting? for naturally it is Israel on the plains of Moab, as every one allows; but rather this, *In doing so does the author put into Moses' mouth such exhortations as would tend especially to bring about a reformation of the conditions existing in*

¹ Cf. Wilkinson-Birch, *Ancient Egypt*, 1878, iii. p. 432; Oort, *Theolog. Tijdschrift*, 1877, p. 354 f.; Wellhausen, *Arab. Heidenthum*, p. 162; Dillmann, iii. p. 362; and Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 292.

² So Dillmann also (III. p. 601), and Driver (*Deut.* p. 19).

his own time? We think not, for these reasons: (a) In Manasseh's, Ammon's, or Josiah's time, a conversion of the *court* was necessary. What the nation needed was something to arouse the *royalty*; the book of Deuteronomy, on the contrary, is confessedly intended for the *people*.¹ It is "the people's book." As a reformer the Deuteronomist could hardly have hoped to have reformed the State by an appeal to the people. (b) The seventh century needed a reformation of *religion*, not merely of worship, an awakening of the national conscience, not the simple abandonment of high places; above all, a reformation of *forms* and *ceremonies* (cf. Jer. 3. 16; 7. 4, 21-23; 9. 26).² And yet the Deuteronomist never alludes, directly or indirectly, to Israel's need of *religious reformation*, but over and over again warns them against falling into the sin of the Canaanites whom they are about to dispossess. (c) The basis of appeal, also, is better adapted to early circumstances and conditions; the author appeals to their own personal remembrance of the past: *e.g.*, remember your servitude in Egypt (5. 15; 15. 15; 16. 12; 24. 18, 22); remember what Amalek did unto thee by the way (25. 17), and what the Lord did unto Miriam (24. 9)—motives which would hardly have survived five centuries of oral transmission, and been emphasized so strongly by a reformer. (d) Again, the personal ring of certain exhortation—*e.g.*, the accusation of rebellion from the day they had left Egypt until they came to the plains of Moab (9. 7, 24)—is that of a writer who fully grasped the relation of Moses to the people, and who most vividly appreciated the authority which his sixty years of seniority over the generation whom he addressed in Moab afforded him as prophet and lawgiver. (e) Finally, the passage contained in Deuteronomy 30. 11-20 ("For this commandment which I command thee this

¹ So Wellhausen, explicitly, *Die Comp.*² 1889, p. 204.

² Cf. Robertson, *The Early Religion of Israel*, 1892, pp. 455 f.

day is not too wonderful for thee"), which, D'Eichtal¹ thinks, in some respects is the most remarkable in the whole book, is psychologically improbable from the pen of a late writer who is supposed to be putting it into Moses' mouth. The literary art involved in supposing such a case is quite too wonderful.

Our final reason for denying that the author of Deuteronomy wrote with the *intention of reforming*, is the fact that many of the most recent results of criticism itself are opposed to such an idea. More and more criticism is recognising that only the smallest fragment of the book of Deuteronomy is really suitable to the circumstances of the seventh century. For example, Wellhausen² says, "He who maintains the unity of Deuteronomy cannot place its composition in the time of Josiah; that is certain." It seems reasonable at first sight to suppose, with Dillmann, Kuenen, Driver and others, that the original kernel of Deuteronomy consisted of approximately chaps. 5.-28.; but then the logic of criticism drives one, with Wellhausen, Cornill, and Stade, to the safer conclusion that it could not have contained more than chaps. 12.-26. And even here there is no sure foundation on which to rest; for, as Wellhausen³ remarks, "Also Deuteronomy 12.-26. is very strongly worked over, and not alone in the parenthetic portions." Thus chaps. 21.-25. are so different in character from the remainder of the kernel that they must have come from a different source. The marks of dual authorship are too strongly visible in chap. 12., also, to think of it as a unity; chap. 14. 1-21 is too similar to P to be pre-exilic; 15. 4-6 are a clear contradiction of v. 11; and 20. 3, 4 and 26. 16-19 are not probably from the original Deuteronomist; so claim such critics as

¹ Cf. *Mélanges de Critique Biblique*, 1886, p. 312.

² *Die Comp.*³ 1889, p. 353.

³ *Idem*, p. 352.

Stade, Wellhausen, Cornill, Vater, Holzinger, and many others. The sum total, therefore, which criticism allows with certainty to have belonged to the original programme of reform is chaps. 12. 1-28 (in part); 13.; 14. 22-29; 15. 1-3, 7-23; 16.; 17. 1-13; 18. 1-14; 19.; 20. 1-2, 5-20; 26. 1-15, or about 167 verses out of 959; or, less than one-fifth of the whole book. This very evidently lessens the force of the claim that Deuteronomy is a code of reform, which is our only justification for employing this mode of argument.¹

¹ The following shows the gradual diminution which the "original kernel" of Deuteronomy has undergone: De Wette, in his epoch-making dissertation on the *Origin of Deuteronomy*, published in 1806, admitted, with few exceptions, the whole of the book to be the work of one writer; Knobel, writing considerably later, limited its size to chaps. 1. 1-31, 14; Ewald to chaps. 1.-30.; Graf and Dillmann, 4. 44-28. 68; Kuenen, the same, omitting chap. 27. More recently Montet to chaps. 1.-30., excepting chap. 27.; A. van Hoonocker to chaps. 1.-26. and 28.; Andrew Harper to chaps. 1.-26.; Kayser and Westphal to chaps. 5.-26., 27. 9, 10, and chap. 28.; Reuss and Driver to chaps. 5.-26., and chap. 28.; W. R. Smith to chaps. 4. 44-26. 19; Kleinert to chaps. 5.-26.; Wellhausen narrows the original kernel to chaps. 12.-26., allowing for various interpolations; Cornill and Stade, to the same, excepting large portions of chaps. 12. 14. 15. 18. 20., and all of chaps. 21.-25.; Kautzsch (*Abriss*, 1897, p. 59), to 4. 44-49; 5. 1-10. 5, 10-22; 11. 1-28; 12. 1-26. 15; 28. 1-68; 31. 9-13, and claiming that *Ur-Deuteronomium* had at least two thorough and complete redactions during the Babylonian exile; Staerk and Steuernagel (also Briggs, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*,² 1897, p. 242 f.) discover on closer analysis that the kernel of Deuteronomy is composed of two independent codes, one of which was written in the second singular, and the other in the second plural. Steuernagel, quite independently of Staerk, has discovered, further, that the singular and plural sources are themselves no longer a unit or even original (pp. 67, 72). He imagines that they have been compiled out of different sources as follows (p. 73): First, there was the *Grundgesetz*, or law relating to the centralization of the cultus to the temple in Jerusalem. This was united with certain *Gerichtssprüche*, which together formed a *Grundsammlung*. This last received two independent redactions; first, by the redactor of the *Ältestenquelle*, who united the *Grundsammlung* with certain other sources (p. 68), after which the author of the *plural* source made further additions; second, by the author of the *singular* source, who took the *Grundsammlung*, and added certain portions partly foreign, partly original. These two collections, the plural and the singular, were then taken, and by D^R, who was the chief redactor, welded together, and with a few new additions form the Deuteronomy of Josiah. A few other additions may have been made later in the time of the exile, or even after the exile, and thus we get our book of Deuteronomy. (Cf. Steuernagel,

2. Criticism claims, further, that Deuteronomy is dependent upon JE (*Exod.* 20. 24-23. 33; 13. 3-16; 34. 10-26), but knows nothing of P (*Exod.*, *Lev.*, *Numb.*). That is to say, the three codes of Law (viz. JE, D, and P) reflect the ideal or practice of three distinct periods in Israel's history: JE, that of the ninth century B.C., D the seventh, and P the fifth. Not one generation, therefore, of thirty-eight years in the desert, but several generations, separate D from JE, during which "the social and political organization of the community had materially developed, and the code of Exodus had ceased to be adequate to the nation's needs." It is further alleged that "the legislative kernel of the book (chaps. 12.-26. 28) may be described broadly as a revised and enlarged edition of the 'Book of the Covenant' . . . adapted to meet the needs of a more developed state of society, for which the provisions of Exodus were no longer adequate." But "in neither its historical nor its legislative sections can Deuteronomy be shown to be dependent upon the source which has been termed P."¹

Restricting our immediate inquiry to the relation of JE to D, the question at issue is, not whether traces of JE may not be found in D, or that some of the laws of JE may not be more fully stated in D, for that is granted on all sides, but rather, is Deuteronomy 12.-26. a revision or enlargement

Die Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes, kritisch und biblisch-theologisch. Untersucht, Halle, 1896.

Such a theory of Deuteronomy's composition and growth obviously reduces the reformatory motive underlying its codification to the minimum.

¹ So Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. xlvi., xix., xxxviii. Similarly, Ewald (*Hist. of Israel*, Eng. transl. iv. p. 222 f.); Graf (*Die Geschichtlichen Bücher*, etc., p. 20 f.); Kayser (*Das vorexilische Buch*, etc., 1874, p. 136 f.); Kleinert (*Untersuchungen*, 1872, pp. 47, 52 f., 77 f.); Wellhausen (*Proleg.*,¹ Eng. transl., p. 32, *Die Comp.*² p. 204 f.); Dillmann (iii. pp. 291, 603-5); Kuenen (*Oudezoeke*,² p. 163 f., *Hexateuch*, p. 110); Cheyne (*Jeremiah*, p. 71); Carpenter (*Mod. Rev.* iv. 1883, p. 261); Oettli (*Deut. Jos. u. Richter*, pp. 13, 16); A. Harper (*Deuteronomy, Expos. Bible*, pp. 27, 28). Cf. A. B. Davidson (*Expository Times*, Jan. 1898, p. 187), who says: "Deuteronomy in short virtually is these chapters (*Exod.* 21.-23.)—Moses' last words—expanded and placed in a homiletic setting."

of Exodus 20. 24-23. 33, and so different in character as to *necessitate* the conclusion that it represents a later stage of society? A critical comparison of these two codes will show, we believe, that this is not required; and for these reasons:

1. *One-third of the laws contained in the Book of the Covenant (Exod. 20. 24-23. 33) find no place in the legal kernel of Deuteronomy; yet these are of a permanent and practical value, which quite forbids their having been set aside in the seventh century for those contained in Deuteronomy.* They relate, for example, to compensations for various kinds of injuries: injury to one's body (Exod. 21. 18-27), injury caused by a goring ox (21. 28-32); to digging a pit, into which an ox might fall (21. 33, 34); ox goring ox (21. 35, 36); theft (21. 37-22. 3, Eng. 4); pasturing in another man's field (22. 4, Eng. 5); fire set in another's corn (22. 5, Eng. 6); property in keeping, stolen, dying of itself, or torn to pieces (22. 6-12, Eng. 7-13); borrowed property injured (22. 13, 14, Eng. 14, 15); lying with a beast (22. 18, Eng. 19); cursing God אֱלֹהִים or the ruler אֲשֶׁר of the people (22. 27, Eng. 28); the Sabbatic year (23. 10, 11); the Sabbath (23. 12). Surely practical statutes of this character can scarcely be said to have been abandoned by the Deuteronomist because "the social and political organization of the community" had so materially developed that they were no longer adequate. One need only compare them with the new enactments which the Deuteronomist substituted in their place to see the falsity of such a claim. Thus it is difficult to see why the Deuteronomist should have rejected the law against feeding in another man's field (Exod. 22. 4, Eng. 5), and yet legislated as to how a man should regard another's crops (Deut. 23. 25, 26). Or, why he should have omitted the many laws in JE concerning *goring oxen* (Exod. 21. 28-36), and yet legislated concerning the *threshing ox* (Deut. 25. 4). There is here certainly no proof that the Deuteronomist was endeavouring "to meet

the needs of a more developed state of society." A similar difficulty is felt in accounting for his omission of religious regulation; *e.g.*, the Sabbath (Exod. 23. 12); or, if chaps. 5-11 be included in the original kernel, why he *retained* the injunction to extirpate the Canaanites (cf. Exod. 23. 31-33, and Deut. 7. 2-4).¹

2. *The order of the laws common to JE and D is different.* If D is an "enlarged edition" of JE, then we should expect the laws in the two codes to follow about the same sequence. On the contrary, the order is quite different. Thus, taking the laws which are common to both the Book of the Covenant and Deuteronomy, the order is, respectively, as follows:—

1. Altar (Exod. 20. 24-26) = Place of sacrifice (Deut. 12. 2-28).

2. Slaves (21. 2-6) = Exhortations against idolatry (12. 29-31).

3. Asylum for manslayer (21. 12-14) = Flesh of beasts dying of themselves (14. 21).

4. Smiting and cursing parents (21. 15, 17) = Seething a kid (14. 21).

5. Man stealing (21. 16) = Slaves (15. 12-18).

6. Seduction (22. 16, 17) = Firstlings (15. 19-22).

7. Witch (22. 17) = Blood of sacrifices (15. 23).

8. Exhortations against idolatry (22. 19) = Three feasts (16. 1-17).

9. Stranger widows and orphans (22. 20-23) = Just judgments (16. 19, 20).

10. Usury (22. 24) = Worshipping other gods (17. 2-7).

11. Pledge (22. 25, 26) = Witch (18. 10).

¹ It is not enough to answer (as Driver, *Deut.* p. xxxii.), because "it formed an element in the older legislation," and "afforded the author a means of expressing indirectly his profound abhorrence of practices which he knew to be subversive of holiness." The same would apply to stealing, which he omitted.

12. Firstfruits (22. 28; 23. 19)=Asylum for manslayer (19. 1-13).
13. Firstlings (22. 29)=False witness (19. 15-21).
14. Flesh torn of beasts (22. 30)=Rebellious son (21. 18-21).
15. False witness (23. 1)=Animals straying or fallen (22. 1-4).
16. Just judgment (23. 2-3, 6-8)=Seduction (22. 28, 29)
17. Animals straying or fallen (23. 4, 5)=Usury (23. 20, 21).
18. Worshipping other gods (23. 13)=Pledge (24. 6, 10-13).
19. Three feasts (23. 14-17)=Man stealing (24. 7).
20. Blood of sacrifices (23. 18)=Stranger, orphans and widows (24. 17, 18).
21. Seething a kid (23. 19)=Firstfruits (26. 1-11).

In other words, instead of following the order of the laws in JE (1, 2, 3, 4, etc.), the Deuteronomist makes (with one exception—the first) a new and independent order of his own, viz. 1, 5, 12, 14, 19, 16, 11, 2, 20, 17, 18, 21, 6, 3, 13, 9, 15, 10, 8, 7, 4.

3. *Verbal coincidences between JE and D are exceedingly rare.* In the original, resemblances in style and verbal coincidences are the exception rather than the rule. Apart from three or four clauses more or less complete, and a brief sentence or two, like "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in its mother's milk," which are too insignificant to furnish a criterion, there are very few resemblances in language between JE and D.¹ And it is hardly common sense to say that the Deuteronomist worked over the Book of the Covenant until it is no longer recognisable.

4. It is generally agreed that the composite code JE is largely Ephraimitic; the Deuteronomist, of course, was a

¹ Slight resemblances exist between Deut. 14. 21b; 16. 16, 19, on the one side, and Exod. 23. 19b, 17, 15b, 8, on the other, and no others.

Judæan. Now this being so, is it reasonable to suppose that a Judæan would revise and enlarge the laws of an Ephraimite?

5. Again, JE is legal and concise; D is expanded and hortatory. The substance of the laws, *common* to both codes, is practically the same. Is it, therefore, logical to say that in the ninth century Israel was given a purely legal code, and that two centuries elapsed before they were revised and given a parenetic setting? Indeed, can criticism affirm, with any degree of certainty, that of two codes of law of unequal size the briefer is the earlier, and the more expanded the later?¹

The other claim under this head pertains to D's relation to P. That "D knows nothing of P,"² and "moves on without displaying the smallest concern or regard for the system of P"³ are statements which require qualification. (1) Deuteronomy 14. 1-21 is almost identical with Leviticus 11. 2-23," as is evident from a comparison of contents and language.⁴ Reasons are not wanting also for thinking that Leviticus 11. 2-23 is earlier than Deuteronomy 14. 1-21, inasmuch as the clean animals are only defined in Leviticus 11. 3, whereas in Deuteronomy 14. 4-6 they are not only defined, but named. Two attempts are made to escape this ugly obstacle: (a) to assign Leviticus 11. 2-23 to H, an *earlier* stratum of P (as Driver);⁵ or (b) to deny Deuteronomy 14. 1-21 to the original kernel of Deuteronomy (as Kautzsch⁶ and others)—both unwarrantable. (2) Another section which resembles the priestly laws of P (Lev. 21. 20) is Deuteronomy 23. 2-15 (Eng. 1-14).⁷ (3) Furthermore,

¹ Steuernagel (*Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums*, 1894, p. 25n.) refutes the idea that Deuteronomy took the place of the "Book of the Covenant."

² Kayser, *Das vorexilische Buch*, p. 133.

³ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xiv.

⁴ Cf. Wellhausen, *Die Comp.*,² 1889, p. 206. Also Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 157.

⁵ *Deuteronomy*, p. 157.

⁶ *Abriss*, 1897, p. 59.

⁷ Cf. Wellhausen, *idem*, p. 207.

Deuteronomy 12. 1 ff. implies a previous law on the subject of a central sanctuary such as is found in Leviticus 17. 4 f. Hence it is plain that D is not entirely ignorant of the laws of P.¹

3. *The other claim made by criticism is to the effect that Deuteronomy's literary influence is observable first in the prophecies of the prophet Jeremiah.* Vatke² asserts that Jeremiah is the earliest witness for the late origin of Deuteronomy; Colenso,³ Zunz,⁴ and Montet,⁵ on account of similarity of style, that Jeremiah himself may have assisted in the composition of the book. Carpenter,⁶ that from the time of its publication the whole conception of Israel's history and religion was modified. Driver,⁷ that while "the early prophets, Amos, Hosea, and the undisputed portions of Isaiah, show no certain traces of its influence, Jeremiah exhibits marks of it on nearly every page. Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah are also evidently influenced by it. If Deuteronomy were composed between Isaiah and Jeremiah, these facts would be exactly accounted for." Zunz⁸ has pointed out sixty-six of the most important passages echoed in Jeremiah, and from these sixty-six Driver⁹ has selected eighteen as "specimens" to show "the influence, theological and literary, which Deuteronomy, after its promulgation, speedily acquired."

At first sight these parallels are striking, and seem to be

¹ Cf. on this point, Dillmann, iii. pp. 340, 605 f.; Kleinert, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 52 f., 77 f.; Nöldeke, *Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie*, i. p. 350; Klostermann, *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, iii. 1892, pp. 421-453, who shows that Deuteronomy is the last addition to the Pentateuch. Also Curtiss, *Levitical Priests*, 1877, pp. 33 ff., all of whom agree that P is prior to D. The trend of the French School of Vernes and Havet is also in this direction.

² *Biblische Theologie*, p. 220 f.

³ *The Pentateuch*, etc., iii. p. 618; vii. pp. 225-227; and *Appendix*, pp. 86-110.

⁴ *Zeits. der deutsch. Morgenländische Gesellschaft*, xxvii. p. 670 f. (ZDMG).

⁵ *Le Deutéronome et la Question de l'Hexateuque*, 1891, p. 193 f.

⁶ *Modern Review*, iv. 1883, p. 257.

⁷ *Deuteronomy*, p. xlvi.

⁸ *ZDMG*, 1873, pp. 671-673.

⁹ *Deuteronomy*, pp. xciii. f

conclusive, but on closer examination they prove delusive. The following reasons justify this conclusion: (1) Of the eighteen parallel passages selected and emphasized by Driver, only *one* (18. 20) falls *within* the legal kernel (Deut. 12.-26.). Of the other seventeen remaining, twelve occur in chaps. 4. and 23., which, according to many, were written considerably later than 621 B.C., and, therefore, cannot be said to have influenced Jeremiah. (2) On the other hand, it is only natural to think that Jeremiah and the prophets of the exile should have been influenced, to some extent at least, by the newly discovered "book of the law" which Hilkiyah found. But why exclude JE? (3) The influence of Deuteronomy on Jeremiah can easily be overstated; *e.g.*, the prophet practically refutes the teaching of his alleged contemporary concerning the importance of a central sanctuary, when he rebukes Israel for trusting in the temple (cf. Jer. 7. 15), and opposes diametrically the repeated teaching of the Deuteronomist, when he declares that God gave Israel no commandments concerning burnt offerings or sacrifices when He brought them out of the land of Egypt (cf. Jer. 7. 22, 23). (4) Finally, the part of criticism is to show, *not* Jeremiah's dependence on Deuteronomy, but rather the Deuteronomist's dependence on Hosea and the other prophets of the eighth century, of whom he is claimed to be "the spiritual heir."¹ From a literary standpoint the latter is impossible.

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

¹ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xxvii.

MISREADINGS AND MISRENDERINGS IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

II.

B. ERRORS OF INTERPRETATION.*

WHILE discussing in last December EXPOSITOR the subject of mispunctuation in the New Testament text, I had occasion to refer also, though incidentally, to some cases of misinterpretation, such as (τὸ) λοιπόν, "well then," "therefore," and καὶ—καί, "both—and." I now propose to devote some pages to this special subject of *misinterpretation* by discussing a certain class of words generally misunderstood and in many cases giving rise to serious errors. In so doing I shall endeavour to account for the origin of the evil, and at the same time to indicate the general method of rectifying many of these errors.

The class of words I mean to discuss are such as ἵνα, ὅπως, ὅτι, διότι, ὡς ὅτι, πῶς, ὅ, τι, εἰ, ἥ, etc., which, as is well known, have not yet received due attention on the part of Biblical critics and commentators. It will be shown that these particles, which may appear insignificant in themselves, have a very important bearing upon the New Testament language and its interpretation. Most of them recur almost times without number, and so they, along with some other little words (as καί, οὖν, etc.), lend to the sacred text its peculiar colour and style, and at the same time

* By inadvertence, which I regret, the passage quoted in my previous article (EXPOSITOR, p. 426) from Soph. Ant. 443, appears misread. The whole should run thus: καὶ φημι δρᾶσαι κοῦκ ἀπαρνέομαι. (Cf. O.C. 317 καίφημι κάπό φημι, Ant. 442; Pl. Theact. 165A φᾶναι τε καὶ ἀπαρνέεισθαι.) Jos. Ant. 6, 7, 4, Σαούλος δὲ ἀδικεῖν ὠμολόγει καὶ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἠρνήετο—which passages restore the force of my argument that John i. 19 ὠμολόγησε καὶ οὐκ ἠρνήσατο is a sort of Græcism.

affect very materially not only its grammar but its very essence.

A good case to the point is afforded by the closing verses of Jesus' "Prayer of Consecration," as it stands in St. John's Gospel 17, 18-26. In these nine verses the particle *iva* occurs no less than *ten* times, and each time the English versions render it by *that . . . may*, a turn which is of course an alternative expression for "to the intent that," "in order that."

In its current version the text referred to runs thus:—

"As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I also sent them into the world. And for their sakes I sanctify myself, *that* they also *may* be sanctified in (A.V. through the) truth. Neither pray I for these alone: but for them also which shall believe (R.V. that believe) on me through their word; *that* they all *may* be one, as thou, Father, art in me, and I in thee, *that* they also *may* be one in us: *that* the world *may* believe that thou hast sent me. And the glory which thou hast given me, I have given them: *that* they *may* be one, even as we are one: I in them and thou in me, *that* they *may* be perfected (A.V. perfect) in one, and *that* the world *may* know that thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as thou hast loved me. Father, that which (A.V. they whom) thou hast given me, I will *that*, where I am, they also *may* be with me; *that* they *may* behold my glory which thou hast given me: for thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world. O righteous Father, the world hath not known me, but I have known thee, and these have known that thou hast sent me. And I have declared (R.V. made known) unto them thy Name and will declare it (R.V. make it known): *that* the love wherewith thou hast loved me *may* be in them, and I in them."

Now in perusing the original of this text with care, we find that, while its vocabulary is quite plain, its gram-

matical construction is too dragging, and at the same time yields a very obscure sense. In fact, were it not for the occurrence twice of the vocative case (Father!), we might take the whole for a calm and deliberate request for certain things with a special long explanation of their object (*That—may-clauses*). As a matter of fact, we have here a long series of sentences succeeding one another in the relation of request and purpose of the thing requested, sentences, however, which show no clear connection with, or dependence upon, one another. It is true that in the first verse quoted (v. 19, "for their sakes I sanctify myself, *that* they also *may* be sanctified," (*ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν ἐγὼ ἀγιάζω ἑμαυτὸν ἵνα ᾧσι καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι*) the *ἵνα*-clause looks final "in order to," and so could—though not logically—depend upon *ἀγιάζω*. But, despite the introductory "for their sakes," can we well argue that Jesus was sanctifying (or consecrating) Himself *to the intent that* the apostles might also be sanctified? Again, what is the logical connection, in the succeeding several sentences, between the leading clauses and their subordinate *That—may-clauses*?

That here the particle *ἵνα* (*that—may*) is the source of the difficulty, is manifest. And as neither our classical lexicon nor our classical grammar can help us out of the dilemma, we must turn to post-classical Greek for an explanation; that is, we must consider the post-classical usages of the particle *ἵνα*. Now as the history of *ἵνα* is inseparable from the history of the infinitive, we have to say a few words about the latter. Such remarks, moreover, will, I hope, prove interesting and useful to Biblical students unfamiliar with the post-classical and subsequent history of Greek, and, what is more to our present purpose, will enable such readers to account for a whole series of vexed questions in the New Testament language.

We know from our classical Greek grammar that one of

the functions of the infinitive was—as still is in some modern languages¹—to do duty for the imperative, in that it expressed a *demand*, *exhortation*, or *wish*, as: ἐξεῖναι, μὴ ἐξεῖναι for ἐξέστω, μὴ ἐξέστω; χαίρειν for χαίρε; εὖ πράττειν for εὖ πράττοις. That this usage, which was common in classical Greek—it occurs some 500 times in the leading representatives of classical literature²—survived down to Græco-Roman times, appears abundantly from the contemporary inscriptions recording public decrees and law provisions; even the New Testament writings supply some examples, *e.g.*: Rom. 12, 15 χαίρειν μετὰ χαιρόντων, κλαίειν μετὰ κλαιόντων. Acts 15, 23. James 1, 1. Col. 4, 6 εἰδέναί πῶς δεῖ ὑμᾶς ἐνὶ ἐκάστῳ ἀποκρίνεσθαι. Phil. 3, 16 εἰς ὃ ἐφθάσαμεν τὸ αὐτὸ στοιχεῖν. Luke 9, 3 μηδὲν αἵρετε εἰς τὴν ὁδὸν μήτε ῥάβδον μήτε πήραν . . . μήτε ἀνά δύο χιτῶνας ἔχειν. Eph. 4, 22. Similarly we must read in 1 Tim. 1, 3 καθὼς παρεκάλεσά σε, προσμείναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, “as I requested thee, do stop at Ephesus.”

We further know that the above jussive or hortative and desiderative function of the infinitive was concurrently and pre-eminently performed first by the imperative, either simple (as λέγε, εἶπατε), or periphrastic (by means of φέρε, ἄγε, δεῦρο, ἄγε ὅπως, as: Ar. Eq. 1011; Nub. 489; Eccl. 149; Pl. Gorg. 495D. Rep. 336D); next by the independent subjunctive (λέγωμεν, μὴ εἶπης, μηδεὶς εἶπη), then by the independent future indicative simple (ἐρεῖς, πάντως τοῦτο δράσεις. Matt. 5, 43 ἀγαπήσεις τὸν πλησίον σου. 6, 5 οὐκ ἔσεσθε ὡς οἱ ὑποκριταί. 20, 26. 5, 48. 5, 21; 27, 33 οὐ φονεύσεις, etc.; 21 ἐρεῖτε. Luke 4, 12. Acts 23, 5. Rom. 7, 7. 1 Cor. 9, 9, etc.); and lastly, in a milder form, by the independent optative (ὄναιο, λέγοις ἄν, ἀλλὰ βουληθείης).

¹ For instance, in French, as: *voir* for *voyez*, like *ιδεῖν* and *ιδέ*,—not to speak of English, which has only one form for both the infinitive and imperative, as: *see* for *ιδεῖν* and *ιδέ*.

² This computation is based upon Richard Wagner's pamphlet, *Der Gebrauch des Imperativischen Infinitivs im Griechischen*, Schwerin, 1891.

We finally learn from the post-classical and Græco-Roman history of the language that, long before the Christian era, the infinitive had begun to shift its position.¹ That is to say, on the one hand it gradually receded before *ἵνα* + subjunctive, even after such verbs as *θέλω*—(in the New Testament we find *θέλω ἵνα* in Matt. 7, 12. Mark 6, 25. 9, 30. Luke 6, 31. John 17, 24);—and, on the other, it steadily spread at the expense of finite dependent clauses of the type: *ὅτε ἔλεγεν, ὅπως* or *ἵνα λέγῃ* or *εἶπῃ, ἐπεὶ εἶπεν*, etc., and particularly at the expense of the kindred participle: *λέγων, λέξων* or *ἐρῶν, εἰπῶν, εἰρηκῶς*). Thus the above variety of dependent verbal and participial constructions was now largely exchanged for the infinitive of the type: *εἰπεῖν, τοῦ εἰπεῖν, εἰς τὸ εἰπεῖν, ἐν τῷ λέγειν, μετὰ τὸ εἰπεῖν*, etc. And as the ground conquered was wider than the ground lost, the infinitive during the Græco-Roman period became unduly common, especially with the article.

It may be added here by the way that this changed position and function of the infinitive remained more or less undisturbed through the succeeding transitional period (300-600 A.D.). However, soon hereafter the old rival of the infinitive, the particle *ἵνα* (now, owing to its great frequency, shortened to *νά*), gained absolute supremacy and eventually dislodged the infinitive altogether. It is in this way that the Greek language has lost the infinitive since the Middle Ages, its place having been taken chiefly by *ἵνα* or rather *νά* with the subjunctive.

But as we are concerned here mainly with the Greek of the Græco-Roman times, let us return for one more moment to the infinitive of that period. We have already said that on the one hand it gained largely and on the other it lost in favour of *ἵνα* + subjunctive. We have fur-

¹ Students interested in the particulars of the infinitive in this period will find ample information in my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, §§ 2062-2098, and especially in Appendix vi., pp. 568-580.

ther explained that the *gains* or conquests were made at the expense of dependent finite and participial clauses, but omitted to indicate the particular kind and nature of the *losses* sustained. Well, these were chiefly in the direction of the independent, *i.e.* jussive or hortative and desiderative function of the infinitive. For this function was now transferred to *ἵνα* + subjunctive, except in the set phraseology of decrees and laws mentioned above, a mode of prescription imitated even in the Christian decrees, namely the canons of the Church Councils.

Here, then, we see that *ἵνα* + subj. begins in post-classical antiquity to act as a substitute for the jussive and desiderative infinitive, that is, in the sense of classical ἄγε or φέρε and εἶθε or εἰ γάρ, which are absent from New Testament Greek. And not only did *ἵνα* dislodge the infinitive from its imperatival domain: it soon attacked also the other kindred exponents, that is, the imperatival Future indicative, the hortative Subjunctive, the (desiderative) Optative, and the third person Imperative, and eventually succeeded in ousting them, one after another, from the living language; nay, it did not even spare its old associate and synonym ὅπως, but forced it to take refuge in the domain of artificial or literary style. In other words, apart from its other multifarious usages, the particle *ἵνα* came to be, as early as Græco-Roman antiquity, and probably under the influence of Latin *ut* and *utinam* (as if *ut-ina-m*), the chief exponent of (indirect) command, exhortation, and wish (besides purpose), thus acting much like classical ἄγε, εἶα—εἰ γάρ or εἶθε, *let, do—may! would that!* etc. Now that *ἵνα* here is no longer a conjunction, but an *adverb*, is too obvious to be dwelt upon. What we may add profitably here is that, as time went on this hortative particle or adverb spread in the lines indicated above, and ended, during the Middle Ages, by becoming, in the shortened form *νά*, the ordinary exponent of in-

direct command and wish, as well as the regular means of forming the Future tense, as we now witness it in modern Greek.

That the foregoing historical survey of the infinitive and its rival and successor *iva* has a direct and important bearing upon the language of the New Testament is manifest. For we are now in a position to account for the peculiar character, function, and relative frequency of both the infinitive and *iva* in the sacred compositions. Keeping this important fact well impressed upon our mind, that is, reading the infinitive and the particle *iva* in the light of their new or post-classical function, when we study the Greek Testament, we shall have no difficulty in grasping the true meaning of all the numerous passages containing an abnormal infinitive or *iva*-clause. Regarding the latter, with which we are particularly concerned here, we shall find that, alike in the New Testament and in the non-Atticistic or unlearned secular compositions of this period, this particle performs a double function, in that it acts on the one hand as a final conjunction, and on the other as a hortative adverb, serving to form or strengthen an imperatival, hortative, or optatival clause.

The following classified data may now illustrate the process and nature of the whole case.

A. "*Iva* AS A CONJUNCTION very often takes the place of the *dependent* Infinitive. Here *iva* governs regularly the subjunctive and stands in particular:—

(a) For almost any Infinitive, except that depending on verbs or expressions of "saying, thinking, perceiving, expecting, swearing," when otherwise it would have been resolved by $\delta\tau\iota$ ¹ with the indicative. To adduce here illustrations of *iva* for the infinitive is quite needless, seeing

¹ Since early Græco-Roman times also by $\delta\iota\omicron\tau\iota$, $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\tau\iota$ ($\acute{\omega}\sigma\acute{\omicron}\tau\iota$), and $\pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma$, as we shall see in our next paper.

that every page of the unlearned compositions of the time can testify to the fact.¹

(b) For the *inferential* Infinitive, that is, for the Infinitive preceded by ὥστε (which ὥστε is scarce in New Testament Greek, and absent from John, except 3, 16): so as to, so that. Thus the sentence: ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ὥστε ἐκβάλλειν τὰ πνεύματα, "so as to cast out," now assumes the form: ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς ἐξουσίαν ἵνα ἐκβάλλωσι τὰ πνεύματα, "to cast out." Here the analysis of the Infinitive to an ἵνα-clause involved the collocation ὥστε ἵνα, which collocation naturally led to the dropping of ὥστε.²

LXX. Job 7, 16 οὐ γὰρ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ζήσομαι ἵνα μακροθυμήσω (= ὥστε μακροθυμήσαι). So too Tobit 3, 15; Sap. 13, 9; 2 Macc. 6, 24; Philo i. 181, 43 πιστός ἐστιν ἵνα τοὺς λόγους αὐτοῦ μηδὲν τῶν ὄρκων διαφέρειν. So 294, 3. 408, 23, etc. Jos. B.J. 4, 3, 10 πρὸς τοσοῦτον ἤκομεν συμφορῶν ἵνα ἡμᾶς ἐλεήσωσι καὶ πολέμιοι; so *ib.* 6, 2, 1 μὴ γενοίμην ζῶν οὕτως αἰχμάλωτος ἵνα παύσωμαι κτλ. (= ὥστε παύσασθαι). Epict. Diss. 1, 19, 13. 1, 27, 8 ἔστω ἐμὲ <μὴ> εἶναι Σαρπηδόνα τὸν τοῦ Διὸς υἱὸν ἵν' οὕτω γενναίως εἶπω (= ὥστε με εἰπεῖν). So too 1, 29, 23; then 2, 2, 16 οὕτω μωρὸς ἵνα μὴ ἴδῃ. So further: 2, 3, 3. 2, 16, 45. 2, 18, 22. 2, 22, 9; and so on *passim*. Plut. ii. 67 F; Inst. Orat. 1 οὐ γὰρ τοιαύτης ἀρετῆς ἐπιδικάζομαι ἵνα τοῖς Ὀμήρου μύθοις πείθωμαι. Lucian, Amores 50 (ii. 455); De Lectu 19 (= ii. 931); Galen. viii. 45 E; Hermas Sim. 9, 1, 10 τὰ δένδρα ἐκεῖνα κατάκαρπα ἦν, ἄλλοις καὶ ἄλλοις καρποῖς κεκοσμημένα, ἵνα ἰδὼν τις αὐτὰ ἐπιθυμήσῃ φαγεῖν ἐκ τῶν καρπῶν αὐτῶν. Ignat. 680 A πολλὰ ἡμῖν λείπει

¹ For such examples of all periods see my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, pp. 570, 572, and 574 ff.

² The reappearance in later times of ὥστε with the *Subjunctive* points to fastidiousness and misplaced reaction against ἵνα, now disdained as a too common word. Basil. iii. 1081c ὥστε ἐπάναγκες ἦ. Acta Tho. 61, 73 (ed. Bonnet), ὥστε μὴ κατεξουσιάζῃ μου (= ἵνα μὴ -ση). Theoph. 270, 23, etc. See my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, §§ 1760 f. and 1764 f.

ἵνα Θεοῦ μὴ λειπώμεθα. Clement. 2, 29, οὕτω νήπιοι ἵνα κτλ. 2, 30; etc.

So then in the New Testament also, as: Luke 9, 45 τὸ ῥήμα ἦν παρακαλυμμένον ἀπ' αὐτῶν ἵνα μὴ αἰσθωνται αὐτό, "so that they could not perceive it" (not "that they should not" perceive it, since there was no intention of concealing it from them). John 9, 2 τίς ἤμαρτεν, οὗτος ἦ οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ, ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῆ; "so that he should be born." 9, 36 καὶ τίς ἐστι, κύριε, ἵνα πιστεύσω εἰς αὐτόν; "so that I may believe in him." So further: Rev. 13, 13; 1 John 3, 1; 1 Thess. 5, 4; 1 John 1, 9 πιστός ἐστι καὶ δίκαιος ἵνα ἀφῆ τὰς ἀμαρτίας, "He is trusting and just so as to overlook our sins";—and so on frequently.

B. *Ἰνα* AS A HORTATIVE ADVERB stands for the *independent* Infinitive, then for any verbal form expressing command, exhortation, or wish. Here, therefore, *ἵνα*, which again governs the Subjunctive, represents the jussive Infinitive, the Imperative, the imperatival Future, the hortative Subjunctive, and the independent or desiderative Optative. This construction goes back to classical antiquity¹ with the mere difference that *ὅπως* here is far commoner than *ἵνα*, obviously because *ἵνα* then was a feeble rival of *ὅπως*. At all events, here both *ὅπως* and *ἵνα* are hortative *adverbs*, acting much like *ἄγε*, *εἶθε*, *let, do; may! would that!*

Aesch. Prom. 68 ὅπως μὴ σαυτὸν οἰκτιεῖς. Agam. 600. Soph. Ant. 776. 1332 ὅπως μηκέτ' εἰσίδω. Ai. 697. 1221 ὅπως προσείπομεν, "may we greet!" Phil. 238. O.T. 1518. Tr. 618. 955. El. 637 (cf. El. 1134. Tr. 602). O.T. 1389 ἵν' ἦ τυφλός = εἶθε ἦν. O.T. 621 ἵνα πῖεται, "he

¹ The supposed omission in this case of *ὅρα* or *σκόπει* is untenable. If we are to assume an ellipsis, the only word to be supplied would be *ἄγε*, the frequent companion preceding the imperative and hortative subjunctive; that is to say: (*ἄγε*) *ὅπως* (μὴ)+fut. indic. (or aor. subj.)=simple imperative, subjunctive, or optative.

will drink," 1377. Soph. Phil. 987 Ζεύς ἐσθ' ἴν' εἰδῆς, Ζεὺς ὁ τῆσδε γῆς κρατῶν, "it is Zeus, do know it." O.C. ἀλλ' ἴνα μὴ προσπέσης (= μὴ προσπέσης). Eur. Cycl. 595. 630. Or. 1060. H.F. 504. I.T. 321. Ar. Aves 131 ὅπως παρέσει μοι (= πάρισθι). So Pl. 326 ὅπως δέ μοι καὶ τᾶλλα συμπαραστάται ἔσεσθε (= γένεσθέ μοι). Eq. 222 ὅπως ἀμυνεῖ τὸν ἄνδρα. Nub. 824 ὅπως δὲ τοῦτο μὴ διδάξεις μηδένα. So too 1177. 1464 ff.; Eccl. 297 ff.; Pax. 1017; Vesp. 1222; Ran. [7 μόνον ἐκεῖν' ὅπως μὴ ῥεῖς, "but be sure not to say that." Xen. An. 1, 7, 3 ὅπως οὖν ἔσεσθε ἄνδρες ἄξιοι τῆς ἐλευθερίας. Cyr. 1, 3, 18 ὅπως οὖν μὴ ἀπολῆ. 4, 2, 39. 4, 1, 16 ὅπως μὴ ἀναγκάσωμεν. Plat. Crat. 430 D ἀλλ' ὅπως μὴ ἦ τοῦτο. Prot. 313 C ὅπως γε μὴ ὁ σοφιστὴς ἐξαπατήσῃ ἡμᾶς. Cf. Meno 77 A. (Cf. also Rep. 445 δεῦρο ἴνα καὶ ἴδῃς.) Aeschin. 3, 21 ἴνα γε μὴ δρασμῶ χρήσῃ.¹ LXX. Macc. 2, 1, 9 ἴνα ἄγητε τὰς ἡμέρας τῆς σκηνοπηγίας τοῦ χασελεῦ μηνός.

Epict. Diss. 2, 11, 18 ἴνα λοιπὸν ἀπὸ τινων γνωρίμων καὶ διευκρινημένων ὀρμώμενοι χρώμεθα ἐπὶ τῶν ἐπὶ μέρους διηρθρωμέναις ταῖς προλήψεσιν, "let us use or apply." 3, 4, 9 ἄγε ἴνα Σώφρων στεφανωθῆ, "let Sophron be crowned" (mark here the collocation of the two synonyms, ἄγε ἴνα!). So *ib.* ἄγε ἴνα τηρήσω τὴν ἐμαυτοῦ προαίρεσιν, "let me keep." 4, 1, 41 ἴνα μὴ μωρὸς ἦ ἀλλ' ἴνα μάθῃ ἃ ἔλεγεν ὁ Σωκράτης (= μὴ ἔστω μωρὸς ἀλλὰ μαθέτω). Ench. 17 (23) ἂν πτωχὸν ὑποκρίνασθαί σε θέλῃ (ὁ διδάσκαλος), ἴνα καὶ τοῦτον εὐφυῶς ὑποκρίνη (= ὑποκρίνου, "do play his part properly!").

Canon. Concil. Sard. (about 343-4 A.D.) 3 καὶ τοῦτο προστεθῆναι ἀναγκαῖον ἴνα μηδεὶς ἐπισκόπων εἰς ἐτέραν ἐπαρχίαν διαβαίνει, *ut episcopi non transeant. ib.* ἴνα καὶ αὐθις ἢ κρίσις ἀνανεωθῆ (= ἀνανεωθῆτω), *ut iterum concilium renovetur*; then 10; and so on through the Middle

¹ For many other classical examples of *ἴνα* in this sense, see W. Goodwin, *Greek Moods and Tenses* (1889), §§ 271 ff.

Ages down to modern Greek speech, where *ίνα*, in its shortened form *νά*, is very common.¹

It is in the light of these data, then, that we must read a great many passages in the New Testament. Thus Mark 5, 23 *ίνα* ἐλθῶν ἐπιθῆς αὐτῇ τὰς χεῖρας *ίνα* σωθῆ καὶ ζήσῃ = "do come and lay thy hands on her, so that she may be saved and live" (not "I pray thee that," etc. There is no ellipsis here).

In John 10, 37 f. Jesus is represented as saying to the Jews: "If I do not the works of my father, believe me not; but if I do (them), though ye believe not me, believe the works: *that ye may* know and understand (γινῶτε, Rec. πιστεύσητε, believe) that the Father is in me and I in the Father."

Surely the construction, "believe the works of my Father *that ye may* know that He is in me," etc., has no logical connection. It is true that commentators here explain away the difficulty by freely paraphrasing "that ye may perceive once for all and then go on advancing in ever fuller perception" (Westcott); but this is theorizing and speculating, possibly suggested by the English verb "may," which is absent from the Greek text. Here Jesus is obviously referring to His previous remarks to the Jews (5, 35 ff.): Ye believe not in me whom the Father has sent. If we remember those remarks, the reading of the present passage regains its intrinsic simplicity; that is to say:

"If I am not doing the works of my Father, believe me not; but if I am doing (them), even should ye not believe me, do believe in these works. Do recognise and do know (*ίνα* γινῶτε καὶ γινώσκητε, Rec. καὶ πιστεύσητε: and do believe) that the Father is in me and I in the Father."

That this is the true meaning of the passage, appears

¹ For examples from all periods see my *Hist. Gr. Grammar*, Greek Index under *ίνα*.

also from the repetition of the same exhortation further below (14, 11), where Jesus employs the simple or direct Imperative: πιστεύετέ μοι ὅτι ἐγὼ ἐν τῷ πατρὶ καὶ ὁ πατήρ ἐν ἐμοί. "Do believe."

In the same way John 15, 11 f.: "These things have I spoken unto you, *that* my joy *may* be (Rec. remain) in you and *that* your joy *may* be fulfilled (A.V. *might* be full). This is my commandment, *that* ye love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love hath no man than this, *that* a man lay down his life for his friends." The passage should be read as follows:—

"These things have I been preaching unto you. *May* my joy be (Rec. abide) in you and your joy be consummated! This is my commandment: *do* love one another, as I have loved you. Greater love than this no man has. Would that (or, If only) every one lay down his life for his friends!"

In Romans 1, 13 ff. the English versions read:—

"And (R.V. Now) I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (and was hindered [A.V. but was let] hitherto), that I might have some fruit among (R.V. in) you also, even as among other (R.V. as in the rest of the) Gentiles. I am debtor both to the Greeks and to the barbarians, both to the wise and the foolish (A.V. unwise). So, as much as in me is, I am ready to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome."

Thus read, St. Paul's words are not only obscure and incoherent; they are virtually perverted in more senses than one. I say incoherent, because I fail to see any logical connection among these three sentences: "I wished to come to you to have some fruit among you—I am debtor to the Greeks and the barbarians—so I must preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome." Again, the break caused by the alleged parenthetical clause ("I was hindered

hitherto") and the severance, through a full stop, of "Gentiles" from "alike Greeks and barbarians," which manifestly belong together (Gentiles, namely Greeks and barbarians), ought to arouse the suspicion of editors against the current way of reading the passage. For my part, I believe the text is grievously mispunctuated and misunderstood, the mischief being of course due to the troublesome *ἵνα*. There is little doubt but that St. Paul wrote and read the passage as follows :—

Οὐ θέλω ὑμᾶς ἀγνοεῖν, ἀδελφοί, ὅτι πολλάκις προεθέμην ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ὑμᾶς καὶ ἐκωλύθην ἄχρι τοῦ δεῦρο. "Ἴνα τιὰ καρπὸν σχῶ καὶ ἐν ὑμῖν καθὼς καὶ ἐν τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσιν, Ἑλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις, σοφοῖς τε καὶ ἀνοήτοις! Ὅφειλέτης εἰμι οὕτω τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πρόθυμον καὶ ὑμῖν τοῖς ἐν Ῥώμῃ εὐαγγελίσασθαι.

Which is to be interpreted in English :—

"And I wish you not to ignore, brethren, that I oftentimes planned to come to you, and that I have been prevented hitherto. May I bear some fruit among you also, as among the rest of the Gentiles, alike Greeks and barbarians, alike wise and foolish !

"It is my duty, then, as willingly as I can, to preach the gospel to you also that are in Rome."

It is the mischievous *ἵνα*, further, that has led to the mispunctuation and mistranslation of Colossians 4, 16: "And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and *that* ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea."

We should of course read : καὶ ὅταν ἀναγνωσθῆ παρ' ὑμῖν ἡ ἐπιστολή, ποιήσατε ἵνα ἐν τῇ Λαοδικέων ἐκκλησίᾳ ἀναγνωσθῆ. Καὶ τὴν ἐκ Λαοδικείας ἵνα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀναγνῶτε.

And translate: "And when this epistle hath been read amongst you, cause it to be read also in the church of the Laodiceans. Moreover *do* ye also read the epistle from Laodicea."

But I must now return to the long passage of St. John (17, 18 ff.) with which I have opened this paper. As the foregoing illustrations fully apply to it, we can now read it without special comment. I shall only, for the sake of convenience, give, in parallel columns, both the Greek original and a fresh English version of it, so as to bring out more clearly the changes involved both in the punctuation and translation.

Καθὼς ἐμὲ ἀπέστειλας εἰς τὸν κόσμον καὶ γὰρ ἀπέστειλα αὐτοὺς εἰς τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν (ἐγὼ) ἀγιάζω ἐμαντόν. Ἵνα ᾧσιν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ! Οὐ περὶ τούτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν πιστευόντων διὰ τοῦ λόγου αὐτῶν εἰς ἐμέ. Ἵνα πάντες ἔν ᾧσιν! Καθὼς σύ, πατήρ, ἐν ἐμοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐν σοί, ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν (Rec. adds ἐν) ᾧσιν! Ἵνα ὁ κόσμος πιστεύσῃ ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ γὰρ τὴν δόξαν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι δέδωκα αὐτοῖς! Ἵνα ᾧσιν ἐν καθὼς ἡμεῖς ἐν, ἐγὼ ἐν αὐτοῖς καὶ σὺ ἐν ἐμοί! Ἵνα ᾧσιν τετελειωμένοι εἰς ἓν! Ἵνα γινώσκῃ ὁ κόσμος ὅτι σύ με ἀπέστειλας, καὶ ἡγάπησας αὐτούς, καθὼς ἐμὲ ἡγάπησας! Πάτερ, ὃ (Rec. οὗς) δέδωκάς μοι θέλω ἵνα ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ κακεῖνοι ᾧσιν, μετ' ἐμοῦ! Ἵνα θεωρῶσιν τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἐμὴν ἣν δέδωκάς μοι! ὅτι ἡγάπησάς με πρὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου, πατήρ δίκαιε.

“As thou hast sent me into the world, even so have I sent them into the world, and in their behalf am sanctifying myself. May they also be sanctified in truth! Now I am not praying in behalf of these alone, but in behalf of them also that believe in me by their word. May all be one! As thou, Father, art in me and I in thee, may they also be in us! (Rec. one through us!). May the world come to believe that it is thou who hast sent me, and that the glory which thou hast given me I have given to them! May they be one, as we are one: I in them and thou in me! May they be consummated into one!¹ May the world know that thou hast sent me, and that thou hast loved them, even as thou hast loved me! Father, that which (Rec. those whom) thou hast given me, I do love: where I am, may they also be: with me! May they behold my glory which thou hast given me! for thou didst love me before the foundation of the world, righteous Father!

¹ That is: “May they become a perfect unity!”

Καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω, ἐγὼ δέ
σε ἔγνω. Καὶ οὗτοι ἔγνωσαν ὅτι
σύ με ἀπέστειλας. Καὶ ἐγνώρισα
αὐτοῖς τὸ ὄνομά σου καὶ γνωρίσω.
Ἴνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με ἐν
αὐτοῖς ἦ, καὶ γὰρ ἐν αὐτοῖς!

Now the world has not recog-
nised thee, but I have recognised
thee. These too have recognised
that thou hast sent me. I have
both declared unto them thy
name and will be declaring it.
May the love wherewith thou
hast loved me be among them!
I also among them!"

As will be seen, there is a substantial difference between the current versions (either English or foreign) and the one now given above. As to the relative merits of either, the reader who has followed the preceding historical exposition with an unbiassed eye can form an opinion for himself. But whatever his choice may be, one thing is certain. As already pointed out, the current versions represent Jesus as petitioning the Father in behalf of Himself, then of His apostles and believers in a rather argumentative manner; that is to say, He appears to be strongly emphasizing the various purposes of His petition by means of a long string of final *That*-clauses, thus appealing to the *mind*. Now a petition of this nature and form would be surely too narrow and unbecoming for Jesus; too inappropriate and unnatural for the solemnity and pathos of the occasion; too calm to be reconciled with the *agony* of Gethsemane; in short, too speculative and argumentative for the character of a prayer, and the text is certainly a valedictory *prayer*. On the other hand, as now read above, Jesus' words regain, I hope, their original form, meaning, and tone. Here Jesus, with His eyes raised up to heaven (*v. 1 ἐπάρας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν*), is addressing from His *heart*, in *plain* and *direct* language, a fervent, pathetic, and sublime prayer to the Father: a farewell prayer directly for Himself, directly for His apostles, directly for the world.

A. N. JANNARIS.

THE DEVOTIONAL READING OF ISAIAH.

A PAPER READ BEFORE A COLLEGE PRAYER UNION.

LET me first recall to your mind some of the general rules given by Thomas à Kempis (bk. I. chap. v.) for the reading of Holy Scripture :

Each part of the Scripture is to be read with the same spirit wherewith it was written.

We should rather search after profit in the Scriptures than after subtle arguments.

Enquire not who spoke this or that, but mark what is spoken.

Men pass away, but the truth of the Lord remaineth for ever. God speaks unto us in sundry ways without respect of persons.

Enquire willingly, and hear with silence the words of holy men.

You see at once from these sayings of St. Thomas that devotional reading of Scripture is one thing, and critical study quite another. Devotional reading is possible for all earnest souls, for it depends on two conditions only, viz., on willingness to pray for the Spirit's guidance, and on willingness to learn meekly under that guidance. The only mental equipment necessary is the power to read; only let me here mention my conviction that he who surrenders himself to the Spirit receives a blessing in mind as well as in heart through His influence; and, indeed, I believe that the whole man—body, mind, and soul—is quickened when the heart is given to God.

Devotion, then, brings with it culture of the mind as well as of the heart. I think many peasants, men and women whom we should otherwise call ignorant, are striking examples of this fact. On the other hand, it is not necessary that any elaborate mental equipment or critical knowledge of the Scripture should precede its devotional use. Those who could thus equip themselves and yet reject the opportunity shall (no doubt) "suffer loss,"

but devotional study is possible even for the unlettered villager who has committed passages of the Bible to memory because he cannot read.

I have dwelt on this point because some of you may be thinking that in the case of such a book as Isaiah modern criticism may have interfered in some way with the devotional reading of it. For myself, speaking as one who accepts a good many of the results of modern criticism as most probably true, I should say that the book of Isaiah remains as helpful to devotion as it ever was. We are now concerned with the contents of the book. These lay before our Lord in the form in which we read them to-day; from these St. Philip preached Christ to the Ethiopian eunuch; in these St. Paul found some of his most fruitful spiritual thoughts. In our devotional reading we will put aside such questions as whether many authors or one wrote the great prophetic book, and we will obey St. Thomas' injunction, "*Enquire not who spoke this or that, but mark what is spoken.*"

Now Isaiah is not the first book to which a Christian would turn for devotional study. The Gospels come before it, because they give us the very words of Christ; the Epistles because of the richness of the Christian experience of St. Paul; and the Psalms because we are exercised in the devotional use of them in the daily service of our Church. Moreover, Isaiah contains much that is intricate and difficult.

But are we to avoid the more difficult books of the Bible in our devotional reading? Surely they were given for some purpose. Certainly there is one case in which such a book as Isaiah helps us greatly. It happens not unfrequently that familiarity with the words of the Bible shows itself as an evil. The passages from the Gospel sound too familiar to us, as though (God forgive us!) we had exhausted the meaning. We become dry and cold in

spirit; our spiritual food for the moment has ceased to nourish us. What is the remedy for this? There are several remedies suiting different natures, but the one remedy of which I would speak now is *a change of spiritual diet*. If, for the moment, the Gospels cease to move us, let us turn to the light the book of Isaiah throws on the Gospel story. If St. Paul's exhortations to a Christian life fall flat on our ears, let us shame ourselves by noticing what lessons in faith and patience and spiritual religion can be gathered from writings written centuries before Christ.

Now, I do not say that every passage of Isaiah is suitable for devotional use, and when a verse is really obscure in meaning I do not think it is right to give it a fanciful explanation, even if by so doing a devotional use may be made of the verse. Such a proceeding is not quite honest, and (be it remembered) devotion is nothing if it be not honest. With regard to abstruse passages we should give heed to St. Thomas' warning: "*Our own curiosity often hindereth us in reading the Scriptures, when we will examine and discuss that which we should rather pass over without more ado.*" On the other hand, even a cursory reading of Isaiah will bring to our knowledge many passages which are in the truest sense helps to devotion.

Let me take three such passages as examples, and point out as far as I can see how they may help us. The passages are xi. 1-9; lii. 13-liii. 12; lxiii. 7-lxiv. 12.

I. The first of these (Isa. xi. 1-9) may be called a Vision of the Kingdom of God. The prophet describes a time at which a king of the house of Jesse will reign, upon whom the grace of God will rest *sevenfold*. This king will judge the poor with righteousness; none will hurt or destroy in his kingdom; and the earth will be full of the knowledge of the Lord "as the waters cover the sea." Here then we have an ideal picture of the future; how will such a picture help us?

In this way, viz., by guiding and quickening our devotion. Devotion (in the fullest sense of the word) means giving ourselves to God for one of God's great ends. St. Paul's great act of devotion on the Damascus road was expressed through the words, *What shall I do, Lord?* (τί ποιήσω, Κύριε; Acts xxii. 10). Our own devotion, like St. Paul's, needs to catch some glimpse of God's great ends, in order that it may not spend itself in aimless feeling. We have been taught to pray, "*Thy kingdom come,*" but it is of no avail to use that petition if we have no notion of that for which we pray. Here Isaiah's vision comes in to help us; we learn from it that the kingdom of God is a kingdom to be realized on earth, that the King is Christ, that all the laws of the kingdom are altogether righteous, that no one citizen shall injure another, that ignorance shall be done away with in the knowledge of God. Isaiah's kingdom is the visible Church of Christ, realized and perfected to Christ's pattern; the prayer "*Thy kingdom come,*" means *May the visible Church grow day by day into the likeness of the yet unseen kingdom.* Here indeed, then, in the prophecy is something to guide and quicken our devotion; the curtain is lifted, and we get a glimpse into the glorious possibilities which lie within the reach of earnest prayer and faithful work.

II. I would call the second passage (Isa. lii. 13–liii. 12) a Study of Christ's Passion. The passage, no doubt, contains difficult points for the critic and for the translator, but its main features may be just as clear to the ordinary English reader as to the Hebrew student. No one can gainsay the fact that we find here in a passage written centuries before Christ's coming, the very principles laid down which governed Christ's atoning work on earth; in fact, we might call these fifteen verses a devotional study of these principles.

The passage teaches us :

1. To look upon the Passion of our Lord with wonder. For the worldly man indeed the story has lost all its freshness by centuries of telling, but it must not be so with the Christian. When he thinks of the Story, its Hero the Son of God, its details so strange for *Him*—the carpenter's shop, the gainsaying of Pharisees, the Betrayal, the three crosses set up against the dark sky, he cannot but wonder. There is no *Of course* in this story; the whole is a fathomless mystery of love. "*That which had not been told them shall they see; and that which they had not heard shall they consider*" (lii. 15).

2. The passage teaches us to meditate on the Passion with thankfulness and with confession of our own sin. Notice that this lesson is acted upon in the Communion Service; Thankfulness and Confession both take a deeper tone when we meet at the Breaking of the Bread, to celebrate our Lord's sufferings. But nowhere more than in these verses of Isaiah do we have the very thoughts we need put into the very words which help: "*He was wounded for our transgressions . . . with His stripes we are healed.*"

3. A third lesson from the Passion taught us here is the lesson of self-restraint under injury. "*He was oppressed, yet He humbled Himself*" (liii. 7). This self-restraint, remember, is needed not only in external action, but also in our devotions. When we fall on our knees before God, we must banish the thoughts of injuries we have received or fancy we have received. Prayer must not be allowed to degenerate into mere complaint. The very injuries inflicted upon us become helps if they lead us to humble ourselves in silence before God. "*He opened not His mouth.*"

4. Finally we learn from this study of the Passion to gather satisfaction and even joy from the story of Christ's Death. Our prayers should have in them an element of confidence and joy, for we learn that however slow Christ's kingdom may appear to us in its coming, the coming itself

is certain: "*He shall see of the travail of His soul and shall be satisfied*" (liii. 11).

III. The third passage (lxiii. 7–lxiv. 12) may be called a Model Prayer for one in trouble. It contains the pleading of one (the Israelite nation is meant) who has had a rich experience of God's goodness in the past and is now face to face with crushing affliction.

It is a pattern of devotion for us for four reasons:

1. It begins with recognising the past goodness of God, the Sun now behind the cloud. "*In all their affliction He was afflicted, and the angel of His Presence saved them*" (lxiii. 9). Here is a lesson for us; if we keep God's past goodness fresh in mind, we have something solid to meet present trial with.

2. This passage does not merely glance at this goodness, but realizes it by tracing it step by step. In Egypt, at the Sea, in the Wilderness, in the Promised Land, the prophet recognises God's present help (lxiii. 9–14). So we should not merely confess God's guidance in our past lives in general terms; the true spirit of devotion will say, here and there and there again in such a year and on such an occasion God helped me. There is reality about this proceeding.

3. Again the prophet gives us an example of steadfastness in devotion. He has not one eye on God, and the other on earthly help. God fills his thoughts; "*Thou art our father, though Abraham knoweth us not, and Israel doth not acknowledge us.*"

4. Lastly, this passage shows us man's part in the day of affliction, viz., to *wait* and to *work*. [God] *worketh for him that waiteth for Him; Thou meetest him who rejoiceth and worketh righteousness* (lxiv. 4, 5).

I have taken three passages only as examples, but it would have been easy to add to them. I have not noticed passages which appeal directly to the guilty conscience lay-

ing sin bare, such as chap. v. ; nor, on the other hand, those which comfort and invite, such as chap. lv. Indeed few books of the Bible offer such variety of devotional help as Isaiah. In it speaks the Evangelist, the spiritual guide, the spiritual comforter, in almost every tone of the language of the spiritual life.

W. EMERY BARNES.

NOTE ON ACTS IX. 19 ff.

A CAREFUL study of these verses brings to light an interesting point in the spiritual experience of St. Paul during the period that immediately followed his conversion ; and also shows that St. Luke's account of what then occurred is quite consistent with what Paul tells us in the Epistle to the Galatians (i. 15-18) : the extreme accuracy of the information possessed by the writer of the Acts is also clearly shown.

Let us first consider what would be the probable effect on such a man as Paul of the special revelation of Jesus granted to him.

His mind was an intensely logical one, deeply imbued with the methods he had learned in the Jerusalem Schools, and of their accuracy he was profoundly convinced : indeed some of our greatest difficulties in grasping his arguments arise from the fact that he continued to employ those methods in his exposition of Christianity.

Now such a man must have had very definite opinions as to what the Messiah would be, and say, and do, when He came ; these opinions would, of course, be founded on a careful and extensive consideration of the Law and the Prophets, conducted in accordance with the methods learned at the feet of Gamaliel, and he would not admit the possibility of a doubt as to their correctness.

The premisses being certain and the methods of logical argument undoubtedly correct, the conclusion reached would naturally be irrefutable.

What Jesus was, and said, and did, was utterly at variance with what Saul conceived that the Messiah ought to be, and say, and do : Jesus was, therefore, regarded by Saul as an impostor ; it followed that His disciples must be put down by every possible means.

But at the scene before Damascus' Gate an entirely new element was introduced into Saul's calculations.

He believed his knowledge of the God of the Jews, derived from the sacred Scriptures to be complete : but here was a Being who spoke direct to his spirit in a manner quite without a parallel in his previous experience. His premisses were shattered ; the conclusion founded on them was overthrown.

The evidence of personal experience could not be gain-said ; but it is contrary to all we know of human nature to imagine that he was able in a short space of time to ascertain what truth there was in his old opinions, and to bring it into line with the new revelation. What was likely to happen ? Reason and logical arguments would for the moment be thrust into the background, only personal experience would count ; he would do just what Luke says he did, " Proclaim Jesus that He is the Son of God." The historical question would be left in abeyance.

In verse 20 the *Textus Receptus* has " He preached Christ" ; but the overwhelming evidence of MSS. and versions shows " Jesus" to be the right reading. The change is an important one ; Saul had not yet had time to consider fully the question whether the man Jesus was, or was not, the Christ of the Jews ; he only knew that Jesus was a divine Being.¹ But in verse 22 Luke tells us

¹ H. J. Holtzmann, in the *Hand-Commentar*, says, " Durch Speiseegenuss erstarkt, predigte er sofort die Messianität Jesu : Sohn Gottes im Sinne von xiii.

that Saul confounded the Jews which dwelt at Damascus, proving that this is the Christ. Can we account for this development in the Apostle's preaching? In Galatians i. 15 ff. Paul says, "When it was the good pleasure of God . . . to reveal His Son in me . . . immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem to them who were Apostles before me, but I went away into Arabia, and again I returned unto Damascus. Then after three years I went up to Jerusalem to visit Cephas." Paul clearly implies that his sojourn in Arabia fell between a short and a long stay at Damascus.

With this Luke's account is quite consistent, for he has two notes of time with reference to Saul's visits at Damascus. In verse 19 we read, "And he was *certain* days with the disciples which were at Damascus"; in verse 23, "And when *many* days were fulfilled."

Any one familiar with the Lucan use of the word *ικανός* will admit that the phrase *ἡμέραι ἱκαναί* probably refers to a fairly long period of time.¹

If we suppose that the sojourn in Arabia fell between the visit of "*certain* days" and that of "*many* days," we can readily believe that Luke was not ignorant of this most important episode in the life of his beloved friend, although it was not part of his purpose to record what merely concerned Saul personally. During his quiet retirement in Arabia Saul must have gone carefully over all his previous investigations into the meaning of the Jewish Scriptures. Under the guidance of the Holy Spirit he must have care-

33, sonst nicht in Act." But the use of the expression "The Son of God" points rather to the special character of St. Paul's preaching at that period.

¹ See Lightfoot's *Galatians*, p. 89, note 3: 'Ἡμέραι ἱκαναί is an indefinite period in St. Luke, which may vary according to circumstances: Acts ix. 43, xviii. 18, xxvii. 7. Certainly the idea connected with *ικανός* in his language is that of largeness rather than smallness; comp. Luke vii. 12, Acts xx. 37 (*ικανός κλαυθμός*).

fully distinguished between those old ideas of his which were indeed founded on God's message to His chosen people through Law-givers, Prophets, and Psalmists, and those other ideas with regard to which he had merely been wise in his own conceits. Then he returned to Damascus, ready to employ in the service of his new Master that minute scriptural learning which, before he had received the guidance of the Holy Spirit, had so utterly misled him.

He now confounded the Jews, proving that this is the Christ. The word translated "proving" (*συμβιβάζων*) is nearly always used of adducing evidence from Scripture : it would only be after long consideration that Paul could thus see and set before others the essential unity between his old and his new beliefs.

The fact that Luke's narrative enables us to trace clearly these two stages in Paul's spiritual experience at this great crisis of his life shows what a thorough insight he had into the spiritual history of his friend.

P. MORDAUNT BARNARD.

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

III.

FORGIVENESS.

Two different men will take as different views of one of those picturesque fishing harbours which can be found along the north-east coast of Scotland and of England. An artist comes to the place in the glory of the summer, and to him the fishing village appeals on purely æsthetic grounds—on account of the little stream which has cut its way between the grey cliffs, and on whose banks the little village is built; the red tiles on the roofs of the weather-beaten cottages; the old-fashioned folk that gather upon the little quay; the boats, with their brown sails, coming home in the setting sun; and the sea of the colour of an emerald gently laving the feet of the iron cliffs. This is to him a fetching bit of scenery, and in the winter-time he transfers it to canvas; next spring it is hung upon the walls of the Academy, and is admired by city folk living in safety and at their ease. But neither he nor they understand. Should you wish to know the value of the break in the cliffs and the shelter of the harbour, you had better ask a fisherman, and ask him during the black winter months. This man has seen the storm coming when far out at sea, and lifted his nets without delay. He has run for home before the wind, and through the waves has made for the harbour lights. His wife and children have been watching on the quay, which is now swept with spray, and their hearts stand still as his boat comes near the entrance between two

jagged rocks. As the boat flashes through the water and comes out on the harbour side, the men lay down their oars and lie back upon their seats. As the boat comes up to the side of the quay, hands are stretched out to bid them welcome, and hearts are lifted in thankfulness to God because they have escaped from the perils of the sea. On such a night men and women understand the value of the harbour as no artist can, who paints it in its peace, and no crowd of inland people, who admire it for its red and blue. To the one it is a picturesque piece of scenery ; to the other it is a hiding-place from the storm.

After the same fashion one can take two views of the Bible, and each of them has its own value. It is impossible that any cultured person should be indifferent to the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament as a noble literature, or fail to admire their unique grandeur of style, their magnificent imagery, the glowing spirit of their hope, and the elevation of their moral teaching. Among all the masterpieces of literature the Bible must take the first place, beside which the achievements of poets and philosophers pale and are put to shame. One, however, realizes that admiration for the literary qualities of the Bible is doing poor justice to the inherent power and the spiritual attraction of the Book. The best witness to the service of this Book is not a man of letters, but a sinner who has been saved. He who has been at sea and has been tossed to and fro in the darkness, who has seen the distant lights and rested not until he had passed into the shelter, alone can testify to the strength and comfort of the Bible. It is the forgiven penitent that can bear the clearest evidence to the Book, for among its chief messages is the promise of forgiveness.

There may be a few people who have never felt the want of forgiveness, and to whom the word itself has a strange sound, but the desire is surely indigenious in the human race, and any exception does not prove a stronger

or finer character. Should one have had the misfortune to offend a friend, and so to wound his heart that intercourse has ceased between the two, then it argues a low state of mind, or an incredible frivolity, that the offender should never miss his friend's company, and should never regret his friend's alienation. Any person with a trace of nobility will consider this quarrel to have been the chief misfortune of his life, and will ever entertain an earnest hope that the way be opened up for reconciliation. He will surely count it a chief day in his life when he has been assured that his friend forgives him, and they return to the relations of former years. Should this be true of human fellowship, how much more true must it be of the communion between the soul and God. And unless it be that a person is able to say that he has never sinned, and therefore has no need of forgiveness, he must be callous to the last degree who has not longed to be assured that his sins have been forgiven of God, and that there is no cloud between him and his Father.

It ought, however, to be said that the sense of sin, and therefore the desire for forgiveness, varies in different ages, since there is a fashion in religion as there is a fashion in books, and clothes, and manners, as there is also a fashion in science. As each age has its own particular sins, so each age has its own particular penitence. It has been unfortunate that in religious literature conviction of sin has been represented in a form so stereotyped, and that no one is supposed to be penitent unless he is penitent after the convention of the day. For instance, there are those who realize that in sinning against God they have broken the eternal law of righteousness which runs throughout their life in this world, and which will run throughout their life in the world which is to come. They realize themselves to be like a person who had broken the law of the Roman Empire, and who was liable at any moment to be arrested.

It mattered not whether he went to Rome, or to Corinth, or to Jerusalem, or to the ends of the civilized world, he was still within the reach of Rome, and from Rome could never escape. For him there was nothing but hiding and fleeing, but hide and flee as he pleased, some day he would be brought across sea and land to stand before Cæsar's judgment seat. Nothing can affect the imagination more powerfully than a sense of outlawry, the hopeless contest with almighty and omnipresent law, in whose hands we are utterly helpless, from which we have no appeal. This sense of outlawry reaches its highest degree when any one is convinced that he has sinned against the law which extends through all worlds, and which is absolutely unerring. Is it cowardice in him that he should be afraid, or that he should earnestly desire a settlement? and is that an unworthy form of religion that one should seek in every direction for some means by which this great quarrel be healed and peace be made between the soul and the eternal righteousness?

Another man may never have thought of his relation to law, but he may be much concerned with his relation to himself, being overwhelmed, not with the thought that he has broken God's commandments, but with the thought that he has stained his own soul. His soul, through sin, has become to him something loathsome and horrible, like unto the skin of a leper when his disease is white upon him, like unto pure snow upon which some loathsome black liquid has been poured. What he desires is not so much reconciliation with God as reconciliation with himself, not to be saved from the fear of punishment, but to be saved from the agony of self-humiliation. And still another man may have been affected not so much by the guilt of sin, or by its corruption, as by its outrageous disloyalty and ingratitude. From early days he has been accustomed to think of God as his heavenly Father, and has not been indifferent to the

innumerable mercies of God. He suddenly awakens to the fact that his return for this unwearied care and divine patience, wherein God has pitied him as a father pitieth his children, has been forgetfulness, and disobedience, and selfishness, and unspirituality. It is as if he had wounded his nearest and dearest, and had done so in wanton carelessness and without a feeling of penitence. What the first man desires is to be reconciled to law; what the second desires is to be reconciled to himself; what the third desires is to be reconciled to his Father; and in every case the heart is longing for forgiveness, and for every case provision is made in the forgiveness of God.

When one turns from the human to the divine side of forgiveness, one learns from Holy Scripture not only that God forgives sin, but that in forgiving sin He acts in a perfectly God-like fashion. Nowhere is it taught that He will make any bargain with the sinner and loose the burden of sin on condition of receiving a gift or compensation from the sinner. Although the human heart has been apt unconsciously to imagine conditions, and has vainly tried to offer some recompense to God, no man would so deal with his offending brother as he imagines God would deal with him. When one of us is prepared to forgive, he always forgives freely; when one of us asks another's forgiveness, he always expects a free forgiveness. It were little short of insult that one should approach a neighbour whom he had offended, and offer him this or that compensation in the hope that he would then forgive. It is enough that one should be penitent to earn forgiveness from any friend worthy of the name. It is worthy of that friend to grant the forgiveness without conditions. What may be rendered unto him by the forgiven offender in after years is another matter: it will be given freely, as forgiveness was granted freely. When the two debtors stood before their creditor in the parable, and

neither could pay, the one owing five hundred pence and the other fifty, their creditor forgave them, or, as it might read, graced them both, without money and without price.

When the hope is held out in Holy Scripture that God will not only forgive, but is also prepared to forget our sins, the promise takes us deeper into the heart of forgiveness. One can understand how a person should forgive; it is difficult to understand how he can forget. Forgiveness depends upon the will, but forgetfulness is beyond our power. If anything can be forgotten, it must be through being replaced. If an incident can be covered over by another incident, so that the one sinks and fades into the other, then the former is not only removed from sight, but it is removed also from the mind. So long as the son remained in the far country, his departure, with its insolence and ingratitude and foolishness, could not be forgotten. When he returned to his father, in penitence of temper and lowliness of faith, the return removed the departure from his father's mind, so that as often as his eyes fell upon his son he saw him not as he went out, he saw him as he came home. Is it not also the case that when God forgives our sins, He forgives us in Christ Jesus, beholding not the sinner that was, but the saint who is to be, so that when he thinks of the Apostle, He remembers not Saul the persecutor, but only sees Paul the prisoner of Jesus Christ.

One can never be satisfied with forgiveness unless it should be accompanied by forgetfulness, but there are times when one longs for a yet further but perhaps impossible blessing, that sin should not only be forgiven and forgotten, but that sin should be utterly removed and pass out of existence. Although sin be forgiven, and although God has cast it, to use Scripture imagery, behind His back and into the depths of the sea, it yet exists, and some day may appear. It requires not that our enemy should dredge the sea for it, and should bring it up against us through pure

malice, for sin has an unholy power of vitality, and might any day face us, if not in our lives, in the lives of others whom we have injured. Every word which we have spoken is immortal, as well as every deed which we have done, and in ages to come both may arise and call us cursed. Is there no power which shall not only loose sin from our conscience, but also bring it to an end in our life? Here we come upon that marvellous word that sin shall be blotted out, and enter still farther into the mystery of this grace. We cannot understand what may be included in the idea, nor can we understand fully the power which will carry it into effect, but we may believe that in the long processes of grace the ravages of sin will be so repaired that what was evil will turn to good, and out of immense wrongdoing blessing will be brought to ourselves and to our fellowmen. St. Paul's persecution of Stephen not only gave Stephen a quicker crown of martyrdom, but also taught St. Paul devotion and humility all the days of his life, so that it may be said that St. Stephen was the spiritual father of St. Paul, and through St. Paul St. Stephen wrought unto the salvation of the world. Mary Magdalene had not shown that spiritual devotion to the Lord which has secured her the affection of Christ's disciples in all ages had she not first wasted her passion, and been dragged in the mire. It was her grateful sense of the salvation of Jesus that kept her, not for a brief space, but for all her life, at the feet of her Lord. It is impossible to believe that sin can last for ever, for sin is negative and passing: good only is positive and lasting. The very crown of forgiveness will be the destruction of sin, when the worst sinner shall be able to look round the spiritual universe and see no trace of the evil which he has done, because it has been absorbed and changed into goodness.

We also gather from the Scriptures of the New Testament that the forgiveness of sins is connected in some way

with the life and death and resurrection and endless intercession of our Lord Jesus Christ. It is a natural question to ask why our heavenly Father should not simply say, "I forgive," and why it was necessary, as it appears to have been, that His beloved Son should endure the humility of the incarnation, and offer that immense sacrifice of the Cross in order that the stream of forgiveness should run free and full, without barrier and without hindrance.

Any complete answer to this question would have to sound the deepest mysteries of the spiritual life, and could only be given by one who has understood the relation of God to the law of righteousness and the action of the law of righteousness upon the spiritual life of the soul. Some things, however, are within our vision and within our understanding, and they throw a very suggestive light upon the relation of the doctrine of the forgiveness of sins to the doctrine of the vicarious sacrifice of Christ. This is without doubt an ethical universe in which we live, and by that we mean not only that there is such a thing as good and such a thing as evil, but that good is bound to be blessed and evil is bound to be punished. No doubt the idea which some people have imagined of the eternal is virtually an extremely good-natured but very weakly father, who cannot find it in his heart to punish anybody and who is feared by nobody. This is not the Scriptural doctrine of the Fatherhood of God, and this is not the likeness of the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Were it so, there had been no misery in the far country; and were it so, there had been no joy in the Father's House. Any earthly father who treats his family after this slack and unbecoming fashion will rear wastrels and prodigals, and the day will surely come when his sons will lift up their hands not to bless but to denounce him. One of the chief blessings in human experience is a father who has been not only loving and merciful, but also severe and

faithful. It were indeed a calamity if the Father of our souls were only a greater and more foolish Eli, who cannot distinguish between saints and sinners, and who treats the sinner exactly as he would treat the saint. This world would not be worth living in for a week if there were not a righteous God upon the throne of the universe. Sin then would obtain the upper hand and righteousness be put to everlasting confusion in the market place. The great judgments upon iniquity would come to an end, and when they ceased human life would be a synonym for injustice and corruption. These judgments have cleansed life and have filled the hearts of the righteous with hope. What a blessing were the fire and brimstone of Sodom and Gomorrah, whose warning casts its wholesome shadow over Hebrew history! What a blessing the French Revolution was when the infamous tyranny and callousness of the rich and powerful were punished in blood! What a blessing the righteous judgments of God upon evil cities and decadent countries have been in all ages of human history! The progress of the human race has depended upon the severe action of the moral laws which have delivered righteous men and have been the enemies to all unrighteousness. Licence to sin and immunity from the punishment of sin are not God's government, and are not the illustration but the contradiction of love. When we see that terrible judgments are intended to cleanse the world and to save nations, when none of us is accustomed to condemn or would on any account reverse this action, we begin to understand that the agony in the Garden of Gethsemane and on the Cross of Calvary may fall in with the system of moral government. Were the sin of the soul loosed without pain and without cost, then God's dealings with the individual would be on another principle from His dealings with the race.

Again, when a man asks for forgiveness, his own con-

science comes into play, and he is not willing to be forgiven in a light and careless fashion. He desires to have his case settled according to the principles of righteousness; and if he is to be set free, to have the sanction of the eternal law. If I have a quarrel with a moral law, let that quarrel be fairly fought out and settled, so that I may look the law in the face, and have this law on my side for ever. Let me come in by the front door when I return to my Father's house, with all the servants to bid me welcome, and not creep in by some back entrance as a tolerated criminal. Were a criminal to be dismissed from a court simply because the judge was too sentimental to punish him, then the judge would be instantly removed from the bench, who had let loose guilty and impenitent criminals upon society; and the criminal himself, if there were any sense of rightness in him, would leave the court unsatisfied and ashamed. It is not in this easy way that the problem of sin can be settled and the relation of the sinner to the moral world adjusted. Conscience demands that law shall be honoured and vindicated even when the vindication must be at one's own cost, and conscience is a competent commentator upon the meaning of Christ's sufferings. When I see my Elder Brother leave the Father's house and all its peace and come into this life with all its sin in order to take on Him the burden of my guilt and the punishment of my sin, and when I see Him fulfilling the great law of righteousness and expiating upon the largest scale its penalty, then I also can see Him take the laws of the universe and write them in letters of gold upon the sky. If they were once broken, they have now been glorified; and if they demanded their just rights, they have now received them in His Cross and Passion, and as I behold this immense sacrifice, I can see dimly, no doubt, but quite certainly, that upon this ground the eternal Judge may lessen my liability not to righteousness but to punishment, and in

speaking forgiveness to me can give rest to the conscience within my heart.

Against this doctrine of forgiveness in its unrestrained freeness and its vicarious reference, it might be alleged that if forgiveness is to be given after this fashion to every man that asks it from a broken heart, the end will not be righteousness, but unrighteousness. If one be so lightly loosed from the penalty of his sins, and especially if this same penalty be laid upon another, then the forgiven person will argue, "I am forgiven, and I am free to sin, and however I sin I shall not be punished"; and so because grace has abounded sin will much more abound. This is in its own way logical, and sounds reasonable, but, fortunately for the dignity of human nature, life is not ruled by logic, and men are not always so bad as by logic they ought to be. If any one indeed does argue along this line, then it may fairly be presumed that he has never been forgiven. He is not in the state of mind upon which forgiveness depends, he is in the state of mind for which there is no forgiveness. He is not in the Christian state, "in Christ Jesus," he is in a state of unblushing and calculating selfishness. If any one imagines that he can so play fast and loose with the eternal law and ever run when he is in danger behind the Cross of Christ as to a city of refuge, then he will discover that the Cross will itself be the strictest of all laws and Christ the most merciless of all judges. If any man be certain of condemnation in this world and in the one to come, it is the man who proposes to make the sufferings of Christ the shelter of his own sins and to make the Son of God the servant of iniquity. With the vast majority of people forgiveness will not lead to a bad life, it will be the certain beginning of the best life, and that because we are men made in God's own image, however the image may have been defiled, and because we are not liars and not cowards. Out of a hundred men who have been forgiven by their fellow-men under circumstances

of great generosity there may be one who afterwards shall lift up his hand against his benefactor and shall trade upon his clemency, but we do not judge the race by one scoundrel out of a hundred, and it is fair to consider that man to be a slander upon human nature. Should you wish to make the other ninety and nine hate the sin wherewith they sinned and bind them to their benefactor in gratitude for all the years to come, then this has been accomplished by their forgiveness. Whatever sins afterwards they commit they will never again sin against the mercy which has been so ready and so unbounded. Within the lowest forms of human nature there remains an inherent nobility and susceptibility to gratitude, and to that the mercy of God has appealed and has not appealed in vain.

It is also to be remembered that the idea of free forgiveness leading to unholy living has been contradicted by history from end to end. The theology of Jesus' day was accustomed to deal out forgiveness in exchange for certain works, and the result was hypocrisy of life and hardness of heart. Jesus used to say, "Thy sins be forgiven, go in peace," to people who had sinned desperately, and the result was holiness. The Roman philosophers laid down laws of good living and severe conditions of life, and the end thereof was the astounding corruption of Roman society; St. Paul went everywhere preaching the grace of God, and the result thereof was the salvation of a decadent world. Tetzal at the Reformation beat his drum in the market place and sold the forgiveness of sins for money, and owing to the work of such men religious society had become rotten to the core and was nigh to destruction; Luther declared that faith obtained mercy without terms, and the Reformation was as much a reformation of morals as it was of doctrine. In our day there are two schools of preaching divided by a clear line. One says, Cultivate your character and repair your faults and discharge the charities

of life and aim at ideal ends. The other school says, You are a sinner, and have been beaten in the great spiritual conflict. God in Christ forgives the guilt of your sin and bids you go in peace. Live from that point forward not as the slave of the law, but as its servant for love's sake. Which school has been associated with the great revivals of religion, which school has fostered the deeper piety, which school has swept everything before it when its doctrine has been preached by a man of Christian compassion and stalwart faith?

Forgiveness has never been lightly bestowed, forgiveness is never bestowed alone. Before forgiveness repentance travels and ever afterwards repentance is the handmaid of mercy. With forgiveness comes holiness, and holiness is the only certain evidence of forgiveness. No man ever obtains forgiveness except at one place—before the cross of Christ—no man can ever verify forgiveness except in one place—within his own heart. No one is ready for forgiveness who has not repented, no one has received forgiveness who is not being sanctified.

JOHN WATSON.

STUDIES IN THE CRITICISM OF THE PSALMS.

I. PSALM XXXIX. (*continued*).

THE student will remember that in the present articles no veneration is accorded to the traditional or Massoretic text, which is far too defective to form the basis of critical translation and exegesis. Respect and veneration are two different things. Protestants highly respect the Pope as Pope, but reserve their veneration for the high moral standard and the maturity of moral experience which they believe or presume him to possess. So critical Protestants highly respect the Massoretic text as an extremely interesting historical document. They would have it edited with all the care and judgment that lifelong students of it can give. But they cannot base their translation and their exegesis upon it. To do so would not make the Massoretic text safer from destruction than it is. There is no fear that the old Hebrew Bible will disappear, nor is it difficult for the student to supply himself with a copy, and keep it open on his desk beside a critical edition of the particular book which he is studying. A critical exegesis, let it be stated once more, ought not to be based on a tenderly corrected Massoretic text. We must give up saying, "This or that correction is not necessary; let us stay by the Massoretic text." A tenderly corrected Massoretic text is an inconsistent medley, which has no right of existence, except as an exercise for an immature critic. The remarks in the Appendix on the Criticism of the Old Testament Text in Prof. H. P. Smith's new commentary on the Books of Samuel are opportune and sound. There is only one passage which, as it seems to me, falls short of preciseness. It is where the learned author says, "We cannot do without conjecture, but it should be our last resort, and it should not be put in the same class with emendation on the basis

of evidence, even the evidence of a version." Here there are several things to regret. (a) "It should be our last resort." This is in one sense perfectly true. The versions should be studied, next to the Massoretic text. But (1) the versions are not in the state in which they proceeded from the respective translators; (2) the translators were full of bias, partly traditional, partly personal, which drew them aside from accuracy; (3) partly out of an uncritical habit of mind, partly out of regard for the "congregation," they are prone to paraphrase; (4) like the redactors of the Hebrew text in all periods, they have sought to make sense where they could not find sense. (b) "It should not be put in the same class with emendation on the basis of evidence." But conjecture, as it has to be practised now, is not arbitrary guessing. It is the product of long study of the palæographical probabilities of corruption, and of the habits and dangers of scribes. This study is now becoming much more practised than was the case twenty years ago. But the remarks made in current commentaries and learned periodicals do occasionally show that the writers have not themselves got very far in the art of conjecture. This art must be slowly and painfully learned; a mere *πάρεργον*, a mere relief to more serious occupations, it cannot be. I am sure that if one half of the time spent on the versions had been devoted to the art of really critical conjecture, some of our best commentaries would deserve a more complete commendation. A large proportion of the corrections based on the "evidence" of versions are, in my opinion, undoubtedly wrong, and the quest of them may have hindered their authors from suggesting more probable corrections. The versions are valuable helps, but often dangerous guides.

I now turn to Psalm xxxix. 5 (Hebrew numeration). The little fragment of a Doubter's Psalm is at an end. Between v. 4 and v. 5 there is no connection whatever. To the reader who has followed me this is not strange, but to earlier

students it has been a difficulty. Riehm, the author of *Messianic Prophecy*, suggestively remarks: "With all its fervour the following prayer betrays nothing of the inward excitement so long repressed. We must therefore hold, with Herder, that the psalmist looks back on the expressions of complaint which had been forced from him, *without quoting them*. The psalm (*i.e.* the remainder of the psalm) is the prayer, which these (unquoted) expressions occasioned." It can hardly be said that this is a natural view; but it certainly does show the exegetical honesty of the writer. As the text stands, the plain man will naturally think that "Make me to know mine end," etc. (v. 5), are the words which the much-trying psalmist "spoke with his tongue" (v. 4). And yet the rest of the psalm is so inconsistent with the opening verses that Riehm is obliged to maintain that verses 5-13 are a quotation of a subsequent prayer which presents not a single trace of the dangerous excitement recorded in verses 2-4. The Revised Version renders v. 5 [4] thus:

LORD, make me to know mine end,
And the measure of my days, what it is;
Let me know how frail I am.

"Frail" is perhaps not the happiest word, but the older version gave it, and the Revisers retain it. A frail vessel may cross the sea many times if carefully managed; but if its materials contain the end of decay, it must soon perish. "Short-lived," "fleeting," are the alternative words which the context suggests, and yet the true word is different. For there is no word in Hebrew bearing either of these meanings, which could have been corrupted into חַדֵּל *ḥādēl*. No such word as *ḥādēl* exists. Isaiah liii. 3 is the only other passage in which the received text presents the word: "He was despised and *rejected* (R.V. marg. *for-saken*) of men," is the rendering of our Bible. But corruption has been very properly suspected (see Haupt's

Sacred Books of the Old Testament, Hebrew edition). In the psalm before us parallelism decides against the current reading; what it prescribes for our acceptance is, "Let me know what my lifetime is."¹ The Prayer-Book version, by a happy guess, actually gives ". . . how long I have to live." The form of correction to be preferred is, מִהַחֲלָדִי אֲדַנֵּי, "(Let me know) what my lifetime is, O Lord." It will now be seen how beautifully *v.* 6 joins on.

Driver renders it thus, with the older and some of the newer critics :

Behold, thou hast made my days as handbreadths ;
And my time is as nothing in Thy sight :
Surely every man, (though) standing firm, is altogether vanity.

This agrees with the Revised Version, except that it adopts from R.V.'s margin as the rendering of the word נָצַב, "standing firm." Also with Hupfeld and Delitzsch, who render line 3 :

Yea, a mere breath is every man, however firm he may stand.

So too De Witt, the most unbending of conservatives in questions of text :

Yea, all men are only a breath, even when standing most firmly.

But when we look closely, we see several great difficulties. (1) In *v.* 12 the received text gives simply "Surely every man is vanity"; "standing firm" and "altogether" have disappeared. (2) The Hebrew has literally, "Surely, all vanity all man standing" (LXX. has ζῶν). One of these "alls" is clearly superfluous, and Aquila, Symmachus, and

¹ Cf. Isa. xxxviii. 11b, where the English Bible gives, "I shall behold man no more with the inhabitants of the world," but where R.V. marg. gives, "Or [when I am] among them that have ceased to be." The supposed Hebrew word is interpreted "cessation," *i.e.* "the place where being ceases" (Sheol). It is usual to read *hālēd*, and to render "the world." There is, however, a better view. Cf. also Ps. lxxxix. 48 [47], where Bāthgen renders, "Remember, O Lord (אֲדַנֵּי for אֲדַנֵּי), "what life is," but where חֲלָדִי, "my life," is entirely correct (not חֲלָדִי). This passage and xxxix. 5c. are completely parallel.

many MSS. are without it. (3) The epithet "standing," or "standing firm," introduces a qualification of a statement which obviously will not stand any qualification. (4) The passage quoted by commentators in explanation of נָצַב (Zech. xi. 6) is certainly not free from corruption; הַנֶּעֱצָבָה should obviously be הַנֶּעֱצָבָה. Bâthgen therefore deserves credit for his attempt to correct the text gently. He reads, "Every man stands as a mere breath." König, the eminent grammarian, also adopts this. It has no doubt the support of an ancient version, but surely it is as "subjective" as anything can be. The evidence of the text is before us; all we have to do is to scan it intelligently. "Selah" (סלה), as several times in the Psalms, is a part of the text; we are not to stop short at נָצַב סלה. נָצַב סלה is a corruption of בְּצִלְמֹת [אֵד], with which *v.* 7 begins. The words were written twice over in error; then the first-written words became corrupted. כֹּל before הַבֵּל is also wrong; כֹּ was dittographed (cf. Pesh.); then ל was inserted by assimilation to כֹּל-אָדָם. Render the second stanza thus :

Surely [like a few] handbreadths
 Thou hast made my days;
 My lifetime is as nothing before thee;
 What mere vanity are all men!

Verse 6 appears thus in Kirkpatrick's *Psalms* (Cambridge School and College Bible) :

Only as a phantom doth each walk to and fro;
 Only for vanity do they turmoil;
 One heapeth up, and he will not know who doth gather the hoard.

"Man," this scholar remarks, "is an unsubstantial phantom (or *shadow*, lit. *image*), lxxiii. 20 : *σκιάς ὄψαρ*, "a dream of shadow," as Pindar calls him (Pyth. viii. 95). With unreal aim and unenduring result do men disturb themselves." The truth is an important one, and I have long supposed it to be contained in the words. But the

text of Psalm lxxiii. 20 is unfortunately in sore need of correction. The only sure senses of צֶלֶם are "image, sketch, model"; nor is the idiom called *Beth essentia* natural here. An anonymous writer in a now extinct theological magazine has already corrected the text. Read אֵיךְ בְּצִלְמוֹת הַלֵּךְ אִישׁ. This is confirmed by my independent correction of the text of v. 12. The right sense had already been given by Ibn Janâh. The "deep gloom" spoken of is that in which all thoughtful men "walk" until the veil which shrouds the future is in some way rent. Render the third and fourth stanzas thus :

Surely in deep gloom does man walk ;
 His turmoil is for mere vanity ;
 He piles up [silver], and cannot tell
 Who may make it his prize.

And now, Lord, what wait I for ?
 In thee is my hope.
 From all my transgressions [absolve me,
 From my distresses] set me free.

This arrangement, it will be noticed, leaves half of v. 9 (8) unprovided for. In truth, the verse division is very often wrong. To alter it, however, would be rash until the text has been revised. It is such a revision which I have attempted ; I am therefore justified in disregarding the traditional verse. A "verse" properly so called is what the ordinary reader would call a line. The stanzas being of two verses (lines) each, the last portion of v. 9 (8) necessarily falls into a different stanza from the first part.

The material we have at our disposal for the fifth stanza appears thus in Wellhausen and Furness's version :

Make me not the scorn of the reprobate.
 I am dumb, I open not my mouth ;
 For it is thou who hast done it.

This agrees with Driver's version, except that Wellhausen delegates v. 10 (9) to the margin as an interpolation. To

justify this treatment of *v.* 10 he gives the following note in the Hebrew edition :

The tenor of *vv.* 11 ff. shows no difference in time and tone from that of *vv.* 5-9; *v.* 11 is a simple continuation of *v.* 9, and stands in the closest connection with it. Ver. 10, on the other hand, breaks the connection badly. Its origin cannot be ascertained.

Bäthgen, on the other hand, and all other critics, retain the passage. But the note of the former scholar should stimulate reflection. I condense it because it is not very clearly expressed :

As long as the Psalmist looked only at the wicked, his complaints were always liable to burst out afresh (*vv.* 3, 4). True peace of mind did not come to him till he looked up to God, the appointer of his sufferings.

Wellhausen's interpolation-theory is the natural development of Bäthgen's exposition. נאלמתי in *v.* 10, if genuine, and all that belongs to it, must be an interpolation, influenced by *vv.* 3, 4. But Bäthgen and Wellhausen are too precipitate. They should have taken the structure of the poem into consideration, and also have scanned the material in *v.* 10 more closely. The psalm is not nearly as formless as these critics suppose, and here, as elsewhere in doubtful passages, we must consider the possibility that the editor may have been at work, making sense as well as he could out of partly effaced characters. The true reading is probably not unlike this: תֵּאלְמָנָה שְׁפִיתִי שָׁקֵר הַדְּבָרוֹת עֶשֶׂק (cf. xxxi. 19, Isa. lix. 13). נ and פ are both liable to be written for ש. An imperfect ק might be taken for a ת. נל was inserted to make sense. The fifth stanza should run :

To the insulting of the impious [people]
Do not thou expose me;
Stricken dumb be the lying lips
Which speak of oppression!

Now the difficulties are removed; there is parallelism both of form and of idea.

As material for the sixth stanza we have words thus rendered by Driver:

Remove thy stroke from off me:
By the hostility of thy hand I am consumed.

Wellhausen and Furness agree, but they put a (?) after "attack" (=Driver's "hostility"). The material is rather scanty, and there is one word which is not known elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew. In the Psalms, which are intended for the faithful community at large, and where the ideas and images are so often repeated, we are bound to look at *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* with suspicion. There is no sufficient justification for the rendering "hostility." The LXX. has *ἀπὸ τῆς ἰσχυοῦς*, which has suggested *מִגְבוּרַת*. But God's heroic strength (*גבורה*) should not cause terror. *בְּתוֹכָהּ*, "through the chastisement (of)," would be better. But metre suggests, *כִּי הִנְהַתָּ [עָלַי] יָדְךָ*. At the close, *כְּלִיתִי* should be *נִבְהַלְתִּי* (vi. 2, 3). *נ* dropped out after *אֲנִי*. The sense now obtained is excellent. In l. 1 I insert *וְשִׁבְטְךָ* and *הִרְחַק*. Words here and there have certainly dropped out of not a few of the Psalms.

Withdraw [thy rod] from me,
[Remove far away] thy stroke;
For thou hast laid thy hand [upon me],
I am terror-stricken.

Verse 12 may be literally rendered thus:

With chastisements for guilt thou disciplinest a man,
And makest to melt away, moth-like, his precious things.
What mere vanity are all men!

According to Delitzsch, the psalmist "raises what has happened to himself into a universal fact of experience." Surely a very strange transition in such a fervent personal supplication! Still, if the Hebrew were good, and the sense clear, we might accept it. But the Hebrew is not good,

and the sense is not clear. "Chastisements for guilt" is unnatural; of course, the chastisements spoken of were "for guilt"; the context proves this. Then, in l. 2, where is the parallelism? And is the moth the destroying agent (so Delitzsch) or the thing destroyed (so Bähgen)? Obviously there is corruption. The versions do not help us except in one particular in l. 2. So much is clear—that the personal complaint ought to be continued, and that *v.* 12 ought to contain two striking figures. Note also the Pask after עון, the occurrence of which, in this psalm, as often elsewhere, coincides with the appearance of textual corruption. Let us write the letters continuously as far as the Pask, and scan them closely, בתוכחותעלעון. Remembering what goes before and what follows after, can we hesitate to read this, בַּתּוֹךְ צְלָמוֹת עוֹן however remains. Connect it with the next group of letters, so producing עוֹנִיסֵרֶת. Here a practised eye discerns at once מִשְׁשֵׁתִי מ; גי became מ; ש passed into ס and עו; ר became י. איש is unaccounted for, but we can make use of it in the next line. Observe the parallelism which now emerges into view between *v.* 12, l. 1, and *v.* 7, l. 1 (rather, say, between line 5 and line 13 of Psalm lxxxix.*b*).

Next take איש ותמס כעש חמודו. This is too much for the second part of *v.* 12, l. 1 (rather, line 13). Part of it must belong to l. 14. תמס occurs once again in the Psalms, viz. in lviii. 9. Both passages are figurative, and in both תמס can only be explained as a slightly corrupted fragment of תַּנְשֵׁמֹת, "screech-owls." In Isaiah lix. 10 the same word for "owls" (ת is *not*, as Tristram thought, the ibis) has become אֲשִׁמְנִים, parallel to which is גִּשְׁף, a fragment of יִגְשָׁף. After making this correction, we see at once that איש must have arisen from גִּמְשֵׁלְתִי ל. We have now only to explain חמודו. This is not quite long enough for l. 13*a*. The LXX. has ὡς ἀράχνη = כעכביש. In truth, עש is several times miswritten for עכביש, as the articles "Moth"

and "Spider" in Messrs. A. & C. Black's *Encyclopædia Biblica* will probably show. This puts us on the right track. Surely כַּעַשׁ is the remnant of כְּקַרְיֵי עֶבְבֵי־שׁ (see Isa. lix. 5; Hos. viii. 6, as Dr. Paul Ruben has corrected, after Quinta in Origen's Hexapla). הַמִּוֹדֵי should of course be הַמִּוֹדִי. The result will not, I hope, be thought too specious to be correct. Some reward of toil may surely be looked for. Render therefore :

In the midst of deep gloom I grope,
I am become like the owls;
All that I have prized is as spiders' webs;
What mere vanity are all men!

Only one correction remains; Hupfeld, Grätz and Bâthgen have already made it. For הַשֵּׁעַ, "besmear," read שְׁעָה (cf. Job vii. 19, xiv. 6, and especially x. 20, where שִׁית should be שְׁעָה). The last two stanzas may be rendered thus :

Hear my prayer, O Yahwè;
Hearken to my cry;
Hold not thy peace at my tears;
* * * *
For I am a sojourner beside thee,
Without rights, like all my fathers.
Avert thy frown that I may be cheerful again
Before I go hence and cease to be.

The reader has now before him almost all that I have to say on the text-criticism of Psalm xxxix. To form a decided opinion of it is hardly possible for any one who has not had much training in the sort of textual criticism which I have described. But perhaps these two articles may serve to open some minds to a new conception of the meaning of text-criticism as applied to the poetical and prophetic books of the Old Testament. There are no doubt parts of the historical books which are not less deeply corrupt, and yet are capable of being corrected by similar methods (such a passage is 1 Kings xi. 14-20). But on the

whole the text of the narrative books is much better than that of the poetical and prophetic Scriptures. We must not, of course, dogmatize too much, such being the state of the case. But there is considerably more reason for a textual critic to be confident as regards the Psalms than as regards the prophets, because of the large amount of repetition natural to a church hymn book. There is much to be gained, and little to be lost, by the procedure here recommended and practised. All those strange, rough passages, which so startle an intelligent Englishman when he hears them sung in church, can be corrected. Let those who undertake the task of correcting them have a fair hearing, and let one of them be believed when he says that the Psalms are more coherent and intelligible, and therefore surely more beautiful, than our predecessors have supposed.

It is not my present object to expound the 39th Psalm. I would certainly much rather expound the text as here presented than that which, after all the efforts of scholars to smooth away its roughnesses, is still so difficult to comprehend. But I must ask leave to point out the remarkable parallelism between Psalm xxxix. 12 [11] as here presented and Isaiah lix. 10. I presume that Psalm xxxix.*b* and Isaiah lix. 1-15*a* were written about the same time. In my *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, pp. 328-334, I have discussed the chronological question, but I was not then aware of the interesting parallel to be found in the second part of Psalm xxxix. The parallel in Job x. 20 and Psalm xxxix. 14 has long been known. The post-Exilic origin of Psalm xxxix.*b* is therefore decided. And there is now reason to think that the special subject of the author's grief was the delay of the Messianic judgment. The religious character of Jewish patriotism is more and more wonderful the more we reflect upon it.

T. K. CHEYNE.

STUDIES IN THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

III.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS AND THE SPIRIT.¹

THE Christian life, as conceived by St. Paul, is founded upon the forgiveness of sin. From condemnation and enmity against God to justification or peace with God is a step across an impassable gulf: we cannot make it nor attempt it; but God's redemptive love and power has accomplished it for us. Our part there is the passive one of faith. Once this step is taken, our feet are planted on the road to salvation; the remainder of our way is traversed under the assured protection of the God who has begun and will complete His work. "Faithful is He that called you, who will also accomplish." "Who shall separate us from Christ's love?"

I.

But is our warfare already accomplished now that our iniquity is pardoned? Is our life to be a primrose path to heaven? and have we an amnesty prospective as well as retrospective? What is the new life to be? What and whence are its obligations?

St. Paul answers this question in vi.-viii. And first, assuming that by baptism we are united not only with Christ, but specifically with His death, he draws out the moral demand which is thus involved, viz., a death to sin, the death of our old self, the destruction of the power of sin over the body. Our old self is dead; a new self takes

¹ Since the following pages were written, Canon Gore's Lectures on the Epistle have appeared. I have decided to abstain from any discussion of his views on this portion of the Epistle, but am glad to find my views on fundamental points in substantial agreement with Mr. Gore's.

its place, animated by a new vital energy, *καινότης ζωῆς*, which is to be the sphere of a wholly new course of conduct. As death no longer wields power over the risen Christ, so sin will no longer wield power over us; the sharp moral summons of vi. 12-14 is not a repetition of the old and morally inoperative commands of law; it is a summons that will take effect; for law is gone and a transforming influence has come in its place. "Sin will not lord it over you, for ye are *not under law*, but under grace."

This is a hard saying, a paradox, and has for long stretches of time been tacitly set aside in church teaching. The A.V. dilutes it by the article "*the Law*," as though St. Paul referred merely to the supersession of the Mosaic Law, not to that of Law as such. But this dilution sacrifices all that is characteristic of St. Paul's meaning. The writer to the Hebrews has been far more readily understood by Churchmen in his treatment of the Law than has St. Paul. The Epistle to the Hebrews treats of the abrogation of the Jewish Law in respect of its content; St. Paul in respect of its character *as Law*; in Hebrews, it is the evanescence of the *ceremonial* Law that is insisted on; in Romans, Law is considered as a factor in the *moral* life, and as such is pronounced to have ended in Christ: *τέλος νόμου Χριστός*—"Christ is an end of Law unto righteousness to whosoever believeth." This is the paradox. For does not an end of "Law-as-such" mean a dissolution of moral obligation? That such a misconception was very natural, we see from the closely following question, *ἀμαρτήσωμεν ὅτι οὐκ ἔσμεν ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ χάριν*; St. Paul's answer is not, in the first instance, an explanation of his paradox. He tells us not what he means, but what he does not mean. I do not stop to analyse more fully than I did in the first paper of this series the passage vi. 15-end.¹ But at the cost of

¹ See EXPOSITOR for January, 1899.

using a conception which he really regards as lowering and unworthy, he makes his meaning clear even to the dullest spiritual apprehension. By renouncing the slavery of sin you *ipso facto* became *slaves* to righteousness, slaves to God. St. Paul leaves us in no doubt or confusion on this most vital point. The obedience of the Christian to God is as absolute as that of the slave—the mere living implement—to his master. Then in a condensed passage (vii. 1-4), where the *subsidiary* illustration of marriage dissolved by death infiltrates into the *main* simile of death as removing a man from the jurisdiction of law [the idea of marriage to the law, or, still more, that of marriage to the old self, is, I venture to say, quite alien to the context], St. Paul insists that to the Christian death to law, and therefore to sin, is a fact involved in union with the death of Christ. The pregnant contrast between the old state and the new (vv. 5, 6) maps out the course of the coming analysis or psychology of the Christian life (vii. 7-viii.).

II.

Here we pause to consider the great paradox. Is it really true of a Christian man that he is not under Law, but under Grace? What is meant by Law here? In a sense, St. Paul speaks of himself as under a Law—*μὴ ὦν ἄνομος θεοῦ, ἀλλ' ἔννομος Χριστοῦ* (1 Cor. ix. 21). The determinant moral motive power of the Christian life is *ὁ νόμος τοῦ πνεύματος τῆς ζωῆς*. But law in this sense is not law regarded as a code, not law regarded as an injunction imposed from without. It is an acquired or implanted instinct of obedience, engraved upon the heart, working from within, identified with the personality of the spiritual man. He obeys because he has learned, as Augustine learned, from the psalmist, “*bonum est mihi adhaerere Deo.*” The slave obeys blindly, because he is ordered; the son, the friend, enters into his father's or his

sovereign's Ends, and pursues them as his own. "Henceforth I call you not slaves, but friends; for the slave knoweth not what his master doeth."

Well, then, understand Law in its literal sense, as a body of commands simply imposed, not in its adapted sense, as a principle of action which has become assimilated as part of oneself—and in that sense St. Paul meant what he said when he tells the Christian that he is not under Law, but under Grace.

Well, then, is it true of us Christians? Yes,—and no! Ideally, yes; in practice, alas, hardly. If we are Christians as we ought to be, yes. But what are we? To many of us who bear the Christian name always—to every Christian surely, in his lower moments—it might be said with more truth, "Ye are not under Grace, but under Law." Yet the free life of grace is the ideal; the servile, graceless, reluctant bondage of law the slough of despond, in which we may still be, but in which we are forbidden to acquiesce. To live the Christian life is to be under Grace; to be under Law is to fall short, and to fail. The principle is very far-reaching in its application; it touches all departments of Christian life and practice. To take one instance in passing. The institutions of the catholic Church, her laws, her definitions, her authority—all these things are ours. They are God's gifts, and our glorious heritage! They are comprised in God's grace. Ideally they are to be accepted by us freely as such; practically they assume the character of Law, imposed upon us by sanction and authority. Man's nature being what it is, this is inevitable; and there are many who are content to receive them simply in this way. But let us not forget that this falls short of the ideal, for here, too, the axiom holds good: "Ye are not under law but under grace." This consideration will not tempt us to despise or reject these gifts of God, but it will teach us a new attitude toward them. They are ours; not we

theirs. "All things are ours . . . but we Christ's, and Christ God's."

I say, then, that this is an *ideal* truth that St. Paul lays down, but one that in practice is too apt to be not true, because of the infirmity of our flesh. And in reading the next section, where, employing, as I have said, a method of difference, St. Paul considers the life of man under law, in order that he may bring out by contrast the characteristics of the new life of the Spirit and of grace, what I have tried to point out will remove the embarrassing pressure of an ancient controversy. We are asked, Can chapter vii. 7-25 be regarded *simply* as a description of man viewed as unregenerate? Is not the gloomy picture of inner conflict ending in failure and subjection to sin too truly characteristic of the experience of the Christian? The answer is this: The state described in this chapter is true of the Christian just exactly in so far as St. Paul's great paradox fails in his case to hold good. It describes man under law, not man under grace. So far as we *are* still ὑπὸ νόμον, still ἐν τῇ σαρκί, still ἐν παλαιότητι γράμματος, still not "dead to that wherein we were held"—so far we are described by vii. 7-25. But in that description the dominant force of the Christian life, *the Spirit*, is conspicuously absent; to take vii. 7-25 of the typical Christian life, is to fix upon St. Paul a craven ideal of that life, which he defies in the triumphant cry of victory, ἁμαρτία ὑμῶν οὐ κυριεύσει· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ὑπὸ νόμον, ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριτι.

III.

In chapter viii., then, St. Paul dismisses the dominant moral factor conspicuous in vii. 7-25—the Law, and replaces the factor he had temporarily withdrawn—the indwelling Christ, the Spirit; and now again, and at last, we see the Righteousness of Faith at work. Now, accordingly, he dismisses the idea of slavery in favour of the true

secret of Christian obedience, that of sonship. "Ye received the Spirit"—that he appeals to as a fact of his readers' experience. "Well, then, in receiving the Spirit, you received not a spirit of timorous, retrogressive slavery, but one of adoption." You are "not in flesh, but in spirit," "the Spirit of God," "the Spirit of Christ," "dwells in you," "you are Christ's," "Christ is in you," "the Spirit of God is in you"—all variant phrases descriptive of the indwelling of Christ, identical with the indwelling of the Spirit.

I cut short what I should have wished to say of the difficult and weighty opening paragraphs of this chapter; I omit a discussion of its second part—the sublime survey of the Christian life reproducing and carrying to the higher plane he has now reached the simpler but not less sublime thought of v. 1-11,—in order to put together briefly St. Paul's doctrine of the Spirit as the dominant factor of the Christian life and of the spiritual man.

The use of the word *πνεῦμα* in St. Paul is notoriously difficult. There is, firstly, what may be called its purely *theological* sense, of the Holy Spirit—τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ, as in the Apostolic Benediction (2 Cor. xiii. 14), and in Romans viii. 11-26 sqq. (τὸ πνεῦμα). The chief difficulty here belongs rather to other epistles than to Romans, viz., the apparent identification of the Spirit with Christ. The main passage is, of course, 2 Corinthians iii. 17, 18. The keynote struck there is strongly persistent in language¹ which meets us in the Church down to the end of the 4th century. With our minds cleared by the dogmatic decisions of the Church's councils, this language is most startling; all I will remark is that the strong tendency to identify the (pre-existent or the) glorified Christ with the Spirit is too contrary to the plain distinction

¹ Vid. Swete in *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, 114, 115 et passim, s.v. Holy Ghost.

between the two Holy Persons in the Godhead in other passages of the New Testament, and the Church's general mind from the first, to have arisen without some strong cause. That cause is this: that the doctrine of the Holy Spirit was given at first not as an abstract doctrine, but as a fact in experience. The indwelling Christ and the indwelling Spirit *were* one fact, one thing, and, as we have seen, are spoken of by St. Paul convertibly. Beginning from a formulated theology of the Holy Trinity, the two could never be confused; but beginning from the facts of Christian experience, they were but slowly distinguished.

Then there is the purely psychological sense of *πνεῦμα*, designating an universal and natural element in the constitution of man. This use is not frequent, but its existence is important. (See 1 Cor. v. 5; 2 Cor. vii. 1). In this sense it merges into the idea of *ψυχή*, and is closely associated with *νοῦς*—still more so with *ὁ ἔσω ἄνθρωπος*. It seems to correspond to our ordinary use of the word "soul" (and a frequent use of "spirit"), denoting the seat of personality, that which constitutes individuality, which at once needs, and is susceptible of "salvation," or, under another aspect, that which distinguishes the man from the animal—the *ψυχή λογική* of later orthodox theology. 1 Thessalonians v. 23 is, I think, too hastily used as expressing a trichotomous psychology, such as Apollinarius afterwards applied to the doctrine of the Incarnation.

In this sense of *πνεῦμα*, man as such is spiritual, even the unspiritual man is a spiritual being.

There remains the sense in which *πνεῦμα* is distinctive of the spiritual man as contrasted with the carnal, *ψυχικός* or *σαρκικός*. This lies between the psychological and the theological use of the word, and connects the two. It is the most difficult use of the word. First, as compared with the purely psychological. The latter denotes rather a capacity than a state of man. Every man is in his

personality spiritual, or else he would be incapable of responding to the inward influence of the Spirit of God; but his spiritual character is potential, latent, ineffective. Only contact with the Holy Spirit of God develops this potency into active reality. When, and in proportion as, this is the case, man becomes spiritual in the true sense, only then can his spiritual nature assert and exercise its natural supremacy over will and action; only then is the *ἔσω ἄνθρωπος* renewed, the assent of the intellect to God's law transformed into the energy of holy *will*, good *intention* made effective—*καὶ τὸ θέλειν καὶ τὸ ἐνεργεῖν*: only then is man no longer under Law, but under Grace.

This is the work of the Holy Spirit—the work of God in man, the fruit of the indwelling Christ. But it consists not in the addition of a new something to the constitution of the soul, but in the invigoration, the calling out into life and action, of what God had created in man as a constituent of his being. When Paul purposed *ἐν τῷ πνεύματι* to do this or that, what is meant is that he purposed in *his* spirit, but his spirit is the vehicle of the Spirit of God. To walk in the Spirit is to live in the highest capacity of our nature; but that highest capacity is but a shadow of a name apart from the indwelling Christ, apart from “the Lord the Spirit.” So that in Romans viii. the regenerate spirit of man and the inhabiting Spirit of God are spoken of in one breath again and again, as though they were one and the same (viii. 9, 15, 16, etc.), and yet the separate existence (viii. 2, 4), the Personality (viii. 26 sqq.) of the Divine Spirit makes itself felt through the whole passage from beginning to end. Union with Christ is a fact founded upon faith, or on baptism the concrete act of faith; but *conscious* union with Christ is the work of the Spirit. Conscious union with Christ the Son of God brings with it the reality and the consciousness of sonship on our part. The Spirit in us cries *Ἀββᾶ ὁ πατήρ*.

IV.

The Filial Spirit is, firstly, the spring of *obedience*. Transformed from within, the outward life is changed; the Christian obeys with the absolute submissiveness of a slave, but in no spirit of slavery; he is not a slave, but a son.

The Filial Spirit is, secondly, the spring of buoyancy in the face of present disheartenment and pain. If sons, then heirs; the Spirit is the actual ἀπαρχή, the first incoming of the inheritance of final redemption, the redemption even of our physical being, when the sons of God will at last be seen as they really are. The Spirit, then, is at once the motive power of moral regeneration now, and the first instalment—ἀρραβών—of consummated salvation hereafter.

To adequately work out this theme would far transcend our limits. I would ask you to combine with this chapter the other and earlier *locus classicus* on the Holy Spirit as the dominant factor of the Christian life in 1 Corinthians ii. 6-16. The two passages have much in common; *e.g.*, the thought of the Spirit of God as mediating between the unsearchable consciousness of God and the dim, embarrassed, bewildered spirit of man even at his best, carrying up from man a prayer which transcends any thought he is able to articulate, bringing down from God the certainty of what God has in store for "them that love Him." The latter phrase is common to both passages; it is a thought St. Paul but rarely ventures to put into words; he dwells more frequently and by preference on the more constant certitude of God's love for us revealed in Christ.

I go no farther, but pause for one moment to draw attention to the individualism of St. Paul's treatment. He brings man to Christ through faith, assures him of peace with God, shows him that where flesh and blood, even under the illumination of God's law, cannot but fail,

he is now enabled to succeed; impresses upon him the double office of the Spirit as the restorer of the moral life and the guarantee of hope,—all without meaning except in so far as it is made a matter of individual experience. The soul, Christ, and God—these are the three great realities of the entire sequence of thought. The paradox of Law and Grace is held fast. What works in upon man from without cannot save him; the Spirit restores him, working outward from within. Direct access of the individual soul to God through Christ, direct control of the life by the inward light of the Spirit—"all taught of God"—that is St. Paul's ideal, and it is that of the prophets too (Jer. xxxi. 31 sqq.).

The spiritual man is enthroned where none can challenge him: "He judgeth of all things, while he himself is judged of none." That is St. Paul's individualism, and to water it down is to miss the height of his ideal.

But it may be and has been misconceived and abused. Popes have externalised it, anabaptists have caricatured it. St. Paul does not say that the individual is the measure of all things, but that the *spiritual* man is judged of none—"the wind bloweth where it listeth." Such a principle is incapable of abuse, because abuse of it *ipso facto* marks us out as not spiritual. To violate God's Law shows that we are not under Grace. The freedom of the Christian from Law, the individualism of the spiritual man, are fundamental truths, but they are ideals. Far from being a charter to laxity or caprice, they demand not compliance, but transformation, and therefore are more exacting than any code, however strict in its prescriptions. To ignore these ideals is to open the door to some "working substitute"¹ for the Christianity of St. Paul. To presume upon them is to take "the highest room" in the feast of God, to claim "to be rich," and "to reign without" the Apostle.

¹ The phrase is from Archbishop Benson, *Christ and His Times*.

St. Paul asserts a true individualism, but he excludes the false. He has no express occasion to do this in the Epistle to the Romans. His passing cautions in viii. 1-10 are to be noted, also the obligations of the Christian toward the Church and toward the State in xii., xiii., and of the strong toward the weak in xiv.

But the essential limitation of St. Paul's individualism springs from the very root and source of that individualism itself. We can study it best in 1 Corinthians, where the principle is worked out twice over¹—in connexion with *εἰδωλόθυτα* and in connexion with the use of spiritual gifts. The keystone of the former subject is the chapter on Self-limitation (1 Cor. ix.), of the latter that on Charity (1 Cor. xiii.). If our freedom in Christ is real, we shall be foremost in building up His kingdom. But all church life, all social activity, is of this world unless it has its root in true individualism—in individual pardon, individual freedom in the Spirit, individual regeneration.

A. ROBERTSON.

¹ I hope to work this out more fully in a paper supplementary to this series.

THE GENESIS OF DEUTERONOMY.

V.

III.—*Conclusion.*

HITHERTO in examining the "basis" and "claims" of criticism our investigation has been largely negative. We are now, however, in a position to offer positive reasons for rejecting the theory of Deuteronomy's late origin.

The key to the solution of the whole problem is, in our judgment, to be found in the introduction (Deut. 1. 1-5). The very first verse of the book is confessedly an enigma on the hypothesis of a late origin.¹ It reads: "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond Jordan; in the wilderness, in the Arabah over against Suph, between Paran and Tophel and Laban and Hazereth and Dizahab." Two different localities apparently are here described: (a) "over Jordan" (v. 1a), and (b) "in the wilderness, etc." (v. 1b). Whoever wrote this verse evidently believed that Moses delivered the orations which follow² twice. But would a late editor have added such a superscription?

The expression "in the wilderness," בְּמִדְבָּר, can hardly refer to Moab, or to the desert east of Moab (as Knobel, cf. Num. 21. 11, 13), the east of the Jordan being conceived of as a part of the wilderness south of Canaan, as a kind of ideal unity in contrast with Canaan. It is certainly more natural to think of the desert of Arabia Petraea stretching south of the Dead Sea towards

¹ Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 5.

² There is little gained by making the initial word אֵלֶּה point backward (as Knobel, Klostermann, Green, and others) to the laws in Numbers 10. 11-36; 13., in which case Deuteronomy 1. 1 would form a link of connection between the antecedent legislation in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and that in Deuteronomy.

the Sinaitic peninsula.¹ This view is confirmed by the geographical designations which follow in the same verse, and which were probably intended to define the wilderness spoken of more closely. Thus the Arabah here alludes most probably to that portion of Palestine's deep depression lying between the Dead Sea and the Gulf of Akabah. The expression "over against Suph" is equivalent to "over against the Red Sea," as the Samaritan and some ancient versions have it. "Paran" is not improbably the modern *Feiran* situated at the base of Jebel Serbail (cf. Num. 10. 12; also 1 Kings 11. 18); "Tophel" is supposed to be on the eastern slopes of Edom; "Laban was probably on the route between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea (cf. Num. 33. 20); "HazerOTH" was the place where Miriam and Aaron were punished for sedition, and from which Israel entered the wilderness of Paran, north-east of Mount Sinai (cf. Num. 11. 35; 12. 16); "Dizahab" is possibly to be identified with a place by the same name, east of Sinai, on the shore of the Gulf of Akabah. Now while many of these places are unknown to us to-day, and their location, accordingly, still remains uncertain, still, what evidence we do possess concerning them all points in one direction, viz., not to the district "over Jordan," but to the desert between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea. Hence we may infer that they were most probably mere caravan stations on the desert route of travel.

This view is supported by *v. 2*, which, unless it was intended to explain *v. 1b*, is a greater enigma even than *v. 1*. It reads: "There are eleven days (caravan travelling) from Horeb by the Mount Seir road unto Kadesh-barnea." But why should we here be told the distance between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea if but one geographical situation is described in *v. 1*, and that the

¹ So Oettli, *Das Deut. u. die Bücher Jos. u. Richter*, 1833, p. 21. Also Dillmann, iii. p. 232.

region "over Jordan"? There certainly must have been some reason for its insertion just here. The expression "by the Mount Seir road" probably suggests the *direction* by which Israel made the journey; so that the verse probably means, "By the Mount Seir route ordinary caravans cover the distance from Horeb to Kadesh-barnea in eleven days."¹

In *vv.* 3-5 the author informs us, further, that the law which Moses had received in commandment from the Lord, he began to *expound* in the last month of the fortieth year in Moab. The verb *בִּיָּר* (*v.* 5), which is used elsewhere in the Old Testament only in Deuteronomy 27. 8, and Habakkuk 2. 2, and means "to engrave," "to expound," "to make clear,"² is thus another witness to our interpretation of *v.* 1, for it suggests that Moses began in the fortieth year to *expound* law which he had given before. Hence, from these introductory statements in Deuteronomy 1. 1-5, we may, tentatively at least, deduce the following conclusions: (1) That in the opinion of the author or editor, the orations contained in the book of Deuteronomy were *spoken twice*—once in Moab, and once on the way between Horeb and Kadesh-barnea. (2) That the author of these verses was evidently acquainted with the caravan stations of the Sinaitic peninsula, also with the chief events which happened to Israel during the forty years of wilderness wandering, and consequently that the book of Deuteronomy probably received (approximately) its present form not long subsequent to the death of Moses. Can these conclusions be substantiated? We believe they can.

1. *Reasons for supposing that the bulk of Deuteronomy was spoken twice.*

¹ This does not require us, of course, to think that the children of Israel actually travelled the distance in eleven days, or made but eleven encampments. Cf. Trumbull, *Kadesh-barnea*, 1834, pp. 74 ff. and 309.

² Cf. König, *Einleitung in das A.T.*, 1893, p. 137.

(1) Because of the author's attempt to identify the *new* generation in Moab with their fathers, with whom God had made a covenant at Sinai. From Numbers 14. 23, 29-33, we know that all the children of Israel "from twenty years old and upward" (except Caleb and Joshua) had died in the wilderness; Moses, in Moab, accordingly, was given the task of instructing a new generation, who, though many of them came out of Egypt in their boyhood and had witnessed the thunders of Horeb, yet had grown up in the desert during the forty years of wandering, and cared too little, perhaps, for the laws given to their fathers. Hence to them the great Lawgiver declares, "The Lord made not this covenant with our fathers (the patriarchs), but with us, *even us, who are all of us here alive this day*" (5. 3). That is, with us, who are *still living*, who have survived the desert discipline, God made the covenant at Sinai.

(2) Because of the *historical* introduction in chapters 1.-4. By prefixing an historical introduction, the author intensifies the force of the original Deuteronomic exhortations contained in chapters 5.-26. Bits of history are occasionally also to be found in other portions of the book (*e.g.*, 5. 5; 9. 1, 23 f.; 11. 29-32; 27. 1 f.; 29. 1 f.), which render the material, delivered, as we think, thirty-eight years before on the way from Horeb northward, appropriate to the *new* nation now in similar circumstances in Moab, *i.e.* again on the eve of conquest.

When Israel broke camp at Horeb, in the second month of the second year of the Exodus, and marched northward toward the promised land, there is every reason to believe that they all (Moses too) expected to enter Canaan *from the south*, and without any very prolonged delay. Accordingly, what would be more natural than to suppose that on the way—indeed, all along the route—at Hazeroth for example, where they encamped at least seven days (cf.

Num. 11. 35; 12. 15), and elsewhere, Moses should have exhorted Israel to keep the commandments which Jehovah had given at Horeb? Their plan, however, failed on account of the unfavourable report of the spies and the faithlessness of the people; and, after thirty-eight years of discipline, during which time the older generation died off, another attempt to take possession of their promised inheritance was contemplated *from the east*. To this new and nomadic generation the aged Lawgiver addresses exhortations similar to those which he had spoken to their fathers, and for the sake of emphasis begins by relating the history of the nation from Sinai to the plains of Moab, emphasizing here and there his instruction by appropriate historical allusions. On this theory many obscure passages in Deuteronomy are made clear.

(3) Because of the double allusion to *the cities of refuge* (4. 41-43, cf. 19. 1-13). In 19. 1-13, which, on our hypothesis, was *originally* spoken in the *second* year of the Exodus, three cities are specified (but not named) to be chosen on the *west* side of Jordan in Canaan, with the added but indefinite provision, that in case Israel's borders should be enlarged three other cities (also unnamed) should be appointed on the east of Jordan. Such an indefinite command was in full keeping with the circumstances of the desert march. But in 4. 41-43 three cities are not only specified, but chosen and named, as places of refuge on the *east* side of Jordan, viz., Bezer, Ramoth, and Golan. This is history; it stands at the close of the historical introduction which Moses spoke in Moab after Israel's conquest of Gilead and Bashan, and, to our minds, is a valuable witness in favour of the view that the bulk of Deuteronomy was spoken twice.¹

¹ This theory is not opposed by Numbers 35. 1 f., which provides for six cities of refuge without naming them, inasmuch as from the context (*v.* 1) it is clear that the command there was also given in Moab, but probably prior to what is recorded in Deuteronomy 4. 41-43.

(4) Because of the (repeated) *introduction* contained in Deuteronomy 4. 44-49. These verses stand as a preface to chapters 5.-26., and, in an apocopated version, may have once constituted the original introduction to the Deuteronomic kernel spoken in the desert. In their present form, however, they have been accommodated to harmonize with Deuteronomy 1. 1-5, which, as we have seen, declares that in Moab Moses *expounded* laws which he had given Israel previously in the wilderness. The same peculiar geographical setting which is characteristic of Deuteronomy 1. 1 f. is to be found here also. For the testimonies and the statutes and the judgments which follow are said to have been spoken first "after they came forth out of Egypt" (v. 45), but also "over Jordan" (v. 46), which is a further proof that the bulk of Deuteronomy was spoken twice. If not, why this *second* introduction?

(5) Because, on this theory, it is not impossible to account for the alternating use of the *2nd pers. sing.* and the *2nd pers. plur.*, which is especially characteristic of the book of Deuteronomy.¹ Steuernagel² has succeeded best in making a thorough-going analysis along these lines, but, in our own opinion, has done little more than to demonstrate, with considerable certainty, however, that no matter how small the original kernel of Deuteronomy was, it never existed as a *legal kernel only*, but from the first had an introduction, a nucleus and a conclusion. The alternating use of the *2nd pers. sing.* and the *2nd pers. plur.* is characteristic of the entire book, not of a single part only; but, as a matter of fact, it is quite impossible to say, in many individual cases, why the one rather than the other should have been employed. And

¹ Cf., however, the rapid transition from the *singular* to the *plural* in Genesis 18. 1-19. 28, discussed by Kraetzschmar in *Z.A.W.*, 1897, pp. 81-92.

² *Die Entstehung des deut. Gesetzes krit. u. bibl. Untersucht*, Halle, 1896.

yet it is comparatively clear that the author has used the *2nd pers. sing. usually* in the legal sections (*e.g.* 5. 6-18 (Heb.), 6. 4-9, and chaps. 12.-26.); when he conceived of Israel as a single nation, or wished to address them as single individuals (*e.g.* 1. 21, 31; 2. 7; 6. 10-15); and in exhortations given in Moab, when Moses was an old man—sixty years their senior (*e.g.* 4. 32-40; 8. 2-19*a*). On the other hand, the *2nd pers. plur.* has been employed when the author addressed the nation as so many individual units (*e.g.* 1. 10, 11, 22-30, 39, 40; 3. 18-4. 8; 5. 22-33; 7. 7, 8; 9. 8-29); and in exhortations given by Moses in the wilderness, where he addressed Israel as a prophet would his own generation. However, only *remnants* of such exhortations remain, as the early addresses of Moses were, for the most part, modified to suit the new conditions in Moab (but cf., *e.g.*, 1. 6, 7, 12-18; 2. 1-6; and parts of chaps. 11. and 12.). For these reasons we think it not improbable that the bulk of Deuteronomy was spoken twice, once near the beginning, and again at the close of the Exodus wanderings.

2. *Reasons for concluding that the book of Deuteronomy was composed early.*

(1) Because *primarily* intended to be a *code of conquest* for Israel. It is a military law book, not a single statute of which was intended for Israel in the desert. Even Deuteronomy 23. 12, 13, is a regulation for soldiers encamped against their enemies.¹ It is expressly stated that Moses taught Israel these statutes and judgments *in order that* they "should do so in the midst of the land whither ye go in to possess it" (Deut. 4. 5, 14); "that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess it" (5. 31*b*); "and keep my commandments *always*" (5. 29), "thou, and thy son, and thy son's son, all the days of thy life" (6. 2). To this end they must expel the aborigines (7. 1*f.*; 4. 38; 9. 1*f.*;

¹ Cf. Alexander, *Pulpit Commentary*, "Deut.," 1897, p. xxviii.

20. 16, 17 ; 31. 3), observe in warfare certain peculiar laws of the theocracy (20. 1-20 ; 31. 6. 8 ; 23. 9-14 ; 21. 10-14), and, when they have vanquished their enemies and taken possession of their inheritance, they must then settle down to agricultural life and live not as nomads, but as citizens of a civilized land (19. 14 ; 22. 8, 9, 10 ; 24. 19-22 ; 17. 14-20).¹ These characteristics are so prominent that they quite forbid, in our judgment, the hypothesis of late codification.

(2) Because the book of Deuteronomy is not only *hortatory* and *prophetic*, but *peculiarly* so. The great outstanding characteristic of Deuteronomy is its parenetic element. It is nothing if not hortatory ; it is *peculiarly* hortatory. It is likewise *peculiarly* prophetic. Its exhortations have a military ring, as though written on the eve of battle. There is nothing fanciful or fictitious in their sound. Everything is natural to the circumstances alleged. They are the message of one interested in Israel's *future*, not especially in the *present*. They reflect the optimism of one who is unacquainted with Israel's chequered history (cf. 15. 4-6), not the hope of a baffled seer who is making a last attempt to win his people from gross idolatry and sin. Indeed, there is a *paternal* vein running through the book of Deuteronomy which renders it exceedingly appropriate to the circumstances in Moab (cf. 9. 24 ; 1. 37 ; 4. 21).²

(3) The *style* of Deuteronomy is a witness to its early origin. The people are repeatedly reminded that they are not yet come into the rest and inheritance which the Lord

¹ With Kittel (*History of the Hebrews*, i. p. 32) we maintain that the author assumes "that the laws which are here promulgated will become binding in the future only."

² The author's repeated solicitations for the Levites, that they should be provided for and not forsaken, etc. (12. 19 ; 14. 27 ; 18. 6-8), are most satisfactorily explained by the fact that the tribe of Levi had just previously been set apart at Sinai (Deut. 10. 8).

is about to give them (12. 9); that the Lord will greatly bless them when they do (15. 4); that they must not make a covenant with the natives of Canaan (7. 2, 3), nor learn to do after their abominations (18. 9); but utterly "devote" their enemies to destruction, which was an archaic mode of warfare (7. 2; 20. 16), and destroy all their places and objects of worship (12. 2f.; 13. 6f.); moreover, they must carry into execution the laws which Jehovah has prescribed (12. 1); choose cities of refuge (19. 1f.); sacrifice at the place which God shall choose (12. 5); and write this law upon great stones and set them up (according to the custom in Egypt—27. 1-8); if they disobey, they will be visited with all the diseases of Egypt with which the author alleges *they are already familiar* (7. 15). Here, again, we claim that nothing short of the actual circumstances of Moab could have produced such a style.¹ Dillmann's idea that the book of Deuteronomy shows long training in the art of public oratory overlooks the fact that oratory is a *gift*. Had not the author possessed rare native ability in this direction, the art might have gone on developing twenty centuries instead of seven, without producing orations like those of Deuteronomy.

(4) The *language* also favours an early date. Such a word as נַעַר for נַעֲרָה, "maiden," which occurs universally in Deuteronomy (except 22. 19), is confessedly an argument in favour of its early date. The frequent use of הוּא in both genders (36 times in Deut.) is another, especially as the feminine form הִיא is never once found in Deuteronomy. The ancient word מַת, "married man," plural מְתִים (2. 34; 3. 6; 33. 6; 26. 5; 28. 62), originally of Egyptian origin, from *mt*, and preserved in the ancient proper names מְתוּשָׁלַח and מְתוּשֶׁלַח, but falling out of use in later Hebrew.²

¹ Cf. Green, *The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch*, 1895, pp. 39 f.

² Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. 44 n. Also Gesenius-Buhl, *Handwörterbuch*, 12th edit., 1895, p. 469.

The archaic demonstrative form הָאֵל for הָאֱלֹהִים (Deut. 4. 42; 7. 22; 19. 11), which is found but once outside the Pentateuch (viz. 1 Chron. 20. 8). The form וְאָמַר (Deut. 1. 9; 20. 29), which occurs usually in the oldest portions of Old Testament literature instead of וְאָמַרְתִּי (cf. Eccl. 2. 15).¹ The more original termination of the 2nd and 3rd pers. plur. Imperf. וְ, occurring fifty-six times in Deuteronomy and but seldom in later Hebrew (rarely in Jer. and Ezek. for example).² The old 3rd fem. sing. verbal ending וֹת־ instead of הֹת־, e.g. אָזַלְתְּ (Deut. 32. 26; cf. וקראת, Deut. 31. 29 and Jer. 44. 23). The anomalous forms וְכִיָּרָךְ and וְכִיָּרָה, instead of וְכָר with suffix, which are completely lost to Hebrew literature outside the Pentateuch (Deut. 16. 16; 20. 13; Exod. 23. 17; 34. 23). Also the ancient Semitic idea of God's "dwelling" with Israel,³ שָׁכַנִּי (Deut. 33. 16),—the form being here accompanied by the original ׳ of the ancient genitive case-ending.⁴

(5) The hypothesis of an *early* origin allows for the obvious *unity* of Deuteronomy. We have already called attention to the confession of criticism that the whole of the book of Deuteronomy cannot be assigned to the year 621 B.C. Yet no other book of the Old Testament (unless it be Ezekiel's prophecies) bears such unmistakable signs of unity—in aim, in language, and in thought—as the book of Deuteronomy. Criticism concedes this openly. Thus Kautzsch⁵ says: "The kernel of Deuteronomy (viz. 4. 44–28. 68) presents a character of real unity throughout." Both Dillmann and Kuenen also argue in behalf of the unity of chapters 5.–26.⁶ Knobel, Graf, Koster, Colenso,

¹ Cf. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*³, 1892, p. 102.

² Cf. Spiers, *The Age and Authorship of the Pentateuch*, 1895, pp. 154 f. The same ending also is found affixed to the *Perfect*, e.g. cf. וְרָעִין (Deut. 8. 3, 16, and only once elsewhere in the Old Testament, Isa. 26. 16).

³ Cf. W. R. Smith, *The Religion of the Semites*², 1894, p. 194.

⁴ Cf. Kautzsch-Gesenius, *Grammatik*²⁶, 1896, § 90 f.

⁵ *Abriss*, 1897, p. 59.

⁶ Cf. Dillman, p. 263 f., and Kuenen, *Hexateuch*, pp. 112–115.

and Kleinert defend the unity of chapters 1.-26. Driver treats chapters 5.-26. and 28. as the kernel of Deuteronomy, but in reality favours the unity of chapters 1.-26. and 28.,¹ frankly allowing that "the literary style of Deuteronomy is very marked and individual," and that, "in his command of a chaste, yet warm and persuasive eloquence, the author of Deuteronomy stands unique among the writers of the Old Testament."²

From the standpoint of language there is no necessity of dissecting the book. The various sections of history (chaps. 1.-4.), exhortation (chaps. 5.-11.), and law (chaps. 12.-26.), including even the "Song" and "Blessing" contained in chapters 32. and 33. respectively, all bear the same identical stamp.³ The resemblance is too striking to be accounted for through imitation. Besides, it should be remembered that the literary sins committed in dissecting much of the Old Testament are great. Analysis is not criticism. For our part we place little value, even on words and phrases, which may occur rarely elsewhere than in the book under discussion; and yet, if language is to be a criterion at all, this would be among the safest. For example, the form אִיכָה, *how*, instead of the usual form אֵיךְ, is used throughout the book of Deuteronomy (1. 12; 7. 17; 12. 30; 18. 21; 32. 30; נָחַל in Hiphil, *cause to inherit* (1. 38; 3. 28; 12. 10; 19. 3; 21. 16; 31. 7; cf. 32. 8); the exhortation שָׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל *Hear, O Israel* (5. 1; 6. 4; 9. 1; 20. 3; 27. 9; cf. 4. 1; 6. 3); the repeated occurrence of לָמַד in Kal and Piel, *learn and teach*, respectively (4. 1, 5, 10, 14; 5. 28 (31); 6. 1; 11. 19;

¹ Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. lxxii.

² *Idem*, pp. lxxvii., lxxxviii. So Löhr, *Kirchliche Monatsschrift*, i., 1896, p. 17 f. A. van Hoonacker, *Le Muséon*, 1888, pp. 464 ff.; 1889, pp. 67 ff., 141 ff. Alexander, *Pulpit Commentary*, Deuteronomy, p. v., and many others.

³ Delitzsch, *Messianic Prophecies*, 1891 (p. 72), does not hesitate to say even that Deuteronomy 32. "contains nothing which betrays a post-Mosaic origin." Cf. his x. study on "Die Entstehung des Deuteronomiums," *Zeitr. für kirchliche Wissenschaft u. kirchliches Leben*, 1880, pp. 505-508.

14. 23; 17. 19; 18. 9; 20. 18; 31. 12, 13, 19, 22); אָבָה, *be willing*, (1. 26; 2. 30; 10. 10; 13. 9 (8); 23. 6; 25. 7; 29. 19 (20); and more than a score of other characteristic expressions which bind the different sections of the book into one solid unit, thus: "so shalt thou exterminate the evil from thy midst," "as at this day," "that it may be well for thee," "the land whither thou goest in to possess it," "with all thy heart and with all thy soul," "the work of thy hands," "the priests the Levites" (with slight variations in several instances), etc., etc.—every one of which is used by the author over and over again throughout the entire book, and rarely elsewhere.¹

(6) The *teaching* of Deuteronomy is more directly appropriate to an early date. *The great central thought of the book is the unique relation which Jehovah as a unique God sustains to Israel as a unique people.* Analyzed a little more minutely, it means that the book of Deuteronomy teaches (a) the oneness of Jehovah, (b) the unity of Israel, and (c) the close relation existing between Jehovah and Israel. To Mosaism, we believe, and not to Prophetism of the 8th century, belongs the honour of having inculcated these truths for the first time; for, without it, Israel's history would have been like the history of any contemporaneous nation—ordinary, instead of extraordinary.

(a) *Jehovah a unique God.* The most striking feature of the Deuteronomic teaching concerning God is the fact that Jehovah is the only, and absolutely unique God. "There is none else" (4. 35, 39; cf. 6. 4; 32. 39); "a God of gods and Lord of lords" (10. 17); "the living God" (5. 26); "the faithful God which keepeth covenant" (7. 9); who being righteous hateth sin in every form (7. 25, 26; 12. 31; 13. 15 (14); 18. 12; 20. 18; 27. 15; 22. 5; 24. 4; 25. 16); to whom belong the heavens and the earth (10. 14); whose providence is over the nations (7. 19); whose relation to His people is

¹ Cf. Driver, *Deuteronomy*, pp. lxxviii. ff.

personal (28. 58); whose being is spiritual (4. 12, 15); whose name is "Rock" (32. 4, 15, 18, 30, 31, 37); and who stands to Israel in the close relationship of "Father" (32. 6). He is further described as a *man fighting* for Israel (9. 3; 20. 4); as walking in the midst of Israel's camp to deliver up the enemy (23. 14, [15]); as leading His people through the desert (32. 10, 12); whose absence from them will expose them to evil (31. 17); whose being is terrible (5. 24, 25; 10. 21; 11. 2-7; 26. 8); whose character is jealousy (4. 24; 5. 9; 6. 15); who hates other gods (7. 4; 29. 26; 31. 16, 20; 18. 20); beside whom idols are impossible (7. 25, 26; 12. 31; 27. 15; 32. 16). Hence all temptation to idolatry must be removed. The Canaanites must be exterminated (7. 2-5, 16; 20. 16-18); all their places of worship destroyed (12. 2f.); and all magic and divination abolished (18. 9-12); for the Lord Jehovah He is the only God (4. 35).

(b) *Israel a unique people.* The new Israel, through the new covenant made in Moab (26. 16-19; 27. 9; 29. 1), were made partakers of the covenant made at Horeb (4. 13, 23; 5. 2, 3), and thus became heirs of the promises made unto the patriarchs (4. 31; 7. 8, 12; 8. 18; 29. 13). Thus they were unto Jehovah a holy and peculiar people (7. 6; 14. 2, 21; 26. 18, 19; 27. 9; 28. 9; 29. 13), chosen specially for Himself (4. 37; 7. 7; 10. 15; 14. 2); especially beloved of Jehovah (7. 8); yet disciplined for their own good (8. 2, 3, 5, 16); to be established as a people (28. 9; 29. 13; 32. 6); to become His lot and inheritance (9. 26, 29; 32. 9); and to stand near unto Jehovah as no other people (4. 7; 32. 43).

(c) *The relation between Jehovah and Israel a unique relation.* Other nations *feared* their deities; Israel were not only expected to fear Jehovah, but to *love* Him. In order to be upright or perfect with the Lord their God (18. 13) they must fear Him (4. 10; 5. 26 (29); 6. 2; 13. 24; 8. 6; 10. 12, 20; 13. 5 (4); 14. 23; 17. 19; 28. 58; 31. 12, 13); but they must also *love* Him (6. 5; 10. 12; 11. 1, 13,

22; 13. 4 (3); 19. 9; 30. 6, 16, 20); and *cleave* to Him (10. 20; 11. 22; 13. 5 (4); 30. 20). The highest privileges belong to them because they are members of a theocracy; others are excluded except by special permission (23. 2-9 (1-8); if they should desire a king to rule over them, Jehovah shall make the choice (17. 15); a prophet shall be raised up to take Moses' place and represent God in the theocracy (18. 15, 18); a distinction is to be made between Israel and strangers (23. 20 (21); 14. 21; 23. 4-7 (3-6)); in short, the people of Israel are to remember that they stand in *covenant* relation to God as His own chosen and peculiar people. All this was most appropriate from the Mosaic standpoint—the indispensable teaching which made Israel's history what it was.

It is here we take issue with many; the reason being that we cannot accept the dictum that *law is the product of prophecy*; or, more concretely, that "the author of Deuteronomy is the spiritual heir of Hosea."¹ On the contrary, the claim that Moses could not have taught Israel the ethical principles contained in the book of Deuteronomy we consider is *philosophical* rather than *scientific*. And the truth of this claim is attested not only by the facts themselves, but by the history of criticism. The key of the new development theory lies, we believe, in the philosophy of Hegel. Vatke, as is known, was a disciple of Hegel. He was also the father of the new philosophy of Israel's history. Wellhausen acknowledges his great indebtedness to Vatke.² Hegel's philosophy of religion was based on the principle that God at first was only a power, which gradually came to be conceived of as an exalted subjectivity and later was clothed in Judaism with wisdom and sublimity. This philosophy Vatke applied to the Old Testament.³ The same principle of de-

¹ So Driver, *Deuteronomy*, p. xxvii.

² *Proleg.*⁴ p. 14.

³ *Die biblische Theologie wissenschaftlich dargestellt*, 1835.

velopment was applied in the same year (1835) by Christian Ferdinand Baur to the New Testament, but without permanent success, as most scholars to-day are willing to confess. The cause is not difficult to see. Pure Hegelianism is metaphysical and opposed to science. It deals with depths of which science only moves over the surface. Hegelianism scorns to be tested by science. But criticism, on the contrary, claims to be scientific. Hence it is obviously impossible for criticism to accept of the Hegelian philosophy and remain inductive and scientific. The true historian must first explain the facts, and *all* the facts. This, we claim, the new theory of Israel's religious development has not satisfactorily accomplished. We call attention, in conclusion, to a passage in Deuteronomy which has never yet been successfully explained by criticism; and which, until it is satisfactorily accounted for, will stand a vocal witness to the early and Mosaic origin of the Deuteronomic law. It constitutes our final argument.

(7) The book of Deuteronomy itself bears explicit witness to the early origin of its principal contents. In Deuteronomy 31. 9, 24-26 it is written: "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, and unto all the elders of Israel. . . . And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, which bare the ark of the covenant of the Lord, saying, Take this book of the law and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of the Lord your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee." Now those who advocate a post-Mosaic origin for the entire book of Deuteronomy must explain the following difficulties: (a) If the author of these statements actually supposed that Moses wrote the Deuteronomic law, when as a matter of fact he did not, how account for his inspiration? On the

other hand, if he purposely falsified, of what value is his history? (b) Again, if the author of Deuteronomy and the prophet Jeremiah were contemporaries, as is usually alleged, and both were true prophets of Jehovah, why should we be asked to believe Jeremiah's account of the origin of his book, and *disbelieve* that of his contemporary? In Jeremiah 36. 32 it is written: "Then took Jeremiah another roll, and gave it to Baruch the scribe, the son of Neriah; who wrote therein from the mouth of Jeremiah all the words of the book which Jehoiakim king of Judah had burned in the fire: and there were added besides unto them many like words." Yet criticism accepts the latter as true, and boldly asserts the former to be false. (c) Finally, why should a prophet of the seventh century B.C. have spoken to Israel in the name of *Moses*, when all his companion prophets, before and after, spoke in the name of *Jehovah of Hosts*?

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

ST. PAUL'S ATTITUDE TOWARDS GREEK
PHILOSOPHY.

Ἐν τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν (1 Cor. i. 21). This statement of the inadequacy of human philosophy to discover or know God is one of incalculable importance in the history of Christian thought. To understand the significance of the words we must place them in their historical connexion. In this part of the Epistle to the Corinthians St. Paul is recalling to his readers the circumstances of his first visit to them, and the subject matter and manner of his preaching on that occasion. He says in chapter ii. 1-5: "I, brethren, when I came unto you, came not with excellency of speech or of wisdom, proclaiming to you the mystery of God. For I determined not to know anything among you save Jesus Christ and Him crucified. And I was with you in weakness and in fear, and in much trembling. And my speech and my preaching were not in persuasive words of wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit and of power: that your faith should not stand in the wisdom of men, but in the power of God."

If these words had stood alone, and if we had been ignorant of the circumstances which immediately preceded the Apostle's mission to Corinth, they would have presented many difficulties. As it is, the narrative in Acts xvii. 16-xviii. 1 explains everything. It explains why *σοφία* should have come to be so prominent a subject of discourse and argument—a glance at a concordance will show how the words *σοφός* and *σοφία* seem to haunt the Apostle at this crisis—it explains also why St. Paul dwells on the simplicity of teaching, and also why he should have come in fear and trembling.

The most interesting incident in St. Luke's account of

St. Paul's visit to Athens is his encounter with the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers. It is the first recorded contact between the wisdom of the world and the preaching of the Cross. We may be certain that it was a moment of intense interest for St. Paul, and that he could listen with earnest attention to the Greek philosophic theories of life and knowledge, presented as they would be with the utmost dialectic skill and eloquence by men who defined philosophy, in their Master's words, as "an activity which, by means of words and arguments (λόγοις καὶ διαλογισμοῖς), procures the happiness of life" (Sext. Emp. adv. Math., xi. 169, speaking of Epicurus, cited Ritter, iii. 405). The word and tense (συνέβαλλον, Acts xvii. 18) describing the encounter imply a vigorous and sustained disputation. The arguments are not reported at length in the Acts, but it is clear from St. Luke's words that the subjects of the Apostle's preaching were the revelation of God as Creator and Ruler of the world; and secondly, Jesus and the Resurrection.

On the part of the Epicureans and Stoics the dispute seems to have been conducted in a tone of supercilious contempt. This new teacher was a σπερμολόγος, an unscientific pretender to knowledge, bringing in strange and amazing doctrines (ξενίζοντα); some dismissed him with a sneer (ἐχλεύαζον); others desired a further hearing, but few indeed were convinced.

All this agrees with St. Paul's account in the Epistle of his arrival at Corinth. "He came in fear and trembling." The response to his preaching of Jesus and the Resurrection in Athens had been little else than contempt and ridicule. Would the same gospel be met with the same reception in Corinth? Was philosophy, in fact, destined to be a fatal barrier to the progress of the gospel?

It was a critical moment in the history of Christianity. The question had arisen and must be decided whether

Christianity could make terms with any system of human philosophy. For an apostle to the Gentiles the decision was of special importance. For the question would be asked at the outset by every intellectual enquirer after Christ whether, in accepting Christianity, he was bound to renounce philosophy.

Greek philosophy had done so much for the elevation and purification of religion and life, its aims were so closely akin to the aims of Christianity, its scope and even its expressions seemed so capable of being merged in the Christian ideal, again philosophy had proved so attractive to the best and loftiest characters of the pre-Christian epoch that St. Paul might well have hesitated in his repudiation. But St. Paul does not hesitate. He makes no compromise and suggests no eirenicon with the wisdom of this world. What he preaches is a σοφία founded on the Incarnation. Philosophy, indeed so far as it was represented by the schools of Epicurus and Zeno, had repudiated the preaching of the Cross (ὁ λόγος τοῦ σταυροῦ). To these philosophers it was a μωρία, an "unwisdom" or "foolishness." For with that term St. Paul sums up in the Epistle the reception given to the gospel at Athens.

And while for one moment the Apostle, in a vein of irony, accepts the reproach of μωρία, in the next he turns the charge back against his opponents. It is not the preaching of the Cross, but the wisdom of the world, which is in a true sense a μωρία: οὐχὶ ἐμώρανεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν σοφίαν τοῦ κόσμου (1 Cor. i. 20), and ἡ σοφία τοῦ κόσμου τούτου μωρία παρὰ τῷ θεῷ ἐστίν (1 Cor. iii. 19). For what is the test? The test is success. The philosophy which best achieves its end is the true σοφία, that which fails to achieve its end is a μωρία. And St. Paul claims for the preaching of the Cross that it achieves the end of philosophy, both on its speculative and ethical side.

Σοφία or philosophy is defined by Aristotle to be a science

of the highest objects (*ἐπιστήμη τῶν τιμιωτάτων*, Arist. Eth., vi. 7), in other words, a science of the Divine; it is *θεολογική*, that by which God is apprehended. With this definition St. Paul would agree. In 1 Corinthians i. 21 he implies that *σοφία* is a *γνώσις τοῦ θεοῦ*, and both in the Acts (xvii. 23, 30) and in the Epistle he contends that the *σοφία τοῦ κόσμου* had failed to apprehend God—*οὐκ ἔγνω ὁ κόσμος διὰ τῆς σοφίας τὸν θεόν*. On the other hand, he claims for the preaching of the Cross that it is *θεοῦ δύναμις*, as well as *θεοῦ σοφία*.

As *θεοῦ σοφία* it is a divine apocalypse by means of the indwelling *πνεῦμα*, which every Christian possesses—*ἡμῖν δὲ ἀπεκάλυψεν ὁ θεὸς διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος*. *Τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα πάντα ἐρευνᾷ, καὶ τὰ βᾶθη τοῦ θεοῦ* (ii. 10). And again: *ἡμεῖς δὲ νοῦν Χριστοῦ ἔχομεν* (ii. 16). Thus is Christian philosophy founded on the Incarnation. The Christian discerns God because Christ discerns Him. It was a high claim, which at once placed Christian philosophy in a position distinct from and more authoritative than the wisdom of the Greeks. The recognition of a divinely implanted perceptive faculty creates a new philosophic standpoint. "The main evidence of the Revelation to us consists in its harmony with the voice of the spiritual faculty within us," says Dr. Temple (*Bampton Lectures*, p. 204).

The preaching of Christ crucified is no less effective in moral action: it is *θεοῦ δύναμις*, a divine force (1 Cor. i. 24), issuing from the Resurrection (Phil. iii. 10), working in the Christian with a view to salvation (Rom. i. 16). St. Paul's life and teaching and spiritual experience are to be viewed in the light of the *σοφία*, which he thus explains. The Apostle is throughout conscious of the working of the divine power within him (*κατὰ τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ*, Eph. iii. 7). "I can do all things," he says (Phil. iv. 13), *ἐν τῷ ἐνδυναμοῦντι με*, i.e. not necessarily and specifically *Χριστῷ*, but by the force within me, which is my very

life. This indeed is St. Paul's revelation; the Christian philosophy is the Christian life, a divinely implanted power which enables Christians to discern and to live. It is the higher instinct which the Christian may trust, as the lower creatures trust the lower instinct (Jer. viii. 7).

Such is St. Paul's exposition of the divine σοφία in contradistinction to the human σοφία which has failed to see God or to guide life. The point, however, may still be raised whether in these strictures on ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία the Apostle intended to condemn and reject philosophy in general, or those forms only of Hellenic philosophy which had been presented to him in persuasive eloquence (1 Cor. ii. 4) at Athens, the schools, namely, of Epicurus and Zeno. No doubt the conclusions of the Athenian philosophers were those which he was mentally combating in this passage, and which he emphatically repudiates in favour of Christian philosophy. And indeed, though originally confirming lofty conceptions, both of those systems had grown degenerate at this epoch. The only ethical end of Epicureanism was to avoid pain and escape the evils of life. Stoicism denied any reality except that which was material; regarded as things indifferent or defensible the impurities and falsehoods of pagan life, which Christianity has unconditionally condemned; and found itself "compelled to admit that true virtue, and with it true knowledge also, is far from the reach of man." (Ritter, *Hist. of Philosophy*, iii. 596).

Such teaching was absolutely incompatible with Christianity, and with a philosophy founded on the Incarnation. But it by no means follows that the highest and purest thoughts of the great thinkers of Greece were to be repudiated. In that large claim which St. Paul makes for Christianity in Philippians iv. 8 the nobler gifts with which Hellenic philosophy has endowed mankind are assuredly included.

In retaining the word *σοφία* in the Christian vocabulary, St. Paul must have foreseen the possibility of some unwelcome associations gathering around it in the progress of history. But here are two reasons which may have determined him in the retention of a word charged with alien meaning.

1. For three hundred years *σοφία* had had an acknowledged place in Hebrew religious nomenclature. To the Greek-speaking Jew it represented *Chokmah*, or wisdom, and round "wisdom" a literature had grown up, and associations of the highest spiritual importance had gathered. Accordingly, to the Jew *σοφία* brought a well-established meaning, very different from that which it conveyed to the Greek. "Wisdom" is a divine emanation, created before all other things (Ecclus. i. 1, 4); the source of all knowledge; the artificer of all things (Wisdom vii. 22). It is therefore the creative power of God, "By Thy wisdom Thou formedst man" (Wisdom ix. 2). Again, "Wisdom ordereth all things graciously" (Wisdom viii. 1); it is "a breath of the power of God, and a clear effluence of the power of the Almighty, . . . an effulgence from everlasting light, and an unspotted mirror of the working of God, and an image of His goodness" (Wisdom vii. 25, 26). A word laden with such thoughts was too precious not to be employed afresh as a help for the expression of Christian truth.

2. But what must have influenced St. Paul more than anything else in his retention of *σοφία* was, doubtless, the use of that word, or of its Aramaic equivalent, by our Lord Himself (St. Mark xi. 19; St. Luke vii. 25), and the ascription of the same divine *σοφία* to the Child Jesus (St. Luke ii. 40, 52).

It was inevitable that the Christian use of *σοφία* should bring it into relation with successive schemes of philosophy as time went on. This has sometimes been done with the

happiest and most reassuring results. At other times a new philosophy has seemed to threaten the existence of Christianity. Sometimes, again, Christian dogma has been put into the mould of the current philosophic system, and when the philosophy has passed away the form of doctrinal expression has remained. This has been a fruitful and unceasing cause of dissension among Christians. One of the most important tasks, therefore, of each Christian epoch is to clear away the accretions which have gathered round its truths owing to the surviving expressions of philosophic systems which have themselves been discredited and forgotten, and to restate Christian doctrine in forms which rest on an original basis of apostolic teaching.

As a first step in this endeavour it may be of service to examine the use and avoidance in the New Testament of current philosophic terms. This we propose in a subsequent paper to do in the hope that an examination of this kind may help to reveal a principle on which fresh scientific theories or discoveries should be treated from time to time by Christian thinkers.

ARTHUR CARR.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

V.

THE SEVEN TRUMPETS.

REV. VIII.—XI.

WE are now entering on the intricacies of this book; and if we would not lose ourselves, we must adhere strictly to our method of dealing with only the main lines of thought. It is for this reason that we include four chapters in our text this month, so as not to make a break in the vision of the seven trumpets, which begins with chapter viii. and does not close till the end of chapter xi. The whole of this space is not occupied by the trumpets, but the portions which intervene are episodes, and so related to the trumpets, especially to the closing one, that we should make a mistake if we took them out of their connexion and bearing. We shall find reason to regard them as visions of consolation brought in before the final catastrophe of the seventh trumpet, to relieve the awful tension of the sevenfold woe.

It would be an immense advantage to the reader of the apocalypse, if it were printed so as to mark out these episodes and interludes. It may be premature to issue a polychrome Bible on the basis of the higher criticism. But a polychrome Book of Revelation would be of immense service, giving the main lines of the successive series of sevens in black type, with episodes in colours and glimpses of the end in gold. This would show at a glance, what requires somewhat careful study now to discover, the marvellously symmetrical structure of the book, and the bearing of its subordinate parts. I wish some enterprising publisher would give us an *édition de luxe* of the Book of Revelation. Whether there could be found an artist of colossal enough genius to illustrate it worthily is another question.

Looking now at the series of trumpets as a whole, the first thing which strikes us is the many points they have in common with the seven seals. Besides the number seven, there is the division into the two subordinate series of four and three, the latter three far exceeding in impressiveness and in minuteness of detail the first four, and moreover, in the one case as in the other, taking us across the boundary of the seen (with which alone the first four deal) into the mysterious realm of the unseen. What is still more remarkable, there is in the trumpets, as in the seals, a break between the sixth and the seventh. It will be remembered that before the opening of the seventh seal there was an arrest of judgment, four angels at the four corners of the earth holding back the winds of wrath until the servants of God had been sealed in their foreheads. In like manner before the blowing of the seventh trumpet there is the sudden appearance—not of four angels this time at the four corners of the earth—but of one strong angel, followed by a vision of measuring just as the other was followed by a vision of numbering the servants of God. Finally, just as at the winding up of the seals we were carried on to the great consummation of all things, when the white-robed throng gathered round the throne, so at the winding up of the trumpets we are carried on to the time when “the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ; and He shall reign for ever and ever.” Thus from beginning to end there is a marvellously close correspondence between the one series and the other.

What does all this suggest? Surely not a continuous history following first the line of the seals and then the line of the trumpets. It is true that history repeats itself, but not in such a fashion that it can be blocked off into cycles of seven, so very closely corresponding to each other. Surely it is much more natural to suppose that this second series is another general view of the great march of events

by which the great Head of the Church "sends forth judgment unto victory." To adopt an illustration which is familiar to all students of Revelation, it is not a totally different stretch of history brought into the field of St. John's telescope; rather have we the same elements thrown into fresh combinations by the turning of St. John's kaleidoscope.

Why then the repetition? Let the patriarch Joseph tell us what such reduplication meant to the Hebrew mind (Gen. xli. 32): "And for that the dream was doubled unto Pharaoh twice, it is because the thing is established by God, and God will shortly bring it to pass."

While it is true that in the main features the trumpets are a reduplication of the seals, there are striking differences of detail. In this respect we may compare these successive pictures of coming judgment with the threefold picture our Lord gives us in the twenty-fifth chapter of Matthew in the successive parables of the Virgins, the Talents, and the Sheep and Goats; or with the successive parables of the kingdom of heaven in the thirteenth, or indeed with the successive Lives of Christ by the four Evangelists, each one covering the ground in his own way, yet with such instructive variety that none of them could well be spared.

This leads us now to look at the new features which emerge in the trumpet series. First, there is a quite new impressiveness in the way in which it is introduced. The seals were preceded by the grand chorus of the elders, and the four living creatures, and the angels, and the whole universe breaking out into an anthem of praise. The trumpets are introduced by "silence in heaven for the space of half an hour," an awful silence during which seven angels noiselessly take their places before the Throne, each one receiving a trumpet. Then as noiselessly there comes another angel and stands over against the altar of incense.

Recall the fact that when the fifth seal was opened, the souls of the martyrs were seen under the altar of burnt offering pouring forth their lamentable cry. These prayers of the saints seemed for the time to pass unheeded, for the persecution still went on. But they are not forgotten; for what is this angel doing? He has a golden censer, and in it much incense, representing the pleadings of the Heavenly Intercessor; and the prayers of the saints and of the Intercessor ascend together to the throne of God. O ye, whose hearts are poured out in an agony of prayer to God, and who seem to get no answer, think not that these supplications are lost; they are caught up by the prayer-angel, taken into his golden censer, laid close beside the pleadings of the Lord Himself; they are not lost, but gone before you to the throne of God, and the answer will surely come in God's own time and way.

In this case we may think of the prayers as having the great burden, "Thy kingdom come." But the kingdom cannot come *per saltum*. It cannot come without effort and struggle; it cannot come but through toil and pain; it must be through judgment that victory is reached. Hence the necessary delay. Hence, too, the significant action of the prayer-angel in taking fire from the altar and casting it on the earth, on which there followed thunders, and voices, and lightnings, and earthquakes. Before the trumpets are done we shall hear that "the kingdom of the world is become the kingdom of our Lord, and of His Christ"; but many "terrible things in righteousness" must come to pass before that longed-for consummation; for see, there are the seven angels preparing themselves to sound; and now the solemn silence is broken by the first loud trumpet blast.

Again, as in the seal series, we have the first four trumpets finished in as many sentences or brief paragraphs. In the seals the destroyer was in each case

prominent; in the trumpets it is the destruction on which the stress is laid. This destruction comes first upon the land, then upon the sea, then upon the rivers and fountains of water, and finally upon the luminaries of the day and of the night; and in each case one-third part is destroyed. The forms in which the destruction presents itself to the seer are evidently suggested by the plagues of Egypt.

The break between the four and the three is made by the flight of an eagle (not an angel, as in A.V.), bird of ill omen to the Jewish mind, flying in mid-heaven, and screeching out, "Woe, woe, woe, for them that dwell on the earth, by reason of the other voices of the trumpet of the three angels, who are yet to sound." As at the fifth seal, so at the fifth trumpet, we pass into the mysterious realm of the unseen, and are confronted by a fallen angel, to whom is given the "key of the bottomless abyss," as our version puts it. "And he opened the pit of the abyss, and there went up a smoke out of the pit, as the smoke of a great furnace; and the sun and the air were darkened by reason of the smoke of the pit." So hell is let loose upon the earth; for these "locusts," which are described so gruesomely in the verses which follow, are evidently not literal locusts; they are demons of the pit, who "have over them as king the angel of the abyss," known in Hebrew as Abaddon, and in Greek as Apollyon, the destroyer.

As the fifth trumpet loosed the demons of the pit, the sixth sets in motion a still more formidable host from the farthest boundary of the land, the river Euphrates, the familiar direction from which the Assyrian armies had been wont to descend upon the land of Israel and make it a desolation. But no Assyrian host that ever came from the Euphrates can be compared with this. The very number is appalling. It is twice ten thousand times ten thousand, two hundred millions of cavalry; and such cavalry! Armed with no ordinary weapons, but breath-

ing out fire, and smoke, and brimstone. One can imagine the plight of the literal interpreters here, compelled to find somewhere in history a literal army of two hundred millions of horsemen, and such horses and men! How different when you realize that we have here a powerful poetical presentation of the resistless might of the forces God can let loose to put an end to the wickedness of wicked men!

For that this is a force on the side of righteousness seems evident, not only from the fact that it is summoned into action by four angels, but also that it is set in motion ultimately by the prayers of the saints; for this is what is meant by the voice coming from the horns of the golden altar which is before God (*v.* 13).

Once more we have reached a climax of horror corresponding to that at the close of the sixth seal, when the "kings of the earth and the chief captains, and the rich and the strong, and every bondman and freeman . . . said to the mountains and the rocks, Fall on us and hide us from the face of Him that sitteth on the throne, and from the wrath of the Lamb." And again, as before, there is a pause, a break, an arrest of judgment, and the intervention of an apocalypse of an entirely different kind, to relieve the tension of feeling, and bring courage and hope to the fainting heart of seer and of saint.

This is no less than a vision of Christ, not now in form like unto the Son of Man, but in the likeness of a mighty angel. That it is Christ Himself and no other is evident from His being arrayed in a cloud ("Behold, He cometh with clouds"), from the rainbow round His head, from the face as the sun and the feet as pillars of fire. His absolute control of all things, above and beneath, is magnificently set forth by the attitude as described: His right foot on the sea, His left upon the earth, and His right hand lifted up to heaven; and His voice, which before had

been likened to the sound of many waters, now awakening the roar of seven thunders, whose message, however, was for the ear of John alone. But all these were only accompaniments of the solemn assurance which He gives, in the name of the eternal God, that these dreadful things are not to last much longer, for the time of the end is drawing near, and the mystery of God will be finished when the seventh angel shall sound.

With this assurance there was given to the seer a little book. The seven great seals have been broken; the sixth trumpet of the seventh seal has sounded; one trumpet only now remains, so a little book will cover it. It may be the little book contained only the summary of the seventh trumpet in verses 15-18 of the next chapter. If we look forward to that summary, we see that it is sweet to the mouth, for it is a proclamation of the kingdom of our Lord; but inasmuch as the establishment of that kingdom meant the final overthrow of all its enemies, as set forth in the chapters which follow from the 12th to the 20th, it had its latent bitterness, which must be tasted before the substance of it could be assimilated; and some terrible things had yet to be said concerning many peoples, and nations, and tongues (*v.* 11), before the great apocalypse should close.

Then in place of the sealing in the former series there is the measuring: "And there was given me a reed like unto a rod; and one said, Rise, and measure the temple of God and the altar, and them that worship therein." The whole passage is one of great difficulty, so much so that some expositors give it up as hopeless; but I think the reason of this hopelessness is the failure to set it in contrast to the corresponding passage in the seal series. When this is done, it seems to me that its secret is yielded up, and we have a passage of singular power and impressiveness.

In the corresponding passage under the seals there is

a numbering; and the numbers are vast, thousands on thousands, twelve thousands after twelve thousands; and then all power to number is lost in the "great multitude which no man could number, out of every nation, and of all tribes, and peoples, and tongues." Nothing could be more cheering and reassuring. But what are those to think who live in the dark days when the number of the saints has been reduced to the very lowest, when the Church loses her members on both hands, her faithful ones by martyrdom, her faithless ones by apostasy, and when this has gone on through such awful days as those which have been foreshadowed in the seals and in the trumpets, till the Church seems annihilated, annihilated so utterly that a Roman Emperor has struck a medal to celebrate the final extinction of the pernicious sect? In days like these the seventh chapter of the apocalypse will scarcely do. Its thronging hosts and innumerable multitudes might seem a mockery. Well, if you must give up the numbering, suppose we try the measuring. "One said, Rise, and measure the temple of God, and the altar, and them that worship therein." That includes all the faithful, both the martyrs who have offered themselves on the altar, and the worshippers who still remain. Only these, however; none of the unfaithful shall be reckoned; "the court which is without the temple leave without, and measure it not"; reckon not the mere formal Christians, those who hang on the outskirts of the temple, and have not courage to face the dangers of the full acknowledgment of God and of His Christ.

Well, where are you? As for the counting, there is no difficulty, for the witnesses are reduced to *two*, the minimum number of Matthew xviii. 20. And these two, how are they arrayed? "In white robes, and palms in their hands"? Nay. They are "clothed in sackcloth" (v. 3). Alas! Alas!

But we are not numbering now; we are measuring. And perhaps these two may require a larger measure than you think. Suppose they are men like Peter and Paul. Well, they certainly seem to be, for it is said of them, "These are the two olive trees, and the two candlesticks standing before the Lord of the earth." And see what power they have (*vv.* 5, 6). Even though the Church be reduced to two witnesses, the minimum number, "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." "Fear not, little flock," though you be reduced to two in number; "Fear not, little flock, for it is your Father's good pleasure to give *you* the kingdom."

Aye, it may even go worse yet with the Church. These two may finish their testimony as their Lord finished His, in death. As He was crucified, and all hope seemed buried in His grave, so may the last two of His faithful disciples be done to death; and as you look at their dead bodies, again you seem to see the corpse of Christ. (Is this the force of the strange singular number? Look at R.V., margin.) For the second time the hope of Christianity is in a dead body. Ah, but who will measure the dead body of Christ then or now? And it is even worse now than then. When the Lord was crucified, His dead body was taken by loving hands and laid in Joseph's tomb, and women brought spices and anointed it. But now the dead body of Christ, as represented by the corpses of the two witnesses, lies unburied in the streets, and the people of the world are rejoicing over it and making merry, saying, "Now we see the end of these poor fanatics who disturbed and annoyed us; they are dead and gone for ever" (*v.* 10).

Are they? Behold, even as Christ rose from the dead, so shall they; as He ascended into heaven, so shall they. "And after the three days and a half the breath of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet; and great fear fell upon them which beheld them.

And they heard a great voice from heaven, saying, Come up hither. And they went up into heaven in the clouds, and their enemies beheld them." And before the face of the risen two, seven thousand fell, and the "rest were affrighted, and gave glory to the God of heaven." Now, was not this vision of measuring fitted in a marvellous way to strengthen faith and perfect patience, even when the worst came to the worst, when the Church was reduced to its lowest, when it actually seemed as if the very last Christian had sealed his testimony with his blood? "God is able even of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."

And now the seventh trumpet, leading on to the final woe, is sounded. And here, just as the seventh seal opened out into the seven trumpets, so we shall find the seventh trumpet opening out later into the seven vials. But again notice the contrast between the opening of the seventh seal, "when there was silence in heaven for the space of half an hour," and the blowing of the last trumpet; for instead of silence in heaven there were great voices of triumph and adoration (*vv. 15-17*).

Here, again, we seem to have reached the consummation; but once more it is only by anticipation, for the nations are yet wroth, and wrath must yet come. The seventh trumpet will see the finishing of the mystery of God; but here, too, it must be through judgment that the Son of God will pass to victory. How this shall come about we shall discover as we proceed to what remains of this great book of Revelation.

Meantime let us see that we, amid all the tumults of our time, be strong in faith, clear in hope, and steadfast in patience, until we all attain to "where beyond these voices there is peace."

J. MONRO GIBSON.

WAS KOHELETH A SCEPTIC?

As in a former paper we considered the question whether Job was an agnostic, so here we propose to inquire whether in the book of Ecclesiastes we have, as some think, the work of a Jewish sceptic, whose scepticism is individual rather than national, though, like the book of Job, having for its background those national misfortunes which called forth serious doubts in many minds as to the Divine direction of national concerns. Koheleth does not speak here, it is assumed, as a patriot, but as an independent observer of men and things in his own day, drawing his ironical conclusions from, and passing his satirical remarks upon the state of society in which he lives, delivering himself, in fact, as a private philosopher in trying to solve the problem of existence. Acquainted, indeed, with Job, but not imbued with the latent faith and fervour of its author, Koheleth is said to approach much more closely the spirit of modern scepticism. Sometimes he is represented as a counterpart of the modern rationalistic Jew in his easy morality and frivolous self-indulgence, with occasional relapses into gloomy Pessimism, himself, like his modern prototype, under the influence of pagan culture. There are those, however, who speak of the book as "a sacred philosophy," which, beginning with reflections on the vanity of things, ends in a return to the fear of God. But by far the greater number among modern scholars of repute, taking the closing sentences of the book as an addition by a later hand to save its orthodox character, see in it only the utterances of a *blasé* mind, sad and dejected by what he sees and feels, expressing here, in a kind of soliloquy, his personal broodings on the nothingness of life, living, as he did, in a social environment of oriental misrule and despotic absolutism.

The idea that Solomon could be the author of such a book is now rarely entertained,¹ whilst in the recent work by Professor Siegfried² no less than four, probably more, authors are mentioned as joint contributors to the work with the original author, whom he describes as an out-and-out pessimist. But whether we have here a "Solomon in a state of mental eclipse," or some one of a much later age assuming his name, which he drops as he proceeds in the discourse, whether we insist on the unity of the book, or admit the existence of collaborators with their glosses, corrections, and amplifications, looking at the work as a whole, and as such the final outcome of Hebrew thought, we may ask simply, without any desire or design to establish or to follow any critical hypothesis on this head, what resemblance with modern scepticism may be found in it, how far may it be said to throw light on some of the difficulties of modern thought, and does it suggest any solution of present-day problems?

In putting the question thus, we must recollect that Hebrew is a language which does not lend itself easily to express philosophical thought, and that the Arian tendency to fathom the reason of things, or curious speculation on the laws of our being, is foreign to the Semitic mind, and that we have to face, therefore, another question, *i.e.*, how far the book is influenced by Greek thought.

We ask, then, Is Koheleth Epicurean or pessimist in its tendencies, or is it neither of these, but only the unsystematic expression of a Hebrew believer in God, with a mind perturbed by doubt and debating—Koheleth is interpreted by some as "the debater"—with himself, like Pascal in the *Pensées*, the general truth of his inherited belief, shaken

¹ See, however, Dr. M. Friedländer's arguments in favour of this view in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, vol. i., p. 359 seq.

² *Handcommentar z. alten Testament: Prediger und Hohelied, übersetzt und erklärt* von D. C. Siegfried; Göttingen, 1898.

as it has been by individual trials, domestic troubles, and national misfortunes?

If we regard him in the light of a Jewish Montaigne, we miss in him the equable temper and cheerful acquiescence in the facts of life professed by the French humanist; for, in spite of repeated exhortations to enjoy life and to take things as they come with a light heart, the Semitic seriousness of Koheleth reasserts itself constantly; the author lacks the mental tranquility and imperturbable indifference of ancient Epicureanism or modern Hedonism. Nor is it necessary to call in Prof. Siegfried's theory of an Epicurean glossator, Q³, a second Koheleth, who is the mouthpiece of all the Epicurean or Sadducean sentiments contained in the book. It is much more natural to see here the "two voices" within the mind of the same debater discussing the respective claims of sensuous pleasure and sad resignation. Nor is it clear that our author is a pronounced pessimist, though the minor key predominates in those passages where he dwells on the sad and seamy side of life. For even in these he is far from being such a hater of life as Schopenhauer professed to be; and if we compare him with Hartmann in his treatment of the three illusions of life, he is far from being as thorough as the modern pessimist in despairing of life. He does not, indeed, reach the cheerful resignation of the later Jewish Stoic Spinoza, who defines happiness as "Tranquility of the soul arising from a clear knowledge of God." But in following the meditations of this Hebrew philosopher of a remote age we seem to listen at times to the voice "of calm despair," and then again, to a cry of resigned cheerfulness trying to make the best of life under difficult circumstances. In all this we cannot help noting something akin to the spirit of our own time and among our leading thinkers, in giving way to the dejection which comes of lost faith, and then, again, descanting in a higher

key on the duty and charm of self-cultivation, and the sublime joy of self-renunciation.

In this Hebrew criticism of life we seem, then, to have the pleadings of faith with scepticism, the arguments of the sceptic traversed by the deeper reflections of the believer, not the utterances of a man hopelessly puzzled by the enigmas of life, vainly trying to recover equanimity amid its bewildering scenes; but, as Delitzsch puts it, we have here a writer who, admitting "the illusory character of earthly things, does not indulge in any kind of extreme asceticism which despises the world as such, and, in so doing, the gifts of God, but one whose ultimatum consists in claiming his share in a bright enjoyment of life, but only so far as this is possible within the limits of the fear of God and made possible by Divine co-operation."

It is not necessary to see with Dr. Dillon in the apparent irrelevancy of general observations and judgments of Koheleth the proof of a disordered mind, or a dislocation of leaves in the original manuscript; but we have here rather the divagations of a mind troubled by the double aspect of things when viewed from different standpoints.

It is worth while to pursue the subject into detail and inquire:

1. *What traces are there in the book of Epicurean modes of thought?* Since all is vanity, does our author simply recommend, as some think, the moderate enjoyment of life, having due regard to the conventionalities of religion, but with a reservation almost leading to fatalism and religious indifferentism? The ground tone of the book is entirely opposed to this view. There are passages, indeed, which sound Epicurean, but these are comparatively small in number. We rather feel inclined to view these Epicurean touches as one of the elements in the soliloquy, admitted for argument's sake, and finally rejected as a philosophy of life; just as a modern sceptical writer on the value of

life may weigh for a moment Hedonism or Eudaimonism as counter theories to Pessimism or Malism. In *Hamlet* and the *In Memoriam*, Shakespeare and Tennyson do the same. Some have suggested that Koheleth suggests a dialogue between two interlocutors maintaining contradictory views. Others that in its etymological meaning it suggests a conference between various thinkers of the academy founded by Solomon, whose different views are stated in the form of a discussion. But there is no need for all this. Every thinker dwelling on such a problem, as the book does, conducts, so to speak, a dialogue in his own inner consciousness, or holds a symposium in his own mind, where two or several voices make themselves heard, each suggesting a different solution or a new doubt, until at last, either in despair the problem is pronounced insoluble, or a conclusion is arrived at—"the conclusion of the matter"—which does not logically follow from the preceding premisses. The abrupt changes in the argument would thus be explained as fresh starts in speculation, or "temporary alleviations" of the mind in its sad musings, as so many attempts to catch a glimpse of the brighter side of life. The pendulum moves backwards and forwards from sad to gay, from cheerfulness to gloom, as one or other mood prevails; though even when the mind has reached what appears to be a sunny height, weariness again overtakes the writer. (see chap. ii. 26). There is no occasion to regard such abrupt changes as independent interpolations of a foreign hand; it is in accordance with the mutability of the human mind in its deeper moods. Even when the influence of Epicureanism is most pronounced, *e.g.* in chap. v. 17 seq., the Hebrew belief in God is no less earnestly affirmed, and throughout the Semitic seriousness of the author returns; a pessimistic gloom absorbs in its shadow the faint gleams of Hellenistic joyousness which for an instant glint across the page. "The genial, philosophical Koheleth," as

some one has called him, even when he exhorts his readers and himself to bright cheerfulness in life, attributes the gift of cheerfulness to God; he never approaches the lower Epicurean standpoint—"let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die."

2. *Was Koheleth, then, a Pessimist pure and simple?* "Pessimism," it has been said, "is the proper emotional reflex of intellectual scepticism. In this sense, it may be admitted, the book of Koheleth is pessimistic in tone, though the work, as a whole, is far from being what a German Pessimist has called it, "a Catechism of Scepticism." Yet the author's mind seems haunted throughout by a sense of the utter worthlessness of existence. He is brooding all along on the dreary aspects of life, which would leave him utterly disconsolate were it not for the one redeeming possibility of its being a school of adversity, and so affording a discipline for training oneself so as to enjoy the passing moments without fretting.

Those passages in the book which recommend tranquility and regulated enjoyment, and from which it has been too readily inferred that he is an Epicurean are, in fact, a relief from a protest against the unmitigated gloom of his own ingrained Pessimism. The work does contain detached thoughts, which are profoundly pessimistic, but it also includes others where the good and evil of life are judiciously balanced against each other, and which exclude the idea of philosophical despair. There may be cases where a misshaped existence and undeserved misfortunes produce a sour misanthropy, as in Swift. There may be others where the sadder experiences of life predominate and produce a kind of moral scepticism, or practical disbelief in virtue, and so generate misogyny. Koheleth is subject to both these, as passing intellectual moods, but he recovers himself, so that his irony or satire never reaches the bitterness of, say, such pessimists as

Leopardi or Heine. The reluctance of orthodox Judaism, which is optimistic, to accept the book for a time as canonical, and the absence of quotations from it in the New Testament and most of the Fathers, no doubt arose from the fact that its Eudaimonism is too Epicurean and its Pessimism not sufficiently redeemed by Christian resignation. But the final verdict in favour of its canonicity and use since in the Christian Church arose from the further consideration that our author, though he seems to go a long way in the direction both of Epicureanism and Pessimism, ultimately returns to a better and higher view of life than that which either of these presents; that he, unlike them, avoids the fallacy of extremes.¹ The book of Ecclesiastes, then, is, after all, and in spite of M. Renan's assertion to the contrary, "a book of sacred philosophy." Its author sees some kind of law and order in the rigid sequence of events which follow from their antecedents. But he stops short of fatalism. He counsels cheerfulness in labour and sorrow, but escapes the charge of Epicureanism; he is deeply affected by the sorrows and sufferings of humanity without losing himself in the abyss of hopeless Pessimism; the outcome of his philosophy seems to be—"Work, and despair not"; or, in the words of a modern Jewish philosopher, he seems to say, "The only true happiness in the world's gift is that which springs up, free and unsought, by the wayside of duty."²

3. *We have here, then, a believer in doubt*, baffled by the contradictions of life, "thinking aloud" to himself, letting us know how his mind turns now to this, now to that theory of life in search after a solution, and how, after a circular tour through the mazes of human thought,

¹ On the theory that Koheleth is a protest against Pessimism of the school of Shammai, see *Jewish Chronicle*, vol. i. p. 364.

² *Path and Goal*, by M. M. Kalisch, Ph.D., M.A.; London, 1880, pp. 490-1. This important work is a discussion founded on an original translation of Ecclesiastes into English.

he finally returns to a firmer faith in God and the Divine law of duty. The book in its recoil from the world thus prepares the way for Christian conceptions of life and duty. For this reason there are thrilling passages without number in recent dramas like those of Ibsen, and recent works of fiction like that entitled *The Open Question*, as typical of a considerable number of the same class dealing with life's problem in a pessimistic vein, which simply re-echo the perplexing doubts and reflections of Ecclesiastes on the vanity of all things.

Again, the modern melancholy which is ascribed by some to the growth of democracy in its futile quest after earthly happiness, and the severe condemnation passed by modern poets and philosophers on the false promises held out by the prophets of evolution and the professors of "dynamic Optimism" seem to have been anticipated by Koheleth, though different in form, corresponding with the difference of the conditions, social, political, and intellectual, of the age to which they belong. He, too, attacks the false Optimists among Jewish theorists; he, too, dwells on the final outcome of life, on death and immortality in a vague, undecided manner, not unlike some of the finer minds of our own day, who try to escape the meshes of doubt, and to find their way out of the confusing maze of life in threading their labyrinthine way guided by the Ariadne cord of faith and a better hope. A distinguished sceptical agnostic speaks contemptuously concerning such a state of mind. "Faith in the beyond," says Mr. Leslie Stephen, "really implies scepticism as to the present, and those who most fervently assert their belief in an omnipotent and perfect governor of the world are, therefore, those who can speak most bitterly, and with the least hopefulness, of the world which he governs." But is not such a secular and mundane scepticism, which despairs of attaining the ideals which haunt the lives of

mortals, a legitimate form of scepticism? and in giving expression to it, does not Koheleth pave the way to the next stage in the evolution of human thought, which looks on life as a state of probation and preparation for another and higher state of existence in the individual and the race here, or hereafter, when these ideals—which are inseparable elements of ideal human nature—may be more fully realized?

And what is the conclusion arrived at, what is the general outcome of the book as the latest product of Jewish philosophy? Does it contain more than the expression of mental weariness produced by a wide survey of life? Since neither wealth nor wisdom avails, and since the well-being of man cannot be secured by any of the ordinary means adopted by man for this purpose, is there nothing left but resigned labour to make life worth living? Is there no escape from moral scepticism amid the prevailing injustice in the universe? and is there nothing left but the practical duty of adjusting the course of life to existing facts without being able to account for them? Is there nothing for it but indolent acquiescence in the unavoidable, in view of man's impotence to alter the destinies of fate? Is there no reality behind the veil across which we see the vain shadows flitting? Is all a deceptive picture, and shall we never be able to forecast the goal of the seeming progress of our race? Is there no prospect of an ultimate realization of our ideals? Are we to be satisfied as best we may with an enforced contentment or a self-imposed renunciation according to "the golden rule" which is "to keep our wishes within the bounds of moderation, and to adjust them to unfavourable circumstances?—and, if so, *cui bono*?

In other words, have we, as some think, here in this book of Ecclesiastes something corresponding to the latest forms of doubt among ourselves, as *e.g.* in J. S. Mill's pathetic desire to snatch some remnant of truth in the old

formulas about God and the soul in his profoundly sceptical *Essays on Religion*; or something like Goldwin Smith's "tremulous aspirations" towards God and immortality in his *Guesses on the Riddle of Existence*, as necessary to the heart, but unprovable by the head of man? or something like the speculations of Sir John Lubbock on "the pleasures of life," when he simply bids us to try to make the best of it, so that "if we cannot hope that life will be all happiness we may at least secure a heavy balance on the right side"? Or have we not rather here something akin to all these, yet something at the same time differing essentially from them, something more worthy of the genius of religion possessed in an eminent degree by the compatriots of Koheleth? Have we not the confession of faith of a true Israelite mingled with thoughts which border on infidelity, representing as it were a class of thinkers, in all ages and countries, searching after truth, who cannot rest till they have tried at least to discover a true philosophy of life on rational grounds; who, when baffled in the attempt, have recourse to faith where reason fails; who, groping in the darkness which envelops us, give utterance in varying accents to the cry of the blind man in the Gospel, "Lord, I believe; help Thou mine unbelief"? "Was Pascal a sceptic, or a sincere believer?" inquires Leslie Stephen in an article on the subject in the *Fortnightly Review*; and thus replies: "The answer is surely obvious. He was a sincere, a humble, and even an abject believer precisely because he was a thorough-going sceptic." The same might be affirmed of Ecclesiastes. It reminds us of Tennyson's line, "Who never doubted, never half believed." The belief in God and duty was not a "vague surmise" like that ascribed by L. Stephen to Hume's Deism. To Koheleth it was a matter of spiritual apprehension. Faith in God was to him the anchor of the soul tossed about upon the sea of doubt in his voyage of discovery after truth. As

a reformer of the current theology he falls back on Old Testament *fiducia*, fearful trust in some sustaining Power amid the evanescent phenomena of existence; it is to him the resting point in the whirl of moral chaos.

The book before us, therefore, in its general drift contains much that is calculated to correct and modify some modern exaggerations of the "blessings of unbelief" and the rash averment of those who speak of Scepticism as "the great sweetener of life." It reminds us that "without sorrow the divine seriousness of life would be unknown." It presents us with the most pathetic picture of the melancholy side of religion. It corrects, at the same time, the too hasty conclusions of Pessimism, "All is dreary"; it seems to say with Dr. Newman, "Till we believe what our hearts tell us, that we are subjects of His governance, nothing is dreary, all inspires hope and trust, directly we understand that we are under His hand, and whatever comes to us is from Him, as a method of discipline and guidance."

If, on the other hand, it indicates a brighter view of life, it does so, as we tried to show, not in the ordinary Epicurean strain, but rather in the spirit of Tennyson's "Ancient Sage," who sees the two sides of the shield:

Cleave ever to the sunnier side of doubt
And cling to Faith beyond the forms of Faith!
She reels not in the storm of warring words,
She brightens at the clash of "Yes" and "No,"
She sees the Best that glimmers through the Worst,
She feels the Sun is hid but for a night,
She spies the Summer through the Winter bud,
She tastes the fruit before the blossom falls,
She hears the lark within the songster's egg,
She finds the fountain where they waited "Mirage."

If the author of Koheleth, like some modern writers of the same type, exhorts us to seek refuge in routine work, or solace in labouring incessantly for the species, as when he exclaims, "In the morning sow thy seed," etc., or "Cast

thy bread upon the waters," etc., he does so not in the sad tone of the modern poet :

Unduped of fancy, henceforth man
Must labour!—must resign
His all too human creeds, and scan
Simply the way divine!

The ancient Hebrew writer goes beyond this, though not far enough for us, because not with the full assurance of those who have reached a further stage in the "way divine," taught by the messenger of truth who brought life and immortality to light by the gospel for which it was the mission of Koheleth to prepare the way.

M. KAUFMANN.

THE DATE AND AUTHORSHIP OF THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE problem treated in the present paper is not soluble in the sense of demonstrating absolutely that one view is true and all other views are false. There is too little available evidence, internal or external.

But there is a strong probability—almost amounting to certainty—that the true view will be found to be widely illuminative, will make clear much that is obscure, and will show the Epistle not merely as a marvellous picture of “the spiritual character of the readers,”¹ but also as an important passage in the history of the first century.

Tried by this test, all the common theories of date and manner of origin fail. The Barnabas theory, the Apollos theory, throw light on nothing, not even on the Epistle itself. A date under Domitian, a date about A.D. 64–66,² make the document more enigmatical and isolated than it is when one has no theory on the subject.

It is not a matter of mere idle curiosity to reason as to the time and place at which the Epistle was written. It is true that the work is independent of those external circumstances, and can be understood and valued as a great book without a thought about them. But the history of the Apostolic Age is a subject of serious importance; and while that great blank remains in it, while the doubt continues as to whether the work belongs to Domitian's or Nero's time, whether it was addressed to a Jewish or Gentile

¹ Westcott, p. xli.

² The latter view formerly commended itself to me (*Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 307). Longer study shows it to be untenable.

Church, there must be a doubt as to the security of the foundations upon which that history rests. So closely related to one another are all the other phenomena of early Christianity, that while this wonderful book stands apart in such isolation, we cannot (or ought not to) feel the same confidence in our ideas of the rest of the history.

The historical questions relating to the date and circumstances of the composition of the Epistle to the Hebrews have been brought nearer to an answer in a series of noteworthy papers by the Rev. W. M. Lewis. While in some respects the view stated in the following remarks differs from that advocated by Mr. Lewis, it agrees with his theory as regards all the main circumstances of the time and place and (to a considerable extent) the manner of composition of the Epistle; and it would certainly not have been attained so soon, possibly not at all, had I not been guided and stimulated by his earlier series of papers.¹ While writing the present article, I have also had before me his more recent articles,² which only confirm my general agreement and my occasional dissent from his opinion.

It will also be clear to any reader how much the writer has been indebted to the Bishop of Durham's great edition of the Epistle. Very often the turn of a sentence or the expression of an opinion is borrowed from him, with only the slight modification that a great man's words always require when they are seized and thought anew by even a humble disciple. I have also made frequent use of the Rev. G. Milligan's judicious and scholarly book;³ but he is further removed than the Bishop of Durham from the opinion which I hold. Their arguments are tested against those of Prof. McGiffert, as the best representative of the opposed point of view.

¹ In the *Thinker*, Oct. and Nov., 1893.

² In the *Biblical World*, Aug., 1898, April, 1899.

³ *Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews*, 1899.

Deliberately and intentionally, here and elsewhere, I prefer to use the words of others as much as possible, and preferably of those who do not hold the opinion which I advocate. This procedure is the best preventive against overstatement of the reasons on which my opinion is founded.

The theory advanced by Mr. Lewis is that the Epistle to the Hebrews was written from Cæsarea during Paul's imprisonment in the palace of Herod (Acts xxiii. 35).¹ He considers that Luke, in a series of interviews (Acts xxiv. 23), was instructed as to Paul's views, and directed to embody these in the form of a letter. The latter part of the theory can hardly be accepted without considerable modification. But as regards the important matters of the place and time and situation in which the letter originated, this theory seems to be remarkably illuminative, and therefore probably true.

The intention of the following remarks is not to recapitulate Mr. Lewis's arguments, which ought to be studied in his own statement; but to state my own reasons for thinking that he has come near the truth.

Stated briefly and dogmatically, the view to which this paper leads up is—

that the Epistle to the Hebrews was finished in the month of April or May, A.D. 59,² towards the end of the government of Felix;

that it treats certain topics which had been frequently discussed between Paul and the leading men of the Church at Cæsarea during his imprisonment, and

¹ Mr. Lewis usually states the date in this wide way. In one passage, however, he places the Epistle at the end of the imprisonment, after Festus had succeeded Felix. That seems to me a little too late, and inconsistent with xiii. 23, as will be shown in the sequel.

² The chronology advocated in *St. Paul the Traveller* is assumed throughout; those who follow another system can readily modify the dates to suit.

embodies the general impression and outcome of those discussions ;

that it was the Epistle of the Church in Cæsarea to the Jewish party of the Church in Jerusalem : this implies that the writer, practically speaking, was Philip the Deacon (Acts xxi. 8) ;

that its intention was to place the Jewish readers on a new plane of thought, on which they might better comprehend Paul's views and work, and to reconcile the dispute between the extreme Judaic party and the Pauline party in the Church, not by arguing for or explaining Paul's views, but by leading the Judaists into a different line of thought which would conduct them to a higher point of view ;

that the plan of composing such a letter had been discussed beforehand with Paul, and the letter, when written, was submitted to him, and the last few verses were actually appended by him ;

and finally, that the letter, as not embodying the thoughts of any single individual, was not completed by adding at the beginning the usual introductory clause of all ordinary letters, "So-and-so to So-and-so" : presumably the bearer of the letter would explain the circumstances.

That there is at this period an opening for a letter in which Paul was interested will at once be conceded. That is proved by the fact that many excellent scholars have placed, and some still place, during the Cæsarean captivity three letters which Lightfoot, supported by the almost universal opinion of British scholars, places in the Roman captivity.¹

No progress is possible until a definite and unhesitating

¹ Harnack, in the table appended to his *Chronologie der altchr. Literatur*, p. 717, gives both possibilities, but leans to the Roman date.

opinion is formed whether the ancient title "Epistle to the Hebrews," is correct or not. Some recent scholars have argued that the letter was written "to a Church or group of Churches whose membership was largely Gentile, where the Jews, as far as there were any, had become amalgamated with their Gentile brethren so that all race distinctions were lost sight of."¹ With all due respect to the distinguished scholars who have argued in favour of that view, I must express what I think—that it would be difficult to find an opinion so clearly paradoxical, so obviously opposed to the whole weight of evidence, so entirely founded on strained misinterpretation of a few passages and on the ignoring of the general character of the document. "The argument . . . cannot be regarded as more than an ingenious paradox by any one who regards the general teaching of the Epistle in connection with the forms of thought in the Apostolic Age."²

For example, it is argued that Hebrews ix. 14—"How much more shall the blood of Christ cleanse your conscience from dead works to serve the living God?"—could not be addressed to Jewish disciples, but only to persons who had been heathen. One would have thought that "dead works" was precisely what the Jew as Jew trusted to for salvation, and that Hebrews vi. 1, 2—"repentance from dead works, and faith toward God, the teaching of baptism, and the laying on of hands, and of resurrection of the dead and of eternal judgment,"—is clearly a summary of the first steps³ made by the Jew towards Christianity, and a most improbable and uncharacteristic way of describing the first steps of a pagan towards the truth. Obviously there is

¹ McGiffert, *Apostolic Age*, p. 468, who gives a clear *résumé* of the arguments of Pfeiderer, Van Soden, etc., on this side.

² Westcott, p. xxxv.

³ What the writer calls "the foundation": he exhorts his readers not to confine their attention to this, but to proceed onwards to the more complete knowledge of what Christianity is.

an irreconcilable difference in the fundamental ideas about history and early Christianity, when two sets of scholars can look at words like these and pronounce such diametrically opposite opinions on them.

Contrast with one another such judgments as the following: "There is no trace of any admixture of heathen converts; nor does the letter touch on any of the topics of heathen controversy (not xiii. 9)":² Westcott, p. xxxvi.

"Not simply is there no sign that the author was addressing Jewish Christians . . . there are some passages which make it evident that he was addressing Gentiles" (McGiffert, p. 467).

"The widening breach between the Church and the Synagogue rendered it necessary at last to make choice between them, and 'the Hebrews' were in danger of apostasy: ii. 1, 3; iii. 6, 12 ff.; iv. 1, 3, 11; vi. 6; x. 25, 29, 39" (Westcott, *loc. cit.*).

"Nothing whatever is said about apostasy to Judaism . . . There is no sign that the author thinks of such apostasy as due to the influence of Judaism, or as connected with it in any way" (McGiffert, pp. 466 f.).

To put the matter in brief, Pfeiderer and his supporters neglect the obvious fact that the Epistle is addressed to persons who believed in the Jewish Scriptures, and were half-hearted in proceeding therefrom to Christianity; whereas Gentile Christians were persons who accepted the authority of the Old Testament Scriptures because they first had become Christians. "The Old Testament belonged to the Gentile as truly as to the Jewish wing of the Church, and an argument drawn from it had just as much weight with the former as with the latter."¹ That is perfectly true; but how different is the spirit in which the Old Testament is appealed to in the two cases. In addressing a Jew the preacher began his first approach by showing

¹ McGiffert, p. 46 f.

that the Old Testament pointed him forward to Christ. In addressing a pagan audience, the preacher would complete his approach by appealing to that prophetic preparation for Christ. Dr. McGiffert compares Hebrews with Clement, and finds that the latter "makes even larger use of" the Old Testament than the former. But how utterly different is the spirit! We also rest our case on the same comparison.

But it is not the intention of this paper to argue that point. Those who agree with Pfeiderer will not care to read any further, as we look from incompatible points of historical view. They may be referred to the arguments of Westcott and Milligan; and if they do not listen to those scholars, they would not listen to me.

But one more specimen of the arguments that are used to prove that the Epistle could not have been addressed to the Jews of Palestine, and specially of Jerusalem, must be given, because important inferences depend on it: "The reference to the great generosity of those addressed, and to their continued ministrations to the necessities of the saints, does not accord with what we know of the long-continued poverty of the Church of Jerusalem."¹ When reduced to a syllogism, this argument may be thus stated:

No poor man can be generous.

The members of the Church at Jerusalem were poor.

They therefore were not generous.

If the major premise is correct, the syllogism is perfect. But who will accept the major premise, when it is put plainly before him?

The argument is a glaring fallacy, and a libel on human nature.

Moreover, the Greek word which is rendered "generosity" is *ἀγάπη*. Surely the writers who employ that argument were writing, not with the eye on the Greek text, but with

¹ McGiffert, p. 464. Heb. vi. 10.

a modern commentator before them. Not even Pfeiderer himself, who of all moderns is the least trammelled by the actual facts of nature and of history, could assert that a poor Church cannot show ἀγάπη.

Let any one who is interested in probing the matter travel in the East for some months or years, and travel not as a Cook's tourist, with tents, and beds, and cooks, and stores of food, and "a' the comforts o' the Sautmarket" (which Baillie Nicol Jarvie could not take with him into the Highlands), but travel in dependence on the inhabitants, and come into actual relations with them. He will learn how true it is that generosity and hospitality may be practised by very poor people even towards travellers with plenty of money, and may be lacking in the rich.

Or, if he cannot travel in the East, he may learn at home, if he does not keep himself shut up in his study, but comes close to real life, to appreciate Matthew Arnold's sonnet about the tramp who begged only from labouring men, while

She will not ask of aliens, but of friends,
Of sharers in a common human fate.
She turns from that cold succour, which attends
The unknown little from the unknowing great,
And points us to a better time than ours.

The truth is that Jerusalem was pre-eminently the city in which there was most opportunity for even the poorest Christians to show the virtues of generosity and hospitality, because it was crowded at frequent and regular intervals with strangers, many of them poor. Corinth and similar "wayside" stations on the great through route of traffic had many similar opportunities; ¹ but even Corinth in that respect could not be compared to Jerusalem. These opportunities afforded admirable opening for the Christians to come into friendly relations with the Jews of distant lands;

¹ *Church in Rom. Empire*, pp. 10, 318f.

and there cannot reasonably be any doubt that they used these opportunities. It was certainly in this way that the gospel spread so early to Rome and Italy; and it is the reason for the friendly relations that evidently existed between the Roman Jews and the Christians, as we shall see in the following remarks.

It may be regarded as incontrovertible that the Epistle was not written by Paul. Origen's opinion "that every one competent to judge of language must admit that the style is not that of St. Paul"¹ will not be seriously disputed, and is echoed almost unanimously by good scholars. The few exceptions in modern times, such as Wordsworth and Lewin, may be taken as examples of the remarkable truth that there is no view about the books of the Bible so paradoxical as not to find some good scholar for its champion.

But are we therefore to disconnect it absolutely from the Apostle Paul?

If that were so, it is difficult to see how such a strong body of early opinion should have regarded it as originating indirectly from Paul, and as conveying his views about a great crisis in the development of the Church. Clement of Alexandria and Origen, while both recognising that the language is not that of Paul, suggest different theories to account for what they recognise as assured fact—that the views and ideas are those of Paul.

Now how did Clement and Origen come to consider the connexion of Paul with the Epistle as an assured fact? It was not because the views and ideas are those which Paul elsewhere expresses. On the contrary, they present a different aspect of the subject from the ideas expressed in Paul's Epistles. It obviously was because an old tradition asserted the connexion.

Further, this belief and tradition is most unlikely to have arisen without some real ground. Mere desire to secure

¹ Westcott, p. lxxv.

canonical authority for this Epistle is not sufficient reason, for the Epistle differs so much from Paul's writings that general opinion, in seeking for an apostolic author, would have been more likely to hit upon one of the apostles separated for a time from the community addressed, and hoping soon to revisit it (xiii. 19). "The true position of the Epistle . . . is that of a final development of the teaching of 'the three,' and not of a special application of the teaching of St. Paul. It is, so to speak, most truly intelligible as the last voice of the Apostles of the Circumcision, and not as a peculiar utterance of the Apostle of the Gentiles" (Westcott, p. 41).

This tradition of a Pauline connexion was so strong as to persist even though there was prevalent a clear perception already in the 2nd century that the style was not that of Paul.¹ It was common in early manuscripts to place *Hebrews* in the midst of Paul's Epistles, even between *Galatians* and *Ephesians* (as was the case in an authority on which our greatest Manuscript, B, was dependent). Origen mentions that "the primitive writers" were positive as to the connexion of Paul with the Epistle.²

A very ancient tradition, therefore, of the strongest character guaranteed that there existed some relation of Paul to the Epistle. While it evidently did not assert that Paul was the author in the same sense as of *Romans* or *Corinthians*, it did assert that the thoughts in the Epistle

¹ Origen mentions theories already current in his time that Clement of Rome or Luke had written the thoughts of Paul in their own words. Clement of Alexandria thought that Paul had written in Hebrew, and Luke translated. These prove that speculation was already active when they wrote.

² Οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἀνδρες: compare Wordsworth, p. 356, on the meaning of this phrase. How Dr. McGiffert can say, "the idea that Hebrews was Paul's work appears first in Alexandria in the latter part of the second century, and seems to have no tradition back of it" (p. 480 note) is to me unintelligible: and equally so his words, "the only really ancient tradition that we have links the Epistle with the name of Barnabas (Tertullian, *de Pud.* 20)." That is a 3rd century statement, and Dr. McGiffert himself concedes that the Pauline connexion has 2nd century authority.

either emanated from him, or were approved of by him when written, or in some way were stamped with his authority, and that the Epistle must be treated as standing in the closest relation to the work of the Apostle.

The persons addressed had been Christians for a considerable time, "when by reason of the time—because they had been Christians so long—they ought to have been teachers, they were themselves in need of elementary teaching": such is the implication of v. 12.¹

They had not heard the gospel from Jesus Himself, but only from those who had listened to Jesus. "(Salvation), which, having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard," ii. 3. It is, however, a mistake to infer from this that the writer and the readers were Christians "of the second generation," and therefore the Epistle must be as late as Domitian. All the 3,000 who were converted on the fiftieth day after the Crucifixion might be addressed in the words used ii. 3.

But, indubitably, the writer and the readers were all alike persons that had not hearkened to the preaching of Jesus, but had only heard the gospel at second hand from men who knew the Lord.² This indication of their position must be combined with another.

"They were addressed separately from their leaders."³ This remarkable fact has not as a rule been sufficiently studied, though almost every commentator from the earliest times notes it. The words—salute all them that have the rule over you—in xiii 24, imply "that the letter was not addressed officially to the Church, but to some section of it."⁴ The inference is correctly drawn by Theodoret: "they that had the rule did not stand in need of such teaching" as it is the object of the Epistle to convey.

¹ Westcott, p. 132.

² It is evident that Paul would never have classed himself in the category so described, ii. 3.

³ Westcott, p. xxxvi.

⁴ *Id.*, p. 451, quoting Theodoret.

There is implied in these words (1) a marking off and separating of a body holding rule in the community (of which those addressed formed part): there was a distinct class of persons recognised generally as "the leaders"; (2) a certain distinction between the views entertained by the leaders and the views entertained by the persons addressed.

In what relation does this peculiar and remarkable fact stand to the history of the period, so far as we know it?

There was one community in which the leaders were a distinct and well-marked body. At Jerusalem James and the Twelve were a clearly defined body with a peculiar standing and authority. That is implied throughout the narrative, and is formally and explicitly recognised in various passages in *Acts* and in the Epistles. But along with them must be classed the original disciples that had listened to the words of Jesus. Wherever they were, clearly those who had followed the Lord Himself were recognised as possessing dignity and character which none converted by men ever attained. In Jerusalem this class must have constituted a certain considerable body even as late as A.D. 59. In no other Church is there likely to have been more than a very few, if any, resident and settled members of this class.

The writer, himself a convert at second hand, does not presume to address his "word of exhortation" to any one who had followed Jesus personally.

Further, these leaders are conceived both by Paul and by the author of *Acts* as differing in opinion from at least a certain considerable section of the Christian community in Jerusalem. It is beyond doubt that Paul claimed (and Luke confirmed the claim) to be in essential agreement with the leading apostles. It is an equally indisputable fact that Paul was at variance with a large section of the Jewish Christians in Jerusalem, who regarded him as an

enemy of Jewish feeling and as bent on destroying Jewish ritual.

There was no other community in which such marked divergence of view between the leaders and the congregation existed, so far as our records show. There was no other community in which it is at all probable that such a division existed. We learn of divisions and differences of opinion existing in several other congregations; but there is not the slightest appearance or probability that in any of them a body of leaders took one side and the congregation as a mass took the other side, while in some cases it is clear that the lines of division were quite different in character. In fact, there is no allusion to anything like a body possessing higher position in any congregation except that of Antioch (*Acts* xiii. 1); and that isolated case hardly seems to be a case of a class of *ἡγούμενοι*.

Further, the subject on which the Epistle dilates is the subject on which divergence existed between the leaders and the general body of the congregation in Jerusalem—the relation of Judaism and the Law to Christianity and Faith. It is precisely on that subject that it would be least easy to address the leaders and the mass at Jerusalem in the same terms.

Moreover, in *Acts* xxi. 20–24, James, speaking evidently on behalf of the leaders, recognises that many myriads of the Christian Jews entertained different views from what he himself entertained about Paul's views on the Jewish ritual. They thought Paul was an enemy bent on destroying that ritual: James and the leaders knew that Paul practised that ritual personally, and James urged Paul to show publicly his adhesion to and belief in the value of the ritual.¹ The writer of the Epistle, similarly, is bent on

¹ It must, of course, be assumed that Paul regarded the ritual as having a distinct value for Jewish Christians. It would have been hypocritical to practise it if it were valueless in a religious point of view.

bringing out the true character and value of the Jewish ritual, on proving that Christianity does not destroy but perfects that ritual, and on showing that the Christian principle of Faith was already a powerful factor in the life of the ancient Jews.

It is therefore certain that the situation implied in the Epistle existed in Palestine during Paul's last stay in the country; and there is no evidence that it existed anywhere else.

In xv. 24 the writer conveys to the readers the salutation of "those from Italy." It is grammatically quite possible to understand this Greek phrase as meaning simply "those who belong to Italy"; and this might imply that the writer conveys from some place in Italy, where he composes the letter, "the salutations of the Italian congregations generally" to his readers. But, as the Bishop of Durham (from whom I quote) goes on to say, "it is difficult to understand how any one could give the salutations of the Italian Christians generally"; the writer would more naturally give the greeting of the Church of the city in which he was writing (*οἱ ἀπὸ Ῥώμης* or the like);¹ hence "it appears more natural . . . to suppose that the writer is speaking of a small group of friends from Italy who were with him at the time."

The conclusion which the Bishop considers more natural is, of course, imperative on our theory of Cæsarean origin. There must have existed near the writer, and in communi-

¹ Westcott, p. xlv. It is not inconceivable either that the writer was on a circular mission to the Italian Churches, or that he wrote from a city, Rome or Puteoli, where representatives of several Italian cities had met. Both suppositions, however, are improbable, and difficult to harmonize either with the Epistle or with what we know about the history of the time. A circular mission through Italy was not the experience which would naturally suggest a letter of this kind; and a meeting of representatives is also unlikely in itself, and would probably be explained by the writer, so that the readers might understand who saluted them.

cation with him, a company of persons belonging to various towns of Italy.

Now, are there any circumstances in which a company of persons from Italy are likely to have been at Cæsarea? Obviously this was quite a natural thing. A company of Jews on pilgrimage would be pretty certain to use a ship from Puteoli to Syria (joining it either at Puteoli or at some of the harbours in Southern Italy, as it coasted along). There were undoubtedly such pilgrim ships sailing every spring. It was on board one of them that Paul dreaded a conspiracy against his life (*Acts* xx. 2, 3).¹ The Roman Government had often guaranteed the right of safe passage of Jewish pilgrims to Jerusalem. In 49 B.C. Fannius, the Governor of Asia, wrote to the Coan magistrates on the subject: the pilgrim ships naturally passed by Cos, which had been a great Jewish centre of trade and banking as early as B.C. 138 (1 *Macc.* xv. 23). Compare the letter of Augustus (Josephus, *Ant. Jud.* xvi. 6, 2).

Every spring, then, a company of Italian Jews passed twice through Cæsarea on their way to and from Jerusalem. Now it is obvious that such a company is most unlikely to have consisted wholly of Christian Jews: it may be regarded as certain that there would be a majority of non-Christian Jews.

But is it not improbable that such a company of Jews would come into relations with Paul and Paul's friends, considering the relations in which Paul stood to the Jewish authorities of Jerusalem? Surely not at the period in which our theory places the letter. A body of Italian Jewish pilgrims would be received hospitably by Cæsarean Jews, and it is exceedingly improbable that the Christian Jews of Cæsarea would fall short of their non-Christian brethren.

Certainly, so far as Paul had any influence with the

¹ *St. Paul the Traveller*, p. 287, compare p. 264.

Cæsarean Church, the Italian Jews would be welcomed and generously entertained.

But presumably there must have been some Christians among the company of the Italian pilgrims. Is not this improbable?

Certainly not! If Paul went on pilgrimage, why not the Italian Jewish Christians?

Further, the friendly spirit which we suppose to have existed between the Italian pilgrims and the Cæsarean Christians harmonizes excellently with the facts recorded in *Acts* xxviii. 17 ff. The friendly tone of the Roman Jewish leaders towards Paul, their ignorance (or rather diplomatic ignoring)¹ of any hostility between him and the Jews, their perfect readiness to hear what he has to say, is precisely the tone which we suppose in Cæsarea. The one throws light on the other. The narrative in *Acts* xxviii. 17-28 has always been regarded as a serious difficulty: it is mentioned by Dr. Sanday² as one of the four striking "real difficulties" of the book. It has been counted a difficulty, because it was thought inconsistent with the presumption from other recorded facts. It ceases to be a difficulty when we find it in perfect harmony with the situation revealed in this *Epistle*. Moreover, as Dr. Sanday proceeds: "the indications which we get in *Romans* xvi. as to the way in which Christianity first established itself in Rome would be consistent with a considerable degree of ignorance on the part of official Judaism." The "difficulty" solves itself when the evidence is fairly looked at as a whole.

It is clear that, if we are correct in this, a common in-

¹ It is noteworthy that they do not deny having heard of the proceedings against Paul. They have no official report by letter, and no one has reported to them any actual crime of which he had been guilty. They are aware that there was general bad feeling against Paul among Jews.

² *Bampton Lectures*, 1893, p. 329, note.

terpretation of Suetonius, *Claud.* 25, must be abandoned. The Latin historian's words, *Judæos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes*, cannot be taken as an allusion of Roman ignorance to quarrels between Christian and non-Christian Jews.

The salutation of the Italians would naturally be sent to Jerusalem on their homeward journey. On the way up to Jerusalem they were, doubtless, for the most part strangers to that city; and, moreover, they would carry their salutations in person. On the return journey they would naturally send greetings to their late hosts.

The message in itself contributes to the effect which the Epistle aims at. The writer desired, while establishing the true relation between Judaism and Christianity as the less and more perfect stages of one faith, to facilitate and preserve harmony between the Jews and the Jewish Christians; and the salutation exemplifies and confirms the harmony.

Incidentally the passage shows the exact date when the Epistle was composed. The final words were written in April-May, A.D. 58 or 59. The latter year is preferable, as the analogies of Hebrews are to Paul's last defence before Agrippa and Festus (*Acts xxvi.*), not to his earlier speeches in Jerusalem and Rome. Moreover the Epistle represents the outcome of a long period of thought and quiet discussion after the stormy period at the beginning of the Cæsarean captivity was ended.

The relation of the writer to the persons addressed is shown most clearly in the conclusion. He was in some way prevented at the moment from being with them (xiii. 19); he does not state what cause is detaining him against his will. Yet immediately afterwards he says confidently that he expects to see them shortly. He therefore regards it as practically fixed that he is shortly to be in the place where the persons addressed are. Accepting Delitzsch's

view¹ that the last few verses were appended by Paul himself, we make the following inferences.

When Paul was at Cæsarea, it is clear from xxv. 9 and from the general circumstances of the case, that if the formal trial of the prisoner occurred, it was almost certain to be held at Jerusalem, where the evidence was most readily accessible, and where the Jews wished it to be held. Every historical student knows how much influence the general wish of the provincials exercised on every Roman governor. It is therefore not at all improbable that at some time during his long imprisonment Paul expected that the trial would not be longer delayed, and that he would shortly be in Jerusalem. This was, of course, written before the plot to assassinate Paul on the way up to be tried had been discovered (when, in despair of a fair trial in Palestine, he was driven to appeal to the Emperor), in the summer of 59 A.D.

The reference to *Timothy* xiii. 23 is obscure on every theory. It touches facts of which we are wholly ignorant. But the intention is clear that, if Timothy be not detained too long by possible hindrances, he will accompany the writer to the city where the persons addressed live. Timothy, moreover, is an intimate and dear friend of the writer, and he expects this dear friend to accompany him. Timothy at the moment is away at a distance, and there may be impediments to his speedy arrival; but if he comes in time, it is a matter of course that he will accompany the writer.

Timothy, it is certain, accompanied Paul to Jerusalem in 57 A.D. (*Acts* xx. 4). We need not doubt that he and the other delegates soon followed Paul to Cæsarea. It is, however, in the last degree improbable that the delegates all remained in Cæsarea throughout the two years' imprison-

¹ The change of author was marked, not merely by change of handwriting, but probably also by a break, or some other device, which was lost in the later manuscripts.

ment. It may be taken as certain that Paul carried out his usual policy of sending his coadjutors on missions both to his churches and to new cities, and that mission work went on actively during that period. Paul then says: "Know that Timothy has been sent away on a mission,¹ with whom, if he returns quickly, I will see you."

In the Epistle "we" generally denotes the body of Christians not immediate hearers of the Lord, in particular the writers in Cæsarea and the readers in Jerusalem (though, of course, in various places what is said would apply to all Christians). Sometimes, however, "we" and "you" are distinguished and pointedly contrasted as the writers and the readers, as in v. 11, vi. 9, 11. Moreover, "we" sometimes (as ii. 5), and "you" often, denote the single body of writers or of readers respectively. The writers express themselves always as a group, for the first person singular in xi. 32² is an instance of literary and impersonal usage, not an indication of personality; and the last few verses we take with Delitzsch as added by Paul with his own hand.

The personality of the writer and his relation to Paul are the points in which Mr. Lewis's theory seems to require modification.

(1) The Jewish nationality of the writer seems as certain as that of the readers: Mr. Milligan, on p. 36 of the work quoted above, says "the writer, who was clearly himself a Jew." Probably this will be disputed by no one, and least of all by Mr. Lewis himself. He, as we may gather, would explain that, when Luke writes as a Jew, he does so because he is expressing the thoughts of Paul. This brings us to the second point.

¹ This interpretation, advocated by Lewin, seems more probable than "set free from prison": cp. *Acts* xiii. 3. But it seems self-contradictory to suppose that the mission is to carry the letter to Jerusalem, as has been suggested.

² The first person singular is used in the English translation in ix. 22, but not in the Greek text: it also is a mere literary form.

(2) Mr. Lewis seems to attribute too little independent action to the writer. He hears only Paul speaking through the words of Luke. He holds that Luke was, if not the amanuensis, yet the mere redactor of Paul's thoughts. That appears a somewhat anomalous and improbable position. One can understand that Luke might act as secretary, and reproduce as faithfully as he could the words and thoughts of Paul; but one sees no reason why Paul should instruct him as to his ideas in a series of short interviews,¹ and tell him to express them in his (Luke's) own words and style. Moreover the Epistle is clearly not an attempt by another to express Paul's ideas, but an independent thinking out of the same topics that Paul was meditating on and conversing about at Cæsarea. The person who wrote the Epistle was not trying unsuccessfully to express Paul's ideas as to "Faith" and "the Law," for example: his own individuality and character are expressed in the use which he makes of those terms—not contradictory, but complementary to, and yet absolutely different in nature from, Paul's ideas.

It has just been said that Paul was thinking at Cæsarea about the same topics that the Epistle discusses. Mr. Lewis has treated this subject excellently, and it should be studied in his own words. I give only a few examples.

In the first place, he quotes from the address to Agrippa and Festus expressions which show that Paul had recently been dwelling on the topics of the Epistle. The idea—"The hope of the promise made of God to the fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God night and day, hope to come" (*Acts* xxvi. 6, 7)—moves in the same sphere as *Hebrews*. The insistence upon the ceaselessness of the ritual, the conception that the Law may be regarded as a system of ritual, and "a scheme of

¹ One can hardly accept Mr. Lewis's interpretation of *διὰ βραχέων* (*Heb.* xiii.) as "in snatches" during brief interviews.

typical provisions for atonement,"¹ are noteworthy in Paul's words, and are characteristic of the Epistle. Again, "the sufferings of Christ, as distinguished from His death," are a characteristic feature of *Hebrews*, but not of any of Paul's Epistles. In *Acts* xxvi. 22 f., "I continue unto this day witnessing to both small and great,² . . . that Christ should suffer."

These are quoted as examples of Mr. Lewis's striking demonstration of the parallelism between Paul's defence before Agrippa and the Epistle, especially in respect of points which are not characteristic of Paul's Epistles.

Secondly, Mr. Lewis gives some important arguments to show that topics and ideas and expressions used in *Hebrews* must have been in Paul's mind at that period, in order to effect the transition from his earlier to his later Epistles. These topics lead on from *Corinthians* and *Romans*, and are presupposed in *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*.

An interesting little point of expression lies in Paul's use of the Song of Moses, *Deuteronomy* xxxii. 1-43: he makes the following quotations or references to it:

- Deut.* xxxii. 4 in *1 Cor.* x. 4;
 „ „ 17 „ *1 Cor.* x. 20;
 „ „ 25 „ *2 Cor.* vii. 5;
 „ „ 35 „ *Rom.* xii. 19, and *Heb.* x. 30;³
 „ „ 36 „ *Heb.* x. 30;
 „ „ 43 „ *Rom.* xv. 10;
 „ „ 43 „ *Heb.* i. 6.

On the other hand, among ideas which are characteristic of the later Epistles, but not of the earlier, Mr. Lewis

¹ Westcott, p. lii.

² *Hebrews* viii. 11, "from the least to the greatest." Mr. Lewis says that no similar expression occurs in the Epistles of Paul.

³ The two quotations are in identical words, yet differing both from the Septuagint and the Hebrew text.

quotes the headship of Christ over the Church, the use of *ἄφεσις*, "forgiveness of sins" in *Hebrews* ix. 22, x. 18, *Ephesians* i. 7, *Colossians* i. 14, and in the defence, *Acts* xxvi. 18, etc.;¹ also Lightfoot's note on the analogy between the context of *Colossians* i. 12, and *Acts* xxvi. 18, "where all the ideas and most of the expressions occur," points us to the fact that both "are echoes of an argument entered into at length previously in *Hebrews*."

The preceding notes are not intended as an adequate treatment of the subject. That would require a detailed examination of many passages read in the Cæsarean light, and a discussion of several well-known arguments.

In conclusion, it may be added that probably the most important result of the Cæsarean view is the light it sheds on the relation of the Cæsarean Church to Paul on the one hand and to the Jewish-Christian party on the other. The reconciliation between the two parties in the Church was making good progress. It is an argument of my chapters on Christian Antiquities in *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* that the reconciliation was very complete in Asia Minor.

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ It must, however, be noticed that the word is used by Paul also in *Acts* xiii. 38, and thrice by Peter (*Acts* ii. 38, v. 31, x. 43).

THE DOCTRINES OF GRACE.

IV.

REGENERATION.

JOHN FOSTER, one of the most virile of religious thinkers, and one of the most suggestive of essayists, had a great aversion to certain forms of expression which were much in vogue amongst some pious people of his day, and declared that, if possible, he would expunge them from every book by Act of Parliament, and often said, "We want to put a new face upon things." Many would agree with Foster, for they believe that in our age the cause of faith would be much served if the hackneyed terms of religion were gathered together and cast into the depths of the sea. Religious phrases remind one of those banknotes which the traveller receives in Scotland, and which he handles with much reserve. No doubt they were once new, and then, it is to be presumed, they were clean and crisp, but after they have passed through many hands, some very greasy and unsavoury, the writing becomes illegible, and the notes themselves have an evil smell. Once a phrase was the symbol for a spiritual reality, and it was used in burning sincerity by good men. By-and-by the multitude got hold of it, and misapplied and vulgarized the noble words until they ceased to have force, and clever writers, anxious to point their gibe at the party of piety, found their opportunity. Lord Clarendon, the Royalist historian of the Civil War, makes himself merry about the Puritan phrase "seeking God," yet could anything be more worthy of a human being than to embark upon this quest and to agonize until heaven had been taken by storm? What, however, was in Clarendon's mind, and is ever in the minds of the satirists of religion, was the hypocrisy of men to whom God

was not the portion of their heart, but simply a catchword of common speech. When a phrase is new, it is certain to be real; when it grows old, it is apt to sink into cant. It is, however, to be remembered that although our banknote be worn so thin that it hardly holds together, and is so soiled that we hesitate to touch it, that bit of paper still retains a definite value, and, if you go into things, it still represents the same amount of gold. When one comes on a phrase in religious literature, and when one finds it largely in use amongst religious people, however abused that phrase may be, or however distasteful to our refinement, let us be sure that phrase stands for a fact. Human souls have, one day, seen this, felt this, wanted this, or else they had not coined this term, and it had not been freely circulated. In proportion to their commonness, the words of religion are an evidence of the facts of religion.

Take, for instance, the word "regeneration," or what is often considered its synonym, "conversion." We have heard people divided into converted and unconverted, and we have resented the arrogance of the preacher who dared to make this deep-cut distinction between a mass of human beings, some of whom might be very good, a few of whom might be very bad, but the most of whom, as we said, with a fine sense of insight, were half and between. We may have been asked ourselves whether we were converted, and we were angry because a frail and, perhaps, foolish brother man had sought to lift the veil from the holy of holies in our souls, and enter with obtrusive foot. This, however, does not touch the point, which is that there must be such an experience in religion, or else the word would not have come into existence, and that the experience is of elemental importance. As a matter of fact, this word describes with perfect accuracy one of the deepest and truest, one of the most lasting and fruitful events in the history of the soul. What one has to do is to exchange the worn-out paper for

the precious gold, or, to vary the illustration, to mark where the float is dancing on the surface of the water, and to search below in the depths for the hidden treasure.

When one speaks about regeneration, and speaks about it as if it were the same thing as conversion, it is necessary to make a distinction in the interests of theology, which is the ordered science of religion. Any one reading the Puritan divines of the seventeenth century, and their pupils of our own time, will be apt to discover that they used the two words as interchangeable, and, in so doing, they confused the two sides of one great event. Regeneration, and here I substantially quote from Aubrey Moore, who was too soon lost to theology and the Church on earth, is really God's act as much as is creation; conversion implies a conscious act of responsibility as we are enabled by God's grace. You cannot tell a man to be born again, you can tell him to turn round: being born again he is able to turn round. The man himself does not know when he is born again: he knows when the change in his life begins. Conversion proves regeneration: regeneration enables conversion. Regeneration is once, and never again: conversion may have a definite and marked beginning; it may also be repeated. Every great moment in sanctification may be called a conversion, and, therefore, Jesus said to Nicodemus that he must be born again, but commanded Peter that when he was converted he should strengthen the brethren. Conversion, therefore, is the human side of regeneration, and it is in the sense of conversion that we are now treating regeneration.

It is always a recommendation of a Christian doctrine that it should not merely be a theory of the schools, but that it should embody a desire of the human heart and an experience of the human life, and, upon the face of it, regeneration is one of the most fascinating and fondest ideals that ever has presented itself to our minds. It is not

to be supposed that Nicodemus in his interview with Jesus was so utterly foolish as to confound the physical birth of a child with the spiritual birth of a soul. When he spoke of a man becoming a child and entering again into his mother's womb, he was stating in figurative terms the immense difficulty of spiritual regeneration. It was, to his mind, as incredible, this spiritual rebirth, as would be a physical rebirth, but in expressing his incredulity he revealed the longing of his heart. One is convinced, as he speaks, that in quiet hours this Jewish rabbi realized the weariness of his outworn faith, and rebelled against the bonds of Pharisaic custom. Beside Jesus, as he had seen the Master preaching in the Temple, he was condemned, because Jesus saw the things which he had not eyes to see, and heard the things which he had not ears to hear. Beside Jesus he was blind and deaf, he was decrepit and ready to die. If it were only possible that a man, tired of his creed and tired of his habits, could begin life again as a young child, full of wonder and full of love! This was the fond dream of Nicodemus's heart, but how could it ever come to pass that this *blasé* Hebrew scholar could become like one of the young children who sang in the Temple choir. Is not this a natural and pathetic desire which visits various kinds of men in their best hours, and which floats before them like a vision of the fairy world? When a young man holds in his arms a little child, and looks upon its smiling, innocent face, there come up before his mind the sins of the past and put him to secret confusion. If he only could be washed clean again, not only from the stain of sin but from its insidious power, not only from that, but also from its very recollection! if he only were a child again! When an old man lays his hand upon the head of his grandchild, and hears the child talk with simple faith of God and of heaven, then he bitterly regrets the worldliness and sordidness of his soul, and would give much to have that child's

fresh outlook upon this world, which is, and the world which is to come. With both, the young man and the old man, the desire is the same, to begin again a new, fresh, hopeful life. The action of degeneration we have too sadly learned in our own souls, our desire, whether we confess it or not, is for regeneration, and therefore the Christian doctrine of rebirth is one of the most spiritual aspirations of the human heart.

Nor is this word less acceptable because it is so thorough, since regeneration is never to be confounded with reformation. The former is used of the spiritual world, the latter of the moral. The former has to do with the soul, where are the springs of life, the latter has to do with conduct, which is only a form of life. In regeneration the old vessel is not repaired and repainted, it is rather remelted and remoulded, and the necessity for this entire and unflinching process lies in the constitution of human nature. No change is worth the name which begins from without and works inward; every change which is to accomplish a perfect result must begin within and work outward. Behind a man's speech lie his thoughts, and behind his thoughts lies his mind, which is the man himself. Each individual has his own mental shape by which his words and his actions are regulated, so that although he may school himself at times to speak a foreign tongue, it will ever be with his own accent; and although he may train himself to an alien course of action, he will ever revert to his natural habits. It is even doubtful whether a man of one mental fashion can ever understand a man of another; it is likely that they will be to each other an enigma for all time, perpetually misunderstanding and mistaking one another. To the ordinary Englishman, a Frenchman will always appear more or less a fribble, and his high spirit and fine taste will be hidden; while an Englishman will always appear to the ordinary Frenchman as little less than a barbarian, stolid and coarse, and the English sense of

justice and brave perseverance will also be hidden. Both men would have to be reborn, each within the country of the other, to be able to understand his neighbour. One who is the son of a rich man, and who has been accustomed to look at life from the standpoint of a capitalist, will never appreciate the grievances and ambitions of the proletariat, and a son of the people will, through no blame of his own, have wrong-headed ideas about those who dress in purple and fine linen. A thoughtful person can hardly express himself to one who is uneducated, and a Philistine rebels, as by instinct, against the manners and attitude of a cultured man. One class would have to be recast before it could enter into the mind of another; and if this be true with regard to nationality, social position, and education, it is ten times more true in the matter of religion. Religious and irreligious persons belong to different spheres which hardly have a common frontier, which have their own language and their own habits. Bunyan, in his autobiography, relates how he saw certain old women sitting in the sun in a street of Bedford, and heard them speaking together about the affairs of the soul. They spoke his English tongue, and they were people of his own condition, but after hearing them he concluded that he knew nothing whatever about religion, for their words sounded strange in his ears, and they were talking of a country where he had never been. When St. Paul stood at the bar of the Roman judge, and Felix looked at him from the judgment seat, it was altogether impossible for Felix to appreciate the position of St. Paul, although the eloquence of the Apostle touched the Roman's heart, and it is evident that St. Paul was not able to estimate the time-serving disposition of the Roman official. St. Paul was concerned about Felix' soul, and Felix hoped that St. Paul would have offered him a bribe. They were strangers one to another, the one a citizen of this world which is passing away, the other a

citizen of the world which remaineth for ever. The religious man has his own idea of God, and of right, and of humanity, but he has no means of making it plain to the irreligious man. The irreligious man wanders about outside the sphere of the religious man's ideas, as one travels round a cathedral seeing nothing but the confused scenes on the windows which he cannot recognise from the outside, and hearing the faint sound of praise which he does not understand. What is necessary for the man outside is to come inside, to be lifted out of his own sphere of thought into that of Christ, or, in other words, to be changed in the very centre of his being. This change is the rebirth of Jesus' teaching which caught the imagination and excited the hope of Nicodemus. It is a birth which cannot be from beneath, it can only be from above. It is a rebirth which changes a man's attitude for ever and is the beginning of a new life. It is, of course, mysterious, but it is real, and without it there is no possibility of true religion. "Blame not the word 'conversion,'" says Carlyle in his *Sartor Resartus*, "rejoice rather that such a word signifying such a thing has come to light in our modern era, though hidden from the wisest ancients. The old world knew nothing of conversion; instead of an *Ecce Homo* they had only some choice of *Hercules*. It was a new-attained progress in the moral development of man; hereby has the highest come home to the bosom of the most limited; what to Plato was but an hallucination, and to Socrates but a chimera, is now clear and certain to your Zinzendorfs, and the poorest of your Wesleys, and Pietists, and Methodists."

Regeneration must be understood in a generous sense, and on no account must its form be limited, for there will be as many kinds of conversion as there are kinds of men. Certainly there are at least four different types of conversion—four experiences by which men have passed from

darkness into light—and one of the most striking is *moral conversion*. Within the Gospels the classical illustration will ever be St. Mary Magdalene, from whose life the chains of sin fell in an instant, and who passed at once from nameless degradation into the holiness of Jesus' fellowship. Outside the Gospels there is no more convincing illustration than the experience of St. Augustine, who was held in the bonds of sensual sin long after he was convinced that Jesus Christ was the Son of God and that Christianity was the true faith. While he was bitterly lamenting his miserable condition, he heard a voice—and who shall say that it did not sound?—calling upon him to take up the Holy Scriptures and to read a passage that will ever be associated with his name; "Not in rioting and drunkenness, not in chambering and wantonness, not in strife and envying. But put ye on the Lord Jesus Christ, and make no provision for the flesh to fulfil the lusts thereof." He adds: "I had neither desire nor need to read farther. As I finished the sentence, as though the light of peace had been poured into my heart, all the shadows of doubt dispersed. Thus hast Thou converted me to Thee, so as no longer to seek either for wife or other hope of the world, standing fast in that rule of faith in which Thou so many years before hadst revealed me to my mother." From that time forward St. Augustine may have sinned, as the best of men fall from their perfection, but never after the fashion of former days. Against the sin which once enslaved him he never ceased to testify, and he passed to the opposite extreme of asceticism. His experience was that of one who had turned completely round, and for whom in a moment everything became new, so that the most dangerous and corrupting of habits, the habits of sensual sin, passed utterly away as though it had never been.

Another form of conversion is *intellectual*, where one

emerges from the darkness of error into the light of the truth. Nathanael had puzzled himself regarding the signs of the Messiah until he refused to believe that the Messiah had come, but suddenly, on his meeting with Jesus, all his former preconceptions passed away, and he saw, as by a flash, the character of the Messiah in the face of Jesus. One minute he was convinced that no good thing could come out of Nazareth, and the next thing he was confessing, with gladness of heart, "Thou art the Son of God, Thou art the King of Israel." Martin Luther, burdened with the sense of his own sins and longing for the peace of holiness, made his pilgrimage to the city which was the capital of Christendom and the home of the Vicar of Christ. Anxious to use every means of grace, so that he might on no account miss salvation, he was ascending the steps of Pilate's staircase upon his knees with a crowd of pilgrims, when the word came to him, "The just shall live by faith." He rose without delay and left the place, and in that hour he was delivered from the superstition which had held his reason in bondage. The whole system of his theology crumbled into pieces, and a new system took its place, as when the darkness flees before the rising of the sun.

The third form of conversion is not so much moral nor intellectual as it is *practical*. As Jesus walked upon the shore of the Galilean Lake He called Peter and John and commanded them to follow Him. They left their nets and followed Him upon the promise that instead of being fishermen on the Lake of Galilee they should become fishers of men the world over. This was the great event in their lives, and from it sprang that spiritual character and magnificent service by which they have laid all generations under a debt of gratitude, and by which they now sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel. It would be only a matter of a few seconds—"Follow Me," and they followed Him—but centuries have not exhausted

the content of that word. A young man of Assisi is banqueting with certain companions, and is visited with such strange thoughts that he withdraws himself from their fellowship and goes into the open air. As he stands beneath the clear Umbrian sky, with the stars looking down upon him, he is moved for the first time in his life by love, and surrenders himself to her service. He goes along the road with his companions, and they charge him with being a lover, and he confesses that he has found his bride. They do not understand, but in after years it appears that his bride was Poverty, whom none had wooed since Jesus lived, and to whom St. Francis was to give his life. Can any one doubt that the decision of that evening was St. Francis' conversion, from which, as from a spring that had arisen at the touch of Christ's crucified hands, there flowed a stream of charity which has made beautiful the history of the Church, and surely has come from the very heart of Jesus Himself?

There is one other type of conversion, which may be called *spiritual*, when all the truth which a person possesses is changed into life, and one passes from forms to reality. This was the experience of that chief Pharisee whom Jesus met on the way to Damascus; and this was the experience of the greatest of Scottish divines—when Dr. Chalmers, who had been an orthodox theologian and a clean-living man, but formal and cold-hearted, realized for the first time the meaning of two magnitudes, the shortness of time and the greatness of eternity. In this conversion the beautifully-shaped marble of a correct and traditional religion suddenly glows, and is touched with life as when the statue turned into a living being. It matters little through what avenue the Spirit of God enters into a man's nature if only the Spirit has free access and accomplishes His great work, and the man is born again of the Holy Ghost, and remade by the very power of God.

Various interesting questions may be raised regarding the time of regeneration, and, again, we ought to allow a great latitude in experience. There are doubtless some, and they are highly favoured, who have hardly been born into this world according to the flesh, but they are born again according to the Spirit, who from their first years have their faces turned towards God and who always bear the likeness of His beloved Son. For them there is no double life, and for them, therefore, there is no marked change, but all their life flows in one direction, from earth to heaven. With others there has been no agony of doubt, and no crisis of faith, for they have passed so imperceptibly into light that they cannot tell the day when they were born again. Doubtless there was such a day, for they are evidently regenerated; but when they awoke, the sun had long risen, and their chamber was flooded with light. Others there are, and not a few, who can tell with certainty before God and man the day when they experienced the great change, and their souls were born again of the Holy Ghost. It is not for one moment to be supposed that their account of the beginning of the spiritual life is only an illusion of fanaticism. There is nothing incredible in the direction of a life being changed within the space of an hour, and, indeed, the great events of life are instantaneous. Many things have gone before this sudden conversion, so that a person has been prepared for that moment during years of doubt and trial and discipline. Many things will follow after, before the tiny spark of life comes to its full height and perfect shape, but the actual conversion may be as rapid as the opening of a flower in the morning, as a breath of wind upon the surface of the sea. Nor is this experience contrary to human nature or without its parallels in other provinces of life. A son has played the prodigal and broken his mother's heart; he returns on the news of her illness and

enters her chamber to find her dead. By her bedside he kneels, and in that hour the power of past sin is broken, and he leaves the room invulnerable against the sins of past years. A lad, unconscious of his talents and feeling about for his lifework, picks up a book of science, and ere he has read a page he understands his calling. A man with disengaged heart and careless of social ties sees a woman's face, and the current of his life sets in a new direction. No one can explain how the change is effected, no one can describe his own experience. The wind blew where it listed, and it was viewless, but the sound was in the heart, and the power was in the life. Savonarola was checked in love, and turned aside from the world: he gave himself to the service of God, and in the end sealed his testimony with his life. Once and again, in the Duomo of Florence, he referred to his conversion, and he used to say with emphasis, "A word did it," but he never told the word, and that word must always be a secret between a man and God.

JOHN WATSON.

HOLY HATRED.

THERE is perhaps no characteristic of holiness more definite and strong than hatred. Holiness is an implacable hater. But its hate is of a peculiar kind; it is hatred born of love. Hence its intensity and its passionateness; for there is no hatred so intense and keen as the hatred of which the parent is affection.

Some persons appear to think that all kinds of hatred are wrong; that hatred itself partakes of the nature of sin. Nothing could be more untrue. There is, of course, bad hatred, just as there is bad love. If we love bad things, our love is bad; our love is only good when its purpose

and object are good. Similarly with hatred. Its character wholly depends on its motive and object. If we hate good things, our hatred is evil; but if we hate evil things, our hatred is good. Both love and hatred alike are evil, or good, according to their purpose and their source. The difference between them is, that love is good or evil directly according to its object; and hatred inversely—that is to say, love is good if its object is good, and evil if its object is evil; whereas hatred is good if its object is evil, and evil if its object be good. Both love and hatred, therefore, are holy or unholy, according to the character of the source from which they spring. And as our duty is to quench every spark of unholy love, so also our equal duty is to cultivate every germ of holy hatred.

It is, indeed, not too much to affirm that the perfection of holiness is unattainable without the practice of hatred. For what is holiness? Holiness is devotion to God and love of righteousness; and there is no hatred more keen than the hatred of evil engendered by the love of righteousness, and the hatred of sin kindled by devotion to God. They that love the Lord hate—they cannot help hating, the spiritual necessity is laid upon them, they *must* hate—the thing that is evil.¹ Love of God cannot live without hatred of sin. True religious love is never lukewarm, never indifferent. It is not an affair of opinion or taste, but a burning passion consuming all things opposite in their nature to itself. When holy love ceases to burn with the flames of a lively, leaping indignation, it soon flickers down into a heap of ashes cold and dead. In order that we may grow in the beauty and purity of holiness, it is essential to feed well the furnaces of holy hatred; for the gold of goodness is often refined in the white heats of indignant hatred against evil.

Holiness has few foes so deadly as indifference. In all

¹ Ps. xcvi. 10.

high and noble pursuits we find that vacillating indifference is fatal. In the world of thought indifference is destructive of success. The half-hearted never reach the heights of knowledge, nor discover hidden truths, nor attain the grace of style. In politics enthusiasm and work are indispensable to victory. No social reform, no moral improvement, no benevolent enterprise, was ever carried to a triumphant issue by wavering and lukewarm advocates. Even in the ordinary avocations of industry and commerce failure awaits flabbiness; none but the determined and the zealous can command success. The same law holds sway in religion. Religious indifference leads inevitably to religious failure. Religion without earnestness, without enthusiasm, without passion, soon ceases to be religion, as fire without fuel soon ceases to be fire. Neutrality in religion is tantamount to irreligion. "They that are not with Me," said Christ, "are against Me." "No man can serve two masters; he must either hate the one and love the other, or else hold to the one and despise the other. Ye cannot serve God and mammon."¹ In religion all halting between two opinions means deciding against God.

Mere acquiescence in religion, or in the appearance of religion, without a passion for holiness, is amongst the worst of all forms of anti-Christianism. It is better to be an open enemy than a lukewarm friend of the Christ. It was lukewarmness which drew down the Divine malediction upon the Church of the Laodiceans. "I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot: I would thou wert cold or hot. So then because thou art lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, I will spue thee out of my mouth." "Be zealous therefore and repent, that I may come in to thee and sup with thee."² The godly sorrow which worketh repentance to salvation not to be repented of invariably works zeal, invariably works revenge; a zeal for goodness

¹ Matt. xii. 30; vi. 24.

² Rev. iii. 15, 16, 20.

which takes revenge upon past days wasted in evil.¹ The true penitent is zealous towards God, zealous of good works, zealous of spiritual gifts, zealous for the salvation of others,² zealous towards every manner of noble ideal—zealous on behalf of all things honourable, venerable, nobly serious, righteous, pure, lovely, gracious, virtuous, praiseworthy, good³—and zealous against all things false, cruel, shameful, mean, unlovely and untrue. To be neither cold nor hot in antagonism to evil, neither cold nor hot on behalf of righteousness, is to be very far indeed from the kingdom of God. Nearer to the kingdom are they who have greatly sinned, and greatly repented, than they who do not even know that they are poor and naked and wretched and blind, and go on in comfortable and self-satisfied indifference to the horrors of sin and the sublimities of holiness.⁴ In matters of mere opinion on questions of religious interest there may legitimately be much wavering and vacillation; but any vacillation or wavering in reference to the eternal verities of righteousness and holiness is spiritual ruin.

Everywhere in the Bible the religious life is represented not as an easy drifting with the stream of things, but as a resolute battling against the stream; not as a placid performance of mechanical routine, but as a passionate pursuit of living ideals. In religion there is no colourlessness, no complacency, no satisfaction either with things as they are, or with ourselves as we are. Religion is a conflict, a wrestling, a race, a hunger, a thirst, a stern resolve to gain at any cost the priceless pearl, a sleepless vigilance lest we should miss the moment of the Bridegroom's coming, a panting, a yearning, a longing, a covetousness, a zeal, a flame of love, a fervour of hatred. There

¹ 2 Cor. vii. 10, 11.

² Acts xxii. 3; Titus ii. 14; 1 Cor. xiv. 12; Col. iv. 13.

³ Phil. iv. 8.

⁴ Matt. xxi. 31.

is, indeed, great quietness, peace, rest, stillness in religion—but it is the stillness of awe, the rest in the Lord, the peace of God which passeth all understanding, the quietness which is strong in eternal hope—the hope anchored within the veil. Yet notwithstanding the sweet rest and calm peace of religion, its sober strength and its serene tranquility, it is a life of unceasing battle, of unresting enthusiasm, of passionate hatred and passionate love.

In its dual character of blessed peace and truceless war the life of partial holiness in man resembles the perfect holiness of the All-Holy God. God is in Himself the perfection of peace, yet is He unceasingly at war with every manner of evil. No terms seem too strong to the inspired penmen of our Holy Scriptures for describing God's abhorrence and antagonism and hatred against evil. The Bible gives a long catalogue of the objects of God's hatred—false ways, vain thoughts, the froward mouth, lying lips, the serving other gods, the proud look, the high stomach, evil imaginations, false oaths, unkindliness to neighbours, vain oblations, formal worship, paraded prayers and fastings and alms, leading little children astray, unclean altars, the sanctuaries of hypocrisy, the substitution of ritualism for righteousness, with every manner of wrong and evil way.¹ The prophets of the Old Testament heap image upon image to convey to the minds of men the intensity of the Divine hatred against all falseness and unreality and sin. God's anger, they say, is like a flaming and devouring fury; it is a bow full of deadly arrows, a great cloud with thunderings and lightnings, a destroying enemy, a violent storm of indignation.² But these vivid images of the Old Testament grow pale in the presence of the still more terrific language of the New Testament—the woes, and outer darkness, and

¹ Ps. cxix. 104, 113, 163; Prov. viii. 13; Jer. xlv. 4; Zech. viii. 17; Isa. i. 10-15; Matt vi. 1-18; Mark ix. 42; Lam. ii. 7; Matt. ix. 13.

² Cf. *e.g.* Lam. ii. *passim*.

unquenchable fires, the indignation and wrath against the worldly rich and the self-complacently full, and the religiously unreal, proclaimed by our Lord; the tribulation and anguish denounced by St. Paul against every soul of man that is self-seeking and factious, that does not obey the truth, but obeys unrighteousness and follows evil.¹

Yet strong and terrible as is the inspired language descriptive of the Divine hatred, none will shrink from embracing it except those whose sense of the infamy and pestilential character of evil is dim and weak and dull. For how could God, the God of love, the all-tender Father of the children of men, who yearns with an ineffable yearning for our highest good, *not* be jealous² when He sees us giving our hearts to the evil ways which He knows must end in our utter shame and ruin? How could He *not* hate, with a jealous fierceness, the sins and iniquities which make shipwreck of the souls whom He has eternally loved, and for whom He did not hesitate, in the boundlessness of His affection, to give His only-begotten and well-beloved Son to die? It is because He so loves us that He so hates everything injurious to our true interests and our final welfare. Because He is our Father He is—He must be—lovingly jealous when He sees us selling our spiritual birth-right for a poor mess of carnal pottage; wasting away our spiritual excellences on concupiscences fraught with misery and shame; setting our affection on secret yet plausible foes; exchanging the bliss of immortality for the treacherous joy of a fleeting hour; recklessly casting the pearl of our life to be trodden under foot by the swine of sin. God sees these things, as we cannot see them, in all their vile-ness and wretchedness and horror; and, seeing them, hates them with a hatred unimaginable to the feeble, broken vision of our sin-blurred spirits. Yet if we would imitate

¹ Luke vi. 24, 25; Matt. xxiii. 13; Rom. ii. 8, 9.

² Exod. xx. 5.

God's holiness, however imperfectly, we must cherish and cultivate a God-like hatred of iniquity. We must abhor that which is evil, that we may go on cleaving to that which is good. We must hate the evil, that we may continue to love the good, not less than because we already love it. For the hatred of unholiness is not only a consequence, it is also a fomentor of the love of holiness. The more we hate evil the more we shall love good; and the more we love good the more shall we hate evil.

Yet while we do not shrink from, but earnestly foster hatred for the sake of holiness, we must be very careful, very watchful, that our hatred is not sinful hatred. For there is a hatred which is wicked and base and unholy, as well as a hatred which is holy and just and true. Nor is it difficult to discern between holy and unholy hatred; between the hatred that is devilish and the hatred that is divine; for holy hatred may generally be recognised by these three conspicuous signs.

(1) First, holy hatred seldom hates persons. It hates things, and it hates them, not because they are disagreeable or unfriendly to the hater, but because they are in themselves sinful and wrong. Unholy hatred is quite opposite in its character. It does not hate any action, or course of action, on account of its essential baseness, apart from all personal considerations—hating the wrong when done to others as fervently as when done to ourselves—but on account of some personal disappointment, some personal discomfort, some personal dislike. If one person hates another because that other person has crossed the path of his purposes, or defeated his hopes, or wounded his self-esteem, or overthrown his desires, or run contrary to his interests and inclination, his hatred is unholy hatred. It was with this unholy hatred that Esau hated Jacob, and his brethren hated Joseph, and Ahab hated Micaiah, and the Pharisees hated the Christ. Their hatred was personal

animosity, and therefore unholy. Holy hatred, on the contrary, is entirely distinct from personal animosity. When it hates persons, it does not hate them as persons, or for personal reasons, but as embodiments of injustice, as tempters and seducers of others, as enemies of righteousness, foes of humanity, displeasers of God. The consuming passion of holiness burns for the purification and exaltation of humanity, and the greater glory of God. And because with all its heart holiness loves both God and man, therefore with all its strength it hates whatever is contrary to human good and the Divine glory. Holy hatred has nothing selfish in it. It hates sin as sin against mankind and God; not merely, or chiefly, or even at all, as an offence against self.

(2) The second mark of distinction between a holy and an unholy hater is that an unholy hater accuses others and excuses himself: a holy hater bitterly accuses himself and sweetly excuses others. The holy hater feels his own sinfulness more deeply than the sinfulness of others. Of all sins he most of all hates his own sins. Like Job, he abhors himself in dust and ashes; like David, his iniquities take such hold on him that he is not able to look up; like Manasses, he feels bowed down with many iron bands by reason of his sins, and unable to behold and see the height of heaven for the multitude of his iniquities; like the Publican, his cry is, "God be merciful to me a sinner"; like St. Paul, of all sinners he confesses himself the chief, carnal, sold under sin, doing the things he would not, and hating the things he does.¹ If we are tender towards our own transgressions, and severe on the transgressions of others, our severity is unholy and our tenderness selfish; but if we hate our own sins, and are gentle towards the faults of

¹ Job xlii. 6; Ps. xl. 12: The Prayer of Manasses. Luke xviii. 13; 1 Tim. i. 15; Rom. vii. *passim*.

others, then both our gentleness and our hatred alike are holy.

(3) The third conspicuous difference between unholy and holy hatred, between sinful anger and the anger that sins not,¹ is that unholy hatred hates the sinner and is indulgent to the sin; whereas holy hatred loves the sinner whilst loathing the sin. Many persons, we know, are angry with others for committing offences which they themselves commit. They condemn lust in others, yet are lustful themselves; they are angry with dishonour in others, yet secretly indulge dishonour in themselves.² Yea, in the fiery smoke of their vehement condemnation of others, they even hope to conceal their own equal guilt. It is far otherwise with holy hatred. Holy hatred burns with indignation at the offence, but yearns with pity for the offender. As it strikes it weeps. In wrath it remembers mercy.³ It is eager to convert, not to condemn. Denouncing woe upon the sin, it proclaims peace to the penitent. It covers the Magdalene's sin, and makes a world-enduring memorial of her tears and her spikenard.⁴ It hates because it loves; and it loves where it hates. Its fury flows from pity, and its wrath is the measure of its mercy. In the All-holy and All-merciful God, both holy hatred and merciful kindness are revealed in their perfection. For it is because God so hated sin, and so loved sinners, that He gave His only begotten Son that sin might perish and sinners might have everlasting life.⁵

JOHN W. DIGGLE.

¹ Eph. iv. 26.

² Rom. ii. 21-23.

³ Hab. iii. 2.

⁴ Luke vii. 36-50.

⁵ John iii. 16.

THE USE OF PAGAN ETHICAL TERMS IN THE
NEW TESTAMENT.

WE have seen that in repudiating *ἀνθρωπίνη σοφία* St. Paul, fresh from disputation with the Epicurean and Stoic philosophers, intended primarily, at any rate, the rejection of those theories and arguments which had been advanced against the preaching of the cross at Athens.

At the time indeed, and in after ages, this contrast between the *σοφία τοῦ κόσμου* and the *σοφία Χριστοῦ* necessarily produced wide and deep results.

But from the first it was apparent that philosophy and Christian doctrine touched at many points and attacked the same problems; and that often they were brought into an agreement, which was sometimes indeed verbal and misleading, but not infrequently essential and true.

For instance, the conception which ran through all ancient philosophy, and is essentially Platonic, that "like apprehends like," reappears in the Pauline statement, "Who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man, which is in him? Even so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God" (1 Cor. ii. 11). It appears in its modern form as an argument against materialism: "That which requires reason and thought to understand must be itself thought and reason; that which mind alone can investigate or explain must be itself mind. And if the highest conception gained is but partial, then the mind and reason studied is greater than the mind and reason of the student" (Prof. Baden Powell, cited Romanes, *Thoughts on Religion*, p. 16). The same principle is used by Romanes as an argument against an agnostic denial of God, "For no one is entitled to deny the possibility of what may be termed an organ of spiritual discernment."

Again, the existence and attributes of God are treated

by Aristotle and by the later philosophers in terms that approach very closely to the Christian expression. Thus Aristotle conceives of God as the prime mover Himself unmoved, immaterial and immutable, and existing independently of time and space, and eternal (*ζῶον αἰδίον*).

The Aristotelian notion that the life of the wise is in virtue of the indwelling Divine element, is common to many philosophers, and is obviously akin to Christian thought. It is a life, says Aristotle, that surpasses ordinary experience (*κρείττων βίος ἢ κατ' ἄνθρωπον*), and which is lived by a man only so far as he possesses a share of the Divine (*ἢ θεῖόν τι ἐν αὐτῷ ὑπάρχει*), *Arist. Eth. Nic. x. 7*. Then again, the leading Aristotelian doctrine of habit (*ἔξις*) is in close correspondence with the moral teaching of the New Testament, though the word itself occurs in one passage only (*Heb. v. 14*).

Many other instances of the same kind of resemblance might be cited. For a fuller treatment of such points of contact between Christianity and Stoic philosophy the reader is referred to Bishop Lightfoot's admirable article on St. Paul and Seneca in his edition of the Philippians. Our present point, however, is to note that there is no trace in St. Paul's writings of an attempt to incorporate or use, except by way of passing illustration, the leading terms and conclusions of Greek philosophy. The Christian philosophy of intuition and of moral guidance stands on its own basis as a result of Divine revelation.

Accordingly, when we inquire into the Apostle's use or avoidance of words deeply steeped in philosophic theories of life or speculation, we find: (1) Some significantly omitted; (2) Others named and disparaged in the light of Christian truth, while a certain number of ethical terms unknown to philosophy are introduced into the Christian vocabulary; (3) Some pagan conceptions beautiful to begin with adopted and purified; (5) Others lowly and

despised in pagan thought exalted and sanctified by Christianity.

1. Perhaps the most significant omission of Greek philosophic terms in the New Testament is that of *εὐδαιμονία* or "happiness." For, however much ethical systems differed, they were practically agreed in regarding happiness (*εὐδαιμονία*) as the chief aim and object of human desire (*τὸ πάντων ἀκρότατον τῶν πρακτῶν ἀγαθῶν*, Arist. Eth. Nic. i. 2, comp. i. 8). It must, however, be remembered that if St. Paul contemplated *εὐδαιμονία* at all as an end, he would contemplate it as interpreted by the later philosophy of Greece with which he came in contact at Athens. That "happiness," whether conceived as the Stoic *ἀταραξία* or the Epicurean *ἡδονή*, was equally removed from the Christian ideal.

And secondly, in rejecting *εὐδαιμονία* as an ethical aim, St. Paul probably desired to place Christian ethics on an entirely new footing. In doing this he was acting in the spirit of our Lord's own words, who, in the Sermon on the Mount, expressly contrasts the aims which the Gentile world set before itself with those which He proposes for the Christian: *ταῦτα πάντα* (all those material objects of desire summed up in food and clothing) *τὰ ἔθνη ἐπιζητεῖ, ζητεῖτε δὲ πρῶτον τὴν βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ* (St. Matt. vi. 32, 33).

Doubtless the beautiful and inspiring definition by Aristotle of the perfect happiness (*ἡ τελεία εὐδαιμονία*, Eth. Nic. x. 7) will occur to some, with its clearly suggested adaptability to Christian purposes. It is activity (*ἐνέργεια*) in the way of excellence, or highest development, of that which is best within us; and that which is best within us is either intelligence (*νοῦς*) or a Divine element in our nature, or at least that which is nearest the Divine within us.

Such a definition might well serve its turn in the history

of Christian thought. But the time had not come yet, and the Apostle has to deal with the word as he finds it, debased and unspiritualized by mean or vicious associations. The very etymology of the word, which connected it with a pagan system of demonology, suggests an objection to its Christian use. With the Stoic the "demon" was but particular providence working in him and watching over him, which brought him into harmony with Zeus, the conductor of the universe, and involved him in a scheme of necessity which is alien to Christianity. But the main cause which necessitated the exclusion of *εὐδαιμονία* from the Christian vocabulary lay in the fact that the Christian revelation had projected the sphere of happiness beyond this life: "For if in this life only we have hoped in Christ we are of all men most pitiable" (1 Cor. xv. 19), a confession which so widely separated Christian ethics from all previous systems that a fresh expression was needed for the new condition of things.

Other words in this category of omission are: *ἀταραξία*, *ἀπάθεια*, *ἐποχή*, *προαίρεσις*.

Of *ἀπάθεια*, the Stoic calmness of mind, which is the result of freedom from care or the harassing events in life, it may be said that it presents at once a parallelism and a strong contrast to the Christian conception of life. For St. Paul that life involved restless energy and unceasing conflict with pain, peril, and the powers of evil within and without. It was disturbed and agitated with rivalries and controversies and with the care of all the Churches, conditions which were inconsistent with the *ἀπάθεια* and *ἀταραξία* of the Stoic and Epicurean. On the other hand, the Christian must be *ἀμέριμνος*, "free from cares" (1 Cor. viii. 32), and he must be a possessor of "peace." Peace (*εἰρήνη*) indeed takes the place in Christian terminology of *ἀταραξία* and *ἀπάθεια*. It covers the same ground, but goes farther and deeper, signifying not only a state of

calm security and happiness (synonymous with *ἀσφάλεια*, 1 Thess. v. 3), but also reconciliation with God as opposed to estrangement from Him, and the consequent condition of peaceful assurance, the special gift of Divine grace realized through Christ. *Ἐποχή*, or "suspension of judgment," was a technical term with the sceptical philosophers. Whether the word was known to the Apostle and purposely excluded cannot be determined. The mental attitude, however, implied by the word is diametrically opposed to the Christian's assurance of faith. And a scepticism which recognised no real distinction between good and evil (*οὔτε ἀγαθόν τί ἐστι φύσει οὔτε κακόν*, Sext. Emp. xi. 140) could not even come in touch with Christianity.

The omission of *προαίρεσις* or deliberate choice may be understood in view of the submission of the Christian to the will of God and the repression of self (*ζῶ δὲ οὐκέτι ἐγὼ, ζῆ δὲ ἐν ἐμοὶ Χριστός*, Gal. ii. 20). The verb *προαιρεῖσθαι*, however, is found, but not in a technical sense (2 Cor. ix. 7). Of the words used to express the four principal Stoic virtues: *φρόνησις*, practical wisdom; *σωφροσύνη*, self-control or sobriety; *ἀνδρεία*, courage; and *δικαιοσύνη*, justice (Ritter and Preller, s. 401), *ἀνδρεία* alone can, strictly speaking, be placed among the omissions of the New Testament, but the first two occur very rarely, and *δικαιοσύνη* is so entirely coloured and appropriated by Old Testament thought and its development in the New Testament as to have no real connexion with the Stoic *δικαιοσύνη*, which is simply "justice." The practical omission of these words, therefore, in the New Testament, notwithstanding their prominence in the Stoic system, is not without significance.

2. Of the second class of ethical terms referred to, those namely which occur in the New Testament but are mentioned with disparagement in the light of Christian truth,

the most interesting examples are *ἀρετή*, "virtue"; and *ἡδονή*, "pleasure," *ἀρετή* being essentially descriptive of the Stoic, as *ἡδονή* is of the Epicurean, philosophy. *Ἀρετή* is used by St. Paul once only (Phil. iv. 8), where, in claiming for Christian consideration (*λογίζεσθε*) all that is best and purest in civilized pagan life and thought, he closes the enumeration with the words, *εἴ τις ἀρετὴ καὶ εἴ τις ἔπαινος*. The juxtaposition of *ἀρετή* and *ἔπαινος* is remarkably suggestive of accepted ethical phraseology, while *εἴ τις* conveys a note of disparagement indicating a sense of failure in realization of the ideal, an indication fully justified by the moral results of the existing schools of philosophy.

The word *ἡδονή* occurs five times only in the New Testament, and once only in the Pauline Epistles, viz., Titus iii. 3 (*φιλήδονοι*, however, occurs, 2 Tim. iii. 4, opposed to *φιλόθεοι*). In each instance it is used with the baser signification of the word. In St. Luke's report of the parable of the sower, *ἡδοναί* are classed with *μέριμναι* and *πλοῦτος* as the things which "choke" the growth of the good seed (Luke viii. 14); in Titus iii. 3, *ἡδοναί* are placed in a description of the pagan life as synonymous with *ἐπιθυμίαι* (compare for the latter synonym Mark iv. 19 with Luke viii. 14). So also in St. James iv. 1, 3 and in 2 Peter ii. 13, it is used of the gratification of the appetite: *ἡδονὴν ἡγούμενοι τὴν ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τροφήν*, "that count it pleasure to revel in the daytime."

This practical exclusion of the word, and its disparagement in the Christian scheme of life, form a remarkable contrast to its frequent occurrence and its value in the current ethical theories.

It is the more remarkable because, according to the definition of Epicurus, *ἡδονή* did not represent by any means a low ideal of life. Pleasure was to be pursued, not for its own sake, but as a means to happiness (*εὐδαιμονία*).

Virtue was inseparable from true pleasure, sometimes even pain was preferable to pleasure, because endurance of pain was necessary to secure the higher pleasure.

Still the New Testament view of *ἡδονή* was justified not only by the actual corruption of the Epicurean system, which gave a sting to the Horatian phrase, "Epicuri de grege porcus," but also by the widespread demoralization of society due to the cult of pleasure more than to any other cause. It is therefore permissible to see the sanctity and purity of Christian life and expression purposely secured and guarded by the exclusion of *ἡδονή* from its literature and aims. For "pleasure," even in the highest sense in which a pagan could use the word, was essentially limited to mundane and temporal gratification. It excludes the conception of immortality, and was consequently inadequate as an expression of the Christian hope.

3. While some pagan words were, as we have seen, too closely associated with the current philosophy to be safely admitted into the Christian vocabulary, others were retained as admirably adapted for the expression of the new revelation. Instances of such words are: *αὐτάρκεια*, *ἐγκράτεια*, *συνείδησις*, *ἐπιεικεία*, *πραότης*.

Αὐτάρκεια, "all-sufficiency," *i.e.*, independence of external aid, lay at the very foundation of the Stoic position. It implied, on the one hand, contentedness, on the other indifference to that which happened, whether good or evil. It was characteristic of the Stoic's pride, which refused to bow to circumstances. With the Stoic, too, in accordance with his unsympathetic creed, *αὐτάρκεια* implied isolation, a thought which was carefully excluded from the original meaning of the word by Aristotle, with whom *αὐτάρκεια* is "the absolutely good" (*τὸ τέλειον ἀγαθόν*), and identical with happiness; "but," he adds, "we do not mean to limit the conception of all-sufficiency to the individual alone leading a solitary life, but we extend it also to parents and

children and wife, and in general friends and citizens, since man is by nature social" (Eth. N. i. 7, Grant's Trans.).

The contentedness or all-sufficiency of which St. Paul speaks (Phil. iv. 11), *ἔμαθον ἐν οἷς εἰμι αὐτάρκης εἶναι*, rests on a sense of the presence of the indwelling Christ, who supplies a force sufficient for all things, *πάντα ἰσχύω ἐν τῷ ἐδυναμοῦντί με*, but it brings with it no scornful repudiation of external aid or sympathy: "I rejoice in the Lord greatly, that now at length ye have revived your thought for me . . . ye did well that ye had fellowship with my affliction" (Phil. iv. 10, 14). There is a wide difference between the all-sufficiency of the Christian in Christ and the self-sufficiency of the Stoic in self. In the two passages of the New Testament where *αὐτάρκεια* is used (2 Cor. ix. 8; 1 Tim. vi. 6) there is a reference to the literal supply of earthly wants: "Having food and covering we shall be therewith content" (1 Tim. *loc. cit.*).

Συνείδησις, or conscience, has received a great accession of meaning and authority by its union with Christian thought. At the same time its moral value as the divinely implanted criterion of right and wrong was fully recognised by Pagan writers; comp. Dion. Hal. 6, 825, 15, *μηδὲν ἔκουσίως ψεύδεσθαι μηδὲ μαιίνειν τὴν αὐτοῦ συνείδησιν* (to speak no falsehood willingly, nor to defile his conscience). So Eur. Or. 390, *τί χρῆμα πάσχεις; τίς σ' ἀπόλλυσιν νόσος; | ἡ σύνεσις ὅτι σύνοιδα δεῖν' εἰργασμένος*. Compare the well-known passage of Horace (Ep. i. 1, 60), "Hic murus aheneus esto | Nil conscire sibi nulla pallescere culpa"; and the no less familiar words of Juvenal, who speaks (Sat. xiii. 195-198) of a penalty more severe than any judge in earth or Hades could inflict, "Nocte dieque suum gestare in pectore testem." This inner consciousness of Divine law among the heathen is of course recognised by St. Paul as rendering them morally accountable in the sight of God. A word, therefore, which expressed the strongest of all

moral forces in the world untaught by direct revelation naturally found a home in the Christian vocabulary. There *συνείδησις* was deepened and sanctified by the fact of the indwelling Spirit, which makes of conscience nothing less than the voice of God, the channel through which the Divine Spirit communicates with man. It is what our Lord, who does not use the word *συνείδησις* itself, means when He speaks of τὸ φῶς τὸ ἐν σοί (St. Luke xi. 35).

There are two ethical terms falling within this category which may truly be said to have served as a "preparatio evangelii," being destined to describe the character and personality of Christ Himself—"meekness" and "gentleness" (*πραότης* and *ἐπιείκεια*). Both of these words came into the Christian vocabulary unstained by debasing association, and both expressed the best and most Christ-like aspect of pagan ethics. *Πραότης* or "meekness," however, though accepted as a virtue, is mentioned with very faint praise by Aristotle. With him it is a mean between undue or passionate resentment and slavish submission to wrong; it inclines however to that defect, and scarcely merits the name of a virtue (*εἵπερ ἡ πραότης ἐπαινεῖται*, Eth. N. iv. 5, 3).

Contrast this with the value of "meekness" in the service of Christian thought. The adjective *πραῖος* or *πραύς* occurs four times only in the New Testament. But in two passages (Matt. v. 5, xi. 29) it is used by our Lord Himself; in another (Matt. xxi. 5), a quotation from Zech. ix. 9, it is applied to our Lord; and in 1 Peter iii. 4, "a meek and quiet spirit" is described as very precious (*πολυτελές*) in the sight of God. With so great a sanction it is perhaps remarkable that the adjective is not of more frequent occurrence. The noun, however (*πραότης* or *πραύτης*) is found in numerous passages of the New Testament, and is placed in the very forefront of Christian virtues associated with humility, self-restraint, patience, and gentleness (*ἐπιείκεια*).

'*Ἐπιείκεια* enters Christian nomenclature with higher credentials than *πραότης*. With Aristotle (Eth. N. v. 10) it is a corrective of the strict application of justice (the *ἐπιεικῆς* being contrasted with the *ἀκριβοδίκαιος*); it is opposed to the spirit of exaction and severity. It is "the sweet reasonableness" of Matthew Arnold, and what Juvenal (Sat. xiv. 15) calls, "Mitem animum ac mores modicis erroribus æquos." It is therefore especially a virtue in masters of slaves (1 Pet. ii. 18, and Juvenal *loc. cit.*), in disputants (James iii. 17, and perhaps Phil. iv. 5), in judges (Acts xxiv. 4), in those who bear rule in the Church (1 Tim. iii. 3; Titus iii. 2). Joined with *πραότης*, it is essentially characteristic of Christ (*παρακαλῶ ὑμᾶς διὰ τῆς πραότητος καὶ ἐπιεικειᾶς τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, 2 Cor. x. 1, where *διὰ* expresses the motive). As *πραότης* is the virtue of the submissive sufferer, and *ἐπιείκεια* the virtue of the considerate master or judge, taken together in this connexion these terms would point on the one hand to the submission of Christ, the absence of resentment under unprovoked injustice, and on the other to His forgiving love, which takes account of every excusing circumstance, both supremely exemplified in the word from the Cross: "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do."

Thus, while, as we shall see presently, the new order and revelation demanded new words for their expression, terms that defined the best outcome of pagan morality were brought into the service of Christ, and in that service charged with a higher meaning and message. It was like the reception of individuals into the Church. Some natures which refused to abandon old ideals were unable to enter; others came with hearts prepared for the higher life; others presented to the world a new type, and were the firstborn of the new creation.

THE PRIESTHOOD OF DAVID'S SONS.

THOSE who think that no fresh Biblical discoveries can be made except through the material spade, are in grievous error. It is the duty of the investigator to use all the facts which he can collect, whether obtained through excavation of the soil or through diggings, not less deep, in the traditional texts. Who has not heard of the interminable discussion as to the meaning of the following passages? I quote from the Revised Version :

“ And Benaiah the son of Jehoiada was over the Cherethites and Pelethites ; and David's sons were *priests* ” (2 Sam. viii. 18).

“ And Ira also the Jairite was *priest* unto David ” (2 Sam. xx. 26).

“ And Azariah the son of Nathan was over the officers ; and Zabud the son of Nathan was *priest*, (and) the king's friend ” (1 Kings iv. 5).

Dr. Driver writes thus in a work much appreciated by students, and in a recent work quoted from continually by Dr. Löhr, of Halle :

What relation did these כהנים bear to the כהנים of *v.* 17? Were both sacrificing priests? From xx. 26 it may be inferred that they stood in some special relation to the king. Were they ‘domestic priests’ (Ewald), or did they represent the king at public religious ceremonies? . . . The term כהן could hardly have been applied to a minister who was not a priest, unless, by long usage of priests who acted specially as ministers, it had come to denote the *non*-priestly duties discharged by them, and could thus be applied to persons other than priests, to whom the same duties were entrusted (*Notes on the Hebrew Text of Samuel*, p. 220).

Dr. H. P. Smith, in his commentary on Samuel, p. 310, has this brief note :

The traditional exegesis has difficulty in supposing David's sons to be *priests* in the proper sense, for by the Levitical code none could be priests except descendants of Aaron. For this reason the Chronicler

changes his text, substituting **הַרְאֲשֵׁנִים לִיר הַמֶּלֶךְ**. Cf. also *ἀνάρχαι* G. But there is no reason for departing from the plain meaning of the text.

Dr. Löhr agrees with these commentators :

This fact (that David's sons were priests) may be difficult to reconcile with the later legal development, but is not to be rendered meaningless by explanations such as domestic chaplains, non-Levitical priests, ministers of state for the religious department, or by viewing the word as a mere title (*Die Bücher Samuels*, 150).

The latter words are an allusion to Baudissin, who holds (*Geschichte des Alttestamentlichen Priesterthums*, 1889, p. 191) that "*kohen* is the designation of a high officer in the court, and is explained in 1 Kings iv. 5 by the appended phrase, 'friend of the king.' . . . Probably the title of priest was attached *honoris causâ* to kings' sons and high officers." To this view Buhl (Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch*, ed. 13, p. 360) gives his assent.

The above is merely a preface to the communication which I have to make. Taking up the three passages quoted above, and also the parallel passage 1 Chronicles xviii. 17, and treating them as one would treat any Hebrew passage elsewhere which had some suspicious phenomena, I seemed to myself to see what the right reading in the respective passages must be. In 2 Samuel viii. 18, for **כְּהֲנָיִם** read **לְכַנָּיִם**; in 2 Samuel xx. 26 and 1 Kings iv. 5, for **כֹּהֵן** read **לְכַן**; in 1 Chronicles xviii. 17, for **הַרְאֲשֵׁנִים לִיר הַמֶּלֶךְ** read **הָיָו לְכַנָּיִם לְדָוִד**. It is easy to prove the correction suggested for 1 Kings iv. 5, and this carries with it the corrections of the first two passages. In 1 Kings iv. 5, **כֹּהֵן** is followed by **רֵעֵה**, "friend" (a well-known official title in Oriental courts). This is plainly a gloss which in G has actually expelled the word which it sought to explain; while in MT the difficult word **לְכַן** has been altered into **כֹּהֵן**. A further confirmation of this is derivable from 1 Kings iv. 6, the beginning of which runs thus in MT :

ואהישר על-הבית, but ought rather to be read (as Klostermann has shown) אָהִיו שֵׁר עַל-הַבַּיִת. The whole passage will then run, "And Zabud, son of Nathan, a royal administrator, his [Azariah's] brother, was the officer over the palace." With this compare Isaiah xxii. 15, where לְכֹן is explained by the phrase אֲשֶׁר עַל-הַבַּיִת (perhaps אֲשֶׁר should be שֵׁר).

The correction of 1 Chronicles xviii. 17 cannot be so certainly proved. Some emendation, however, is necessary, and this I believe to be the best. הַרְאִשְׁנִים לִיד הַמֶּלֶךְ was not a natural expression for a writer like the Chronicler to adopt in order to remove a phrase which he found troublesome in his authority. I may remark, by the way, that textual criticism does not confirm the view that the Chronicler was quite so ready to interfere with his authorities as has been supposed. In the case before us, I do not believe that the interference theory is justified. If the Chronicler had set himself to efface a reference to non-Levitical priests, he could easily have found a more distinct expression than "the first beside the king." The correction which I have adopted seems very probable. What the *sōkēn* was, or, at least, might be, we know from the passage of Isaiah already quoted (xxii. 15). The word *sōkēn* was also in use in Phœnician.

Since forming the above view, I have found this remark in Hitzig's *Psalmen*, ii. 318 [1865]:

Exceptionally David officiated as priest (2 Sam. vi.) at a time when the cultus was suspended, and there were no longer any priests. He was obliged to appoint some himself, and nominated Levites as such (2 Sam. viii. 17; xx. 25); his sons he made, not priests, but (so we should write in viii. 18) סִבְגִּים.

The case is analogous to that of Zechariah ix. 13, where some earlier critics, who were adverse to throwing 2 Zechariah into the Greek period, sought to emend the trouble-

some ין. For my part, I am with the "advanced" critics on the critical questions affected, both by the Samuel passages and by the Zechariah passage; but I believe that the conservative critics were on the right track, both when they sought to weaken the sense of כהנים and when they tried to correct ין. Hitzig may have been stimulated to correct כהנים in 2 Samuel viii. 18 by a non-critical prejudice, but his correction was right. He omits, however, to justify it. This I have myself tried to do, and in my corrections I know that I was entirely independent of Hitzig. The reading סכנים cannot any longer be dismissed, as Baudissin (I now observe) has dismissed it in his *History of the Old Testament Priesthood*. The scales are falling from the eyes of many students of the Hebrew text. For those who have worked critically through the text of a single book on the principles of the newer textual criticism (cf. my article in the EXPOSITOR, April, 1899), it will not be natural to hesitate long to accept at any rate the first two of these emendations.

Before concluding, I would remark that Prof. van Hoonacker has a very full discussion of the priesthood of David's sons in his new work, *Le Sacerdoce Lévitique* (1899), pp. 266-281. He at any rate has no prejudice against corrections of the text. He asks (p. 280): "Might not the כהן of the Massoretic text [in 1 Kings iv. 5] be the result of a confusion with the name נהן which immediately precedes, and which, moreover, appears twice in the same verse?" This would be a very plausible suggestion, but for 2 Samuel viii. 18 and xx. 26, where כהנים (כהנים) also occurs. Prof. van Hoonacker, however, is of opinion that the notice of the sons of David in these passages originally assigned to them the title which we now find in 1 Chronicles xviii. 17. I am sure that, whether he convinces his readers or not, he will succeed in satisfying them of the thoroughness of his investigation and of his freedom from controversial bitterness. I am very sure, too, though not through his

own researches, that historical critics have fallen into error on the office of "David's sons." It is not, indeed, an extremely important error, but it is a conspicuous one, and it has arisen from their undue conservatism in matters of textual criticism. Caution is not everything in textual criticism. Indeed, neither caution nor boldness is specially the characteristic of the textual critic, but resourcefulness.

T. K. CHEYNE.

APOCALYPTIC SKETCHES.

VI.

THE SUN-CLAD WOMAN AND HER ENEMIES.

REV. XII.-XIV.

THE seventh seal opens out into seven trumpets; and now we shall find the seventh trumpet opening out into a series of developments which issue in the catastrophe of the seven vials or bowls of judgment. I am aware that some regard the seventh trumpet as closed in the eleventh chapter; but this seems quite inconsistent with the solemn warning of the fourteenth verse: "The second woe is past: behold the third woe cometh quickly." The first and the second woes have been so appalling that we naturally expect the third to be more appalling still, whereas if it is finished in the eleventh chapter it could scarcely be reckoned a woe at all; rather is it a jubilation. The true view, therefore, seems to be, as in former cases, that when a great catastrophe is about to be announced, the mind is prepared for it by a preliminary assurance that what is dark and dreadful is only temporary, only a preparation for the time when the harshest discords shall be resolved into universal harmony. The third woe then is the woe of the seven vials or bowls reached in the 15th chapter, in which we are

told (xv. 1) "is finished the wrath of God." And that this is no mere conjecture can be seen by looking back to the vision of consolation preceding the seventh trumpet, in which we find (x. 7) this definite declaration: "In the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound, then is finished the mystery of God." This clearly identifies the seventh trumpet with the seven vials which are to be its outcome.

How then does the passage before us this month come in? Let me endeavour as briefly as possible to make this clear. The whole series of judgments through which the Son of God will advance to victory is given in this book in the form of a treble seven-fold woe: seven seals, seven trumpets, seven vials; but these, strictly speaking, are not three but one, for the seven vials are all comprehended in the seventh trumpet, and the seven trumpets are included in the seventh seal. Before each great outbreak of judgment there are visions of consolation and preparation: before the breaking of the first seal, the great vision of the throne of God and of the Lamb (iv., v.); before the breaking of the seventh seal, introducing the trumpets, the vision (in chap. vii.) of the four angels and the sealing of the 144,000 and "the great multitude that no man could number out of every nation"; before the blast of the seventh trumpet, the vision of the strong angel, and the measuring of the temple and sifting of the church (chap. x., xi. 1-13). But now that the final catastrophe of the seven vials is coming, there is, as it were, a great reluctance to bring it out. There is a lingering and a holding back, and a multiplication of gracious assurances, all fitly expressing the mind of Him who through His prophet Hosea said to Israel of old: "How shall I give thee up, Ephraim? How shall I deliver thee, Israel? How shall I make thee as Admah? How shall I set thee as Zeboim? Mine heart is turned within Me, My compassions are kindled together."

This is still more striking when we realize that the third and last series of woes has specially in view those who have an outward connection with the Church, but instead of having the seal of God on their foreheads allow themselves to be branded with the mark of the beast. Up to this time judgment has been on the world as distinguished from the Church; now the Church is sifted, the tares and the wheat are separated, and while the wheat is gathered into the garner the tares must be burnt up with unquenchable fire. We can well understand then why there should be chapter after chapter of warning, and instruction, and encouragement, and comfort, before the seven angels having the seven last plagues are allowed to pour their vials on the earth.

See then what we have in the way of preparation. First there are these great voices in Heaven proclaiming in advance what was to be the glorious consummation (xi.15-17), the dark side only hinted at as yet in verse 18. Then there is the opening of the Temple of God in Heaven, and the vision of the Ark of His Covenant, to suggest that the Church is specially interested in the judgments which follow, indicated here by "the lightnings, and voices, and thunders, and an earthquake and great hail" (v. 19), and now in chapters xii.-xiv., the passage specially before us, we see as it were the *dramatis personæ* of the tragedy, the combatants in the awful conflict which will be finished when the vials shall be poured out.

A most unequal contest it promises to be; for on the one side there is a woman in agony; on the other side a great red dragon, supported by two monsters more horrible and dreadful than even imagination had ever pictured before. But we must follow the passage a little more in detail, though not so as to depart from the general plan of these sketches.

The scene of the mighty conflict is first in Heaven

(xii. 1-12*a*), then on earth (12*b*-xiii. 18), and back again in Heaven (xiv.).

First, then, in Heaven we see a woman and a dragon arrayed against each other. The woman's sole defence is "the armour of light." She is "arrayed with the sun, and the moon under her feet, and upon her head a crown of twelve stars"; and her hope is in the pangs she is enduring, for they are birth pangs, and her child is to be the hero of the awful conflict. The woman is the symbol of the Church. The Virgin Mary naturally rises to our mind, but we are not to think of her as an individual; if she was in the mind of the Apostle at all, it must have been simply as the representative of the tribe of Judah and the House of Israel, of whom sprang the man Child who was to be the great Deliverer (cf. Rom. ix. 5). The dragon opposed to her is "great," for his power is terrible, and "red," for he thirsts for blood; "with seven heads," for there is no end to his devices; "and ten horns," for there is no lack of power to carry them out; and "upon his head seven diadems," for he is "the prince of this world," "the prince of the power of the air." The reference to the casting to the earth of the third part of the stars of Heaven probably points to the angels who shared with him in his fall. And he it was at whose instigation Herod lay in wait for the coming Child to destroy it as soon as it was born; and not Herod only, but the whole power of the world, set against the Holy Child all through His earthly pilgrimage on to the time when another "Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together against Him" and put Him to death. But even that was no victory for the dragon, for He did not remain under the power of death: "the Child was caught up unto God and unto His throne."

But still the war goes on; for the woman has fled to the wilderness, and the Church of Christ is suffering perse-

cution, and the battle seems to go against her. But that is only on earth and only for a limited time.¹ Look up and follow the fortunes of the war in Heaven (*v.* 7 *seq.*). Who is Michael? None other than the man child who has been caught up unto God and unto His throne. We are accustomed to think of Michael as an archangel and to class him, say, with Gabriel and Uriel. But it is not Scripture, but *Paradise Lost*, which is responsible for that idea. In Scripture there is only one Archangel, and every time He appears He stands for the Lord Jesus Christ. The Archangel is the Lord of Angels; that is the meaning of the word. The name Michael means, "Who is like God?" and its appropriateness here is evident from the connection with the man Child who has just been caught up to God and His throne.

A man Child? Yes; nevertheless Divine; and when He goes forth to war with the dragon, His name is Mi-cha-El, "Who is like unto God?" (*cf.* here *xiii.* 4, "Who is like unto the beast?") And look further down, *v.* 6: "to blaspheme His name," *i.e.* the name Mi-cha-El). Nothing more seems needful to be said to make clear the story of "the war in Heaven" (*vv.* 7-11).

All this has been in Heaven, *i.e.* in the region of the Unseen. The veil has been drawn, and we have seen that though the Church on earth is as a feeble woman, driven into the wilderness, the armies of Heaven led by the Son of Man Himself, now "declared to be the Son of God with power, by the resurrection from the dead," are arrayed against the devil and his hosts, and have already gained the victory. This agrees with what we have in the Gospel: "Now is the judgment of this world, now shall the prince of this world be cast out."² How far cast out? Only out

¹ 1,260 days, = 42 months, = 3½ years (*v.* 14, *cf.* *xi.* 3, etc.) = ⅔ = broken as distinguished from complete time.

² In this passage (*John* *xii.* 31) the reference is to the cross; *cf.* *xii.* 11, "they overcame him because of the blood of the Lamb."

of the heavenly places where those dwell who are risen with Christ. "I beheld Satan fallen as lightning from heaven." He has no more place there; "therefore rejoice, O heavens, and ye that dwell in them" (v. 12). ("Whosoever abideth in Him sinneth not.") But "woe for the earth and for the sea; because the devil is gone down unto you, having great wrath, knowing that he hath but a short time."

The scene, you observe, is now transferred to earth. And here, in a passage which has difficulties in detail I shall not here attempt to face, it is plainly intimated that a certain portion of the professed followers of Christ make terms with the enemies of the Church, and save their earthly lives by losing the heavenly, while the remnant remain faithful, to the intense disgust of their relentless foe, who "waxed wroth with the woman, and went away to make war with the rest of her seed, which keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus" (v. 17). Feeling his weakness, the dragon looks out for allies. "He stood upon the sand of the sea." This to a Hebrew would mean a westward look; for the Great Sea was the western boundary of their land. And as he looks westward there emerges from the sea a frightful monster, described in such a way as to make it evident that the great world power of Rome is meant, as embodied in the reigning Emperor. The dragon will henceforth act through this monster—leopard, bear, and lion all in one—and, claiming to be Divine, demand to be worshipped as the divine Augustus.¹ There is one then who on earth takes the name of Michael (Who is like unto God?) "And it was given unto him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them: and there was given to him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation. And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him,

¹ Augustus, Latin form of Greek *σεβαστός*, which literally means "a man to be worshipped."

every one whose name hath not been written in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain from the foundation of the world." A terrible prospect this, and therefore a heartening word is given (*vv.* 9-10) before another terrible ally of the dragon appears.

"And I saw another beast coming up out of the earth." Remember where the dragon was standing, on the sand of the sea, and looking westward, saw the first beast rise out of the sea. The second would rise behind him on the land, *i.e.* the land¹ of Israel. For this reason especially I am inclined to accept the view that as the first beast was the Roman Empire as embodied in the reigning Emperor, the second was the land of Judah as represented at this time by the Roman procurator, "who exerciseth all the authority of the first beast in his sight," and by the apostate Jewish Church,² which also played into the hands of Rome. That the Roman procurator, in the later years in the reign of Nero, was himself a second Nero is as certain as history can make it; and if we were acquainted with all the facts of his administration, we might be able to follow all the details of his tyranny as set forth in *vv.* 12-17. The second monster set himself to insist on all worshipping the first monster, the Nero in Jerusalem compelling his subjects to be marked with the mark of the number of the name of the Nero in Rome. That number was 666, which certainly fits exactly Nero Cæsar when put in Hebrew letters, though it is perhaps more to the purpose to observe that as seven is the number of completeness, so six is that which falls short of it; so that no number could to a Hebrew mind more solemnly impress the thought, "Weighed in the balances and found wanting." O Nero, thou seemest all but God;

¹ Both in Hebrew and also in Greek the word for the earth and the land is the same.

² This twofold reference is perhaps confirmed by the alternation between the two different names given to this monster, which is sometimes known as the second beast and sometimes as the false prophet.

thou art well nigh omnipotent; but thou art wanting, thou art lost. And lost too are those who allow themselves to be marked with the number of thy name, 6-6-6.

Now surely the case is hopeless for the poor woman in the wilderness, for the persecuted Church of God, and especially for those who are faithful to the death, for those who "keep the commandments of God, and hold the testimony of Jesus." There are three great enemies arrayed against her: the great red dragon, who is prince of the power of the air; the resistless might of Rome and of its Emperor, who is prince of the power of the sea; and the cruelty and rage of the viceroy in Jerusalem, who is prince of the power of the land, having at his disposal its spiritual forces as well as its material strength. Surely the result must be ruin to the defenceless woman in the wilderness.

Look up again. The scene is once again transferred to Heaven. The veil is drawn, and before the seer is the sunny mount with a rejoicing throng of holy worshippers pouring out their hearts in the thrilling music of the new song (xiv. 1-5). What a marvellous contrast to the harrowing scenes on which the eye was resting ere the veil was drawn! And now turn from the heavenly Zion, with its happy throngs arrayed in white, and look away into the wondrous future of the purposes of God. See first a mighty angel flying in mid heaven with the eternal gospel to proclaim to every nation and tribe and tongue and people (vv. 6, 7). See another angel following, proclaiming the doom of godless Babylon (v. 8); and still another, proclaiming the eternal overthrow of all who surrendered to the blasphemous claims of the world-ruler (vv. 9-11). What a contrast to the faithful ones who loved not their lives unto the death! "Here is the patience of the saints, they that keep the commandments of God, and the faith of Jesus. And I heard a voice from heaven saying, Write, Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: yea,

saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours; for their works follow with them."

And now the harvest has come: "And I saw, and behold, a white cloud; and on the cloud I saw one sitting like unto a son of man, having on his head a golden crown, and in his hand a sharp sickle" (v. 14). There is first the ingathering of the saints by the Lord Himself (vv. 15, 16). Then follows the vintage of judgment, committed to the angel who had power over fire (vv. 19, 20).

Thus the mighty conflict is to end in the triumph of the Lamb over all the powers of evil, a triumph so vividly set forth in this marvellous preparatory vision that the heart of the seer who writes and the saints who read the word of this prophecy may be reassured before the seven angels with the seven last plagues shall pour their vials on the earth.

J. MONRO GIBSON.

THE STAR OF THE MAGI.

The Editor of the EXPOSITOR has kindly forwarded to me the following interesting letter from a correspondent in Calcutta:

I have read with great interest Mr. Canton's article on the Nativity in your February number, and it seems to me that there is much to be done yet for the elucidation of the Bible by bringing to bear upon it the historical and poetical imagination of such minds as his. But has not his imaginative insight failed him in two points connected with the journey of the Wise Men? He justly takes exception to the expression "star in the east." All stars rise in the east and set in the west. But it does not appear to me that we are compelled to fall back upon the explanation "in its rising," which conveys little more of a definite sense than the other. St. Matthew says nothing about a star in the east. He says twice that the Wise Men *saw it* in the east

(ii. 2, 9)—*i.e.*, they were in the east when they saw it. Again, he says nothing about it going before them on their journey from the east to Jerusalem. Such a guiding is scarcely conceivable, because in so moving it would have followed the same course as all the rest of the stars, and they would have had no indication that a special guidance was intended. His narrative implies (ii. 9) that after their first sight of the star it disappeared, and they did not see it again till they were on their way from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, when it went before them on a road which leads almost due south. Such a course could not have been taken by any of the planets or fixed stars. I should therefore regard this second appearance as almost certainly meteoric; and when St. Matthew says that this was "the star which they saw in the east," he either means that the first appearance was also meteoric, or he is speaking from the Wise Men's point of view, and means that the meteor seemed to them to be the same star. On this latter supposition it is quite possible that the first appearance was one of those conjunctions of planets to which Kepler called attention.

I trust Mr. Canton will forgive these suggestions (necessarily belated) towards an emendation of his admirable paper. It has a special interest for us missionaries, whose privilege it is often to go over the facts of the gospel and strive to bring them home to the imagination of their hearers.

Calcutta.

E. F. B.

I should be glad if E. F. B.'s suggestions were to elicit the views of writers less inadequately qualified than myself to speak on this interesting subject. Still there are a few points on which I should like to attempt an answer.

It is scarcely possible to read St. Matthew's account of the Magi, and to regard it, not as a beautiful legend blossoming out of the devotion of the early Church, but as a simple historic incident, without asking how far science puts us in a position to explain the marvellous part of the story without having recourse to a miracle for which there appears to be no warrant in the text.

The statements and indications in the first twelve verses of chapter ii. are so few and so brief that ample scope is

allowed for surmise and conjecture ; but while it is quite legitimate to exercise the realistic imagination, one cannot too strongly insist on the necessity of surrendering no single particle of the evidence with which the *Evangelist* has furnished us, of giving full value to every statement and indication, and of resisting the temptation to warp facts—just a little—in order to work out some particular theory.

Speaking as an average layman, I fear that the details in *St. Matthew's* account are not sufficiently explicit to warrant a reader in putting forward any particular theory as conclusive ; but it does appear to me that, if we are to believe the story of the Nativity at all, the astronomical conjectures briefly indicated in my article are of such a character that, without having recourse to the miraculous on the one hand, and without setting at defiance the laws of astronomy on the other, any one who reads the Gospel in its obvious sense may accept the scanty record of the star of the Magi with a tranquil and undivided mind.

It is possible that the star may have been spiritual and subjective—a divine light mysteriously guiding the steps of the eastern sages ; but I do not think it possible to believe that *St. Matthew* took that view of the phenomenon. Such an explanation is out of keeping with the frankness and straightforward simplicity of his narrative.

It is possible that while the star seen in the east was a conjunction of planets or a perfectly natural luminary, the light which guided them from Jerusalem to Bethlehem was a providential meteor ; but obviously *St. Matthew* was not aware of any such distinction. The star of Bethlehem was “the star which they saw in the east.”

It is possible that the star seen in the east and the star which stood over the house at Bethlehem were both meteors. But on what hypothesis are we to imagine that those Oriental star gazers recognised in a supernatural meteor the token of a child born King of the Jews ? It is strange that

they should have associated even a conjunction of planets with so specific an incident, but we do know that there was an old tradition, which may have been derived from the Chaldeans, that connected such a conjunction with the coming of the Messiah. Furthermore, why should we tax our faith with a miraculous interposition so extraordinary as this meteoric phenomenon would have been? For, though St. Matthew "says nothing" about the star going before the Magi during their journey from the east, what reason have we to doubt that it did so? It was in this wise that the early Church read the story; it was read in this wise for centuries by artists, and poets, and theologians, and simple, devout souls whose only guide was their natural sense of the congruous; it was told in this wise by the Evangelist himself, for there appears to me to be no justification whatever for E. F. B.'s assertion that the "narrative implies (ii. 9) that after their first sight of the star it disappeared, and they did not see it again till they were on their way from Jerusalem to Bethlehem." If ever there was a time when there was no need for guidance from the heavens, it was precisely when they went from Jerusalem to Bethlehem, after having had the assurance of the chief priests and the scribes that Bethlehem was the place of birth.

I am aware that several learned German critics take the view set forth by E. F. B. The late Mr. Proctor, too, in his chapter on "The Star in the East" (*The Universe of Suns*: Chatto & Windus) declares that the "loss of the star" is in itself sufficient ground for rejecting the theory of a planetary conjunction, seeing that a planetary conjunction *could* not have been lost. But let us turn to the text for ourselves, and see if any necessity compels us to accept that reading.

In support of the "lost star" theory stress is laid on verses 9 and 10: "When they had heard the king they

departed ; and lo ! the star which they saw in the east went before them ” ; and “ they rejoiced with exceeding great joy ”—as though, having vanished after its first appearance, it now suddenly swam into their ken. In verse 7, however, there occurs a little phrase, the force of which is not felt in our English versions, but it must not be lost sight of as a point in the evidence : “ Herod . . . enquired diligently what time the star appeared.” In the Greek the expression is τὸν χρόνον τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος—“ the time of the appearing star.” Now the real significance of this Greek participle cannot be expressed in any English participial form ; but, roughly speaking, the participle expresses a fact, and indicates the continuity of the fact. A distinguished Greek scholar has favoured me with what he regards as the nearest English equivalent of the passage in the following phrasing : “ Now as to the time of this star which, as you say, appears to you ? ” That is the sense a scholar would take out of the words if he met them in a Greek classic. The star did not appear once only, and that long ago ; it still appears.

Without laying undue emphasis on a nicety of language, I am prepared to take my stand on the obvious general sense of the narrative. St. Matthew, it is true, does not say that the star guided the Magi ; neither does he say that it vanished. He merely records the arrival of certain Wise Men who say that they had seen in the east a star, the forerunner of a royal birth. If I conceive that the celestial sign must have shone steadily in the heavens night after night, otherwise those Magi would never have set out on their quest, otherwise their faith would have failed them, and doubt, danger, and fatigue would have turned their faces home again, the Evangelist does not contradict me ; and the human probabilities of the story give some force to my speculations. As I travel with them in imagination, I see night after night the star marshalling us to the west,

till at last we reach Jerusalem. There they learn from Herod that the Messiah is to be born in Bethlehem,¹ and the wicked king bids them hasten thither and search diligently for the young child. They set out in the cool of the day; and again I accompany them and try to realize all they feel—the eager expectancy, the strange, vague hopes, the quick beating of the heart, the occasional doubt as to the success of this last stage of the journey, for now we are travelling no longer westward as heretofore, but almost due south. Can the wily king have deceived us, and sent us astray? Shall we find the wondrous Babe in the little town among the hills six miles off? Is it true? Is our long wandering so nearly done?

Through the grey hills we go: the sun sinks, the dusk gathers—and “lo! the star.” The star we saw in the east, the star which led us nightly across Tigris and Euphrates and through the deserts and over Jordan, which gave us assurance that we were not dreamers of wild dreams and foolish believers in fond traditions, the star goes before us, leads us still though our course be southward and no longer to the west; and we know that our search will not be fruitless.

A little onward lend thy guiding hand
To these dark steps, a little further on!

Is it strange that we “rejoice with exceeding great joy”?
Possibly I may be too fanciful in my interpretation; but

¹ The Greek scholar to whom I have referred gives me the following note as to Herod's question to the priests: “He cannot mean, ‘Where is the Messiah being born *at this moment*?’ or again, ‘Where was He born’—some weeks or months ago? or yet again, ‘Where will He be born?’ His question, as I understand it, is more general—‘What is understood by your traditions and interpretations of Scripture to be the birthplace of the Messiah? Where is He to be born?’ It is nearly equivalent to the future, but not quite. It is something like the difference between (a) ‘When will there be an eclipse?’ and (b) ‘When is the (expected) eclipse to come off?’ ‘When *does* it come off?’” At the same time it is clear from the words “Search diligently” that Herod, impressed no doubt by the presence of the Magi and the story of the star, believed that the birth had actually taken place.

the Evangelist does not contradict me. In his fervid emotion does he not indeed justify me?

E. F. B. observes that such a stellar guidance as tradition describes "is scarcely conceivable," for this particular star would have moved, in common with all the stars, from east to west, and the Magi "would have had no indication that a special guidance was intended." The objection is shrewd, but it is the objection of one who is thinking of a modern astronomer, not of an ancient Oriental star gazer with his astrological fancies and his curious traditions of stellar influences and celestial portents. The star was conspicuous and marvellous enough to be recognised as "His star"; and if the Magi had a sufficient indication that a special summons for their journey was intended, we may reasonably conclude that they were also satisfied that a special guidance was guaranteed.

E. F. B.'s next objection is that when the Magi were on their way from Jerusalem to Bethlehem the star "went before them on a road which leads almost due south," and "such a course could not have been taken by any of the planets or fixed stars." But are we really bound down to taking the verbs of motion in the joyously lyrical language of verse 9 in a rigorously literal sense? Many a starry night I have followed a road leading due south, and over the road hung Betelgeux or Capella (westering with the others), and as I walked the star "went before me," and when I stopped it "stood" over farmstead or cottage. It was no strain of imagination to say that the star led me on; on the contrary, the optical illusion was so strong that while one was in motion one could scarcely help thinking of the star as advancing just as I myself advanced. No planet or fixed star, it is true, was ever known to revolve from north to south, but I see no reason to suppose that St. Matthew meant to say with absolute literalness that the star of Bethlehem moved in such a course.

In this connection it is interesting to note that in the work to which I have already referred Mr. Proctor does not raise this objection. On the contrary, writing of the brilliant planetary conjunction of Jupiter and Saturn, about December 5, B.C. 7, he states that if the Magi travelled to Bethlehem in that year and at that season of the year as evening was drawing in, they would have seen the conjoined planets shining over Bethlehem. "It is, in fact," he adds, "on this circumstance chiefly that the planetary conjunction theory of the star in the east has been based." Whether the planetary conjunction of the following year, or the "new star," the appearance of which has been conjectured, would have been visible to the Magi in a similar position, an astronomer has not sufficient data to decide. I can only hope that I have made out a fair case for accepting the narrative of St. Matthew in its natural, straightforward sense—at least in the meanwhile.

WILLIAM CANTON.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. J. Mordaunt Barnard, M.A.	
Notes on Acts ix. 19 ff	317
Rev. W. Emery Barnes, D.D.	
A Study of Psalm cxxxvii.	205
The Devotional Reading of Isaiah	311
Vernon Bartlet, M.A.	
"Mindful of the Poor."	218
Rev. Prof. W. H. Bennett, M.A.	
Some Recent Old Testament Literature	236
Rev. Armstrong Black.	
"The Burden of Dumah."	48
The Leaven of Herod	173
F. C. Burkitt, M.A.	
Chuza	118
William Canton.	
The Nativity: an Outline	123
The Star of the Magi	465
Rev. Arthur Carr, M.A.	
St. Paul's Attitude towards Greek Philosophy	372
The Use of Pagan Ethical Terms in the New Testament	443
Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
Has Amminadib in Canticles any Existence?	145
Studies in the Criticism of the Psalms	252, 334
The Priesthood of David's Sons	453
Ven Archdeacon Diggle, M.A.	
Holy Hatred	434
Late Prof. Henry Drummond.	
The Problem of Foreign Missions	16
Rev. Prof. G. G. Findlay, M.A.	
St. John's Creed	81

Rev. J. Monro Gibson, M.A., D.D.

Apocalyptic Sketches:—

- | | |
|--|-----|
| 1. The First and the Last and the Living One | 72 |
| 2. The Seven Lamps | 136 |
| 3. The Throne of God and of the Lamb | 226 |
| 4. The Seven Seals | 263 |
| 5. The Seven Trumpets | 379 |
| 6. The Sun-clad Woman and Her Enemies | 457 |

Prof. A. N. Jannaris, M.A.

Misreadings and Misrenderings in the New Testament:—

- | | |
|---------------------------------------|-----|
| 2. Errors of Interpretation | 296 |
|---------------------------------------|-----|

Rev. M. Kaufmann, M.A.

- | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----|
| Was Koheleth a Sceptic? | 389 |
|-----------------------------------|-----|

Rev. Angus M. Mackay, M.A.

- | | |
|---|-----|
| The Late Professor Drummond and His Critics | 110 |
|---|-----|

Prof. W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L., LL.D.

- | | |
|---|--------|
| Questions | 35 |
| A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians | 57, 97 |
| The Date and Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews | 401 |

Rev. Principal A. Robertson, D.D.

- | | |
|--|-------------|
| Studies in the Epistle to the Romans | 1, 187, 345 |
|--|-------------|

Prof. George L. Robinson, Ph.D.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|
| The Genesis of Deuteronomy | 151, 271, 356 |
|--------------------------------------|---------------|

Rev. Canon Armitage Robinson, D.D.

- | | |
|--|----|
| Liturgical Echoes in Polycarp's Prayer | 63 |
|--|----|

Rev. T. G. Selby.

- | | |
|--|-----|
| The Passover and the Lord's Supper | 210 |
|--|-----|

George Augustus Simcox, M.A.

- | | |
|----------------|-----|
| Agur | 148 |
|----------------|-----|

Rev. John Watson, D.D.

The Doctrines of Grace:—

- | | |
|-------------------------------|-----|
| 1. The Grace of God | 161 |
| 2. Repentance | 241 |
| 3. Forgiveness | 321 |
| 4. Regeneration | 423 |

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis xix. 19	196	Matthew i. 18	86
Exodus xx. 5	439	i. 21	197
xx. 24	156	ii. 2	181
Numbers xiv. 12-13	159	iv. 8-11	95
Deuteronomy x. 8-9	159	vi. 24	436
xiii. 1-18	273	vi. 32	445
xvii. 8-13	273	xii. 18	67
xviii. 6-8	153	xii. 30	436
xviii. 9-22	276	xviii. 20	386
xix. 14	277	xxi. 31	437
xx. 1-20	277	xxi. 42	36
xxi. 1-23	278	xxviii. 20	87
xxii. 5-21	280	Mark viii. 15	173
xxiii. 1-26	231	xi. 49	120
xxiv. 1-17	283	xv. 35	120
xxv. 1-15	285	Luke i. 35	86
xxvii. 4-7	158	ii. 4	119
xxix. 27	155	iv. 58	95
xxxii. 1-43	421	viii. 3	121
Joshua viii. 33	160	viii. 14	448
xviii. 1	157	x. 3	121
xxii. 11-34	157	Jchn i. 11	93
xxiv. 15	193	i. 12	95
1 Samuel ii. 5	260	i. 14	86
2 Samuel viii. 18	453	i. 29-34	92
1 Kings iv. 5	453	iii. 16	442
v. 13	157	viii. 36	92
vi. 12	157	x. 28	86
viii. 25	260	x. 37	306
2 Kings xxii. 3	152	xv. 11	307
xxii. 16	155	xvii. 3	94
xxiii. 9	153	xvii. 12	87
2 Chronicles xix. 8-11	273	xvii. 18-26	297
xxxiv. 8	153	xviii. 10	118
Jeremiah vi. 6	118	Acts iv. 11	36
Psalms vii. 9-11	194	iv. 27-30	67
xv. 1	192	ix. 19	317
xviii. 25	193	x. 44, 45	103
xxxix.	252, 334	xi. 29	225
lxxiii. 20	339	xiii. 1	413
xcvii. 10	435	xv. 3	104
cxxxvii. 1	205	xvi. 1-5	106
Proverbs xxx. 5, 6	148	xvi. 6-8	39
xxxi. 1	257	xviii. 18	58
Isaiah xi. 1-9	313	xviii. 24	403
xxi. 11, 12	48	xx. 2-3	415
xxxvii. 22	205	xx. 4	418
lii. 13	67, 314	xxi. 8	404
liii. 12	314	xxii. 3	437
lxii. 7	316	xxiii. 35	403
lxiv. 12	316	xxiv. 25	12
Jeremiah viii. 7	376	xxviii. 17-28	416
xxxvi. 23	155	Romans i. 13	307
Zechariah ix. 13	455	i. 16	194

	PAGE		PAGE
Romans i. 17	189	Galatians ii. 10	218
iii. 5	11	iii. 10	61
iii. 26	8	iv. 12-13	61
v. 5	204	iv. 13	98
v. 12-21	6	iv. 15	101
v. 20	8	v. 3	101
vi. 12-14	346	v. 10	108
vii. 5-6	10	v. 21	60
vii. 25	89	Ephesians iii. 17-19	95
viii. 11-26	350	Philippians iii. 19	190
xv. 19	4	1 Thessalonians i. 10	94
xv. 26	218	1 Timothy i. 13	98
1 Corinthians i. 21	372	i. 15	441
ii. 8	93	Hebrews vi. 1-2	405
iii. 13	12	vi. 10	407
iii. 19	374	ix. 14	405
xiii. 4	222	xiii. 16	222
xv. 11	13	1 Peter i. 11	74
2 Corinthians iii. 3	14	ii. 7	37
iii. 17-18	350	ii. 25	87
vi. 21	86	1 John v. 18-21	81
vii. 10	437	Revelations i.	72
viii. 9	223	ii.-iii.	136
ix. 7	447	iv.-v.	226
xi. 32	118	vi.-vii.	263
xiii. 14	350	viii.-ix.	379
Galatians i. 9	101	xii.-xiv.	457
ii. 1-10	224	xiv. 18	139

a

UCSD LIBRARY
X-18425

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



A 000 456 969 5

