

T H E

# Old and New Testament Student

---

VOL. XI.

SEPTEMBER, 1890.

No. 3.

---

A PYRAMID upon its apex is in a state of most unstable equilibrium. A pyramid upon its base is not easily overturned. Yet many people, in constructing a conception of the Bible or of Christ, insist upon putting the pyramid of faith upon its apex, to the great danger of its overthrow.

If Christ did this, or was that, it is said, I cannot believe in Him as the Divine Saviour of men. If He made intoxicating wine, or if He did not know who wrote every one of the books of the Old Testament, I cannot accept Him as teacher and Lord. If the Bible has in it one scientific or historical allusion that is not in harmony with absolute truth, I cannot accept it as the Word of God. So is the pyramid of faith planted upon its apex.

The folly of such a course is shown by the history of the past. Men once said, "If the world is round, the Bible cannot be the Word of God." Yet we easily believe now in both the roundness of the world and the Divine authorship of the Bible. Later it was said, "If the world was not made, and the fullness thereof, in six days of twenty-four hours each, the Bible is not divine." In this case, also, a way was found to take the pyramid from its apex, and thus to save our faith. How very absurd to go on repeating this process for ever!

---

THE fact is, this work of making our faith in the divinity of the written Word, or the Word made flesh, rest upon some notion of what we think either is or ought to be, is not only shown, by the history of the past, to be dangerous to faith, but it is

unreasonable in itself. It is nothing else than setting up human reason as the final judge in regard to what God has done and can do. It is saying, if there is an incarnation, it must result in such and such facts. If God gives to man a book, it must be a book, the pattern of which I can draw upon my nail. Now, when a thinker who denies the reality of the supernatural in nature or history reasons thus, we say he is a rationalist, and that he is setting his reason up as a judge of God. We say rightly and well. Because he affirms that his knowledge of God is final and complete, or that he knows the universe so thoroughly and so well that he can be utterly sure there is no God in it. Such a claim is the height of conceit and folly. But, after all, is there much difference between such a thinker and the man who claims that he has so far reasoned out God, and so known the Almighty unto perfection, that he can surely say what will be exactly the results when He becomes flesh, or exactly what will be, or will not be, the books which He will cause to be written for men? From what source can this knowledge be obtained? Not from God himself; for He has nowhere told us the truth about these matters. Not from the facts in the life of Jesus, and in the Bible itself; for the question is what these facts really are. To assume, and not to determine, the true character of the facts, is to beg the whole question. The seeming knowledge is only deductions from the data furnished by the human reason. A God is made in the mind, by the mind itself working upon its own philosophical conceptions, and to this God possibilities are assigned in harmony with these conceptions. Then it is easy to say what this God will, or will not, do. But this is only to make reason the judge of God. It is rationalism. This orthodox rationalism is as conceited and absurd as any other.

---

It is much more reasonable, as well as more safe, to rest our faith upon what we know, from the facts in the case, Jesus and the Bible are, rather than upon what we think they are not. Then we place the pyramid upon its base. The Bible claims to be from God. Jesus claims to be from

God. They and their history in the world can only be explained by admitting their claims. If any one feels there are difficulties in the way of believing Jesus and the Bible to be divine, if he is an honest thinker, he will find the difficulties to be vastly greater in attempting to account for them without recognizing them as divine. God is their only satisfactory and complete, and, therefore, their only reasonable and scientific, explanation. That they are divine, however, does not in itself determine, without further study, just what they are in all particulars. It is with them as with nature. God is the only satisfactory explanation of nature. But this established, we do not at once know all that nature is. We study it in all its parts, and in all its workings, to think God's thoughts after Him. So we come to know His works. In like way we must come to know His Word and His Son. We must honestly ask for, and earnestly seek after, all the facts that lie in each, and relate to both, and then must gather from these facts their whole meaning. Thus we never can show, however far our inquiries are pushed, that either is not from God ; but we shall only come better to know what the Divine Man and the Divine Book really are. It is in the interests of this knowledge that the STUDENT was founded and is conducted. Its aim is to find and teach, as far as possible, all the facts of the Divine Man and the Divine Book.

---

THE author of *God in His World* has some interesting and just remarks on the influence of the prophets in the life of the Chosen People. He maintains that it was the prophetic movement which preserved the vitality and simplicity of the Hebrew faith. It came naturally into contact with the state religion, representing as it did the spiritual freedom of the people. One would expect that the holy city would hate and kill the prophets. But we are ourselves prone to glorify the very features of Judaism that the prophets deprecated, the Mosaic ritual, the temple, and forget the spiritual religion for which prophecy stood. The synagogue was in its inception a prophetic institution, as its form of worship shows, though it fell under the sway of the theocracy when prophecy as a

vital power perished. But, as the writer adds, the prophets themselves were born out of the popular faith and are representatives of that divine historical movement which reveals itself in Israel's history, and which is the root of the writings which we call the Bible.

---

THE glory of prophecy is its power to infuse a fresh stream of spiritual vigor into established forms of life. The tendency of organized society is toward institutions, and the peril here is of satisfaction in these monuments of human pride. The writer just referred to declares that the people is blessed which, "generation after generation, has a school of prophets to break up those strictures and to call men back with Isaiah-like yearning to the love of the living God." Such was the work of prophecy in Israel. But, in this large sense, there have been prophets in all nations, and these have succeeded or failed, according as they have wrought toward this great end of spiritual regeneration. Greece had her prophets, but they were satisfied to minister to the "martial and heroic pride" of the nation. They helped to "disintegrate the old sacred foundations," but they substituted no real divine material in place of what they destroyed. The Christian preacher is our prophet to-day, and if he is true to his mission, he is ever calling us back to the real, the eternal, the spiritual, interpreting to us the meaning of passing events in this light, and warning us of the transitoriness of all institutional life. Often this prophetic office is held by a man of the people who partakes of the simplicity and clear vision of unsophisticated humanity, and who is hereby able to pierce the shams and expose the hollowness of much that we proudly boast as part of our civilization. Happy such prophets seldom are, but blessed the people among whom they dwell.

---

DOES the Christian preacher realize the dignity and glory of this prophetic mission with which he is entrusted? Does he come in any way near comprehending his responsibility in this great prophetic office? Does he see that this calls upon

him to strive after the highest and broadest culture, the largest range of vision and the finest power of insight? All this—that he may bring God's thought to bear upon the secularisms and crude establishments of human sagacity, riddle them with the sword of the Spirit, and build upon their ruins the foundations of the City of God?

Let him listen, when he is tempted to ride upon the current of human progress, or find the sources and stimuli for his prophecy in the teachings of merely human thinkers or the doings of merely human energy however striking—let him listen to these words of one of the truest of his own number who has exemplified in very deed these words which he recently wrote for the readers of the *STUDENT*.

“I think that the teaching of the Bible, or exegetical preaching, is altogether the principal business of the Christian minister. He is God's prophet to the Church and to the world; and what more important thing can he do than to unfold his Master's message? Public exegesis, when it is both truthful and useful, is, it seems to me, the highest kind of sacred oratory.”

THE LITERARY CHARACTER OF ST. PAUL'S  
LETTERS. II.

By Rev. Professor E. P. GOULD

P. E. Divinity School, Philadelphia, Pa.

[Continued from the August number.]

But we shall miss the real quality of St. Paul, if we think of him as a mere thinker, a logical machine warranted to be always in order, and to work with surprising exactness, which, I am afraid, is the current view of him encouraged by the use that has been made of his writings. Equally apparent and prominent in his letters is the genuine religiousness of the writer. Of course, any man writing about religious topics is going to display a certain amount and kind of religiousness in his writings. But we have to distinguish between the real article and the counterfeit, and now and then we come upon a man who is what we call a religious genius, one who is so en rapport with spiritual and divine realities that he makes us feel their truth and greatness, not so much by any process of reasoning as by a subtle sense of these things which its possessor is able to impart to others by the mere contact of spirit with spirit. This is the basis of what we call inspiration, and this faculty St. Paul possessed in a marked degree. One of the marks of this genuineness is the presence of the ethical tone, the right emphasis given to conduct in the religious life. And Paul's whole treatment of this is that of a man possessed with this genius for religion. The single fact that he broke with the Jewish law, seeing what no other of the apostles saw, its entire inadequacy to contain the spirit of the new religion, and its real disagreement with it, is a sufficient sign of that inspiration which makes the new ways for humanity to walk in. Put by the side of this his enunciation of faith as the principle of the new life. In order to get the significance of this, notice that he

does not mean by faith the acceptance of this or that religious truth as the means of gaining favor with God, but such a belief of any great fact about God as shall inspire in the man a new life, and so create a new spring of life within him. He insists moreover that no outward observances, but only these gracious affections, these high beliefs, this inspired living can commend us to God.

But it is when he leaves this region of principles, exalted though they are, and comes to the personelle of the new religion, and shows us the Christ as the source of this quickened life, that he rises to the height of his subject. Faith in itself is good, even the crude faith of Abraham, but it is the faith of Jesus the crucified which can bring about the wonders that St. Paul is never tired of contemplating. In him he sees a new beginning of the race, the dawn of a new era, in which righteousness shall replace sin; through him the man dies to sin and rises to a new life; he is freed from sin, and made the bondservant of righteousness; in him man becomes conformed to the Spirit of God, and his purposes become those of the Spirit; and yet at the same time, the man under this influence does not become a mere passive recipient of grace, but is quickened into a strenuous and eager pursuit of the things that are high and excellent, and a vigorous conflict with the forces of evil.

Another sign of this true religious feeling is the frequency with which the apostle mounts from practical themes to lofty considerations, and on the other hand descends from lofty themes to practical applications. That is, the spiritual insight which enables him to see that religion means the bringing together of earth and heaven, so that the man who dwells in the region of lofty contemplation and is at home with heavenly things is not thereby divorced from practical life, but really gets the only genuine good out of these when they leaven his life with good. A general proof of this is to be found in the discourses on conduct with which he closes the most profound of his epistles. See Rom. 12-16. Gal. 5: 13-6: 18.

In the passage in Romans what a singular elevation is given to the whole discourse by this mingling of the religious and the practical elements! He gathers together the whole

impression of the preceding argument in the single phrase, "the mercies of God," and makes that the basis of an appeal to them to make to God the offering of themselves, a holy, living, acceptable, and spiritual sacrifice. And then see how, starting from this high ground, he presents duty in a large and lofty way. "Be not conformed to this age, but be transformed by the renewing of your mind;" "not to think of himself beyond what he ought to think, but to think so as to be rightminded;" "for we the many are one body in Christ, and members one of another;" "let love be undissembled; abhorring evil, cleaving to good; in brotherly love affectionate to each other; in honor preferring each other; in diligence not slothful; in spirit fervent; serving the Lord; in hope rejoicing, in affliction enduring, in prayer persevering; communicating to the needs of the saints, intent upon hospitality; bless them that persecute you, bless and curse not; rejoice with them that rejoice, weep with them that weep; be of the same mind towards each other, not setting your mind upon high things, but submitting to lowly things; be not wise in your own conceits; rendering to no one evil for evil; taking thought for things that are good before all men; if possible, as far as you are concerned, being at peace with all men; not avenging yourselves, brethren, but give place to the wrath of God; for it is written, 'vengeance is mine;' I will recompense, saith the Lord. But if thy enemy hungers, feed him; if he thirsts, give him drink; for in doing this, thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head. Be not conquered by evil, conquer evil in your good."

A striking instance of this power to rise from practical themes to lofty considerations, and so to lift the whole subject to a higher plane is found in the familiar eulogy of love in the 13th chapter of 1 Corinthians. The beauty of the passage in itself is great, but it needs to be seen in its connections, in order to appreciate the power of the apostle to see a practical subject in its higher relations. He has been talking of the contentions in the Corinthian church about the relative value of the different gifts of the Spirit, such as prophesying, speaking with tongues, and the like, and the claim to distinction conferred by these gifts. He has just



said, "desire eagerly the best gifts," and then he proceeds with the statement, that he has a better way to show them. And this better way is the way of love, the superiority of which he unfolds in this incomparable chapter. Another example is the 3d chapter of 2 Corinthians, where he answers the charge that he brings no letters of commendation, such as the Judaizing teachers opposed to him in the church had, by the statement, "ye are our letters," and then in a beautiful passage develops the contrast between the glory of the new dispensation and the fading glory of the old, in the new life of the Spirit displayed in them, contrasted with the spiritual death which alone resulted from the Mosaic law. And in Philippians 2: 2-11, in enforcing his exhortation to humility and unselfishness by the example of Jesus, he rises to the very height of his teaching about the pre-existent glory of the Lord.

Still another mark of this religious genius of the apostle is the height to which he rises in his conception of the relation of the believer to God (Christ or the Spirit). Such expressions as "in Christ," "died with Christ," "live with Christ," "in the Spirit," "the Spirit of God dwells in you," "Christ lives in me," "to me to live is Christ," and the like, are the commonplaces of religious speech now, and like many such, have become possibly emptied of much of their meaning. But in the speech of the apostle, marking, as they did, his individual thought of the relation between himself and God in Christ through the Spirit, they show how he, out of his personal experience, had come to grasp that idea of the immanence of God which is the supreme test of the spirituality and truth of our conception of God. He felt that it was not any outward relation established between himself and God in Christ, but an inward relation, the meaning of which was nothing else than the life of God in him.

This combination of intellectuality and the religious faculty would lead us to expect eloquence as the natural result, and such expectation would not be disappointed. There are flashes of it all through his letters, and sometimes there are passages of sustained eloquence which belong to the classics of such speech. For examples of the shorter passages in

which the apostle rises above the ordinary level of his style into that fitness and greatness of speech which we call eloquence, see Rom. 1: 14-17; 5: 1-11; 13: 11-14; 14: 6-12; 1 Cor. 3: 21-23; 2 Cor. 3: 17-18; 4: 16-18; 6: 3-10; 11: 22-30; Gal. 2: 19-21; 6: 14-18, which is a very noble specimen of the apostle's best style; Phil. 1: 21-26; 2: 1-11; and finally, the surpassingly beautiful close of this epistle contained in the 4th chapter. The whole passage is worthy to be committed to memory, and some of its expressions have passed into the current speech of Christianity. "Stand fast in the Lord;" "Be of the same mind in the Lord;" "Whose names are in the book of life;" "Let your gentleness be known to all men;" "Be anxious for nothing, but in everything by prayer and supplication, with thanksgiving, let your requests be made known to God; and the peace of God which surpasseth every understanding, shall guard your hearts and your thoughts in Christ Jesus;" "Whatsoever things are true, whatsoever things are noble, whatsoever things are right, whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, whatsoever things are gracious, if there is any virtue, and if there is any praise, take account of these things." "I learned, in whatsoever state I am, therein to be content. I know how to be abased, and I know how to abound; in everything and in all I have learned the secret both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to be in want; I can do all things in him who strengthens me."

But, as we have said, St. Paul was capable also of a sustained eloquence. The examples of this are too familiar to need mention. The 8th chapter of Romans, the 13th and 15th of 1 Corinthians are noble examples of his power to transport his readers into regions of high thought and lofty imagination.

We come back finally to the quality in these letters which we mentioned at the outset, the strong personal element which marks them, in spite of the lofty themes discussed in them. St. Paul is writing to churches most of which he had founded, and in which he took the deepest interest. And the admirable thing about his letters is that his interest in persons and in churches is never obscured or overlaid by his

interest in subjects, no matter how profound. He is like his master in this, that his heart is moved as quickly by contact with men to deep and tender feelings, as his mind is quickened by large themes to large and true thought.

The two parts of 2 Corinthians are an illustration of the way in which the apostle's style responded to strong personal feeling. He had been very anxious about the state of things in this church. As appears from the first epistle, there had been great irregularities both of conduct and opinion among them. And now the matter had been complicated by the delay of the church to follow some of his instructions under the influence of his old enemies, the Judaizers. Timothy had failed in his mission to them, not being mature enough to stem the tide that had set in against the apostle. And Titus had been sent to represent the apostle in a final attempt to win the church back to its old allegiance. His mission had succeeded with the majority of the church, but a part had held out, and were inclined to say disparaging things about the apostle and what they considered his weakness and want of courage.

The first part of the epistle therefore, addressed to the loyal majority, is full of the anxiety, the relief, the love which identifies him with his churches, the dignity with which he sustains his authority, the perception of important principles involved in the matters at issue between himself and the church, and an air of genuineness, an absence of exaggeration, which makes the whole a powerful appeal to right feeling. He had been meaning to come to them himself, but was detained by his regard for them, which led him to refrain from coming as long as their state of feeling toward him would have made it necessary for him to come with reproaches on his lips. As he says, with solemn asseveration, his object in not coming was to spare them. But he had written to them a letter strongly expressive of his grief, not that he might grieve them, but that they might know his great love and longing for them. Moreover, the wrong done by the recalcitrant member, whose sin and failure to repent had caused all the trouble was not his grievance, but theirs, and that had been the reason of the apostle's severity. And now, that the

church had, by the action of the larger part of its members, visited the offender with the consequences of his evil, the apostle enjoins them to treat him henceforth with mercy, assured that he would forgive what they do, and that what he has already forgiven is for their sakes. In place of coming himself, he had sent Titus, and in his anxiety to hear from them, he had left a work which promised greatly in Troas, and had come into Macedonia to meet him. And he gives thanks to God that the result was another triumph of God's grace in him.

Then the apostle comes to the conflict of authority between himself and the Judaizing teachers, and over against the commendatory letters which they had shown to the church, by a fine stroke of genius, he places the statement, that the Corinthian Christians are his epistle, and advances from this to a comparison of the new dispensation represented by himself, and the old law represented by them, set forth in the noble passage beginning with chapter 3: 3. At the same time, he admits that this treasure is committed to earthen vessels, that he bears about in his body the possibility of violent death such as his Lord had suffered, but also the life of the Lord Jesus. But then, this exposure to death in him meant life to them, for whose sake he suffered all things, and it was offset by the certainty of a glorious life in the heavens. We will not follow this noble address any further. It closes with a direct appeal to the church to receive the apostle, and his felicitation of himself and them that the mission of Titus had produced so gracious results in them.

The second part of the letter is very different, being addressed to the contumacious members of the church, and is the sharpest and severest of all the apostle's writings. Chap. 10-13. They brought against him the charge that he is bold in his letters, but weakens and humbles himself, when he is present with them, and that such craft is an exhibition on his part of just that walking according to the flesh which he professes to warn them against. In reply he alleges the well-known spirituality of the weapons employed by him in his warfare against the reasonings of men hostile to God. Moreover, so far as he has shown any such weakness as they

allege, any softening of his severity towards them, they must remember that his authority is given him to build up, and not to destroy. He does not propose to apply to himself the standards of measurement adopted by his opponents, who measure themselves by their own standards, but God has given him a standard by which his ministry may be judged, in the ground covered by him as an apostle. Not skipping anything, and not, as these men have done, occupying another man's field, he has come as far as them in his preaching of the Gospel, and hopes to be still further magnified by the same standard in reaching out into the regions beyond them. Again, since they have seen weakness in his refusal to exercise his authority and to lord it over them, he shows that these very signs of weakness are the things of which he boasts. To suffer, instead of using his power to inflict suffering upon others, is to be like his Lord, and is really the source of his power. And finally, since they will have it, he is about to come to them, and then they will see that he represents, not only the Christ who was crucified out of weakness, but the Christ who lives out of power. And yet, when that time comes, he prays that he may find them such that he will, after all, have no opportunity to display this power. This brief sketch is not intended to reproduce the peculiar power of this epistle, but simply as a guide to the thought in reading, since the peculiar mingling and conflict of feeling which constitutes its charm is such as cannot be reproduced.

These letters do not mark an extended literary activity. But they are enough to show us the mental and spiritual quality of the man, whose deeds so far surpass his words, who founded the Gentile churches and gave its distinctive character to Gentile Christianity, and the person revealed, to us in them is evidently a great man, measured by any standard. Suffice it to say, in closing, that the Church has not yet apprehended his greatness, nor fathomed his thought.

## BIBLE LEPROSY.

By Professor T. WYTON DAVIES,

Baptist College, Haverfordwest, Wales.

Since the death of Father Damien our attention has been called over and over again to the awful disease to which in the prime of life he fell a victim. In magazines, the question of its contagiousness has been argued with much learning and with not a little warmth. Many Bible students imagined in reading these articles that they were adding to their knowledge of the Bible, at least of an important Bible disease. Perhaps they were. But one thing which I hope to make clear before I am done is that the Leprosy about which so much has been said is quite a different thing from the disease known by that name in the English Bible, Old Testament and New Testament. But if the two things are quite distinct, why is it that they have one name? Before answering this question of the name, let us try to find out whether the diseases are or are not the same. The simplest way will be to look at the modern disease, so-called "True Leprosy;" then to look at the Bible account of what is there in our English version called "Leprosy." It will be seen that the two things are very different.

As to the modern disease, I will follow the account which Dr. Erasmus Wilson gives in Dr. Quain's Medical Dictionary. Dr. Wilson has written a much fuller account in his book on "Diseases of the skin;" this I have not seen; and there is for our purposes a sufficiently full description in the article referred to.

In all forms of modern Leprosy the parts most immediately affected are the integument (skin and membranes) and nervous system. There are sores outside on the surface of the body, but there are also tubercles formed inside. The liver, kidneys, and alimentary canal are attacked; general waste

sets in, which stops only with death. This disease is not merely on the outside, it is organic: awful smells are given out, and sleep is next to impossible.

The disease develops in three special directions—more or less in all three, but, as a rule, more in some one than the others. Drs. Daneelsson and Boeck have written largely on the disease as they have watched it in Norway: they hold that there are only two quite independent kinds (1) Tubercular (2) Anaesthetic.\*

The three varieties named by Dr. Erasmus Wilson are as follows:—

1. THE TUBERCULAR KIND, *elephantiasis tuberosa*. In this, red spots cover the body so closely on the face as to give a general redness. These spots are followed by tubercles or pimples which break, after which others are formed. The nasal bones fall in, the eyes are destroyed. There is a swelling of different parts of the body, hands, feet, etc.: then the members get deformed and the voice becomes hoarse.

2. There is the ANÆSTHETIC KIND, *elephantiasis anæsthetica*. In this there are spots and blotches but no tubercles or ulcers. The prevailing character of this is that the system becomes insensitive. You can apply fire or any sharp instrument to the skin, but there is no feeling at all. Yet the internal pains are almost always indescribably keen.

3. The MUTILATING KIND, *elephantiasis nodosa* or *mutilam*. This is more local than the others; its main feature is the loss of the limbs. The fingers and toes, the hands and feet fall entirely away.

Though these three are noticed as if they were quite distinct yet they are found together, in the same districts, and not seldom in the same individuals.

This leprosy has been described by travelers in language strong and hard to read; yet from what I saw in Egypt and in Palestine I consider no words too strong in which to set forth its awfulness. I have seen with infinite pain the open sores, the deformities of face and hands. I have seen the poor creatures going about with several of their limbs altogether gone. I have heard their deep-throated, harsh cry for

\* See Keil's Biblical Archæology; 114-16.

help. I have given myself the joy of dropping coins into their out-stretched hands.

This is the leprosy about which so much ado has been made of late; from this Father Damien died. Edward Clifford, the sympathetic biographer of Damien, visited the Sandwich Islands; he describes the faces of the poor lepers as "swelled and drawn and distorted, with bloodshot goggle eyes." He says Father Damien used to smoke in order to deaden the loathsome smell coming from the lepers. In March 1888 Mr. Clifford visited the leper asylum at Agra, India. The faces of the inmates were too dreadful to look upon: those lepers were lame, maimed, and mutilated. They sang lustily under the leadership of an American Baptist missionary, Mr. Jones.\* This leprosy prevails largely in our Indian empire; in Palestine and Egypt; in the West Indies; and nearest of all to us, in Norway. In the middle ages it was common in this country, so common that there were in England alone 250 leper hospitals. In Waterford at the present moment, a friend tells me, there is a building marked "Leper House." In a church at Ripon there is a door, now fastened, with the words "Lepers' door" still printed on it. The room into which this door leads was at one time a chapel used exclusively by lepers.

Some have held that Leprosy was introduced into Europe by the Crusaders from Palestine. This is against the voice of history, for in the eighth century there were many leper hospitals in the Frankish kingdom: there were hospitals in Ireland in the ninth century, and in England long before William the Conqueror won Hastings.

This disease was known among the Greeks as *elephantiasis* because it makes the skin rough like that of an elephant. What we now commonly understand by *elephantiasis* is the "Barbadoes leg" or swelling of the lower portion of the body. The other is now called *Elephantiasis graecorum*, or more generally, "True Leprosy."

The common view is that *True Leprosy* is not contagious;

\*This must be my friend and fellow student Rev. Daniel Jones, a Welshman not a Yankee. And in our College days Mr. Jones was quite clever at the musical art.



most of the authorities support this view. In the year 1867 the Royal College of Physicians took this matter under special consideration. Evidence was got from every spot affected, and they came to an almost unanimous decision that leprosy is not contagious. Since then, men of the greatest eminence have taken the opposite view. Only in December last Dr. Morell Mackenzie in the "Nineteenth Century" and Dr. Robson Roose in the "Fortnightly Review" argued very strongly for the contagiousness of "True Leprosy." Those who deny this explain the case of Father Damien by inoculation, some of the leprous matter somehow finding its way into the blood. I have seen this explanation in the *Lancet*.

Now I wish you to consider the *Leprosy about which we read in the Bible*. Nowhere is it anything like so fully described in the Bible as in Leviticus 13. Let us attend to this account. Moses, or the author of this part of the Bible, is aiding the people to know the true leper, in order that he may be kept apart. What are the signs? First, we are informed how to know leprosy from spots appearing on the skin. If there is a rising, or a scab, or a white spot, leprosy is present, providing that the plague reaches below the skin, and the hair growing on the part turns white.\*

If proud flesh shows itself without previous spots, etc., and if the hair on the part swollen with raw flesh turns white, that is Leprosy, chronic Leprosy, and the person so affected is unclean, and must live outside the camp.†

When a man is wholly covered with white spots, he is declared clean. His being so covered shows that he does not suffer from the serious kind, though this too is called "Leprosy." It answers to what we call "White Leprosy."‡

The care of a man who has a sore following a boil§ or a burn|| is next examined. If the sore goes lower down than the skin, and if the hair growing on it becomes white, this makes the man unclean.

Then we have to do with the head and the face as covered

\* 13: 1-8.

† vs. 9-11.

‡ vs. 12-13.

§ vs. 18-23.

|| vs. 24-25.

by hair and beard. If an eruption breaks out on the head or under the beard the man has real leprosy, provided that the sore is lower than the skin, and that the hair turns yellow.

In vs. 38 and 39 a sort of Leprosy is described which is quite harmless: it is known by its having a pale, white complexion and is called *bohaq*. This disease is to this day well known among the Arabs, and, singular to say, they call it by the very same name *bohaq*.

Now, it will appear to anyone who compares so-called "True Leprosy" with the disease spoken of in Leviticus, that we have to do with kinds of diseases altogether different, though in all alike the skin is affected, and all are loathsome. In Leviticus there is not the faintest suggestion of deformity of limb, or of loss of limbs: we are told of sores breaking out—nothing more. It is wonderful that diseases so different in their causes, operation and result, could have been identified. It makes one think of the words of an eminent Italian physician, "L'opinione era contagiosa, e non la malatha" (Brunelli). It has been said that the symptoms named in Leviticus relate to the early history of Leprosy, so that we should not expect to find the more serious developments of Greek *elephantiasis* referred to. But Sir Resdon Bennet, M. D., LL. D., F. R. S., ex-president of the Royal College of Surgeons, holds that the appearances of the Levitical disease are quite unlike the early showings of "True Leprosy." He quotes from medieval writers who have given directions for discovering the approach of Greek *elephantiasis*, and he proves to demonstration that the Leprosy which they diagnose is altogether different from Bible Leprosy.\*

If we carefully consult other allusions to Leprosy in the Bible, we shall see no reason for changing our opinion. The first Bible mention of it is in Exodus 4: 6, where Moses was to prove his Divine mission by putting his hand into his bosom. After taking it out, his hand became "leprous as snow." There is no difficulty here. In the leprosy of Miriam, Numbers 12: 10-16, we seem to come upon a case looking like modern Leprosy. Miriam became "lep-

\*See Diseases of the Bible, pp. 32-33.

rous, white as snow." This account agrees with all I have said. But Aaron pleads on her behalf to their brother Moses in these words: "Let her not be as one dead, of whom the flesh is half consumed when he cometh out of his mother's womb." This is practically the rendering of the Revised Version, though the two great versions the LXX and the Vulgate give a different form to the words and seem based on a different text. What do the above words mean? That the leprosy of Miriam made her as one half eaten up with disease, one with the foundation of life sapped? This I verily believe. But like such a person in what? in being diseased? I think confidently not, but in being shut out of ordinary society. So explained, the words present no difficulty to me. We read of Naaman and Gehazi in 2 Kings 5. Of Naaman we are told only that he was "a leper"—no more. Of Gehazi more is said, though no more than we learn from the cases of Moses and Miriam; he was "a leper, as white as snow." But neither of these persons could have had an attack of what we now call "Leprosy," for Naaman still discharged his duties as General of the army of Syria, and he moved in the royal circle; while Gehazi acted as servant to Elisha and conversed with the king of Israel after his infliction.

The leprosy of Uzziah (2 Chron. 26: 19-21) and of the four who lingered before the gate of the city of Samaria (2 Kings 8: 3-11) has nothing special—indeed, no description is given at all. After closely looking into all the allusions to Leprosy in the New Testament, I see no reason at all to change my position, indeed, the position is made stronger, as the Greek word *lepra* has a more definite meaning than the Old Testament word *tsarangath*. New Testament Leprosy shut its victim out of society, except in one instance, "Simon the Leper," and perhaps he received the name because at one time he had been a leper, but was now recovered. If he were still a leper, his disease must have been of the clean type. Of Christ, the great Healer, we are told that he touched the leper, and "straightway the leprosy departed from him, and he was made clean." Mark 2: 41-42.

What, in modern speech, are we to understand by Bible

Leprosy? Nothing is more clear than that there are many kinds of Leprosy referred to in the Bible, but all of them are diseases of the skin more or less serious, none of them being particularly perilous to life. The word now in common use among medical men for the *lepra* of the Greeks is *Psoriasis*, a word which Dr. Wilson would confine to eczema, corresponding to its Greek original *Psora*; but which, as a fact, covers all that in the Bible is known as Leprosy. Sir Resdon Bennett is very pronounced in what he says—and *his* words have much weight:

“It may, however, without fear of contradiction be affirmed that scarcely any physician of the present day, can see in the various features of the Levitical disease any but varieties of cutaneous disease of some kind.”\* An additional proof of the conclusion at which we have arrived is that in the LXX the Greek word *lepra* translates the Hebrew word for Leprosy, *Tsarangath*.† Now this word *lepra* has a very clear and well defined meaning in the writings of the Greek physicians from the time of Hippocrates, who flourished four and one-half centuries before the time of Christ, until medical science passed away from the Greeks. We are quite sure that those who made and favored the Septuagint version regarded the Hebrew *Tsarangath* as a mere disease of the skin. This goes for a good deal. Then the physician Luke employs the same word *lepra*, and he could not but know what the word meant at his day, and indeed long before and after. Josephus too uses this word, and though he was not like Luke a physician, he had a fair knowledge of the meaning of common Greek words. If the LXX translators, Luke and his fellow evangelists, and Josephus had wished to speak of what to-day goes by the name of Leprosy, they would have used the word *Elephantiasis*, which had this meaning, and to a Greek scholar no other.

Remember again that skin diseases like *Psoriasis* are common in Egypt and Palestine at the present day, while among

\* Diseases of the Bible. p. 38.

† I represent the third Hebrew consonant by ng, not because this is its pronunciation, but to show that a consonant is meant, and I know of no more correct way of setting forth this letter, which has two sounds, as the Arabic shows.

the Jews of Egypt, Syria, India, etc., *Elephantiasis* is very rare. In Tangiers, both kinds of Leprosy, biblical and modern, abound, but Jews though common victims of what we argue to be Bible Leprosy, are almost wholly free from modern Leprosy. Is it not also significant that while Greek *Elephantiasis* or modern Leprosy is hereditary if not contagious, Jews in England are entirely free from the slightest taint of it? If this were the disease of their forefathers, it would be natural for them to show at least some traces of it.

In Arabic as in Greek there are two distinct words for Bible Leprosy and modern Leprosy; the former is called *Baratz*; the latter, modern Leprosy, is called *Judham*, which means "maimed" from *Jadham*, to maim. It is a pity we have the word "Leprosy" in the Bible in a sense altogether alien from the one it has in common speech or in the dictionaries. The Bible has the best right to the word as the latter is from a Greek word *Lepra*, which has the same meaning. Yet it is extremely awkward having a Bible meaning for Leprosy, and another—the commoner by far—altogether different.

Dr. Erasmus Wilson thinks we ought to follow the Greeks by keeping the word "Leprosy" for the Bible disease and *Elephantiasis*\* for modern Leprosy, *Psoriasis* then standing for what the Greek physicians meant by it. Can we not somehow bring this about? The Welsh language is as unfortunate as the English, for "Gwahanglwyt" (separating disease) stands for the two kinds of diseases, as the English word "Leprosy." As far as I am aware, German is no better off, "*Aufsatz*" covering the same ground as the English word: and there is the same confusion in most modern tongues—even in Hindustanee, as Rev. James Hewlett, M. A., Benares, informs me.

*How and when did this confusion arise?* Most recent authorities agree in making the Arab physicians responsible for the mistake. These were at their height in the tenth century when Rhazes and Haly Abbas flourished. They occupied

\*What is now commonly dubbed "Elephantiasis" received this name through a careless mistake of the Arab physicians, and it has no right to the name at all.

themselves almost wholly in rendering into the Arabic speech the works of Hippocrates and Galen, just as the Arab philosophers of the same period translated the writings of Plato and Aristotle. The Greek word "Elephantiasis" which meant what "Leprosy" now means, they rendered by an Arabic word meaning "Bible Leprosy." This was the beginning of the confusion. When the era of the Crusades came round, Europeans were shocked by the the cases of Leprosy they saw in the East. As they gazed at the victims compelled to live apart; and as they surveyed the awful spectacles of misery, they thought at once they saw the "Leprosy" of the Bible. In the vernacular Arabic, long before established in the Holy Land, they found this awful disease spoken of in terms that strictly meant Bible Leprosy. The number of Crusaders was very great and they went out from every country of Europe; their influence is sufficient to account for the mistake which soon became almost universal, and which even now is so widespread that nine out of ten who read in the papers about Father Damien and Lepers' Homes have no suspicion but that they are reading of the disease called "Leprosy" in the Bible.

Old Matthew Poole, the delight of Bible scholars even at this time of day, in his wonderful "Synopsis" (mine is the London, best edition of 1669) points out the distinction between the two kinds of Leprosy. See also his "Annotations" where he more clearly decides for the view taken in this paper. Without naming intervening commentators who nearly all go wrong on this question, just think of an expounder so recent, so scholarly and so commendable as Adam Clark explaining the disease of Leviticus by quoting the orthodox passage from old "Maundrell's Travels." Good old Dr. Gill sees in *Tsarangath* nothing but a Divine infliction different from ordinary diseases, and only Divinely remediable. He is followed by Scott and others. They rest their conclusion on the root of *Tsarangath*—*tsarang*, which is held to mean "strike." But even accepting this root meaning\* which

\*The meaning "strike" is got from the Arabic; but another Semitic language—the Ethiopic—has the meaning "to make cease," from the same three letters.

is at least doubtful, the inference is unwarranted, as is proved by our word "stroke."

I cannot close this paper without calling attention to the question of "Contagion" and "Heredity."

Bible Leprosy is not contagious if we have properly explained it. There is no instance in Scripture of the disease being caught by contact with another. The common belief that Bible Leprosy is contagious arises from making "unclean" equivalent to "contagious." But that they have different meanings is proved by the fact that every dead body was "unclean," healthy animals and things without life were "unclean." Dr. Erasmus Wilson guided by the Bible account, Dr. Greenhill (quoted by Sir Resdon Bennett) and Sir Resdon Bennett, affirm that Scriptural leprosy is not contagious, and their view seems, out of question, correct.\* Why then were lepers to be kept apart?

There are many skin diseases neither dangerous nor contagious which yet are unpleasant, and separation adds to the comfort of persons not so suffering. Many such diseases are caused by the want of cleanliness; and if thus applied to Bible Leprosy of the "unclean" kind it was well to punish the victims in order to make them and others avoid uncleanly habits.

Moreover priests mingled with lepers, and I have already called attention to the freedom with which Naaman and Gehazi moved about in society. When, after the captivity, synagogues were built wherever Jews resided, lepers were not prevented from attending with others,† nor were they excluded from early Christian assemblies.

*Is Bible Leprosy hereditary?* There is nothing in the Bible to show that it is, nor is there in the subsequent history of the Jews to show that this Leprosy is. And indeed it seems evident that the disease *Tsarangath* as spoken of in the Bible, is neither contagious nor hereditary. Sin is nowhere in the Bible compared to "leprosy," but some of the earliest Chris-

\* It is but fair to say that according to Dr. Wilson *Tsarangath* may include some kinds of skin diseases that were contagious, such as the itch in which Eiphyta can be conveyed from one body to another.

† Lightfoot's works, Pitman's edition. Vol. XII. p. 172.

tian writers such as Gregory Nazianus, Tertullian, Origen and Augustine the Bishop make frequent reference to this disease as a type of sin. In many modern sermons, references are made which apply to modern leprosy only, and it is to be feared that many of us have "stock" sermons which require altering in this direction. But we would better be correct, however many popular sermons we spoil.



## THE TITLES OF THE PSALMS.

By Professor W. HENRY GREEN, D. D., LL. D.,

Princeton, N. J.

There is no book of the Old Testament which so reveals the inmost hearts of the pious under the former dispensation as the Psalter. We learn something of the exterior of their lives in the historical books, though these are for the most part occupied with events affecting the nation rather than those which concern individuals. We learn the obligations laid upon them and the standard of moral and religious duty set before them in the precepts of the law, which, however, are largely symbolical and ritual, and might leave us in doubt whether their spiritual meaning was duly apprehended or the people rested in the husk of outward ceremonial observance. We learn the ideals of a later age in the discourses of the prophets, with their stern censures of prevailing sins and their fearless exposures of men's departures from God and from duty; but they present most prominently the dark features of their own times. How far the evils and the corruptions which they depict with a strong hand were balanced by the true-hearted sincerity and uprightness of the better classes of the people, they do not inform us.

But the Psalter was Israel's manual of devotion. There we see the pious heart pouring itself out before God in the various experiences of life, offering its prayers and praises, uttering its hopes and fears, joys and sorrows, disclosing its inmost feelings toward God and toward men. Here the real spirit of the religion of the Old Testament reveals itself as nowhere else in its profoundest characteristics. And the substantial identity of true religion in every age is most clearly shown by the extent to which these Psalms have been adopted as the hymn-book of the Christian Church as well as of the temple and the synagogue, and supply the language of devo-

tion, of which they offer a most suitable vehicle and powerful quickener.

This universal adaptability of the Psalms gives them a meaning and value quite independent of the persons by whom or the period and occasion in which they were severally produced. They speak directly to every pious heart, and find an answering echo there. Nevertheless, it is not a question of idle curiosity, but one both interesting and important, Who wrote those sacred songs? and What are the circumstances which called them forth? It adds greatly to the interest of any composition to know when and by whom it was written. This is the case even with those Psalms, which are purely didactic or devotional, and contain little or nothing that reflects or is affected by the particular circumstances under which it was prepared, and which would seem equally appropriate as the utterance of a devout mind at any time and in any situation. When, however, as is frequently the case, the psalm contains personal, local and historical allusions, or when it is interwoven with, or, it may be, grows directly out of the individual or national experiences to which it relates, it is important to its correct and thorough understanding that the precise situation should, if possible, be ascertained, which is there depicted. A knowledge of the history and of the actors in it will throw light upon the psalm, and the psalm will in turn illustrate the history, giving a fuller insight into the feelings and actions of those immediately concerned, as these appeared at the time and are set forth by one who was in the midst of that which he describes.

The determination of the authorship of the Psalms and of the age to which they belong is, further, of eminent consequence in tracing the history of the religion of Israel. These utterances of pious souls reveal their conceptions of God and of duty, the character of their worship, both in its outward forms and in its inward exercises, and the body of their religious faith. If the age of the Psalms can be definitely fixed, the contemporaneous religion of Israel is clearly and indubitably mirrored forth in them, and with this its relation to antecedent and subsequent stages of that religion is necessarily linked. So that the testimony of the Psalms becomes

an important factor in dealing with the theorizing of revolutionary critics respecting the origin and history of the Old Testament religion.

One hundred of the Psalms are in their titles referred to their reputed authors.

1	(the 90th)	is ascribed to Moses.
73		“ David.
2	(viz., 72, 127)	“ Solomon.
12		“ Asaph.
11		“ Sons of Korah.
1	(the 89th)	“ Ethan the Ezrahite.

Are these titles reliable? If they are, the authorship of two-thirds of the Psalms is settled, and the particular occasion on which some of them were composed is further made known. It has been the fashion of late to distrust the testimony of the titles. And yet even critics, as little disposed as Ewald and Hitzig to submit to the trammels of traditional authority, did not venture to set them altogether aside, but confessed that several of the Psalms must be admitted to be the genuine production of David. Thus Ewald speaks of a series of Psalms “which all indications combine to show can proceed from no other and no less a poet than David himself.” Critics of the school of Kuenen and Wellhausen, however, have adopted a notion of the gradual development of religious ideas in Israel, which is absolutely inconsistent with the admission that David could have composed Psalms breathing such a pure and lofty spirit as those which are attributed to him. They find it essential to the maintenance of their fundamental hypothesis to set these testimonies peremptorily aside. Kuenen says (*Religion of Israel*. I. p. 322): “It was no longer possible to disguise the fact that not a single psalm or proverb was guaranteed by these headings to be a production of the age of David and Solomon. At last critics had the courage to say that all those titles without distinction are contradicted by the oldest portions of the historical books. . . . It is true that a great portion of tradition is thus set aside. . . . As a result of such an application of historical criticism, the age of David and Solomon assumes quite a new character.”

In like manner, Dr. Robertson Smith (*Encyclopedia Britannica* xx. p. 32): "The tradition that David is the author of these two collections (viz., Ps. 3-41, 51-72) comes to us, not exactly from the time of the Chronicler, but certainly from the time when the view of Hebrew history which he expresses was in the course of formation. And it is not too much to say that that view implies absolute incapacity to understand the difference between old Israel and later Judaism, and makes almost anything possible in the way of the ascription of comparatively modern pieces to ancient authors." The plain English of which is that the traditional date of the Psalms is utterly irreconcilable with his critical views of "the difference between old Israel and later Judaism." These views oblige him to maintain that the Psalms ascribed to David and other ancient authors are comparatively modern. Delitzsch very properly says (*Comment. on Psalms*, p. 16): "The denial of what has been delivered by historical tradition [in these titles], which has been prevalent since the last decenniums of the preceding century, has now come to be a contemptuous snap-judgment, which would be regarded as madness in any other department of literature, in which the decision was not so biassed by foregone conclusions."

In attempting to arrive at a correct estimate of the value of these titles, a few general considerations bearing on the subject will here be presented. They should in the next place be brought to the test of the internal evidence of the Psalms themselves; but upon this we cannot now enter.

1. These titles embody the oldest accessible tradition of the origin of the Psalms. They have been from time immemorial a part of the text and have the same external vouchers as the body of the Psalms themselves. Sixty-nine of the seventy-three Psalms entitled David's are attributed to him likewise in the Septuagint, the oldest of all the versions and the most ancient voucher that we possess for the text of the Old Testament next to the Hebrew itself. But, on the other hand, stress has been laid\* on the circumstance that four of the Psalms ascribed to David in the Hebrew (Pss. 122, 124, 131, 133) do not bear his name in the LXX.;

\* *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 111.

and fourteen (Pss. 33, 43, 67, 71, 91, 93-99, 104, 137) are ascribed to him in the LXX. but not in the Hebrew. This, it is said, betrays a tendency in copyists to attach the name of David to Psalms not really his. If four such titles have been added in the Hebrew and fourteen in the Greek since the Septuagint version was made, who can say how many were inserted without authority before that date? And thus suspicion is cast upon them all. Fortunately the Hexapla of Origen here comes to our aid, showing that the Greek versions of Aquila, Symmachus and Theodotion, as well as the Hebrew of his day, were in exact correspondence with the Massoretic text, as we possess it, in this particular. Explicit statements to this effect have been preserved in respect to each of the aforesaid Psalms with the exception of two (Pss. 95, 124), whose titles do not chance to be mentioned owing to the fragmentary condition of the Hexapla. And the Chaldee Targum further corroborates the exactness of the title of Psalm 124\* in the Hebrew. It appears, therefore, that there are four instances, and only four, in which the ascription of Psalms to David in the Hebrew is not confirmed by the LXX. These are the only cases consequently in which there is any legitimate doubt respecting the text; and in these the Hebrew has the support of the other Greek versions.

2. It further appears from indubitable evidence that the titles belonged to an age much more remote than this. They were already ancient when the Septuagint version was made. Many of the titles contain musical directions which were intended to guide in the use of the Psalms in the worship of the temple. They indicate the chief musician to whose oversight they were entrusted, and sometimes specify whether they were to be performed by male or female voices, the tune or air to which they were to be sung, and the instruments which were to form the accompaniment. Several of these terms were no longer intelligible to the translators, and are either incorrectly rendered or simply reproduced in Greek letters. In fact, their true sense became obscured long prior to that time. As Dr. Delitzsch correctly remarks (*Com. über die Psalmen*, p. 16): "The key to understanding them must

\* The Targum refers Ps. 124 to David, but not Pss. 122, 131, 133.

have been early lost, for they cannot be explained from the books of Chronicles and Ezra, in which much is said of music, but in which they appear as older constituents of the language revived." And Dr. Robertson Smith admits (*Enc. Brit.* xx. p. 34): "It is not quite clear whether the Chronicler understood them fully." The only satisfactory explanation of this is that these terms belonged to the musical arrangements of the temple, which were in current use before the exile. These were abruptly terminated by the destruction of the city and the removal of its inhabitants. A long suspension of sacred services followed. And when the Jews were permitted to return to their own land, the reduced numbers and the impoverished condition of the early colonists made a complete reproduction of the ancient order of things quite impossible. Through this enforced disuse the meaning of these technical terms gradually faded from their minds, until it was nearly or wholly lost.

And this accounts for the very remarkable circumstance that musical terms, whether in the titles or occurring elsewhere as *Higgaion* and *Selah*, are not attached to all the Psalms, nor to Psalms taken at random, but are limited exclusively to pre-exilic Psalms. However obscure or unintelligible, they are extremely interesting as the sole surviving relics of the musical notation which prevailed in Solomon's temple. They mark the Psalms, in which they are found, as set to music and sung in the manner here indicated in that ancient sanctuary. These musical notes are found in two anonymous Psalms (66, 67) of uncertain date, and besides, only in those which are attributed to David and to Asaph and the other Levitical singers. And Psalms of late date belonging to the guild of Asaph, as Pss. 74, 79, are without these notes. They do not occur in any psalm which is demonstrably post-exilic.

Dr. Robertson Smith attributes the decadence of these musical terms to a much later period, and seeks to account for it by the introduction of Greek art consequent upon the conquests of Alexander, when, as he supposes, the old national music was superseded by that of the west. But this obliges him to assume a preposterously late date for the books

of Chronicles, since these terms were but partially understood when they were written. His hypothesis is moreover clearly set aside by the facts already recited, showing that the musical crisis was induced by the exile.

That the musical notation which we have been considering was pre-exilic, is further established by the psalm of Habakkuk in ch. 3 of his prophecy, with its Selahs and its title and subscription modelled after the titles of the Psalms: "To the chief musician on my stringed instruments. A prayer of Habakkuk the prophet, set to Shigionoth." It is to be observed that both the possessive pronoun, and the fact that the psalm is an integral portion of the prophecy, indicate that the inscription is from the prophet's own hand. Again in Hezekiah's psalm, in Isa. 38, we find the technical terms of the Psalter in its closing verse: "We will sing my songs to the stringed instruments all the days of our life in the house of Jehovah." And we are reminded of the technical phrase in the title of Psalm 60: "Michtam of David, to teach," by the words prefixed to David's lament over Saul and Jonathan, 2 Sam. 1: 18, "he bade them teach *the song of the bow.*"

This demonstrable antiquity of the technical titles necessarily attaches likewise to the authors' names, not only because the latter are consistent parts of the same titles, but it is a very significant circumstance that the authors' names invariably follow and never precede the musical directions. Any addition made to an already existing superscription would naturally be prefixed to it. There is an illustration of this in Ps. 88, which affords the only instance in the Psalter of a double inscription. Its original title was, "For the chief musician: set to Mahalath Leannoth, Maschil of Heman the Ezrahite." This psalm belonged to an old collection antedating the present Psalter, which was denominated "Psalms of the Sons of Korah." Accordingly, when it was inserted in our present book of Psalms, the words, "A Song, a Psalm of the Sons of Korah," were prefixed to its former title, to indicate the source from which it was taken. Now, it is noteworthy that the invariable order is, "For the chief musician. A Psalm of David," never the reverse.

3. Allusion has already been made to the existence of partial collections of Psalms prior to the formation of the present Psalter. A fresh corroboration may be thence deduced of the conclusion already reached respecting the antiquity of the titles recording the names of the authors. The Revised Version of the Old Testament has made the English reader familiar with the ancient division of the Psalms into five books. These books indicate in a general way successive stages in the growth of the collection, so far at least as this, that the fourth and fifth books are a later appendix to the first three, a fresh body of temple melodies added to those previously in use. This new accession was probably in great part post-exilic, though containing a few ancient compositions. In the first and older portion of the Psalter titles are the rule, in the subsequent portion they are the exception. Of the first ninety psalms only eight are anonymous; of the last sixty, with the exception of eighteen referred to David and Solomon, all are anonymous.

We can push our inquiries yet one step further in tracing the early history of the Psalms. The first three books, which we have seen to be the older portion of the Psalter, have been formed by the combination of two pre-existing collections, called respectively the Prayers of David and the Psalms of Asaph and of the Sons of Korah. Each of these, as they lie in the present book of Psalms, is divided into two parts by the interposition of a portion of the other between its severed segments. The subscription to Psalm 72 marks the termination of one of these: "The Prayers of David the son of Jesse are ended." By the help of the titles we are able to discover the other collection, Psalms 42-50, continued Psalms 73-89. If, in order to restore it to its original completeness, we bring these parts together by removing Psalms 42-50 from its present place, there will be left Psalms 1-41, 51-72; and we can hardly be mistaken in assuming that this was the original compass of the primitive body of temple melodies known as the Prayers of David, so called because with very few exceptions all were from his pen. Psalm 72 is the only one that is attributed to another; it bears the name of Solomon. Psalm 10 is commonly supposed to be a continuation of the alphabetic acrostic begun in Psalm 9. Psalm 2 is



in Acts 4: 25 said to have been spoken by the mouth of David; and the internal evidence strongly favors his authorship. There are but three beside which are not in their titles ascribed to David, viz., Pss. 1, 33, 71.

There is no reason, so far as appears, why this collection may not have been coeval with the reign of Solomon, since it contains nothing which can with any certainty be referred to a later period. We learn from 1 Kings 10: 12 that there were singers connected with the temple service from the beginning; and the elaborate arrangements made by David and Solomon in this respect are detailed at length in the books of Chronicles. It is further explicitly mentioned that in the restoration and purification of the temple worship by Hezekiah at the beginning of his reign the commandments of David in this matter were punctiliously obeyed, and "the Levites sang praise unto Jehovah with the words of David and of Asaph the seer," 2 Chron. 29: 25-30. Snatches are even quoted by Jeremiah 33: 11 from Psalms (106, 107, 136) occurring in what is recognized as the later part of the present book, and yet were sung in the temple in his day.

The genuineness of the Davidic psalms is thus vouched for by this ancient collection of the Prayers of David. That this collection now lies before us in precisely its original compass, and that no unauthorized additions were suffered to gain admission to it, appears from the fact that other Psalms entitled David's are to be found in the subsequent portions of our present book. Though recognized as David's, they were inserted in the more recent portion of the Psalter, and thus the integrity of the primitive collection was maintained. We are hence able to distinguish between those Psalms of David which belonged to the temple liturgy from the first and those which were added to it at a later time. That process was repeated in the final constitution of the book of Psalms, which, as we are expressly told, was performed by the men of Hezekiah in relation to the proverbs of Solomon, Prov. 25: 1. Songs of David not previously in use in the temple worship, and yet adapted for the purpose, were culled from various sources and added as an appendix along with others of more recent origin.

The careful discrimination between Psalms of David and those of the Levitical singers, and between both of these classes and all others, is also calculated to inspire confidence in the accuracy of the titles. This further accounts for the fact that no other names of authors were deemed worthy of preservation besides those of these great masters of song, and justifies the belief that no spurious production would be suffered to rank with what was held in such estimation, or to be entitled David's if it was not really his and known to be such.

But Dr. Robertson Smith seeks to neutralize the testimony of this ancient collection of the Prayers of David. He says:\* "The collection may not have been framed from the first exclusively with an eye to Davidic poems. But in process of time it may have come to be called Psalms of David because it contained some of his poems. . . . And thus, when the first Psalm book was taken up into a longer collection, each psalm may have received a title derived from the current name of the book in which it was found." The title, "Psalm of David," would thus merely indicate the collection from which it was taken, but would give no assurance that it was really David's or that the compiler of the collection supposed it to be his. There is not only no evidence on which to base this conjecture, but it is disproved by Psalm 72 itself. The subscription to this psalm shows that it was unquestionably in the old hymn-book denominated the Prayers of David; and yet it is entitled a Psalm of Solomon. The title was plainly not derived from the collection in which it had stood, but was descriptive of the individual psalm.

There is a further incidental proof of an interesting kind, that the titles were already attached to the individual psalms before the primitive collection was formed. It is well known that the order of the Psalms among themselves was frequently determined by the recurrence of some prominent word or phrase. Thus Psalm 35 follows 34 because "the angel of Jehovah" occurs in both, 34: 7; 35: 5, 6, and nowhere else in the Psalter. Psalm 51 follows 50, because in each material sacrifices are contrasted unfavorably with spiritual. And so

\* *The Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, p. 198.

abundantly elsewhere. Now, it is a most significant circumstance that the link which binds Psalm 56 to 55 is the correspondence between the title of the former and the text of the latter. The former is set to the tune of "the silent dove of them that are afar off;" in the latter the Psalmist exclaims, verses 6, 7, "Oh, that I had wings like a dove, . . . lo, then would I wander afar off." The title must be older than this primitive collection to have influenced the arrangement adopted in it.

4. Considerations have now been adduced from the testimony rendered on behalf of the titles by the ancient versions, from their containing musical terms which became obsolete in the exile or shortly after, and from their antedating the ancient hymn-book of the first temple, which is still traceable as the oldest constituent in the gradual formation of the present book of Psalms. These certainly establish their very high antiquity, and prove them to have been in the responsible custody of those officially charged with directing the musical services of the sanctuary. We have thus a strong guarantee of their accuracy and safe transmission. This is further confirmed by the analogy of other titles in the Old Testament. Those that occur in the books of the prophets are with very few exceptions acknowledged to be trustworthy even by the most revolutionary critics. The alleged length of Hosea's ministry has been doubted, but not that he was really the author of the prophecies to which his name is prefixed. Those who dispute the genuineness of Isaiah 40-66 and the closing chapters of Zechariah, lay stress upon the circumstance that these have no special titles indicating their authors. The burdens of Babylon by Isaiah ch. 13, 14, and Jeremiah ch. 50, 51, have been discredited notwithstanding their titles, but these supply a strong argument of their genuineness, which is abundantly corroborated by additional evidence. Hezekiah's psalm, Isaiah 38, and that of Habakkuk, ch. 3, are unchallenged, and their titles afford an exact parallel to those of the Psalter. That of Habakkuk at least must in all probability have been prefixed by the prophet himself. In the opening verse of the last words of David, 2 Sam. 23: 1, his name is announced as the author. There

is much to favor the opinion that the titles of the Psalms are to be attributed to the writers themselves, who were in the habit of prefixing their names to their compositions; or at any rate, that they were placed there by responsible persons cognizant of the fact thus attested. So that, at all events, there is a strong presumption in favor of the correctness of the statements contained in them, which were allowed to be made and permitted to remain, because their truth was known and acknowledged.

5. The titles cannot be, as has sometimes been alleged, the conjectures of a later age, mere inferences deduced from the Psalms themselves respecting their author and occasion; in which case modern critics would be quite competent to review the grounds of judgment and pronounce upon the correctness of the conclusion. But the specific occasion of Psalms of a general nature, e. g., Psalm 34, is sometimes recorded, though they contain no obvious clue to their origin, the circumstance that gave rise to the train of thought pursued in the psalm not being itself the subject of it nor dwelt upon with any prominence. And, on the other hand, there are Psalms, such as Psalms 20, 48, 83, which seem to suggest their own occasion or afford ready materials for an easy and plausible inference, to which no such titles are attached. The natural conclusion is that the titles were based on extraneous information and not inferred from hints or implications in the Psalms; otherwise the obvious would not have been passed by and the more recondite and obscure have been exalted to prominence. Still less can they have been arbitrary and baseless inventions. Then, why were any Psalms left without them? Unfounded fancies could be readily multiplied without limit; and it would be as easy to invent occasions for all as for a part. And by what lucky accident has it happened that random suggestions, if they were such, find such frequent and striking corroboration when they are examined minutely and in detail?

6. Upon the critical assumption of Kuenen and Dr. Robertson Smith and others of like tenor, it is impossible to account for the reference of so large a number of the Psalms of David in their titles, or for his name being given to the

primitive hymn-book of the first temple, as it subsequently was to the present book of Psalms in ancient times, 2 Macc. 2: 13; Heb. 4: 7. If David was by way of eminence "the sweet psalmist of Israel," as he is characterized 2 Sam. 23: 1, if he introduced and regulated the psalmody of the sanctuary, and if he composed a large proportion of the songs that were used in public worship, and set the style for the rest, then it is easy to understand how the whole book came to be popularly called the Psalms of David. *A potiori denominatio fit.* But if in point of fact he wrote none of the Psalms, and the ordering of the service of song attributed to him in Chronicles is an erroneous ascription to him of arrangements made long subsequent to his time, then it remains a puzzle how David ever came to be connected with the preparation of the Psalms in the popular imagination.

The critics here involve themselves in precisely the same difficulty that meets them in their hypothesis respecting the legislation of Moses. The only explanation that Dr. Robertson Smith has to give is that David was famous for his musical skill, 1 Sam. 16: 18, and is credited by Amos 6: 5 with inventing instruments of music, though in a connection suggestive only of revelry and of profane uses. Thence it became customary to speak of the temple choirs as using "the musical instruments of David," Neh. 12: 36. And since the temple music was ascribed to him, the oldest liturgy came to be known in its totality as the Prayers or Psalms of David. This is certainly building a large structure on a very slender foundation. That David was a skilful player on the harp and in that capacity quieted the disturbed mind of Saul, cannot have originated the belief that he was the principal composer of the temple Psalms, if in point of fact he had nothing whatever to do with them. The popular belief must have had some foundation. And if David wrote any of the Psalms attributed to him, however few, the entire hypothesis of the history of Israel's religion framed by the Kuenen and Wellhausen school of critics vanishes into smoke. For they all breathe an elevated and spiritual religion, which, according to the scheme propounded by these critics, could not possibly have existed in David's days.

The forbearance of such as may read this article has been seriously overtaken by this protracted and technical discussion of a theme dry and uninteresting in itself, and yet of no small importance as preliminary to the direct study of the book of Psalms. We have seen the documentary evidence from the ancient versions showing that the titles to the Psalms were a constituent of the text prior to the LXX., the oldest known translation; further, the proof that they were then already so ancient that the meaning of the musical terms associated with them was completely lost; that this musical notation was pre-exilic, a knowledge of its meaning had already begun to fade in the long cessation of its use during the exile, and there is no evidence of its employment subsequently; that these titles are not only limited to the first three books of the present Psalter and such Davidic Psalms as are found in the fourth and fifth books, but they certainly antedate the primitive collection of the "Prayers of David," which carries us so nearly back to the age of the royal Psalmist; that the inscriptions referring particular Psalms to him may well have been prefixed by the author himself, or by some one thoroughly cognizant of the facts regarding their composition. Still more, their trustworthiness thus attested by their high antiquity is confirmed by the analogy of the titles found in the books of the prophets, whose statements respecting the authors of the pieces to which they are prefixed are of acknowledged validity; and from the clear internal evidence that the titles of the Psalms cannot be the conjectures of a later age based on the contents of the Psalms themselves; nor can the traditional ascription of the Psalms to David be accounted for unless some at least are genuinely his. To which it is to be added that the wholesale denial of the existence of Davidic Psalms in the Psalter by the most recent critics is under the constraint of a revolutionary hypothesis respecting the gradual development of Israel's religion, which is still under discussion, and is to be tested by the evidence afforded by these ancient records, and cannot be suffered in advance to shape that evidence into accordance with its own prepossessions.

The full treatment of this subject would demand, what is

of course impossible here, the detailed comparison of individual Psalms with the statements contained in the titles prefixed to them. The writer can only state his own conviction that the result of a careful and unbiassed examination would serve to confirm the preliminary conclusion already reached that these titles are in the general entirely trustworthy, that they deserve our confidence as in the main a reliable tradition respecting the authors of the Psalms and the occasions upon which they were prepared. If in any case the title is clearly incompatible with the psalm to which it is prefixed, it should of course be set aside as erroneous. But where no such incompatibility exists, as it is believed, can be shown in the majority of cases, if not in all, the title should be accepted as a veritable and reliable tradition.

## THE LIFE AND TIMES OF THE CHRIST,

BASED ON LUKE.

BY WILLIAM R. HARPER AND GEORGE S. GOODSPEED,

YALE UNIVERSITY.

(Copyrighted, 1890.)

STUDIES XXXVII. AND XXXVIII.—CLOSING JOURNEYS AND  
TEACHINGS IN PEREA. LUKE 17 : 11-18 : 30.**Remark.**—It is desirable that in beginning each "study" the entire passage assigned be read over rapidly and the main divisions of the narrative noted.

## I. EXAMINATION OF THE MATERIAL.

[It will be noted that the following order is observed invariably in this work ; (1) the verse or section is read and its contents stated in a general way ; (2) important or difficult words and phrases are studied ; (3) a complete statement of the contents of the verse or section is formed in view of the work already done ; (4) the religious teaching is sought.]

## § 1. Chapter 17 : 11-19.

1. The student may read the passage and decide on a subject.
2. Important words and phrases are : (1) *to Jerusalem* (17 : 11), a new cycle of narrative ? cf. 9 : 51 ; 13 : 22 ; (2) *through the midst*, cf. marg. ; (3) *go and shew yourselves* (17 : 14), (a) i. e. act as though you were healed, cf. 5 : 13, 14, (b) a test of faith ; (4) *as they went*, (a) lit. "were going," (b) was it a gradual process ? (c) they had faith to take Jesus at his word ; (5) *when he saw* (17 : 15), (a) he was going to a Samaritan priest, (b) did he go and then return ? (6) *at his feet* (17 : 16), (a) was not this a violation of law and disobedience to the command of Jesus ? (b) how was it excusable ? (7) *were there none found*, etc. (17 : 18), were not the nine fulfilling Jesus' command ?
3. Note the following statement of the thought : *On the border between Samaria and Galilee, ten lepers ask for healing, and are told to go to the priests as if healed. As they go their way, they are healed. One, a Samaritan, returns thankfully to Jesus and is blessed by him, while he reflects upon the failure of the others to show gratitude.*
4. An important religious thought here is the example of faith without expression of gratitude or love. Are we not all of us liable to be thus imperfect ? \*

\* Men have the faith which justifies ; they are pardoned and they have the sense of freedom from the burden and disease of sin, and yet their lives show no glow of loving gratitude. *Plumptre*, p. 282.



## § 2. Chapter 17 : 20, 21.

1. A reading of these verses suggests the subject: *The Pharisees' Question and its Answer.*
2. The following are important points to be considered: (1) *asked* (17 : 20), out of (a) mockery, or (b) speculation; (2) *with observation*, i. e. "careful and anxious watching;" (3) *within you* (17 : 21), note the margin and compare the two readings in view of (a) the persons addressed, (b) the context.
3. The student may make his own statement of the thought.
4. It is to be noted that Jesus chides the folly of speculating about the blessed future to the neglect of present facts of life and duty.

## § 3. Chapter 17 : 22-37.

1. Read and criticise the statement of the subject. *Coming of the Son of Man.*
2. (1) *Disciples* (17 : 22), may they have been deceived by the statement of 17 : 21? (2) *one of the days*, (a) which are past, or (b) which are to come; (3) *shimeth*, etc. (17 : 24), "sudden and universally perceived event;" (4) *but first* (17 : 25), "this is not coming till" etc.; (5) *in the days of the Son of man* (17 : 26), (a) i. e. when he is about to come, (b) there will be a great catastrophe; (6) *in that day*, etc. (17 : 31), (a) "when he comes," (b) "do not give a thought to worldly affairs;" (7) *gain his life* (17 : 38), i. e. at that time; (8) *be taken* (17 : 34), to join the Son of man? (9) *where the body is* (17 : 37), i. e. wherever the situation is ripe for the catastrophe.
3. The following condensation of the thought is suggested: *To the disciples he said, "Do not expect the kingdom and its glory now. You are going to suffer trial, and then you will long for my presence. People will assure you that I am here or there, but when I do come it will be like lightning, seen everywhere. But I must first be rejected and die. And as the time approaches, people will be unthinkingly going on their wordly rounds, as when Noah's flood suddenly fell. Remember Lot's wife and let your earthly interests all go. Then will be separation of those together in bed and at the mill." When they asked "where?" he replied "the vultures gather wherever there is carrion."*
4. The student may state the religious teaching in his own words.

## § 4. Chapter 18 : 1-8.

1. May not the subject be stated as: *Parable of the Widow and the Judge?*
2. Words and phrases of special interest are: (1) *ought always to pray*, etc. (18 : 1), (a) was there need of this teaching in view of 17 : 22-37? (b) was this to be prayer for the coming consummation? (2) *judge* (18 : 2), a type of God? (3) *wear me out* (18 : 5), cf. marg.; (4) *and he is long suffering*, etc. (18 : 7), i. e. "and all the while he is delaying to avenge;" (5) *faith* (18 : 8), (a) cf. margin, (b) i. e. the faith in the consummation, (c) throws light on the "pray" (v. 1).
3. The student may criticise the following statement of the contents: *He spoke a parable to teach them to continue to pray for his coming, saying, An unrighteous judge was so persistently followed up by a widow that he gave her justice to get rid of her. Shall not God, though he delays, at last surely requite his people? Still when I come will there be any who are expecting my coming?*
4. The religious teaching of the passage is clearly this, that the character of God is the permanent encouragement to prayer and the sure pledge of its answer.

## § 5. Chapter 18 : 9-14.

1. Read the passage and note the subject: *Parable of the Pharisee and the Publican.*
2. The student may examine carefully the words and phrases of the section, especially any difficulties which they present.
3. A condensation of this passage is as follows: *Those who were self-righteous, he taught by the parable of two worshipers in the Temple. One, a Pharisee, thankfully reminded God of his good deeds and his superiority to others. The other, a Publican, humbly besought God's mercy on himself, a sinner. This one, said Jesus, departed with God's approval rather than the other, for God humbles the proud and exalts the humble.*
4. The student may determine the religious teaching.

## § 6. Chapter 18 : 15-17.

1. The student may state the subject after reading the verses.
2. (1) *They* (18 : 15), who? (2) *rebuked*, what was their feeling, (a) the common sentiment of the time regarding children, or (b) their reverence for their master, or (c) the interruption of their discoursing, cf. Mk. 10 : 1-16? (3) *of such is*, etc. (18 : 16), (a) i. e. the kingdom belongs to such, (b) is this literal or figurative, (c) explained by the following verse?
3. Consider this presentation of the thought: *When babes were brought to Jesus for his touch, the disciples found fault with it; but Jesus said, Let the children come. They are the ones who possess the Kingdom of God, and you too must become like a child to enter there.*
4. The student may determine the religious lesson.

## § 7. Chapter 18 : 18-30.

1. Read and consider a subject, e. g. *Jesus and the Ruler.*
2. Important and difficult words and phrases are: (1) *why callest thou*, etc. (18 : 19), (a) is this humility on Jesus's part, or (b) claim to be equal with God, or (c) sharp challenge to the superficial greeting? (2) *one thing* (18 : 22), (a) but three things are commanded, why? (b) is this command a means of perfecting one's self in the religious life, or does it lie at the basis of such a life? (c) how far is it to be literally obeyed by all? (3) *how hardly* (18 : 24), i. e. with what great difficulty; (4) *enter into*, is this (a) enjoy a future state, or (b) acquire a present character? (5) *house or wife*, etc. (18 : 29, 30), (a) is this literal or figurative? (b) if figurative, is it equivalent possessions in the Christian community (1 Cor. 4 : 15; Acts. 4 : 34; Rom. 16 : 13), or spiritual compensations to the individual (1 Cor. 3 : 22; 2 Cor. 6 : 10)? (6) *world to come* (18 : 30), is this (a) the epoch of the Christ, or (b) the future life? (c) cf. and explain also "eternal life" (v. 30).
3. The student may make out a statement of the thought noting these divisions (1) vs. 18-23, (2) vs. 24, 25, (3) vs. 26-30.
4. The great religious thought emphasized here is the absolute necessity of putting Christ and the Kingdom first in our affections and purposes.

## II. CLASSIFICATION OF THE MATERIAL.

## 1. Contents and Summary.

- 1) **The Contents.** The following table of the contents is to be made thoroughly familiar.

## CLOSING JOURNEYS AND TEACHINGS IN PEREA.

- § 1. THE TEN LEPEERS CLEANSED.  
 § 2. THE PHARISEES' QUESTION AND ITS ANSWER.  
 § 3. THE COMING OF THE SON OF MAN.  
 § 4. PARABLE OF THE WIDOW AND THE JUDGE.  
 § 5. PARABLE OF THE PHARISEE AND THE PUBLICAN.  
 § 6. JESUS AND THE CHILDREN.  
 § 7. JESUS AND THE RULER.

- 2) The Summary. The student may exercise himself in making a summary of the passage in one hundred words.

## 2. Observations upon the Material.

The following "observations" upon the passage invite comparison and scrutiny.

- 264) 17 : 11. Jesus seems to be upon a border ministry, and it may be owing to a fresh outbreak of hostility rising out of the events and teachings of chapters 14-16.\*
- 265) 17 : 16. It is Luke of all the synoptic Gospels which brings in these favorable references to the Samaritans.†
- 266) 17 : 18. It is significant that those who went to the Judean priests did not return. Was Jesus in bad odor with the ruling classes? ‡
- 267) 17 : 19. It is characteristic of Luke to record the teaching of Jesus that even a Samaritan, if believing, may be saved.
- 268) 17 : 27-30. This picture is very like the reality of things just before Jerusalem was destroyed.§
- 269) 17 : 31-33. Some sudden event, apparently a hostile attack, is to come, at the approach of which servants of the Christ are to be ready to let their property go in the endeavor to escape.
- 270) 18 : 3. Widows in those times were defenceless, and a prey to wicked men, cf. Isa. 1 : 23; Mt. 23 : 14.
- 271) 18 : 2-8. The judge illustrates the dealing of God either (a) by contrast, or (b) as in our impatient and wicked way we are prone to regard Him.¶

\* We may conjecture that, on leaving Ephraim [John 11 : 54], Christ made a very brief detour along the northern frontier to some place at the southern border of Galilee—perhaps to meet at a certain point those who were to accompany Him on His final journey to Jerusalem. *Edersheim*, II., 327, (Ab. Ed. 436).

† As in the parable of the Good Samaritan, Luke's purpose in the selection of the incident falls in with what may be called the Catholicity of his gospel. *Plumptre*, p. 282.

‡ The suddenness of their cure—what we call its miraculous character—had not the slightest effect in startling the nine Israelite lepers out of their moral torpor. They were glad to be freed from a plague, however the advantage might come. But there was no divine message to them in the deliverance. *Maurice*, p. 269.

Perhaps we may overestimate the faith of these men. *Edersheim*, II., 330 (438).

§ These characteristics of former crises or judgments were strictly verified in the one which befel that age. There was the same incapacity of believing that the holy city could fall, in its inhabitants . . . The Lord of David, they said, could not mean that David's conquest should be won by sacrilegious Romans. All our Lord's warnings have been directed to remove this expectation from His disciples' minds. *Maurice*, p. 275.

¶ The words manifestly point . . . to the destruction of Jerusalem as an actual revelation . . . of the Son of Man. *Plumptre*, p. 286.

Then when the Roman forces should be at hand, there would be no security for Christ's disciples but in immediate flight. *Bliss*, p. 265.

¶ That our Saviour should represent his Father by so unworthy a judge is perplexing, till one notices that it is by way of contrast that he so represents Him. *Bliss*, p. 266.

We must not shrink from saying that . . . the unjust judge represent[s] God as he appears to faith tried by delay . . . Too anxious to vindicate God, [expositors] do wrong to the tempted, instead of helping them with sympathy and counsel, by indulging in reflections to the effect, "Thus God appears to unbelief." No, not to unbelief only, but to faith also in times of trial. *Bruce, Parab. Teaching*, p. 448.

- 272) 18 : 11, 12. The fundamental religious defect of the Pharisee was self-righteousness.
- 273) 18 : 15. With this incident ends Luke's great characteristic addition, chs. 10-17, to the life of Jesus. Now he comes back to parallel narratives with Matthew and Mark.
- 274) 18 : 18. It seems as though the ruler's estimate of Jesus was somewhat patronizing.
- 275) 18 : 23. His character was not yet hardened into selfishness; he was sorry that he could not give up the riches.\*
- 276) 18 : 26-28. The disciples are not above the spirit of the Old Testament in relation to riches, Deut. 28 : 1, 11, etc.

### 3. Topics for Study.

**The Perea Ministry.** † [Obs. 148-266]: (1) Recall the three steps—might they be called stages?—in the narrative of the Perea ministry, (a) 9 : 51-13 : 21, (b) 13 : 22-17 : 10, (c) 17 : 11-18 : 30. (2) Consider as carefully as possible the course of events in each stage. (3) Estimate the probable length of this ministry from (a) the passover imminent at its close, cf. 22 : 1, (b) the passover before its beginning and events between John 6 : 4, (c) the journey of 9 : 51 (cf. 10 : 38) identical (?) with that of John 7 : 2. (4) Note the attitude taken by Jesus toward the Pharisees. (5) Observe his position toward the people in general, judicial warnings and condemnations. (6) Notice also the severe terms of discipleship and the stern spirit of Jesus generally. (7) Compare with it the teachings of grace toward (a) publicans and sinners, (b) Samaritans. (8) Sum up as to the purpose and results of this ministry and the development of Jesus' work and teaching through it.

### 4. Religious Teaching.

The student may select a theme, e. g. "Self-sacrifice the true safety and reward of the follower of Jesus the Christ"—or any other which gathers up the sections of these last days in Perea, and work out the various lessons which the passage contains.

STUDIES XXXIX. AND XL.—INTO THE SHADOW OF DEATH. LUKE  
18 : 31-19 : 48.

**Remark.**—It is desirable that in beginning this "study" (1) the material of the preceding "study" be reviewed, and (2) the entire passage assigned be read over rapidly and the main divisions of the narrative noted.

### I. EXAMINATION OF THE MATERIAL.

[It will be noted that the following order is observed invariably in this work; (1) the verse or section is read and its contents stated in a general way; (2) important or difficult words and phrases are studied; (3) a complete statement of the contents of the verse or section is formed in view of the work already done; (4) the religious teaching is sought.]

\* He was a rich man; he had not yet discovered that to be a man was more than to be rich. *Maurice*, p. 284.

† It is not possible for us to devote more space to a review of this most important division of the work of Jesus the Christ, though two "studies" might profitably be given to it. The student is therefore requested to devote more than the usual study to this special "topic."

## § 1. Chapter 18 : 31-34.

1. Read and consider a subject: *The unwelcome Teaching again.*
2. The following are important words and phrases: (1) *understood none* (18 : 34), how explain this (cf. 9 : 45)? (2) *was hid*, by whom?
3. A condensation of the passage may be made by the student.
4. A striking religious thought appears in v. 34—the power of prejudice and preception in religious matters to hide the clearest statements of fact from one's ind.

## § 2. Chapter 18 : 35-43.

1. The student may, after reading, decide on a subject.
2. Important and difficult words and phrases are: (1) *drew nigh*, etc. (18 : 35), cf. Mk. 10 : 46 and note explanations, (a) two cities, new and old Jericho, (b) cure was long in the working, so that Jesus went and came back, (c) an inexplicable discrepancy; (2) *son of David* (18 : 38), a messianic title; (3) *rebuked him* (18 : 39), (a) for presumption, (b) in view of what? (4) *all the people . . . gave praise* (18 : 43), a new attitude toward Jesus.
3. The following is a statement of the contents: *Near Jericho a blind beggar hears a crowd passing, of whom he learns that Jesus is the central figure. Him he begs as the Christ to pity him and restore his sight, and, though rebuked by the crowd, is called and healed by Jesus, amid the glad thanksgivings of the multitude.*
4. A religious teaching here is found in the fact that Jesus permits the blind man to name the gift which is to be granted to him. His faith determined the blessing.

## § 3. Chapter 19 : 1-10.

1. After reading the passage note a subject, *The Meeting with Zacchæus.*
2. (1) *Chief publican* (19 : 2), i. e. at the head of the publicans of the district; (2) *rich*, is this extraordinary? (3) *Zacchæus* (19 : 5), how did Jesus know his name? (4) *joyfully* (19 : 6), light on his feeling toward Jesus; (5) *I give* (19 : 8), i. e. "I propose to give;" (6) *I restore*, a confession of wrong? (7) *for* (19 : 10), the apology for his action, cf. ch. 15.
3. A condensation of the passage is here suggested: *A chief publican named Zacchæus, short of stature, is so anxious to see Jesus as he passes through Jericho, that he climbs a sycamore tree. Jesus, passing, says to him, I lodge with thee. He gladly receives him, and solemnly pledges himself to benevolence, and promises restitution of stolen property. Jesus says, This man, a son of Abraham, may be saved, for I came to save such lost ones.*
4. What a proof of the wisdom of Jesus in offering himself to this publican is the utter surrender which Zacchæus makes of his property and the promise of a new life which showed itself in him. Love "hopeth all things" and is not disappointed.

## § 4. Chapter 19 : 11-27.

1. Read and criticise the subject suggested: *Parable of the Pounds.*
2. The student may make out his own notes of the important or difficult words of this passage.
3. Criticise and improve upon the following statement of the thought: *To those who, as they approached the city, supposed that he was to establish the Kingdom at*

once, he said, *A prince went far away to receive his kingdom. He left ten servants each a pound with which to trade till his return, when they reported their gains—one ten, another five pounds. One brought his pound back, carefully kept, saying that he feared the prince's exacting demands. To him the prince said, "If you did, you ought to have put it at interest. Give it to the one who gained the most, for that is fitting." But those citizens who had rejected his rule before, he bade to be brought and slain.*

4. The religious thought here lies in the fact that while many of the Lord's servants receive the same endowment, they are expected not to make the same return, but to do the best they can, and thereby are they rewarded.

#### § 5. Chapter 19 : 28-40.

1. The subject of this passage is, *The Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem.*
2. (1) *Bethany* (19 : 29), cf. John 12 : 1, Jesus probably spent the Sabbath there; (2) *ye shall find a colt*, etc. (19 : 30), was this (a) more than human knowledge, or (b) was it known to him by observation or previous arrangement? (3) *ever yet sat*, cf. Num. 19 : 1, 2; Deut. 21 : 3; Zech. 9 : 9; 1 Sam. 6 : 7; (4) *the Lord* (19 : 31), either (a) Jehovah, or (b) the Christ, or (c) the master, teacher, cf. 18 : 41; 19 : 8; (5) *spread their garments* (19 : 36), cf. 2 Ki. 9 : 13; (6) *King that cometh* (19 : 38), cf. Lk. 7 : 19; (7) *in the highest*, i. e. in heaven; (8) *stones will cry out* (19 : 40), (a) so glorious is the sight, or (b) so imperative is the need of testimony.
3. The student may make his own statement of the thought.
4. One teaching in the passage is this, that Jesus the Christ is our King and rejoices in the homage of his servants.

#### § 6. Chapter 19 : 41-44.

1. Read the section and criticise the subject: *The Lament over Jerusalem.*
2. Note the following words and phrases: (1) *hadst known in this day* (19 : 42), indicating (a) the opportunity still open, (b) but the hopelessness of Jesus that it would be seized; (2) *because thou knewest not* (19 : 44), cf. 13 : 34, ignorance born of willfulness.
3. The thought may thus be stated: *Beholding the city before him, he bewailed its blindness concerning what was best for it. It did not see that soon it would be besieged and totally destroyed with its inhabitants, because of this ignorance of him.*
4. The student may formulate the religious teaching.

#### § 7. Chapter 19 : 45-48.

1. The subject may be stated as, *Jesus in the Temple.*
2. (1) *Them that sold* (19 : 46), (a) consider the occasion for the trading in the temple, (b) note the spirit of Jesus in casting the traders out—a prophet, the Christ? (c) cf. John 2 : 14; (2) *den of robbers* (19 : 46), how was this accusation true?
3. The student may make the statement of the thought.
4. The religious lesson suggested by the temple scene is of religion made a means of gain. Is there anything of this sort to-day?

## II. CLASSIFICATION OF THE MATERIAL.

### 1. Contents and Summary.

- 1) **The Contents.** Carefully examine and master this table.

#### INTO THE SHADOW OF DEATH.

- § 1. THE UNWELCOME TEACHING AGAIN.
- § 2. HEALING OF A BLIND BEGGAR.
- § 3. THE MEETING WITH ZACCHÆUS.
- § 4. PARABLE OF THE POUNDS.
- § 5. TRIUMPHAL ENTRY INTO JERUSALEM.
- § 6. THE LAMENT OVER JERUSALEM.
- § 7. JESUS IN THE TEMPLE.

- 2) **The Summary.** Study the following summary of the whole passage: *On his way he came to Jericho and healed a blind beggar who had hailed him as the Christ, amid a glad company. As he passed through he lodged with Zacchæus, the publican, who was led to renounce himself and his unlawful gains. The multitude expecting the speedy coming of the kingdom, he told them of a "prince who had to go far away to get his kingdom, leaving his servants money to trade with. On his return he rewards the faithful, and punishes the unfaithful servants and enemies." He proceeds up to Jerusalem as the Christ, letting the multitude thus proclaim him, but weeps over the coming destruction of the city for its blindness. Entering the temple, he cleanses it of traders, and teaches crowds there daily, in spite of the plots of the priests and scribes.*

### 2. Observations upon the Material.

The student may exercise himself in making observations similar to those already made in previous "studies," on the following verses:

- |                          |                 |                  |
|--------------------------|-----------------|------------------|
| 1) 18 : 32.              | 5) 19 : 14, 27. | 9) 19 : 40.      |
| 2) 18 : 34.              | 6) 19 : 12.     | 10) 19 : 43, 44. |
| 3) 18 : 36, 43 ; 19 : 3. | 7) 19 : 13.     | 11) 19 : 45, 46. |
| 4) 18 : 38.              | 8) 19 : 35-38.  | 12) 19 : 47, 48. |

### 3. Topics for Study.

**The Last Journey to Jerusalem.** (1) Note the state of things, (a) the work in Perea over, (b) the people gathering for the passover, (c) Jesus determined to observe the passover in Jerusalem, (d) takes the main high road through Jericho. (2) Observe the attitude, (a) of the twelve, (b) of the people, (c) of the Pharisees. (3) Consider the entry into Jerusalem, (a) the people hail him as the Christ, (b) he accepts this attitude on their part, (c) and publicly enters as the Christ. (4) Note his teaching on this journey, (a) the parable of the obscure, poor king, who is going to return in power to punish and reward, (b) the servants left to labor, (c) the religious system of Israel to be overthrown and Jerusalem to be destroyed. (5) Consider finally the position of things when Jesus has entered, (a) he offers himself to the nation as its Christ, (b) he is conscious that he is to be rejected, (c) what if he had been accepted?

#### 4. Religious Teaching.

Let the religious lessons of this passage be found in a contemplation of *the Heroism of Jesus*, (a) in waiting and doing the work which lay before him until the hour came, cf. 13 : 31, 32, (b) in advancing steadily into the face of death with full knowledge, (c) in making his claim to be the Christ and offering himself as the Christ to a people who were to reject him—all this without self-seeking, (d) in clearing the temple of those who defiled it, (e) in admonishing and warning even those who were most confident of his success, (19 : 11).



## A "SYMPOSIUM" ON THE "GRADUALNESS OF REVELATION."

Few subjects are of more living interest at the present day in connection with Bible study than that which heads this article. There are few subjects on which there exists so great diversity of statement if not of opinion. It was to ascertain the opinions and statements of some of our leading teachers and preachers and to present them to the readers of the *STUDENT* that the questions which follow were mailed to the eminent men whose remarks are herewith presented.

It will be noted, alas! with regret by not a few, that since their words were written two of the writers have passed away. Ransom Bethune Welch and Israel E. Dwinell, leaders in the respective communions to which they belonged, are looking upon this great subject we may believe in the brighter light of another life.

The following are the questions submitted:

1. What is meant by the phrase "gradualness of revelation," or "development of revelation?"
2. Is this phrase based upon, or does it imply, a sound and reasonable explanation of the phenomena of revelation? (Will you be kind enough to indicate the grounds upon which the answer rests?)
3. What, in your opinion, will be the results of a widespread acceptance of this position?

From President E. BENJ. ANDREWS, LL. D.

By the gradualness of revelation or the development of revelation we mean, I suppose, precisely what we mean when speaking of development in any department of life or history. We mean the progress from the simple and homogeneous to the complex and heterogeneous. We are not to take this in a sense which would imply that truth has made headway apart from an original personal source of truth, but that it has pleased the Eternal Spirit to reveal to mankind the truth necessary for human conduct and salvation in a gradual way rather than all at once. It will be seen that this is, strictly speaking, not an *explanation* of revelation. It is not a causal law of the phenomena of revelation, but only a formal law. It is probably true that we cannot fundamentally or finally tell why it pleased the Power above us so to proceed. We can, however, partly see, when we reflect that the human mind learns gradually and itself develops slowly. Had the whole New Testament been published so early as the time when the first sentence of the Old was written, it must have remained for ages and generations mostly a dead letter. The more widely the doctrine of progress in revelation is accepted, the better. No ill results of consequence can possibly arise from its prevalence. On the contrary, the other view, which puts all Scripture upon a level of worthiness to be taken as final, is fraught with the utmost danger.

*Brown University.*

From Rev. WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D. D.

(1) I suppose that revelation is God's gracious disclosure of Himself to his children ; and that the law of this disclosure is, "Grace for grace,"—or "Grace upon grace,"—each gift making room for a larger gift. The plant just springing from the earth cannot take much sunshine or rain, but the more it receives of this life-giving ministry the more it is able to receive. God's manifestation of Himself to men has certainly followed this law ; it has been conditioned upon and adapted to their mental and moral receptivity ; and yet it has constantly, by its own action, enlarged this receptivity. There is, obviously, a progress in revelation, from lower to higher forms of spiritual truth ; from a defective morality to a perfect morality. The revelation of the Bible is a progressive revelation ; the light is clearer and the standards are higher in the Gospels than in the Hexateuch.

(2) Certainly. This is only saying that truth is self-consistent. No other explanation of the phenomena of revelation is sound or reasonable. The grounds on which the answer rests are many : I can only point to the words of Christ in the "Sermon on the Mount," repeating, in the most express terms, portions of the old legislation, and substituting for it a higher law.

(3) The result will be a great gain to Christian faith and Christian morality. It is always a gain to the Kingdom of God, when his people are ready to face the facts, and make their theories conform to them.

*Columbus, O.*

---

From Professor E. H. JOHNSON, D. D.

What others mean by "gradualness of revelation" or "development of revelation" I would rather they would say. I prefer the phrase "progress of doctrine in the Bible," because this includes increase of knowledge not only by objective communication of truth or revelation, but also by progressive insight or illumination. The importance of covering both processes may be seen in the fact that our Lord vainly sought to communicate by revelation the necessity of his impending crucifixion ; whereas, the understanding of what the crucifixion had accomplished came in by and by solely through insight into the fact and into what Jesus had in advance said about the fact, when at length the Holy Spirit brought this to remembrance and interpreted it. Except perhaps in the case of Paul we are without any intimation that the apostles reached their view of the atonement through new revelations as distinguished from new insight into former revelations.

The phrase you ask me to give a meaning to is therefore "based upon" and "implies a sound and reasonable explanation of the phenomena of revelation," if by revelation is meant only the process of objective communication of truth to the writers of the Bible ; but it is based upon only part of "the phenomena of revelation," if "revelation" is used concretely for the product of revelation and of related processes, as that product is recorded in the Sacred Scriptures. The main ground on which I assert the gradualness of revelation, and of other processes by which the Holy Spirit enabled the writers of Scripture to come into knowledge of religious truth, is the obvious fact that the Scripture is a record of increasing knowledge. The illustration above given shows progress of doctrine in the New Testament. Comparison of the elder with the later Scriptures is even more conclusive. The prediction that the "seed of the woman" should "bruise the serpent's head" did not convey so ample or so

definite an idea to the writer of Genesis, as the writer to the Hebrews found in the fact that the Lord partook of flesh and blood "that through death he might bring to naught him that had the power of death, that is, the devil." Justification by faith was not nearly so plain a matter when Abraham's faith was "reckoned unto him for righteousness," as when Paul commented upon this transaction. So of all the wide range of truth latent in the Old Testament, patent in the New.

The all-inclusive advantage of a "wide-spread acceptance of this position" will be that a fact about the Bible will be widely accepted. Our sole interest is in dismissing error and admitting the truth as to the word of God. I think that progress of doctrine in the Bible is already widely recognized. Its further recognition will at least extend the advantages already received from its partial recognition. For instance, biblical criticism recognizes in progress of doctrine evidence of lapse of time and change of situation during the intervals at which the Scriptures were written. So great development of doctrine implies intervals long at briefest, and changes profound at the slightest; whereas absence of development in ideas would bring the pretensions of the Bible into disrepute. An essentially unhistorical literature cannot have proceeded from God. The All-Wise fits his undertakings more perfectly to his ends. In other words, the Bible must be genuinely human if it is to be accepted as genuinely divine.

To acknowledge progress in doctrine is to be in the way of reaching a proximate theory of inspiration. Deficiency was acknowledged by the Master to exist in the law of Moses. But to admit deficiencies is to be armed against the charge of errors in the religious and ethical teachings of the Book.

To recognize progress of doctrine is to secure an effective instrument for the interpretation of the Word. To deny this phenomenon is to involve oneself in every sort of violence to the phenomena of the Scripture, that is, to put on them a false construction, and to elicit from them a false meaning.

In a word, if the fact you inquire about be generally admitted the Bible will be more unreservedly believed and more fully understood.

*Crozer Theological Seminary.*

---

From the late Professor ISRAEL E. DWINELL, D. D.

1. The two phrases, "Gradualness of Revelation," and "Development of Revelation," refer I think to two entirely different and inconsistent conceptions. "Development of Revelation" goes on the supposition that a germ of revelation was planted in the race, and that germ has gradually unfolded, taking form from the specific conditions. "Gradualness of Revelation" goes upon the supposition that revelation is something made known from a Revealer, and has been gradually made known according to his wisdom and plan.

The difference between *development* and a *gradual giving* is very marked. A development is from an impulse within; a gradual giving is a process originating from without. The fruits of the country are a development from the original crude fruits of nature. The currency of the country is in no sense a development, but is the result of successive acts of government by a gradual process according to the supposed needs of the country and the wisdom and ability of the government to meet them.

So Revelation, in my judgment, has come into the world by a succession of disclosures from God, as He saw men needed it and were ripe for it. I believe, thus, in the gradualness of Revelation, not in the development of it.

2. I think this theory gives a reasonable explanation of the phenomena.

(a) It harmonizes with the obvious facts and claims of the *record* of Revelation. This is the account which the record itself gives of its origin. It purports to be a record of successive historical disclosures from God, not of successive unfoldings of religious truth in the religious consciousness of men. There is not a word in the Bible that gives countenance to the theory that Revelation is a development from a principle inborn in humanity, or subsequently implanted.

(b) It harmonizes with the *historical, psychological and religious facts* of the case. When those to whom God was giving his Revelation were ready for it, He gave the new increment; and so, on and on, till the Revelation was complete. Here all the historical, psychological, and religious conditions are met, as much as if Revelation were a development from those conditions, and, with as much more wisdom, skill, and *off-look*, as an all-wise and loving Planner is superior to a blind and spontaneous impulse seeking self expression in humanity.

(c) It explains the *unity* and the steady *progress* of Revelation from the dim objects disclosed in Genesis to the sublime results recorded in the Gospel, the redemption of the world by Jesus Christ. If Revelation were a development, there might be unity, doubtless; but we cannot account for the fact that Revelation holds on its way to the sublimest end possible, out of the ten thousand different directions it might take, except on the supposition that God was presiding over it and shaping it, making it infinitely higher than a development. The theory that God gives the new revelations from time to time, as the Book represents, alone fully accounts for the facts.

(d) This theory harmonizes with the fact, the central fact of the world's history, that the *Son of God has come into the world*. If this fact is admitted, it logically covers all the difficulties and objections; and it furnishes ample reasons why he should interpose by giving previous subordinate revelations to prepare the way for this supreme one and makes it a success. Those who make all the previous miscalled revelations a development are led by logical and moral reasons both to regard the character and mission of Christ as a development, while, on the contrary, those who believe in the Divine Incarnation hold to a system which morally and logically prepares them to accept the evidence that God has proceeded towards this highest revelation by various subordinate approaches leading up to it, according to the record.

3. I can not see that anything but good, all the way round, would result from this theory. One great advantage resulting from it would be the separation of Christian believers from those who deny the supernatural element in the religion of the Bible, and try to drag it all down to the plane of the nature religions. The adoption of a hybrid theory of development, or evolution, by certain Christian people, furnishes a common ground on which rationalists can stand and work for the overthrow of Christianity as a supernatural system.

*Pacific Theological Seminary, Oakland, Cal.*

---

From President ALVAH HOVEY, LL. D.

1. What is meant by the phrase "gradualness of revelation," or "development of revelation?" The former expression, as I understand it, represents the Scriptures as being a record of religious truth that was revealed to man, little by little, part by part, but with increasing fulness, until the intended sum

of it was completed by the teaching of Christ and his apostles. This view appears to be justified by a comprehensive study of the Scriptures and to be taught by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews (1:1). Yet it must not be understood to affirm that in the process of revelation the less important truths were always made known before the more important, the ritual before the spiritual, the rule of duty before the underlying principle, or *vice versa*. It must not be interpreted to mean that glimpses of a great principle were never given long before that principle was made perfectly clear to religious teachers. Nor must it be supposed to imply that religious truths are incoherent, so that the order in which they were revealed was a matter of no consequence and the revelation of one truth not preparatory to the revelation of another.

But the second expression, "development of revelation," is less satisfactory. For the word 'development' suggests a theory of revelation which is questionable—a theory that the increase of religious knowledge among men was due to the natural unfolding of a germ of truth implanted once for all in the human mind, or in some human mind. This theory seems to me incompatible with the obvious phenomena of Scripture, with any natural interpretation of the language in which the prophets, the apostles, and Jesus Christ himself speak of the truth which they taught.

2. "Is this phrase based upon, or does it imply, a sound and reasonable explanation of the phenomena of revelation?" I would answer this question in the affirmative. For, reading the Bible from Genesis to Revelation with a view to the point in question, it is easy to see that the amount of religious knowledge possessed by the apostles was far greater than that possessed by the Old Testament prophets. And, speaking more in detail, it is easy to see that religious truth was revealed to Abraham which was unknown to Noah, and to Moses which was unknown to Abraham, and to Isaiah which was imperfectly known to Moses. With almost equal clearness it appears that more truth was communicated to Peter before his death than to John the Baptist, and more to the minds of Paul and John than to Peter. The Christian doctrine of God was gradually revealed—the trinity being scarcely suggested to the ancient prophets. The same is true of the doctrine of the Messiah, both as to his person and his work. From the promise in Eden to the birth in Bethlehem, and even to the ascension from Olivet, the light of revelation was gradually increasing until all was made known which could be of real service to men. The same in substance may be said concerning the doctrines of the Holy Spirit, the use of the law, the nature of sin, and the way of salvation. Equally gradual was the revelation of a future life, unless we deny that any intimation of it was given to Old Testament saints, and affirm that it was first and fully brought to light by Christ himself. But even if it were certain that a few truths of the Christian religion were revealed once for all and with perfect clearness by Christ, it would still be true that revelation has been for the most part gradual.

3. "What, in your opinion, will be the results of a wide-spread acceptance of this position?" (a) A deeper interest in the study of the Holy Scriptures. (b) A clearer view of essential religious truth. (c) A more intelligent rejection of obsolete rites and methods of service.

*Newton Theo. Institution.*

---

From the Rev. NEWMAN SMYTH, D. D.

That there is a growing interest to-day in the study of the Bible is very evident. It is also very evident that with this growing interest there is much confusion of thought and diversity of opinion in regard to the Bible, and the right method of interpreting it. Some things however are gradually becoming clear; and among them, these. First: that the books which constitute the Bible, being a part of the world's literature must be examined as to their date and authorship and genuineness, in the same manner precisely as all other books. Second: that the Bible is not itself the revelation of God, but the *record* of that revelation in human life and character. The record may not be infallible: it does not claim infallibility, and yet in spite of mistakes and inaccuracies, the fact of the revelation is not thereby obscured nor its value impaired. Third: that the revelation of God in human life and character which the Bible records is gradual and progressive, appearing more fully in the later than in the earlier history of Israel and presenting in consequence a higher standard of righteousness to us, and Fourth: that that revelation reaches its consummation in Jesus Christ, whose character, having its witness in itself, is the greatest of all miracles, making the miracles attributed to him not only possible, but in the highest degree probable; and which cannot be accounted for except upon the hypothesis, that "He is the brightness of the Father's glory and the express image of his person."

*New Haven, Conn.*

---

From the late Professor R. B. WELCH, D. D.

It should be stated that Revelation and Inspiration are distinct in form and in fact. To confound the two must lead to confusion in treatment and in conclusion. The question proposed here is concerning Revelation—"the gradualness of revelation." It is not a question concerning the fact or form of inspiration.

Now revelation has to do with knowledge. To reveal is to make known. Revelation is the communication of knowledge. It includes three terms,—the knower or revealer; the thing known or truth to be revealed; and the making known or revealing.

Revelation is then primarily and essentially related to a knowing, personal author—an intelligent, free spirit, self-revealing and so communicating knowledge to intelligent, free spiritual creatures, themselves capable of receiving and appreciating such revelation—a revelation not only originated in a personal intelligence but governed by personal intelligence and guided evermore by an intelligent purpose. In principle and process related to a personal efficient cause and to a personal final cause, it is therefore in a profound sense scientific and rational and in the highest sense a revelation communicating knowledge.

At the outset, it should be noted that the phrase "gradualness of revelation," or "development of revelation" is employed by different persons with diverse and even opposite meanings.

In view of these diverse meanings, is the method or process of revelation gradual?

This we may best ascertain not by speculation but by an inductive study of the history of revelation as it is presented in the written Word and in the liv-

ing Word—the Scriptures and the Christ; and in the record of creation throughout the physical and moral world, especially the earth and man. This is matter of fact, not of fancy. With this fourfold record before us, we should not err in our research and conclusion.

Yet even here we are confronted with diverse answers according to the different view-points occupied and the fairness and thoroughness of the inductive study.

#### 1. *The Theistic View.*

Consistently with what has been already said of the significance of revelation, the theist believes and affirms "a gradualness of Revelation" in this high sense,—as a divine process of revealing, not by mere continuity or natural development but by a progress of revelation combining the supernatural and the natural and thus advancing toward a higher and supreme end—supremely wise, supremely good.

At the very first, revelation appears not as development but as an origination—not as simply natural and evolutionary but as supernatural and creative: "In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." The revelation was of an Author not of an Evolver—of a personal, free spirit not an impersonal, necessitated energy.

So the ongoing was not merely natural and evolutionary, but supernatural, also, and originating,—"And the Spirit of God moved upon the face of the waters" and transformed the chaos into a cosmos—as the word signifies—regulated, wisely adapted, well ordered—revealing the power, wisdom, goodness and care of a personal Author—a revelation not of evolutionary gradualness by mere continuity or development but a gradualness as progressive involving supernatural knowledge and purpose, and revealing that knowledge and purpose by higher and still higher acts combining, now, the natural and supernatural: "And God said, Let there be light and there was light"—superinducing higher forces upon the lower,—chemical and electric forces upon gravity and attraction, and upon these superinducing life, vegetable life, and, higher still, animal life or the living soul, and, still higher, creating man, a person endowed with a rational spirit "in the image of God."

Such is the record in the written revelation—the Scriptures.

Such is the record in the unwritten revelation, e. g., in Scientific Geology, a science inlaid of God in the history of the earth. By such progress there is given to us a revelation advancing even to the complete purpose of God in the completed cosmos—Rom. 1: 20, "Since the creation of the world, the invisible things of God are clearly seen being perceived through the things that are made even his everlasting power and divinity," and Rom. 2: 15. Similar to this, as supernatural and natural, is the order of divine revelation in the written and the Living Word—the Scriptures and the Christ—until the revelation is complete in him.

Such in brief is the theistic conception of revelation, of the divine process and purpose, of the grounds upon which it is based, and of the benign consequences of such a revelation issuing as it does in reverence, love, adoration, loyal service.

#### 2. *The Atheistic Theory.*

This affirms a process of phenomenal development or gradualness in continuity simply natural and evolutionary. It is based upon the postulate of evolution—"Evolution as a law of continuity, as a *universal law of becom-*

ing." This theory has no need of God, the Author and Upholder of all things. It ignores, it rejects him from the Universe.

### 3. *The Agnostic Theory.*

This affirms an unknowable force or all-pervading Energy as the impersonal cause or underlying ground of all phenomena. The Agnostic like the Atheistic theory asserts a continuity of development, natural, gradual, evolutionary.

Indeed there would be no personal will or wisdom in either case to originate or modify or guide the ongoing development. This agnostic theory leads its chief representative to assert "an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed," (Spencer's *Ecclesiastical Institutions*, pp. 839, 843), and, again, to assert "Our only course is to recognize our symbols—Mind and Matter—as symbols only of some form of Power absolutely and forever unknown to us," (*Principles of Psychology*, pp. 159, 162, Vol. I.). Pressing his theory, on the ground of evolutionary development, Mr. Spencer would retrace the notion of "soul" as distinct from "body" to dreams when, it was supposed, the "other-self" wandered away from the body. From this idea of a double self was evolved the notion that in swoon, death, etc., the "other-self" had gone away on a longer journey than in sleep. This simple idea, according to Mr. S., would lead by natural evolution to all those views of inspiration, resurrection, a future life, etc., and to ancestor-worship which he regards as "the root of every religion"\*

But without pursuing further Mr. Spencer's speculations which he applies to revelation and to the doctrines of revelation as an evolutionary development, let us turn to trace another theory—diverse from and yet akin to the agnostic, viz.—

### 4. *The Gnostic-Agnostic Theory.*

This affirms "a Spirit (or Energy)" as immanent in Nature, and asserts an evolutionary continuity or gradualness of development. While it talks of a divine Spirit, it quotes approvingly the agnostic speculations and adopts the practical conclusions of Agnosticism, vacillating between Spirit and Energy, playing fast and loose with these terms, adopting both and employing either, at convenience. (See, *Evolution of Man and Christianity*, pp. 75, 281.) Asserting revelation as a development continuous and evolutionary, it tries all possible revelation by this gnostic and agnostic test, ignoring or ruling out the supernatural, at pleasure. This theory leads Mr. MacQueary in his very recent book (*Evolution of Man and Christianity*, p. 32), to say, "that I may illustrate my idea (of the divine Spirit) more clearly,—God secretes physical Nature as the snail secretes its shell;" and, again p. 271, speaking of "the fascinating unity which all Nature discloses," he quotes admiringly, "This unity is an expression of the Divine Being. God is one. But in this unity what a bewildering manifoldness! How infinite the changes of form which the Divine Being takes," and much more to the same purpose.

Assuming this all-comprehensive ground of evolutionary development he declares, pp. 47, 70, "I am an evolutionist. I believe that man has evolved, *body and soul*, from a lower animal." This theory of a gradual development based upon evolution he applies to the Scriptures, and proceeds to say, p. 117, "We have no more reason to believe that our Genesis (in the Hebrew Scriptures) is inspired than we have to believe that George Smith's 'Chaldean Genesis' is."

\* See MacQueary's, *Evolution of Man and Christianity*, pp. 129, 258, where he refers approvingly to these speculations of Mr. Spencer's, *Principles of Sociology*, Vol. I. Chaps. VIII-XXV.



On the same evolutionary ground, he maintains that Jesus was the son of Joseph and Mary, and that his resurrection from the dead was only myth or fiction, "though it is (he says) the best attested miracle in the history of the world."\* Yet he declares Jesus "to be in himself an embodied revelation; humanity in its divinest phrase" (p. 288, quoting W. R. Greg) worthy of and receiving the devout admiration and glad worship of even such men as Ingersoll and Renan, as Lecky, Leslie and Greg, pp. 15, 286-289.

But we need not further trace the application of this theory to the other essential doctrines of Revelation exploding, as he declares, the Scriptural doctrine of the Fall, of the Atonement, of Christ's second coming, and of the final Judgment.

In contradistinction from the theistic which we regard as the true view, stand the atheistic, the agnostic and the gnostico-agnostic theories. The common ground on which these three stand we have rapidly but carefully surveyed. The meaning which they attach to the phrase, "gradualness of revelation" or "development of revelation" is evident. Their wide-spread acceptance would, we think, be unfavorable and perilous to Christianity.

*Auburn Theo. Seminary.*

\* *Evolution of Man and Christianity*, pp. 218, 229.

## Contributed Notes.

**The Sinlessness of Christ. St. John VIII. 46.** In comparing the life of Jesus Christ with the lives of good and holy men we are as much surprised at what we fail to find as at what we do find.

We look for consciousness of sin, but we do not find any trace of it. From Adam to Malachi this consciousness of sin is painfully manifest in every man's life. No sooner had Adam eaten the forbidden fruit than his own heart condemned him and he hid himself from the presence of the Lord God among the trees of the garden. Cain's answer convicted him of murder. Abraham's lying brought a plague upon Pharaoh and upon his house.

Moses was not allowed to enter the promised land on account of his wrong doing and the 90th Psalm is a doleful confession of his transgression against the Lord. David has filled the Psalter with his wailings for his own sinfulness. Solomon too in the dedication of the Temple has the same confession to make. Isaiah cries out in the bitterness of his soul, "I am a man of unclean lips and I dwell in the midst of a people of unclean lips and mine eyes have seen the Lord of Hosts." And so on through every page of the Old Testament. There is not one of these holy men free from the consciousness of sin, no not one.

We might hope to find a change in the New Testament. The Christian lives under a new covenant. Old things have passed away, all things have become new. But if we expect to find men free from sin there we are sure to be disappointed. St. John the Baptist founds his gospel on the very fact that men are conscious that they are sinners. His cry is Repent, and this cry finds an echo in countless human hearts. They find in their own breasts the consciousness of sin, and they leave the palaces of Jerusalem and the market-places of Judea and go down to the Jordan to wash and be clean. They carry their accuser in their own bosom, and it is to stifle that accuser's voice they go out to the Baptist. Christ's own apostles are among the number of the self-accused. St. Peter is obliged to say "Depart from me for I am a sinful man O Lord," St. John says "If any man saith he hath no sin, he deceiveth himself and the truth is not in him." St. Paul calls himself the chief of sinners.

The greatest saints of Christendom have been the most ready to confess their sinfulness. Some of them have written books revealing the secrets of their hearts and even in the case of the holiest men these books are not pleasant reading. Modern Christians have made the same confession. "I do not know," says a great Frenchman, "what the heart of a felon is; but I know what the heart of an honest man is and it is awful."

Thomas Erskine of Linlathen says that he would not like to see his own life repeated in another man, and he was one of the most holy and blameless men the nineteenth century has seen.

In turning from the lives of such men to the life of Christ we naturally look for some words of confession on his lips, but we do not find them. We do not find one single expression which can be construed to mean that he was conscious of sin. We would naturally look for this confession in his prayers to God, His Father. The Lord's prayer which he gave to his disciples is prefaced by the words "But thou, when *thou* prayest." "After this manner pray ye."

It is the disciples' prayer. It is a prayer for the use of Christians. It is not the prayer he uses when he is praying for himself and so the words "Forgive us our trespasses as we forgive them that trespass against us" do not apply to Him.

On the other hand he defies even his enemies to convince him of sin. They have been watching him and trying to entrap him in his talk but they have signally failed. He can look them in the face and challenge them to point out one single error in his public ministry.

He can do more. He can look God in the face and feel confident that the Father finds no fault in him. Has not God manifested his approval in the voice from heaven which said, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased?" He can say to his Father "I know that thou hearest me always."

The consciousness of righteousness, the blessedness of the man to whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity and in whose spirit there is no guile, this freedom, from the smallest tinge of remorse for sin in thought, in word, in deed, is unique in the history of the world. The holiest men are those who would shrink the most from claiming such exemption. Jesus Christ stands alone. He is the First and the Last who has put forth such a claim from Adam to the present hour.

Another remarkable trait in the character of Jesus Christ is the *absence of Aspiration*.

The most beautiful parts of the Old Testament are the Psalms, and the most beautiful of the Psalms are those in which David lifts himself on the wings of prayer into a holier and a better world. He confesses his sins, but he asks God to purify him, to make him holier and happier and more useful than he has ever yet been. This faculty of aspiration is one of the most spiritual capacities of the heart of man. The best men possess it the most fully. It is the hunger and the thirst after righteousness which Christ himself tells us is blessed for it shall be satisfied. It is that divine discontent with ourselves and the world which weans us from the earth and sets our affections on things above. But while this is necessary for us, it is not necessary and it does not exist in the heart of the Saviour. He does not need to pray to God to make him holy or good. He does not yearn like the saints after heights of virtue that he hath not yet reached. He does not ask the Father to give him strength that he may do his work more faithfully in the future than he has done in the past. On the other hand there is a complete satisfaction with himself and his work. While his disciples are beginning to think that his mission is a failure he knows and feels that everything is being done according to the perfect will of God. He knows and feels that it could not be improved. He has nothing left to hope for. He has nothing to wish for. And so in his communion with his Father he can ask changes to be wrought in the world and among his disciples. But as for himself he only asks that God's will may be done. The ideal and the actual in his life arc one and the same. He does not transgress God's law on the one side, and on the other he conforms to it in every point. He does nothing that he ought not to have done, he leaves nothing undone that he ought to have done.

The lives of other men are but fragments. They leave many plans unfulfilled at their decease, and they do many things amiss. But the life of Jesus Christ is a perfect whole. He could say "It is finished" on Calvary. "I came to do thy will O God and I have done it, without transgression, without omission, and now I return home unto Thee."

*Blantyre, Glasgow, Scotland.*

REV. THOMAS PRYDE, M. A.

## Synopsis of Important Articles.

---

**Are There Traces of Greek Philosophy in the Septuagint?\*** The investigations of this question by German scholars during the years 1830-50 have never been brought to any definite issue and should be continued. H. Hody was the first to assert that foreign philosophy influenced the Seventy. Michælis found Gnostic ideas in a few passages. Their positions were refuted by Ernesti and Horn. Gfrörer (1831) sought to show that the Septuagint was the source of Alexandrian theosophy. Dähne (1833) went further and maintained that many of Plato's thoughts had found place in this translation and that Philo and the Christian Alexandrians, Clement and Origen, were largely indebted to it in their philosophical ideas. Later these conclusions were disputed by Frankel and Zeller who think that the Seventy had but slight contact with Greek philosophy. Siegfried finds but few traces of this philosophy in the work of the Seventy, as in Gen. 1: 2, while Bickell thinks that the avoidance of anthropomorphism can only be explained by the influence of Greek philosophical conceptions. An examination of several terms of philosophical import such as *psyche*, *nous*, *arete* and *kosmos* as used in LXX. tends to the conclusion that Greek philosophy had not influenced the translators. In cases where this seems to be the case, we can by no means be sure that we have the original translation of the Seventy, since the quotations from it by Philo show that the text was thus early corrupted and may, in such passages, have been exposed to modification.

A learned discussion of a difficult but interesting theme. For the author's argument in detail reference must be had to the article itself.

---

**Did St. Paul use a Semitic Gospel?†** There are four questions connected with St. Paul's relation to the Gospels. (1) To what extent was he familiar with the facts of our Saviour's earthly life? The answer to this question is of great evidential value, since the undoubted epistles of Paul show that he accepted the resurrection as an historic fact and taught the divinity of Christ—all this twenty or twenty-five years after Jesus' death. (2) Was he acquainted with the discourses of the Lord? There are six well-established cases of direct or indirect reference to words of Jesus contained in the Gospels. (1) 1 Cor. 7: 10, *cf.* Mat. 5: 31-32; Luke 16: 18, (2) 1 Cor. 11, *cf.* Luke 22: 19, 20, (3) 1 Thess. 4 and 5, *cf.* Luke 21, (4) Rom. 14: 14, *cf.* the Sermon on the Mount, (5) Rom. 13: 7, *cf.* Mat. 22: 21, (6) 1 Tim. 5: 18, *cf.* Luke 10: 7. Note also 1 Cor. 7: 12, 25 where Paul seems to be acquainted with what Jesus did *not* say. (3) Is there evidence that these discourses existed in a written form in Paul's day? It is highly probable that this is to be answered in the affirmative. The first few verses of Luke's Gospel, which was probably written while Paul was a

\* By Prof. J. Freudenthal in *The Jewish Quarterly Review*, April 1890.

† By Rev. Professor J. T. Marshall, in *The Expositor*, July 1890, pp. 69-80.

prisoner at Caesarea, A. D. 58-60, would make this tolerably certain. (4) In what language were these evangelistic fragments written? The difficulties are many in the way of supposing them to have been in Greek. Grant that they were written in the then language of Palestine. This hypothesis bids fair to explain many variations in the Synoptical Gospels—that they are variant translations of a common Hebrew or Aramaic original. Without going into the question at large, the six cases cited above in St. Paul's epistles are examined and of them three bear out the hypothesis, 1 Thess. 5: 1-8; 1 Tim. 5: 18; 1 Cor. 2: 24. Therefore it is concluded with much probability that St. Paul used an Aramaic Gospel.

An ingenious argument which suggests much but which as it stands is based on too few facts to claim much credence. The cases cited are, however, very interesting.

---

## Book Notices.

---

### First Corinthians XIII.

*The Greatest Thing in the World.* By Henry Drummond, F. R. S. E., F. G. S. New York: James Pott and Co.

This charming booklet with its enigmatic title contains Mr. Drummond's exposition of the thirteenth chapter of I. Corinthians. As is the case with all his writings it is simple and clear in expression, evangelical and freshly so in thought, intense in the emphasis of conviction. The division of the chapter is into three parts, the Contrast, the Analysis, the Defence. The Analysis is, of course, that which receives the most attention, and in the keenness of its distinctions and the closeness of its application is admirable. One can do little more than urge all to buy and read the book and then to read it again. The latter suggestion scarcely need be made.

### God in His World.

*God in His World. An Interpretation.* New York: Harper and Brothers.

The author of this book prefers to remain unknown, because, it may be, the general position of the book is too decidedly original to be handicapped by the mention of some familiar name in the theological world as its author. The title fairly represents its contents. The history of God's revelations of Himself in the world of nature and of men is traced from the beginning to the present time. This history is considered not in the dry light of scientific investigation but is suffused with the warm glow of intellectual and religious feeling. The leading idea is that the natural and the supernatural are one,—all is natural because all is supernatural—all is supernatural because all is natural; the universe is not divided into hemispheres. Nature is personified and glorified. Natural law is spiritual law. The principles governing the two worlds are not analogous but identical.

The book is open to severe criticism but any criticism fails to reach the secret of its strength. It fascinates the reader who will submit to be led through its mystical and subtly thoughtful passages. The style is delicate and flowing. There is much insight into life and the history of religious thought. The Bible suffers many new interpretations, some illuminating, some disappointing. All is exceedingly suggestive, dangerously so, many would think. The author deprecates system as partaking of human infirmity and yet is rigidly systematic in the development of his ideas; he inveighs against intellectual ability as short-sighted and yet has written one of the acutest speculative treatises of our age. One does not care to classify the book. It does not invite attack. Its tone is irenic and spiritual. No one can fail to enjoy and profit by it, if it be read with single eye and open heart. One's conception of the unity of things, of the immanence of God, of the meaning of the incarnation and the power of the spiritual Christ will be broadened and beautified by a thoughtful study of this remarkable book.

#### Revelation.

*The Nature and Method of Revelation.* By Professor George P. Fisher, D. D., LL. D. New York: Charles Scribners' Sons. Price \$1.25.

This is a book the larger part of which discusses one of the most important questions of theological study. What is Revelation? has greatly concerned the minds of students for the past twenty-five years, when the new spirit and methods of biblical research have been so fundamentally altering our conceptions of the Bible. Can the old ideas be maintained in the face of these altered conceptions? Does revelation mean the same to us as to those of the last century? The reply, as found in Professor Fisher's book, is clearly in the negative. The thought of the historical progress of revelation in the Bible, of which so much is made in these chapters, is one, the working out of which into its details has been the task of this generation. It is the most popular feature and perhaps the most useful service of these papers, (for they originally appeared as monthly papers in the pages of a popular magazine) that they have presented in simple and pleasing style this most fruitful conception, that, within the Bible itself, there is a progress from age to age in the thought and apprehension which men had of God and religious truth in Bible times. One need not call attention to the almost revolutionary influence which this idea, thoroughly grasped and applied in theological science, is bound to exercise upon the great problems of religion. The many intelligent persons who read this work will have their own religious horizon broadened and the landscape quite changed by contemplating things from this new point of view. Besides these articles on Revelation, Professor Fisher gives us some more technical articles on New Testament subjects, such as the origin of the Gospels, the Parousia, Huxley on the Gospel narratives etc. They are clearly written, and while scholars would not agree that they are in all respects satisfactory, they indicate that the writer is a well-informed and independent thinker. Indeed the versatility of Professor Fisher as shown in this volume is quite surprising, especially when we remember that he is most widely known as a student of Church History. Here he appears as a theologian and biblical critic of no mean ability. His book is one of permanent value.

## Current Old Testament Literature.

### American and Foreign Publications.

99. *The Ethnographic Scope of the Tenth Chapter of Genesis.* By Rev. A. K. Glover. Pamphlet. Published by the Author.
100. *After the Exile: a hundred years of Jewish History and Literature. Part II., the coming of Ezra to the Samaritan Schism.* By P. H. Hunter. London; Oliphant. 5s.
101. *Etude d'histoire et d'archéologie. Israël et ses voisins asiatiques. La Phénicie, l'Aram et l'Assyrie de l'époque de Salomon à celle de Sanchérib.* By E. Archinard, Avec 2 cartes dressées par l'auteur. Geneve: E. Beroud & Cie. 1890. 8 fr.
102. *Geschichte der Philosophie des Judenthums.* By J. S. Spiegler. Leipzig. \$3.00.
103. *Der Optimismus u. Pessimismus in der jüdischen Religions-philosophie. Eine Studie üb. die Behandlg. der Theodicee in derselben bis auf Maimonides.* By H. Goitein. Berlin: Mayer and Müller. m. 2. 80.
104. *Précis d'histoire des religions. Première partie: Religion de l'Inde.* By L. de Milloué. Paris, lib. Leroux, 1890.
- Articles and Reviews.**
105. *The Length of the Sojourn in Egypt.* Note by H. B. Pratt, Pres. Quar. July 1890.
106. *Pentateuch Criticism.* In the London Quarterly, July 1890.
107. *Apologetische Beiträge zum Pentateuch.* By A. Zahn, in Reform. Kirchztg. 1890, 1, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11.
108. *Zu den neuesten Verhandlungen über die Pentateuchkritik [seit 1888]* In Evang. Kirch-Ztg. 1890, 20.
109. *Substitutes for the Fourth Commandment.* Editorial note by T. W. Chambers, D. D., in Pres. and Ref. Rev. July 1890.
110. *Driver's Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel.* Review by H. P. Smith, in Andover Review, July 1890; by I. Abrahams, in the Jew. Quar. Rev. July 1890.
111. *Rawlinson's Kings of Israel and Judah.* Rev. by A. Gosman, in Pres. and Ref. Rev. July 1890.
112. *Judah and Babylon: a study in Chronology.* By Rev. Prin. Harding, in Expository Times, July 1890.
113. *Recherches bibliques. XIX. Vérifications documentaires de deux données bibliques relatives à Sennachérib [II Rois XVII, 19—XIX, 37].* By J. Halévy, in Revue des études juives janv.-mars. 1890.
114. *Exegetical Notes on the Psalms, 3. Psalm 3:5.* By Prof. John DeWitt, D. D. in Pres. and Ref. Rev. July 1890.
115. *Exposition of Psalms 42 and 43.* By W. J. Beecher, D. D., in Homiletic Rev., Aug. 1890.
116. *The Sixty-third Psalm.* By Rev. Prof. T. K. Cheyne, in the Expositor, July, 1890.
117. *Studies in the Psalter, 20. Psalm 100.* By T. W. Chambers, D. D., in Hom. Review, Aug. 1890.
118. *Notes upon the Date and Religious Value of the Book of Proverbs.* By C. G. Montefiore, in Jewish Quar. Rev., July 1890.
119. *Orelli's Jeremiah.* Review by R. Y. Thomson, in Pres. and Ref. Rev., July 1890.
120. *Israels Restauration nach der Weissagung Ezechiels 40-48.* By J. Knabenbauer, in Ztschr. f. kath. Theol. 1890, 2.
121. *A Prophet—What is he?* By S. Henning in The Theo. Monthly, June 1890.
122. *Elliott's Old Testament Prophecy.* Review by W. M. McPheeters, in Pres. Quar. July 1890.
123. *Smith's Religion of the Semites.* Review in Sunday School Times, July 12, 1890.
124. *The Apocryphal Scriptures.* By Rev. J. A. Quarles, in Pres. Quar. July 1890.
125. *Was the Book of Wisdom written in Hebrew?* By D. S. Margoliouth, in Journal of the R. Asiatic Soc. of Great Britain and Ireland, April 1890.
126. *The Book of Enoch.* By W. J. Deane, in The Theo. Monthly, June 1890.
127. *The Jewish Sibylline Oracles.* By Dr. S. A. Hirsch, in Jewish Quar. Rev. July 1890.

## Current New Testament Literature.

### American and Foreign Publications.

128. *Jesus the Carpenter of Nazareth.* By a Layman. London: Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co. 78. 6d.
129. *The Sermon Bible V. Matthew 1-21.* London; Hodder and Stoughton. 78. 6d.
130. *The Expositors' Bible: The Gospel according to St. Luke.* By Rev. Henry Burton, London; Hodder and Stoughton. 78. 6d.
131. *Paulus vor Agrippa.* *Apq.* 20, 9-20. Vortrag auf e. Pastorkonferenz. By Haarbeck. [Aus: *Mittelign.* 1d. Ev. Gesellsch.] Elberfeld, Buchh. d. Ev. Gesellsch. 1890. —15.
132. *The Epistle to the Hebrews; with Notes by C. J. Vaughan, D. D.* London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 78. 6d.
133. *Erklärung der Offenbarung des Johannes. Ein Beitrag zur Förderung ihres Gebrauches in der Gemeinde.* By A. Lindenbein. Braunschweig. \$ .95.
134. *Christianity and biblical criticism: a paper, read before the St. John Clerical Association, 1890.* By J. de Soyres. Saint John N. B.: J. & A. M. McMillan, 1890.
135. *Die biblischen Vorstellungen vom Teufel u. ihr religiöser Werth. Ein Beitrag zu der Frage: Giebt es e. Teufel? Ist der Teufel e. Gegenstand d. christl. Glaubens?* By G. Längin. Leipzig: O. Wigand, 1890. m. 1. 50.
- Articles and Reviews.**
136. *Lloyd's Greek Testament.* Rev. by I. H. Hall, in *Pres. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 1890.
137. *Notes on Dr. Riddle's edition of Robinson's Harmony of the Gospels: being a contribution to a complete Harmony of the Gospels.* [Concl.] By Ch. Leaman. Bibliotheca Sacra. April 1890.
138. *Die Bildersprache in den drei ersten Evangelien.* Eine religionsgeschichtliche u. geographische Studie. By K. Furrer, in *Ztschr. f. Missionskde u. Religionswiss.* 2, 1890.
139. *The Miracles of our Lord. 21. Healing of the Syro-Phœnician Woman's Daughter.* By W. J. Deane, in *Homiletic Mag.*, July 1890.
140. *Were there four months before the harvest? An examination of John IV. 35.* By M. A. Power, in *The Dublin Review*, April 1890.
141. *In welchen Zusammenhang gehört der Abschnitt von der Ehebrecherin? [Joh. 8; 3-11.]* By P. Seeberg, in *Mitthlgn. u. Nachr. f. d. ev. Kirche in Russland* 1890, Febr. u. März.
142. *The Hallel and Jesus Singing.* By Rev. A. B. Grosart, in *Expository Times*, July 1890.
143. *New Testament Teaching on the Punishment of Sin. 4. The Fourth Gospel.* By Rev. Prof. J. A. Beet, in *The Expositor*, July 1890.
144. *Did St. Paul use a Semitic Gospel?* By Rev. Prof. J. T. Marshall, in *The Expositor*, July 1890.
145. *Judas Ischarioth. Probleme seiner Person und seiner That.* By E. Höhne, in *Beweis des Glaubens*, April, May, 1890.
146. *The Ethiopian and the Old Testament.* By Rev. Geo. Adam Smith, in *Expository Times*, July 1890.
147. *St. Paul at Ephesus.* By Prof. W. M. Ramsay, in *The Expositor*, July 1890.
148. *Godel's Studies on the Epistles.* Review by J. S. Riggs, in *Pres. and Ref. Rev.*, July 1890.
149. *The Characteristics of Paul's Style and Modes of Thought.* By Prof. G. B. Stevens, Ph. D., in *Andover Review*, July 1890.
150. *Pauline Usage of the Names of Christ. III. Its bearing on Questions of Authorship.* By B. Hellier, in *The Theo. Monthly*, June 1890.
151. *Outlines on the First Eight chapters of the Epistle to the Romans.* [Rom. 3: 10.] By Rev. C. Clemance, in *Homiletic Magazine*, July 1890.
152. *Christ our Passover. 1 Cor. 5: 7.* By H. Crosby, D. D., in *Homiletic Rev.*, Aug. 1890.
153. *The Resurrection of the Dead. II.* By Rev. Prof. W. Milligan, D. D., in *The Expositor*, July 1890.
154. *Note on 1 Corinthians 15; 20-28.* By Prof. D. C. Marquis, D. D., in *The Pres. and Ref. Rev.*, July 1890.