THE BIBLICAL WORLD

CONTINUING

The Old and New Testament Student

VOLUME II. DECEMBER, 1893 NUMBER 6

ONE may sometimes talk about himself and not be egotistic. There are occasions, indeed, when talk about one's self is not only proper but desirable. There is, moreover, less danger when the "self" is not an individual. THE BIBLICAL WORLD believes that in this, the last number of the current year, the last number likewise of its first year as reorganized, it may familiarly speak of its past, its present and its future. Should any one take exception, it begs leave to cite as precedent the example of many able journals. That it has a purpose in entering upon this easy chat with its constituency, no one will doubt. What is that purpose? To tell its friends something of the "inside", which perhaps many of them have already learned from a perusal of its contents month after month; to gain the closer sympathy and the more active assistance of these same friends, who, in any aid which they may render, will help not only THE BIBLICAL WORLD, but also the world at large.

NO ONE will deny that the past ten years have been years of wonderful significance in the history and development of biblical study. It will be remembered that during these years the study of the English Bible has received a place in the curriculum of our colleges never before accorded it. The young men who leave our theological seminaries are no longer wholly ignorant

of the form and structure of the books which are the foundation of all their work. Schools for the study of the Bible have been established in a multitude of places. Many of our largest cities have been stirred as never before by the scientific exposition of portions of sacred Scripture. Agencies of various kinds have been set at work to dignify and magnify the work of Bible study. The people in general have come to possess ideas about the Bible more intelligent, more reasonable, and consequently more wise and effective than hitherto had been held. Many of our most talented young men have been led in the providence of God to adopt "a new calling"—that of Bible teaching. Contributions have appeared on every side which render possible a better and truer comprehension of the scope and purpose of the sacred books. New methods of study have been introduced which, though not reactionary, have changed most radically the character of the work which we are now doing and which we are to do in the future. New foundations have been laid on which a stronger and more lasting superstructure may be reared than would otherwise have been possible. With all this work, THE BIBLICAL WORLD, under the various names which in its development it has assumed, may surely claim to have been closely identified. Modesty suggests caution at this point; but with all due modesty, it may be claimed that *The Student* in former years, THE BIBLICAL WORLD of to-day, has led thousands and thousands of men and women to a larger and better comprehension of sacred truth, has inspired many persons to work and strive for higher things, and has aided many a troubled soul which found itself in the midst of doubt and difficulty. Some will ask, What evidence have we that this claim is well founded? And we answer: The evidence of this is seen in the letters from every part of the world which hundreds of subscribers are continually sending; in the appreciation shown by the religious and secular press of this country and other countries in the use made of the material published from time to time; in the kindly words and friendly hand-grasps—for THE BIBLICAL WORLD has hands that may be shaken—received on every possible occasion. In a single day, one just beginning the work of study and investiga-

tion makes words of inquiry and requests for aid; a teacher indicates cordial appreciation of this or that suggestion which had been adopted with great advantage; a brother, old in years and of mature wisdom, writes expressing gratification that there is an instrument ready and able to render valuable assistance in so important a cause. Is it egotistical to say this? Very well, let it be so regarded.

THE WORK of the journal in the past has been, it is believed, a helpful one. Its work has also been consistent. The interests of truth are never conserved by a policy of repression; most surely does this statement hold good of everything that relates to the Bible. On the other hand, that spirit which seeks to destroy, which takes away the old without substituting for it something better, is even worse than devilish. To refuse to be identified with either the one or the other of these tendencies undoubtedly subjects one to suspicion on the part of those who are themselves already committed. From the beginning a policy of steady adherence to the great truths most commonly accepted has been maintained, but at the same time there has been exhibited an openness to consider new presentations of truth. We challenge any one to discover at any point the slightest indication of the destructive spirit. There has been no vacillation from one side to the other; there has been no attempt to startle or confound. The effort at all times has been to adopt the judicial point of view rather than that of the advocate. The desire has been not to furnish opinions which others might accept, but rather to aid those who were desirous of our aid in formulating opinions for themselves. Here we are compelled to confess that mistakes have been made. Statements have gone forth which were not sufficiently guarded, and which consequently have conveyed a meaning not intended; but human speech in its best form is inadequate at all times to express one's thoughts. THE WORLD congratulates itself, with modesty of course, that its mistakes have not been more numerous. So much for the past, which, in spite of everything, is known to have been helpful to many and in the main consistent.

THE PRESENT, in the midst of which our work moves along, is, at all events, as critical as any other present through which we have passed. Is it not perhaps more critical? How so? (1) Because of the restlessness which seems to characterize all mental and particularly all theological activity. Are we sure of the foundations upon which we have been building? (2) Because of the many new factors which are all the time being introduced; factors which demand recognition, and which, when recognized, require readjustment on every side. (3) Because of the new methods now coming into vogue, methods which have proven false much that was supposed to be true and have disclosed so much of the new as to render them suspicious. Is a crash coming? A breaking up of the beliefs of the past, with no certain and definite basis on which to rest our faith? So the alarmist would have us believe. *It is not true.* Our present is but a repetition of a thousand presents that have passed. It is our duty, as it is our privilege, to adopt the policy of the great teachers whose words and lives have during historic times guided humanity. What policy was this? That of progressive conservatism; a spirit of progressiveness which made it impossible to be satisfied with the past and which presented an ideal far in advance of the present; a spirit of conservatism on the other hand which compelled a degree of accommodation to the situation in which each found himself, and which prevented, at least in a majority of cases, radical change and open rupture. It is not always a revolutionary spirit that accomplishes most. It is with this spirit of progressive conservatism that THE WORLD takes up again the work which has fallen to it.

SINCE the future is always becoming the present, it is the policy of the future rather than that of the present which should be outlined. Here our good friends will allow us to be more specific, even though we may utter that which shall never be realized. What now is it that we wish to accomplish? How shall we proceed, and in what spirit shall we undertake the work?

In spite of the progress already made, the ignorance of Bible thought and Bible truth is amazing. In intellectual circles comparatively high, the Bible is a book unknown and consequently lightly estimated. From the better class of our educational institutions we are now sending forth men with a respectable equipment in this department of learning. They go forth, and so strong is the prejudice against new light, so dense the ignorance of what scholarship has demonstrated beyond a doubt, that the men sent forth to uplift are dragged down and, after a few years of fruitless effort, accept the position of those whom they should have lifted up, having lost all hope of accomplishing the mission assigned them by God himself. What, then, is the difficulty? That to-day the average man and woman who accepts the Bible refuses to do that which will enable him or her to grow in the knowledge of the truth which it contains. What is the remedy? An earnest effort on the part of those whom a kind Providence has permitted to make progress in these lines to reach the thousands and millions who need to be reached in order that the condition of things may be changed. Who may do this work? Those who, after careful and patient work, have gained a comprehension of its magnitude and the proper knowledge of the great truths revealed. Who are the Bible teachers from whom to-day the masses receive their instruction? For the most part men and women who have no knowledge of the Bible, whose work, in too many cases, alas! is more hurtful than helpful, whose ignorance is only less than that of those whom they profess to teach. The real difficulty has been that the men and women trained by education and by special study for this work have grown away from the work itself. They have forgotten the great responsibility which rests upon them because of the opportunities which have permitted them thus to gain, to this or that extent, a true knowledge of the sacred Scriptures. The scholar refuses to follow the example of the great Teacher who was willing to accommodate himself to the multitude in order that they might receive instruction in a form in which it could be understood by them. Does this mean that we must make our work more popular? Yes. For the

learned there are many means of intercommunication. The people have been forgotten except by those who, in the nature of things, could not help them. THE BIBLICAL WORLD will in the future adapt itself to a broader constituency; but in doing this it will maintain the scholarly spirit which it is believed has thus far characterized it. This new adaptation will require changes. These changes, however, will not be of a nature to make the journal less valuable to its present constituency.

FOR the details of the work proposed, our friends are referred to the prospectus published in another place. The new features there announced will indicate in some degree our plans for the coming volumes. The scope will be broader; less of the technical will be introduced, there being an opportunity for the publication of this material in that other journal, *Hebraica*, which may perhaps be called the sister of THE BIBLICAL WORLD,—a sister more sedate, more technical. In a word, THE WORLD will be more popular in matter and in form than it has been hitherto. In this way its influence may be extended, and a work accomplished which to-day no one has undertaken. The spirit will be the same,—that of loyalty to the truth. This means little perhaps because it is a spirit which everyone professes. Time, however, will show to those most interested, and to those best capable of passing judgment, whether the claim of the WORLD to the exercise of this spirit is well grounded.

IN CONCLUSION, we beg permission to ask that which is the test of every close relationship. If our friends feel themselves drawn toward THE BIBLICAL WORLD, if the purpose is one which commends itself to them, if they approve the policy, if the cause represented is a cause which appeals to them, will they not *help* us? How? In many ways known to them as well as to us, and which we leave to their better judgment in each case to indicate. Come how it may, we wish the help. We need it. We deserve it. Will you give it?

IS GENESIS 21:9–21 A DUPLICATE OF GENESIS 16:5–14?

By Professor Edwin Cone Bissell, D.D.
McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

Is the account given of Hagar in Gen. 21:9–21 only a different version of that in Gen. 16:5–14? This is claimed by the advocates of the current analysis of Genesis. The reasons given for the opinion are these: (1) The use of Elohim for God in the second passage, Jehovah being used in the first; (2) the similarity of the accounts in other respects; (3) the difficulty of harmonizing the second passage with itself on the supposition that the events of the book are here described in chronological order. Conceding, however, the principle that different names for God are, in themselves, proper in the Bible and even to be expected, we find the two terms here wisely discriminated. The first passage which uses Jehovah, is directly concerned with the trial of Abraham's faith as it concerns the promised seed. What is said of Hagar is incidental to the main thought. The second passage, on the contrary, relates to the expulsion of Ishmael from Abraham's family and to his future history. From analogy where similar themes are treated in Genesis, it might be expected, were the name of God to be used here, that it would be Elohim. The history of Ishmael is carried on to the point where he marries a foreign wife and settles outside of Palestine. Excepting the use of Elohim, the language of the passage is generally admitted to have no peculiarities sufficient to distinguish it from the first.[1]

What then are the points of likeness leading to the conclusion that the two passages are but different versions of the same story? They both relate how Hagar, the handmaid of Abraham and Sarah, was driven from the family at Sarah's instigation, and that Hagar was comforted by an angel in the wilderness where she wandered. Here, in general, the points of likeness end.

[1] See Delitzsch, *Commentary, in loco.*

They hold no comparison, in number or quality, with those of unlikeness.

In the first passage the occasion of the outbreak against Hagar is her conception, causing her to despise Sarah who remains barren. In the second, it is the weaning of Isaac whom Sarah has already borne, and at whom, as it would appear, Hagar's son—who had been born still earlier and had now grown to boyhood—mocks. In the first case Sarah deals "hardly" with Hagar, so that she flees away alone. In the second, Abraham sends Hagar away with her child at God's command. In the first, the angel finds Hagar by a fountain of water "in the way to Shur" (cf. verse 14). In the second, the angel hears the cry of distress from Hagar and her child who are ready to perish from thirst in the "wilderness of Beersheba." In the first, the promise made respects Hagar's unborn child. In the second, it respects the same child now accompanying Hagar and is to the effect that he shall become a great people. The first account closes with a statement as to the name Hagar gave to the angel that appeared to her, and to the fountain where he appeared. The second, closes with a statement concerning Ishmael's maturing, marrying and the place where he dwelt.

It will be seen at a glance that the differences of the second account from the first are throughout of the nature to imply that the events it describes occurred several years after those described in the first. This conclusion harmonizes perfectly with the position which has been assigned to it by the author of Genesis in his book. He has inserted between the first and second accounts four chapters of history, including two theophanies, the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah, Abraham's experience with Abimelech in Gerar and, most important of all, the institution of the rite of circumcision together with an account of the circumcision of Ishmael *at the age of thirteen years* (17:25). According to the writer's chronology, Ishmael was sixteen or seventeen years old when the events took place which are recorded in the second passage (17:24, cf. 24:5, 8). He was unborn at the time of those recorded in the first passage. So far, accordingly, there is almost everything to favor the view that we have here, not two

different accounts of the same story, but one account in two successive stages. It surely seems that the material of the second passage forms a strict and proper sequel to that of the first.

At this point our critics' third reason for their view properly comes in. It is that the second passage cannot be harmonized with itself on the supposition that, as compared with the first, it is simply a successive stage of the narrative. In 21:14 Abraham is represented, they affirm, as putting, besides a bottle of water, Ishmael on Hagar's shoulder when he sends her away. This they hold—and very properly if it be true—would be absurd, supposing him to be a youth of sixteen or seventeen years. That it is actually the thought of the writer that the child is put upon the shoulder, they say, is confirmed by the subsequent context which speaks of Hagar as casting her son under a shrub; and by the translators of the Septuagint who, beyond dispute, definitely state it as a fact. Hence, Ishmael cannot be thought of as more than a babe at this time.

Suppose, for a moment, that this reasoning be looked upon as valid, is the passage thus brought into harmony with itself? And is it thus proven to be a duplicate of the first? It would still represent a subsequent stage of the history, if not so late a stage; since in the first passage it is represented that Ishmael is unborn. It would also fail to harmonize (Gen. 21:9–21) with itself along the line of our critics' theory. It would, in fact, create more and greater difficulties than it would solve. Verse 9 represents that Hagar and her son were turned out on account of some misdemeanor ("mocking") on the latter's part. Surely then he was regarded as something more than a mere child. The same point of view is represented in verse 18 where Hagar is commanded to lift up the "lad" and take him by the hand. The Hebrew forbids the supposition that she is expected to support him like an infant upon her arm. The word rendered "lad," too, is not to be overlooked. It means a youth, and, properly, (etymologically) one of about the age which Ishmael, according to the previous history, would be. The word rendered child in verse 14 is less definite, but cannot be confined to one that would need to be borne.[1]

[1] See 1 Kings 12:8; Eccl. 4:13; Dan, 1:4, etc.

It is clear, then, if the passage is to be harmonized with itself—and with what goes before—the rendering of verse 14 accepted by our critics cannot be adopted. The translators of the Septuagint are blind guides here as so frequently elsewhere. How is it to be rendered? Why, just as it is in our Authorized and also our Revised Version; "Abraham took bread and a bottle of water, and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder, and the child, and sent her away." That is to say, he gave her the child to lead by the hand (as in verse 18), or to walk by her side, while putting the bottle of water on her shoulder. The construction does not make the thought as perspicuous as it might be made, but it is not unknown in Hebrew, nor in other languages. There is a similar one in Gen. 43:15: And the men "took double money in their hand, and Benjamin." Of course, it is not meant that they took double money and Benjamin *in their hand;* but in the same sense that, while taking double money in their hand, they also took Benjamin along.

But what of the statement in verse 15: "She cast the child under one of the shrubs?" We cannot suppose that the writer means that, in a fit of petulance, Hagar *hurled* her infant child from her shoulder into the bushes. Note the expression, "one of the shrubs," indicating a measure of care; and especially, note the following verse: The mother seated herself a little way off, weeping and saying: "Let me not look upon the death of the child." So good a Hebraist as Delitzsch (referring to Jer. 38:6; cf. Matt. 15:30) holds that the word rendered "cast" means no more here than "hastily to lay down," and that it pictures the "sudden resolve of hopeless resignation." And Strack in his still more recent commentary renders the clause: "So she laid the child under a bush." Supposing Ishmael to have been really exhausted and famishing, as the context represents, there is nothing out of place in the conduct of Hagar, but it is just what might have been expected from her. It is only when the "traditional" view is accepted accordingly, that Gen. 21:9–21 is found to be consistent with itself, with its preceding context, and with the chronology of the book.

One point more should not be omitted. Not only are our

critics obliged to forsake the Massoretic text in Gen. 21:9–21 and resort to the LXX. to gain even a measure of plausibility for their view, they are forced to a far more serious textual alteration in Gen. 16:8–10. To prevent misunderstanding, let the exact language of one of them be quoted (Addis, *the Oldest Book of Hebrew History*, p. 24): "As, however, the compiler meant to insert another story of Hagar's flight written by the Elohist, he was obliged to add the verses in brackets, viz., 8, 9, 10, and make Hagar return for a time to Sarah." That is to say, the compiler invented a situation in order to harmonize this passage with the later one. But if the passages are already in the best of harmony, as we think we have shown them to be, then the author of Genesis is not obnoxious to this very serious charge.

THE SELF-CONSCIOUSNESS OF JESUS.

By T. H. Root.
The University of Chicago.

III.

In our two previous papers we considered the historical problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus under its two complementary aspects, viz: (1) historical,—in relation to the sources; (2) scientific,—in relation to the mind's knowledge. In our first paper we found in the progress of the consideration that the problem sought the unity of the life underneath the forms of representation, and that in this search the work of criticism was incidentally involved. In our second paper we considered what the nature of that investigation must be if the demands of science were to be satisfied.

When we turn to the practical bearings of the problem, we see that on the religious, or so-called practical, as well as on the philosophical side of Christianity, the problem is fundamental.

4. *Bearing of the Problem on Christianity*—(*a*) *as Life*; (*b*) *as Doctrine.*

Christianity is the religion of its founder. It originated on the assumption and with the conviction that Jesus was the Christ. It is, therefore, the religion of Jesus as the Christ—not the religion of Jesus merely, as the phrase is often used, not the religion of the Christ as an ideal personality embodying certain ideal conceptions, but the religion of Jesus as the Christ. Christianity has been stated by some to be a life, by others to be a doctrine. But whether it be preëminently life, or preëminently doctrine, or whether it be preëminently both, essentially doctrine because essentially life, and doctrine in so far as it is life, however it be defined, it is essentially related to the person of its founder, having, indeed, its origin in the self-consciousness of Jesus, and being found there in its very essence and genius. It is the self-consciousness of Jesus, therefore, that is determinative of

Christianity, whether in its practical or philosophical aspects, whether it be considered as life in the lives of men, or as doctrines in men's minds.

(a) *Christianity as Life.* To him who will embody this life in his own life, the study and contemplation of the consciousness of Jesus is indeed a vital matter. How else should that consciousness become the guide to his own life? This is what is done inevitably by him who has the practical aim of reproducing in so far as he may in his own life the life of Christ. He does not indeed do this consciously. He studies the sayings of Jesus and seeks to obey his commands. He contemplates the character of Jesus, and seeks to imitate it. He notes the actions of Jesus and seeks to make them the example of his own. But in so far as this is done, to that extent it is the contemplation and the coming to an understanding of the consciousness of Jesus. And in these days when there is so much questioning concerning the facts of Jesus' life, the importance of the study, viewed from its practical aspects, is at once seen. Men need this for their life. If it be true, they wish it for their truth. If, on the other hand, it be not true, or if there be great doubt in their minds as to its truth, they hesitate to take it as the truth. Let it be known and felt, however, as fact, and it may be taken into the life without reserve as truth, subject in the results of its workings only to the limitations of the life into which it is received. If the fact be true, what is needed most in these days, is not only the knowledge that it be true, as objective fact, but also the conviction that it is the truth for the individual, personal life. If Christianity be life then the source of that life must be known as the life of that life. Known not merely as that from which originated certain sayings and deeds, but as the life of which these sayings and deeds served as the medium of expression. Whether Jesus be indeed the Christ; whether he be, as has been conceived, the perfect revelation of God in man; whether he be, within the bounds of time and space the eternal truth and life and love; whether—in the terms of the problem—his self-consciousness be complete in its content and in this content perfect in its relations, or whether it be incomplete, imperfect—this is of vital practical import.

(b) *Christianity as Doctrine.* Or, on the other hand, if Christianity be doctrine, then the philosophical bearing of the fact is of central importance. For this fact must be at the center of its philosophy. Its philosophy is, indeed, essentially this—the interpretation of the fact. Christianity has never been without its theology, at first in germ, but growing all the time and coming into consciousness of itself, now in one of its phases, now in another, as in the exigencies of life and in the stress of thought it developed its various distinctive doctrines.

There are two main questions of intrinsic interest regarding the life of any individual. The first is, Who was he? the second, What did he do? The second is, indeed, often a method of arriving at the first. He was the one who did so and so, or such and such a thing. The second question is itself an element in the first. The fundamental question must always be, Who was he? and in the full answer to this there must necessarily be included the statement of what he did. What he did helps us to determine who and what manner of man he was. The individual himself is always more and greater than what he does. His actions inhere in his person and are expressions of his own nature and character. These as they are the two questions concerning the life of every individual are the two questions that confront the student of the life of Christ. It is only when we recognize the problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus as the fundamental problem that these questions can receive their answer. The question as to what he did becomes merged in the former question as to who he was. For what he did must first have existed in his own thought and life as ideal, motive, purpose. What he did will therefore help to interpret who he was.

These two questions, which are the two questions of his life, and for their answer take us to his own self-consciousness, are indeed the two questions that have always been uppermost in the thought of the church. Its two great doctrines have been the answer to these questions. For three centuries the church was seeking its answer to the former of these questions. When system after system had given its answer, and when each had been rejected as belonging to a philosophy that was alien to Christian-

ity, the church finally forged in the stress of conflict and in the keenest intellectual activity it has ever known, its doctrine of the Trinity. And here the answer rested and has rested to the present day, save as in the present century attempts have been made to interpret the same answer in terms of current thought. "This is the doctrine," declares the church, "that represents what we hold to be our life. This answers the question, who was Jesus. This is the interpretation of our conception of his person. This is our most sacred truth, for it is this that guards the very vitals of our faith. The heart of Christ is in this doctrine. We rest in this. Here our minds have found what our hearts have felt and known. In this the deepest conception of thought are embodied those truths that are the deepest of the heart. As we value our Christianity as a religion of heart and soul for daily life and conduct, so we value this truth. As with this life we meet the dangers to this life from the various forms of life that are foreign to it, so with this truth, this doctrine, we meet those forms of thought that are hostile to it and that represent other types of life than that we cherish. In our heart we know our Christianity as life; in this doctrine we know it in our minds as truth." There could have been no rest for the church until it had found in thought that which was the adequate interpretation and representation of what it already possessed in life. Its doctrine of the Trinity enabled it to meet both friend and foe in the conscious possession of the truth. It had become conscious of itself in the terms and in the conceptions of universal thought, and felt that its life had justified itself before the bar of universal reason. It had answered to the best of its ability the question who Christ was, and had interpreted, in the only way in which it was possible for it to interpret, that truth which it knew immediately, by vital experience, in its own heart.

Take the other question—What did Christ do? This, too, had been before the church from the very first, and although its answers have been many and have varied through the centuries according to that phase of thought which was characteristic of the time, and although even now the church gives no uniform answer in which all agree, yet the question still is before it, and

always some answer is attempted. Though there be various theories of the atonement, yet the *fact* is always insisted on as being the answer to the question—What did Christ do? It may be that the answer to the second question is waiting till the answer to the first be anew investigated. It may be that the answer shall be found in some suggestions that may come when the first theme, so rich and fertile in ideas, is again considered. Indeed, as we have seen above, there is an essential relationship existing between the two questions; and hence, also, between their answers. This essential relation existing between the two doctrines of the atonement and the Trinity, will, then, be better understood with that better understanding of the latter doctrine that cannot be far distant.

This is not the place to discuss the doctrines of the Trinity and the atonement. It is important, however, to note in passing the bearing on these questions of the problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus, and to note that the two great doctrines of the church, those that have interpreted most deeply its deepest life, and round which the thought of the Christian ages has loved to dwell, are simply the attempted answers to these fundamental questions—Who was Jesus? and, What did Jesus do?

The ultimate answer to these questions can be found only in the renewed study of the life of Jesus. Christian thought must go below the text to the life. The church must fathom the depths of Christ's own consciousness. It is not sufficient to base a doctrine on isolated texts, or on any number of texts outwardly related. The solution of the problem does not lie here—on the surface, though that surface does reveal depths of truth. The depths themselves must be known, and explored, and fathomed. The truths themselves, not in their surface expression, but in their inner reality, and in their inter-relation in the organic unity of a life, must be known. This is the ultimate source of Christian truth, and until this source be thoroughly known, not only will Christian doctrine be inadequate as the interpretation of the Christian life, but it will fail to coördinate itself with truth as discovered and known in other realms of life. And hence there will be conflict instead of harmony, and Christianity will be

forced back into itself, to discover itself anew, in order that it may know itself aright and come forth with its true interpretation. There is no conflict between truth and truth, but only between truth and error. Error will fall away; truth will remain. That which is truth as life to the consciousness of Jesus, will in the realm of thought be truth as doctrine. Between truth in life and truth in doctrine there is a perfect correlation; and that which is truth in Christian life and doctrine will be truth in all life and thought, and will coördinate itself as such with all that is truth in other realms. There is no division in truth. All truth is one. And that which is found as truth in the deepest source of truth known to science or philosophy, will be found to be the center of all truth, correlating itself with all truth immediately and deeply.

The problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus is thus of vital importance to theology. A searching investigation of this problem will result not only in a more evident foundation for Christian doctrine, a more evident essential relation between Christian doctrine and Christian life, but also in a fuller knowledge of the facts, and so, because of this, in a more harmonious and complete system of Christian truth. A knowledge of the truth in life will be the means to a knowledge of the truth in doctrine. The true life will be the basis for the true theology.

Leaving the historical and scientific aspects of the problem and its bearings within the sphere of Christianity itself on the individual religious life and on theological thought, there remain to be considered, last of all, and briefly, its bearings on the comparative study of religions.

5. *Bearing of the Problem on the Comparative Study of Religions.*

The fundamental importance of this problem has recently been illustrated in a most striking way. For the first time in history there has been convened a Parliament of Religions. Each of the great religions has had its characteristic features sketched by one or more of its adherents. The unity underlying all religions has been dwelt upon. The common possession of the idea of God and of the spirit of human brotherhood have been emphasized. The Parliament cannot fail to bring into promi-

nence and into public interest, the questions—What have Christianity and the other religions in common? and what are those characteristics of Christianity that distinguish it from all others? Take for example, Buddhism. In no other religion is there a spirit so akin to that of Christianity. No founder of any of the great world religions is so near to Christ in sympathy as Gautama. In the record of no other life are we so impressed with the fact that we are in the presence of one whose spirit of human love and of self-sacrifice make him kin to Christ. Yet with all the sweetness and feeling of human brotherhood that we find in Buddhism, with all its noble precepts and its inspiring example of self-sacrifice in the person of Gautama, Buddhism is essentially pessimistic. It cannot escape from that conception of God and of the universe and of humanity out of which it rose, and in which it developed,—a conception that has stimulated the development of the most radical pessimistic systems of the present day. According to the philosophy in which it had its roots, the highest goal of the individual is a state in which the individual personality is lost in the impersonal infinite. The purpose of Buddhistic ethics is escape from the burden of existence. Where is Buddhism to be best studied if not in the person of its founder? Where can the genius of Buddhism be so well understood as in the life of him who discovered in his own experience the way of escape, and renounced all to teach this way to others?

It is in the religious consciousness of the founders of the great religions that we can best study these religions, or at any rate that we must ultimately study them, if we are to arrive at their true inwardness and place upon them their true comparative value. It is a question not of conceptions merely, but of life. We are not studying conceptions and their inter-relation in thought, but life in its actual reality. Here is the true center for the ultimate solution of many questions, not only merely religious and ethical but also speculative. What is true in life, must be true in thought. If we can only see life in the organic unity of its component parts, we have before us in reality that which the mind is to know in thought. What are the great religious problems? Do they not center round these three things: the idea of God;

the conception of righteousness ; the idea of immortality? Granted that there be a life that is a perfect embodiment of the conception of righteousness, that is conscious of its own immortality as a personal being, that is a perfect revelation of God in humanity, where can we discover the relations of these concepts so well as in the living life, in which they exist as actualities? The matter then would not be in the realm of speculation merely, but in the realm of reality. It must be that the true relations of these, as seen in life, would throw light upon the true relations as existing in thought, indeed would be the true relations for thought. The problem would be, given the unity of these in life, what is their relation in thought ? Whatever realization or near approach to realization of these conceptions in life there may have been, we surely are most likely to find the realization, if at all, in the lives of the founders of the great religions. It is from their own consciousness that these religions sprung, and in these that they had their fullest vital expression. And if there be no perfect realization of any one of them in any life, it yet remains true that the lives in which there was the nearest approach to this, would be of the greatest significance to the student of the respective religions. What, for example, is the Buddhistic conception of God ? Look for it in its essential elements in the life of Gautama. What of immortality ? what of righteousness ? For though there may have been developments in Buddhist doctrine, since the days of Gautama, yet the essential elements of that religion, as they have existed in men's lives, and as they do now exist as a basis for doctrine, must be seen most clearly in that life whom millions venerate as the one who showed to them the way of salvation, having first entered therein himself.

It is not within the scope of this paper to make even a brief comparison between Christianity and the other religions of the world, except in so far as is necessary to illustrate the bearings upon their study of the problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus. It may not be amiss, however, to remark, since the whole emphasis of the problem, as it has presented itself in its various aspects, has been on this point of the fact itself, that if Christianity is the ultimate religion and is to become the univer-

sal religion, it is because it witnesses to a fact; because it presents, not primarily a philosophy, but a life, which it holds to meet alike the demands of mind and heart and will. It is more than Confucianism, a system of ethics; more than a speculative system and a noble ideal and example, as Buddhism; more than a pure and lofty monotheism, as Judaism. Christianity proclaims as a fact, realized in the actual history of humanity, the perfect revelation of God in man.

We have thus briefly considered the problem of the self-consciousness of Jesus in its various aspects and bearings, viz.: (1) its historical aspects—its nature in relation to the sources; (2) its scientific aspects—its nature in relation to the mind's knowledge; (3) its religious bearings—in relation to the individual life; (4) its philosophical bearings—in relation to theology; (5) what may be called its ethnic bearings—in relation to the study of comparative religion.

The subject is thus seen to fall under two general divisions according to its internal and external relations respectively, viz.:

I. Aspects of the problem: (1) historical; (2) scientific.

II. Practical bearings of the problem: (1) on Christianity, (*a*) as life, (*b*) as doctrine; (2) on the study of comparative religion.

The problem in its historical and scientific aspects is subordinate to its practical bearings—religious, philosophical, ethnic. That is, the problem exists for its solution, and for the practical results that such solution will have not only on individual life and thought within the sphere of Christianity itself, but also on the religious life and thought of the adherents of the other religions. The Christianity that most simply and most deeply and most adequately represents in its life and interprets in its thought the life of Christ, as this is found most deeply in his own consciousness of himself, will be that which will be most effective in mediating Christ, not only to the adherents of Christianity itself, but also to the adherents of other religions.

THE HISTORICAL CHARACTER OF THE NARRATIVES OF THE PATRIARCHS.

By Rev. Professor Lewis B. Paton, M.A.,
Hartford Theological Seminary.

II.

A second argument for the unhistorical character of the narrative of this period is the lateness of the date at which the traditions of the patriarchs were committed to writing. According to the dominant school of criticism of the day, the oldest documents of the Hexateuch were not composed before the eighth or the seventh century B. C. Even if they had been written at the time of Moses, they would be long posterior to the events and would be hard to trust; coming from the time of Hosea or of Isaiah, they cannot claim the least historical credibility.

In regard to this argument it should be noticed, first of all, that in the *dating* of the documents of the Pentateuch we are upon the disputed ground of the higher criticism of the Old Testament. It may be that substantial unity has been reached in the analysis of the documents, particularly of the P element, but no such unanimity exists in regard to the dating of these elements. When a critic of the reputation of Professor König can hold, in his recent Introduction to the Old Testament, that E belongs to the period of the Judges and that J need not have been written later than the time of Solomon, it is evident that the historical problem is not yet solved, although the literary problem seems to be approaching solution. It cannot be said that the origin of most of the narratives of the patriarchs in the middle of the period of the Kings has yet been proved; the personal opinion of the writer of this article is that they have a much greater antiquity. However, to argue this point would require a book rather than a review article, and since the theory of the later date is the current one, it is better for apologetic reasons to discuss the question from this stand-point.

Granted that JE, which is the main source of the story of the patriarchs, first originated in the eighth century B. C., does it follow from this that it is unhistorical? Not necessarily, it seems to me. It may be that a record which is itself late was based upon earlier written sources and consequently is more ancient in substance than it is in form. There is a very real distinction, which is often ignored by modern critics, between the age of the contents of a book and the age of the composition. Indications of earlier records within JE are not wanting, although it is impossible to indicate the limits of these documents with certainty. One thing we may affirm positively, the stories of the patriarchs did not *originate* in the time of the Kings even if they were then first committed to writing. The notion that legends were invented in order to give additional sanctity to the numerous sanctuaries of Israel by bringing them into connection with Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, is destitute of historical probability. The sanctuaries may have arisen on the basis of the stories but the stories cannot have arisen on the basis of the sanctuaries. Tradition of this sort is the heritage of a race as a whole, and its poetic form is the product of the race spirit. For this reason it can have its origin only in the earliest period of national existence, when the race is still a unit. Stories of the forefathers and of the origin of the tribe may continue to be handed down after a people has become divided as Israel was, but they do not originate then. Such traditions would be nothing more than myths, and myths are not the products of historical times, but belong to the first stage of human development. At whatever time they were written out, these traditions themselves go back to Israel's primitive period. The only question which can arise is whether it is possible that they should have preserved the memory of the original historical fact through so many generations. What are then some of the circumstances which are favorable to the correct transmission of tradition, and how far did these conditions exist in the case of the patriarchal narratives? History in general shows that the tradition of events is easily lost unless it be associated with some objective aid to memory.

1. One of the most important aids is the connection of an

event with a name. Names persist even when languages or races change, and when the name has arisen out of an historical circumstance, the circumstance will probably remain in memory as long as the name is used. The modern name West Indies, for instance, will always bear witness to the fact that Columbus was looking for a passage to India, apart from any explicit historical testimony to that effect. In ancient times names both of persons and of things were usually significant, and this fact was conducive to the preservation of many valuable historical reminiscences. Now the connection of events with names is a marked feature of the Old Testament record as far as the end of 2 Samuel and this is a strong point in favor of the historicity of the tradition. Probably the story of Moses' rescue from the river owes its preservation to the fact that it is connected with his name by means of the play upon the words mā-shā and mô-shé to draw out (Ex. 2:10) in spite of the fact that the name mô-shé was, no doubt, of Egyptian rather than of Hebrew origin.

In the patriarchal history of Genesis nearly every name is associated with an anecdote. The association may be as old as the name, in any case it is very ancient, and is a guarantee for the correct transmission of the tradition from the time of its first appearance. Thus the name Isaac, "laughter," has carried with it through the centuries the memory of the fact that Isaac was a child of his parents' old age (Gen. 21:6), and the name Jacob has preserved both the incident of the birth of Rebekah's twins and the way in which one supplanted his brother. The name Israel has been the means of preserving the story of Jacob's remarkable experience at the ford of Jabbok (22:28). Names of places also, such as Beersheba (21:31), Bethel (28:19), Mizpah (31:48), and Mahanaim (32:2), have kept in existence the stories connected with them in Genesis, and they prove that these stories are not late fictions.

2. Besides names, an important aid for the conservation of tradition is found in the brief pointed sayings which become an integral part of the language of a nation. Proverbs, epigrams and ancient songs furnish a thread on which a great deal of historical matter may be strung. Even as late as the time of David we find

the record of the capture of Jebus coupled with an obscure proverb in regard to the lame and the blind (2 Sam. 5:8), and we rightly infer from this that although the incident is traditional, it is historical. In a similar manner the song of Deborah has preserved a correct memory of the defeat of Sisera, and the stories of Gideon and Samson owe their transmission to the pithy sayings which, on certain great occasions, fell from the lips of these worthies and were repeated ever afterward by their fellow-countrymen.

This kind of association is not wanting in the narrative of the patriarchs. In Gen. 22:14 the current proverb "In the Mount of Yahwè he shall be seen (or one shall appear)" has been the means of preserving to us the beautiful tale of the offering up of Isaac. Compare also the venerable poetic fragment in 25:23; 27:27–29; 27:39 ff., which doubtless, whenever they were repeated, carried with them the story of the circumstances under which they were first spoken.

3. Equally important as conservers of tradition are national customs and religious observances. Wherever in the Christian church the Lord's Supper is celebrated, the fact of Christ's death is commemorated, and apart from all documentary evidence, that celebration will always carry with it the story of the institution and of the meaning of the rite, nor is it conceivable that any important modification should be introduced into the accompanying narrative, however long the time of transmission may be.

So long as Passover existed, Israel could not forget the origin of this institution, and whenever it was celebrated, the story of its historical meaning was sure to accompany it. In a precisely similar way the rite of circumcision was a guarantee of the genuineness of the story of the origin of this observance in faith in a covenant of God, whose outward sign this ceremony was. Even events of little national importance may be connected with national custom and thus escape oblivion. The fate of Jephtha's daughter was remembered in Israel because of its association with the annual lament of the women (Judg. 11:40), and similarly the memory of Jacob's lameness is preserved by connection with

the custom of the Israelites not to eat the sinew of the hip which is upon the hollow of the thigh (Gen. 32 : 32).

4. Physical objects, such as trees, wells, stones or altars served also to keep fresh the tradition of historical events. Every European traveler knows what a mass of history is transmitted in purely traditional form in connection with churches, castles and other famous places of antiquity. So long as the Wartburg stands, the story of Luther's forced residence there will be told, and it is not probable that any important modifications will come into the narrative so long as it is told on the original ground. The earlier writings of the Old Testament are full of such local associations and this makes it evident that the first writers of the history of the patriarchs did not invent their narratives, but went carefully about and gathered up traditions as they were told in connection with places and things in different parts of the Holy Land. In Gen. 12 : 6 the oak of Moreh, no doubt a venerable landmark in the time of the writer, is the scene of a tradition in regard to the wanderings of Abraham. In 21 : 23 the tamarisk tree in Beersheba, which Abraham planted, is the bearer of the tradition in regard to the transaction between Abraham and Abimelech. "The oak of weeping" (35 : 8) has preserved the memory of Deborah, Rebekah's nurse, who was known to be buried beneath it. Wells have historical reminiscences connected with them in Gen. 16 : 14 ; 21 : 30 ; 26 : 33; and often elsewhere. Stones as mementoes of historical events are referred to in 28 : 18; 31 : 45–48, and altars in 12 : 8; 13 : 18; 26 : 25, and 35 : 1.

There is no reason why traditions which were thus localized might not be transmitted for an indefinitely long time without material modification, and the circumstance that nearly all the traditions in regard to the patriarchs are connected with some such external aid to memory, is strong evidence that they have historical foundation. In view of this fact it seems to me to be possible to affirm that in the patriarchal period, as well as in the Mosaic, we are on historical ground, even if the documents were composed as late as many critics now believe to be the case. Of course if a greater antiquity of the documents can be maintained the historical certainty rises proportionally.

1. Admitting all this, we cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that a history which rests wholly upon traditional sources cannot possess the same degree of exactness as one based upon original documents. Tradition retains only the main incidents and easily loses its hold on minor matters. Even the gospel narratives differ from one another in regard to the details of events in the Old Testament. The numerous double accounts of incidents show what modification may be introduced into a tradition within a comparatively short time. In 1 Sam. 10:11 f and 19:24 different accounts are given of the origin of the proverb, "Is Saul also among the prophets?" According to one it was when Saul was on his way home after being annointed by Samuel, according to the other it was when he was going down to Naioth to capture David. 1 Sam. 24 and 26 are generally regarded as parallel accounts of David's sparing Saul's life when he had the opportunity to slay him. According to one it happened when Saul went into a cave where David and his men were hiding, and David cut off a piece of his robe; according to the other it occurred in the camp of Saul, and David took a spear and a cruise of water. Similar instances are found in the patriarchal history. For instance, two accounts are given of the origin of the name Beersheba in Gen. 21:31 and 26:33 respectively. Gen. 12:10–20 and Gen. 20 are probably parallel accounts of the taking away of Sarah from Abraham, the only difference being that in one case it is Pharaoh who does it; in the other, Abimelech, king of Gerar. Cases of this sort show, in the most conclusive manner, that although the main point of an event may be handed down by tradition, the details cannot be accurately transmitted.

2. Candor compels us to recognize also the fact that oral tradition has a tendency to glorify the past, and that this modifies the strictly historical character of the narrative. When the memory of an event depends upon tradition only, it is inevitable that the striking features of this event should be rendered more striking, and that by artistic touches of various narrators the impression should here and there be heightened. We all know from our experience how the story of an episode improves with frequent telling, and how, without loss of the basis of the fact,

the setting of the incident gradually becomes somewhat different from what it was before. This is true on a larger scale in the transmission of history by tradition. The main incidents are all preserved because of national or religious interest in them, but this very interest causes them to be told in such a way as to increase their impressiveness. Even in the later and more certainly historical tradition of the Mosaic period, instances of the embellishing result of oral tradition are not wanting. If such a heightening of tradition can have taken place at so late a time, it is plain that it must also have occurred to a greater or less degree in the history of the patriarchs, although here we are not in the position to recognize it so readily as in the later history. So far as the sacred record has been obliged to depend for its information on traditional sources, it is liable to all the disturbing influences which are a necessary accompaniment of oral tradition. Were this not so, the true humanity of the Bible would be lost, and we should have to assume the Romish theory of an infallible tradition in the Old Testament church as well as in the Christian church. We have no warrant, however, either in Scripture or in reason for such an assumption, and we must conclude, therefore, that the narrative of the patriarchal period has not escaped that modification in detail which is the inevitable fate of all history which depends upon oral transmission.

3. The oral tradition of events carries with it of necessity a subjective coloring. Every time that a story is told it is unconsciously adapted by the narrator, and however early it is recorded, it can never give us the plain prosaic facts of the past, but carries with it a certain poetical element. Tradition is a matter of the feelings and of the disposition of the race which transmits it as well as of the memory. Each age tells the story in the spirit of its own beliefs and aspirations, and thus it grows in beauty, in instructiveness and in ideality. This is the poetic side of tradition. It weakens the strict historical value of the narrative, in the modern sense of the word historical, but it strengthens its religious significance. The central thoughts of the past thus become more prominent than they were in real life. All the details are so arranged as to strengthen the impression of these

thoughts, and a picture is thus produced which is of more value as an example than the plain original. As Professor Hermann Schultz beautifully remarks (*Alttest. Theol.* p. 18), "The main figures of the past become imprints, types of the nationality and of its historical destiny. We are given a glimpse into the inmost heart of the race, and behold there the moving and impelling forces out of which its historical life flows. Hence the ever fresh impressiveness of these narratives, hence the feeling that we are brought into contact with beings of flesh and blood, who are truer than if they were only historical. For this reason no one ever feels so much at home as in history. Here one sits by the hearth in the home of a nation and hears the very breath which it draws."

4. The recording of the earliest traditions of Israel was not a critical process, and this fact also detracts from the strict historical exactness of the narratives of the patriarchs. Among the Hebrews, as among other races, the recording of tradition probably began when it was observed that the memory of antiquity was beginning to die out. This recording was not such an easy process as one might suppose. The would-be historian did not know all the traditions which were current among his people and had to search them out. They were probably the possession of a special class of narrators, as is the case among the Arabs, and were to be obtained in their most exact form only from the lips of these professional guardians of tradition. In different parts of the land in the mouth of different persons the stories varied and the relative value of the traditions had to be estimated and the best one chosen. Most of the tales of the olden times were fragmentary, and one must be used to supplement and explain the other. Historical items and anecdotes of the forefathers were scattered, and the editor was obliged to collect and arrange them. The modern historian would have approached this task in a critical spirit, and would have subjected the heterogeneous matter before him to an analytical investigation, and have endeavored from a comparison of the various elements to construct the exact original historical basis of the tradition. This was not the method of the ancient historian. For him the national tradition was

something far too sacred to be sifted, and even if he had had the wish to investigate it critically, he would not have had the ability. Like all other biblical historians, the gatherers of the traditions of the patriarchs had neither a critical nor a scientific, but a religious aim. The principle on which they have selected and arranged their material was that of edification. They have, it is true, given us very valuable historical information, but this was not their main purpose. If they had had only an historical interest they would never have written. It was the hope of awakening the religious spirit of their own age which led them to gather up the treasures of the religious experience of Israel. To appreciate the true significance of their work we must come to it not in the cold critical spirit of scientific investigation, but with a sympathetic heart and the longing for religious inspiration. Coming in that spirit, we shall rejoice that the first gatherers of the stories of the patriarchs were not critics, and that instead of attempting to separate the objective from the ideal elements, or to distinguish between versions of the same event, they have recorded the tradition for us in all its simplicity and beauty, just as it came from the heart of a race which had experienced God's presence in the past, and was conscious of his abiding grace and direction in the present.

REALISM IN PSALM 23:1–3.

By Dean A. Walker,
The University of Chicago.

The realist and the idealist in art work from the same motive, to make truth effective upon character, but while the idealist does this by presenting the ideal for us to admire and strive after, the realist believes that to present life just as it is with all its blemishes as well as its virtues is the best way to attain the object of art by vividly drawing the contrast between what is and what should be, and so leading us to strive for the ideal. This realism may be carried too far, as when a few years ago an artist exhibited his collection of paintings representing in minute detail all the horrors of war and public executions, for the avowed purpose of making war and capital punishment so odious that they would be abolished. The public was shocked by the exhibition and declined to be taught in that way.

But though realism in art may be carried too far, there is a growing demand that art should be in a proper degree realistic, that it should in its presentations conform more to facts, or at least to probabilities. We demand of the historical painter that he should so familiarize himself with the historical setting in time and place of the incident he attempts to paint that he will introduce no anachronisms nor *outlandishisms* in furniture, dress or physiognomy, and we demand this in the presentation of sacred scenes as much as in any other. We demand such careful study of probabilities as Munkacsky has shown in the details of his "Christ before Pilate." We can forgive the great masters, though they sinned grievously in this respect, because of their many other virtues, and because they perhaps knew no better. We may even forgive the old illustrated German Bible that in its engraving of Samson and the lion put in the background a man shooting birds with a gun. But henceforth let no artist people Bible scenes with chubby-faced Dutch men and women, or paint the

Madonna seated in a high-backed chair, or the Twelve at the last supper sitting upright in European style along one side of a long deal table. We should rather imitate the faithful realism of the artists of the ancient courts of Egypt and Assyria on whose monuments we can distinguish at once the Ethiopian captive from the Jew, and both from their conquerors, by dress and physiognomy. Their art was rude, but so far as it went, was true to the life of the times. They did not make the mistake of supposing that all men and all scenery the world over were Assyrian or Egyptian.

It is some such mistake as this that the translators of the English Bible have made in their rendering of the first three verses of the twenty-third Psalm. By the rendering they have given to a single word, they have given us an English scene where they should have given us a Palestinian one. They have not been true to the time and country in which the psalm was written and so have not been true to life.

What is the picture that we have in the English translation, "He maketh me to lie down in green pastures; he leadeth me beside the still waters"? Is it not that of a beautiful English meadow by the side of a calm lake or quiet deep-flowing stream, an ideal picture of abundance and ease? But such a scene could hardly be found in all Palestine. There, with the exception of the large bodies of Tiberias and the Dead Sea, the one bitter as brine and both shadeless under a burning sun, the "still waters" are the stagnant waters, either the marshes of the Huleh or the dirty village pools, the common resort of the town for drinking or washing for cattle and men, more suggestive of buffalo wallows than of English lakes and meadows. If then we accept the English translation, "still waters," we have a picture that from the oriental standpoint is either idealistic but untrue to nature, or realistic at the expense of beauty.

But if we change a single word and, keeping closer to the Hebrew original, read instead of "still waters," the words "the waters of rest," or more literally, "of resting places," which is the form also in the Arabic translation, we shall have a picture at once realistic, *i. e.*, true to oriental life, and not less beautiful

than the other and at the same time more true as a type of spiritual experience. "He leadeth me beside the *waters of rest.*" The reference here is to the waters of the noon-tide rest, some sparkling spring or babbling brook, coursing down the valley between its grassy banks and under the shade of its own tangled growth of bushes and trees, where the sheep that have been feeding all the morning on the scanty herbage of the hills above, under a blazing sun, are gathered in by the shepherds at this hottest time of the day to enjoy a cool and refreshing hour.

The psalm thus rendered recalls the scene we once witnessed at the 'Ain Mousa, or Spring of Moses, in the Wady Mousa in Moab near the foot of Mt. Nebo. We had spent the morning in a ride from Medeba to view the Promised Land as Moses viewed it, and at noon descended to 'Ain Mousa for an hour's rest before returning to Medeba. 'Ain Mousa is a copious spring of clear, cold water gushing from the side of a great rock, its banks lined with mosses and cresses, and shaded with oleander and fig. We had not been here long when a dozen flocks of sheep and goats were seen in different directions making their way down the steep sides of the valley to the spring. The sun had served as their clock to tell them the proper time, and here for an hour they drank the cool water or lay in the shade of the bushes or nibbled the tender grass and twigs. This was the restoration of soul of which the psalm speaks. What it was to them we knew, not only from their actions, but from our own feelings, for we too had been climbing for hours on the hills above, and were now bathing, drinking the cool water, lunching and resting; in a word, restoring our souls beside the "waters of rest."

But most interesting of all it was, to see here the illustration of the next line of the psalm. "He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake." The "paths of righteousness" are the paths of *duty.* When these sheep and goats had had their hour of rest and refreshment, it was a remarkable sight to see their preparations for returning to the hills. Apparently without signal from the shepherds, the patriarch of each flock took his stand at some distance from the brook facing up the hillside in the direction from which he had come. One by one

the rest fell in leisurely behind him, till each flock stood ready in single file or column of twos, according as they had been trained, the sheep by themselves, and the goats by themselves, or, as I noticed in one flock, in column of twos made up of sheep and goats, with the sheep in the left-hand file and the goats on the right. And then, when the shepherds had stirred up the few laggards that were still indulging themselves, forgetful of duty, in the shade of the bushes, the columns moved slowly off up the hillsides without breaking their files till they reached the plateau above. We could hardly be persuaded that it was not a sense of duty that the shepherds had imparted to them that led these sheep to turn away from the water and shade and still abundant grass to browse on the stony hills where the sun was still shining with almost noonday heat.

The psalm with its translation changed as suggested is true to nature. Is it not also more true to spiritual experience? Few if any of us in our spiritual experience live always "in clover." A continual pasturing beside "still waters" is a type realized in few lives. But hours of refreshment, of restoration of soul beside the *waters of rest*, are common experiences, and it is common experience also to have to turn away from such refreshment, to walk again in the paths of righteousness, to take up the practical duties of life, to bear the heat and burden of the day, to earn the daily bread for ourselves and those dependent upon us, often by scanty pickings and amid uncomfortable surroundings. It is such experiences as these that give value to the hour of rest, and the shepherd psalmist had some such scene in mind when he wrote:

"The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want.
"He maketh me to lie down in green pastures:
"He leadeth me beside the waters of rest.
"He restoreth my soul:
"He leadeth me in the paths of righteousness for his name's sake."

PAUL'S VISITS TO JERUSALEM.

By Professor Willis J. Beecher, D.D.,
Auburn, N. Y.

The visits made by Paul to Jerusalem, after his conversion, are especially important, because our knowledge of the dates and the order of the events of early Christian history depends upon them. Five such visits are mentioned in the narrative portions of the Acts. The first, Acts 9 : 26–30, is the one when Saul was recognized as a disciple; let us call it the *recognition* visit. In the second, Acts 11 : 30; 12 : 25, Barnabas and Saul, in the famine, carried relief from Antioch; call this the *relief* visit. In the third, they met the apostles and elders and "all the multitude" of the Jerusalem church, Acts 15 : 4, 6, 12, 22, on the question of the status of Gentile Christians; call this the visit of the *council*. Of the fourth, Acts 18 : 18, 22, we have no details, except that Paul "went up and saluted the church"; call this the *salutation* visit. The fifth, mentioned with many details in Acts 19 : 21 and the following chapters, and in the Epistles to the Romans and the Corinthians, is the visit when Paul carried large alms to the poor saints in Jerusalem, and when he was assaulted, kept two years a prisoner, and then sent to Rome; call this the visit of the *imprisonment*.

In Paul's addresses, as distinguished from the narrative, he speaks twice of having been in Jerusalem, Acts 22 : 17–21; 26 : 20. The latter of these two passages is apparently general, but the former refers to a definite occasion, when he was in a trance in the temple, and was forbidden to remain in Jerusalem, and required to go "far hence to the Gentiles"; call this the visit of the *trance*. Further, in Gal. 1 : 18–19, Paul speaks of a visit to Jerusalem, three years after his conversion, when he abode with Cephas fifteen days, but saw no other apostle, though he saw James, the Lord's brother; call this the *Cephas* visit. Finally, in Gal. 2 : 1–10, he speaks of a visit fourteen years after either his

conversion or the *Cephas* visit, in which he and Barnabas received "the right hands of fellowship" from James and Cephas and John; we will call this the *fellowship* visit.

If any one cares to study the matter, he should begin by fixing in memory the important statements made in the passages just referred to. Any one who does this will, I think, recognize the eight names that I have given to the visits as correctly describing, in each case, the most important characteristic of the visit. And, in the process of examining the passages, he will come to see that the central question in any investigation that may be made is the question whether the *fellowship* visit, Gal. 2 : 1–10, is to be identified with any of the visits mentioned in the Acts, and with which of those visits, if with any.

Conybeare and Howson, and more recent writers as well, give accounts of the various answers that have been proposed. So far as I know, a strong majority of scholars identify the visit of Gal., chap. 2, with the *council* visit, Acts, chap. 15. Others identify it with the *relief* visit, Acts 11 : 30, or with the *salutation* visit, Acts 18 : 18, 22, or make it different from all the five visits mentioned in the narrative in Acts. The solution I have to propose is unlike all these. I hold that the *fellowship* visit, Gal. 2 : 1–10, is identical with the *recognition* visit, Acts 9 : 26–30. Very likely some one may already have proposed this view, but I do not happen to have met it. It seems to me that it carries positive evidence along with it, and I shall, therefore, discuss the other solutions only to the extent to which they contribute to the bringing out of this evidence.

1. The usual solutions of the problem take for granted the identity of the *Cephas* visit, Gal. 2 : 18–19, the *trance* visit, Acts 22 : 17–21, and the *recognition* visit, Acts 9 : 26–30. They do not argue this. They assume it, as being a matter of course. And just at this uninvestigated point, their position is weak.

There is, indeed, no reason against identifying the *Cephas* visit with the *trance* visit. Saul may have gone to the temple, during the fifteen days of his stay with Cephas, and may there, in a trance, have been forbidden to remain in Jerusalem, and required to go to the Gentiles. If this occurred, it admirably

fits and supplements the rest of the history. Three years before this, at his conversion, he had been designated to work among the Gentiles, Acts 9 : 15 ; 26 : 17–18. Now he has an intense longing to labor at Jerusalem, on the very ground where he had formerly been known as a persecutor, Acts 22 : 19–20. What Peter and James think of the matter we are not told. The temple vision decides it, and he departs, only returning to Jerusalem, many years after, to report upon his work among the Gentiles, and seek fellowship.

But, when it comes to identifying the *Cephas* visit with the *recognition* visit of Acts 9 : 26–30, the obstacles are insuperable. True, the *Cephas* visit is the one first mentioned in Galatians, and the *recognition* visit is the one first mentioned in Acts, and this creates some presumption that the two are identical, and accounts for the fact that many have so regarded them. But this presumption vanishes when we notice the differences between the two. In Acts 9 : 26–30 Barnabas is prominent, while it would be difficult to find a place for him in Gal. 1 : 18–19. The object of the visit of Acts, chap. 9, is "to join himself to the disciples," and that of the visit of Gal. 1 is "to become acquainted with Cephas," and these two objects, while not necessarily inconsistent, are unlike. In Acts, chap. 9, his errand is with the apostles, while in the affair in Galatians he sees no apostle but Peter, unless we call James, the Lord's brother, an apostle. Even if we count James an apostle, the statement in Galatians cannot apply to the event described in the Acts :

"He was with them going in and going out at Jerusalem, preaching boldly in the name of the Lord ; and he spake and disputed against the Grecian Jews ; but they went about to kill him," Acts 9 : 28, 29.

Further, after this public association with the apostles, in and out of Jerusalem, he would not have been "unknown by face" to the Judæan churches as he declares he was after the *Cephas* visit, Gal. 1 : 22. Still further, the account of the *recognition* visit makes the impression that he then escaped from Jerusalem to Tarsus, and there remained till Barnabas persuaded him to go to Antioch, and again engage in work, Acts 9 : 30 ; 11 : 25–26 ;

while the account of the *Cephas* visit makes the impression that he went at once into active work, in Syria first, and then in Cilicia. In view of these differences, it is, in the highest degree, improbable that the visit described in Acts, chap. 9, is the same with that described in Gal., chap. 1. But much of the argument for the commonly received view rests on this identification, and loses its strength when the identification is broken up.

2. The identification of the *fellowship* visit, Gal. 2: 1–10, with the *council* visit, Acts, chap. 15, is beset with difficulties. This is confessed even by those who advocate the identification, but the difficulties are greater than they are willing to acknowledge.

There are certainly some resemblances between the two visits. In each, Barnabas is associated with Paul. In each, James and Peter are prominent. In each, matters connected with Gentile disciples are under discussion. In each, the question of being circumcised and keeping the law of Moses is raised. In connection with each, mistaken brethren are mentioned as interfering with liberty. But in the affair of Gal., chap. 2, John appears associated with James and Peter; he does not so appear in the Acts. Titus figures conspicuously in the account in the epistle, and not at all in that in the Acts. In the affair of the Acts, Paul and Barnabas go up as the result of appointment by the church; in that of Gal. chap. 2, Paul goes up by revelation. The affair in the Acts is the result of dissensions in the church, and is as public as any affair can well be; the affair in Galatians is one in which Paul acted "privately." The matter in the Acts was publicly considered before a large council, while that in Galatians, so far as appears, was decided by a few men of reputation as leaders. The account in Galatians seems to be an account of the first recognition by the Jerusalem apostles of the work of Paul and Barnabas among the Gentiles; but the account in the Acts is of an affair that occurred some years after Barnabas had been officially sent from Jerusalem to labor among the Greeks at Antioch, Acts 11: 22; and not less than a year or two after Saul and Barnabas had been sent to Jerusalem with alms from these Gentile Christians, Acts 11: 30. These considerations exclude the possibility that the visit of Acts, chap. 15, is the

same with that of Gal. chap. 2. To these should be added the entirely separate consideration that the account in Galatians seems to imply that Saul had not been to Jerusalem between the visit of Gal. 1 : 18, and that of 2 : 1. It follows that this latter visit must have preceded the *relief* visit, Acts 11 : 30; 12 : 25, while the affair of Acts, chap. 15, certainly follows the *relief* visit.

3. There are strong reasons (though reasons that have been much neglected) for regarding the *fellowship* visit, Gal. 2 : 1–10, as identical with the *recognition* visit, Acts 9 : 26-30.

The very names that we have used thus far, based as they are upon the statements made in the two passages, suggest this identification. In a case like this, fellowship is not materially different from recognition. "The apostles" of the account in the Acts correspond to the men "of repute," the "pillars," the "James and Cephas and John" of the account in Galatians. In each account, Barnabas is associated with Saul. According to Acts 9 : 26, Saul "assayed to join himself to the disciples," while Paul's account of the matter is Gal. 2 : 2, 9 : "I laid before them the gospel which I preach among the Gentiles, ... lest by any means I should be running, or had run, in vain . . . . And when they perceived the grace that was given unto me, ... they . . . . gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship."

These two statements as to the objects of the visit agree. If the events of Acts 9 : 26–30 had already taken place, there would have been no occasion for the visit of Gal. chap. 2. Paul had been preaching fourteen years in Damascus and other parts of Syria, and in his native Tarsus and other parts of Cilicia. He had founded churches there, Acts 15 : 41. There was danger that the gospel he was preaching would come to be considered a different religion from that preached by the apostles at Jerusalem. He wished to join himself to them, securing from them a recognition that they were all teachers of the same gospel. Further, the two accounts agree in representing that suspicions and difficulties stood in the way, but that the recognition sought was finally secured. Afterward, if the two accounts be of the same event, the reasons for being private ceased to

exist, and Saul was with the apostles at Jerusalem, publicly teaching there with them, recognized by them as a fellow laborer, until persecution arose, and he was obliged to flee to Tarsus, Acts 9: 28–30.

At first thought, one might object to this that the passage Acts 9: 26–30 is to be regarded as an account of something that occurred soon after Saul's conversion, and not of something that occurred fourteen years later. But if one will look carefully at the passage and its context, he will probably be convinced that there may have been an interval of time between the events of verses 26–30 and those narrated in the preceding verses. Paul explicitly declares in Galatians that three years elapsed after his conversion before he went to Jerusalem at all. As we have seen, the common view is that three years intervened between Saul's conversion and the events of Acts 9: 26–30, and the continuity is no more broken if the interval is fourteen years, than if it were three years.

4. With this identification many difficulties are removed, and it becomes easy to complete the solution of the problem, and to fix the important dates. Saul, as we have seen, was persecuted, and went to Tarsus. Meanwhile, Barnabas, having been recognized along with Saul as one who should "go unto the Gentiles," was formally appointed by the Jerusalem church to look after the work among the Greeks at Antioch, Acts 11: 20–24. From Antioch he went to Tarsus, and returned bringing Saul with him, verses 25–26. A year later, Barnabas and Saul, remembering their promise, Gal. 2: 10, concerning the poor, went to Jerusalem carrying relief. This was Saul's third visit to Jerusalem after his conversion, and, as we have just seen, occurred somewhat more than a year after his second visit, the second visit being that described in Gal. chap. 2, and Acts chap. 9.

If we had no information save that in the book of Acts, we should be inclined to date this almsbringing visit in the year in which Herod Agrippa I. died; for the account of the killing of James, the imprisonment of Peter, and the death of the king is inserted between the two verses that give the account of this

visit. The year of Herod's death was A.D. 44. But we learn from Josephus that the famine, by reason of which the relief was sent, occurred after the death of Herod, under his successors Cuspius Fadus and Tiberius Alexander. That is, it lasted more years than one, and was within the period from 45 A.D. to 50 A.D. The stipulation that they should remember the poor, Gal. 2 : 10, seems to indicate that, at the time of the *fellowship* visit, the suffering from the famine had already begun. Hence we might date the *fellowship* visit and the *relief* visit in any two successive years between A.D. 45 and A.D. 50. As a matter of fact, we must date them as early in this period as possible, in order to allow sufficient time for Paul's first and second missionary journeys, which followed soon after. Thus we have A.D. 45 for the visit of *fellowship* and *recognition*, and A.D. 46 as the year of the visit of *relief*.

This gives us the following cast of events. Notice how, in this cast, some events that are commonly regarded as very unmanageable slip readily into place. This fact is a strong confirmation of the correctness of the views here advanced.

Assuming that the crucifixion occurred at Easter of A.D. 30, the death of Stephen probably occurred the same year, some weeks or some months after Pentecost.

Then the remainder of A.D. 30, with the whole of A.D. 31 and some part of A.D. 32 constituted the time when Saul was persecuting the church.

A.D. 32 was the year of Saul's conversion, the fourteen years of Gal. 2 : 1 being the year 32, the year 45, and the twelve intervening years. Persecution did not cease at once, but was still carried on by his associates, and by others. Saul's mission to the Gentiles was declared immediately upon his conversion, Acts 9 : 15, 26 : 17.

The year of the *Cephas* visit was A.D. 34, the three years of Gal. 1 : 18 being A.D. 32, 33, 34. By this time, perhaps, the persecution had ceased, and "peace" (Acts 9 : 31) had come to the churches. In consequence of the scattering by the persecution, the Gospel had been preached to Jews throughout Judæa, Samaria, Galilee, the Damascus region, and Cyprus, and very

likely already in Cyrene, Phœnicia, the Antioch region, and other regions, Acts, chap. 8, 9:1–14, 31; 11:19; 4:36, etc. Saul himself had been laboring among the Jews in Damascus, 9:20, 22, and had been to Arabia and returned, Gal. 1:17. Had he already begun preaching to the Gentiles? And had Peter already met Cornelius, and learned that Gentiles might receive the Gospel? As to these questions we have no information, but we may conjecturally answer them both in the negative. We are told nothing as to the subjects of conference between Cephas and Saul at this visit, but we naturally infer that they considered the question of coöperation in the work of the Gospel, and that the conference was without apparent result.

Saul's escape from Damascus in a basket, under Aretas, Acts 9:25; 2 Cor. 11:32, is by some dated either early in A.D. 37 or between A.D. 38 and A.D. 41. These dates are not very well established, but as Saul went from the *Cephas* visit to Syria, Gal. 1:21, and as Damascus was in Syria, there is no difficulty in the idea that his escape by the basket was after the visit.

A.D. 44 was the year of Saul's splendid revelations by vision from God, when he was caught up into the third heaven, 2 Cor., chap. 12; for these revelations, he says, occurred fourteen years before the writing of 2 Corinthians, and this epistle was written A.D. 57, and both terminal years are to be counted in the fourteen. This was also the year of the death of James and the imprisonment of Peter. Saul had now been preaching in Syria and Cilicia for ten years since his visit to Cephas, Gal. 1:21–24. He was personally unknown, but favorably known by reputation, among the Judæan churches. That Gentiles were included in his ministrations appears from Gal., chap. 2. That he founded churches appears from Acts 15:41. Meanwhile the Jerusalem apostles and their followers had doubtless greatly enlarged their work, in different regions, among the Jews, and, beginning with Peter's visit to Cornelius, had done some work among Gentiles. Possibly the church at Rome was already founded. Probably the preaching to Greeks at Antioch by compatriots of Barnabas had now begun, Acts 11:20. The religion of Jesus was growing rapidly in two sections, the one headed by the

Jerusalem apostles, and containing a small Gentile element, and the other headed by Saul, and containing a large Gentile element. There was reason for exultation over its rapid growth; but there was also reason for anxiety lest the two sections should become two different and antagonistic religions.

As to the things revealed to Saul, at this eventful period in his experience, we have no information. It is difficult to believe, however, that none of them referred to the existing condition of Christ's kingdom; and we naturally infer that they were somehow or other connected with his going up, the following year, "by revelation," to Jerusalem, for his *fellowship* visit there. Matters had ripened since his previous visit, and he had now more reason to hope for success. Somehow, moreover, he had come into relations with Barnabas, and Barnabas would be an influential mediator.

In A.D. 45 occurred the *fellowship* visit, Gal. 11 : 1–10. Identifying this with the *recognition* visit, Acts 9 : 26–30, the man who had been so recently exalted to the third heaven, in the revelations made him, was doubtless deeply mortified at being compelled to flee for his life. Yet the fellowship that had been established was fruitful. One result of it was that Barnabas was appointed by the Jerusalem church to look after the work among the Greeks in Antioch. From this it resulted that Saul was called to Antioch, and that, in a few months, Christianity made wonderful advances there.

The *relief* visit was made in A.D. 46, and the first missionary journey may have begun the latter part of the same year or any time thereafter. Positively this tour must have taken a good deal more time than the few months sometimes assigned to it. It was followed by the dissensions at Antioch, and the *council* visit at Jerusalem, and then by the second missionary tour. In this tour, as the events are commonly understood, Paul revisited the churches of Syria, Cilicia, Lycaonia, and Phrygia, evangelized Galatia, crossed into Europe, labored at Philippi, Thessalonica, Berœa, and Athens, and reached Corinth in the summer or early autumn of A.D. 52. This work, again, demands a good deal more time than the fraction of a year assigned to it by some

writers. A fairly general agreement among some recent scholars dates the council at Jerusalem in A.D. 50; the time will be better distributed if we assign the council to 49 A.D., and suppose that the first tour began in A.D. 46.

Those who hold that the *council* visit, Acts 15, is the same with the *fellowship* visit, Gal. 2 : 1–10, find it difficult to understand the conduct of Cephas, Gal. 2 : 11–14. Cephas was now an older and wiser and more responsible man than in the days when he denied the Lord. He took an influential part in the decision of the council at Jerusalem. It is not credible that, a few months after that council, he went to Antioch, and conducted himself in the manner described in Gal. 2 : 11–14. It is credible that he did this at some time between Saul's *fellowship* visit, A.D. 45, and the meeting of the council, A.D. 49. Very likely Paul and Barnabas found him at Antioch on their return from their first tour. He had come with very cordial feelings toward the Gentile Christians—he, the man to whom God had shown by miracle that nothing is unclean. He went to an extreme in neglecting the restrictions of the Jewish law, and afterward went to the opposite extreme. For this Paul rebuked him, but Barnabas took sides with him and his friends, and, later, the two were sent to Jerusalem on the matter. Meanwhile Peter found his true bearings, and was influential in bringing to a happy settlement the question which had arisen partly through his own impulsive conduct.

BIBLICAL CRITICISM IN SOME OF ITS THEOLOGICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL RELATIONS.

By Rev. James Ten Broeke, Ph. D.,
Burlington, Vermont.

II.

We have now reached the point where it becomes evident that this sketch of the speculative Christology held by the philosophers from Kant to Hegel has an important bearing upon the subject of modern criticism and theology. David F. Strauss forced the question of the historical reality of Christ into the foreground although his own answer was in the negative. He was a pupil of Hegel in Berlin until Hegel died in 1831. Then Strauss heard Schleiermacher. So two highly speculative and powerful minds influenced Strauss who adopted the philosophy of the one and was directed to the gospels by the other. Hegel's distinction between the *notion* as philosophy and the *idea* as religion, which were said to be formally but not materially different, troubled him. Strauss was a student of Scripture and he could not help asking: Do the gospels belong merely to the covering, the envelope, of the *idea* which is capable of being torn off by reason from the inner pure thought? Or, do the gospels and their meaning form an essential part of the material alike in both *notion* and *idea*, in philosophy and in religion? Is the person of Christ a mere element in the form and so not essential? Or, has he value for the matter, the notion, speculative thought? Assuming the Hegelian doctrine of the Absolute, Strauss then asked: can I not with the critical method work the life of Jesus as it is set forth in the gospels into harmony with the Hegelian philosophy? This he accomplished but only by attributing all that was supernatural in the life of Christ to myth and legend, leaving only a pure and wise man.

Strauss was attacked from all sides; by Hegelians who believed

that he misrepresented Hegel; and by many theologians such as Neander, Ullmann, Tholuck, Hengstenberg and others. These men maintained the gospel record of Christ as real in history. From this time forward the speculative construction of the life of Christ gave place to questions concerning the nature and reliability of the sacred literature and to Christ's historical reality as the chief problem.

An important factor in the renewed investigation of Scripture was the Tübingen school under the leadership of Baur. Agreeing with Strauss in his philosophical views Baur yet looked at the problem otherwise. With Baur, the problem was to understand Christ, not, as with Strauss, to explain him away. He wished to escape Strauss' mythical theory which was unscientific because Strauss had not applied the principles of criticism to the gospels themselves and neglected the fact of Christ's existence. Baur gave Christ so much positive importance in history that the tendency was to acknowledge his historical reality.[1] The school of Baur revived the knowledge of the early church and forced New Testament criticism to become a science; but, while it gave much importance to Christ, it was so philosophical that it failed to come face to face with Christ as the creator of Christianity.

The fact which has the most importance for this discussion is that the reaction against Strauss, and later against the Tübingen school marked the beginning of a new epoch in religious thought and biblical science. It created the school of Neander and others inspired by a like spirit, who sought to give both the Old and the New Testaments their true place and to recognize Christ's historical reality fully. I believe that the evangelical critic in his opposition to the rationalist concerning the whole Bible is fairly called the representative of this new movement.

I have now reached the point of view which enables me to show more clearly the already implied distinction between the rationalist and the evangelical critic. We have traced the move-

[1] It was the Hegelian principle, out of difference and contradiction, unity comes; thesis Jesus, of Nazareth as Messiah; antithesis, Jesus as Christ, the Saviour of the world; synthesis, the Catholic Church with its law, priesthood and ceremonial for all, In this historical sketch, I acknowledge my indebtedness to the able work of A. M. Fairbairn, *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, N. Y., 1893.

ment of speculative thought from English deism, through France to the rationalism of Germany. We saw what prominence was given to natural laws in a mechanical view of the world. Supplementary to this view of the world was the mathematical method or theory of knowledge for the first time clearly expressed in the Discourse on Method by Descartes, reappearing in Spinoza, then in Leibnitz with some modifications whose teachings were popularized by Wolf resulting in the generally accepted principle that every truth to be accepted must be capable of demonstration and positive proof. Then followed the speculations concerning Christ and Christianity from Kant to Hegel and Strauss, resulting, as has been shown, in the entire loss of the historical reality of Christ.

It is difficult to fix upon any one of the systems of the past as characteristic of the thought of the present. But I think we are safe in affirming that the rationalistic critic, such as Reuss, Kuenen, and Wellhausen, is one in whom the speculations I have reviewed find a representative. For example: Why should any critic of either Testament rule out the supernatural and the miraculous as impossible?[1] Has he not made the assumption that the universe is a closed system in which natural law is an inviolable something forbidding all interference from without, that in this world from the first was all that afterwards became manifest? That Christianity was in the world in germ from the beginning? Or, speaking less according to the deist and more after the manner of Schelling and Hegel, that there can be no supernatural manifested in a particular Christ for all is supernatural, and supernatural is natural because the incarnation of the Absolute is universal, that is pantheism?

Again, men like Reuss, Kuenen and Wellhausen, attempt a reconstruction of Jewish literature and history prompted by speculative assumptions perhaps unconsciously made. Everything in the history of Israel must be in harmony with logical development. A full revelation of a complete body of Levitical laws to

[1] See A. B. Bruce, *Apologetics*, N. Y., 1892, p. 497f. for a good discussion of present thought. Also James Martineau's work, *The Seat of Authority in Religion*, whose object is to show that the authority in religion is God immanent in human reason.

Moses would have been a violation of the steady syllogistic unfolding of the idea in history for, as Hegel said, the actual must always be the rational. I find also a remnant of the Leibnitz-Wolfian theory of knowledge, namely, prove everything with mathematical exactness and reject all that does not admit of such demonstration. The supernatural and the miraculous factors in Judaism and Christianity do not admit such demonstration and consequently must be rejected.

If the rationalistic critic has such assumptions and prejudices, he differs widely from the evangelical critic. The latter assumes that the supernatural and the miraculous in religion are not only possible but actual. This of course is not a deistical position. Nor are we in these days shut up to the deistic or even the Hegelian view of the world. To-day such a philosophy as that of Lotze, a theistic monism, serves the evangelical critic better because it provides for the possibility of the miracle[1] and because it is more true to life and history. The theory of development which lies at the basis of evangelical criticism in its application to progressive revelation is not logical but morphological and biological—life acting and reacting and adjusting itself to its environment.[2]

Especially does the evangelical critic differ from the rationalist in assuming that there is a divine authority in the Scriptures. He proceeds to "inquire what the Scriptures teach about themselves and to separate this divine authority from all other authority."[3] Consequently, his criticism does not concern inspiration directly which is assumed. These Christian scholars also set a limit to their results by their fidelity to Scripture; for "they admit freely that the traditional beliefs as to the dates and origin of the several books may be brought in question without involving any doubt as to their inspiration, yet confidently affirm that any theories of

[1] Lotze, *Microcosmus* II., 479 ff. Lotze makes the possibility of the miracle dependent upon the close and intimate action and reaction between the world and the personal Absolute in consequence of which the movements of the natural world are carried on only *through* the Absolute with the possibility of a variation in the general course of things according to existing facts and the purposes of the divine Governor.

[2] H. Spencer's conception of development expressed in his works on biology and sociology is instructive at this point.

[3] C. A. Briggs, *Biblical Study*, N. Y., 1883, p. 171.

the origin or authorship of any book of either Testament which ascribes to them a purely naturalistic genesis, or dates, or authors inconsistent with either their own natural claims or the assertions of other Scripture are plainly inconsistent with the doctrine of inspiration taught by the church."[1] Despite some differences in results this is the general position of the evangelical critic with reference to the authority of the Scripture.

It must now be clear that the differences between the rationalist and the evangelical critic have nothing to do with the principles of higher criticism which are necessarily common to both parties. But the differences depend upon the assumptions and prejudices with which each approaches the Scriptures. We are, therefore, shut up to a choice, not between different principles and methods of literary criticism, but between the assumptions and prejudices of the rationalist and those of the evangelical critic.

If we decide with the evangelical critic, we are pledged to a warfare against the rationalist according to the principles of higher criticism and within the limit already given. *Christian* scholars who strive bitterly against each other, simply miss the question at issue. When certainty as to the meaning of Scripture has been reached according to the principles of critical investigation, let it be put over against the rationalistic negations without fear of successful contradiction; let it be brought into a theology whose philosophical basis is so firm and so true that the conclusions of rationalism shall be forever untenable.

Finally, I wish to show that biblical criticism by emphasizing the human factor in Scripture and by directing attention to the humanity of Christ as a real character of history has done much towards making a true philosophy of Christianity possible. It is doubtful whether there is any *science* of religion prepared to offer to philosophy facts and principles for consideration and unification. Rather does philosophy have to go directly to human life

[1] *Presbyterian Review*, II., 244. It is an interesting fact that this limit to criticism was accepted by the participants in the discussion of 1882 and 1883 in which very different views were expressed. For list of disputants, see Briggs, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, N. Y., 1893, p., 130.

as a whole for its facts and principles in order to form a philosophy of religion. In this appeal to human nature, it is found that religion embraces the whole intellectual and spiritual nature and is not unrelated to the physical. A philosophy of religion must take cognizance of such facts as the following: (*a*) a vague feeling of complete dependence which with Schleiermacher was the source of the religious life; (*b*) the feeling and idea of moral obligation; (*c*) the feeling for the not merely useful but also for the beautiful; (*d*) "the metaphysical impulse which demands a cause of recurrent groupings of experience, a "substratum," a Being in the world of reality;" (*e*) "the unifying of all experience in some known or postulated unity of reality."[1] These facts the philosophy of religion must consider together with that higher and yet concrete representation of them by which ethical laws become the will of God, individual finite spirits not mere products of nature but children of God, actuality not a mere course of the world but the kingdom of God.[2] Thus the philosophy of religion concerns man in his constant relations and interchange of life with the personal God in which communion the personality of each is preserved; for religion is God the Father in constant vital relation with the children of men; "for in Him we live and move and have our being; as certain also of our own poets have said, "For we are also his offspring."

If such an understanding of religion be correct, no inspiration of sacred writers would remove their personal characteristics and their fallibility. In their productions, we may expect errors growing out of their limitations and peculiarities, yet errors not conflicting with the essential revelation; we may expect the whole religious life to show the presence of God in the developing human life. The human side of religion would never be lost sight of.

Has the higher criticism contributed anything towards the proper recognition of the human side of religion as well as the divine? It has done so, first, because it has made the Bible a

[1] G. T. Ladd, *Introduction to Philosophy*, Chap. XIII.

[2] Lotze, *Philosophy of Religion*, Tr. Sec. 80. See also Ed. von Hartmann's *Die Religion des Geistes*, for an able and suggestive analysis of religious life even in an *un*-christian philosophy.

book of *life* as it has been lived in the great movements of history. "Fresh light from the ancient monuments," the examination of the sacred writings and other sources of information have given to the Old Testament a new reality and vividness as the record of man's emotions, thoughts and hopes while he lived consciously in the closest relations with the personal God. Secondly, criticism has filled up the traditional gap of centuries between the Old and the New Testaments, and shown that God did not leave Israel without guidance when she needed it most under the Persian and the Greek yoke exposed to other religions and civilizations. But this was impossible on the traditional view which assigns all the law to Moses, all psalms to David, all the wisdom to Solomon. But there were many writers, and God was with Israel in that long period of waiting for the Messiah. From David on to the Maccabæan period, Israel was singing and praying, not backsliding. The heart of the people responded to the law of God in sacred psalms full of devotion.[1] So criticism shows, on the one hand, that there was a constant religious activity in Israel; and, on the other hand, that there was an unbroken continuity in divine revelation until the summit was reached in Jesus Christ and his apostles. Thus criticism has done much to open the way to a true philosophy of the Christian religion by compelling a fuller recognition of the human as well as divine side of religion.

Also in emphasizing the humanity of Christ, the same service to the philosophy of religion has been rendered. The reaction against Strauss removed the far away theological Christ and restored to the religious life the Christ of the Gospels, Jesus, our loving, suffering Lord and Saviour. Jesus as human shares all the changes and weaknesses apart from sin incident to the earthly life. All that I wish to maintain in this connection is that the return to the human Saviour is not only in the line of what we might expect, since religion is the specific expression of the relations of men and God, but also in the line of what must be if there is to be a true philosophy of the Christian religion. If we

[1] C. A. Briggs, *The Bible, the Church and the Reason*, 148 ff.; also S. R. Driver, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, N. Y., 1892, p. 351 f., 363 f., 467 f., as examples.

lose sight of the human element of revelation, its adaptation to life as it has been and is, we enter the path to a speculative Christology which will rob us of the real Saviour. We must have the actual, pitying Jesus. If critical investigation has established the basis of our belief in such a Saviour more firmly, we should have only gratitude to those scholars who have so skilfully accomplished their task.

In conclusion, shall we, while seeking the true philosophy of the Christian religion, entirely forget those marvelous speculations and Christologies from Kant to Hegel in which the supreme life of spirit was found in religion, and religion became the final problem? We may not be satisfied with Hegel's "Das Andere ist bestimmt als Sohn"[1] or even with Baur's *thesis;* but shall we lose sight of the impressive thought, which certainly was Hegel's, that Christ is the center of the truest philosohpy of religion? If the life of Israel set forth in the Old Testament had its goal in the first advent of the Messiah; if prophecy also centers in the second coming of Christ; if he is the head of the church, and the director of the destinies of mankind; if all history actually moves on towards the consummation of his kingdom; if, finally, the essence of religion is the relation and the communion of men and God, Jesus Christ, the human divine Saviour, must be the alpha and omega of religion, and the philosophy of religion must be the philosophy of Christ.

If the Christian religion is ultimate; if "the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain with us," yearning for the fulfillment of the purposes, the philosophy of all nature and spirit must be in some sense the philosophy of Christ.

[1] Hegel's *Werke*, XII. p. 206.

THE AMERICAN INSTITUTE OF SACRED LITERATURE.

A new phase of University Extension work seems to be coming into prominence, namely, Biblical lecture courses. This is a line of work which must be carefully and judiciously guarded. In this as in no other single subject, because it appeals to so large a constituency, there is danger of producing a "fad," and consequently more or less sham. A spirit of generous rivalry between the different Extension organizations working in the same field is undoubtedly productive of good, as it stimulates interest and action where perhaps a single organization would die out, but too great a rivalry is attended with evil.

In order to guard against the overstocking of the field with second-rate lecturers, and the creation of a general uproar in the line of biblical study with no abiding results, the American Institute of Sacred Literature proposes an attempt to unify and strengthen the work of all Extension societies in this department of work by becoming itself a central council to which all Extension societies may refer for the suggestion of the names of the best lecturers in all biblical lines, for choice in regard to programs, syllabi, etc.

The Institute will, through its many departments, keep a close watch of the entire field, and wherever there seems to be an opening for biblical work, the nearest University Extension organization will have its attention called to the matter, and thus be enabled to propose its courses with authority. All societies entering this union will, of course, give no biblical lectures without first submitting the name of the lecturer, with the subject of his lectures, to the Institute. Under this arrangement the University of Chicago offers the following courses of biblical lectures this winter:

William R. Harper, Ph.D., D.D., President of the University; The Stories of Genesis, six lectures.

Richard G. Moulton, Ph.D., Professor of English Literature; Studies in Biblical Literature, twelve lectures.

Emil G. Hirsch, Ph.D., Professor of Rabbinical Literature and Philosophy; Religion in the Talmud, six lectures; The Jewish Sects, six lectures; Biblical Literature, six lectures; The History of Judaism, six lectures.

Ernest D. Burton, A.B., Professor of New Testament Literature and Exegesis; The Second Group of Paul's Letters, twelve lectures.

Ira M. Price, Ph.D., Associate Professor of the Semitic Languages and Literature: What the Monuments Tell Us Relative to the Old Testament, six lectures. (Illustrated by stereopticon slides of the monuments). The Forgotten Empires and the Old Testament, twelve lectures. (Illustrated).

Oliver J. Thatcher, A.B., Assistant Professor of History; The Apostolic Church, twelve lectures: The Life and Work of Paul, six lectures,

N. I. Rubinkam, Ph.D., Lecturer in Old Testament Literature; The Five Megilloth (Rolls), six lectures.

Clyde W. Votaw, A.M., B.D., Docent in New Testament Literature; Sources and Relations of the Four Gospels, six lectures; Jewish and Christian Writings Parallel with, but Excluded from, Our Bible, twelve lectures; Some Aspects of the Life of Christ, six lectures.

Chas. F. Kent, Ph.D., Docent in Biblical Literature; Social Philosophy of the Hebrews, six lectures: Hebrew Wisdom Literature, six lectures; Messages of the Neglected Books—Studies in the Minor Prophets, six lectures.

Theophilus H. Root, A.B., B.D., Tutor in New Testament Literature; The Life of Christ, six lectures.

Exploration and Discovery.

ZAPHENATH-PANEAH AND THE DATE OF GENESIS.

By Rev. Camden M. Cobern, Ph.D.,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

In The Biblical World for October appears an interesting article commending to American readers Dr. Steindorff's identification of Zaphenath-Paneah, Asenath and Poti-phera (Gen. 41 : 45, 50; 46 : 20) with Egyptian names of a late period. This article intimates confidently that this identification offers a new and conclusive proof that Joseph and his relatives could not really have borne such names as the Bible gives them, and therefore that the passages in which the misstatements appear must have been written not earlier than 930 B. C., and most probably in the seventh century B. C. when such names became common.

This suggestion is not a startlingly new one. It has been four years or more since Dr. Steindorff openly published it in the *Zeitschrift für Ægyptische Sprache*, and it has been often referred to since in German and American reviews. That the discussion has been of any great significance in settling the date of Genesis it is difficult to believe for various reasons:

1. Divergent views have been and are yet held by competent Egyptologists as to what hieroglyphic groups exactly correspond to the names given above. Other groups than those preferred by Dr. Steindorff have been declared by distinguished Egyptologists to answer "letter for letter" to these Hebrew names.

2. Since the publication of Dr. Steindorff's views, it has been stated by high authority that the very groups which have been selected by him as exactly corresponding to the names in Genesis can be read upon monuments which are as old as the era of Joseph. This indeed seems to be granted in the case of Asenath by the writer of the paper in the October issue of this review.

3. Granting that the names given by Dr. Steindorff are exact equivalents of the Hebrew names, and granting also that they have never been found on any monument earlier than the tenth to seventh century B. C.; yet to infer from this that the book of Genesis was not written until the seventh century before our era, would seem to be a conclusion more generous than just.

These names may have been XXVIth dynasty explanations or translations of XIIth dynasty forms, just as "*Salvatorem Mundi*" was the IVth century translation of one of those very names given by St. Jerome in the Vulgate.

Again, the Egyptian literature is confessedly fragmentary, and an Egyptologist must be of very sanguine spirit who can argue with confidence that because those names have not been found on any recovered monument earlier than the XXIId dynasty, therefore they were never used in Egypt previous to that date. If our Bible were torn in pieces and scattered to the four winds it would appear no bashful assumption if some foreigner, after examining a handful of leaves which he had succeeded in finding, should affirm that it was now settled that no man by the name of Joseph was ever mentioned in the Hebrew or Christian Scriptures, for no such name could be read on any of his fragments.

Synopses of Important Articles.

WAS THERE A GOLDEN CALF AT DAN? A note on 1 Kings 12:29,30 and other passages. By VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., in *The Expositor* for October, 1893. Pp. 254–265.

Tradition, for 2,500 years, as well as the statements of rabbis down to the present time, would answer the question affirmatively. "There are some grounds for the view that there were two calves at Bethel, and that there was no calf at Dan, but only the old idolatrous ephod and images of Micah" (Judges 17:4). These so-called calves were only cherubic images such as those sanctioned by Aaron, by Moses and by Solomon. On this point we must note that Jeroboam's calves neither did nor were intended to interfere with the worship of Jehovah. This is seen in the fact that the kings of the northern kingdom never persecuted, suppressed or repudiated the worship of Jehovah, and that on the other hand many of them had names which embodied therein an element (Jah) of the divine Name. No prophet before Amos and Hosea condemned calf-worship. There is no word of reprobation of calf-worship by any southern prophet or king, except the speech put in the mouth of Abijah, son of Rehoboam, by the chronicler (2 Chron. 11:15; 13:8). If these calves were the cherubic emblems which were regarded as intolerably wicked by the chronicler of five centuries later, though not condemned by king and prophet, is it not extremely probable that there were *two calves* at Bethel and not one? If such were their form it is not more probable that Jeroboam would have placed *two* of these symbols at Bethel than that he placed one? Hosea 10:5 speaks of "the calves of Beth-Aven." "If there were *two* calves . . . at Bethel, this fact and the constant reference to them as two in number—would naturally help to stereotype the notion that one of them was at Dan and one at Bethel when once it had arisen; especially since there was *also* a highly irregular cult at Dan, and the growth of centuries tended to obliterate the distinctness of facts which were only preserved for long centuries by dim tradition" (p. 259). There is no reference in all the history of the northern and southern kingdoms to a calf at Dan except possibly in Amos 8:14. Further, it is *a priori* improbable that Jeroboam would think of erecting a golden calf at Dan, because (1) the place was on the remote border of his dominions, and entered but slightly into the stream of Israelitish history; (2) there was an ancient sanctuary at Dan already (Judg. 18:14, 18), and this was officered by the same line of priests "to the days of the captivity of the land" (Judg. 18:30).

The only two passages which militate against these conclusions may be

explained as follows: (1) Amos 8:14 says nothing of a golden calf at Dan, only "as thy god, O Dan, liveth." It is unlikely that this refers to a golden calf at Dan, because in that case there could "be no reason for passing over the far more prominent calf or calves at Bethel" (p. 261), and because the sin of Samaria was probably some Baal-image or Asherah there. Amos exercised his prophetic gifts at Bethel, but never once mentions calf-worship.

Hosea speaks of several headquarters of idolatrous worship, but never mentions Dan. In 8:5, 6; 10: 5; 13:2 he speaks of *calf-worship*, but only at Beth-aven and Samaria. In Zechariah 9–11, though occupied with the later kings, there is no allusion to calves either at Dan or Bethel. Finally, the passage in 1 Kings 12:28–30 evidently contains on the face of it a textual difficulty. In verse 30, in place of *the one*, by changing a single letter, we may read *the ephod*. This corresponds exactly to the conclusions arrived at above, viz., the calves were set up at Bethel, and the old ephod of Micah was regarded as the consecrated thing in Dan.

Dr. Farrar has ingeniously constructed his line of argument, but the careful reader will notice several cracked links in the chain. The dangerous *e silentio* argument is required to do rather more than its legitimate service. The question is not yet satisfactorily answered. PRICE.

JESUS' SELF-DESIGNATION IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By ORELLO CONE, D.D., in *The New World* for September, 1893. Pages 492–518.

The inquiries raised by Jesus' designation of himself in the synoptic gospels as "The Son of Man" are among the most difficult in New Testament theology, and though many of the ablest scholars have proposed solutions of the problem, a consensus of opinion has not yet been reached.

The Old Testament uses the term "son of man" as a synonym for "man" with emphasis upon the idea of dependence on God. The use of the term in Jewish apocalyptic literature begins with the familiar passage in the seventh chapter of Daniel. The "one like unto a son of man" symbolizes the human qualities of the victorious prophetic people in contrast with the bestial attributes which appear in the preceding type. The term "son of man," therefore, here also implies only human attributes, and is not as yet distinctly Messianic. The hint, however, of a Messianic use of the term in this passage gives rise in the later apocalypse of Enoch to its use as a distinct designation of the Messiah. The picture of the Messiah given under this name is very different from the traditional Hebrew idea, and presents him as a mighty ruler and a judge, but not even yet as divine.

Numerous New Testament examples show that the term "son" followed by the genitive of a noun designates one possessing the attributes of the latter. Cf. such expressions as "sons of light," "sons of the most high," etc. According to this usage "the son of man"—it must be taken into

account that both nouns have the article in Greek—implies that he who applies the term to himself is conscious of belonging to the species man, representing in himself the essential qualities of the race (so Holsten).

The general attitude of Jesus toward the Old Testament favors the view that he derived his use of the term from the Old Testament (not including Daniel) rather than that he took it from the apocalyptic literature, or himself invented it. The synoptic passages, however, in which it occurs, fall into two distinct classes, those in which the term bears a sense naturally derivable from the Old Testament use, and those in which it was the apocalyptic sense. It cannot be that both classes represent Christ's own usage. This would be to put him into sharp contradiction with himself. As between the two, a sane and reverent interpretation of Jesus' teaching and spirit decides for the passages of the first class as those which come from Jesus himself, and judges that those of the second class have been incorrectly attributed to him by the evangelists, who must indeed have had some basis for this in a Messianic claim on the part of Jesus, but who have shaped his actual sayings under the influence of Jewish apocalyptic ideas.

This explanation relieves the whole problem of much of its difficulty, presenting to us a self-consistent and sober use of the term on the part of Jesus. By it, we conclude, he designates himself as man, yet without its being a designation of mere humanity. The presence of the article is significant, and taken in connection with his claim of lordship over the Sabbath, and of authority to forgive sins, shows that he thought of himself as having an exalted spiritual function and ministry, and an exceptional rank among the sons of men, as being the Man preëminently.

In so far as this article is a criticism of the views of Meyer and others who have interpreted "the son of man" as applied by Jesus to himself in the apocalyptic sense, and have thus found in it an explicit Messianic claim on his part, and in so far as it opposes the view that the term is an expression of divine nature, it is eminently just and reasonable. It may also fairly claim that it offers in a sense a simple solution of the problem. But it must be doubted whether this solution is not somewhat too easy; whether instead of resorting to the easy expedient of excluding from the problem one whole class of the passages in question, one ought not to make a more serious and painstaking attempt than the article gives evidence of to ascertain whether, when the passages are fairly interpreted, the two classes are so different that they could not both have proceeded, substantially as reported, from Jesus. The difference between them is, we are persuaded, somewhat exaggerated; there is an apparent failure to allow sufficiently for a fuller expression of Messianic claim on the part of Jesus toward the end of his life; and there is seeming neglect of the significance of the fact, which the author's own interpretation of the non-apocalyptic passages makes clear, that whenever the Enoch parables were written, they exerted no influence outside, possibly, of a narrow circle of the learned (of even this, is there any evidence?) in Jesus' own day, so that the attributing to him of these so-called apocalyptic sayings by no means attributes to him the ideas of the apocalyptic literature in general. E. D. B.

THE HISTORICAL DIFFICULTIES IN KINGS, JEREMIAH AND DANIEL. By REV. GEORGE DOUGLAS, in *The Expository Times* for September, 1893.

The conclusions of the writer are as follows :

(1) The first verse of the Book of Daniel, whose supposed inconsistency with Jeremiah and the historical scriptures has been to many evidence that the book is uninspired, and has caused some to doubt the prophet's historical existence, is, on the hypothesis of its Babylonian origin, in perfect harmony with these other writings, and that, not after a strange interpretation, but when read in the meaning which any child would attach to the words. (2) On the same hypothesis the first verse of the second chapter of Daniel, whose supposed inconsistency with the first chapter has been another evidence against the book, likewise harmonizes with it simply and completely. (3) Those passages in Kings and Jeremiah making mention of captivities in the eighth and nineteenth years of Nebuchadnezzar, which were supposed to contradict other passages in the same books referring the same captivities to the seventh and eighteenth years, are, when read in a reasonable way, confirmatory of them. (4) The statement in Kings and Jeremiah regarding the time of the relaxation of Jehoiakim's captivity, which appeared to differ from the rest of the sacred narrative and from the works of Berosus and Ptolemy, is, when viewed in the light of the tablets, in perfect harmony with them. The following table is presented as satisfying all scriptural statements :

Battle of Megiddo and death of Josiah,	609 B.C.
Jehoahaz begins to reign,	609
Jehoahaz taken captive by Pharaoh-Necho,	608
Jehoiakim set on throne by Pharaoh-Necho,	608
Fall of Nineveh,	? 606
Battle of Carchemish,	605
Jerusalem besieged and Jehoiakim taken by Nebuchadnezzar,	605
Captivity of Daniel and others,	605
Nebuchadnezzar succeeds to throne of Babylon : his first year according to Jewish reckoning,	605
His first year according to Babylonian reckoning,	604
Daniel interprets Nebuchadnezzar's dream,	603
Death of Jehoiakim,	598
Jehoiachin begins to reign,	598
Zedekiah set on throne by Nebuchadnezzar,	597
Destruction of Jerusalem and deportation of Zedekiah and others,	587
Further deportation,	582
Death of Nebuchadnezzar and relaxation of Jehoiachin's captivity,	562

It is only fair to say that this article contains a good deal of that harmonizing work which has brought commentators and the Bible itself into disrepute. W. R. H.

Notes and Opinions.

German as an Aid in the Study of Theology.—"What more and what better can the Colleges do in fitting men for the study of Theology, and so in fitting men to become ministers?" This question is asked by President Charles F. Thwing, of Western Reserve University, who gives in the *Outlook* for October 7, extracts from the responses of various theological teachers. Prof. G. F. Moore of Andover, emphasizes the need of the study of German in the Colleges. He writes: "I will name only one point where the Colleges all seem to fail. We get very few men who have not studied German; and we do not get one in ten who can read German in such a way as to be of any use to him or us. Whether too little time is given to it, or whether it is not well taught, or whether the students themselves slight it, I cannot say. German is as indispensable now as ever Latin was to the student of theology." President Thwing himself in commenting on the answers, writes: "The study of German is to be emphasized in the College, not merely for its own sake (although this is worthy), but also as a tool. German is the language of the best modern scholarship. The works most essential to a theologian are written in German; some of them which are the most necessary are not translated. No one can presume to be a thorough and ripe scholar in the important matters of theology without the ability to read German with facility. The testimony of Professor Moore of Andover, that nearly all students of theology are able to read German somewhat, but only a few are able to so read it as to make it of much value in theological investigation, is true beyond Andover. Colleges, therefore, should emphasize the study of German." President Hartranft, of Hartford Seminary, in his letter, also states strongly this need. T. H. R.

The Kingdom of God—The prominence in the theological thought of this day, of the idea of the kingdom of God, is an evident fact of no little importance. It is not strange that at present there should be much divergence of opinion in the interpretation of Christ's conception of the kingdom. Dr. Cone in the *New World* for September, as mentioned elsewhere in this number, maintains that Jesus conceived of the kingdom as belonging wholly to the present order of things, involving indeed a moral transformation of human society, but coming unobtrusively and gradually. Those sayings attributed to Jesus which refer to a future kingdom to be ushered in by his own second coming in power and glory, he regards as misrepresenting the real thought of Jesus. On the other hand, Dr. H. H. Wendt, of Heidelberg, in an article translated in the *Expository Times* for October, criticises the view

of Dr. J. Weiss, that Jesus regarded the kingdom of God simply as an eschatological state, such as will not and cannot be realized under the conditions of the present earthly dispensation, holding, on the contrary, that while in many passages Jesus does thus speak of a future kingdom, which indeed he looked to see established within the life-time of men then living by his return from heaven after his death, yet he also spoke of the kingdom of heaven as something already in existence. Thus we have presented to us three views, one that Jesus spoke only of a kingdom belonging to this dispensation, another that he spoke only of a kingdom belonging to a future dispensation, a third that he spoke of both. The point of agreement among these three writers is that our present gospels represent Jesus as speaking of a future kingdom to be set up on his return from heaven. Evidently there is still need to study this great term of Jesus' thought. E. D. B.

Work and Workers.

THE CHRISTIAN LITERATURE COMPANY, which with the end of 1892 discontinued the publication of their *Magazine of Christian Literature*, substituting therefor the English publication, *The Thinker*, with the addition of bibliographical material prepared in New York, now issues (November) the first number of *Christian Literature and Review of the Churches*. The new magazine is reckoned as the Vol. 10 of the Christian Literature Magazine. The Christian Literature part consists of some thirty pages of articles, partly original, partly reprinted from English magazines, together with list of books received, and Index to Religious Periodicals. The Review of the Churches is the well-known English periodical of that name. The monthly bibliography, which was one of the most valuable features of the predecessors of the new journal, seems to have been dropped.

BIBLICAL scholarship has to lament the departure of a noble and candid student and teacher, and the Christian world the loss of a large-minded and sweet-spirited believer in the death of Dr. Schaff. We give a brief appreciation of him. Philip Schaff was born Jan. 1, 1819, at Coire, Switzerland. He studied theology at Tübingen, Halle and Berlin. In 1841 he passed his examination in theology at Berlin, and the next year began to lecture as a *privat docent*. In 1843 he was made professor in the Theological Seminary of the German Reformed Church of the United States at Mercersburg, Pa., where he remained till 1863. In 1869 he was made Professor in the Union Theological Seminary of New York. He died in that city October 20, 1893.

Few men are better known in America than Dr. Schaff; he had been the teacher of hundreds of ministers of almost every denomination, and had written or edited enough books to make a large library, all of them good, many of them excellent. He was kept prominently before the Christian public by his connection with such important bodies as the Evangelical Alliance, the Pan-Presbyterian Council, the American Bible Revision Committee, and others, in all of which he was one of the recognized leaders.

In Berlin he was a pupil of the great and good Neander, who deeply influenced his development. He became thoroughly imbued with the methods, principles, spirit, and aims of the mediating school of theology of which Neander was a great representative. And Dr. Schaff never deserted this school. It has broadly influenced all his books, and characterized his work in the class-room. He always tried to hold fast to the old truths, without accepting the old formulas and definitions. He declared that Christianity is life,

not creed, and therefore there might be Christian unity with the greatest diversity of belief and practice.

To Dr. Schaff more than to any other man is due the great influence which "German Theology" is now exerting in America. He gave up a life of independent scientific investigation to become expounder, translator, and purveyor of the treasures of German thought and scholarship to the Church in America. For this we owe him a great debt of gratitude.

Great as he may have been as a scholar and professor, he was even greater as a Christian. His nature was clear and sunny as the air and meadows of his mountain home. His Christian character attracted and held his friends with rare power. His students were astonished at his learning, but they were filled with a strange awe as they listened to his prayers, revealing, as they did, a depth of Christian feeling and experience before unknown to them. His influence in the direction of a wise liberality, Christian tolerance, true communion and fellowship in the spirit and love of the Master, cannot be estimated. He found and commended the Christ in everyone. His death is a loss to the whole Church. O. J. T.

THERE has been introduced into the University of Cincinnati a series of Bible lectures in connection with the Extension courses. The extension work is carried on in the University building on Saturdays for the benefit of those who cannot attend at any other time. Professor Sproull, Dean of the University and Chairman of the Extension Faculty, came to the conclusion that there was a demand for lectures of a high order on biblical subjects. The matter was presented by him to the different ministerial associations of Cincinnati; namely, the Methodist, Baptist, Presbyterian, and Episcopalian, and met with a hearty response. Each association appointed a committee of coöperation. The following program is announced:

Lectures on the Bible and Biblical Subjects, fourteen in number, will be given on Saturday mornings, from 10:30 to 11:30, at the University of Cincinnati, as follows:

November 4, 1893. The Ethics of Moses.—Rev. I. M. Wise, D.D., President of Hebrew Union College.

THE BIBLE.

November 11, 1893. Old Testament and New Testament Courses.—Professor M. S. Terry, Ph.D., Garrett Biblical Institute.

November 18, 1893. The Transmission of the Bible.—Rev. C. W. Rishell, Ph.D.

December 2, 1893. The Revised Version.—Professor W. W. Davies, Ph.D., Professor of Hebrew, Ohio Wesleyan University.

THE BIBLE AND ANCIENT MONUMENTS.

December 9, 1893. Discovery and Decipherment of the Monuments.—Professor Ira M. Price, Ph.D., Associate Professor Semitic Languages and Literature, University of Chicago.

December 16, 1893. Egypt in the Days of Abraham, Joseph and Moses.—Professor J. R. Sampey, D.D., Professor Old Testament Literature, Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky.

January 6, 1894. The Fall of Assyria to the Fall of Babylon. Professor Ira M. Price, Ph.D., University of Chicago.

January 13, 1894. The Bible as Literature.—Rev. George A. Thayer, D.D.

THE PROPHETICAL BOOKS OF THE BIBLE.

January 20, 1894. Some Traits of the Hebrew Prophets.—Professor Edwin Cone Bissell, D.D., Professor of Old Testament Literature and Exegesis, McCormick Theological Seminary, Chicago.

January 27, 1894. (Subject to be announced later).—Professor Willis J. Beecher, D.D., Professor Hebrew Language and Literature, Auburn Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

February 3, 1894. (Subject and Lecture to be announced later).

THE POETICAL BOOKS OF THE BIBLE.

February 10, 1894. Job.—Rev. Dudley W. Rhodes, D.D.

February 17, 1894. The Psalms.—Rev. Frank Woods Baker, B.D.

February 24, 1894. Ecclesiastes.—Rev. Lewis Brown, B.D.

The public is cordially invited to be present at these lectures.

One or two changes will be made on this program. There is one Rabbi, also Methodists, Baptists, Presbyterians, Episcopalians, and a Unitarian. Up to the present time, one lecture has been given by Dr. Wise. The University Hall was crowded, a proof of the interest that can be awakened in the community by a scholarly treatment of such topics. A circular letter had been sent by the Dean to all the clergymen of the city, inviting the members of his congregation to be present. W. O. S.

THE autumn meeting of the Chicago Society for Biblical Research was held at the Palmer House, Chicago, November 18. Papers were read by Professor Charles Horswell, Ph.D., of Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill., on "Romans 16: 1–16 and its Relation to the Rest of the Epistle;" and by Professor Ira M. Price, Ph.D., of the University of Chicago, on "The Date of Obadiah."

Professor Price's positions are briefly summarized as follows: The Book of Obadiah is dated in King James's Version, and by Driver and Cornill, at or after the fall of Jerusalem in 586 B. C. The main supports of this view are (1) the hypothesis that this event furnishes the best explanation for Obadiah's words; (2) the relations of Obad. 1–9 and Jer. 49: 7–22; (3) the hostility of the Edomites at that time. But, the Edomites showed a malicious spirit toward Israel throughout their history (cf. Amos 1: 9), breaking out in open abuse several different times. Obadiah is admittedly more original, logical, and complete than Jeremiah. Of the seven captivities of Jerusalem, the most

appropriate for the events in Obad. 11–14, is that under Jehoram of Judah by the Philistines and Arabians, about 850 B. C. This occasion would answer the demands of the text, and present the natural consequences of the open revolt of the Edomites against Jehoram.

Professor Horswell's paper on Rom. 16: 1–16, considered the arguments for and against the opinion that these verses were a part of Paul's letter to the Romans. The character and structure of the Book of Acts was held to be such as to render wholly unsafe any argument based on the assumption that the chronology of Paul's life could be gained from that book. The salutations of these verses were examined, and maintained to be in effect commendations of persons already better known to Paul than to the Roman Christians, and hence probably persons converted under his influence elsewhere. The bearing of Lightfoot's comparison of the names in the epistle with those occurring in the inscriptions, chiefly sepulchral, discovered in modern times in Rome was urged. The conclusion reached was that these verses are a genuine part of the original letter.

Comparative-Religion Notes.

THE PARLIAMENT OF RELIGIONS has greatly stimulated the interest of thinking people in the study of Comparative Religion. The Report of the Proceedings of the Parliament will be even more effective. But it is not so generally known as it ought to be that a Society of Comparative Religion had been established in the United States for some time, and had been doing effective work in this great department of study before the Parliament came into existence. This organization is called "The American Society of Comparative Religion," and was formed at the University of the City of New York, May 9, 1890, as an outgrowth of the course of lectures on Comparative Religion in the graduate department of that institution, given by Professor F. F. Ellinwood, D.D., Secretary of the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian Church, and Professor of Comparative Religion in the University of the City of New York. From a statement put forth by the society we take the following account of its purposes: "The design of the society is, primarily, to furnish to its members a helpful agency whereby the study, begun at the University, may be advantageously continued and expanded; and, secondarily, to awaken an interest in the subject among Christian thinkers who have hitherto given little attention to it, and to exhibit its character, scope and importance. The society also aims to secure such accurate information regarding the origin, development and character of the religions of the world, especially of those now existing, as may qualify its members to fairly estimate and effectively oppose the endeavors of the adversaries of Christianity to exalt the non-Christian systems to the disadvantage of Christian faith, and the disparagement of Christian enterprise. It is not too much to hope that the study to which the society is devoted may result, not merely in timely and competent contributions to current discussions of questions vital to the interests of Christ's kingdom, but also that it may be permanently influential through the useful additions which may be made to the literature of Comparative Religion."

The society holds meetings monthly, at which times addresses are made by distinguished scholars, or papers contributed by members of the society. The program of the meetings from September to December of the present year is as follows; April 25, "Mohammedanism as seen in America and Elsewhere," by Professor George Donaldson; October 30, "The Theistic Idea," by Rev. J. M. Meeker, Ph.D.; November 27, "Islâm," by Rev. Howard S. Bliss; December 18, "Unwritten Revelation," by Rev. John A. Davis. The society has already published some papers, and hopes to do more work in that line in the future.

An interesting feature of its plan contemplates the annual assigning to each member a definite field of work—a religion or group of religions—to which he shall specially devote himself, keeping track of new literature, discoveries, etc., and report thereon to the various meetings. It is added in the Society's statement that while the membership is composed largely of those who have pursued the graduate course in Comparative Religion at the New York University, it is not limited to such students. All persons who are in sympathy with the aims of the Society and are willing to unite with its members in its work, will receive a cordial welcome to membership." The President of the Society is Prof. F. F. Ellinwood, D.D. The Corresponding Secretary and Treasurer, Rev. C. R. Blauvelt, Ph.D. The fees of membership are but a dollar a year, and we heartily urge any who are interested, and there should be many such, to correspond with the Secretary, Dr. Blauvelt, whose address is Nyack, N. Y. G. S. G.

THE authentic and authorized Report of the Parliament of Religions is the work in two volumes edited by Rev. Dr. John Henry Barrows, the chairman of the great gathering. The first volume has already come from the press and quite fulfils all expectations. It is a portly volume of nearly 800 pages, of compact but clear type, adorned with portraits of many of the distinguished speakers and views of many scenes notable in religious history or objects of religious use or reverence. It revises the ordinary idea of a subscription book—poor work and a high price—for it is beautifully printed and remarkably reasonable in price. The number of valuable papers read at the Parliament, reproduced here in full, the chronicle of the gathering day by day, the descriptions of memorable scenes occurring from time to time during the sessions, the preface by Dr. Barrows, and his noble and tender words of dedication to his wife—make this first volume a marvelously attractive and valuable book. The second volume, equally large or larger, we are informed, will be equally valuable. The papers will not all be given in full, but the most valuable parts will be preserved; many papers not read in the Parliament, and others read only at section-meetings, will appear in full or abridged form in the second volume. Some of these papers cannot be obtained elsewhere, such as those by Professor Orelli on Sacrifice, and by Canon Freemantle on the Union of Christendom. People interested in preserving the proceedings of the Parliament or wishing to study its deliverances more closely should by all means obtain these two volumes. We very heartily recommend them to our readers and urge all who are thus minded to write to the Parliament Publishing Company of Chicago for Dr. J. H. Barrows' authorized book and to take no other. G. S. G.

THE literature, present and prospective, of Comparative Religion is something to alarm one who hopes to keep abreast of the investigations and movements of thought in this field. One of the most useful of books to the

general reader is a collection of lectures and essays entitled *Religious Systems of the World*, just appeared in its third edition from Swan Sonnenschein of London. Each religious sect or system is treated by an adherent of the same or a specialist on the subject. It has reached the great bulk of 824 pages, is a kind of encyclopedia of religions, but for an intelligent general student it is the best work available in English at present.

Saussaye's *Manual of the Science of Religion* is not completely translated as yet. We are promised in the International Series of Theological Handbooks a volume on Comparative Religion by Principal A. M. Fairbairn, which will be looked for with great expectations. Rev. Dr. Allen Menzies is announced as the author of a forthcoming manual on the same subject in another series of volumes. The series of books on the History of Religions under the editorship of Professor Jastrow, the prospectus of which appeared not long since, has already been referred to in this journal. Altogether it seems that the new science will not lack for competent and skillful expounders.

Book Reviews.

Aids to the Devout Study of Criticism. Part I. The David Narratives; Part II. The Book of Psalms. By the REV. T. K. CHEYNE, M.A., D.D., Oriel Professor of the Interpretation of Holy Scripture in the University of Oxford; Canon of Rochester. New York: Thomas Whittaker. 1892. Pages viii + 397. Price, $2.50.

Canon Cheyne's name is too familiar to students of biblical criticism to call for an introduction. His numerous contributions to this department of science have already given him a seat in the galaxy of leaders. In addition to his productions as professor, we are receiving those of the preacher Cheyne. These sermons are critico-homiletical treatises. The book in hand is a kind of duplex article. Part I., covering less than one-third of the work, is semi-sermonic in form, and analytically critical in treatment. The narrative record of David was constructed out of *eight* or more documents or sources, dating from the tenth or ninth century down to the time of the final editor or editors. This final composite document preserves many contradictions and variations. It is a mixture of history, tradition, and the imagination of the compiler, but put together to present the most beautiful picture, and impress the most forcible lessons. Non-critical students have endeavored to harmonize and explain these difficulties, but to no purpose. They defy rational explication, and yield only to the magical wand of the technical and professional critic. Lay workers are not capable of understanding the requirements of the case, nor of appreciating the processes of the specialist. Professor Cheyne as a critical specialist undertakes to spread before the reader the state of the case regarding David and the David narratives. "There are virtually two Davids,—one the historical David who both sang songs and reigned over the people of Israel, the other that unworldly poet who speaks in the name of the church-nation in many of the Psalms, and who is poetically a direct descendant of David." "More easily could Karl the Great have written St. Bernard's hymn than the David of the Books of Samuel the 51st psalm," (p. 28). David was not the model man we are accustomed to regard him. He is to be respected, however, in some degree. He had some noble traits withal. The doubtful character of the narrative leaves us in perplexity on many points. For instance, very full evidence would be required to make us believe that the speech in 1 Kings 2:2–9 is authentic, because this supposed dying charge is diametrically opposed to what is told us of David's character elsewhere (p. 66). "Did Joab—the hero of a hundred fights—really become a craven at last? One may venture to doubt it." It is not David

therefore who is to be blamed, but a Hebrew narrator who sought to relieve the pious builder of the temple from the responsibility of some doubtful actions by ascribing them to the influence of David (p. 66). "The narrators (or some of them) and the editors who welded their work into a whole, have done what they could to mitigate the shock caused by many of the traditional facts by making David use beautifully devout expressions, some of which at any rate were certainly beyond his horizon." (p. 67). The story of David and Goliath is a popular tradition, and as other such must not be interpreted too realistically, especially after it has been touched by a moralist (p. 100). "Let us thank God for having given us in the Old Testament a few flowers of the popular imagination which are poetically only less delightful than the glorious Homeric poems" (p. 111). These are some of the statements of the writer as he picturesquely unfolds the beauties of the old traditional events, and moralizes upon their teachings for his audience.

In Part II. he discusses and amplifies in fifteen chapters many points previously published in his Bampton Lectures, and gives a running exegesis of Psalms 51, 32, 8, 16, 24, 26, 28, 63, 68, 86, 87, 113–118. "The only temple songs or fragments of (presumed) probable pre-exilic origin, which have come down to us, are a passage from a hymn by Solomon in 1 Kings 8, and a thanksgiving formula in Jer. 33:11, to which may possibly or even probably be added Psalm 18" (p. 131). David was not the author of the Psalms attributed to him. "But if we can show that in losing David we have gained a succession of still sweeter psalmists, and that though we know not their names we partly know their history, and can follow them in their changing moods and experiences, we shall more than compensate the educated reader" (pp. 136–7). The inspiration of the psalmists is superior to that of Dante or Browning, or the far-famed Greek poets, though the latter were inspired. They are apparently the same in quality but different in degree. The various Psalms *exegeted* are first tipped from their old pedestals and made to stand on Professor Cheyne's new foundation. Israel was a church nation, and most of the Psalms are expressions not of any individual but of that personified nation. The Maccabees occupy a large space in his pictures. They occupied a great and important period in Israel's struggles. Their presence solves many, many problems for the Oxford exegete.

Now, what can be said of this book as a whole? How does it impress the reader—"the educated reader" (p. 137)? It is a companion to the Bampton Lectures of 1889. It should stand side by side with its hypotheses, processes, and conclusions. It poses as a pious attempt to popularize critical conclusions. Its assumptions and asseverations, its dissections and distributions of the text, make a profound impression upon the reader—that it is extremely easy to make a few facts responsible for a vast array of hypothetically dogmatic statements. Without doubt Professor Cheyne has some ground, some facts as a basis. But if every scholar should set out to deal with the narrative and text of the Old Testament as arbitrarily as does Canon

Cheyne, biblical criticism would commit suicide within ten years. The educated reader can thrive least of all on assumptions. He must have solid reason for his beliefs. Pride ourselves all we please on being experts, specialists, and the like, but the real test of our assertions is made in the crucible of educated readers.

The spirit of the writer is the best. With admirabie charity and tolerance toward others he wends his way through to the end. But his devout method of procedure wears such a mask as to frighten away from criticism many thoughtful minds he addresses. PRICE.

Historische Erklärung des 2. Theils des Jesaia, Capitel 40 bis 66. By DR. JULIUS LEY. Marburg i. H. 1893. M. 3.

This book reposes on two assumptions, neither of which can be said to have yet met with general acceptance. The one is, that the chapters in question all date from the time of Cyrus the Great and his immediate successors; and the other, that the three cuneiform authorities known respectively as the Sippara Inscription of Nabonidus, the Annalistic Tablet of Cyrus and the Cyrus Cylinder, give a sufficiently full account of the movements of the Persian conqueror which resulted in the acquisition of Babylon and its empire to warrant a positive decision concerning his religion, and to enable us to follow the fortunes of the Jews during the last few years of Babylonian rule and the first months of Persian domination. The former of these assumptions will be questioned alike by those who adhere to the traditional view and by those scholars of the advanced school who ascribe portions of these chapters to a period or periods long subsequent to the time of the Return. The latter assumption cannot be accepted as more than probable so long as we possess no record giving a Persian account of the administration of Cyrus in the newly conquered Babylon. Nevertheless the studies of Professor Ley, which have evidently been conducted with great care and not inconsiderable ability, constitute a valuable addition to the literature on Deutero-Isaiah. He is unfortunately not an Assyriologist, his knowledge of the inscriptions being entirely second-hand; but he seems to have diligently examined the best authorities so that his statements concerning the Babylonian evidence may be trusted as in the main reliable. The sequence of events is supposed to have been as follows. In 550–549 B.C. Cyrus conquered Astyages. Four years later (546–545 B.C.) Crœsus succumbed. In 539–538 B.C. began the war with Nabonidus. In July, 538 B.C., Gobryas, the general of Cyrus, entered Babylon without fighting, Cyrus not following till November of the same year. During this interval of several months the Jewish captives in Babylon remained in *statu quo* so far as the government was concerned, but they were treated more harshly than ever by

their Babylonian masters. The personal rule of Cyrus brought speedy relief. Peace was proclaimed to all and the return of the Jewish captives took place in the ensuing year (537 B.C.). In 536 B.C. the rebuilding of the temple was commenced, but was languidly prosecuted owing to the hostility of the surrounding peoples, and the portion erected was ultimately destroyed by the Edomites. A period of still greater depression followed which extended until 520 B. C., when the building was recommenced. During nearly the whole of this period, that is, for thirty years or more, Deutero-Isaiah was striving to comfort or stimulate his fellow countrymen. These twenty-seven chapters must not be read as a single literary product, but as a collection of prophetic addresses written at different times and under different circumstances. Most were penned in Babylonia, but the last five chapters seem to hail from Jerusalem. Chapters 40 to 52: 12 date from the years before the Return. The earlier chapters (with the exception of the first) show with what intense interest the movements of Cyrus were followed by the prophet and his fellow captives. Very little was known about Cyrus at first. The prophet seems to have believed that he either was or would become a worshiper of Jehovah (41 :25). As time passed this hope faded because Cyrus was found to be "a polytheist like the Babylonians themselves" (45 :4); but he was still regarded as God's instrument for the execution of his purpose concerning Babylon and Israel. When the Persians under Gobryas entered Babylon the Jews, as already remarked, were bitterly disappointed by his policy, which led to the continuance of their bondage if not to increased hardship. To this dark interval are referred chapters 48 to 51, which represent the prophet's efforts to sustain and cheer his fainting brethren. Allusions to their sufferings at this time are found in 51 :13–14, 19, 20, 23; 52 :5. The jubilant song which follows (52 :1–12) was composed immediately after the publication of the edict of Cyrus warranting the Return. The remainder of the book—52 :13–66 :24—was composed after that event. The prophet was gravely disappointed in Zerubbabel and Joshua. He disapproved of their treatment of the Samaritans and of the growth of the hierarchy. During the dreary years which intervened between the first attempt at rebuilding the temple in 536 B.C., and the resumption of the work in 520 B.C., it was the prophet's mission to cheer and stimulate and rebuke. The great prophecy of the suffering and dying servant of God 52 :13–ch. 53, may have been delivered about the commencement of this gloomy period. Those who are extremely depressed by the sad intelligence that the erection of the temple is suspended are encouraged by the promise of a mighty Saviour who will make perfect atonement for that guilt of Israel which has led to these painful occurrences. Chapters 63–65 date from the darkest of these dark days. The partially restored temple has been laid in ruins. "Thy holy people possessed it but a little while; our adversaries have broken down thy sanctuary" (63 :18). "Our holy and our beautiful house where our fathers praised thee is burned with fire, and all our pleasant things

are laid waste" (64:11). In reference to this point Dr. Ley is not quite consistent. In one part of the book he ascribes the destruction of the temple to the Edomites (p. 35), in another (p. 151) to the Samaritans. The last chapter is supposed to have been penned when the rebuilding of the temple under Darius Hystaspes was in prospect. The dissertation on the Significance of "The Servant of God" and the exposition of the great prophecy in 52:13–53, which is closely connected therewith are extremely interesting. "The Servant of God" in chapters 42, 49, 52:13, and chap. 53, cannot, in the judgment of Dr. Ley, be the collective Israel, or the ideal Israel, or the pious portion of Israel, or the prophetic order, or any historic personage known to the writer. He can only be identified with the Messiah who was so vividly portrayed by the older Isaiah from whom Deutero-Isaiah has borrowed so largely. The reasons for and against are carefully stated and discussed. The historic background will appear less evident to most readers than to the writer, but the essay as a whole is admirable. Like some other recent products of German scholarship it points at a distinct reaction in some of the German universities from the destructive criticism which was at one time so popular. The remarks on 52:3–ch. 53 are accompanied by a new translation and several emendations of the text. Our space allows only two illustrations. The latter clause of 53:1 is rendered with Orelli, "*On* whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed?" and is referred exclusively to the Servant. It is he in whom the power of God is conspicuously manifested. The eighth verse is rendered as follows with the help of a startling and doubtful emendation. "He was taken away by oppression and judgment and *his pain* who expresses it? For he was taken away out of the land of life, through the transgression of my people was he smitten." Instead of *doro*, "his generation," Professor Ley proposes to read *dewayo*, "his pain" (cp. Psalm 41:4). Students of Deutero-Isaiah who can read German ought to find room on their shelves for this unpretentious but suggestive volume.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations. A Study of the Teaching of Jesus and its Doctrinal Transformations in the New Testament. By ORELLO CONE, D.D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1893. Pages viii., 413. Price $1.75.

The Gospel referred to in the title of this book is the teaching of Jesus; its earliest interpretations are those which were put upon it in the period in which the New Testament was growing up and taking shape. The "teaching of Jesus" is recovered from the synoptic gospels by a process of critical elimination of sayings falsely ascribed to him. The "Jewish-Christian interpretation" is found, mainly in the first gospel and in the speeches of Peter, in the book of Acts. The "Pauline transformation" is found in the genuine letters of Paul, viz., Romans, First and Second Corinthians, Galatians, First Thessalonians and Philippians. The "Deutero-Pauline interpretations" are

those of Hebrews, Colossians, Ephesians, and the First Epistle of Peter. The "Johannine transformation" is presented in the fourth gospel, though the designation of it as Johannine is merely conventional, this gospel not in fact proceeding from the apostle John. The "Anti-Gnostic interpretations" are presented in the First Epistle of John (so-called) in the pastoral Epistles ascribed to Paul, in Jude and in Second Peter. "Jewish-Christian apocalyptic" is, of course, found in the book of Revelation.

Concerning the legitimacy of the general aim and general method of this book there is no ground for question. The church or scholar that takes the name Christian, cannot but ask precisely what Jesus taught, and cannot assume without investigation that all that has come to us under his name is certainly his, or that all his followers represented his spirit and thought.

The author possesses two qualifications for his work which are of great value. He is familiar with what others have written on these subjects, at least with the writers of the general school, to which he himself belongs, and he is apparently fair-minded and candid. There is in his book, moreover, an agreeable absence of superciliousness and bitterness, such as has sometimes marred the writings alike of those who have defended, and of those who have controverted the commonly accepted view of the origin and nature of the New Testament. Nevertheless we cannot regard this book as giving us a trustworthy representation of the doctrinal development of Christianity. The writer who would give us this, must build upon a sound criticism, and with a sober and discriminating interpretation.

The author's position on the critical questions is indicated in general by the classification of the New Testament books given above. That position, though substantially accordant with the opinions of some distinguished German scholars, such as Hilgenfeld, Holtzmann and Pfleiderer, cannot be regarded as an established certainty; it is greatly to be doubted whether it is more than a passing phase of criticism. In interpretation the author seems so constantly on his guard against attributing to the words of Jesus and the New Testament writers an unduly profound meaning as sometimes to fail of finding the meaning that is there. But are Jesus and his apostles, alone of the world's great thinkers, to be denied the privilege of profound sayings? To the interpreter who admits that the meaning of the sayings of Jesus may sometimes be something more and deeper than that which can be read at a glance, many superficial differences disappear into a profounder unity. It is surely not unreasonable to ask that a serious and painstaking effort be made to understand the Jesus presented to us in the gospels before we attempt to construct a truer picture of the historical person by a process of elimination largely based on subjective grounds. The Christ of our gospels may not be percisely the Christ of history; it is certainly the duty of Christian scholarship to inquire whether he is, and if not, to recover for us, if possible, the true picture of the real Jesus. But we are persuaded that the picture presented in the gospels is both nobler in itself and truer to fact than that which Dr. Cone has given to us. E. D. B.

A Harmony of the Gospels in the Revised Version, with some new features. By JOHN A. BROADUS, D.D., LL.D., the notes at the end of the volume by A. T. ROBERTSON, D.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong and Son. Pp. 17+264.

This harmony differs in two important respects from the best known similar works previously put forth in this country. It discards the division of the ministry of Jesus into Passover years, and it substitutes the text of the Revised Version of 1881 for that of the Common Version. In both these respects the work is undoubtedly an improvement on its predecessors. The author makes eight main divisions of the gospel narrative, which in his judgment represents stages of historical progress. Summaries of the narrative are interspersed between the sections of the gospel-text, and the place of the several events is in a large proportion of cases indicated at the head of the section. Numerous explanatory footnotes by Dr. Broadus are scattered through the book, and longer notes by Dr. Robertson are added at the end. These latter are to a certain extent apologetic in tone, their general point of view being indicated in these sentences taken from a general prefatory note at the beginning of the book. "In explaining a difficulty it is always to be remembered that even a possible explanation is sufficient to meet the objector. If several possible explanations are suggested, it becomes all the more unreasonable for one to contend that the discrepancy is irreconcilable. It is a work of supererogation to proceed to show that this or that explanation is the real solution of the problem." The views contrary to those of the author are not usually very fully stated, and not always quite adequately answered.

The typography and arrangement of material on the page is in the main good. To the lengthening list of English Harmonies of the Gospels this adds one that many students of the New Testament will welcome.

E. D. B.

Current Literature.

BOOKS.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Aids to the Student of the Holy Bible. (London, Eyre, 1893. 8vo). 5s.

Berger, M. Samuel. "Histoire de la Vulgate pendant les premiers siècles du Moyen âge." Mémoire couronné par l'Institut. (Paris, Hachette, 1893. 8vo).

Berry, T. S. "Holy Scripture: Human, Progressive, Divine." (London, Christian Knowledge Society, 1893. 12mo). 2s.

Brodbeck, A. Zoroaster. Ein Beitrag zur vergleichenden Geschichte der Religionen und philosophischen Systeme des Morgen- und Abendlandes." (Leipzig, Friedrich. 8vo). M. 8.

Cambridge Companion to the Bible (524 pp., 12mo. London, Clay, 1893). 2s. 6d.

Erdmann, O. "Die Glaubwürdigkeit der heiligen Schrift als das Wort Gottes" (120 pp., 8vo. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1893). M. 1. 60.

Gwatkin, H. M. "Selections from Early Christian Writers." (Macmillan & Co., New York and London). $1.25.

Liddon, Canon H. F. "Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey, D.D." Edited and prepared for publication by J. O. Johnston and R. J. Wilson. With Portrait and Illustrations. 4 vols. 8vo. (London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1893; 2d edition. Vols. I. and II.). 36s.

Pentecost, G. F. "Bible Studies: Pentateuch and Life of Christ. (8vo. London). 4s.

Renan, E. "Geschichte des Volkes Israel." Deutsche autorisirte Ausgabe, übersetzt von E. Schaelsky (in 5 Bdn). Berlin, Cronbach, 1893; Bd. I. (iv., 421 pp. 8vo). M. 6.

Riehm, Ed. "Handwörterbuch des biblischen Alterthums für gebildete Bibelleser." 2te Auflage, besorgt von F. Baethgen. Mit Abbildungen, Karten, Plänen und einer Schrifttafel. I. Band. (Bielefeld, Velhagen & Klasing, 1893; viii., 948 pp. 8vo). M. 12; bound, M. 15.

Rishell, C. W. "The Higher Criticism. An Outline of Modern Biblical Study, with Introduction by H. M. Harman." (Cincinnati, O. Cranston & Curts, 1893; 214 pp. 12mo). 75c.

Schaff, Philip. "Theological Propædeutics." (New York, Scribner's Sons, 1893. 8vo. 634 + 60 pp.). $3.00.

Schlottman, K. "Compendium der biblischen Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments." Herausgegeben von Dr. E. Kühn. (192 pp. Leipzig, Dörffling und Franke). M. 4.

Stokes, Sir S. G. "Natural Theology." The Gifford Lectures for 1893. 8vo. 3s. 6d.

Happel, T. "Der Eid im Alten Testament, vom Standpunkte der vergleichenden Religionsgeschichte aus betrachtet." (Leipzig, W. Friedrich). M. 2.

Huyghe, C. "La chronologie des livres d'Esdras et de Néhémie." (Besançon, impr.-Jacquin, 1893. 46 pp. 8vo). Extrait de la Revue des questions historiques du 1er juillet, 1893.

Jennings, A. G. "The Mosaic Record of the Creation explained. Scripture truth

verified." (New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1893; ii. and 67 pp.) 20c.

Niebuhr, Karl. "Geschichte des Ebräischen Zeitalters." Bd. I. Bis zum Tode Josuas. (Berlin, Gg. Nauck. xii. 378 pp. 8vo). Vol. 1 of "Geschichte des alten Orient von etwa 2500 v. Chr. bis zur Eroberung Babels durch Kyros. M. 8.

Orelli, C. von. "The Minor Prophets" (English translation). T. & T. Clark (Edinburgh). 10s. 6.

Renan, E. "Histoire du peuple d'Israël." T. IV. (Paris, C. Lévy. 415 pp. 8vo). Fr. 7.50.

Reuss, Eduard. "Das Alte Testament übersetzt, eingeleitet und erläutert," Aus dem Nachlasse des Verfassers herausgegeben von Erichson und Horst. Lieferung 21 and 22 (Bd. 4). Die Kirchenchronik von Jerusalem; Chronik, Ezra und Nehemia. à M. 1.30.
Lieferung 23 und 24 (Bd. 5). Die Hebr. Poesie; der Psalter, die Klagelieder und das Hohelied. (Braunschweig, Schwetschke & Sohn). à M. 1.50.

Sayce, A. H. "The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of Archæology." (London, Soc. for Promot. Christ. Knowledge. 8vo. Cloth bd.) 2s.

Sayce, A. H. "Life and Time of Isaiah as illustrated by contemporary monuments." (New York, Fleming H. Revell Co. 96 pp.) 60c.

Schilling, J. "Bibel-Studie über Psalm 71." (Riga, Stieda, 1893; 15 pp., 8vo).

NEW TESTAMENT.

Brandscheid, Frd. "Handbuch der Einleitung ins neue Testament. Prolegomena zum griechisch-lateinischen Neuen Testament. Für höhere Lehranstalten und zum Selbststudium herausgegeben." (Wiesbaden, Weiser, 1893; pp. viii., 196. 4to).

Falke, R. "Die geschichtlichen Thatsachen des neuen Testamentes, untersucht nach ihrer Gewissheit und religiösen Bedeutung." (Gütersloh, Bertelsmann. 112 pp. 8vo). M. 1.50.

Godet, F. "Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Spezielle Einleitung (in 3 Bänden). 1. Band. Die Briefe des Apostels Paulus." Deutsch bearbeitet von E. Reineck (in circa 9 Lieferungen). Hannover, Meyer. 1893. 1. Lieferung (48 pp.) M. 1.

Göbel, S. "Neutestamentliche Schriften, griechisch mit kurzer Erklärung. 2. Folge, enthaltend die Briefe des Petrus und des Johannes. (Gotha, Perthes, 1893). M. 3. 20.

Jäger, Gfr. "Gedanken und Bemerkungen zur Apostelgeschichte." 2. Heft. zu Kap. 13-19. (Leipzig, Dörffling & Franke, 1893; 50 pp. 8vo.) M. 1.

Kappeler, A. "Der Pseudoprophet der johanneischen Apokalypse." Habilitationsvortrag. [aus Theol. Zeitschr. aus d. Schweiz] Zürich, A. Frick, 1893; iv & 31 pp. 8vo. M. —.60.

Klöpper, A. Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Philipper." (Gotha, Perthes, 1893). M. 4.50.

Robinson, J. Armitage. "The Philocalia of Origen. The Text revised with a critical introduction and indices." (New York, Macmillan & Co.; lii. & 278 pp; 8vo). $2.75.

Sadler, M. F. "The Revelation of St. John the Divine, with Notes, critical and practical." (London, Geo. Bell & Sons. Crown 8vo, cloth). 6s.

Savage, M. J. "Jesus and Modern Life." (Boston, G. H. Ellis). $1.00.

Schaefer, A. "Die Bücher des Neuen Testamentes erklärt. V. Band. Erklärung des Hebräerbriefes. (Münster, Aschendorff, 1893; VIII., 343 pp. 8vo). M. 5.

Schubert, H. von. "The Gospel of St. Peter; Synoptical Tables with translation and critical apparatus." Authorized English translation by J. Macpher-

son. (Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1893; 32 pp. 8vo). 1s. 6d.

Schwarzkopf, P. "Das Zeugnis des 4. Evangeliums in seiner Glaubwürdigkeit." (Stuttgart, Steinkopf, 1893.) M. —. 20.

"Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Altchristlichen Literatur, hrsg. von O. v. Gebhardt und A. Harnack." Bd. ix. 3 und 4 Heft. "Die Apostelgeschichte, Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung von *B. Weiss.*" (iii. 113 pp.); Bd. XI. 3 Heft. "Das Indulgenz-Edict des römischen Bischofs Kallist, kritisch untersucht und reconstruiert" von *E. Rolffs*, (viii, 138 pp). Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1893. 8vo. M. 14.50.

Voelter, D. "Das Problem der Apokalypse." (Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1893; viii, 528 pp. 8vo). M. 10.

Wagner, M. "Die Parteiungen im jüdischen Volke zur Zeit Jesu." (Hamburg, Verlagsanstalt, 1893. 8vo). M. 80.

ARTICLES.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Bernard, Prof. "Evolution and the Doctrine of the Incarnation." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct. '93, 334–39).

Osgood, H. "The Bible and Higher Criticism." (Christian Thought, Oct. '93, 83–96).

Riggs, James R. "Recent Exegetical Literature." (Presb. and Ref. Review, vol. iv. 678–680).

Schmidt, H. "Die Glaubwürdigkeit der heiligen Schrift." (Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift, vol. iv. No. 8).

Schodde, Geo. H. "Modern Biblical Criticism." (Hom. Rev., Nov. '93, 396–401).

Blaikie, W. G. "Anomalies in Old Testament Character." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct. '93, 306–312).

Cheyne, T. K. "The Nineteenth Chapter of Isaiah." (Zeitschr. f. alttest. Wissenschaft, vol. xiii. 125–9).

Döderlein, J. "Der erste vermeintliche Irrthum in der Bibel (Gen. i. 5). Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1893, No. 24, sp. 393–4.

Döderlein, J. "Der erste Fehler der neuen [revidirten] Bibel (Gen. iv. 1). *ibid.* sp. 543–44.

Driver, Canon. "The Methods of the Higher Criticism." (Academy, No. 1121, Oct. 28, 1893, 367–8; against A. H. Sayce, *ibid.* No. 1120).

Farrar, F. W. "Was there a Golden Calf at Dan? A note on 1 Kings xii. 29, 30." (Expositor, October, 254 ff).

Green, W. H. "Dr. Briggs' Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch." (Presbyt. and Ref. Rev., vol. iv. October, 529–61).

Haghebaert, P. B. "La Vierge-mère au chapitre vii^{e} d'Isaïe." (Revue biblique, No. 3, p. 381–83).

Herbermann, Ch. G. "Education in ancient Babylonia, Phœnicia, and Judæa." (American Catholic Quarterly Rev.; Abstract in The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct. '93, 356–6).

Holtzheuer. "Zur Pentateuchkritik." (Evangel. Kirchenzeitung, No. 36).

Howorth, H. H. "The Septuagint versus the Hebrew Text of the Bible." (London Academy, Sept. 16, No. 1115, and Oct. 7, No. 1118).

König, Ed. "Alttestamentl. Kritik und Christenglaube." (Neue Jahrb. f. deutsche Theologie, vol. ii, No. 4, 485–528).

Ley, Julius. "On the Significance of the Expression 'the Servant of God,' Isaiah xl. to liii." (Abstract in The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct. '93, 289–90).

Rose, S. P. "The Prophecy of Hosea." (Canad. Meth. Quart., Oct., 434–451).

Rothstein, J. W. "Über Habakkuk, Kap. 1 and 2." (Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1894, Heft 1).

Rouse, G. H. "Belshazzar." (Expos. Times, Oct., 41).

Sayce, A. H. "Lygdamis the Kymmerian." (Academy, London, No. 1117, p. 277).

Steude. "The Bible Account of Creation." (Neue Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theologie, 1893, No. 3; Abstract in The Thinker, vol. ix, 4, Oct. '93, 362 f).

Zahn, Th. "Die syrische Statthalterschaft und die Schatzung des Quirinius." (Neue Kirchliche Zeitschr. vol. iv. Heft 8).

Bernard, J. H. "The Gospel of Peter and Dionysius of Alexandria." (London Academy, Sept. 30, No. 1117, p. 275).

Blass, Fr. "Die Zweifache Textüberlieferung in der Apostelgeschichte." (Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1894, Heft 1).

NEW TESTAMENT.

Bruce, A. B. "St. Paul's Conception of Christianity. 10. Adoption; 11. Without and Within." (Expositor, Oct., 266–282, and Nov., 348–361).

Burwash, Rev. "Analytical Study of Acts xxi. 27–xxviii. 31." (Canad. Meth. Quarterly, Oct., 511–521).

Carman, A. S. "The New Testament use of the Greek Mysteries." (Biblioth. Sacra, Oct., '93, 613–39).

Chadwick, G. A. "The Daughter of Jairus and the Woman with the issue of Blood." (Expositor, Oct., 309–320).

Chapuis, P. "L'évangile et l'apocalypse de Pierre, I." (Rev. de théologie et de philosophie, 1893, No. 4, pp. 338–355).

Chwolson, D. "Über das Datum im Evangel. Matthäi, xxvi. 17: 'τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων.'" (Monatsschrift für d. Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judentums; Neue Folge, i, 12, Sept., '93, 537–555).

Clemen, Karl. "On the Genesis and Purpose of the Acts of the Apostles" (abstract in The Thinker, 1893, Oct., 290–92).

Clemen, Karl. "Chronology of the Pauline Epistles" (*ibid.*, 292–3).

Conybeare, F. C. "Aristion, the author of the last twelve verses of Mark" (Expositor, Oct., 241–54).

Deissmann, G. A. "The Method of the Biblical Theology in the New Testament." (Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche, 1893, No. 2; abstract in The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct., 364–7).

Forest, D. W. "Did our Lord unite in Prayer with his Disciples?" (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct., 330–334).

Gloag, Paton J. "I Peter iv. 1." (Homiletic Rev., November, 456–62).

Gess, W. T. "The Feet-washing, John xii. 1–17." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct. '93, 312–320).

Grosart, Alex. B. "Note on Matthew xxviii. 8." (Expository Times, Oct., 41).

Hofmeijr, N. J. "The Apostleship of Peter." (Abstract in The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct., '93, 369–73).

Jacquier, E. "L'évangile selon Saint Pierre." (L'université catholique, n. s. T. xiv, 9, Sept., '93, 5–29).

Kaufmann, D. "Ein Übersetzungsfehler bei den Synoptikern (Das Passamahl Christi)." Monatsschrift f. Gesch. und Wissensch. d. Judentums, N. F. i, 9, Juni, 1893, 393–95.

McLane, W. W. "New Testament teaching of Hell." (Homiletic Review, Nov., 388–95).

Milligan, W. "The Pattern in the Mount." (The Thinker, vol. ix, 4, Oct., '93, 320–328).

Moore, Dunlop. "Public and Private Epistles of the New Testament." (Presb. and Ref. Rev., iv. Oct., 662–63).

Orr, James. "Wendt on the self-witness of Jesus." (Expository Times, Oct., 23–28).

Ramsay, W. A. "The first Epistle attributed to Peter." (Expositor, Oct., 282–96).

Roberts, A. "On the Proper Rendering of ἐκάθισεν in St. John xix. 13." (Expositor, Oct., 296–308).

Roebuck, A. "Expository Note on Luke xv." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct., '93, 328–330).

Westcott, B. F. "In many Parts and in many Fashions." (Expository Times, Oct., 11–15).

Wendt, H. H. "The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Christ, I." (Expository Times, Oct., 20–23).

Wilson, Rob. Dick. "On καθήμενος in Matth. iv. 16." (Presbyt. and Ref. Rev., vol. iv. Oct., 663–65).

REVIEWS.

OLD TESTAMENT.

Crooker, J. H. "The New Bible and its New Uses." (In Expos. Times, Oct., 42).

Deane's "Pseudepigrapha." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, Oct., 382–84, Alfr. Plummer).

"Divinity of Jesus Christ," by the *Authors of Progressive Orthodoxy.* (Expository Times, Oct., 46).

"Faith and Criticism." Essays by (9) Congregationalists. (Critical Rev., iii. 418–24, D. Somerville).

Paisley, John. "Resurrection of the Dead; studies in the 15th chapter of First Corinthians." (Expos. Times, Oct., 43).

Charles, R. H. "The Book of Enoch." (Critical Review, iii. 427–29).

Kellogg's "The Book of Leviticus." (Canad. Meth. Quarterly, Oct., 538).

Klostermann, Aug. "Der Pentateuch." (Critical Rev., iii. 390–1, W. H. Bennett).

Maclaren's "Psalms I." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, 383–84, Willis J. Beecher).

NEW TESTAMENT.

Barnes' "Canonical and uncanonical Gospels." (The Thinker, vol. ix. 4, 380–1, Alfr. Plummer).

Bovon's "Théologie du nouveau Testament, I." (Critical Review, iii. 379–82, Marcus Dods).

Clemen, Karl. "Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe." (Theolog. Literaturblatt, xiv, No. 37, Paul Ewald).

Everett's "Gospel of Paul." (Theolog. Literaturzeitung, No. 22, H. Holtzmann).

Feine. "Der Jacobusbrief." (Theol. Literaturzeitung, No. 22, by H. Holtzmann; Theol. Literaturblatt, xiv. No. 38).

Felten. "Die Apostelgeschichte übersetzt und erklärt." (Theolog. Literaturblatt, xiv. No. 37).

James' "Apocryphal Anecdota." (Critical Review, iii. 435–6; Theol. Literaturzeitung, No. 22, Preuschen).

Jolley's "Synoptic Problem." (Theolog. Literaturzeitung, No. 21, H. Holtzmann).

"The King and the Kingdom." A study of the four Gospels." (Critical Rev., iii. 365–69; John Massie).

Ramsay's "Church in the Roman Empire before A. D. 170." (Critic. Rev., iii. 356–65, G. G. Findlay).

Robinson's "Philocalia of Origen." (Critical Rev., iii. 436).

Schmidt, H. "Zur Christologie. Vorträge und Abhandlungen." (Deutsche Literaturzeitung, No. 39; W. Bousset).

Stevens. Geo. B. "The Pauline Theology." (Canad. Meth. Quart. Rev., Oct., 534 ff.)

Swete's "Akhmîm Fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel of St. Peter." (Critical Rev., iii. 431–2).

Venable's "Considerations upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Ephesians." (Expos. Times, Oct., 44).

THE
Biblical World
CONTINUING
THE OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT STUDENT

EDITOR
WILLIAM R. HARPER
ASSOCIATE EDITORS
IRA M. PRICE
ROBERT F. HARPER
GEORGE S. GOODSPEED
ERNEST D. BURTON
OLIVER J. THATCHER

The Editors are not responsible for opinions expressed by contributors
Entered at the Post-office at Chicago for mailing at second-class rates

OLD SERIES Vol. XVII — DECEMBER, 1893 — NEW SERIES Vol. II No. 6

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, $2.00 A YEAR, IN ADVANCE
Foreign Subscriptions:—Great Britain, 9s.; Germany, M. 9; France and other countries, 11 fr.

CHICAGO
The University Press of Chicago
D. C. HEATH & CO., DIRECTORS
LONDON: LUZAC & CO., 46 GREAT RUSSELL ST., W.C.

Now is the Time to Subscribe.

Commencing with the January, 1894, number

THE BIBLICAL WORLD will be enlarged to the full magazine size, and will appear in an attractive new cover. The subscription price will be Two DOLLARS PER YEAR, payable in advance.

EXCEPTIONAL OFFER.

THE BIBLICAL WORLD
THE GOLDEN RULE
THE COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE.

ALL FOR ($4) FOUR DOLLARS FOR ONE YEAR.

This makes one of the most attractive and varied combinations ever offered at a low price, and will give the largest amount of interesting, suggestive and instructive reading that can be secured for the home at any similar rate.

THE COSMOPOLITAN MAGAZINE is, in many respects, the finest of the monthly family magazines. Every number is profusely and richly illustrated, and represents the latest thought of many of the best writers here and in Europe.

THE GOLDEN RULE represents the earnest movement among the younger Christians of the country, and is the official organ of the CHRISTIAN ENDEAVOR SOCIETY. It is edited by Dr. Clark, the president of the Society, and is filled every week with the most stimulating and helpful matter for all interested in active Christian work.

The combined price of these three periodicals, taken separately, is $5.50. Our price for all is

FOUR DOLLARS PER YEAR.

Send in your subscriptions to-day. As the terms for subscription to all these periodicals is strictly payment in advance, subscribers will kindly send the full amount with their orders.

All communications should be addressed, and all checks, drafts or money orders made payable, to

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS,
Chicago, Ill.

A Thousand Pages of the Freshest Thought on Biblical Subjects for $2.00.

The Biblical World

Continuing the Old and New Testament Student

. . . . .

PROSPECTUS FOR 1894

I. REGULAR DEPARTMENTS.

1. **The Editorial Department,** devoted to the interpretation and criticism of current tendencies in religious life and thought, so far as they bear upon the Bible and are concerned with it.

2. **The Department of General Articles,** in which brief, popular, stimulating and accurate contributions to biblical learning are made by leaders of thought in America and Europe.

3. **The Department of Exploration and Discovery,** in which reports of the latest work in Bible lands and in the far East are reported in brief and clear statements presented from men personally acquainted with exploration.

4. **The Department of Comparative Religion,** containing illustrative material from the world's great faiths; discussion of important points of agreement and contrast between the Bible and the other sacred books of the world, throwing new light upon the Scriptures from the spiritual illumination of the non-Christian peoples.

5. **Work and Workers,** a chronicle of the doings of biblical scholars, and hints and familiar gossip relative to their personality and methods of work.

6. **The American Institute of Sacred Literature,** the common meeting ground of the many students in all the various courses of the Institute, where hints and suggestions as to new work and better methods are given.

7. **The Sunday School Department,** in which the characteristics of the leading Sunday School systems will be presented and discussed; the best methods of Bible study as adapted to Sunday School work considered; and the progress being made in Sunday School work throughout the world noted.

8. **Synopses of Important Articles,** in which the essence of the best periodical literature on the Bible is gathered, and acute and careful criticism of these articles by the editors is given.

9. **Notes and Opinions on Current Biblical Thought,** presenting selections from the latest and best literature, original paragraphs from thoughtful students and editorial suggestions concerning current topics.

10. **Book Reviews,** a department which aims, not merely to criticise with candor and care the current literature of the day, but also to assist busy ministers and laymen to a knowledge of the best sources of information upon biblical topics.

11. **Current Biblical Literature,** a condensed list of the books and articles published monthly in the great world of biblical learning and investigation, including not merely books, but periodical literature in America and Europe.

II. SPECIAL FEATURES FOR 1894.

1. **Twelve Studies in Genesis,** in which the early Hebrew stories will be taken up one by one, for the consideration of (1) their origin in the light of the parallel stories in other ancient literatures; (2) their interpretation in view of recent critical and archæological investigations; (3) their teachings as compared with those of similar passages in other literatures.

2. **Biblical Biographies;** namely, those of Samson, Saul, Solomon, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Stephen, Mary, John the Baptist, Peter, Barnabas.

In these articles the particular characteristics commonly overlooked will be brought forward. Special emphasis will be laid upon their delineation as types of religious character.

3. **Crises in Biblical History,** for example, Jeroboam and the Disruption of the united Israel, Isaiah and the Invasion of Sennacherib, Nehemiah and the Mixed Marriages; Daniel and the Fall of Babylon, The Galilean Proposal to make Jesus king, The Day of Pentecost, The Council in Jerusalem, the Threatened Apostasy of the Hebrew Christians.

4. **Realistic Production of Biblical Situations,** in which an effort will be made to present in modern form the utterances of ancient biblical writers as interpreted in connection with their historical background. Among others the following: Hosea's domestic tragedy, the events which constituted his call to the ministry; The child-prophecies of Isaiah; The burning of Jeremiah's roll; Paul and Agrippa; The mistakes of the Galatians; The faults of early Christians as shown in the Epistle of James.

5. **Twelve living topics:** outline references to the best literature.

The Origin of the Book of Deuteromony,
The Errancy or Inerrancy of the biblical Writings.
The National vs. the Individual Element in the Psalter.
The Literal Fulfillment of Prophecy.
The Persian Influence upon the later Jews.
What Christianity owes to Greece.
What Christianity owes to Rome.
The Priesthood in Israel and India.
The Historical Trustworthiness of the Book of Acts.
The Phenomena of Demoniacal possessions.
Was the term Kingdom of God as used by Jesus a sociological Term.

6. **The best helps for the study of particular books,** namely, those of Genesis, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Job, Proverbs, the Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of John, Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians, and Book of Revelation.

7. **Selections from a Buddhist Catechism,** written by Col. Olcott, for use in the training of Buddhist children, the form being modeled upon the Westminister catechism and therefore of great value for the comparative study of Buddhism.

8. **Selection of passages from the World's Scriptures** with special reference to their similarity to biblical teachings, to be printed in parallel columns. Among others the Babylonian Penitential Psalms; The Vedic hymns to Varuna; The Life of Buddha; Vergil's fourth Eclogue.

9. **Sketches of foreign biblical scholars with portraits,** among others, Canon S. R. Driver, Prof. A. B. Bruce, Prof. T. K. Cheyne, Prof. A. F. Kirkpatrick, Prof. August Dillmann, Prof. Hermann L. Strack, Prof. Holtzmann, Prof. Sanday and Prof. Weiss.

10. **Letters from representative pastors** on "How much I study the Bible and How?"

11. **What Higher Criticism Is Not.** A series of six papers by representative scholars showing the various popular misconceptions which are commonly entertained concerning this much discussed method of biblical investigation.

12. **The Book of Proverbs,** being a reprint of the book in the revised version with the material of the book classified according to subjects; the passages belonging to each subject being grouped together, with brief explanatory notes.

13. **Expository Treatments of Selected Books,** chapters and sections from the Old Testament and the New, with suggestions from eminent preachers; critical discussions on the best expository sermons.

14. **Bible Work in Colleges and Theological Seminaries,** being brief reports of the Bible work now in progress in the leading institutions of the country.

15. **Articles upon the following, among other, topics:**

Why did Christ work miracles? The Good of Phariseeism.
Simplicity of Religion according to the teaching of Jesus.
The Central Importance of the life of Christ in biblical Study.
The Marriage Customs of the Jews in the first century.
Jewish Literature of the last two centuries before Christ.
The Prophetic gift of the Apostolic Church.
A free modern Translation of the Sermon on the Mount.
The Rome of Paul's day.
Recently discovered Manuscripts of value for biblical Study.
How to Read the Psalter? How to Study the Psalter?
How to Preach the Psalter? How to Use the Psalter Devotionally?
The Question of the Second Isaiah, and what is involved in the question.
The arguments for unity of the Book of Isaiah.
The Arguments for the Second as distinguished from the First Isaiah.
The Point of View of Chronicles compared with that of Samuel and Kings.
The Alleged Discrepancies between Chronicles and Kings.
Slavery in the Old Testament. The Forms of the Decalogue.
The Relation of the Decalogue to the Mosaic law.
The Account of Balaam's Ass. The Witch of Endor.
The Blessing of Jacob, Gen. 49. The Song of Moses, Ex. 15.
The Song of Deborah, Judges 5. Human sacrifices among the Hebrews.
The use of Mythology by biblical writers.
The Underlying Principle of sacrifice in oriental religion.
The Book of the Covenant. The Order of the Prophets.
The Suffering of the Babylonian Exile. The Significance of the Return.
Sociological laws in the Old Testament.
The Exegetical Method of Jesus.
Wisdom in teaching critical results.
Jesus Christ and Gautama Buddha.
Jesus' Idea of the Kingdom of God.
The Purpose of Christ's parabolic teaching.
Christological Implications of the higher criticism.
The External Evidence of the Exodus.
The Pattern Marriage in Israel.
Beliefs of a Brother.
Jewish Apocalypses.

THE JOURNAL OF GEOLOGY

Will be issued Semi-Quarterly on or about the following dates: February 1, March 15, May 1, June 15, August 1, September 15, November 1, December 15.

The immediate editorship of the Journal will rest with the geological faculty of the University of Chicago, under whose auspices and guarantee it is issued, but its policy will be open and comprehensive. The names of its associate editors are the best index of its scope and character.

Editorial communications and publications for review should be addressed to Editors Journal of Geology, University of Chicago, Chicago, Ill., U. S. A. Publications intended for the editors personally should be addressed to them by name.

Business communications, subscriptions, advertisements, etc., should be sent to the University Press, University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

Subscriptions in America, $3.00 per annum.

Subscriptions in other countries in the postal union, $3.50 per annum.

Copies of "Distinct Glacial Epochs and the Criteria for their Recognition," by Professor Salisbury, can be had for class use at 10 cents per copy.

HEBRAICA.

Contents of the April-July HEBRAICA Now Ready:

1. **On an Unpublished Cylinder of Esarhaddon**—By S. Arthur Strong, Cambridge, England.
2. **The Calendar of Enoch and Jubilees, II**—By Rev. Benjamin Wisner Bacon, Oswego, N. Y.
3. **A Charm worth Reading**—Syriac Text and Translation—By Isaac H. Hall, Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York.
4. **Old Persian Names in Babylonian Contracts**—Assyrian Text of S. + 409, with Transliteration, Translation and Notes—By Theo. G. Pinches, Egyptian and Assyrian Department, British Museum.
5. **The Views of Jehuda Halevi concerning the Hebrew Language**—By W. Bacher, Budapest, [translated by A. S. Carrier].
6. **The Vowel-Points Controversy in the XVI and XVII Centuries**—By Rev. B. Pick, Allegheny, Penn.
7. **The Pentateuchal Question,** (continued)—By W. Henry Green, Princeton, N.J.

Etc., Etc., Etc.

BOOK REVIEWS:

The Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia, Vol. IV. 2d ed.—By Robert Francis Harper, The University of Chicago.

Aus dem babylonischen Rechtsleben, (I and II), **von J. Kohler und F. E. Peiser**—By Morris Jastrow, Jr., The University of Pennsylvania.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Contents October-January Number:

1. **A Letter to Assurbanipal**—By S. Arthur Strong.
2. **Inscription of Nebukadnezzar, Son of Nin-eb-nadin-sum**—By Rev. J. N. Strassmaier, S. J.
3. **A Comparative Study on the Translations of the Babylonian Creation Tablets with Special Reference to Jensen's Kosmologie and Barton's Tiamat**—By Rev. W. Muss-Arnolt, Ph.D.
4. **The Letters of Abdiheba.** By Prof. Morris Jastrow, Jr., Ph.D.
5. **History of the Printed Editions of the Old Testament, together with a Description of the Rabbinic and Polyglot Bibles**—By B. Pick, Ph.D., D.D.
6. **Contributed Notes**—Contributions to the History of Geography—Richard Gottheil.

BOOK REVIEWS:

Aus dem Babylonischen Rechtsleben, (I and II), **von J. Kohler und F. E. Peisser**—Morris Jastrow, Jr.

Some Recent German Works—Professor George H. Schodde.

Kohut's 'Arukh Completum—B. Felsenthal.

Abel's Vorarbeit—William O. Sproull.

In the April and July Numbers of HEBRAICA will Appear, among others, the Following Article:

Livre intitulé Laisa, sur les exceptions de la langue arabe, par Ibn Khalouya, dit Ibn Khalawaihi—Texte arabe publié d'apres le manuscrit unique du British Museum, par Hartwig Derenbourg, professeur à l'Ecole des langues orientales, directeur-adjoint à l'Ecole des hautes-Études à Paris.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: $3.00 a year in advance. Foreign Subscriptions: Great Britain, 14 s.; Germany, 14 M.; France and other countries, 18 fr.

HEBRAICA, The University Press of Chicago,

CHICAGO.

Luzac & Co., 46, Great Russell St., London, England.