

UCSD LIBRARY
X-18417


INTERNET ARCHIVE

Digitized for Microsoft Corporation
by the Internet Archive in 2007.

From University of California Libraries.

May be used for non-commercial, personal, research,
or educational purposes, or any fair use.

May not be indexed in a commercial service.



THE EXPOSITOR.

VOL. I.

List of Contributors to Volume I.

- REV. EDWIN A. ABBOTT, D.D.
REV. PROF. KARL BUDDE, D.D.
REV. HENRY BURTON, M.A.
VERY REV. G. A. CHADWICK, D.D.
REV. PROF. T. K. CHEYNE, D.D.
A. COWLEY, M.A.
REV. PROF. A. B. DAVIDSON, D.D., LL.D.
SIR J. WILLIAM DAWSON, C.M.G., F.R.S.
REV. J. W. DIGGLE, M.A.
REV. PROF. MARCUS DODS, D.D.
REV. PROF. S. R. DRIVER, D.D.
REV. A. M. FAIRBAIRN, D.D.
VEN. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S.
J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A.
REV. PROF. WILLIAM INCE, D.D.
REV. PROF. THOMAS M. LINDSAY, D.D.
REV. PROF. JAMES ORR, D.D.
PROF. W. M. RAMSAY, D.C.L.
REV. H. R. REYNOLDS, D.D.
REV. T. G. SELBY.
REV. PROF. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D.
REV. JAMES STALKER, D.D.
REV. PROF. H. B. SWETE, D.D.
REV. PROF. B. B. WARFIELD, D.D., LL.D.
REV. JOHN WATSON, M.A.
REV. PREB. WHITEFOORD, M.A.

THE
EXPOSITOR.

EDITED BY THE REV.

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

FIFTH SERIES.

Volume I.

London :
HODDER AND STOUGHTON,
27, PATERNOSTER ROW.

MDCCCXCV.

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

THE SINAITIC PALIMPSEST OF THE SYRIAC
GOSPELS.

AMONG the many events which have made this generation memorable in the history of mankind, will certainly be reckoned, hereafter, the rich and unexpected discoveries which have thrown such a flood of light upon the origins and the true character of our sacred literature, both Jewish and Christian. The monuments and inscriptions of various ancient races, and especially of Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia, have furnished us with information unattainable during many silent centuries. Palestine exploration has been rewarded with results which have added new and undreamed of precision to Scripture archæology and geography. In such remarkable "finds" as the Moabite Stone, the Siloam Inscription, and the inscription on the *Chél* forbidding any Gentile, on pain of death, to set foot within the most sacred precincts of the Temple, we have records which may have been actually seen by the eyes of King Jehoshaphat, of King Hezekiah, and of our Lord and His Apostles. As regards the Old Testament, since it has been subjected to the combined microscope and spectrum analysis of historic and linguistic criticism, we make a perfectly sober statement when we say that we are, in all probability, better acquainted with the structure and characteristics of the ancient Jewish literature—not only than any of the greatest Jewish Rabbis, not only than Hillel or Aquiba—but even than Esra himself and his successors in the rather shadowy "Great Synagogue," living as they did at an epoch when tradition had already become dim and defective, and

when the science of criticism was absolutely unknown. But we have also made an immense advance in our knowledge of early Christianity, and we may entertain the hope that documents may yet come to light which will solve many an uncertain problem, and enable us to understand much which is at present dark and dubious. It was only in 1883 that Archbishop Bryennios published the precious manuscript of the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, which will be henceforth indispensable for the history of Christian thought and practice at the close of the first century. Then we had Mr. J. Rendel Harris's publication, in 1891, of the Apology of Aristides, which he had found in 1889. Next came the recent publication of the newly-found Akhmim fragment of the Apocryphal Gospel and Apocalypse of St. Peter, which have been edited by Prof. Swete, and were discovered by the French Archæological Mission in Egypt. Thus a grave at Akhmim, on the east of the Nile, yielded us a document which, though apocryphal and Docetic—perhaps Valentinian—in its characteristics, is full of interest, and “has a note of comparative simplicity and sobriety, which is wanting in apocryphal writings of a later date.” Previous to this, in 1881, we had the recovery of the commentary by Ephraem Syrus on Tatian's *Diatessaron*, of which an edition was published in 1882 by Professor Zahn. It was of surpassing interest and importance, because of its early date. Ephraem the Syrian died A.D. 378, and in the Church of Edessa the *Diatessaron* was actually regarded as Scripture, and was preferred, in many parts of the Syrian Church, to the Gospels themselves, while there prevailed “only a sporadic, and in every sense imperfect knowledge of the original Greek Gospels.” Already, in 1869, had been published in England *The Homilies of Aphraates*, written about A.D. 340, which Dr. Zahn also proved to be based on the same Harmony of Tatian. Now Tatian was an Assyrian, and was stigmatised

as a heretic; but the practical recovery of his *Diatessaron* convincingly proves the most important fact that, as early as A.D. 172, "*The Gospel of St. John was not only recognised, but made the chronological framework of a Harmony by a disciple of Justin Martyr.*"¹

And now we have this newly-found Sinaitic Codex of the four Gospels in Syriac, which, from its antiquity and history, must always have high importance in all questions of the textual criticism of the Gospels. The readers of the EXPOSITOR will naturally wish first (1) to know something about it; and (2) to be informed whether its discovery will tend in any way (as some too rashly suppose) to shake the fundamental beliefs of Christians respecting the being and work of Christ.

I.

Under the first head I propose merely to give some information as to (1) how it was found; (2) in what relations, so far as it has yet been examined by a few competent English scholars, it is believed to stand to other texts and manuscripts; and (3) as to some of its more interesting readings.

i. The happy discoverer of the codex was a lady, Mrs. Lewis, widow of the late Rev. S. S. Lewis, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. The interesting story of the find has been published from the diaries of Mrs. Lewis by her twin sister, Mrs. Gibson.²

It is briefly as follows:—

In 1892 three persons, Mrs. Lewis, Mrs. Gibson, and Father (afterwards Abbot) Galaktéon, then the monk-librarian of the Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai, were standing in a small dark room in the monastery; and

¹ See articles on Dr. Zahn's edition of Tatian's *Diatessaron*, by Dr. Wace, EXPOSITOR, second series, vol. iv., pp. 161 ff., 294 ff. (1882).

² *How the Codex was Found*, 1893 (Macmillan & Co.).

there Mrs. Lewis—who alone of the three knew Syriac—discovered the precious MS.

Two years previously, Mr. J. Rendel Harris had discovered in the same library the MS. of the Apology of Aristides. It was he who told Mrs. Lewis that among the Estrangelo MSS. in the convent library, some further discovery of value might be made; and, in view of this possibility, he taught her the art of photographing MSS., lent her his own camera, and devised a MS. stand which would save her from fatigue. Mrs. Lewis and her sister had previously studied ancient and modern Greek, and their way was paved for them by their reputation as Philhellenes, and by friendships which they had formed with dignitaries of the Greek Church. Mrs. Lewis had also studied Arabic, Hebrew, and Syriac, and Mr. F. C. Burkitt had taught her how to copy the ancient Estrangelo alphabet. Thus equipped, and armed with a letter from the Metropolitan of Libya to the Archbishop of Mount Sinai, together with a letter to the monks, written by the Vice Chancellor of Cambridge University, the ladies made their way to Mount Sinai, and on February 8th, 1892, worked for seven hours in the library. The most ancient Syriac MSS. are kept, not in the main library, but “in a little room half-way up a dark stair, and partly in a dark closet, approached through a room almost as dark, where they repose in two closed boxes and cannot be seen without a lighted candle.” The monks, absorbed in their eight daily and nightly liturgies, are for the most part profoundly ignorant.¹ They have stored their MSS. at times in vaults, and knowing nothing of their preciousness, have allowed them to suffer from damp and

¹ Mrs. Lewis says that for 15 centuries “prayers have risen from this monastery night and day, the liturgy and the Sacraments having been continually repeated. But as for being a centre of light to the populations around, it might as well never have existed. This seems to me to be the inevitable tendency of attention to a ceremonial worship which leaves neither time nor energy for the instruction of the multitude.” (p. 55.)

decay. It is much to be feared that they have wilfully destroyed some out of sheer ignorance, and every one knows the accident which enabled Tischendorf to save the famous Uncial \aleph from being used to light fires. The two ladies, with indefatigable diligence, and braving many hardships, succeeded, among their other labours, in photographing a Syrian palimpsest of 358 pages, "into which," says Mrs. Lewis, "no eyes but our own had for centuries looked." Its leaves were mostly glued together; they crumbled at a touch, and had to be sometimes held over the steam of a kettle. The upper writing of the palimpsest is probably A.D. 778, and is a Hagiography of female saints. The underwriting, which is centuries earlier, is mainly a copy in red ink of the four Gospels in Syriac.

The sisters took back to Cambridge their priceless photographs, though with no conception of their value, and developed them at leisure.

One day in July they entrusted some of the photographs to Mr. F. C. Burkitt, who, with intense interest, took them to Prof. Bensly, and they discovered the palimpsest to be a variant copy of the fragmentary Syriac version found in 1847 by Canon Cureton among the Nitrian MSS. brought home by Archdeacon Tattam in 1833.

The next day Mrs. Lewis, Mrs. Gibson, Mr. and Mrs. Burkitt, and Prof. and Mrs. Bensly decided that they would, as soon as possible, go to Sinai and transcribe the entire MS., and they were accompanied by Mr. Rendel Harris.

On February 8th, 1893 they reached the monastery. Galaktéon, then Hegoumenos or Abbot, gave them every facility, and the little party faced their heroic task. In many places the under-writing of the palimpsest had faded, but became decipherable after the use of a strong composition for reviving ancient writing which Mrs. Lewis had brought from the British Museum. The result of their labours was that they brought home with them a trans-

cription of all that is decipherable of the complete text of this Syriac version of "the separated Gospels."

The text would have been edited by Prof. Bensly, but alas! that scholar, who was as modest as he was learned, came home only to die. He caught a chill at Rome on his homeward journey which proved quickly fatal; but his last hours must have been consoled by the thought of one more service rendered to the cause of Biblical criticism.

2. To the two other scholars, Mr. J. Rendel Harris and Mr. F. C. Burkitt, who accompanied Mrs. Lewis and Prof. Bensly on this journey, we owe some account of the critical position occupied by the MS. and of the peculiar readings which it contains.¹

Up to the time when this new Codex was brought to light there were two ancient Syriac versions of the Gospels—the Curetonian and the Peshittâ.² Further, there was the Syriac Diatessaron. Professor Zahn, after elaborate comparison of these texts, came to the conclusion that the Curetonian was the oldest, the Peshittâ next, and that the Diatessaron presented a text intimately related to the Curetonian, but varied in accordance with Tatian's knowledge of an ancient Greek text, akin to the *Itala*, which he probably took with him from Rome to Mesopotamia. This is also the view of Dr. Nestle (*Allgem. Zeitung*, Nov. 20).

Zahn's conclusion that the Curetonian version ("Cur.") of "the separated Gospels" (called by Dr. Hort "*Syr. vt.*") was really older than the Peshittâ may now be regarded as proved. For if there was any uncertainty as to the source of the quotations in Ephraem Syrus, it was certain that in the *Homilies of Aphraates* (published by Wright in 1869), and in the *Acts of Judas Thomas* (published in 1881), and in Moesinger's Latin version of the Armenian version of

¹ Unhappily the colophon which would have told us the date of the MS. and the place of its transcription is illegible.

² The Philoxenian version is not earlier than A.D. 508.

Ephraem's lost Syriac commentary on the Diatessaron, the text used was allied to *Cur.* rather than to the Peshittâ. It has now become clear that *Syr. vt.* is older than the Diatessaron.¹ The arguments urged against this conclusion by Baethgen (*Evangelienfragmente*, 1881) break down before the fact that the new codex (*Sin.*) contains readings which diametrically oppose the Encratite prejudices of Tatian, by insisting on the actual marriage of Joseph and Mary. It is also clear from the *omissions* in *Sin.* Tatian had the unauthentic, though canonical conclusion of St. Mark; but *Sin.* concludes decisively at Mark xvi. 8, and also omits the bloody sweat (Luke xxii. 43, 44), and the prayer, "Father, forgive them" (Luke xxiii. 34), both of which passages were in the Diatessaron. Also there is in *Sin.* a very curious mistranslation in Luke iv. 29, "so as to hang him," for "to throw him down," arising from the translator's confusion of *κατακρημνίσαι* with *κρεμάσαι*. This mistranslation of *Sin.* would have been impossible if the scribe had the Diatessaron lying before him. Mr. Burkitt therefore seems entitled to the conclusion that the *Syr. vt.* is the oldest known Syriac text.

These conclusions, then, may be regarded as certain :

i. In this Syriac palimpsest we have a *manuscript* which from its style of writing, its absence of diacritic points, and other peculiarities, is believed by experts to be certainly not later than the beginning of the fifth century, and possibly half a century earlier.

ii. This manuscript preserves a *text*, which is the *oldest Syriac text* hitherto known; preserves it in a form far more complete than the Curetonian (for only four hundred and

¹ The facts here mentioned are derived from a very learned paper on the Sinai Palimpsest by Mr. F. C. Burkitt, in the *Guardian* of October 31. Westcott and Hort (Introduction, p. 118) have pointed out that the *Peshittâ* (or "Simple") version was a sort of Syriac Vulgate, which had undergone revision in conformity with Greek MSS., and that this surmise was verified by *Cur.* The revision probably took place near the beginning of the fourth century.

fifty verses are missing, and a few parts illegible); and represents the form of the Gospels in Syriac *not later than* A.D. 150.

iii. It is most important to establish the relation of this old Syriac text to the oldest Greek and Latin texts. Now our oldest and most valuable Uncial MSS. are \aleph (Tischendorf's Sinaitic MS.); and B, the Vatican MS. Very high importance is rightly given to these venerable Uncials in the Westcott and Hort's standard critical edition of the text, and with these Uncials *Sin.* constantly agrees. The critical value of the new palimpsest (*Sin.*) is immensely enhanced if it can be shown to be *independent* of \aleph B; and a reading contained in \aleph B receives very strong additional support if it is contained in *Sin.* as an independent authority for the oldest text, since *Sin.* represents "a text superior in antiquity to anything yet known." This independence of *Sin.* of the text found in \aleph B can only be proved if it be found that *Sin.* diverges from them where they appear to be wrong. Now Mr. Burkitt states that out of ninety-five instances in which the readings of \aleph B are rejected, and relegated to the margin by Westcott and Hort, *Sin.* is legible in eighty-two, and only coincides with \aleph B in twenty-three of these; and "in all but two of these readings the combination of \aleph B *Sin.* is supported by the whole mass of authorities, except D *latt.*" It is obvious then that when *Sin.* agrees with \aleph B, it adds immense weight to the probability that they present the truest reading.

iv. As regards its relation to D and old Latin versions, Mr. Burkitt says that *Sin.* may be described as "a western text without western interpolations." As regards *mixed* texts, it had been already observed that the old Syriac is connected with a peculiar element in the Ferrar group of MSS., so much so that some suspected these cursive MSS. to have been retranslated from a Syriac text; but Mr. Burkitt points out a very peculiar reading, "shall eat

breakfast" (ἄριστον) for "shall eat bread" (ἄρτον), in Luke xiv. 15, which is found in *Sin.* and *Cur.*, and also found in the Ferrar group, though it is obviously a Greek and not a Syriac variant.¹

v. Mr. J. Rendel Harris, the collaborateur of Mr. Burkitt, in an interesting and valuable paper in the *Contemporary Review* for November, gives a rough diagram to express the general position of this newly-recovered text. He thinks that from the primitive text originated *two* sets of MSS.—one, which comprises the large majority, is orthodox; the other was unorthodox. From the *unorthodox* text came a series of *secondary* orthodox readings, and also the unorthodox *Sin.* From the *secondary* orthodox text were derived the Diatessaron and the Curetonian, and in a more direct line the Græco-Latin and old Latin texts, and the Ferrar group.

3. We now come to some of the more interesting peculiarities of the new text, of which Mr. J. Rendel Harris and Mr. Burkitt have given us a glimpse.² The most interesting points, omitting for the present one of capital importance of which I must speak separately, are as follows:—

OMISSIONS.

1. Every one knows how overwhelming is the *textual* taken in connection with the *critical* evidence against the genuineness of the verses Mark xvi. 9–20, which are omitted in $\aleph B$, and in "accurate copies" mentioned by Eusebius, and abound in peculiarities. The evidence of $\aleph B$ is immensely strengthened by the conclusion of *Sin.* at v. 8, which is immediately followed in the palimpsest by Luke i. 1, after the words, "the Gospel of Mark is ended."

2. The Lord's Prayer in St. Luke xi. 2–4 occurs in the shortest form. ("Our *daily* bread" is rendered "our *constant* bread," as in *Cur.*)

3. *Sin.* agrees with $\aleph B$ and *Cur.* in omitting Matt. xii.

¹ Mrs. Lewis renders it "meat."

² Mrs. Lewis's translation only came to hand after I had revised the first proof.

47. "Then one said unto Him, Behold Thy mother and Thy brethren," etc.

4. Matt. xvi. 2, 3. "The red and the lowering sky."

5. Matt. xvii. 21. "Howbeit this kind goeth not out but by prayer and fasting." (Perhaps an ascetic gloss.)

6. Matt. xviii. 11. "For the Son of man is come to save that which was lost."

7. Matt. xxiii. 11. The Scribes and Pharisees shutting up the kingdom of heaven against men, etc.

8. Matt. xxiv. 36. Omit "neither the Son."

9. Mark ix. 44, 46. "Where their worm dieth not," etc.

10. Mark xv. 28. "And the Scripture was fulfilled which saith, 'He was numbered with the transgressors.'"

Luke xix. 25. "And they said unto Him, Lord, he hath ten pounds."

11. Luke xxii. 43, 44. The bloody sweat.

Luke xxiii. 10-13. The reconciliation of Herod and Pilate.

12. Luke xxiii. 34. "Father, forgive them, etc."

13. The story of the adulteress (John vii. 53, viii. 11).

14. Matt. xix. 29, Mark x. 29, omit "wife."

Any reader, who has even the most superficial acquaintance with textual criticism, will recognise, without further comment, the importance of some of the omissions, and the curious interest of others. Generally speaking, we have (as in the case of the genuine Ignatian letters), as Mr. Harris says, "a substantially shorter text than the majority of the extant documents." There is "an almost entire absence of such passages as are generally held to be interpolations."

PECULIAR READINGS.

1. Matt. xxi. 31. "The last" (instead of "the first").

2. Matt. x. 23. (Add) "and if they persecute you in the other, flee ye into yet another" (with D).

3. Matt. xiii. 48. "They gathered the good (*καλά*) as good" (perhaps reading *ὡς ἀγαθὰ* for *εἰς ἀγγεῖα*). (Mrs. Lewis has "The very good fishes.")

4. John iii. 6. "For God is a living spirit."

5. Matt. xxvii. 16, 17. "Jesus Barabbas."

6. Mark vi. 8. "Take nothing save a staff."

Mark x. 40. "Is not mine to give, but it is prepared for another" (or "others").

7. Mark x. 50. "Putting on" (*ἐπιβαλὼν*) for "casting away" (*ἀποβαλὼν*).

8. Luke ii. 6. "To be taxed with *Mary his wife*" (not "his espoused.")

9. Luke ii. 14. "Good will towards men," for *ἀνθρώποις εὐδοκίας* of \aleph A B D.

10. Luke iii. 23. "Jesus, *as He was called*, the Son of Joseph." (So Mrs. Lewis, p. 103.)

11. Luke iv. 44. "Of Judea," with \aleph B C L, etc., for "of Galilee."

12. Luke ii. 4. "For *they were both* of the house of David."

13. Luke xxiii. 37. The crown of thorns put on the head of Christ on the cross.

14. Luke xxiv. 51. "He was lifted up from them."

15. John i. 34. "I saw and bare record that this is *the chosen* of God."

16. John viii. 37. And hath Abraham seen thee?"

17. John xi. Martha asks, "Why are they taking away the stone?"

18. Luke xxii. 17. "Take this and divide it among yourselves. This is my blood, the new covenant."

19. Luke xxiii. 48. "And they said, Woe to us, what hath befallen us? Woe to us because of our sins!"

Among other peculiarities we may mention that Jesus is often called *Māran*, "our Lord." In Luke ii. 25 we are told that Simeon "was receiving the supplication of Israel," and in ii. 36 that Anna had only lived seven days with a husband, and had been a widow eighty-four years.¹

¹ In Luke xii. 47 we have "shall swallow many stripes," which Mrs. Lewis compares to the Egyptian "eating stick."

II.

But we now come to another aspect of the importance of the MS., and one which has already excited great and painful attention. It is that the palimpsest contains variations of a distinctly unorthodox character, apparently introduced, at whatever period, into the Syriac text, for the express purpose of implying that Jesus was the Son of Joseph, and either not born in a supernatural manner, or only so in a secondary and almost metaphorical sense.

That this is the intention of the variations in Matt. i. 18-25 there can be, unhappily, no manner of doubt. This will be seen at once from the readings which we print in italics in Matt. i. 16, 21.

Thus in Matt. i. 16 we read with a start of pain and surprise: "Jacob begat Joseph; *Joseph, to whom was betrothed Mary the Virgin, begat Jesus, who is called Christ*";¹ and in Matt. i. 21, "For she shall bear *thee* a son"; and in Matt. i. 25, "And he married his wife, and she bare *him* a son, and he called His name Jesus." Here it will be observed that not only is "him" added to assert the paternity of Joseph, but that the words "*knew her not until,*" are significantly omitted.

Now already this reading has led to the publication of two papers in the *Academy* (November 17th), by Mr. F. C. Conybeare and Mr. F. P. Badham, in which they advocate views which are suggested by these readings, but are at variance with the doctrine of the Catholic Church since the days of the Apostles. It is needless to say that such views—and we are destined to have many more of them—will not be knocked down by mere fierce blows from the mace of authority; and it would be equally needless for me to say that I do not wish, even for a moment, to use against them the base *argumentum ad invidiam*. The days of the

¹ Mrs. Gibson, in a letter to the *Times* (November 2, 1894), suggests an error of transcription or translation, but I am informed on high authority that the view is untenable.

Inquisition — with its horribly execrable atrocities, and deadly crimes against the indefeasible rights of the human race—are over: at least one used to hope so. The world will have sunk into a very abyss of degradation if it ever allows the re-imposition of bondage by tyrannous and usurping priests upon the neck of freed humanity. Members of the Reformed Churches, at any rate, have long returned to the great principles of the earliest Greek and Latin fathers, before the sacerdotalism of Cyprian and the intolerance of Augustine. They hold that *Βία ἐχθρὸν Θεῶ*, and “*religionis non est cogere religionem.*” Views which we regard as errors or as heresies must be met, and can only be effectually met, by calm and incontrovertible reasoning, not by the swash-buckler denunciations in which ecclesiastical orthodoxy usually delights, because it cannot any longer resort to the desperate sincerity of fagot and stake, as it did in days of Papal supremacy, and may do again if priests get the upper hand. Mr. Badham and Mr. Conybeare are scholars and men of learning; and if their views are to be refuted, it can only be by serious arguments, not by contemptuous anathemas. Some may be eager to regard the new readings as genuine because they are unorthodox; we should only be following a bad and unscientific example, if, for the same reason, we refused to examine them.

Mr. Conybeare sees, and fully admits, that the naturalistic account of the birth of Jesus in Matt. i. 16, 21, 25, is found side by side with the miraculous account; but he argues (if I interpret him rightly) that the text was *originally* and *primitively* “unorthodox”; that this original text is correctly restored by *Sin.* in these three verses, and that the consistently miraculous text of our all-but unanimous authorities is, in reality, a text which has been tampered with for orthodox purposes.

He argues—and surely the arguments are far too slender to bear so vast a superincumbent weight—that,—

i. The genealogy of *Joseph* would have been meaningless on the "orthodox" hypothesis, since "all parties will admit" that "it was originally devised on heretical lines and destined to prove that Jesus was the natural son of Joseph."

Surely "*all parties*" are very far indeed from making any such admission. Before the eyes of the Jews, Jesus was, for all civic and social purposes, regarded as the son of Joseph (Luke ii. 43, 48, etc.). Mary, we are expressly told, had "kept all these things and pondered them in her heart"; she had not revealed to the Nazarenes—not even to "the Lord's brethren"—the awful and stupendous secret which lay far too deep for words, and which could not but vindicate itself in God's due time. It was the will of God that only by slow degrees of enlightenment should the truth dawn even on the mind of Christ's most chosen Apostles, that He was not only "the Son of David," but in the highest sense "the Son of God." It may be, and probably is true, that Mary and Joseph were near of kin, and that Christ's Davidic descent (as is expressly stated by *Sin.* in Luke ii. 4) was derived from the Virgin as well as, for civic and public purposes, from Joseph. But for those to whom the supernatural birth had not yet been made known, the Davidic genealogy of Joseph was necessary, and it was a matter of historic interest to all.

ii. Mr. Conybeare is quite right in saying that the genealogy of Joseph (which we do not admit to have been heretically devised) "cannot be detached from the text as a later addition"; and on that we need not dwell. He, however, attaches to the phrase "the *generation* of Jesus Christ," in Matt. i. 18, a significance which it does not bear more necessarily than in Gen. ii. 4, where the word is applied to the *creation* of the heavens and the earth.

iii. It is true that the words "*and he knew her not until,*" are also omitted in a *single* cursive MS., namely *k*, a cursive of the African Latin version.¹ But though the

¹ For the general reader I may mention that *k* in a cursive MS. (known as

value of *k* is high, it is much to say that the consensus of *Sin.* and *k*—a MS. of a Syriac translation, and of a Latin translation—are at all sufficient to prove “a widely diffused and *established* text” against the overpowering consensus in the opposite direction of all the other versions, all the other uncials, and all the other cursives.

iv. Mr. Conybeare thinks that a heretic could not possibly have been content with such slight changes as we find in *Sin.*; that he would have made, at least, a clean sweep of Matt. i. 19 (“Now Joseph, *her husband* (not in *Cur.*), because he was just, did not wish to expose Mary, and thought of quietly divorcing her”), which entirely stultifies the notion of his paternity. “We should have to reduce the infancy section to shreds,” says Mr. Harris, “before it would satisfy an Adoptionist hypothesis.”¹

On this point I do not *at all* admit Mr. Conybeare’s argument. An unorthodox scribe might easily venture on tiny, and almost surreptitious, tamperings with the text, when it might have been (and probably was) absolutely impossible for him to gratify his dogmatic prejudices by wholesale omissions and insertions. By way of instance, the ascetic bias which tampered with the text by inserting “fasting” in Matt. xvii. 21, Mark ix. 29, 1 Cor. vii. 5, Acts x. 30, did not, for a moment, venture to excise passages which told so powerfully against its cherished principles as Matt. ix. 14, 15; Mark ii. 18, 19; Luke v. 33; Col. ii. 21–23.

To me, then, it seems that Mr. Conybeare’s arguments in

the *Codex Taurinensis* or *Bobbiensis*) of the 4th or 5th century, brought from Bobbio to Turin, highly valued by Tischendorf, and pronounced by Tregelles to have been “amended from a Greek text more Alexandrian than that which had been the original basis of the Latin version.” It has been edited by Bishop Wordsworth and Mr. White.

¹ As Mr. Harris says, *Cur.* “is of the nature of an orthodox revision.” His quotations from St. Chrysostom prove that “the language in the infancy section in Matthew was a fertile ground of misunderstanding, and that its text was at a very early period encumbered with various readings.”

favour of an original, unorthodox, or only semi-orthodox, text, are quite untenable. They break down (i.) under the vast agreement of numberless MSS. of all schools and origins—*Cur.*, the Ferrar group, the Armenian version, old Latin, and Greek—which militate against these naturalistic readings of *Sin.* Even *Cur.* has the orthodox reading in Matt. i. 16, and an orthodox one in i. 25. (ii.) They militate against the unquestioned belief of the Apostles (through the Epistles, and Apocalypse *passim*); (iii.) against the whole Gospel of St. John; (iv.) against the unvarying belief from the earliest times of the universal Church; and (v.) against the involuntary and inevitable retention, even in *Sin.*, of entire passages which make the heretical variation entirely meaningless. *Sin.*, in this matter, contradicts itself. All that it proves is—and that we already knew from Christian history—that “there was unorthodoxy near the source.”

v. Mr. Conybeare thinks that he has accounted for the anomalies of the text by arguing that “the Jews, in the time of Christ, deemed it possible and natural for a child to be conceived of the Holy Spirit, and yet at the same time to be begotten in the ordinary way.” His knowledge of Philo enables him to adduce interesting evidence that this was the case; but, on the one hand, he presses too literally the vague and abstract mysticism of Philo; and in the second place, there is nothing new in such a view. It applied, if at all, to every child alike. It is, indeed, simply the view of the “Creationists” as opposed to that of the “Traducianists,” and something very like it is involved even in such lines as Wordsworth’s:

“Trailing clouds of glory do we come
From God, who s our home”;

and Tennyson’s:

“A soul shall draw from out the vast,
And strike its being into bounds”;

not to mention the fact that the notion occurs quite com-

monly in ordinary parlance. This Philonian view, then, throws no light whatever on the assumption that the birth of Christ was by ordinary law, and it either reduces great parts of Matt. i. 18-25, and the whole infancy narrative of St. Luke, and the whole Gospel of St. John (not to add the greater part of the whole New Testament), to self-contradiction and chaos; but even then it leaves us with *another* miracle instead of the belief of the Catholic Church. Considering the fact that every birth is a practically insoluble miracle,—considering the ancient question, “Canst thou tell how the bones grow in the womb of her who is with child?”—considering that the belief in a naturalistic birth was undoubtedly found in early days among a few heretics, so that any scribe with such views might be tempted to pervert the text,—the attempt to modify the belief of Christendom by these new hypotheses, and by such scantily supported traces of textual divergence, has not the least force. It would have been much more natural for a belief of a purely supernatural birth to have grown out of the story of John the Baptist, which exactly resembles that of Isaac, of which Philo speaks directly (comp. Gal. iv. 29). Yet there never was such a suggestion.

vi. In Matt. i. 16 *Sin.* gives us “Joseph, to whom was betrothed *Mary the Virgin*, begat Jesus.” Here, even in the heretical alteration of the text, we find the emphatic title “*Mary the Virgin*.” Will Mr. Conybeare find even a single follower in the attempt to persuade us that the title, “the Virgin,” was thus *par excellence* given to Mary because she remained a widow after her husband’s death? Every one knows the view, that in the second century widows were, in a very secondary sense, classed with “the virgins,” but only as an organised body.¹ But not only is

¹ See *Ignat. ad Smyrn.*, 13 τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγομένας χήρας. But the title, “widow,” was *higher* than the title “virgin,” as appears from Tert., *De Virg. Vel.*, 9. The Virgin could not possibly have been called a Virgin because she

there no proof whatever that any such custom prevailed in the days of the *Apostles*, but (so far as I know) it has never occurred to any one before Mr. Conybeare, for more than eighteen centuries, to appeal to this custom as an explanation of the title "the Virgin Mary." Moreover, we are told that in Syriac "the word *Virgin* is always used in its strict sense."

vii. Much that I have said of Mr. Conybeare's paper applies also to Mr. Badham's (*Academy*, Nov. 17). The only new suggestion is that the apparent discrepancies (as he regards them) in the actually orthodox and assumed heretical text of the Gospels may be accounted for partly by considerations analagous to those urged by Mr. Conybeare, and partly by the suggestion—if I rightly catch the drift of his arguments—that a child may have been born to *Joseph and Mary* without either of these being conscious of the fact! If that be his meaning, it is difficult to conceive that any one could accept this wildly original version of the Virgin Birth of Christ, in lieu of that which has prevailed since the earliest dawn of Christianity and by reason of which St. Luke says of Christ—not in any secondary or Philonian sense, but in the only sense which accords with his own and the other Gospels and the rest of the New Testament—that He was "*the Son of God.*"

Into the purely theological aspects of the great unshaken doctrine of the Incarnation in Christ's Virgin Birth, and into the defeated and rapidly extinguished heresies by which it was impugned, I have left myself no space to enter. I trust that they will be treated by abler intellects than mine.

F. W. FARRAR.

[P.S.—Since this paper was in print I have read the

was a pure unmarried widow. See Lightfoot's *Apostolic Fathers*, I. 1-385, II. 323. Mr. Simeox, in a paper in the *Academy* (Nov. 24, 1894), which I only saw when my paper was finished, thinks that the text of Ignatius may have been tampered with.

learned article of the Rev. R. H. Charles (*Academy*, December 1). He argues that the heretical reading is what we should expect to find in a genealogy of Joseph, which he regards as an Ebionitic addition to the primitive text. This he thinks is shown (i.) by its absence from Justin Martyr (*Ap.*, i. 33); but Justin Martyr evidently knew of it (*Dial. c. Tryph.*, 120); (ii.) from Tatian's *Diatessaron* (ii. 1-8); and (iii.) from the fact that Irish and other Latin MSS. place the initial letter of the Gospel *not at verse 1. but at verse 18.* As to the text of *Sin.* he says that in *k* at Matt. i. 16 there is a *lacuna* after the word *Virgo* and before *Maria*, which was not originally filled up as it now is in *b* (the fourth century Cod. Veronensis); viz. "et Jacob genuit Josef, cui desponsata erat virgo [*Maria Virgo autem Maria*] genuit Jesum." *Genuit*, however, normally means paternity not maternity, and is altered into *peperit* by *d* (the sixth century Cod. Cantabrigiensis). He infers that *Sin.* represents the primitive text, that this text is necessarily implied in *Cur.* and the old Latin and Armenian version; and that therefore Matt. i. 1-17 is the wrong addition of a scribe. He also doubts the genuineness of the genealogy in Luke. It would require a separate paper to enter into this view, but it is interesting, and deserves full consideration. On the other hand Mr. White suggests that the omission of "knew her not until" in *k*, and the omission of *accipere* in i. 20 are due to a desire to insinuate the ἀειπαρθενία of Mary.]

FATHERHOOD THE FINAL IDEA OF GOD.

IT is an attractive theory that the spiritual dominates the physical, and the soul, in the long run, selects its own body: it is an evident fact that life is created by thought, and every action has its root in the Unseen. What one thinks to-day, he will do to-morrow; and the first equipment for living is a creed. No one is so simple that he does not hold some article firmly—it may be attachment to his tribe: no one is so liberal that he has cleansed his house of every article—he will possibly deny the knowledge of God. Totemism and agnosticism are the extremes of belief; but the immense variety between those brackets proves that whether one affirms or denies, he must have a belief as he must have a home. History proves the necessity of a creed: experience proves its effect. As the light of the sun colours the tiniest blade of grass, so the idea in the background of the mind tinges every detail of life. We grant that a man's theology will be built on his belief, and will follow its lines to the highest pinnacle. This is a grudging concession, a limited analysis. The energy of a human life, however it may have been fed on the way, and whatever common wheels it may turn, arises from the spring among the hills. Belief gives the trend to politics, constitutes the rule of business, composes the atmosphere of home, and creates the horizon of the soul. It becomes the sovereign arbiter of our destinies, for character itself is the precipitate of belief.

Belief, within the sphere of religion, has a wide range, but its centre is God. Tell me what is your conception of God, and I will work out your doctrine of man, of forgiveness, of life, of punishment. Given the axioms, and geometry is only a question of process. Given your God, and your whole theology can be constructed within a measurable

time. The chief service of a prophet is not to rebuke sin, nor instruct in virtue: it is to give the world a radiant idea of God. Has he no word on God? Then his silence is irreparable—every other doctrine will be isolated and fruitless. Has he a fitting idea of God? Then his blank chapters can be supplied; they are contained in the introduction. If a prophet deal after a satisfying fashion with the idea of God, he will be permanent. If a prophet complete and crown the idea of God, he will be final. Many may expound him: none can transcend him. Jesus taught the world various principles of religion—the nature of faith, the glory of sacrifice, the secret of peace, the strength of love. These were the splendid incidents of His Gospel. The Gospel of Jesus was the revelation of God.

Jesus availed Himself of what existed, and began with the assumption of God. He never fell into the *banalité* of theology, and set Himself to prove the existence of God, which is as if a geologist should introduce his science with an argument for the reality of the world. When one has to begin before the beginning, he is filled with despair, for that way lies madness. We are entitled to take some things for granted, as, for instance, the evidence of our senses and the teaching of an instinct. Belief in God is an instinct, a part of the constitution of the soul. It may be confirmed and illustrated: it must not be proved, for the proof of an instinct is its denial. When Jesus said God, He appealed to the belief latent in every human being, and called it into a nobler exercise. He did not create the idea of God—He illuminated it.

Jesus availed Himself also of what had been done, and accepted that character of God, which was the discovery of ancient piety. As the belief in God began with the first father of the Race, the doctrine of God began with the Hebrew saints. Long centuries before Jesus patriarchs and prophets had been wrestling with the problems of the

Divine Being and the Divine Name. With the sword of faith and great travail of soul, those pioneers of religion had conquered, foot by foot, the land of promise, and left it as an heritage unto their children. They had extricated the idea of God from the work of men's hands and the phenomena of nature: in later days the pious Jew guarded it from the abstractions of philosophy and the corrosion of scepticism. This monotheism was not the natural tendency of the Semite, born of the desert environment—that ingenious naturalistic theory is now exploded; it was the slow, painful attainment of Hebrew faith reinforced by the Divine Spirit. We owe the "Living God" to the Jew, and as often as this sublime conception is obscured or sapped by the eccentricities of modern speculation the religious consciousness must fall back on the masculine vigour and ethical grandeur of Old Testament thought.

The genius of the Jewish mind was not metaphysical; it could not have produced the Athanasian Creed: it was ethical; it is embodied in the Ten Words. With the Jew, therefore, God was not abstract Being—the First Cause of things. He was actual character, the "Holy One of Israel." Jehovah dwelt in the high and holy place, and with him also of a humble and contrite heart; and if He "maketh the clouds His chariot," and "walketh upon the wings of the wind," His "righteousness is like the great mountains," His "judgments are a great deep." There grew in the consciousness of this people the idea of a God who was not only real—no carved and painted log of prophetic satire, but also moral—no complacent deity tasting the sweetness of his worshippers' sins. They verified His character in the disasters that followed national corruption, in the swift recoveries that rewarded national repentance. In the mirror of a cleansed conscience the prophets saw the face of God; they traced His life in the processes of righteousness. We fail sometimes to appreciate the force of this discovery;

we forget to imagine the surprise. With moderns, Deity and virtue are synonymous; with ancients, deities and vice were synonymous. Upon two hills only was the Divine raised above the

“Howling senses’ ebb and flow.”

One was the Acropolis where the golden shaft in Athene’s hand guided the mariner on the Ægean Sea. The other was the Holy Hill where Jehovah remained the refuge of every righteous man. But the advantage lay with the Jew. The wisdom of Athens was seated in reason, and did not affect life: the wisdom of Jerusalem was seated in conscience, and created conduct. The Jewish Savonarola who thundered in Jerusalem, “Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes,” had come out from a secret place where the Seraphim said, “Holy, holy, holy is the Lord of Hosts.”

Jewish piety has laid the world under a hopeless debt by imagining the austere holiness of God, and has doubled the obligation by adding His tenderness. It was an achievement to carve the white marble; a greater to make it live and glow. The saints of Israel touched their highest when they infused the idea of the Divine spirituality with passion, and brought it to pass that the Holy One of Israel is the kindest deity that has ever entered the heart of man. There was no human emotion they did not assign to God; no relationship they did not use as the illustration of His love; no appeal of affection they did not place in His lips; no sorrow of which they did not make Him partaker. When a prophet’s inner vision had been cleansed by the last agony of pain, he dares to describe the Eternal as a fond mother who holds Ephraim by the hands, teaching him to go; who is outraged by his sin, and yet cannot bear that Israel should perish: as a Husband who has offered a rejected love, and still pleads; who is stained by a wife’s

unfaithfulness, and pursues an adulteress with entreaties (Hos. xi. 1, ii. 14). One cannot lay his hand on the body of prophetic Scripture without feeling the beat of the Divine Heart: one can detect in its most distant member the warmth of the Divine love.

Your first conclusion is that faith can go no farther: your second reading reveals one significant reserve. Prophets continually call God the Father of the nation; they never (with one doubtful exception) call Him Father of the individual. Psalmists revel in an overflowing imagery for God, but one word lying to their hand they do not use. He is the "Shepherd of Israel" and "our dwelling-place in all generations" (Ps. lxxx. 1, Ps. xc. 1); He is the "Rock of my Salvation" and a "very present help in trouble" (Ps. lxxxix. 26, Ps. xli. 1): He is the "Health of my countenance," and "thy shade on thy right hand" (Ps. xlii. 11, Ps. cxxi. 5); but He is not Father. King is the Psalmists' chief title for God and his highest note. "The Lord reigneth." These saints are unapproachable in their familiarity with the Eternal; they will argue and complain; they will demand and reproach, but never at any moment are they so carried beyond themselves as to say "My Father." They are bold within a limit: they have restraints in their language. It is not a refusal to say Father, because the idea is an offence: it is an unconsciousness—because the idea has not yet dawned. The clouds which had gradually risen from the base and sides of the doctrine of God still veil the summit.

When one passes from the Gospels to the Psalms he is struck by the absence of Father. When one returns he is struck by its presence. The Psalmist never said the word; Jesus never said anything else. With Jesus God and Father were identical. Fatherhood was not a side of Deity; it was the centre. God might be a King and Judge; He was first of all, and last of all, and through

all, Father. In Fatherhood every other relation of God must be harmonized and find its sphere. Short of His Fatherhood you cannot stop in the ascent of God. Under Fatherhood is gathered every other revelation. Jesus reasoned in terms of the Father: "If ye then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to those that ask Him?" (St. Matt. vii. 11). He laboured in the fellowship of the Father: "I seek not Mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent Me" (St. John v. 30). He rested in the wisdom of the Father: "In that hour Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, I thank Thee, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes: even so, Father; for so it seemed good in Thy sight" (St. Luke x. 21). And Jesus suffered in the faith of the Father: "Therefore doth My Father love Me because I lay down My life that I might take it again. . . . This commandment have I received of My Father" (St. John x. 17). When the consciousness of God awoke with power in the soul of the Holy Child, He was filled with a sudden enthusiasm, "Wist ye not that I must be about My Father's business?" (St. Luke ii. 49). When He had fulfilled His calling and offered His sacrifice, His soul turned to His Father: "Father, into Thy hands I commend My Spirit" (St. Luke xxiii. 46). From Nazareth to Calvary the love of the Father was Jesus' dwelling-place.

"In that one thought He abode
For ever in that thought more deeply sinking."

No one can ignore this constant and radiant sense of the Divine Fatherhood in the life of Jesus. It must be a suggestive fact to an unbeliever, for it will be admitted on every hand that Jesus knew more about Religion than any man that has ever lived. It ought to be an absolute conclusion to a believer, since he holds that Jesus is Himself Very God of very God.

It goes without saying that Jesus' sense of the Fatherhood must be supreme. It is a contradiction of the Gospels to say that it was exclusive. Jesus toiled for three years to write the truth of the Fatherhood on the minds of the disciples with at least one result, that it is interwoven with the pattern of the Gospels. He pled also with His friends that they should receive it into their hearts till St. John filled his epistles with this word. With minute and affectionate care, Jesus described the whole circle of religious thought, and stated it in terms of the Fatherhood. Prayer was to be to the Father: say "Our Father, which art in heaven" (S. Luke xi. 2). The principle of life was the Will of the Father: he only attained who had done the "Will of our Father which is in heaven" (S. Matt. vii. 21). The type of character was the Father: "Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect" (St. Matt. v. 48). Providence is the mindful oversight of a Father: "Your heavenly Father knoweth that ye have need of all these things" (St. Matt. vi. 32). Repentance was a return to the Father: "I will arise and go to my Father" (St. Luke xv. 18). One of the few rays Jesus cast on the future showed the Father's dwelling-place: "In My Father's house are many mansions" (St. John xiv. 2). The effect of such passages is cumulative and irresistible. They are better than the proof texts for a dogma; they are an atmosphere in which religion lives and moves and has its being. They are sunrise.

People with dogmatic ends to serve have striven to believe that Jesus reserved Father for His disciples; but an ingenuous person could hardly make the discovery in the Gospels. One searches in vain to find that Jesus had an esoteric word for His intimates, and an exoteric for the people, saying Father to John and Judge to the publicans. It had been amazing if Jesus were able to employ alternatively two views of God according to His audience,

speaking now as an Old Testament Prophet, now as the Son of God. It is recorded in the Gospels, "Then spake Jesus to the multitude and His disciples, saying, . . . one is your Father, which is in heaven" (St. Matt. xxiii. 1, 9). This attempt to restrict the intention of Jesus is not of yesterday; it was the invention of the Pharisees. They detected the universal note in Jesus' teaching; they resented His unguarded charity. Their spiritual instincts were not wide, but they were very keen, within a limited range, and the Pharisees judged with much correctness that the teaching of Jesus and the privileges of Judaism were inconsistent. If a publican was a son of God, what advantage had a Pharisee? It was natural that they should murmur: we are now thankful that they criticised the Master. Jesus made His defence in His three greatest parables, and in the parable of the Prodigal Son He defined the range of the Divine Fatherhood beyond reasonable dispute. His deliverance was given with deliberation—in Jesus' most finished parable; the parable was created for a definite purpose—to vindicate Jesus' intercourse with sinners. It contains Jesus' most complete description of a sinner—from his departure to his return; it declares with emphasis that sinner a son of God—a "son was lost and is found." Between the son in the far country and the son at home is an immense difference; but if he had not been a son from home, there had been no home for his return. The possibility of salvation lies in sonship. It would not be fair to rest any master doctrine on a single parable, were it not that the parable is Jesus' definition of Fatherhood, given in answer to the practical challenge of privilege, were it not that it simply crystallizes the whole teaching of Jesus or God from His boyhood to His death. If Jesus did not teach a Divine Fatherhood embracing the Race, then He used words to conceal thought, and one despairs of ever understanding our Master.

When Jesus speaks of Fatherhood, it is almost a stupidity to explain that He is not thinking of any physical relation—the “offspring” of the heathen poets, and that Father is not a synonym for Creator. Jesus rested His own Sonship on community of character. God was love, for He gave His only Son, and Jesus was love, for He gave Himself. He realized His Sonship in community of service. “My Father worketh hitherto, and I work” (St. John v. 17). The bond between son and father in the spiritual world is ethical. It is perfect between the Father and the Son in the Holy Trinity: it is only a suggestion between a sinner and God. As one can detect some trace of likeness between a father and his son, although the son may have played the fool, and defiled the fashion of his countenance, so the most degraded and degenerate of human outcasts still bears the faint remains of the Divine image. The capability of repentance is the remains of righteousness; the occasional aspirations after goodness are the memories of home; the recognition of right and wrong is an affinity to the mind of God. The sonship is hidden in Zaccheus and Mary Magdalene—a mere possibility; in St. John and St. Paul it is revealed—a beautiful actuality, so that this paradox is only the deeper truth that one may be, and yet become, a son, as the ethical likeness is acknowledged and cleansed. Jesus’ message was, “You are a son.” As soon as it was believed Jesus gave power to live as a son with God (S. John i. 12).

With this single word “Father,” Jesus instantly defines the relation of man and God, and illuminates theology. He transfers the Divine idea from the schools, where they discuss the Sovereignty of God, to the hearth where the little children can say “Our Father” with understanding. It was a felicitous image which suddenly appropriated for theology the analogies of love and the associations of home; which teaches us to argue with irresistible force what my

father on earth would not do because it is evil my Father in heaven will not do; what my father here will do of good, that and more my Father above will do. Granted that this is anthropomorphic reasoning, how else can we argue than from the best in us to the better in God? Granted that this analogy is faint, that only invests it with more winsome attraction. What an astounding *gaucherie* it has been to state the intimate relation between God and the soul in the language of criminal law, with bars, prisoners, sentences. This terminology has two enormous disadvantages. It is unintelligible to any one who is not a criminal or a lawyer; it is repulsive to any one who desires to love God. Take it at the highest, it was the spirit of Moses. Without disparagement to a former dispensation, it has been superseded by the spirit of Jesus.

One is not astonished that some of Jesus' deepest sayings are still unfathomed, or that some of His widest principles are not yet applied. Jesus is the Eternal Son, and the ages overtake Him slowly. One is aghast to discover that the doctrine which Jesus put in the forefront of His teaching and laboured with such earnestness did not leave a trace on the dominant theology of the early Church, and for long centuries passed out of the Christian consciousness. Had it not been for the Lord's Prayer and, in a sense, the three Creeds, no witness had been left for the Fatherhood in Christian doctrine and worship. The Anglican communion has thirty-nine articles, with one on oaths, one on the descent into hell, one on the marriage of priests, one on how to avoid people that are excommunicate, and not one on the Fatherhood. The Presbyterian communion has a confession with thirty-three chapters, which deal in a trenchant manner with great mysteries, but there is not one expounding the Fatherhood of God. It was quite allowable that theology should formulate doctrines on subjects Jesus never mentioned, such as original sin; and elaborate

theories on facts Jesus left in their simplicity, such as His sacrifice. These speculations are the function of that science, but it is inexcusable that the central theme of Jesus' teaching should have been ignored or minimised. This silence, from the date of the Greek fathers to the arrival of the modern Broad Churchman, has been more than an omission ; it has been a heresy.

It is an endless consolation that our Master's words are indestructible and eternal. Certain ideas of Jesus disappeared, and seemed to have died ; they were not dead, they were only sown. When their due time came they awoke to life, and it is now spring-time with the Fatherhood. The disciples of Jesus owe a debt that can never be paid to three men that have brought us back to the mind of our Master. One was Channing, for whose love to Jesus one might be tempted to barter his belief ; the second was Maurice, most honest and conscientious of theologians ; and the third was Erskine of Linlathen, who preached the Fatherhood to every one he met, from Thomas Carlyle to highland shepherds. This sublime truth received at first the same treatment from the nineteenth century as from the first. Its inherent grace has not been an immediate commendation ; its utter reasonableness has been an indirect provocation. But the Spirit of Jesus has been working in men age after age, and it is now evident that the name for God that lay in Jesus' heart is to be acclimatised in the Christian consciousness.

Two persons hesitate to accept the Fatherhood in its fulness who are neither biassed by spiritual pride nor are disloyal to Jesus. With one it is an ethical difficulty, that stands in the way ; he has a rooted suspicion that the assertion of God's Fatherhood means the denial of His authority, and that we shall exchange the Holy One of Israel for a magnified Eli. Certain advocates of Jesus' idea have themselves to blame for this misapprehension,

since they have invested the "Holy Father" of Jesus, whose Name is "hallowed," with a cloud of sickly sentiment, a God too weakly to rule, too soft-hearted to punish. If this conception should obtain, Christianity would deserve to lose her hold on the conscience, and morality would have to fight for very existence. Jesus is not responsible for this helpless Deity, this pitiable descent from the God of the prophets. With Jesus the Father was Lord of heaven and earth, who "seeth in secret," and holds the times in His hand, who has not only prepared the "many mansions," but also the cleansing fires of Gehenna. No judge is so omniscient as a father, no despot so absolute. The Father of the Sermon on the Mount is not less awful than the God of the Ten Words, nor is the conscience of St. John less strenuous than the conscience of Moses.

The second objection is practical, and carries much force, for it simply comes to this, that experience is a denial of the Fatherhood. One admires the Galilean dreamer with His Father-God, and His charming illustrations of the lilies and the birds, but this is an idyll, and life is real. What signs of paternal government can be found in the martyrdom of man from the first days of history to the last war, in the hideous sufferings of slavery or in the equal miseries of great cities? With such a record before one it is certainly open to argue that Jesus was too optimistic. Granted, but that does not close the question. With the record of His own life before one, it is not open to conclude Jesus was wrong. He drank the bitterest cup; He suffered the shamefullest death, and yet reconciled the incalculable tragedy of His life with the love of His Father. Jesus did not regard suffering as the contradiction of love; it was one of its methods. When Jesus said Father on the Cross, it may have been a pathetic delusion, but it was the delusion of Him who knew God best of the Race.

One joyfully anticipates the place this final idea of God

will have in the new theology. Criticism has cleared the ground and gathered its building materials. A certain conception of God must be the foundation and give shape to the whole structure. No one can seriously doubt that it will be the Fatherhood, and that Jesus' dearest thought will dominate theology. No doctrine of the former theology will be lost; all will be recarved and refaced to suit the new architecture. Sovereignty will remain, not that of a despot, but of a father; the Incarnation will not be an expedient, but a consummation; the Sacrifice will not be a satisfaction, but a reconciliation; the end of Grace will not be standing, but character; the object of punishment will not be retribution, but regeneration. Mercy and justice will no longer be antinomies; they will be aspects of Love, and the principle of human probation will be exchanged for the principle of human education.

One sees already the place which the Fatherhood will have in the new life into which the race in every land is entering. While piety imagined God as the Father of a few and the Judge of the rest, humanity was belittled and Pharisaism reigned: slavery was defended from the Bible, and missions were counted an impertinence. When He is recognised as the universal Father, and the outcasts of Humanity as His prodigal children, every effort of love will be stimulated, and the Kingdom of God will advance by leaps and bounds. As this sublime truth is believed, national animosities, social divisions, religious hatreds and inhuman doctrines will disappear. No class will regard itself as favoured: no class will feel itself rejected, for all men everywhere will be embraced in the mission of Jesus and the love of the Father.

JOHN WATSON.

THE TWENTY-THIRD PSALM.

THE twenty-third Psalm seems to break in two at the end of the fourth verse. The first four verses clearly reflect a pastoral scene; the fifth appears to carry us off, without warning or connection, to associations of an utterly different kind. This, however, is only in appearance. The last two verses are as pastoral as the first four. If these show us the shepherd with his sheep upon the pasture, those follow him, shepherd still, to where in his tent he dispenses the desert's rites of hospitality to some poor fugitive from blood. The psalm is thus, so far, a unity, even of metaphor. We shall see afterwards that it is also a spiritual unity; but at present let us summon up the landscape on which both of these features—the shepherd on his pasture and the shepherd in his tent—lie side by side, equal sacraments of the providence of God.

A Syrian, or an Arabian, pasture is very different from the narrow meadows and fenced hill-sides with which we are familiar. It is vast, and often virtually boundless. It has to be so, for by far the greater part of it is desert—that is, land not absolutely barren, but refreshed by rain for only a few months, and through the rest of the year abandoned to the pitiless sun that sucks all life out of the soil. It is thus, by no carelessness of speech, but on the regular tide of the seasons that the Hebrew word for *pasture* has drifted off into the meaning of *wilderness*, or *desert*.¹ The landscape is nearly all glare, monotonous levels or low ranges of hillocks, with as little character upon them as the waves of the sea, shimmering with mirage under a cloudless heaven. The bewildering monotony is broken by only two excep-

¹ מִדְבָּר from דָּבַר, to *range* or *drive forth* the flocks, becomes *wildland*, defined by Jer. ii. 2, as אֶרֶץ לֹא זָרְעָה, *land not sown*. Cities are said to be reduced to מִדְבָּר, Jer. xxii. 6 and the name is used especially for the Arabian desert and the wilderness of Judæa.

tions. Here and there the ground will be cleft by a deep ravine, which gapes in black contrast to the glare, and by its sudden darkness blinds the men and sheep that enter it to the beasts of prey which have their lairs in its recesses. But there are also hollows as gentle and lovely as the ravines are terrible, where water bubbles up and runs quietly between grassy banks under the open shade of trees.

On such a wilderness of mirage, illusive paths, lurking terrors, and infrequent spots of herbage, it is evident that the person and character of the shepherd must mean a great deal more to the sheep than they can possibly mean with us. With us, sheep left to themselves may be seen any day—in a field or on a hill-side with a far-travelling wire-fence to keep them from straying. But I do not remember ever to have seen in the East a flock of sheep without a shepherd. On such a landscape as I have described he is obviously indispensable. When you meet him there—“alone of all his reasoning kind,” armed, weather-beaten, vigilant, leaning on his staff, and looking out with eyes of care upon his scattered flock, their sole provision and defence, your heart leaps up to ask: Is there anywhere in all the world so dear a sacrament of life and peace as he?”

There is, and very near himself. As prominent a feature in the wilderness as the shepherd is the shepherd's tent. To our western eyes, a cluster of desert tents looks ugly enough—brown-black lumps often cast down anyhow, with a few loutish men lolling on the trampled sand in front of the doorways, that a man has to stoop uncomfortably to enter. But conceive there coming to these a man who is fugitive—fugitive across such a wilderness. Conceive a man fleeing for his life as Sisera fled when he sought the tent of Jael, the wife of Heber, the Kenite. To him, that space of trampled sand, with the ragged black mouths above it, mean not only food and rest, but dear life itself. There,

by the golden law of the desert's hospitality, he knows that he may eat in peace, that though his enemies come up to the very door, and his table be spread as it were in their presence, he need not flinch nor stint his heart of her security.

That was the landscape the Psalmist saw, and it seemed to him to reflect the mingled wildness and beauty of his own life.¹ To him human life was just this wilderness of terrible contrasts, where the light is so bright, but the shadows the darker and more treacherous; where the pasture is rich, but scattered in the wrinkles of vast deserts; where the paths are illusive, yet man's passion flies swift and straight to its revenge; where all is separation and disorder, yet law sweeps inexorable, and a man is hunted down to death by his bloodguiltiness. But not in any of those things is life more like the wilderness than in this, that it is the presence and character of One, which make all the difference to us who are its silly sheep; that it is His grace and hospitality which alone avail us when we awaken to the fact that our lives cannot be fully figured by those of sheep, for we are fugitives and in need of more than food—we are fugitives with the conscience and the habit of sin relentless on our track. These are both elements of the religious experience of man, just as the two figures which the Psalmist has used as their symbols, are both elements of the shepherd's life. The Psalm is a spiritual as well as a pictorial unity. And it is a poor exegesis and unworthy of its calling that is satisfied with the letter and the figures of the art it interprets, but makes no attempt to sound beneath them those tides of living experience, whose motion gives them all their array and sequence.

¹ It is unnecessary and even absurd to ask the question whether the Psalmist spoke of his individual experience, or in the name of the pious in Israel. It was both.

The Lord is my Shepherd: or—as the Greek, vibrating to the force of the original—*The Lord is shepherding me*; ¹ *I shall not want*. This is the theme of the first four verses. Before we enter into the details in which it is elaborated, a preliminary consideration is raised by its general character.

Every one feels that the psalm was written by a shepherd,² and the first thing that is obvious, of course, is that he has made his God after his own image. Now there are many in our day who sneer at that kind of theology—pretty, indeed, as the pearl or the tear, but like tear or pearl a natural and also a morbid deposit—a purely human process which, according to them, pretty well explains all religion; the result of man's instincts to see himself reflected on the cloud that bounds his view, man's honest but deluded effort to put himself in charge of the best part of himself, to fill the throne of an imaginary heaven with an impossible exaggeration of his own virtues.

But it is far better to hold with Jesus Christ than with such reasoners. Jesus Christ tells us that a man cannot be wrong if he argues towards God from what he finds best in himself. *If ye then being evil, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask it. What man of you having an hundred sheep doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost until he find it? Either, what woman having ten pieces of silver, if she lose one piece, doth not light a candle and sweep the house and seek diligently till she find it. . . . Likewise, say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.*

¹ ποιμαίνει με. The original is not a noun, but the present participle of the verb, רָעָה.

² Or, which comes to the same thing, has risen out of the heart of a shepherd people.

That is a true witness, and strikes its Amen out of every chord of our hearts. The Power so evident in nature that He needs no proof, the Being so far beyond us in wisdom and in might, must also be our great superior in every quality which is more excellent than might. With thoughts more sleepless than our thoughts, as the sun is more constant than our lamps; with a heart that steadfastly cares for us, as we fitfully care for one another; more kingly than our noblest king, more fatherly than our fondest fatherhood, of deeper, truer compassion than ever mother poured upon us, whom, when a man feels that the highest thing in life is to be a shepherd, he calls his Shepherd, and knows that as the shepherd, *whose the sheep are*, shrinks not to seek one of his lost at risk of limb or life, so his God cannot be less in readiness of love or in utterness of self-sacrifice. That is the faith of strong and unselfish men all down the ages. And its strength is this, that it is no mere conclusion of logic, but the inevitable and increasing result of duty done and love kept pure—of fatherhood and motherhood and friendship faithfully fulfilled. One remembers how Browning has put it in the mouth of David when he has done all he can do for "Saul," and is helpless:

Do I find love so full in my nature, God's ultimate gift,
That I doubt His own love can compete with it? . . .
Would I fain in my impotent yearning do all for this man;
And dare doubt he alone shall not help him, who yet alone can?

Could I wrestle to raise him from sorrow, grow poor to enrich,
To fill up his life, starve my own out, I would—knowing which
I know that my service is perfect. Oh, speak through me now!
Would I suffer for him that I love? So wouldst thou—so wilt thou!

Thus have felt and known the unselfish of all ages. It is not only from their depths, but still more from their topmost heights—heaven still how far!—that men cry out and say, *There is a rock higher than I!* God is stronger than

their strength, more loving than their uttermost love, and in so far as they have loved and sacrificed themselves for others, they have obtained the infallible proof that God too lives, and loves, and gives Himself away. Nothing can shake that faith, for it rests on the best instincts of our nature, and is the crown of all duty faithfully done. He was no hireling herdsman who wrote those verses, but one whose heart was in his work, who did justly by it, magnifying his office, and who never scamped it, else had he not dared to call his God a shepherd. And so in every relation of life. While insincerity and unfaithfulness to duty mean nothing less than loss of the clearness and sureness of our faith in God, duty nobly done, love to the uttermost, are witnesses to the love and ceaseless care of God, witnesses which grow more convincing every day.

The second, third, and fourth verses give us the details. Each of them is taken exactly from the shepherd's custom, and applied without interpretation to the care of man's soul by God. *He maketh me lie down*—the verb is to bring the flocks to fold or couch—in pastures of green grass—the young fresh grass of springtime.¹ *By waters of rest He refresheth me.*²

This last verb is difficult to render in English; its original meaning was evidently to guide the flock to drink, from which it came to have the more general force of sustaining or nourishing, *My soul He restoreth*—bringeth back again from death. *He leadeth me in paths of righteousness for His name's sake*, not necessarily straight paths, but paths that fulfil the function of paths and lead to somewhere, unlike most desert tracts which spring up, tempt your feet for a little, and then disappear. *Yea, though I walk in a valley*

¹ נֶשֶׁת as distinguished both from dried grass cut for fodder, and from the larger herbs and cereals. Dethē, the equivalent of נֶשֶׁת in the southern Arabic dialects, means springtime.

² LXX. ἐπὶ ὕδατος ἀναπαύσεως ἐξεθρέψε με.

of deep darkness, I will fear no evil, for Thou art with me. Thy rod and Thy staff are not synonymous, for even the shepherd of to-day, though often armed with a gun, carries two instruments of wood, his great oak club, thick enough to brain a wild beast, and his staff to lean upon or to touch his sheep with, while the ancient shepherd without firearms would surely still more require both. *They will comfort me*—a very beautiful verb, the literal meaning of which is to help another, choked with grief or fear, to breathe freely, and give his heart air.

These simple figures applied thus lyrically to the conduct of the soul by God require no interpretation. Who cannot read into them, from his own experience, more than any other can direct him to find? Only, perhaps, on two points is a word required. *Righteousness* has no theological meaning. The psalmist, as the above exposition has stated, is thinking of such desert paths as have an end and goal, to which they faultlessly lead the traveller: and the analogy of these in God's care of man is not the experience of justification and forgiveness,¹ but the wider assurance that he who follows the will of God walks not in vain, that in the end he arrives, that all God's paths lead onward and lead home. And this thought is clinched with an expression which would not have the same force if righteousness were taken in a theological sense: *for His name's sake*. No being has the right to the name of guide or shepherd unless the paths, by which he takes the flock, do bring them forward to their pasture and their rest. The other ambiguous point is the *vale of deep darkness*. As is well known, the letters of the word may be made to spell *shadow of death*; but the other way of taking them is the more probable. This, however, need not lead us away from the associations with which the old translation has invested them. It is not only darkness that the poet is describing, but the dark-

¹ So commentators from Jerome downwards.

ness where death lurks for the poor sheep,—the gorges, in whose deep shadows are the lairs of wild beasts, and the shepherd and his club are needed. It is thus every dismal and deadly passage through which the soul can pass, and, most of all, it is the valley of the shadow of death itself. There God is with a man no less than by the waters of repose, or along the successful paths of active life. Was He able to recover the soul from life's wayside weariness and hunger?—He will equally defend and keep it in life's deadliest dangers.

Up to this point the simple figures of the sheep with their shepherd have satisfied the poet in his song of human life under God's guidance. But now other thoughts of life, other needs of man, appear to have visited him. It might have seemed as if the soul's experience of God had reached its climax in the fourth verse. What higher glory is there than to feel God's presence in the hour of life's most awful dangers, and of death the awfulest of them all? Yet man is no mere sheep that is turned easily with the staff, that has no need but of rest and food, that has no fear but of pain and death! How can a sheep figure human life? Man's life is no mere wandering and search for grass; it is a being searched. It is not all a following; most of it is a flight. Not the future do we chiefly shrink from, even though death lurk in the shadows. What we most fear, if we are awake and honest, is the past. The past is on our track and hunts us down. We need more than guidance, we need grace.

I cannot but feel that if we are to read this psalm, not of the national fortunes of Israel, but of the religious experience of the pious in Israel, we must suppose that it was by some such thought the psalmist was visited when he did not close the Psalm with the fourth verse. He added the other two because he knew that weariness and death are never the last enemies of men, nor the future the true

man's only fear. He remembered the inexorableness of the past; he remembered that bloodguiltiness, which sheep never feel, is worse to men than death. As perchance one day he lifted his eyes from his sheep and saw a fugitive from the avenger of blood crossing the plain, while his sheep scattered right and left before this wild intruder into their quiet world; so he felt his fair and gentle thoughts within him scattered by the visitation of his past; so he felt how rudely law breaks through our pious fancies, and must be dealt with before their peace can be secure; so he felt, as every true man has felt with him, that the religion, however bright and brave, which takes no account of sin, is the religion which has not a last nor a highest word for life.

Consider this system of blood-revenge. It was the one element of law in the lawless life of the desert. Everything else in the wilderness was fitful and uncertain, everything else might swerve and wander. This alone persisted and was infallible. It crossed the world; it lasted through generations. The fear of it never died down in the heart of the hunted man, nor the duty of it in the heart of the hunter. The holiest sanctions confirmed it, the safety of society, the honour of the family, love for the dead. And yet, from this endless process, that hunted a man like conscience, a shelter was found in the custom of Eastern hospitality, the "golden piety of the wilderness" as it has been called, by which every wanderer, whatever his character or his past might be, was received as the "guest of God"—such is the beautiful name they give him to this day—and kept inviolate, and furnished with rest and food, his host becoming responsible for his safety.

Now that the psalmist had this custom in his view, when composing the last two verses of the Psalm, is plain from the phrase with which these open: *thou spreadest before me a table in the very face of mine enemies*, and

perhaps also from the unusual metaphor in verse six : *surely goodness and mercy shall follow, or pursue me, all the days of my life.*

And even though those were right (which I do not admit) who interpret the enemies and pursuers as the human foes and persecutors of the pious, it is plain that to us using the psalm this interpretation will not suffice. How can we speak of this custom of blood-revenge, and think only of our material foes? If we know ourselves, and if our conscience be quick, if we be faithfully reading our past, then of all our experiences there is surely but one which suits this figure of blood-revenge, when and wheresoever in the Old Testament it is applied to man's spiritual life. So only do the conscience and the habit of sin pursue a man. Our real enemies are not of our opponents, our adversities, our cares and pains—these our enemies! Better comrades, better guides, better masters no man ever had. Our enemies are our evil deeds and their memories, our pride, our selfishness, our malice, our passions, which by conscience and by habit pursue us with a relentlessness and a cruelty past the power of figure to express. We know how they persist from youth unto the grave; *the sting of death is sin.* We know what they want: nothing less than ourselves, our whole character and will. *Simon, Simon,* said Christ to a soul on the edge of a great temptation, *Satan hath asked you back again for himself.*

Yet it is the abounding message of the whole Bible, of which our twenty-third Psalm is but a small fragment, that for this conscience and this habit of sin God hath made provision, even as sure as those thoughts of His guidance, which refresh us in the heat of life and comfort us amidst the shadows. In Nature? Yes; for there too the goodness of God leadeth to repentance. There is nothing which the fifth verse so readily brings to mind as the grace of the Divine hospitality in nature. *Thou preparest a table for me*

in the presence of mine enemies. How these words contrast the fever and uncertain battle of our life with the calmness and surety of the Divine order ! Through the cross currents of human strife, fretted and sullied, the tides of nature keep their steady course, and rise to their invariable margins. The seasons come up undisturbed by crime and war. Spring creeps even into the beleaguered city ; through the tents of the besiegers, across trench and scarp, among the wheels of the cannon, and over the graves of the dead, grass and wild flowers speed, spreading God's table. He sendeth His rain upon the just and the unjust. And even here the display is not merely natural nor spread only in the sight of our physical enemies ; but God's goodness leadeth to repentance, and even for deliverance from sin is Nature bestowed. Who has come out upon a great landscape, who has looked across the sea lying under the sun, who has lifted his eyes to the hills and felt the winds of God blowing off their snows, who has heard earth's countless voices of praise rising heavenwards, but has spoken to himself, saying : " What a wide place this world is for repentance ! " Man does find in Nature deliverance from himself, oblivion of his past, peace and purity ! And yet the provision, though real, is little more than temporary. The herdsmen of the desert are not obliged to furnish to their fugitive guest shelter for more than two nights with the day between. Little more than two nights with the day between is the respite from conscience and habit which Nature provides for the sinful heart. She is the millionfold opportunity of repentance ; she is not the final or everlasting grace of God. And, therefore, whatever may have been the original intention of our Psalmist, the spiritual feeling of the Church ever since has understood his words as in the last two verses of that mercy and forgiveness of our God which was spoken articulately to men by the mouth of the prophets, but reached the fulness of its proclamation and

proof in Jesus Christ. He who took the throbbing heart, which beats in the first four verses, and laid it on His bosom, saying, "Thou art right, I am the Good Shepherd," so that since He walked on earth the name is no more a mere metaphor of God, but the clearest, strongest reality that has ever visited this world of shadows—He also has been proved by men as the Host and Defender of all who seek His aid from the memory and the pursuit of sin. So He received them in the days of His flesh, as they drifted upon Him across the wilderness of life, pressed by every evil that it is possible for sin to bring upon us. To Him they were all "guests of God," welcomed for His sake, irrespective of what their past might have been. And so, being lifted up, He still draws them to Himself, and still proves Himself able to come between them and their past. Whatever they may flee from He keeps it away, so that, although to the last for penitence they may be reminded of their sins, and their enemies come up again and again to the open door of memory,—in Him they are secure. He is their defence, and their peace is impregnable.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

GOD'S CALL TO SELF-POSSESSION.

NAPOLÉON the Third is said to have shown traces of a peculiar power, which may perhaps be described as the exact converse of that personal magnetism by which some leaders inspire and exalt their allies. His presence seemed to lower for the time being the vitality and intelligence of those who came into contact with him, and so acted as to destroy their self-possession. By some occult spell thrown over them, he could disturb their recollectedness, and so empty them of

their power that it was impossible for them to be at their best in his company. If that strange man had really such a gift, and set himself to exercise it, the motive could only have been selfish, inhuman, flagrantly wicked. Some men, laying no claim to occult endowments of any kind, do nevertheless delight to bear down, overawe, and paralyse all possible rivals, and we apply to them one of the most contemptuous epithets in the language. Animated by envy, the lust of dominion, assertive egotism, they take a sinister pleasure in obtruding their power and parading their superior audacity. There is a despotism of the will and the brain and the tongue just as unholy and ungracious as the despotism of the irresponsible autocrat who tramples upon the bodies and material interests of those subject to his sway.

Such tempers and methods must ever be inconsistent with true virtue and benevolence of character. The man who is great by gift, or office, or opportunity, and at the same time unfeignedly good, will shrink back at the idea of incapacitating by occult terrorism those who come within the field of his influence. He will wish them to employ their powers to the best possible advantage for the common weal, and to this end will seek to put them at their ease, to encourage them to intellectual self-command, to build them up, and not to cast them down.

Such is the character of God. The vision of His presence and power is not meant to permanently depress and overawe and paralyse. His glory is overwhelming, but it is not His will to annihilate reason and all that constitutes personality by the manifestations of His majesty. As in the cases of Job, Ezekiel, and John in Patmos, He calls His servants to dignified self-possession, to collected reasonableness, to quiet, unfluttered thought and deliberation in His presence.

Self-possession is necessary for the highest forms of inter-

course with God, as well as for that service of God amongst men for which such intercourse qualifies. The Divine service is essentially reasonable, establishing its sanctions through an appeal to the reason, and achieving its ends by the instrumentality of the reason.

A man cannot be an intelligent recipient of the Divine Revelation till he has made some little progress in the art of self-possession. Now and again God makes Himself known in vivid and stupendous ways which smite mortals with fear and trembling. For the time being, He strips them of their manliness. As He suddenly discovers Himself to their perceptions they seem to be plunged into an atmosphere in which it is all but impossible to breathe. Some such sensation afflicts them as though they had been placed under the receiver of an air-pump and all that which vitalizes the mental consciousness were being slowly sucked away from them. The characteristic attributes of the personality are numbed, stifled, half destroyed, and the man who is the subject of these manifestations might well think himself in the throes of a process intended to dissolve the elements which make up the unity of his being, and merge him irrecoverably into the terrible Infinite. Now this paralyzing sense of the supernatural which seems almost to threaten the obliteration of the individual is only temporary. God does not wish to subtract anything from the personality or to make us less than that which He created us to be. It can be no part of His design to sink us below the stature of our full manhood and to make us grovel in His presence, just as the subjects of some eastern kings upon appearing before the throne are expected to drop, like quadrupeds, upon all fours. This putting forth of His subduing power and splendour both upon contumacious sinners and saints whose obedience is deteriorated by reservations, has its urgent needs-be. It

arrests men in their headstrong sin, it tames the soul to completer harmony with God's nature and demand, it touches sleeping fibres of faith and reverence in their being which have escaped quickening in the superficial processes of bygone years. But after all the only thing God wants to draw out of the personality, is the taint of selfishness, affinity for wrong, soft complaisance towards transgression. Indeed it is the sin latent in us which produces collapse before His presence, and when that is gone serene self-possession is recovered. He does not wish to blight or restrain and reduce a single constituent in the sum total of a man's identity. His first word after laying low the turbulent transgressor or overwhelming with His glory the imperfect and half-hearted servant, is the word that calls us to our feet and bids us be ourselves.

This lack of quiet self-possession is sometimes the reason why stricken, conquered, storm-tossed souls cannot enter into the quiet of saving faith. A temptation to keep back the obedient response to God's solicitation of human confidence may come in two opposite ways. Many a man persuades himself that his heart is not sufficiently stirred to be able to exercise the faith that will save him. He is too cool, too much master of himself, too deliberate and calculating and self-possessed in his moods. The psychological atmosphere, he is tempted to think, is far too commonplace. And, on the other hand, those most profoundly wrought upon, most overpowered by a sense of their guilt and of the Divine holiness, exercised to the point of distraction by some force which has fixed itself within their emotions, find it is very difficult to collect their minds into an intelligent and purposeful effort of faith. Their natures are almost stupefied by the mighty supernatural arrest that has come to them. They feel as most people feel after some sudden and tragic trouble has burst over their heads, as though they were made of stone. The

power of thought and emotion seems to have been frozen up or has almost passed away. They cannot collect themselves for what is demanded at their hands. They are prostrate, inert through the excess of feeling, "all of a heap," as the familiar and homely phrase puts it. Saul, the blinded persecutor, must have been in some such condition as he lay prone at the gate of Damascus, for he could not then and there put forth the faith by which he was healed, built up, sanctified. Time and opportunity must be allowed for the mind to assert itself, a space for rest and mental recuperation, meet occasion for the powers to collect themselves again and to act. God cannot breathe faith into a purely passive soul, or a soul exhausted by the excess of its own emotion. The nature prostrate and helpless through overwhelming conviction must be brought out of its paralysing amazement. Faith is an act which demands collectedness of mind, a rational and reflective attitude, modest self-possession. Overwhelming emotion may sometimes precede and may often follow conversion, but the critical moment of faith is a moment of quiet and intelligent endeavour. True it is that faith is God's gift, but the hand that receives is not the hand which is clutched with terror or folded in sleep, but the hand which is heedfully and unfalteringly held out. God can no more put faith into a nature paralysed by the excess of its own emotion, than He can put faith into a nature dead in trespasses whilst it continues dead. There must be quiet, collected, steady-eyed vigilance.

Whilst reverence in God's presence is a duty from which there can be no release, that sacred emotion of the soul is not intended to dumbfound and transfix us, however mighty the revelations to which it is a tribute. Indeed, the reverence that is allied to helplessness and imperfect perception is manifestly a sentiment of inferior quality. The man brings some kind of reproach upon himself who wishes to

dazzle the supporters he is rallying to his side. He confesses his own meagre endowment in the power to captivate, who seeks to lull his admirers into dreaminess, or fascinate them into stupor and so disarm their judgments. The Commander-in-Chief of an army, who plots to drug the battalions of his opponents, admits thereby the weakness of his own fighting forces. He is not able to measure himself against his adversaries under normal conditions. If, as God comes forth to conquer us, His revelations put the larger part of our mental life to sleep, or obscure a single faculty or perception, that would be practically a confession of weakness. It would imply He has not adequate moral and spiritual reserve force wherewith to subdue our souls into adoration of His attributes and homage to His great behests. The first flash of His presence may affright, stupefy, half blind; but that is because we have been such atheists in the past and have accustomed ourselves to live without the sense of His presence. By-and-by all the powers of the nature will rise up to receive Him in the vast totality of His greatness and splendour. When God sees fit to disclose His majesty and abash our pride, He does not intend to permanently weaken, discourage, paralyse. That would be to surround Himself with worshippers of meaner capacity and servants of inferior fitness for His tasks. He has nothing in common with those barbarian kings, who fancy dwarfs, deaf-mutes and shrivelled monstrosities for their pages, and who make their courts spectacles of deformity and mutilation. Alike for the honour and glory of His own name, the quality of the love which He wishes to attract to His person, and the prosperity of the work to which He designates us, he desires to call forth, train, and perfect the maximum powers that are in us.

The largest and the loftiest service of God is that which is rational in the best sense of the word. Those disclosures of His being, character and operation which God will

make both in this life and in that which is to come, are intended to stimulate and not to depress that group of faculties of which the brain is the symbol. Is it likely that God by His breath would create this subtle mechanism of thought within us for the gross, mercenary ends of our physical life, and then when we pass to the confines of a nobler destiny wreck the mechanism by the impact of His unmeasured revelations, or throw it out of working gear by the fierce untempered pressure of His terrible presence? He has created us all that which we find ourselves, so that we may be better able to comprehend Him than beings less richly endowed, and we cannot think that this special capacity will be overwhelmed and destroyed as soon as the goal comes into view. At the zenith of his development, man can pay his Maker a loftier tribute than bird or beast or flower, and it is incredible that the Maker should wish to take us permanently back a single step towards lower levels of intelligence by suspending the operations of any of our faculties as a sign even of His superior grandeur. Every mental power must be healthy, well mastered, on the alert, so that we lose nothing from His many-sided revelations. God is more honoured by the praise of a wakeful, active-minded congregation, than by the praise of a solitary worshipper or two whilst the rest are asleep. The soul is an assembly of faculties whose operations blend into each other, and God is most worthily extolled and glorified when the congregation of faculties within us is alive, conscious, operative rather than dazed by a mood compounded of wonder and fear in which consciousness is all but lost. We cannot apprehend God and assimilate His truth and life in states of feeling which are partly trance conditions. The highest intercourse with God attainable by a human soul is that in which the soul is perfectly self-possessed and competent to command its own powers and apply its own discernments.

Men may come into mental states in which we describe them as possessed,—possessed either by the Spirit of God for good or by an unclean spirit for evil. But possession represents only a half-way stage towards a final goal of holiness or sin. There is something worse than devil-possession before the wicked man; it is the state in which he has become master of himself for evil, and brings his entire nature into play to promote what is bad without the prompting or instigation of an associated mind. And there is perhaps something higher than being possessed by a Divine afflatus for good; it is the state in which a man has become master over himself for what is noble, and quietly and thoughtfully uses the entire group of his disciplined powers for the apprehension of God and the setting forth of His will to others. Perhaps that may never be reached in this life, or reached only as the consummation of its gracious training. In possession both for evil and for good the personality becomes more or less veiled, overshadowed, suppressed.

The manifestation of majesty that confounds and permanently disables by its intenseness unfits for the truest and most comprehensive communion with God. Vivid theophanies may have overwhelmed for an instant saints of peculiar privilege, and plunged them into self-forgetting transports, but it has been in the Divine order that the highest powers of the mind should come to assert themselves again; and the unutterable and awe-struck experiences of the great Jehovah's presence issued at last in making those who received them more royally masters of themselves, and their own spiritual resources.

In our own, as well as in earlier times, Christianity has fallen under the influence of those Oriental philosophies which assume that the basis of human personality is evil, and its duration fleeting, and that reabsorption into the infinite and universal life is the goal of all aspiration and

progress. Preachers who are more eclectic than profound, sometimes deny a physical resurrection, speak ambiguously about the permanence of the individual consciousness, and half imply that in the end we shall be taken back into the Divine, and be as indistinguishably lost there as we were before our creation. If immortality is affirmed at all, it is affirmed as an attribute of the race rather than of its members, of the power which moulds universal life rather than as the property of those who embody the mystery of life for a season, and then vanish away. Such theories suggest a universe presided over by the spider which sucks the vital juices out of its victims and leaves fragments of legs and glittering wing-cases to decorate its web. The idea seems to be that the infinite cannot tolerate the finite, that it is always thirsting to draw all the properties, and attributes of manhood out of us, and that it will leave at last the mere husk and shell of a forgotten personality behind, to bleach in the wind, or not even that. The infinite is painted as though it were the giant of old, who devoured his own children, a dark bottomless whirlpool of fury, drawing into its vortex all created life. Such a view credits God with predatory instincts rather than pays Him the glory of His own absolute and eternal love. No father wishes to see the personalities of his children effaced, and to find them reach the height of their destiny in an apotheosis of absorption would be a prospect the heart of parental love could not contemplate without dismay. God wishes to take nothing but the folly, defect and evil out of our personalities.

In Christ's high-priestly prayer we find the charter which pledges the permanence of all those elements which constitute personality. His relation to the Father which presupposed the essentials of personality was to be the standard looked to in the perfecting of the disciples. "As Thou Father art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may

be one in Us." Our Lord's union with the Father was not of such a character as to lead Him to think of Himself as the Father rather than the Son. Whatever else was common between the Son and His Father, consciousness was differentiated and personal. Love would have been impossible apart from this bifurcation of consciousness or would have assumed the form of self-love, which after all is the negation of love and mere selfishness of a more or less refined quality. The branch which is grafted into the stock of a tree still produces its own specific flowers in spite of its union with the tree, and produces them more nobly because of the reinforcement of life it receives from the tree. Our Lord's union with His Father, accentuated rather than obscured the properties of His personality. The outburst of glory on the holy mount which dazed the disciples and made them heavy with sleep awoke Christ's faculties into keener consciousness and finer energy. He was in His eternal environment and all the elements of His life were vastly quickened. The Father was ever dwelling in the Son, but the personality of the Father was not lost in the mystery of intercommunion, and the Son was ever dwelling in the Father, but He remained a perfectly conscious and clearly defined Son, and His personality was neither volatilised nor swallowed up by the mystic relation. The union which entirely absorbs makes *communion* a fixed impossibility. And His own age-long fellowship with the Father, Christ presents as the type and consummation of all human excellence and blessedness. We might as well speak of God losing Himself in man as of man losing his personal consciousness in God and never finding it again. Pantheism makes human personality a mere snow crystal which is to be dissolved in the sun, but in Christ's view it is more like the diamond which is brought into the sunbeam. No chemical change is set up which destroys the diamond ; on the contrary new proper-

ties are shown in both stone and sun by the juxtaposition of the two, and there is no trace of absorption on either side. The stone does not entomb the sunbeam nor does the sunbeam disintegrate and dissolve the stone.

Ages await us in which the revelations of God will far transcend the grandest disclosures of the past; but even then these revelations will be attempered to our capacity to receive and assimilate. Man's intellectual grasp, far from being overstrained and palsied by the strange secrets of the future, will only be stimulated and enlarged. The manifestations of glory which await us are sometimes so described as though they were designed to smite men into petrifications of awe, to put upon the nature a weight of solemnity that will render it entirely passive, to dispossess the intellect of that which makes it kingly and invests it for royal priesthood, and weaken, if not destroy, all the elements of personal consciousness and self-possession. Now He who spake to Moses face to face, and who assuaged the fears of John when he was smitten by a countenance which eclipsed the sun shining in his strength, and who told the prophet Ezekiel to lift himself up to the full height of his manhood, so that he might learn his supreme lesson and receive his commission direct from the lips of the Most High Himself, will say to us as we lie oppressed by the solemn and weighty revelations which will burst upon us at our emancipation from the senses and sense-elements, "Stand upon thy feet, and I will speak unto thee."

We are not children of the mist, freaks of cloud-scape, broken shadows, iridescent vapours whose destiny it is to confront the sunlight and be irretrievably dissolved. In the maturity of an all-round, unshrinking, indefectible personality, we shall be summoned into the presence of His glory to quietly receive the nobler teaching of the hereafter. He will call us to lift ourselves up to the full measure of the stature of our perfected manhood so that we may be

fit to receive truths which for the present are unutterable. He will need a personality symmetrical, uncrippled, royally upright and complete to address in the new communion of relationship into which He will call us. He will ask us then to be self-possessed, and He is teaching us the alphabet of that duty now.

T. G. SELBY.

PROFESSOR G. A. SMITH'S "HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY OF THE HOLY LAND."

IN venturing to write a review of Prof. G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*, I feel somewhat like "the man in the street" attempting to criticise a work of fine scholarship. But the wish that I should do so has been expressed by those whom I am unwilling to disappoint; and perhaps the impression made by the book on a bystander who is interested in the game of Old Testament study, though not himself able to play, may possess some slight interest, and warrant the following paragraphs in appearing before the public. Besides having myself studied with some minuteness the *Historical Geography* of another part of Western Asia, I have had the advantage of frequently talking about the early history of the Hebrew people with my friend Prof. Robertson Smith, and of reading under his guidance in 1878 everything that he thought most valuable on the criticism and interpretation of the Mosaic books and the historical books of the Old Testament—a long piece of work which afterwards proved a most valuable education for the problems that face the historical investigator in Asia Minor. Naturally, after such a course as was marked out by Robertson Smith, one retains a permanent interest in the subject; and this interest has made me welcome most heartily a book which

attacks that fascinating problem in a new way, bringing new methods of analysis to the investigation, and applying them with a union of boldness and caution and free, wide view that is most refreshing after the niggling way in which many of the recent investigations about Asia Minor (over which I have had to spend too much time) are composed. Here we have an investigator who sets himself to master the problem as a whole, who tries to conceive clearly the general disposition and character of the land about which he is to treat, to view it always in association with man and with history, and to understand the interrelation of its parts, and then proceeds to take his readers along the same path that he has trod. He has seen the places with the reconstructive eye and the warm, creative imagination of the historian; he has inhaled the atmosphere with the love and enthusiasm that breathe through his pages, and make the reader fancy that he can catch the same breath.

A writer on Historical Geography could get nowhere else so favourable a field as Prof. G. A. Smith has found. Not only does an eternal interest cling to it; it is also a land of singularly well-marked features, easy to understand and easy to bring home to the reader's understanding; and further, it is a small land, which can be pictured with that breadth and fulness of treatment that are necessary to make the scenes and facts live before the reader—and yet within reasonable compass. And, having a good subject, the author uses his advantage to the full, giving us a book which is of the first importance as opening up a fresh path of study. It applies the modern methods of united historical and geographical investigation to the department where prepossessions and inherited prejudices were strongest, and where methods too purely literary absorbed the energy of the more free and unprejudiced scholars. It applies them, too, with a spirit of free, lofty, and generous enthusiasm, that makes it fascinating from the first to the

last page. It is, of course, far from completing its task; it is really only the first opening up of what will hereafter prove a fruitful field of study. No one appreciates that fact better than Prof. Smith himself; and when the critic tries to estimate the future that is opened up before us by this book—in other words, the problems that it leaves unattempted or unsolved,—he feels that the author himself would be best able to look out over the vista in front.

There remain many sites which have to be localized much more precisely before the full bearing of the incidents connected with them becomes plain. This important part of the subject Prof. Smith has avoided—wisely and rightly for his immediate purpose—but it must be faced hereafter either by him or by others. See, for example, pp. 221-2, where Prof. Smith brings out very clearly both the local character and vividness of the tale of Samson, and also the obscurity in which it must remain involved until the localities are more fully identified.

Book II., Western Palestine, nearly 400 pages in length, is the main part of the volume, and shows Prof. Smith at his best. He is most familiar with this part of the country, and he has put forth all his strength on the elucidation of the many incidents which he has to introduce. Every page, almost, seems more interesting than the preceding; one must go through it steadily with the map and the authorities by one's side in order to appreciate the character of the book. The only criticism which one can make on it in reasonable compass is—read it.

Book III., on Eastern Palestine, seemed to me less satisfactory than any other part of the book. The questions which have to be treated here are not so purely Hebrew, but take us into a wider range of history. Perhaps it is due to the necessity of bringing the book, already a long one, to an end; perhaps it arises from the fact that much of the history of the East country appeals to a different class

of readers; but the treatment as a whole is thinner in this part; the subject has not naturally the same interest as that of Book II., and is, I think, not handled with so sure a touch as the main part of the work. To take one example: there are on p. 635 several statements from which I must express dissent. Prof. Smith is here giving examples of the difference of tone between Christian and pagan epitaphs in the Hauran; and contrasts the hopelessness of the latter with the "quiet confidence" of the former. Such a contrast is often obvious in literature; but I doubt whether it can fairly be traced in the epitaphs of either the Hauran or of Asia Minor.

He says "καὶ σὺ, Even thou, is a common *memento mori*." I have always thought that this is the supposed reply of the deceased to the greeting presumed to be uttered by the passer-by; it occurs sometimes in the fully expressed form, χαῖρε χαῖρε καὶ σὺ, *i.e.* "Farewell," "Fare-thou-well also." Again we read that "'thou hast finished' is a common epitaph." But the verb τελευτάω had come to be used regularly in the sense of "to die" from the fifth century B.C. downwards.; and no such connotation as Prof. Smith supposes could, I think, have been present to the epitaph-writers of the Hauran. Hence the epitaph which he next quotes must be translated "Titus, Malchus' son, farewell! Thou hast died ere thy prime (at the age) of twelve years—Farewell." The last word is the reply of Titus to the greeting, and the epitaph is far from favouring the contrast which Prof. Smith draws. Still less do his next examples support his case: "the dead are told that theirs is the inevitable fate, no one is immortal." But the formula on which he relies, οὐδείς ἀθάνατος, is, as I believe, Christian, and not, as Prof. Smith argues, pagan. Once or twice it occurs in doubtful cases, but Waddington 2032, 2050, and Ewing 163,¹ are epitaphs containing the common and

¹ Mr. Ewing's inscriptions will be published in the ensuing *Quarterly State-*

typical Christian formula, *ἐνθάδε κείται*, Here lies—; while Waddington 2459 is, as the editor remarks, clearly Christian (being one of the most interesting Christian epitaphs of Eastern Palestine, belonging probably to the third century, and being engraved while Christian formulæ were still fluid, and had not yet become fixed and stereotyped). Waddington 1897 is also almost certainly Christian; the name Domitilla is one of the most interesting of early Christian names. The formula *θάρασει*, Be of good cheer, which often precedes *οὐδεις ἀθάνατος*, would alone be sufficient to mark the whole as Christian, and to show that the hopelessness which Prof. Smith finds in the phrase is not really there: the precise sense in which it is to be taken is probably "no one is free from death," rather than, as he maintains, "no one is immortal."¹ It is quite probable that the phrase was adopted from pagan epitaphs by the Christians, as many other forms were, but most of the cases in which it occurs are clearly Christian, and the contrast which Prof. Smith founds on it cannot be maintained.

In another interesting little inscription, mentioned on the same page, Prof. Smith restores *μετὰ πάντα τά(φος)*, After all things a tomb; but on the analogy of common formulæ, such as *ὁ βίος ταῦτα*, Life is—this, I should prefer *μετὰ πάντα τα(ῦτα)*, After all—this.²

I have dwelt on this page at some length, because the line of demarcation between Christian and non-Christian epitaphs is a very delicate one, and there is no point in

ment of the Palestine Exploration Fund by Mr. A. A. G. Wright and Mr. A. Souter, two of my recent pupils in Aberdeen.

¹ In n. 4 he quotes Wadd. 1986 as pagan, but Waddington considers it as Christian (in my opinion rightly). In n. 5 "Wadd. 2429" seems to be a wrong reference.

² An excellent parallel in thought and in expression occurs in an inscription of the Phrygian Hierapolis, which seems to Waddington No. 1687 (as well as to myself) to be Christian, *εἰδὼς ὅτι τὸ τέλος ὑμῶν τοῦ βίου ταῦτα*. It is given more accurately in many points as No. 28 in my forthcoming *Local History of Phrygia*.

antiquity on which more mistakes are made, while it is of peculiar interest and even of importance to notice the gradual steps by which the Christians separated themselves from the customs and ways of ordinary society around them, and created a code of manners and forms distinctive of themselves.¹

Perhaps some readers may find the discussion of general principles contained in Book I., The Land as a Whole, the least interesting part of this fascinating volume; but for my own part, it appeals to me with almost greater interest than Books II. or III. The descriptive part of Book I. is luminous and most successful, but I confess to being rather disappointed with the general reflections on the bearing which Historical Geography has on the criticism of the Hebrew authorities. These are rather vaguely and slightly indicated; they seem to express the general ideas with which one might approach the subject for the first time rather than the cream of the results which one gathers from the doing of the work; and I should imagine that chapter v., in which they are contained, was written before Book II., and did not spring from a mind filled with the facts and the method applied in that part.

The first four chapters of Book I. deal with "the place of Syria in the world's history," and with the form, climate, and scenery of the land; and, finally, chapter vi. places the reader at two points of view from which to acquire a general idea of the effect produced by the characteristics described in the preceding chapters, viz., on the deck of a steamer² and on the top of Mount Ebal beside Shechem. The relation of Arabia to Syria (including Palestine) and of

¹ I notice also that on p. 544 Prof. Smith remarks that Tacitus (whom I had quoted on my side in a discussion of the name *Ituræi*) is against me: he must have made some mistake, for the MSS. and all good editions are with me.

² On p. 119 there is a harshness of expression. The steamer is sailing *north* from Jaffa, but the places seen are enumerated as going south. Should we read *south* for *north*?

Syria to the outer world are set before us very suggestively in chapter i. The Arabian tribes, always in process of growing too numerous for their bare and barren land, are ever also in process of forcing themselves into the surrounding countries, sometimes in peaceful emigration, generally in the guise of marauders or conquerors; but of the four paths open to them, the path of Syria is the easiest, and the one most trodden by them throughout history. The frontier tribes of the Arabian wilderness have been constantly pressing in on the fertile lands of Syria. So long as Syria has been held by strong, energetic rulers the nomads are kept back, or are allowed to enter only as peaceful emigrants or as useful mercenaries in the service of the Syrian Government; for, while their warlike and restless character makes them a terror to the settled Syrian peoples, who become steadily less fit for war by continuance of peace, it also makes them excellent soldiers to recruit the Syrian armies. Thus it is impossible for any Arabian tribe to continue very long a frontier-tribe; an unvarying law pushes on each in succession towards and over the frontier; and this constant immigration tends to invigorate the Syrian population and keep it from stagnating in Oriental peasant life. So the Hebrews forced their way into Canaan. So also the Ituræans, whom we first hear about in the late period when Chronicles was composed¹ as warring on the eastern frontier against Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, gradually forced their way on towards Anti-Lebanon (in the position where they are represented in the maps attached to Prof. Smith's work) and even penetrated in part across Anti-Lebanon into the fertile valley of "Hollow Syria," taking advantage of the disorganization caused by the decay of the Seleucid Empire after 190 B.C. Had

¹ While these wars are projected into a remoter period by the writer, it is probable that he took the name of this nomad tribe from the facts of his own time. The Septuagint reads *Ἰτροπαῖοι* in 1 Chron. v. 19.

not the Seleucid power been soon replaced by the strong hand of Rome, in all probability the Ituræi would have overrun Syria entirely, in pursuance of that eternal law of succession by which the effete dynasties and peoples of the East are swept away by fresh vigorous conquerors, a process which the support of Europe, propping up the worn-out stock of Turkish or Hindu or other dynasties, has sometimes stopped, always to the great detriment of their subjects.

There seems to be a curious and deep-seated variation between two different points of view as regards the religion and development of Israel. We read, *e.g.*, "Monotheism was born, not, as M. Renan says, in Arabia, but in Syria" (p. 113); and Prof. Smith goes on to argue that, as the character of Syria and its peoples is so opposed to monotheism, we are driven to "the belief that the monotheism which appeared upon it was ultimately due to direct super-human revelation." So also on p. 90, "those spiritual forces which, in spite of the opposition of nature, did create upon Syria the monotheistic creed of Israel."

Such passages as these are quite in accordance with that view of Hebrew history which sees in it a gradual rise towards a loftier and purer conception of God and of the Divine nature, as the people under the guidance of its prophets disengaged itself step by step from the grosser religion which was once shared by the Hebrews with the other Semitic races. On that theory it would be quite natural to assert positively that the Hebrew monotheism arose in Syria, not in Arabia. But alongside of this view, sometimes even in the same paragraph with it, we find another, which seems—so far as I can venture to judge—to be inconsistent with it, and to involve an opposite view of the character of Hebrew history, *viz.*, the traditional view that the lofty character of Hebrew religion was impressed on it, once for all, in Arabia, not in Syria, that

constant lapses from the purity of this religion occurred amid the seductions and temptations of Syrian surroundings, that the prophets resisted these lapses and recalled the people to the original purity of their faith, expounding and unfolding in detail the character of that faith, and applying it to each new political and social situation that arose, but not making it loftier or purer, for it was absolutely lofty and pure from the first. Take, for example, the words on page 89: “the conception of Israel’s early history which prevails in Deuteronomy, viz., that the nation suffered a declension from a pure and simple estate of life and religion to one which was gross and sensuous, from the worship of their own deity to the worship of many local gods, is justified in the main—I do not say in details, but in the main—by the geographical data, and by what we know to have been the influence of these at all periods in history.”

But, in truth, what are called the moderate critics seem all—in the rough judgment of ignorant outsiders, such as the present writer—to be involved in the same double point of view, and to be attempting to combine two different (and I would add irreconcilable) theories in their attitude towards the history of Israel. I am, of course, not speaking about the recognition of the composite nature of the law-books and the older class of historical records: those who do not recognise that fact occupy a position so diametrically opposite to mine that we can see nothing alike, and there can be no profitable discussion between us. But to those who recognise that fact there remains the further, and, I think, far more important question, viz., as to the relation between the various component parts of these books—one might say between the different *strata*, were it not that the very word *strata* implies and presupposes a settled opinion in regard to the question which is put before us for settlement. That question has been answered by almost all critics in one way,

viz., the relation between the components is one of time, and the differences between them are due to gradual development of religious feeling and organization in the nation. Those critics who carry out that principle logically and consistently form the extreme critical school; those who accept it but shrink with wise caution from the full consequences of their own position are the moderate critics. Professor Driver puts the point in his usual clear, well-defined, and unmistakable way, in his *Introduction*, page 80: "Can any one read the injunctions respecting sacrifices and feasts in Exodus xxiii. 14-19 beside those in P (Lev. i.-vii., Num. xxviii.-xxix., for instance), and not feel that some centuries must have intervened between the simplicity which marks the one and the minute specialization which is the mark of the other?" Any one who feels compelled to give to that question the answer that Dr. Driver desires is "making the assumption that the principle of the extreme critical school is right, though his natural practical sense makes him shrink from carrying it out with ruthless logic. Neither the wise statesman nor the wise scholar can permit himself to be thoroughly consistent in carrying into practice the one-sided and incomplete principles from which occasionally he does not shrink in their general form. It is a fair answer to Dr. Driver's question to say that other reasons besides lapse of time have been found sufficient to cause differences of this class,¹ and that no sufficient reasons have yet been brought forward to prove that no other cause except progressive

¹ For example, if in A.D. 1860 two able American statesmen, deep in practical politics, but of opposite parties, had been set separately to the task of formulating the principles of the American constitution, they would have produced very different books, at variance on many most fundamental points. Of course the many centuries of organized civilization that lay behind them would have forced on them a great amount of similarity in other points; whereas no causes existed to produce such similarity in the case of the Hebrew tribes, bringing with them, as we assume, a lofty religion and moral law, which none of them had fully comprehended and worked into their nature, much less developed into a practical working system of ritual and life.

development can account for the great difference which all of us wish to understand. I entertain no opinion on the point: I am merely seeking for information; and I do not find any one who faces fairly the question as a whole. All seem to me to start with their faces set determinedly towards one side of it alone.

When I say "no sufficient reasons" for the answer expected have been given as yet, it is necessary to except the thorough and "advanced" critics, whose position is quite logical and complete. They carry out thoroughly their view that a gradual, progressive, and perfectly natural development took place on the soil of Syria, and infer that those parts of the Hebrew documents which imply a declension from a primitive revelation spring from a late misrepresentation of early history, in which the steps of ascent were described as successive recoveries from lapses and errors. Prof. Smith seems in some places to use this principle, and yet on the whole to declare that geographical study is opposed to it. But it would lead us too far to exemplify and make clear the results which, if I may venture to criticise his method, seem to me to spring from this unconscious inconsistency in principle.¹ I may however say that, if a fuller discussion of the subject were possible, I should take exception to Prof. Smith's fundamental contrast between most of the Semitic religions on the one hand as being purely polytheistic, and the three² monotheistic religions

¹ A few slips of expression may be noticed here, which it would be well to correct in a later edition: p. 25, l. 5, Africa was not made a Roman province till 146 B.C.; pp. 22-3, *note*, read Kronos for Chronos, and βαίτυλοι for βερυλοι (a form which is not given in the *Thesaurus* of Stephanus) twice; p. 17, *note*, it is too vague to quote "Porphyry in the *Acta Sanctorum*," for there are over sixty folio volumes of that work; p. 35, l. 13, the number fifteen is too small (I notice often a tendency to state numbers rather low), Nazareth is decidedly more than that from Caesarea, and is not within fifteen miles of any point on the coast, if the maps are right. The accentuation of Greek words is often incorrect or wholly wanting (see, *e.g.*, pp. 4, 22, 23, 356, 406, 415, 442, 455, 483).

² "Three" on p. 28, "two" on p. 29, by a natural variation in the thought.

on the other hand, which arose among the Semites. I cannot agree with the view that the character of the other Semitic religions is adequately expressed by calling them "polytheistic": the term "multiplicity-in-unity" seems to express their nature better. I have attempted in a work that will appear almost immediately¹ to collect, point by point, all the facts that can be found about the ancient religion of Asia Minor, *i.e.*, the religion of the Hittites; and if my results be right, Prof. Smith's contrast would have to be modified. I hope he will subject the work to the same rigorous criticism which I have applied to his *Historical Geography of the Holy Land*.

W. M. RAMSAY.

JEREMIAH: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.

I. HIS CALL.

IN ordinary biographies no part is more fascinating than the first—if details are given of the childhood of the hero or heroine—for in the sayings and adventures of a gifted child there are singular prognostications of future greatness, and the very beginning of life is a miniature of all that is to follow. The Scripture is not lavish of such details. Of Jeremiah, for example, before his appearance as a public character, we receive hardly any information, except that he was a native of Anathoth, a town a mile or two to the north of Jerusalem, and that he belonged to a priestly family.

But on one particular of what may be called the ante-public life of its heroes the Bible is wonderfully communicative: it describes with great fulness how they were led to abandon private life and come forward as public witnesses

¹ *The Local History of Phrygia*, of which Vol. I. will be ready probably next month.

for God. These scenes are among the most remarkable passages of the divine record. Of this nature was the appearance of Jehovah at the burning bush, when Moses was called to his great life-work. The night scene in which the boy Samuel was called by the voice of God, as he slumbered in the tabernacle, is one of unapproachable beauty. Isaiah has described his own call in the sixth chapter of his prophecy—the scene in the temple when he saw Jehovah on a throne, high and lifted up, and around Him the seraphim, chanting, “Holy, holy, holy.” The account of Ezekiel’s call fills several chapters at the beginning of the book of his prophecies. The call of St. Paul, on the way to Damascus, is related no fewer than three times in the Book of Acts. In every one of these cases the call is not only an incident full of spiritual grandeur, but it also throws a great deal of light on the life which follows.

Jeremiah also received a special call to the work of the prophet, and he has described it with his own pen.¹ It does not, perhaps, in beauty or sublimity come up to some of those just alluded to; but it is indispensable as the key to the life of the prophet.

I.

The description begins without any of the picturesque accessories supplied in other cases of the kind. We are not informed where the event took place, whether in his native Anathoth or, like Isaiah’s call, in the temple at Jerusalem. Nor is it clear whether Jeremiah already knew the Lord or whether, as in the case of Samuel, the call to God’s work synchronized with the first acquaintance with God Himself; although perhaps the impression left by the narrative is that this was not the first time Jeremiah was in communication with God. We do not know what was his age at the time. In reply to God, indeed, he called himself “a child”; but

¹ Ch. i. 4-10.

this is an elastic term, and in the sense in which he used it, a person of any age might say, "I am but a child."

Although on this occasion God not only spoke to Jeremiah, but even touched him, the prophet does not, like Isaiah, give any account of His appearance or of the sound of His voice;¹ he merely tells what He said: "Then the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Before I formed thee in the belly I knew thee; and before thou camest forth out of the womb I sanctified thee; and I ordained thee a prophet unto the nations."

No mystery is greater than that touched upon in these words. Before birth, in the secret laboratory of nature, the gifts are already distributed on which depend the station and degree to which everyone can attain and the work which he is fitted to do in the world. Some theorists have, indeed, held that all children are born with equal capacities, and that the differences which subsequently appear are entirely due to training; but who can believe it? The size of the brain, the fineness of the organization, the sensitiveness of the nervous system—such circumstances as these determine beforehand the amount of talent or genius which each is to possess.

We discover by degrees, at the beginning of life, what is the share which has fallen to us. The specially gifted soon find out, for many flatterers are ready to whisper to them the delightful secret. The result sometimes is the development of egotism: they are filled with conceit of their powers and look down on those less highly favoured; they see the prizes of life just within their grasp and start forth in pursuit of them—to win wealth and position or to write their names in the book of fame. Sometimes the knowledge of their superiority leads to their own undoing; for, trusting to their genius, they neglect their opportunities and are outstripped in the race by persons who have added to their

¹ See Giesebrecht, *Jeremia, in loc.*

more moderate abilities industry and perseverance; or the flattery called forth by their talents leads them into company where their gifts are wasted and their candle burns out before the time.

But the awakening to the consciousness of possessing great powers may have a different effect: it may breed a sense of responsibility. If God bestows great gifts, it is reasonable to suppose that He will prescribe a great task on which to employ them. It was in this manner that Jeremiah's mind worked. When it was revealed to him that he had been born with unusual gifts, at the same moment the conviction was borne in upon him that they were to be expended in declaring to his fellow-men the will and purposes of the Most High.

II.

The natural effect of the divine intimation which had been made to Jeremiah would have been the rush of all that was in him to the point indicated, in eager desire to be engaged in God's work; and this no doubt came later. But it was not the first result. On the contrary, the first feeling was a recoil from the course indicated. His reply to the voice which had addressed him was not, like Isaiah's, "Here am I; send me," but, "Ah, Lord God, behold, I cannot speak, for I am a child."

This has been the first feeling of many of the servants of God at the same critical juncture. Moses received the call of God in the same way; and so far did he carry his refusal as to arouse the anger of Jehovah. When John Knox was called to be a preacher by the acclamation of his fellow-prisoners in the church of St. Andrew's, he was so overwhelmed that, after an ineffectual attempt to address the congregation, he burst into tears, rushed out, and shut himself up in his chamber, persuaded that he could never appear in the pulpit again.

There is in modest and healthy minds a natural shyness against going into a position where one must attract the attention of all. In Jeremiah's mind there must, besides, have been an instinctive fear of the opposition which he would have to encounter; for the state of the times was such that anyone could foresee, even at the first glance, that a true prophet would have to lift up his voice against the whole course of society and bring down on his head the maledictions of high and low.¹ But the chief dread of a position such as that to which Jeremiah was being summoned always is responsibility for the souls of men. "What am I to stand up among my fellow-creatures as the representative and spokesman of God, to reprove their modes of life and point them upward to the heights of holiness? What about my own holiness? What about my own sins? Am I so certain of being in the way myself that I can take it upon me to offer myself as a guide to others?"

These are legitimate fears, and those who are called upon in any way to testify for God ought not to suppress them too soon. They make a man examine his foundations; they keep him from trusting to his own talents or his own goodness; they cast him back upon God, who, if He really wants him, will soothe his fears and renew His prompting, as He did to Jeremiah: "Say not," He told him, "I am a child; for thou shalt go to all that I shall send thee, and whatsoever I command thee thou shalt speak."

Not infrequently those who are most timorous at the first, when they are called, are the bravest at the last. When it

¹ It is a common thing to say here, as in the case of Isaiah, that some elements of the introductory scene are due to Jeremiah's later experiences. This is a kind of remark which one writer makes and others repeat after him, as sheep follow their leader. But to say nothing of conscientiousness in recording what happened, the artistic instinct would have preserved these prophets from introducing anachronisms into these solemn scenes. Many writers have no sense for the divinatorial power which belongs to great moments in experience.

is made perfectly clear to them that it is their duty to go, they are all the more fearless because they are sure that they are going, not in obedience to their own fancy or vanity, but because they cannot disobey a divine command. The best antidote to the fear of man is the fear of God. Knox shed tears and trembled and fled, when first called to preach, but over his open grave this witness was borne, "There lies one who never feared the face of man." So Jeremiah's was naturally a sensitive and shrinking nature, but God made him to his age "a defenced city and an iron pillar and brazen walls,"¹ that is, a heart which no task could tire and no opposition terrify.

III.

The final feature of the call of Jeremiah was the touching of his mouth by the divine hand—"Then the Lord put forth His hand and touched my mouth, and the Lord said unto me, Behold, I have put My words in thy mouth."

This reminds us of a trait in the call of Isaiah: one of the seraphim flew and, taking a live coal from off the altar, laid it on his mouth, saying, "Lo, this hath touched thy lips, and thine iniquity is taken away and thy sin purged." The vision of God had awakened in Isaiah an overwhelming sense of sin; and for some reason his sin was felt to be lying particularly on his lips. The burning coal laid there was to burn the sin away, and so open a free course for the testimony which it obstructed.

The laying of the divine hand on the mouth of Jeremiah might be thought at first sight to have a similar meaning. He had complained that he was unable to speak—that he was tongue-tied. The touch of the divine hand signified that the restraining cord was loosed and a free passage made for whatever he had to say.

The words which accompanied the touch suggest, how-

¹ Ch. i. 18.

ever, a different idea—"The Lord said, Behold, I have put My words in thy mouth." Perhaps the difficulty of Jeremiah was not exactly that of Moses. When Moses complained that he could not speak, he meant that, never having acquired facility in the art of expressing himself, he could not utter what was in his mind, even though he was full of matter. This was naturally the difficulty of an elderly man, as Moses already was, because the art of expression has to be acquired in youth. The difficulty, on the other hand, of a young man, as Jeremiah was, is apt to be deeper: it is not the lack of power to utter what is in his mind, but the fear lest there should be nothing in his mind worth uttering—in short, it is the lack not of words, but of ideas. The touching of his lips signified, therefore, that God was putting His own words into his mouth. It was an assurance that the well of ideas would never run dry, but that God would furnish him with such a revelation of His mind and will that he should never be without an ample message to his age.

In accordance with this is the faith in the power of the word which pervades the entire writings of Jeremiah. He speaks of it as a fire and a hammer breaking the hard rock in pieces.¹ So in the introductory vision it is spoken of as that which will root out and pull down and destroy and throw down, and which at the same time will build and plant.² Words appear the lightest and feeblest things that exist; as, indeed, they often are. Yet there are words which are as explosive as gunpowder and as destructive as invading armies. Luther's words, someone said, were half battles. The words of Voltaire and Rousseau brought down the French monarchy and destroyed the Bastille. And words can do better work than this: they can build institutions and plant beneficent customs and nurture holy lives. Jeremiah knew that his word could perform such

¹ xxiii. 29.

² i. 10.

miracles, both destructive and constructive, because it was the word of the Lord.

But we need not determine too mathematically what was intended by the laying of the Lord's hand on the mouth of the young prophet. It was a symbol which might have many meanings. If God touches the mouth, it cannot be dumb; it must testify for Him and His Christ. Yet it will be dumb. God's hand closes the door against the boasting which would mar the message and the inconsiderate speaking which would misrepresent the truth. There is a correctness which the grammarian can teach and a charm like the tongues of men and angels which the rhetorician can impart; but there is a grace poured into the lips which is as far above these as the heaven is above the earth; and it is only communicated by the touch of the hand of God.

JAMES STALKER.

IDEALS AND GRACE.

WE who are the messengers of God, stewards of the message and mysteries, and upon whom is laid the tremendous responsibility of awakening dormant faith, of quieting bewildered conscience, of soothing broken hearts, of helping men to die, and what is more difficult, to live; we who have to deal with little children and feed the "little sheep" of the flock, we who know our ignorance and our helplessness and lack of inner harmony with the slowly evolving purposes of the living God concerning the world, we who are often startled with our sickening insincerity and our mixture of motive in doing our Father's will, need almost more than any other living creatures to get near to the eternal, into close quarters with God Himself. We have to speak of Him, we must therefore know Him for ourselves, we must be sure not only of His Being, but of His character, must achieve this

highest end of all philosophy, and find that He recognises us, forgives our sins, deals with us, "considers our meditation," lays His hand upon us, tells us His secret, interprets to us His Providence, sends us on our mission, and permits us to enter into His great redeeming purpose towards the whole world.

There are, however, certain stages of mental and spiritual progress which we have to take one by one, and which we must follow frequently if we would renew the strength of our best convictions and enter into the joy of our Lord.

We must pray—we must lift our hearts to God Himself, who is within us and around us, and, though throned above all worlds, is yet waiting for our cry. It is not so easy for us in this crisis of thought to pray, to speak right to the heart of God, as it has been in many other phases of thought, but there are words of prayer which, though we cannot pretend to interpret fully, may be allowed to steal into our hearts and be transferred into our own experience, *e.g.*, Ps. xliii. 3, 4: "O send out Thy light and Thy truth: let them lead me; let them bring me to Thy holy hill, and to Thy tabernacles. Then will I go to the altar of God, unto God my exceeding joy, and on the harp will I praise Thee, O God my God!"

In this prayer these steps up the ladder emerge out of the mist. In these magical words we discern "altar-stairs which slope through darkness up to God." They correspond with many an equivalent uplifting of the soul recorded in the holy oracles, such as, "God who commandeth the light out of darkness hath shone into our hearts to give us the illumination of the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ."

Verily we yearn continually for light. We can understand in these days the dying cry of Goethe for "more light"; but as Christian men we crave the all-revealing light—the supernal light which makes us sure of our posi-

tion and our pathway. We supplicate the "Kindly Light," the Divinely-given illumination, which convinces our whole nature of the favour of God, of a Divine bestowment, unearned, undeserved, unbought, perfectly sufficing, flowing exhaustlessly and eternally from the heart of God. We are often weary with our search for light. Human love, and the accumulated wisdom of the ages, cheer us as we wait in the valley of the shadow for the morning to be spread upon the mountains. We know what it is to cry with bursting hearts, "O send forth Thy light."

Then, further, seeing that both mind and spirit are confused on account of the discordant voices which say, Here is the way or there, we are driven also to ask, with passionate eagerness, for God's *truth* about things, for *His* judgment and view of the world, *His* word about the life that now is, and that which will be for ever and ever even for us; and so we take up and make our very own, this same cry, "Send out Thy truth." "God's thought" is our most conclusive definition of truth, expresses the absolute TRUTH. God's thought can satisfy the hunger of our pilgrim souls, as they press on to the city of God. Send forth, we cry aloud, these angels of Thy presence, "Thy light and Thy truth." Nor is it enough that they should simply come our way, that we should mark their station and know that God has thoughts about us, and a good will towards us. The Bible and the Church, the home and the kingdom, have taught us this much. What we trust for is a higher stage of communion and a deeper understanding of reality. "*Let them lead us.*" Let heaven's *light* and God's *truth* lead us! In other words, "let these blessed visions of the Highest show us the way we should take, inspire our enthusiasm, excite our admiration, satisfy our intelligence, make perfect our definitions. May they present themselves as lofty ideals of a new science and a satisfying interpretation of all things visible and invisible!" But, alas! *ideals* have been flashing before

our troubled gaze generation after generation. From "the glory of Buddha" in the Himalayan hills it is a long cry to poor Heine, lying love-sick, in despairing sobs and tears at the feet of the Venus of Milo. Ideals have not been quite useless to Confucianist or Mohammedan, to mediæval mystic, or modern agnostic; but they have not done much to help us. They lead, it is true. But suppose we do not wish or care to follow. How to perform that which is good, we wot not. Unquestionably we need and, as Christian men, we seek, something more than ideals, even though they be as lovely, as overpowering, as the vivid portraiture of the Perfect Life. The interior mischief and misery of the *will* must be exorcised, or we shall die of the dazzling light, be confounded with the revelation of the truth of God. "Oh! Angels of the Presence, not only come forward and show us the way, but *bring* us, for ye can. Our prayer is, 'exert such power over us, that we shall most certainly follow your leading.'" We cry to Thee that Thou would'st throw the chains of Thy grace around the waywardness of our freedom, and compel us to follow the glorious vision, and yield our very selves to God. If Thou lead and bring us, then we will go—freely, spontaneously following whithersoever Thou wouldst point us. And whither? To the *holy hill and the tabernacles of God*, to the place of highest manifestation.

There are stages and degrees, "altar stairs," even here, and we discern the wide places of the Divine kingdom, and the inner and secret pavilions of the Divine love and fellowship. "The holy hill" embraces the conspicuous fact of the kingdom, the laws which reveal the wide methods of God's wisdom and goodness, the universal aspects of His rule, and of His righteous mercy; but in His "tabernacle" in His incarnate love, in the humanly expressed image of His glory, we find the possibility, nay, the reality of mutual recognition of a sure rest and a perfect

peace. Oh, that the light and truth of God may, not only lead us, but bring us there! We are naturally seeking what we call "the throne of grace," and the house of God. We will go under these Divine drawings, even to His *seat*. We *must* get verily into contact with God and know it.

Neither gorgeousness of shrine nor splendour of ritual, nor entrancing music, on the one hand; nor the extremity of humbleness, nor the extravagance of simplicity, nor the groan of discordant and despairing self-abasement, will be the passages and corridors which lead us and bring us to the holy hill and the tabernacle. There are special places and sacred epochs where the highest manifestations have been made to our race. God has educated mankind by great events in its history, by mighty and wise and holy men. There is the "holy hill" of light and peace and grand endeavour, and there is the tabernacle where the most glorious revelation has broken upon the eyes of our heart. "I heard a voice saying, Behold, the tabernacle of God is with men." Verily we shall *know* when we come near our Lord. The full expression of His light and truth will satisfy us. The prayers and seeking of a life-time will be fulfilled.

But now, what was and what is the central place of access? Where did the old saints find Him? Where can *we* find the living God at His highest and best? Is it not at the altar? *Bring* me to the holy hill, and to the tabernacle within it, and then I *will* go, then I *must* go, to the *altar*, *i.e.*, to the place of sacrifice, of burnt offering, of self-surrender, of full communion with the living God. The altar of God is for us the great event in the history of the world, where the eternal harmony of an infinite righteousness and an absolute love received a perfect revelation, where what God in the fulness of His Being must have always been, and must for ever be, dawned upon the prepared intelligence and the broken heart of the world. We do not gather to the altar merely for the purpose of making our own submis-

sion, or offering up ourselves in sacrifice, or abandoning our own will to the supreme will, and thus losing ourselves in Him. It is God's own altar, Gethsemane and Calvary, where we for the first time understand the mystery of these duties, where the motive becomes strong enough to carry us through with them, where our selfishness and pride are done to death, where we are crucified with Him to the world and the world to us.

Let Thy light and truth lead us and bring us to the very centre of the Divine and incarnate love. Our passion is to be *constrained* by this supreme inducement, and to judge that if One died for all then all died, and that they which live should live no longer to themselves but to Him who died for them and rose again. Do what thou wilt, but compel us to understand Thee. This is the meaning of all our striving, of all our research, of our secret anguish, and of our burst of gladness, when some real light breaks; let us know where we may find Thee, and we then come nigh even unto Thy seat, to the centre of Thy throne, to the unspeakable glory, and to the perfect peace.

The old Psalm shows us how near the altar of God is to the object of all our search and by *it* "we have access by one spirit unto the Father." A veritable approach to the altar of the cross, to that observatory of the universe, to that central crisis of all history, to that consummate revelation of the eternal Father, assures us as no other revelation does of the nature of our God. We reach there "our God, and find our most exceeding joy." Along these lines of revelation, from the beginning until now, the Almighty and Eternal One has been the joy of those who have learned His secret, and understood what He has meant to man. God Himself becomes our most exceeding joy—a joy that has transcended all the pleasures of sense, all the rapture of every other discovery, all the exhilaration of youth, love and victory, all the mellowness of age. "Take all the joys of

all the spheres and multiply these through endless years," and this vision of God transcends them all. "Exceeding joy," or as another of these sacred Psalmists puts it. "In Thy presence is fulness of joy." The entire capacity of our nature for blessedness is filled to the full. Whatever be the weakness of our mind, and the bitterness of our grief, this fulness satisfies, compensates and completes. "I shall be satisfied," sang another of these holy seers. God is the most exceeding joy. Such a God as ours becomes the triumph of our soul. We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have received the reconciliation. But there is much to be done with such a joy as this. We cannot keep it to ourselves—and so "upon the harp will I praise Thee, oh God, my God." Our common words are all too feeble for our new necessities—our commonplace of speech is not strong enough, nor symbolic enough to give utterance to the joy which has overspread our life. We must strike the chords of our harp, we must call in the power of holy music, with its sacramental force, to set forth what God *our* God is to our soul.

The service of song in the house of the Lord proves on the grandest scale that the joy of the Lord is too great for words.

None need so deeply to come into close contact with God, into clear consciousness of His goodness and justice, His majesty and His mercy, as those of us who are called upon to deal with men in the present whirlwind of conflicting thought. Let there be no falsetto notes of confidence in that which we hope may emerge out of the loud contradictions which we cannot solve. We may prophesy, call spirits from the deep, threaten opponents with confusion, and nevertheless be far from peace. We need an overwhelming joy in God, and a harp on whose chords we may smite with all our might. We must *find* the words of the Lord and eat them. They must become a part of our very life, must

enter into our rational, emotional, imaginative processes. We must so drink the water of life and eat of the bread of life, so that we become one with it, and then there will flow forth from us rivers of living water.

Peace in believing means, as it has always done, the equilibration of opposing forces. At this moment, as at many previous epochs in the history of the Kingdom of God, the contending energies are not exactly face to face. They work at obtuse angles with each other. Until they are approximately adjusted there is no calm but wild tumultuous motion. Against our haunting fear, we must cherish an equal hope. To our sense of utter insufficiency must be borne the whisper of *grace* equal to our need. In the very throes of shipwreck will break forth the harbour light, and so on the harp will we praise Thee, O God our God.

HENRY ROBERT REYNOLDS.

PROBLEMS OF THE PROPHETIC LITERATURE.

I. ISAIAH.

THE problems of the prophetic literature have received less than their fair amount of attention. There was a time when the same remark might have been made respecting the problems of the narrative portions of the Old Testament. When Ewald's influence waned, the effect was soon seen in the new spirit which animated Hexateuch criticism, and when Dillmann's influence is checked by some stronger one, which may be that of a group of workers rather than of an individual, the effect will be seen in the advances which will be made in the criticism of the prophets. Dillmann was essentially a transitional critic, and as such he was indispensable. He had, no doubt, fine qualities which in any period would be of priceless value, but from the point of view of the larger (not to say higher) criticism he was transitional. It would be unfortunate that he should be too much deferred to in England, if we wish to make good our claim to be critical scholars like the Germans, and therefore I will at once say that, high as is my own veneration for Dillmann, I would gladly enlist comrades in the work of carrying prophetic criticism to a point much beyond the resting-places devised by that relatively open-minded representative of the past. Not as though I were not equally interested in the progress of other portions of the larger criticism, but just at present I limit myself to a subject which pressingly needs a renewed critical investigation.

Mr. Gray, one of those younger scholars who have or should have the advantage of starting free from the theories

of the past, has already described and commented upon some of the bold but not arbitrary hypotheses of Hackmann (see EXPOSITOR, November, 1894, p. 334). Cordial thanks to him for his work! It is not, however, the hypotheses of any one scholar that I have set myself to expound, but a view of the composition of Isaiah, which is as much my own as any critical view formed at this period of a century-old movement can be that of an individual. Though delighted to learn from Hackmann or from Duhm, my own work is far older than that of the first, and not more recent (if not of somewhat earlier origin) than that of the second. Having lately brought it to a provisional close,¹ and being well aware that on many points conference is needed with fellow-students, I wish to save time by mentioning some of these points. Now I count it wholly unnecessary to slay the slain, and therefore remark at the outset that the one question of questions is, not whether certain parts of our Book of Isaiah do, or do not, belong to a period later than B.C. 586, but whether, in addition to certain passages written at the close of the Exile, a number of post-Exilic passages have not found admission both into 1 and into 2 Isaiah. To an able French scholar's indignant exclamation, "Et c'est ainsi qu'au nom de l'histoire on détruit l'histoire,"² I reply with a quotation from Geiger, "The Bible (of the Jews) is and at all times was a Word full of fresh life, not a dead book. This everlasting Word belonged not to a particular age; it could not be dependent (for its meaning) on the time when it was written down, and as little, upon this theory, could it be without what seemed to be new truths and new discoveries. Hence every period, every school, every individuality introduced into the Bible its own way of regarding the contents of the Bible. In later times this took place in the field of

¹ See the author's forthcoming *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah* (A. and C. Black).

² A. Westphal.

exegesis, but before that, when the Bible had not yet attained an absolutely fixed form, the same result was reached by manipulation of the text. Thus the Bible became the full expression of the higher life of the people. That which seemed deficient in the text of the holy book, the national spirit innocently supplied, and, unconscious of any breach of law, impressed its own stamp on the traditional text." Must not the editors of Isaiah, including him who brought together the two parts of our Book of Isaiah, have worked in this spirit? The Book of Isaiah comes to us from post-Exilic times; on this point there can be no doubt among educated students. It was brought into its present form, not by a committee of lovers of ancient literature, but by men whose great preoccupation was the building up of a righteous, God-fearing people. To this we may add that the editors of Isaiah held a view of prophecy which differed widely from that held by the prince of prophets, and which approximated to that which most preachers and teachers of our day are doing their best to correct. It was no longer in their view the glory of a prophet that he declared the will and purpose of God to the Israel of his own day, but that "by a great spirit he saw the last things" (Ecclus. xviii. 24). The question therefore for modern students of Isaiah to consider is this, "Must not the works both of 1 and 2 Isaiah have been adapted to the wants of the Palestinian Jews of the post-Exilic period by the insertion of fresh passages, inspired by what the later Jews called technically the holy spirit (*i.e.*, the spirit of prophecy), relative to the hopes and fears, the merits and demerits, of the post-Exilic church-nation"? If we reply in the affirmative, it is plain that we can no longer assume that a prophecy is Isaianic unless it contains something flagrantly opposed to this assumption (such as the mention of Cyrus or an Aramaic loan-word), but have simply to consider to what period the circumstances presup-

posed, the beliefs and ideas, and the linguistic and literary phenomena (including rhythm) most naturally assign it.

It is important, therefore, for the advanced study of Isaiah that the results of the criticism of the other parts of the Old Testament, so ably and so moderately summed up by Kuenen in his introduction,¹ should first be duly assimilated. Not as though this invaluable work were perfect, but there is at any rate no other book which initiates the student nearly as well into the present state of knowledge and the problems which await solution. It needs, of course, to be supplemented (1) by a picture of the development of Israel's religious ideas (a purely religious teacher might prefer another phrase) from a similar point of view to Kuenen's, and (2) by something analogous to Schürer's admirable *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, i.e., a history (so far as this is possible) of the external events which form the setting of the great movement of ideas referred to. The former of these themes has been finely handled in Smend's *Lehrbuch*;² the latter would probably receive adequate treatment, could Stade be induced, in collaboration with archæological specialists, to bring out a new edition of his celebrated *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*.

I have myself done what I could to improve on the imperfect archæological treatment of Isaiah in my earlier work. I hold with Kuenen that the distinction sometimes drawn between literary and historical criticism, or criticism of the form and of the contents of the Old Testament

¹ Dr. Driver's fact-full work will, I hope, whet the appetite for Kuenen's more satisfactory because in its theories more consistent Introduction. The first part of vol. i. of the latter has been translated into English (Macmillan, 1886). An authorized German version of the entire work (so far as Kuenen had completed it) was published in 1893-1894. For the most recent progress the oral teaching of a competent teacher is of course the only substitute for a wide and intelligent reading.

² This work deserved the translation which it has not found. It has the alternative titles, *Old Testament History of Religion* and *Old Testament Theology*. The former appears deserving of preference.

books, however plausible, is both wrong in itself and impracticable, and that every step we take in the criticism of the contents will assist us in that of the form (and *vice versa*). Hence the best critics of our day are able to profit by Assyriology much more than they could ten or fifteen years ago; nor have the researches into primitive Semitic culture carried on by Robertson Smith and Wellhausen been by any means without their effect on critical theories. In the use of the archæological evidence, however, circumspection is requisite. Mischief is sometimes wrought by giving precedence to the real or supposed archæological evidence over that derived from language and beliefs, ideas and general situation.

I will now mention some of the chief problems which require, in my opinion, special and prolonged attention. First, is the fine prophecy of the spiritual primacy of Jerusalem in Isaiah ii. 2-4 the work of Isaiah or of a post-Exilic critic? Duhm, from a somewhat surprising excess of caution, adopts the former alternative. To me, however, it has long appeared that there was greatly preponderating evidence for the latter. Verses 29-31 of chapter i. are possibly best understood as a fragment of the close of a lost prophecy of Isaiah against Israelitish idolatry, which the editor linked to the preceding discourse by the two poor and almost demonstrably late verses 27 and 28. Most probably ii. 2-4 (= Mic. iv. 1-3), together with Micah iv. 4, once stood after i. 29-31. It was, if not written, at any rate placed there by the late editor, in the spirit of the passage quoted above from Geiger, to mitigate a threatening which seemed too strong for the pious believers of the church-nation. Verse 5 is, beyond doubt, a linking verse, added when the prophecy in ii. 2-4 received its present position. I should much like trained students to consider the evidence for this and for the post-Exilic origin of the Messianic prophecy in iv. 2-6, which will be given elsewhere.

Next, can we safely regard the more strictly Messianic prophecies in ix. 1-6, and xi. 1-8, as Isaianic? Habit makes it hard for us to do otherwise, but Hackmann has produced evidence to show that it is post-Exilic, and I am afraid that Isaiah's authorship is more than doubtful. Even if Gunkel be right in supposing that the description of the coming golden age is based on a primitive myth, it is plain that this does not prove the passage (and its context) to be Isaiah's, or even to be pre-Exilic at all. There was, as I think that I have conclusively proved, a revival of mythology in the Babylonian period of Israelitish history, and the idea that the early history of the world is typical of the events of the latter days, is, so far as I can see, distinctively late. It is true that Hackmann's linguistic evidence with reference to the two prophecies needs sifting; but his argument, which I have adopted elsewhere, may on the whole be sound.

Passing over the interesting critical problems of chap. x., I pause next at chaps. xix. and xxiii., with regard to which I venture to ask whether a post-Exilic date is not after all more probable, even for xix. 1-15, than the date which, in deference to Assyriological evidence, I offered in 1892, viz., the time of the conquest of Egypt by Assurbanipal. The epilogue, I presume, is undoubtedly of the early Greek period. I also ask whether chap. xxiii. 1-14 must not in its present form be post-Exilic? I have myself endeavoured, following Dillmann, to show that there is an Isaianic basis, but I am rather doubtful of this view, and fear that this is only a possibility. Is this hesitation endorsed by other students?

That chaps. xxiv., xxv. 6-8, xxvi. 20, 21, xxvii. 1, 12, 13, is a genuine early apocalypse (in a wide sense of the term) appears to me absolutely certain, and I am gratified to have Professor Kirkpatrick's support in referring it to the fourth century B.C., though this slowly moving scholar

has not had occasion, like Duhm and myself, to attempt an analysis of the group to which it now belongs. Chap. xxvii. 7-11 seems a fragment of a longer poem of very slightly later date, and the liturgical meditation in xxvi. 1-19, together with the three songs (xxv. 1-5a, xxv. 9-11, and xxvii. 2-5), seem contemporary with it. The difference of date may be small, but the Persian empire had certainly fallen, and the Greek empire risen in its place, when the portions just mentioned were composed. A later editor arranged the passages as they now stand. The evidence for this is my own, but the results would hardly have been reached without the help of Duhm's analysis. They appear to me important, and relatively conservative.

In the criticism of chaps. xxviii.-xxxiii., I shall, I fear, be regarded as revolutionary. But I am at least no nihilist, and the results, if correct, are of the utmost importance for the history of the higher religion of Israel. Nowhere has the hand of the editor been busier than here. Even xxviii. 1-6 has been edited later, while the proverbial poem in verses 23-29 is demonstrably Exilic or post-Exilic. Of xxix. 1-8, the same account must be given as of the opening verses of chap. xxviii. Our eyes are so dimmed by conventionality that it requires a strong effort to see the unnaturalness of the ordinary solution. But when we have once realised what it means to ascribe final production of our Book of Isaiah to post-Exilic editors, it will be seen that the evidence for non-Isaianic origin is indeed overwhelmingly strong. Chap. xxix. 16-24, and xxx. 18-26, must also be post-Exilic. If the student will only read these passages in the light of similar passages of acknowledged post-Exilic origin, he will only wonder that the discovery was left for the end of the nineteenth century. But I am quite willing to be contradicted, and, if possible, refuted, with regard to the five passages, xxx. 27-33, which, in spite of a pronounced mythical colouring, I believe with

Hackmann to be post-Exilic. Let the evidence be slowly and carefully weighed by those who are accustomed to this kind of argument, and know their Kuenen well.

Chaps. xxxii. and xxxiii. are full of interesting problems. The period of the latter is important to settle, for no more characteristically post-Exilic passage, as some critics maintain, exists, and the question (as Dalman rightly points out) has a bearing on the date of those interesting psalms, xlvi. and xlviii., which cannot easily be shown to be pre-Exilic. Students may also be asked to decide whether Duhm can be right in attempting to rescue some parts of chap. xxxii. for Isaiah. To me it appears that, even if the Messianic prophecies in chaps. ix. and xi. be recognised as possibly Isaiah's work, the admission can, on critical grounds, hardly extend to the Messianic portion of chap. xxxii.

Chaps. xxxiv. and xxxv. I have doubtfully placed as early as 450-430 B.C. But if the Massoretic text of xxxiv. 16a be accepted, some readers will probably hold that this date is too early, and that these closely related compositions are works of the Greek period.¹ To the Greek period, at any rate, must (it would seem) be due the appending by an editor of the narrative chapters xxxvi.-xxxix., which, though ultimately derived from prophetic biographies, are, as they now stand, by no means entirely historical. A full investigation of the origin of these chapters requires a more careful treatment of their historicity than previous scholars have given. Gladly would we hold to such a wonderful proof of "God in history" as the received belief requires, but can we do so? And is He who "only doeth great wonders" compelled to do them on such a grand physical scale? Failing any reason to the contrary, the final redaction of Isaiah may be assigned, like xix. 16-25, to the

¹ There are two ways of avoiding this influence. One is to amend the text by the help of the LXX.; the other is to omit either v. 16a or vv. 16-17 as a late insertion. I cannot, however, see my way to adopt either.

second half of the third century (say 250-220 B.C.). I need hardly state that this decision is only a probable one. It agrees with the generally accepted view of the date of the (provisional) close of the prophetic canon. But a still later date is not absolutely impossible.

Proceeding to the second volume of Isaiah, viz., chaps. xl-lxvi., I am embarrassed by the number of the interesting problems which present themselves. I have, however, shown long ago that this work does not possess either unity of action or unity of historic background, and, so far as the critical analysis is concerned, need only say here that, while agreeing with Duhm (1) that chaps. xl.-lv. contain, besides the prophecy of comfort, a cycle of poems on the "Servant of Yahwè (Jehovah)," and that this prophecy (if not also the poems) belongs to the close of the Exilic, and (2) that chaps. lvi.-lxvi. are of post-Exilic origin. I am not at all convinced by his argument for regarding the latter chapters as a literary whole, produced by a single writer called the Trite-Isaiah. To me the second part appears to consist of about ten compositions, which proceed from the same school (hence their resemblances), and several of which may possibly come from the same writer. Most of them too belong to the age of Nehemiah. I ought, however, to add that a thorough analysis of chaps. xl.-lv. (attempted first of all by Duhm) reveals the fact that, partly for edification, partly with the view of filling up illegible passages, post-Exilic editors have made a number of insertions even in the Exilic prophecy of the restoration of Israel. The most remarkable of these occur in chap. xlvi., where the post-Exilic editor has (as it appears to me) demonstrably interlaced the second Isaiah's work with severe reproachful remarks addressed to his contemporaries, who had fallen back, as he considered, into obstinate unbelief. This view of the passage is due to Duhm, though Bredenkamp before him had divided chap. xlvi. between

Isaiah and 2 Isaiah. Dr. C. H. H. Wright has also lately taken up a position which reminds us of both scholars. "The phraseology," he says, "is Isaianic, worked over by a later hand, prophetic text and prophetic comment being so intermixed, that they cannot be separated." This "later hand" is post-Exilic, though "the thoughts and verbiage (?) are still mainly Isaianic."¹ It is plain that neither Bredenkamp's view nor that of Wright is tenable. The reader will do well to take this passage in connexion with x. 20-23 (also probably post-Exilic).

The importance of these questions will be fully seen whenever the student attempts to frame for himself a picture of the course of the development of religion in Exilic and post-Exilic, on the basis of the analysis here presented in its outlines. The discussion which they require involves decisions on many difficult points, on some of which even those who on the whole agree in their critical presuppositions may fairly differ. I have not ventured upon these with a light heart, but claim the respect which is due to all patient and independent critical work. Perhaps I should add that one of these critical decisions refers to a point on what I would gladly first of all have heard the judgment of Professor H. E. Ryle. Should the excellent editor of Ezra and Nehemiah, in the Cambridge Bible Commentary, convince me that I am wrong, he will not thereby have materially injured my theory of the origin of 2 Isaiah, but he will have deprived the historical picture which this theory suggests of some of its distinctness. Let me explain myself, so far as this is possible, within a very brief compass.

It is hardly necessary to remark that the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah do not present a thoroughly consistent view of the events of the Restoration period. Schrader long ago found reason to suppose that the foundation of the

¹ Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*, ed. 2, i., 1469.

temple was ante-dated by the Chronicler in Ezra iii. 8-13, and his arguments have been admitted by men of such different schools as Kuenen, Stade, Ryssel, and König. This, however, was only the beginning of a series of critical inquiries, conducted by van Hoonacker, Kuenen, Sir H. H. Howorth, and Kuenen's able successor at Leyden, Kusters. The last-named scholar has profited much by the work of his predecessors, and, as it seems to me, has reached conclusions which are in the main solid.¹ Like Schrader and Kuenen, he is of opinion that the temple was rebuilt in 520-516 B.C., under Darius Hystaspis; but the builders, as he seems to have proved, were not the Gôla or (returned) exiles, but that part of the Judahite population which had not been carried away to Babylon. The sources of the Chronicler, preserved in Ezra v. and vi., know nothing of a return of the Gôla prior to the rebuilding of the sanctuary. Nor is there any sound evidence that it was the Gôla which rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem; Ezra iv. 6-23 (which probably means to assert the rebuilding of the walls by Ezra and his companions) is in conflict with Nehemiah i. 1-vii. 5. In 445, Nehemiah, on his arrival from Susa, found the walls unbuilt, and no Gôla in Jerusalem. Very soon, however, the walls were built, *i.e.*, by the same Judahite population which had already erected the temple. Now the glorification of Jerusalem, promised by 2 Isaiah, appeared a little more possible. It was not, however, till Nehemiah's second visit (432) that the great want of Jerusalem—that of an increased and of a more strictly religious population—was satisfied. Soon after the great governor's return, Ezra, "the scribe," arrived with a caravan of exiles from Babylonia. Now it became possible to counteract the unidealistic spirit of the old Judahite population. And though

¹ See *Het Herstel van Israël in het Perzische Tijdvak* (Leiden, 1894), a most able specimen of analysis, which has already received from some of the best critics the recognition which it deserves.

even Ezra failed at first to achieve the separation of the lower elements, he succeeded in forming a *kāhāl* (קָהָל) or congregation, which had the consciousness of being the people of God—the true Israel. Then came Ezra's introduction of the law-book—how soon after, we know not—and by degrees the Kahal absorbed the best element of Jewish society, not, however, so completely (as later passages in 2 Isaiah show) as to exclude the possibility of opposition and reaction.

To us this course of things may appear in a high degree natural; but to the Chronicler, as Kusters rightly observes, it was incredible that the poor country-folk (יְלֵלֵי הָאָרֶץ, 2 Kings xxiv. 14, xxv. 12) should have done so much for their religion. The Gōla was in his eyes the only possible doer of great deeds. And so, after rewriting the early history of his people, the Chronicler quite innocently transformed to a great extent the annals of his own time. Kusters deserves warm thanks for opening up this matter. For my own part, I think that he has in the main points proved his case. I would not indeed deny the possibility that a scanty band of exiles may have returned under Cyrus. The famous cylinder inscription (as Wildeboer has pointed out) suggests that the opportunity of return was really given, and it is not easy to believe that no Israelites availed themselves of it. Nor can Haggai and Zechariah, as it appears to me, be supposed to have grown up in the low-minded and uncultured community to which their prophecies are addressed. But if any exiles did return before 432, they were not strong enough to neutralize the downward tendency of those who had been left behind by the stern Babylonian invader.

All this has a direct and powerful bearing on the interpretation of chaps. lvi.–lxvi., though I cannot stay to explain it. The influence of the Samaritans, or half-Jews, can now be much better understood, and the phenomena

of such a passage as chaps. lx.-lxii., which once appeared to me to be a fragment of the genuine 2 Isaiah, can now probably be seen in their true light. Let the student weigh the evidence upon sound critical principles—not those which are at present most popular among us, but those which the trained commonsense of consistent criticism has used with such great results—and judge. Should they correct any errors of mine, they will earn my warm thanks. Should they see that even a part of my own results are true, I shall have earned theirs. And in the latter case, they need not apprehend the least injury to true edification. Like Hagar's angel, the advanced criticism of devout-minded students opens up the view of unsuspected "wells of water"; and he who allows it to revolutionize his theory of the Book of Isaiah will feel the true Isaiah of Jerusalem, and the true Second Isaiah of Babylon, becoming more and not less of prophets to himself—more and not less capable of bringing men near to the self-revealing God.

T K. CHEYNE.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST :

A PROBLEM IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

PART I. THE PROBLEM.

IN the Gospels, the Synoptic no less than the Fourth, the two views of Jesus which we are accustomed to distinguish as the natural and the supernatural, are both represented. It is their conflict which turns the simple story of a humble and beautiful life into the supreme drama of history. The natural was the obvious view, taken as a matter of course, and acted on by the men of cultivated intelligence. They judged Jesus to be a common man, and held any who believed otherwise to be deceived.¹ As they judged, they handled Him, and He died at their hands just as any ordinary person would have died. So universal was this view, that Scribe and Priest, Pharisee and Sadducee, Herodian and Roman, agreed in it, and so convinced were they of its truth that they allowed it to govern their conduct, with results that seemed to themselves satisfactory and conclusive. The two men that most completely impersonate the view are Caiaphas the High Priest, and Pilate the Roman Procurator, for these two so believed it as to become the joint authors of the tragedy of the Cross.

I.

1. The relation of these two men to this tragedy was very different; the one was the author of the plot, the other the cause of the catastrophe. Caiaphas was a Sadducee, an aristocrat in family and feeling, head of the Church, and an authority in the State, with the instincts and habits of the ruler controlled by the mind and exercised in the manner of the ecclesiastic. In the Sanhedrin his characteristic qualities had room for the freest and most effective play,

¹ John vii. 47.

especially when it met in such confusion and alarm as had followed upon the events at Bethany and the triumphal entry.¹ The Passover was at hand, Jerusalem was filled by an expectant crowd, massed, as it were, into a colossal person, sensitive without to the softest touch of national hope or fear, while within, like a fire in the bones, burned the fierce passion for its religion of their ancient race. Through this crowd the sudden fame of Jesus swept, fused it, inspired it, moved it by the delirious hope that here, at last, was the Messiah come to break in pieces the heathen oppressor, and to purge the holy city from the defilement of his presence.² The council knew the people, knew, too, the procurator, whom it seemed to see sitting in his palace, jealous, vindictive, watching as if with a hundred eyes for an occasion to interfere. And it stood bewildered between the rival terrors: on the one hand, the uncalculating and incalculable passion of the crowd, and on the other, the cold omnipotence of Rome, here so easily roused and so pitiless when provoked. Just then Caiaphas stood up, the one masterful spirit who could command the storm. He had the significant yet dark distinction of being "High Priest that fateful year," and was about to fulfil his office in a sense and manner he little dreamed of. He spoke with a certain imperious scorn words that may be paraphrased thus:³ "Ye know nothing at all: the public safety is the supreme law, and must not be endangered by the passion which in a multitude is a fitful madness, easily kindled, but only to be cunningly quenched. In this case it can best be quenched through its cause; smite the hero the multitude admires, and their admiration will die into disgust." The words seemed those of gifted sagacity; Jesus was nothing; the mere creation of a fanaticism blinded by many disappointments, and, though He was guiltless of crime, yet it

¹ John xi. 47. ² Matt. xxi. 8-11. Luke xix. 35-40, 47, 48. John xii. 12-15.

³ John xi. 49, 50.

was the high expedient of statesmanship to save the people by making an end of Him; and if He were only the common man the priest and the council conceived Him to be, who will say that the priest was unwise?

But now let us turn from the man who planned the tragedy to the man who caused the climax. Pilate is an unconscious actor in the drama, with only the dimmest sense that anything extraordinary is proceeding, or that he is playing more than his ordinary part.¹ There is something fateful and pathetic in the position and action of this man; when we think of him we feel that justice must be blind, or she would pity too much to be just. Here is the only Roman known to history who saw Jesus, but his eyes had no vision in them, and so he looked as one who did not see, or so saw as only to misjudge and mishandle. In him Rome was impersonated. Out of him looked her imperial strength, in him dwelt for a subject people her statesmanship. As he faced the Jew he thought of Cæsar, and ruled him with his feet firm planted on an empire which stretched westward to the Pillars of Hercules, northward to the forests of Germany and the utmost coasts of Gaul. And what was the Jew to him? A turbulent man, intolerable for his intolerant superstition, a people that the imperial image on a banner provoked into madness,² who would not allow the shadow of a Gentile to fall on their temple, though, indeed, it was so poor a place as to be unadorned by the statue of any god. Still it was necessary, the people being subject, to rule them considerately—if they behaved; but if at this high feast they were, or even if they only threatened to be, seditious, then in Cæsar's name their blood would be mingled with their sacrifices.³ And what did Jesus seem to this man as He stood before him? A Jew, only a Jew, though most unlike the typical Jew in the

¹ Matt. xxvii. 24. John xviii. 31, 37; xix. 6.

² Josephus, *Antiq.*, xviii. iii. 1-2.

³ Luke xiii. 1.

gentleness of His bearing, the mystery of His speech, and the glamour of soul which the Roman felt now touch his heart, now wake his mockery, now move his pity.¹ He knew the chief priests, and had for them the sort of contempt the conqueror feels for those of the conquered who seek by excessive suppleness to keep themselves in place, mollifying by the one hand the strong-willed victor, and soothing with the other the irritable impotence of the vanquished. Jesus was a being of another order than these men, and though Pilate, listening to His discourse, and vividly by contrast reminded of Epicurus and his great Roman disciple, threw out the jesting question, "What is truth?" yet he turned away with the feeling that he would save Him,—unless, indeed, the obstinate unreason of this most excitable people made it too troublesome.² For Rome did not mind the shedding of blood when it was necessary, but it did not love too frequent bloodshed in any province, Cæsar being prone to suspect some fault in the governor. So, then, it might happen if His death were needed to keep the turbulent quiet, it would be easiest to let Him die—worse things were done daily in the amphitheatre under the Emperor's own eye. And so Pilate stood, now scornfully temporizing with the multitude, and now patronizing Jesus, befriending Him with a sort of lofty condescension, touched with regret, looking Him, as he thought, through and through. But let us imagine that in the very moment when he boasted his power to crucify or to release,³ a lucid vision had come to him, and that he had beheld the centuries before him unroll their wondrous secret. In less than eighty years he sees in every city of the Roman world societies of men and women meeting in the name of this Jesus and singing praises to Him as to God, while so powerful has His name grown in some provinces that the

¹ Luke xxiii. 4-7, 13-22. John xix. 8-9, 12, 19-22.

² John xviii. 38, 39.

³ John xix. 10.

very temples are deserted, and the most famous governor of the day writes to ask the Emperor what policy he is to pursue. Then he sees Rome, astonished and angry at the might of His Name, lose her proud tolerance, become vindictive, brutal, and even turn persecutor, making profession of the Name a crime punishable with death. But even the resources of the Empire are powerless against the Name; the legions that had carried the Roman Eagles into the inaccessible regions lying round the civilized world, forcing the tide of barbarism back before them, here availed nothing, and he beholds in less than three hundred years the symbol of the Cross on which he was about to crucify this Jesus floating victorious from the capitol, while the Emperor was sitting, not amid patricians in the Roman Senate, but in a council of Christian pastors, all without pride of birth, all without names the Senate would have honoured, many maimed, some even eyeless, disfigured by the tortures Rome had inflicted in her vain attempt to extinguish the infamous thing. In another hundred years he sees the very empire herself fallen, while in her seat sits one whose only claim to rule is that he represents the Crucified, and he there builds up a kingdom beside which Rome at her vastest was but as a hand-breadth, and the city that had been proudly called eternal was in duration only as the child of a day. And if Pilate had waked from his dream as suddenly as he had fallen into it, and looked at Jesus sitting before him mocked and buffeted, helpless in the face of the howling mob, deserted of man, manifestly forsaken of His God, what could he have said but this? "What foolish things dreams are! Their world is a sort of topsy-turvydom of reality, for were this vision of mine true, then the invisible kingdom of this Man would be the only real empire, and my claim of power either to crucify or to release Him a vain and empty boast! Happily the cross will soon show the vanity of the dream."

2. This much, then, and no more, Caiaphas and Pilate saw in Jesus, and as they saw they judged, and as they saw and judged so did all the men of cultivated intelligence in their time and place. They were not unreasonable, nor without integrity; but honest after their kind, only, like all who are consciously and proudly men of the world, they made their experience the measure of other men and all their possibilities. I wonder how many of all the sagacious intellects composing the Royal Society or the British Association would, similarly situated, have judged differently; certainly not many—possibly not even one; for the modern idea of the limitations of nature is more positive than the scientific belief in its potencies or in man's capabilities. But there were even then a few men who had mind enough to differ from those scholars and statesmen who imagined that the duty of the world was to think their thoughts after them. These men were for the most part poor and ignorant enough, but their disadvantages were lost in one supreme advantage—they had known Jesus, and had learned of Him, and because of this learning they were able, by what I can only describe as an act of extraordinary faith, to read a meaning into Him which the men of cultivated intelligence had failed to find. They had formed a theory—or, more correctly, an hypothesis—of His place and person, which had this remarkable peculiarity—it was an hypothesis which did not so much explain facts that had been and that were, as facts that were to be. It was what we may term a prophetic and a creative hypothesis,—prophetic because centuries of history were to be needed, not only to justify it, but even to make it conceivable; creative because it was to call into existence the very facts that were to be its justification. And what was this hypothesis? It was the idea embodied in our Gospels, common to all, though differently complexioned in each. Jesus is conceived as the Messiah, sent of God, descended through the Jews, come

to live and die for the saving of the world. For Him all past Jewish history had been ; towards Him the hopes of men and the events of history had alike converged. From Him went out the light that was to enlighten—the life that was to quicken—the nations. And how was it that He had this transcendent place and function? The author of the Fourth Gospel explained it thus :—“ The Word which had ever been with God, and was God, became flesh and dwelt among us—the only begotten Son in the bosom of the Father came forth and declared Him.” And Jesus was this incarnate Word, this manifested and manifesting Son. His person was, as it were, the tabernacle or tent of meeting for God and man ; and they that could look within and bear the light saw the symbol of the invisible Presence, the living image which expressed the Eternal God. Jesus, in a word, was Deity manifested in humanity and under the conditions of time.

The Evangelist, we may say, then, does for the historical Christ—and through Him for man, and all that man signifies—what the imagination under the long discipline of science has attempted to do for the earth—viz., so places our time in relation to eternity, our space in relation to immensity, as through the greater to explain the less, though only by the less can we know and understand the greater. Here we swim in the bosom of two infinities, and only through these infinities can the process be conceived by which our finite has come to be. To our fathers earth had no mystery. It was but a narrow plain, bordered and washed by the inviolate sea. It could hardly be termed venerable ; its whole history lay within the brief period of six thousand years. On a given day in a given month of a given year, God had spoken through six successive days, and the earth had become what we know it to be. But now inquiry has crept slowly back through the centuries behind us, pushing time before it as it crept, and the few thousands

of years have lengthened into millions; and as man in imagination has ascended this vast avenue of ages, he has seen the successive generations of being slowly descend in the scale until organic being has disappeared; and he has stood, as it were, on an untenanted earth, a slowly cooling mass, with fire within, with vapour around, like a monster sleeping in its own thick breath; while the vapour, slowly condensing, forms the seas, and the mass, cooling, hardens into the rocks. And even here the imagination has not remained; it has travelled back, and has looked, as it were, into the void which is the womb of time, and seen the raw forces of things mustering for their creative career, the atoms falling through space, striking against each other, aggregating, combining, solidifying, so as here to form a sun, there projecting smaller masses to form planets, though rigorous law so bound the severed masses together as to make them constitute one system. And then the imagination, unexhausted by its backward exploration through time, has crept out into space, pushing before it the walls that limit our immensity, and by the help now of the telescope, and now of the photographic plate, it has added realm upon realm of being to our known and observed universe, till we feel as if earth were but a mote floating in the midst of a measureless expanse, which yet is no wilderness, but, as it were, a fair and fruitful land, peopled with innumerable worlds. But infinitesimal as seems the earth in this infinitude, it yet for us holds the secret which explains it. It is one of the mighty host amid which it swims and floats. It shares their being, it partakes in their life, it marches in their order, it belongs to their system. We, though but a part, are yet in and through and because of the whole, and so in us the problem of the whole is concentrated. Our existence, little as it seems, is big with the meaning of the universe, holds the only solution we can ever find of the over-mastering mystery of

being. Now just as our earth becomes at once more majestic and intelligible through these infinities that bound its finitude, and as it yet is the key to all their secrets, so Christ is conceived by the Evangelist as a mystery that must be read through the eternal God, and yet as a reason that makes all His mysteries intelligible, credible, lucid, and, as it were, articulate. The secrets which were in the bosom of the Father are so manifested in Him as to be perceptible by our grosser sense. Hence, within the limits of the sensuous lives a spiritual expressive of things the eye hath not seen, nor the ear heard, nor the hands handled. And the humanity which so reveals Deity could not be other than universal, embodied indeed in a person, but a person who is as essentially related on the one side of His being to man in all his phases and in all his ages, as on the other side to God. And so to the evangelists He is at once the Son of Adam and the only Begotten of the Father.

II.

Here, then, we have two views facing each other in sharp contradiction, and our problem is: Which of the two is the more reasonable and scientific? As the views differ, so do the men who hold them. On the one side stand the culture, the science, the theology, the political wisdom, and the judicial faculty of the place and the hour; on the other side stand the simplicity, the inexperience, the faith of the men whose only claim to be heard was that they had been His disciples. Does it not seem almost too ridiculous a thing to ask, On which side did the truth lie? It would, without doubt, have so seemed to us had we been in the Sanhedrin with Caiaphas, or in the Prætorium with Pilate; *then* we should have said without a moment's hesitation, The truth lies with the cultivated statesmen and scholars. This extraordinary hypothesis is a dream of the credulous, belief of it is possible only to the rude imagination of the

ignorant. But between that time and ours the most incorruptible and unerring of judges has come. "Die Weltgeschichte ist das Weltgericht." And to this inexorable judgment-seat we carry our appeal and invoke it to help us to determine whether the truth lies with the priest and the procurator or with the evangelists and the apostles.

1. Now this surely is a problem grave and imperious enough to tax the scientific and the philosophical mind. We have many Societies that cultivate special sciences, and one Association that makes the cultivation of the co-ordinated sciences its special function. In its presence two things fill me with wonder—the immensity of the field these sciences cover, and the inadequacy of them all combined to the interpretation of man as at once the interpreter and the interpretation of the universe. If we think of it, is not the point where these co-ordinated sciences stop even more remarkable than the point where they begin and the goal whither they tend? They start with those mathematics which are pure metaphysics, those ideas which the reason cannot think without or think away, and which underlie all its attempts at the interpretation of Nature as being in space. And then from this they rise through the more concrete sciences—physical, chemical, geological, biological—till they terminate in man as a social and economical being. The field is vast and crowded with marvels; but what is more marvellous than even its extent is its limitation. What is most cardinal and characteristic in man and his creations remains untouched, or is touched only at a point remote from the centre, and so distant from the enquirer that he cannot so see it as to bring it within the terms of anything that can be called scientific knowledge or discussion. The thing I mean is religion, and the point at which science attempts to touch it is savage custom and belief. Without religion can we have man? He is never found without it, and as it is to him he

becomes to history. His first attempt to interpret Nature is governed by religious ideas, and from his last attempt they are inseparable. He must, as he is rational, think, and what is the thought of a reasonable being but a factor which relates him to the infinite and the eternal? The society man creates embodies his religious idea, and the same idea orders his history: in it his customs find their reason, his laws their sanction. Language in all its terms is instinct with religious feeling, and thought in its whole development is governed by the religious problem. In theology philosophy begins, in theology science ends; all the more that it may refuse to name the very notions which transcend its sphere and yet are implicit in all its premisses and will not be excluded from its conclusions. For what is the Agnostic but a man who confesses that there are ideas he will not express but cannot escape from? These beget the ideals which have an infinite meaning for man, for they are born of religion and for ever cause religion to be born anew within him.

Man, then, as he appears in history, a voyager between life and death, is governed by religious ideas, is held in the hands of religious sanctions which he may be unable to explain yet can neither dissipate nor repeal. There is no vision so impressive to the imagination as the vision of the race of man feeling after God if haply it may find Him. Anthropology, like a new and more formal comparative anatomy, or a sort of psychological palæontology, may take up the dried and broken and scattered bones of savage myth and custom, and, with the benevolent condescension which marks the child of culture when he deals with those lower civilizations out of which his own was born, attempt to discover for us the process by which primitive ideas entered the primitive mind and then organized themselves into the customs and the myths which are the originals of our civilized religions. Yet when

it has spoken its last word does it not leave unexplained the mystery of thought within the savage that compelled him to make and follow the custom, to think and create the myth? Our speech tends even now to become bewildered when we stand in presence of the mysteries of being, but are we to cease to think because the expression of our thought is inadequate? And is the scientific way to discredit thought through the inadequacy of its vehicle, or to read the vehicle through the reality of the thought? For how strong must have been those instincts in the savage that moved him to the creation of these naïve beliefs and rites we seek so curiously to explain? And is not the nature behind the beliefs more significant than the beliefs it causes? Or let us go back to our most ancient civilization, unbury the temples of Egypt, disinter her cities, rifle her tombs, unswathe her mummies, and read her hieroglyphs, and what do we find? That the thing that made her the mother of the arts that bade her build her pyramids and her temples, that forced her to preserve her dead that the disembodied soul might yet again find a home, was belief: faith in the life that never died—her religion. Or let us move eastward till we enter the old Mesopotamian valley, dig into its shapeless and melancholy mounds and dig out its winged bull or its man-headed lion, discover and decipher its cuneiform inscriptions, and there read the history of its wars, the ambitions and the achievements of its kings, the myths and the legends of its people, and what have we discovered? That the thing all lived by and lived for was religion. Or let us go still further eastward into India, and what is the idea that there penetrates everything, that fills all nature, that builds up and organizes all society but the idea of an omnipresent Deity, impersonal yet impersonated in all things, out of whom all came, into whom all return? Let us move still eastward till we come to China, and there we find man held in the lean yet iron fingers of his

dead ancestors; but all his ancestors, with the heaven above and the spirits of the earth below, speak to him of the one thing—the religion which the people did not make, but which has made the people. And if we think that by returning to the saner west and investigating its sanest and sunniest peoples we may escape from this all-environing belief, what do we find? That the poetry, the art, the philosophy of Greece live and move and have their being in its religion, and without it they could not have been either what they were to the Greeks or what they are to us. And what was Rome in all her State and Empire save the creation of the religious idea? The gods built and ruled the city, and all the city achieved was by the favour of the gods. And what does this ubiquity of religion, what does its action as the creative and architectonic idea of our race, mean? Not simply that man possesses it, but that it, as it were, possesses man. Till it is explained he is inexplicable, and only as it is purified and strengthened can he be made perfect.

2. From this rapid survey of religion as of all facts the most universal and distinctively human, as of all factors of progress and of civilization the most potent and determinative, two or three important consequences follow. First, the circle of the sciences concerned with man and his universe can never be complete until it embraces the religions—enquires into their cause, their function, the ideas they embody, and their action on man in history. Secondly, religion is so essential to man that he cannot escape from it. It besets him, penetrates, holds him even against his will. He may will to have nothing to do with religion, but instinct is stronger than will, and religion returns, be it as the memory of a dead woman as with Mill or Comte, or as an abstraction like Humanity—*le grand Être*—loved of the Positivist, or as the Unconscious adored by the pessimist, or as the Unknown affirmed by the logic and worshipped by

the awe of the Agnostic. And so thirdly, if religion be, as it were, so built into man as to be the very heart of his being, it follows that the greatest religious personage will be the most important person in history. Genius is varied and can accomplish great things in all the provinces and spheres of thought and life. In art it can give us the things of beauty that are joys for ever, and that govern the taste of all later ages; but art is not the whole of life. Sensuous beauty and moral uncleanness have before now lived together without any feeling of mutual dislike or disgust; but in the course of ages the moral uncleanness proves mightier to harm than the sensuous beauty to bless. Genius in literature may create the classical forms that educate all later intellects, but the most cultivated literary societies have often been cursed by the most absolute selfishness. In music the imagination of the master can blend the harmony of sweet sounds in the *opera* or *oratorio* that speaks to man in the language of the gods. But the delight music may give is of the sense rather than of the soul. Religion, on the other hand, affects and controls all these. To it art, classical or Christian, owes its noblest subjects and highest inspirations. From it literature has received the problems which have given it dignity, the spirit which has breathed into it sublimity, and the soul which has been its life. Without religion music would lose its power to charm, for it elevates in proportion as it is the vehicle of the religious idea, the minister of the religious emotions. The religious is thus the architectonic idea of society, the commanding idea of conduct, the imperial idea of all our being and all our thinking, and he who can create its most perfect form is our supreme benefactor—the foremost person in all our history.

Our problem, then, is, What inference must we draw as to the nature of Him who occupies this foremost place? This will be the subject of our second paper.

JEREMIAH: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.

II. HIS TIMES.

THE great difficulty in reading the prophets is that our knowledge is so limited of the times in which they lived. They were not philosophers, teaching abstract truths, but reformers speaking to contemporary circumstances. Their message came out of life and returned to life again. Jeremiah prophesied for fifty years, his half century being nearly bisected by the year 600. Beginning in the thirteenth year of Josiah, his activity extended through the remaining eighteen years of the reign of that prince, and through the reigns of the four succeeding kings—Jehoahaz, Jehoiakim, Jehoiachin and Zedekiah. But it is doubtful if to the mind of the ordinary reader of the Bible these names, with the exception of the first, mean much or suggest any very definite events. Yet with the events of these reigns the teaching of Jeremiah is closely intertwined, and, the more exact our knowledge of them, the more intelligible will his pages become.

One circumstance, indeed, to a certain extent, renders such preparation for reading his prophecies superfluous. To Jeremiah, it may be said, there was only one event during his long life. This was the destruction of Jerusalem. In the introductory vision of the seething pot,¹ this was already indicated: the mouth of the pot was turned towards the south,² and its boiling contents were to be poured out over the land. This, he was told, signified that an evil from the north was to burst over the country. The north, in the prophets, always means Mesopotamia; and the warlike tribes of that region were, he was informed, to set their thrones at the gates of Jerusalem and at the gates

¹ i. 13 ff.

² In verse 13, "towards the north," ought to be "away from the north."

of the cities of Judah. This image of invasion never left the mind of the prophet, and, as time went on, it became more and more definite, till at last he was able to announce quite distinctly that the city was to perish; and he even specified the details of the calamity. It reminds us of how our Saviour announced His own sufferings and in His communications to His disciples added touch after touch of detail.

Now, if any man in any age were aware that his country was to be invaded by a cruel and irresistible army, and the place of his abode destroyed, the fact could not but colour his habits of thought and utterance. But the place whose destruction Jeremiah foresaw was Jerusalem—a city whose very dust was dear to the hearts of its inhabitants; the holy city whose temple was the sanctuary of the most High—and the destruction of Jerusalem involved the ruin of the country and the exile of its inhabitants. It looked like the end of religion itself, and of all the hopes and promises which Israel had inherited.

That this foreboding should have taken such rooted hold of the mind of Jeremiah is the more remarkable because at least the commencement of his ministry might have appeared to be an epoch of unusual hope. The throne was occupied by good King Josiah—a prince whose tender years and early piety remind us of our own Edward VI.—and, just about the time when Jeremiah's public ministry began, the king carried out on an extensive scale a reformation of the most sweeping description. The ancient law-book had been discovered in the temple, and the reading of it had revealed to the king the vast discrepancy between its provisions and the actual state of things in the kingdom. But he resolved—and the good men by whom he was surrounded seconded him—to restore everything in exact accordance with the Mosaic pattern. Accordingly every vestige of the foreign

religions with which Manasseh had defiled the house of the Lord was swept away; the worship at local sanctuaries, with which so many immoralities were connected, was strictly prohibited; and the priests who had ministered to idolatry were degraded. It looked as if a new era of pure religion and morality had dawned, and a young prophet like Jeremiah might have been expected to be the mouthpiece of the movement, praising the reforms and predicting an epoch of prosperity which they would inaugurate.

We look into the pages of Jeremiah, however, in vain for anything of the kind. Now and then, indeed, he promises that his countrymen, if they make haste to repent, shall dwell in their own land; but such gleams of hope are rare, and they are swallowed up in monotonous floods of denunciation. Even at this early stage, he asserts, God had forbidden him to intercede for his people—they were past praying for—as He did subsequently again and again.¹ Apparently he perceived that the reforms of Josiah, however well meant on his part, were superficial, and would not permanently hold the will of the people.

So it turned out. As in the history of our own country at the Restoration, when the strong hand of Cromwell was removed, the English nation rushed back, under the guidance of Charles II., into the pathways of indulgence, so, when at an early age Josiah was cut off in the battle of Megiddo, and a few months thereafter his son, King Jehohaz, was carried captive to Egypt, the party which had been opposed to the reforms of Josiah obtained the upper hand; and in Jehoiakim, the new king, they had one thoroughly in sympathy with their spirit. The floodgates of idolatry and immorality were reopened and the godly party driven to the wall.

Of course a man like Jeremiah was summoned by such a state of affairs to lift up the voice of warning more

¹ vii. 16, cf. xi. 14; xiv. 11; xv. 1.

loudly than ever. But he met with determined opposition. Having appeared one day in the court of the temple, when many worshippers were present from the cities of Judah, and predicted that, unless they repented, ruin would overtake the holy city and the sanctuary itself, he was stopped by a popular tumult, and would have lost his life, had not some of the better-disposed princes intervened and by timely words of moderation saved him from violence.¹ On another occasion he was not so fortunate. The governor of the temple smote him and put him in the stocks.² Whether the smiting was merely an angry blow, or a regular legal infliction of forty stripes save one, we cannot tell, but Jeremiah was treated as a blasphemer, because he had suggested that the temple could be destroyed.

In consequence of such proceedings he appears to have been unable to continue his public work. He took advantage of the opportunity of retirement to commit to writing the prophecies delivered by him up to this date; and he got his young secretary and friend, Baruch, to read them aloud in one of the chambers of the temple. They were listened to by a distinguished audience, and made so profound an impression, that those who had heard them endeavoured to bring them under the notice of the king, apparently in the hope that he might be turned from his evil ways. He agreed to listen to the reading of the manuscript, but, after he had heard a few pages, he snatched it from the hand of the reader and, slashing it with a penknife which he had in his hand, tossed it into the fire and ordered Jeremiah and Baruch to be arrested.³

Against this daring act of impiety three who were present ventured to utter a remonstrance, but the rest, it is ex-

¹ Ch. xxvi.

² Ch. xx. It is well known that Jeremiah's prophecies are not in chronological order. Buchanan Blake's volume (*How to Read the Prophets*) on Jeremiah is useful, as it gives the prophecies in the order of time.

³ Ch. xxxvi.

pressly said, "were not afraid, nor rent their garments." Evidently the majority of those near the person of the king were in sympathy with the profane course which he was pursuing. The priesthood, as we can see from every part of the Book of Jeremiah, were as a body on the same side. But his bitterest opponents, strange to say, were themselves prophets. "False prophets," we call them now, but of course they did not so call themselves, nor were they so called by their contemporaries. They were called "men of God" and were supposed to possess the prophetic inspiration and foresight. They opposed Jeremiah face to face, pretending to have received revelations contradictory of the oracles delivered by him. The inviolability of the temple was the central article of their creed, and they looked with holy horror on the man who ventured to say that the shrine of God Almighty could fall into human hands. In this belief they may have been sincere, but their views were shallow, and they were afraid to utter disagreeable truths. They healed, as Jeremiah says, the hurt of the daughter of Zion slightly and said, "Peace, peace," when there was no peace. The great prophet was prejudiced against them; but there can be no doubt that his general estimate of their character is correct, and he says expressly that from the prophets of Jerusalem profaneness had gone out into all the land.¹ Thus priest and prophet, instead of being examples and pillars of religion, were its deadliest enemies. Nothing could more sadly prove the hopelessness of the age.

Jeremiah and Baruch escaped the myrmidons of Jehoiakim sent to arrest them; but probably they had to remain in hiding. Jehoiakim, meantime, continued to pursue the downward path, and at last the end came. The Babylonian power had risen to predominance in Mesopotamia, and Nebuchadnezzar, its prince and warrior, carried everything

¹ Ch. xxiii. 15.

before him in Western Asia. Jehoiakim became his vassal; but, attempting to throw off the yoke, lost both his throne and his life in the attempt; and his successor, Jehoiachin, after a reign of only a few months, was carried away captive to Babylon along with the flower of his subjects.

Zedekiah succeeded to the throne. He was a mere puppet of Babylon and obtained his seat by a solemn promise to be loyal to his suzerain; yet he also after a few years began to dream of independence and to form a combination with the petty kings of the surrounding countries, to cast off the galling yoke. Thereupon the crisis so long foreseen by Jeremiah came rapidly near. The prophet ventured into the very palace to remonstrate, as John the Baptist long after ventured into Herod's; and Zedekiah was impressed, as Herod was, but, like him, he was the slave of the public opinion by which he was surrounded; and the ruling classes were intoxicated with dreams of revolt and liberty. Subsequently Zedekiah again and again held private interviews with Jeremiah and sent to ask his prayers; but he had not force of character enough to follow the advice he received from the prophet.¹

At length the moment long dreaded arrived; the Chaldean army encompassed the city, and a siege of eighteen months began. It was raised for a time, indeed, by the appearance of an Egyptian army on the southern frontier; and, as Nebuchadnezzar had to turn to meet this enemy, the besieged hoped that the danger was past. The king sent to Jeremiah to inquire if this were so; but the prophet sternly answered that undoubtedly Nebuchadnezzar would return and complete the work which he had begun; and he advised the king to surrender and so save the city.²

At this time Jeremiah one day happened to have business to attend to in his native town of Anathoth, and was pass-

¹ xx. 1; xxxvii. 17; xxxviii. 14; cf. xxi. 1; xxvii. 12.

² xxxvii. 4 ff.

ing through the gate of Jerusalem with the purpose of proceeding thither, when he was arrested on a charge of deserting to the Chaldeans, and after being beaten—perhaps again with rods—was cast into prison. The king, hearing of it, set him at liberty; but the feeling against him continued to be bitter. Those who called themselves the patriotic party represented to the king that his gloomy vaticinations were weakening the courage of the defenders of the city. This view was not destitute of a show of justice, and they pressed it on the king so strongly that he agreed to yield up the prophet to their will. Accordingly Jeremiah was cast into a horrible dungeon,¹ where he would soon have perished, had not a friend of his in the palace, an Ethiopian eunuch, named Ebedmelech, interceded with the king on his behalf, who gave directions that he should be lifted out of the dungeon and kept in more lenient custody; and there he remained till the city was taken.²

This event took place at last, after the garrison and the inhabitants had suffered the extremities of starvation. Then ensued the sack of the city, when the fierce soldiery, long baulked, rushed on their prey and enacted those scenes of cruelty and lust which are described with awful realism in the Book of Lamentations. The city was reduced to ruins; the temple was set on fire, after its treasures had been rifled; the king escaped, but was captured, and, after his sons had been slain in his sight, his eyes were put out, and he was carried away, along with many of his subjects, to exile in Babylon. Only the poorest of the people were left behind; and one Gedaliah was set over them.

Jeremiah, in common with the rest of the more distinguished citizens, was led away from Jerusalem in irons; but the conqueror had heard of the attitude maintained by him during the siege and gave orders that he should be well treated and should have the option of either going to

¹ Ch. xxxvii. 1 ff.

² Ch. xxxviii.

Babylon or remaining in the Holy Land. He elected to do the latter, and accordingly became associated with Gedaliah, who was a friend of his and with whom he would have co-operated in shaping the poor remnant of his fellow-countrymen into something like a nation. But very shortly Gedaliah fell under the blow of an assassin, and the remnant over whom he had been placed, in a panic lest they should be held accountable by Nebuchadnezzar for the murder, resolved, in the teeth of the advice of Jeremiah, to flee to Egypt. Thither they carried the prophet, and his subsequent activity consisted in ministering to them in the city of Tahpanhes, where they had obtained a settlement. The last glimpses afforded of him in Holy Writ are in strict harmony with his previous life: he is still reproving sin, and the opposition to him is more sullen and determined than ever. There is too much likelihood in the rumour handed down by tradition that at last, in a popular tumult, he met with a martyr's death.¹

Such was Jeremiah's extraordinary career. Never surely was there a life of such unrelieved gloom. Like Newman, in our own century, he was early convinced that it was not the will of God that he should marry. He was an ascetic: "Thou shalt not go into the house of feasting, to sit with them to eat and to drink," was a voice he had heard from the Lord; and even from the solemn charities of burial he was equally to abstain.² We are glad to find that he was the owner of a bit of land in Anathoth, and that he had a few loyal friends, especially those of the house of Shaphan.³ Was ever a man who loved his country placed in a position like his, when, instead of cheering on his fellow-countrymen to resist the enemy by whom the city was invested, he had

¹ Ch. xlv.

² Ch. xvi. 1-9.

³ Ahikam and Gemariah, sons of Shaphan, Michaiah and Gedaliah, grandsons—xxvi. 24; xxix. 3; xxxvi. 11; xxxix. 14.

to advise the king in secret and the people in public to surrender, and after the fall of the city received special marks of favour from the conqueror? What a contrast to the position of Isaiah, who, when the enemy was at the gates of Jerusalem, sustained the fainting courage of the garrison within the walls and had his prophetic career crowned by a miracle of deliverance which he had predicted.

Yet, if ever there was a loving and patriotic heart, it was Jeremiah's. At any moment he would willingly have sacrificed his life for his country; and he may be said to have died for her many deaths. No wonder he often broke down under the burden of his destiny. There do not exist in literature passages more pathetic than those in which he complains of his lot. "Oh, that mine head were waters," he cries, "and mine eyes a fountain of tears, that I might weep day and night for the slain of the daughter of my people." He often wished he were out of all the strife and trouble: "Oh," he cries, "that I had in the wilderness a lodging-place of wayfaring men, that I might leave my people and go from them." He felt that the part which he had to play was clean contrary to his nature: "Woe is me, my mother, that thou hast borne me a man of strife, and a man of contention to the whole earth; I have neither lent on usury nor have men lent to me on usury; yet every one of them doth curse me." Sometimes he resolved that he would give it all up: "Then I said, I will not make mention of Him nor speak any more in His name." Sometimes he was so sad and dead-beaten that he wished he had never been born: "Cursed be the day wherein I was born; let not the day wherein my mother bare me be blessed. Cursed be the man who brought tidings to my father, saying, A man child is born unto thee, making him glad."¹

Jeremiah is "the man of sorrows" of the Old Testament;

¹ ix. 1, 2; xv. 10 ff.; xx. 9, 14 ff.

and in not a few respects he strikingly resembles the Man of sorrows of the New. Both were without honour in their own country and in their own house; for, as the people of Nazareth attempted to cast Jesus down from the hill on which their city was built, so the men of Anathoth plotted against Jeremiah's life; and, as he says, even his brethren and the house of his father dealt treacherously with him.¹ Both were opposed by the representatives of religion in their day—Jeremiah by the priests and prophets, as Jesus by the Pharisees and scribes. Both wept over the city of Jerusalem with passionate love, and the zeal of God's house did eat them up; yet both were considered traitors to their country and blasphemers of the temple; both were scourged; and, if the tradition already quoted is true, both were put to death by their own countrymen. Jeremiah lacked the sunshine of Jesus, the social sympathies, the power of forgiving enemies, the soaring and unflagging hopefulness. Yet his faith was remarkable: when the Chaldean army was in the country, he redeemed a field at Anathoth, to show that he still had faith in the country's future, as at Rome, when Hannibal was at the gates, the field on which his camp stood, being put up to auction, was bought at an undiminished price.² Jeremiah did not doubt, even at the worst, that the promises of God would yet be fulfilled. Sad as are the pages of his book, there are in it a few chapters—like beds of lilies floating on the surface of a lake of tears—hardly surpassed even by Isaiah in his loftiest and most hopeful moods. And, although Jeremiah himself would perhaps hardly have credited it, to few lives is the great word of Christ more applicable: "Except a corn of wheat fall into the ground and die, it abideth alone; but if it die, it bringeth forth much fruit." Like the life of Jesus that of Jeremiah seemed a tragic failure; but his influence

¹ Ch. xi. and xii.

² xxxii. 6 ff.

experienced a glorious resurrection ; and the secret of its profound and permanent power lies in the pain and pathos of his life, which can never cease to move the heart of humanity.

JAMES STALKER.

THE FORESIGHT OF FAITH.

THE difference between the eternal vision of God and the temporal outlook of man has been compared to one standing on a hill with the landscape in its length and breadth before him, and another crossing the plain in a swiftly moving train, on whom the landscape breaks part by part. This ingenious illustration, after it has served its purpose to show the relation of eternity and time, may be utilized to suggest that we also have an eternal kinship. We retain what we have seen after it has vanished ; we anticipate what has yet to be seen before it appears. It is the present which is not yet ours, since it is only being transferred to the exposed plate of experience—the past and the future are carried in our consciousness. One faculty of our mysterious nature records, as by an automatic register, the experiences of yesterday, so that not one deed, or word, or thought is lost—not one but can be reproduced by some commonplace spell, the crowing of a cock at early dawn, or the fragrance of dried rose-leaves in some old-fashioned drawing-room. Another pictures with minute prophetic power the experiences of to-morrow, so that the distant horizon is golden with inspiring illusions, or black with brooding anxieties. We are the slaves of memory and imagination, but in the conflict for the control of the soul imagination is easily victor. Hope rather than repentance is the instrument of salvation.

Imagination is the faculty which represents the future,

foresight is the quality which possesses it ; and foresight is one of the standards of character. Without foresight no one can claim to be of serious account—he may take lessons from an ant ; with it no one need despair of any achievement—he has outrun time. Foresight confers distinction on every effort of man, and raises it a degree. It elevates economy into providence ; it broadens business into enterprise ; with this addition politics become statesmanship, and literature prophecy. Life gains perspective and atmosphere ; it is reinforced by unseen hopes and rewards. The burden of the future becomes a balance in life, tempering the intoxication of joy with the cares of to-morrow, and softening the bitterness of sorrow with its compensations. Foresight, sending on its spies into the land of promise, returns to brace and cheer every power of the soul, and becomes the mother of all hardy and strenuous virtues, of self-restraint, and self-denial, of sacrifice and patience. He who seizes to-day may have pleasure ; he who grasps to-morrow shall have power.

An admirable work of modern art shows Jesus standing at the door of a carpenter's shop, and stretching himself after a long day's labour. The setting sun falling on His outspread arms makes the shadow of the cross, and carries terror into Mary's heart. The attitude of the body was typical of the attitude of the soul. Jesus grasped at the future, as He seemed also to carry with Him a mysterious past. Before Him extended the long distances of the Divine Will, and He arranged His life for Calvary. When a pious scholar came by night to discuss His new ideas, Jesus could not explain the Kingdom of God without a reference to His cross (St. John iii. 14). As He spake in the synagogue of Capernaum after the miracle of the loaves, His sacrifice rose before Him, and the bread of life became His Flesh and His Blood (St. John vi. 53). On the way to Jerusalem He drew His disciples aside, and, while the people passed in their

carelessness, Jesus described the tragedy that was at hand (St. Matt. xx. 18). The sight of certain foreign Jews, full of curiosity about this new Master, suggested to Him that throne from which He was to rule the world, and He saw across His Passion the victory of His Love (St. John xii. 23). In the upper room His vision had passed beyond the cross, and He commanded that the sacrament of His Body and Blood should be celebrated till His second advent (St. Luke xxii. 19). After His resurrection He gave the first earnest of the Holy Ghost, and anticipated the spread of the evangel throughout the world (Acts i. 8). With Jesus the present was ever eclipsed by the future, so that while the multitude would have made Him a King, He saw Himself forsaken on a cross; and while He was about to be crucified, He was promising to return for the judgment of the world. He set His face steadfastly, lifted above the ebb and flow of circumstances, because the Divine Will was ever revealing itself, peak above peak, to the ages of ages.

Possessed by the spirit of to-morrow, it was natural that our Master should labour to imbue His disciples with the same; but on a first reading His teaching presents a perplexing paradox. This Man, who was born amid the narrow circumstances of poverty, and acquainted with its exacting cares, belittles ordinary prudence to an audience of country folk, and gives counsels of perfection about an easy mind. With the scanty wages of Galilee, and the charge of little children, they were to allow to-morrow to take care of itself, and not even concern themselves about the bare necessities of life (St. Matt. vi. 25, 34). He saw His chosen disciples fling away their only means of livelihood with approval, and sent them forth on a mission as bare as the monks of St. Francis (St. Matt. x. 9, 10). If a young man won His love, He did not hesitate to demand the sacrifice of his possessions (St. Matt. xix. 21), and He pursued with bitter mocking rich men who doubled their investments (St. Luke

xii. 20). As for Himself, He was dependent on the charity of pious women (St. Luke viii. 3), and had to work a miracle to pay the temple tax (St. Matt. xvii. 27). He seems to justify the light heart of imprudence, and the recklessness of impulse, to condemn prudence as unbelief, and enterprise as crass foolishness.

Parallel with this depreciation of foresight, runs an endless exhortation to its practice. The Kingdom of God as the Chief Good is to be the first object in life (St. Matt. vi. 33); it is the pearl of great price which one ought to secure as the best of all his possessions (St. Matt. xiii. 46). It was wisdom to humble oneself as a little child, because the child-character stood highest in the coming State (St. Matt. xviii. 4); and better to take the lowest room at the feast of life, since the lowest would be the highest in the end (St. Luke xiv. 7-11). If one did sell all he had for Christ's sake, he would have treasure in heaven (St. Matt. xix. 21); and they who abandoned their best in His service, had the promise of a hundred-fold return (St. Matt. xix. 29). It was shrewder to labour for the Living Bread than for the meat that perisheth, because it would endure (St. John vi. 27); and to place one's capital in heaven rather than on earth, because of the moth and rust which corrupt, and the thieves which break through and steal (St. Matt. vi. 19). Lazarus, with his good things on the other side, has the advantage over Dives with his brief while of purple and fine linen (St. Luke xvi. 18-31); and as a mere matter of profit and loss, he that saves his soul is wiser than he who gains a world (St. Mark viii. 36). Jesus amazes us twice, first by casting the principle of prudence out of common life and making no provision for the future; and second, by introducing the principle of prudence into the sphere of religion, and making the rewards of the Kingdom of heaven a subject of calculation.

Let us remember that one of Jesus' most convincing

characteristics was a certain soundness of mind, which kept Him continually in contact with fact and life. He accepted creation before proceeding to regeneration, and preferred to utilize human nature rather than quarrel with it. Foresight is an instinct which is atrophied in criminals and wastrels, which flourishes in workers and rulers. It may be cultivated either within the sphere of the seen or the unseen, and as a matter of fact has seldom been adopted by faith. With two worlds before His eye, Jesus proposed to shift the *venue* of this influential motive from this world unto that which is to come, and sought to accomplish the change by starving foresight, when expended upon the material, and fostering it when devoted to the spiritual. As it is evidently out of the question that one can make the best of both worlds—ye cannot serve God and mammon, as our Master said in His conclusive way—Jesus desired that His disciples should concentrate themselves upon the world which remaineth.

Jesus embodied His comparative view of material and spiritual foresight in a parable which has a double distinction. The Unjust Steward is the only parable of Jesus which gives for one instant a shock of moral offence to the reader; it is also the only one which illustrates the action of the principle of foresight on two different ethical levels. It is quite allowable for us to be surprised that Jesus should choose a case of deliberate and clever fraud for a parable; it is scarcely pardonable that any intelligent person should suppose that Jesus approved or condoned the fraud. One is indeed struck by Jesus' felicity in selecting a set of circumstances which will so certainly excite intellectual curiosity, and so perfectly bring out His point. Within the briefest space the place of foresight in human action is defined, while its lower application is skilfully depreciated, and its higher power fully enforced. It is Jesus' most incisive deliverance on worldliness, and other-worldliness.

The parable is a palimpsest whose surface presents a story in commercial life, so ignoble and uninviting that it does not deserve record, and contains beneath half-hidden, half-revealed, a gospel of Jesus. But this palimpsest has a peculiarity of its own, because the upper legend is not an obliteration of the lower truth, but rather its introduction—the envelope which holds the message. One ought not to erase the legend before he has mastered it, because in that case he will miss the key to the interpretation of the truth. This indolent and luxurious steward, without conscience or manliness, is the lowest type of a man of this world. The unexpected discovery of his embezzlement, and his threatened dismissal from office, are the sudden changes which affect the ease and comfort of the present life. His vivid anticipations of the hardness of life for a poor and disgraced man show how selfishness can be served by imagination. And the fellow's fraudulent device is an-example of insurance against coming risks, and of adaptation to new circumstances. Jesus did not choose an honourable merchant because He required the dismissal for His parable, and He desired to invest sheer worldliness with a dash of contempt. This was a petty rascal—a mere fox of a man—but he saved himself, according to his lights, by foresight.

The under writing on the parchment corresponds with the upper, save for one or two significant blanks, and is a translation of the same story into another language. This self-indulgent steward is replaced by the disciple of Jesus with his cross. Death will release him from this inhospitable life and restore him to his home. Yet his imagination has never realized what shall be the splendour of his spiritual environment. And he is not striving with all his might so to till the opportunities of this life that he shall reap their harvest in the life which is to come. That shallow trickster will sell his conscience to secure a roof above his head for a brief space; but Jesus' disciple will not bestir

himself to make certain of everlasting habitations. It was to Jesus quite astonishing either that any one should take much thought what might befall him in this world which passeth away, or that any one should be indifferent to the infinite attraction of the world which abideth. The parable is a eulogium on foresight, and a plea that its whole force should be used to secure the "everlasting habitations." It is Jesus' argument for "other-worldliness."

It may be frankly admitted that a very coarse and sordid interpretation can be put on this argument, and the conduct of the unjust steward be repeated with aggravation on the spiritual side of things. The parable does lend itself to that material Theology whether of Rome or Geneva, which teaches that Heaven can be literally bought. Whether the price be the merits of Jesus or the merits of saints, the sufferings of Jesus or the alms of penitents, does not matter, since in either case the principle is the same and is clearly unreasonable. Heaven is a spiritual state and its settlement on any person, either on account of a payment in blood or money is an absurdity. His introduction into this new environment without respect to his fitness would be an outrage. This is too literal a rendering of the steward's book-keeping; too flagrant a contradiction of the whole spirit of Jesus' teaching. Jesus' blood will give white robes which are the dress of Heaven: the faithful use of riches will produce character which is the passport to Heaven. One can imagine how the penitent thief might become suddenly fit for Paradise, because he did homage to goodness—when goodness was obscured by the shame and weakness of the cross. One cannot imagine Ananias obtaining entrance by the unwilling gift of all he possessed, or by an act of mercenary faith. Foresight will win Heaven, but it is not the foresight of a mercantile speculation.

One remembers at the same time that certain persons in the Gospels did use their earthly possessions after such

a wise and gracious fashion that they proved themselves not unworthy to have a place in the Kingdom of Heaven, either in this world or the next. The Magi who brought their gifts to the Holy Child; the faithful women who made a home for God's Son; St. Matthew, and such as he, who left all to follow Him; Zaccheus, who in honour of His coming gave half of his goods to the poor; Joseph, who obtained Christ's body from Pilate and laid it in his own garden tomb were good stewards. These men did make friends with the mammon of unrighteousness, and changed their gold and silver into eternal riches. They did not make their sacrifices for ends of gain, but for love's sake. Keeping the one commandment of Love, they had kept all the others, and had a right to enter in by the gate into the City. This little handful saw farther than all their generation, for in the things of the Spirit foresight is not the cunning calculation of chances, it is rather the sacrifice of everything for Christ. There are two passages which go well together in the Gospels: one is "Then took Mary a pound of spikenard, very costly, and anointed the feet of Jesus"; and the other, "In My Father's house are many mansions . . . I go to prepare a place for you."

According to the mind of Jesus, the foresight which prepares one for the future life is a certain attitude of soul. No person, it may be assumed, would refuse the reversion of a blessed future, with its high hopes of the freedom of holiness and the unfettered service of the Divine Will, but many persons are not minded to subordinate its unseen excellence to the solid possession of the present. They have made themselves so absolutely at home among the principles and rewards of a material world that they would be out of place amid the very different conditions and occupations of a spiritual world. It is this unfitness that will deny them a habitation. Certain persons, on the other hand, are determined that

the physical shall not fling its "tangling veil" so close around their hearts as to blind them to the glory of the Unseen, and are prepared to use the things which are seen as the stepping-stone to the things which are eternal. They store within their souls these intangible treasures of goodness, which are wrested from the experiences of sacrifice as pearls from the dark caverns of the deep. With such gold they purchase their home in the Land of Promise. Their fitness will ensure their habitation.

"He who flagged not in the earthly strife,
From strength to strength advancing only he,
His soul well knit, and all his battles won,
Mounts and that hardly to eternal life."

Jesus approved the man who lived under the power of the Unseen, who was guided by a resolute, strenuous faith, who was determined not to lose the future. He had no hope of easy-going, thoughtless, improvident persons—the pauper class—in the spiritual world: from them he expected no great endeavours: for them he prophesied nothing but disasters. The man who had forethought built his house on the rock: the man who had none built his on the sand. The rock-house stood, the sand-house fell. The servant who played the fool because his master delayed his coming was cast out: had he persevered unto the end, he would have been accepted. It was the catastrophe of short-sightedness: he ought to have kept his master's coming before his eyes. Five virgins are resolved that they will on no account miss the marriage, and make their arrangements at a cost of thought. Five have other things to think about besides the marriage, and do not burden themselves with preparations. Five enter in because for them the Kingdom of God was first: five remain outside because for them it was an ordinary matter. The wise virgins were of the same temper as Jesus Himself, and so they were His friends.

“Other-worldliness” has been the subject of much satire in our materialistic day, and has been condemned for its enervating and crippling influence on life. It is right, therefore, to remind oneself that “Other-worldliness” has two forms and that both are not open to such charges. One school of piety has always held that the choice preparation for the Eternal World is seclusion and devotion, and when the Second Advent was confidently expected, in the middle ages, society was disorganized and life arrested in Europe. Western Christendom was caught in a spasm of repentance, and even irreligious people were shaken; some entered sacred houses; some hid themselves in caves; some set out for Palestine to meet the Lord. The fruits of that brief emotion remain unto this day in stately buildings and ecclesiastical donations. Yet about that very time some one conceived a very lovely parable that also remaineth. How a godly monk prayed and fasted and longed to see Christ. How one day a light began to shine in his lonely cell, and he waited for the visible revelation of his loved Lord; how at that very moment his summons came to feed the poor at the convent gate; how he obeyed the call and gave out the loaves of bread and returned in sorrow, for he was sure that he had missed the condescension of the Lord; and how Christ was waiting for him, and said, “Hadst thou refused thy duty, I had left; since thou wast faithful, I tarried to bless thee.” Two complementary chapters in “Other-worldliness.”

Charles V. of Spain was the greatest personage in the history of his day—the heir of four royal lines, ruler of Spain, the Netherlands, Austria and Naples, for whom Cortes had also conquered the New World. He led huge armies, gained great victories, conducted momentous affairs, lived amid critical events. In his day the Ottoman was beaten back from the frontiers of Europe and the Christian

Church was divided. It was in this wide place Charles lived, amid these stirring circumstances he moved; yet he was ever thinking of the end, and had resolved, with Isabella, his loved Queen, to retire at a certain time into a holy place and wait for Christ. The Master came for her before the day arrived, but Charles abdicated his throne and divested himself of power amid general sorrow and admiration, and gave his last days to the practice of religion in the Monastery of Yuste. Contrast with this cloistered piety the scene in the American Senate-house during the Revolution, when at mid-day a great darkness fell and no man could see his brother's face. Even these stout Puritans were for the moment dismayed. Voices cried, "It is the Day of Judgment," and there was some confusion. Then one of the Fathers rose and said, "Whether it be the Judgment Day or no, I know not, but this I know, that it is God's Will we save our country, and we shall be judged accordingly. I move that the candles be lit and that we go on with our business." Two schools of "Other-worldliness," and very different. With the Catholic foresight spelt devotion—with the Puritan, duty.

It is an ungenerous task to compare these types of piety, and one ought to be grateful for each in its place. The Master is not likely to despise that delicate and reverent feeling which would wait for His coming in a secret place and meet Him in prayer. Nor is it to be thought that He will set any store by the mechanical performance of loveless service and exalt Judas with his bag above Mary with her spikenard. Jesus has wrought a beautiful harmony, for in one of His parables He has taken the most mystical form of "Other-worldliness"—that which watches for His Second Advent, and has laid on His waiting servant the most homely task—to give to the household their meat in due season. With one touch of grace He has made duty a synonym for piety, and has reconciled the inner and

outer life. He has vindicated the "Other-worldliness" of the Gospels, for He has made the foresight of the Kingdom of God, in its loftiest ambition as well as its minutest calculation, identical with the unsparing and self-forgetful service of man.

JOHN WATSON.

PROFESSOR F. BLASS ON THE TWO EDITIONS
OF ACTS.¹

ONE of the most important contributions to the textual criticism and the interpretation of *Acts* that have appeared in this century is the new edition by the veteran Greek scholar, Dr. F. Blass, of Halle. Dr. Blass leads a conservative reaction in Germany. He accepts the Lucan authorship and the unity of *Acts* unhesitatingly; and occasionally makes rather discontented allusions to the "critical views" on this subject. But he is not disposed to worship the "Eastern Text" (what we may call the "Approved Text") of *Acts*, and to reject the "Western Text" wherever it varies, according to the general (though happily not the universal) opinion of modern scholars. He considers that the Eastern and the Western Text are both original, both written by Luke himself; and his views on this point are probably the feature of his book that will attract most attention. They had been stated already in an article in the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1894, p. 86 f., and are here repeated in a fuller form. In at least one detail the book improves on the view stated in the article. In the article he held that the text of Codex Bezae, in XIV. 2, "the *archisynagogo*i of the Jews and the rulers of the synagogue" resulted from a union of two different readings; but

¹ *Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum Liber alter*: editio philologica, etc., auctore Friderico Blass, Göttingen, 1895.

now he rightly says that the *archisynagogoi* are not the same as the rulers,¹ and retains both in the text which he believes to be Lucan (omitting only "of the synagogue").

Dr. Blass proceeds to edit and explain the book as he would a Greek classic. He starts, not with the fixed idea that the book is a second-century compilation, but with the simple and straightforward desire to determine the exact words written by the author, and to understand what he intended to say; and therefore he has succeeded in doing far more for the interpretation of his author than if he had essayed the insoluble problem of dissecting him. No previous edition has done so much in the way of analysing the exact meaning of words. For example, he has devoted especial care to observing the author's intention in varying between the imperfect and the aorist—a variation which is always carefully planned, and gives the key to many misinterpreted passages—and this alone would give the edition a high rank. That single point, the use of the tenses, is by itself sufficient, as I believe, to prove to any man of literary feeling that the book is a real book, planned throughout by a writer of considerable literary power and of marked individuality. Unfortunately some excellent scholars have had their attention withdrawn from the literary quality of the book, and concentrated on cutting it up into scraps, which, when taken as scraps, are necessarily misinterpreted into incongruity with each other. This author requires to be read as a whole, and studied with a microscope. There is no historical narrative known to me which will bear such minute examination as *Acts*, none which requires to be pressed so close before its meaning is caught. The author depends for his effect on many minute points of style, and

¹ A similar observation (though, as I think, more exact in expression) was made on this passage in my *Church in the Rom. Emp.*, pp. 46, 480: naturally Dr. Blass's agreement in this matter is gratifying, especially as it is arrived at independently (for he evidently has not seen my book).

demands from his readers so much knowledge and such constant effort to recreate the picture which the writer had before him, that his work has been—I do not hesitate to say—misunderstood and undervalued to an extraordinary degree; and his most delicate and telling points have been often misinterpreted as proofs of ignorance or inaccuracy.¹

This edition is full of good remarks on the language and style of the author, and quotation cannot give a fair idea of its wealth in this respect. Still I will quote one or two which (all unknown to the author) have some bearing on subjects familiar to readers of the EXPOSITOR. He repeatedly points out that *μὲν οὖν* is used without a following *δέ*, *ut sapissime* i. 18, cp. the notes on i. 6, ii. 41, v. 41, xi. 19, xiii. 4, xvii. 17, xxiii. 18, etc. He shows the fondness of Luke for participles; and points out (p. 20) that an aorist participle does not necessarily denote an anterior action, or a present participle a coincident action.² He remarks on the *mirus error* of those who have fancied that *διήλθον* in xvi. 6 could be used here in the sense of travelling without preaching in the country traversed;³ and, comparing *Galatians* iv. 13, he goes on to show that the theory which maintains that Paul, travelling idly in Galatia, became ill, and in gratitude for the nursing given by the natives, proceeded to evangelize them, is contrary to the plain force of the words of *Acts*. He will, however, have nothing to do with the South-Galatian theory; but, after thus cutting away the interpretation on which Lightfoot

¹ The great superiority in vivid style and local accuracy of *Acts* xiii.–xxviii. over *Acts* i.–xii. and the Third Gospel, is due to the author's intimate knowledge of persons and places and events in xiii.–xxviii. as compared with his dependence on transmitted information in the earlier chapters and the Gospel.

² He however rejects *ἀσπασάμενοι* in spite of the general consensus of Greek MSS. in xv. 13, printing *ἀσπασόμενοι* in his text.

³ After reading this remark, one can only wonder that Dr. Blass has introduced *διήλθον* into even the Eastern Text in xvi. 8, where it is a manifest error of the Western Text. Mysia was a part of Asia; and the travellers, on Dr. Blass's own principle, could not *διελθεῖν*, but only *παρελθεῖν* (*i.e.* neglect it).

and other recent scholars have based the North-Galatian theory, he *alters the text of Galatians* iv. 13, and thus gets a foundation for the North-Galatian theory.¹ This bold solution brings us to one of the weaknesses of this edition—viz., Dr. Blass's fondness for introducing conjectures into the text. That was the fault of the old-fashioned scholars; but we did not expect that he would have been guilty of it. According to the principles of modern scholarship, it is simply not permissible to introduce conjectural emendations in a case where textual authority exists of such abundance and high character as the MSS. of *Acts*. It is therefore not surprising that Dr. Blass's conjectures are far from convincing; it was impossible that they should be convincing. For example, in xvi. 13 he gives the text οὐ ἐνόμιζον ἐν προσευχῇ εἶναι, "where they were wont to engage in prayer," in place of ἐνομιζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι. That this reading is impossible becomes obvious at once when we ask what is the nominative to ἐνόμιζον? With Dr. Blass's text the narrative states that "we reached Philippi; and on the sabbath went to a place where they were wont to engage in prayer." A vague third person plural of this kind can, in Luke, refer only to the whole body of residents in Philippi.² But obviously the subject here must be "the Jews who resided at Philippi," and such a sudden introduction of a new idea as unexpressed nominative is an unjustifiable conjecture. Dr. Blass's reason, in dependence on Schürer's

¹ I need not comment on the extraordinary error in l. 10 from the bottom of p. 176, where he seems to think that the inhabitants of Galatia were called *Galli*. They were of course called Galatæ. Dr. Blass also, while he often praises Luke's accuracy of expression, makes him, in xvi. 6, guilty of the solecism of using Γαλατικὴ χώρα in the sense of Γαλατία. No person who had any knowledge of the country, or had spoken to persons that had such knowledge, could be guilty of such an error, which is similar to the use of "the British Territory" in the sense of "Great Britain." Dr. Blass also takes Φρυγίαν in xvi. 6 as a noun, which is of course necessary for the North-Galatian theory.

² Compare, e.g., xiii. 3, where after the Church at Antioch has been spoken of, the third plural is used of "the whole body of adherents."

Gesch. d. Jüd. Volkes, ii. p. 373, is that "it cannot be proved that open places where meetings for prayer were held were distinguished from synagogues by the name *προσευχή*, as was inferred wrongly from this passage." But Dr. Schürer does not give exactly what Dr. Blass gathers from him; he says that *προσευχή* is equivalent to *συναγωγή*.¹ Whether Schürer is right or wrong is not here the question.² The fact remains that *προσευχή* on his view, as on that of others, can be used (and was used by Philo) in the sense of "a place of prayer"; and so the text says, "where we thought that there was a place for the Jews to pray." This place is, according to Schürer, simply a synagogue; but more probably Luke means, "whether or not the praying-place was precisely a synagogue." That *proseucha* denoted a praying-place of some kind or other is familiar to every reader of Juvenal iii. 296, where one man insults another by insinuating that he is a Jew or a proselyte in the question, "In what *proseucha* shall I look for you?"

Take as an example of wrong text xiii. 14: he reads *Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας*, with the note "*cum adj. Πισιδίος non exstet, lectio τὴν Πισιδίαν reicienda est.*" The agreement of *ἌΒC* is nothing to Dr. Blass; the Lexicons do not recognise an adjective *Πισιδίος*, and therefore the MSS. must give way. The few who have tried to understand the place-names of Asia Minor and have appreciated the depths of ignorance and error in which these names are buried, will recognise at once the inadequacy of this reason; for the very name Pisidia is strictly *ἡ Πισιδία (γῆ)*, and implies the former existence of an adjective *Πισιδίος*. I would in such a case take the evidence of *ἌB*, even without *AC*, as suffi-

¹ Schurer, p. 373. "So wird überhaupt zwischen beiden Ausdrücken kein sachlicher Unterschied zu statuiren sein."

² I hardly dare to hope that he is right; but, if he is, the view which I entertain about this incident and expect soon to publish would be strengthened very greatly. But Luke would not use *προσευχή*, unless he meant to indicate something different from *συναγωγή*.

cient to prove that the adjective continued in use. But further, the adjective occurs in Ptolemy v. 5, 4, where "Pisidian Phrygia" is spoken of.¹ No defence is needed for the consensus of these four MSS.; and had not Dr. Blass been a little too eager to justify the Western Text (D has *Πισιδίας* as a noun), he would not have felt any need for defence; but since he will not follow the MSS. without some warrant, we give him Ptolemy. Nor is this a small matter: so admirable is the art of Luke that nothing can be safely said to be a small matter in his text. A whole chapter of instruction in Luke's method as a historian hangs on that adjective *Πισιδίαν* in xiii. 14, and the contrast with the genitive of the noun in xiii. 13, *τῆς Παμφυλίας*. One cannot wonder that the critics, whose attention is monopolized by the task of cutting *Acts* into fragments by different authors, have missed the point of that delicate distinction; but I marvel that Dr. Blass has not observed it with all that follows from it.

The error of judgment in this case is due to deficient acquaintance with the antiquities of the country; and in general we notice that Prof. Blass, while he is admirable as an expounder of the language of Luke, shows not infrequently an inadequate knowledge where *Realien* (to borrow a convenient German term) are concerned. For example, he has quite a good note (though founded on a rather incomplete list of authorities)² on xiii. 51 (p. 156);

¹ Dr. Blass may perhaps say that Ptolemy's words *Φρυγία Πισιδία* mean 'Phrygian Pisidia;' but Ptolemy's regular custom in his *headings* is to put the noun first and the epithet afterwards: cp. e.g., the heading of v. 15 *Συρίας Κοίλης* (though *ἡ Κοίλη Συρία* was almost an established name), but in the text v. 15, 22, *Κοίλης Συρίας Δεκαπόλεως πόλεις αἶδε*. Similarly *Πόντος Γαλατικός*, *Πόντος Καππαδοκικός*, *Κιλικίας Τραχείας* (v. 5, 3), etc., occur in the headings of sections.

² But he adds from Stephanus, a native Iconian legend (omitted by me), in which the inhabitants of Iconium style themselves Phrygians. The additional instance strengthens most satisfactorily my argument that the conception which is implied in xiv. 6 of Iconium as being outside of Lycaonia

but when, in his *Addenda*, p. x., we find him quoting with approval a contradictory and extraordinarily inaccurate remark on the same passage (one of the few blots on the excellent English work whence Dr. Blass quotes it), we must suppose that his original note was right by mere accident. Nor is it only in the heart of Asia Minor (where hardly any one except Bishop Lightfoot ever takes the trouble to be right), that Dr. Blass is disappointing; he is just as little at home on the open Levant, or in the Athenian Agora¹ (in spite of Dörpfeld's skilled help, see on xvii. 19). It would require a whole article to examine Dr. Blass's commentary on the narrative of Paul's visit to Athens, where we have an excellent specimen both of his strength and (as I venture to maintain) of his weakness.² But let us take an example of his commentary on the open sea.

On xxvii. 4, Dr. Blass remarks that sailors were in the habit of making a straight course from Syria to Lycia keeping west of Cyprus. But, with the steady and persistent westerly breezes of the Levant, such a voyage was rarely possible; and there can be no doubt that the Adramyttian ship took the usual course.³ A study of James

rests on familiarity with the local circumstances, viz., the pride of the Iconians in their Phrygian nationality.—*Vide Church in Rom. Empire*, p. 46.

¹ I do not mean to imply that Dr. Blass has not visited Athens or the Levant, as to which I have no knowledge.

² One truth I must quote. On *σπερμολόγος* (a word of Athenian slang) he says *sine dubio hoc ex ipso ore Atheniensium auctor exceptit*. One serious error shall be set alongside of it. He rejects Ernst Curtius's admirable and convincing exposition of the scene at Athens on the ground that "non dicitur 'Ἄρειος πάγος nisi de loco.'" One of my pupils, Mr. A. Souter, when he saw this statement, at once remarked that Dr. Blass had evidently not studied Cicero, who says to Atticus I. 14, 5, "Senatus 'Ἄρειος πάγος,'" Our senate is a veritable (court of) Areopagus. Cicero had learned that phrase during the six months he spent in Athens; and here again, if we begin by understanding Luke, we shall say, "hoc exceptit ex ipso ore Atheniensium." After beginning so well with *σπερμολόγος*, Dr. Blass should have applied Curtius's theory; and kept in mind that the scene is described in Athenian slang as it occurred.

³ The same steady westerly winds which carried many ships every year from Myra to Tyre (see xxi. 2-4), would prevent the return voyage from Tyre

Smith's *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul* would have saved Dr. Blass from this error. But, it may be urged, Luke when he states so carefully the reason why they sailed east of Cyprus, implies that their course was exceptional. If he implies this, he is wrong; but, in truth, this is one of many little touches which show that Luke was not familiar with the Levant and its navigation, as he was with the Ægean Sea. The reason why he introduces this statement (and he is an author who rarely mentions causes, and contents himself with recording facts) is purely literary; the same writer who mentioned in xxi. 3 that he had come by the west side of Cyprus now felt bound to explain why he did not go back the same way. Here we have a slight mark of unity of authorship.

Again, the note on xxvii. 6 shows singular want of acquaintance with ships and voyages; and the inferences drawn from Lucian's *Navigium seu Vota* are utterly vitiated thereby. With the prevailing westerly breezes, the Alexandrian corn-ships going to Rome could often make a straight run across to Myra¹ (*Acts* xxvii. 6), but when the winds were north-westerly, the ships were driven towards the Syrian coast (Lucian, *loc. cit.*), whence they had to keep along the Karamanian coast to Myra (*Acts* xxvii. 4-5; Lucian, *loc. cit.*). From Myra the ships hugged the coast for some way, and then ran down to keep south of Crete (*Acts* xxvii. 7). Occasionally a ship might try to run from opposite Cnidus across to Malea; but, with the winds that

to Myra. Compare the admirable account of Barnabas's voyage to Cyprus in the *Periodoi Barnabæ*.

¹ To any one that has sailed a boat, or knows anything about "the way of a ship in the sea," a glance at the map would prove that this was their ideally best course, as soon as he learns what are the prevailing winds in the Levant, and, until he learns that, he will make no assertion at all in the matter; but the thorough landsman can rarely quite disabuse himself of the idea that a line drawn with a ruler on a map from Alexandria to the south point of Italy is the course which a ship would naturally aim at.

prevail in the Ægean Sea, this could not have been common, for ships dreaded lest a north wind might run them on the harbourless north coast of Crete.¹ Lucian's ship is, for the purposes of the author, supposed to have tried to run across, but to have been forced by south-westerly gales to take refuge in the Piræus. It is strange how dark all this is to the commentators on Acts xxvii., and yet James Smith cleared up the whole subject (nearly but not quite faultlessly) about fifty years ago.²

It has long been recognised that the MSS. of *Acts* are divided into two classes, which cannot be traced to a common original text; but there has been general agreement that the class to which the overwhelming majority of MSS. (including the oldest and best) belong represents the original text, as written by the author, and that the other text is not original; but as to the way in which this other text (commonly called the Western³ Text) came into existence, no agreement exists. The Accepted Text, commonly called the Eastern, can be determined, and has been determined with very considerable accuracy, in the form which it had in the early part of the fourth century, and which Westcott and Hort's edition probably gives more correctly than any of the other great modern editions. For my own part I venture to think that there are decidedly more corruptions in that text than Westcott and Hort admit; but still they and all other scholars admit that it does contain corruptions, and does not give us the exact text as it was written by the author. It follows

¹ "Harbourless" of course means "possessing very few harbours." Suda Bay is an excellent harbour on the north coast.

² I have not seen Smith's second edition, where probably he may have made all the needful corrections.

³ Prof. Blass justly objects to this name, which conveys a false idea of the relation between the two texts; but, as it has become customary, and as every one recognises its wrong character (which prevents its doing harm), we shall use it in this article.

that we must try to get behind the MSS. of the Eastern Text in order to reach the true Lucan Text. Does the so-called Western Text help us in this difficulty?

In studying and trying to restore the Western Text there are two entirely different problems which ought to be kept quite distinct, but are not always kept distinct. (1) What is the genesis of the text contained in *Codex Bezae*? (2) What is the "Western Text"?¹ *Codex Bezae* is the best representative—but a bad representative—of the "Western Text," containing a great amount of corruption pure and simple. Further, supposing that we have solved these two problems, and have got the "Western Text" as it existed about 160 A.D. or 180 A.D. (not to name too early a date for fear of rousing controversy at this stage), there still remains a double problem, (a) Does the Western Text enable us to get behind the Eastern Text and reach the original source of some of the corruptions that have affected all MSS. of the latter? (b) What is the origin and authority of those readings in the Western Text which obviously go back to a different original from the Eastern? I have elsewhere attempted to show, as to (a), that by means of the primitive text, which is embodied (along with much else) in *Codex Bezae*, we can reach back to the correct text of various corrupt passages in the Eastern Text,² and Prof. Blass has carried this process much further.³ As to question (b) Prof. Blass maintains that Luke wrote two divergent copies, and that the Eastern Text springs from

¹ Prof. Rendel Harris in his *Study of Codex Bezae* quite recognises the existence of two separate problems (see, e.g., p. 223 § 1), though I doubt whether he has always kept them sufficiently apart in actual handling. It is, however, hardly fair to criticise a book which the author now declares not to represent his maturer opinion; see his *Lectures on the Western Text*, 1894. It is right to wait his full statement of his views.

² *Church in Rom. Emp.*, pp. 36, 46, 52, 87, 94, 128, 140, 151 f., 167.

³ It is interesting to observe that several of those readings in *Cod. Bez.* which I have defended are rejected as corruptions by Prof. Blass, e.g., xix. 28, 34; xiv. 13.

one, the Western from the other, of the two Lucan copies ; both texts, then, have equal authority, provided that we can recover their original form amid the corruptions (more or less numerous) which have affected them.

The only satisfactory method of establishing such a theory is to restore the Western Text, and let it justify itself. No systematic attempt has hitherto been made, but now Dr. Blass has essayed it. He fully admits (p. 25 f.) that the task cannot be properly completed with our accessible material ; and his attempt therefore is confessedly only provisional. But if Dr. Blass, with his consummate scholarship, training, and experience, cannot perform the task, no one can. He has picked his steps along the slippery path with marvellous care and success, and has given us a fair approximate idea of what the Western Text must have been ;¹ and we shall not, for the purpose of this inquiry, go beyond the limits he has marked out for it. I may say that I had no prejudice against his theory when it first appeared in the article quoted above ; but on the contrary have been, in a humble way, a defender of the real value of that text against the great MSS. of the Eastern Text. I pondered for months over the theory, and at last actually adopted it for a time ; but during a nine days' voyage in September, with full leisure to think over the problem as a whole, I seemed to see more clearly its real character ; and now the contemplation of the text as settled by Dr. Blass only confirms the opinion I then reached. This text is not Lucan ; it has a superficial smoothness, which is fatal ; it loses much of the rather harsh but intensely individual style of Luke ; and it neglects some of the literary forms which Luke created.

¹ At the same time I must express dissent about details ; he has rejected as corruptions some readings which seem to me to belong to the Western Text, and he has introduced even into the Eastern Text some readings which seem to be corruptions.

But it has a distinct and independent value (1) as preserving amid corruptions an independent second century witness to aid us where the great uncials are all at fault, (2) as giving the idea entertained as to the meaning of the text during the first half of the second century in the churches that lay along the great line of connexion between Antioch and Ephesus, and (3) as recording on trustworthy independent evidence certain facts which were omitted by Luke.

If this view be right, the Western Text retains a high value even for the words of Luke (quite apart from the cases where it preserves the true text). For example, it shows in xvi. 12 what was the text which the schools of Asia Minor and North Syria were commenting on during the second century, and thus vindicates the accuracy of the Eastern Text against the conjecture even of Dr. Hort himself.¹ It is one of the few authorities which help us to get at the ways and thoughts of the Eastern Churches and Christians during the period between 80 and 150 A.D. It enables us, *e.g.* in xiv. 2, to observe the genesis of the "Pauline Legends," as yet barely distinguishable from history; and in this respect it stands on much the same level as the original text of the "Acta of Paul and Thekla," which I have elsewhere tried to disentangle from the later accretions by which it is overlaid: there also it is hardly possible to distinguish where history ends and historical romance begins. With the help of these two authorities, combined with the early Christian inscriptions (for, although they begin only about 190, they give retrospective evidence), we realize that there was in the churches of North Syria² and Asia Minor a considerable amount of intellectual life

¹ See *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 158 note.

² Perhaps I should say "Greek Syria" rather than "North Syria," *i.e.*, this intellectual life was found where the Greek or rather Græco-Roman education and civilization dominated the tone of the churches of Syria.

during that obscure but most interesting period. How then has almost all trace of that intellectual life disappeared? Simply because it was so different from and so repugnant to the spirit of the Christianity which was the ruling element in the fourth century and even earlier. Christianity, as struggling to establish itself in the life of pagan society and as gradually transforming that society, was not to the taste of those who ruled (or were almost ready to rule) with a rod of iron the civilized world and to crush all difference, all dissent, all individuality, beneath the centralized despotism of the Christian Empire. But to the historian and many Christians of the present day the second century spirit is by far the more interesting study, and presents the more vigorous and invigorating form of religious thought.

In arguing against the too high character which Dr. Blass claims for the Western Text, it is fair to take the text at its best. Doubtless every one will agree that the most distinctive and important Western variants lie in that "group of bold and startling expansions of the narrative, the major part of which certainly proceeded from a common hand," as Prof. Rendel Harris says.¹ It is about this class of readings probably that Dr. Hort remarks,² "an incautious student may be easily tempted by the freshness of the matter to assume that it must have come from the hand of the writer of the book before him." An additional advantage in dealing with readings of this kind is that we can select cases where objective and external criteria are applicable, and mere individual subjective opinion has less scope. I think that a dispassionate consideration of the best and

¹ *Study of Codex Bezae*, p. 223.

² *New Testament in Greek*, II. p. 174, though he there speaks especially of the Western Text of the Gospels, and more hesitatingly of *Acts*. Dr. Blass, on the other hand, maintained in his article that his theory applies only to *Acts* and not to the Gospels.

most vivid additions made in the Western Text of Acts will lead us on purely archæological evidence to the unavoidable conclusion that they are, as a rule, subsequent appendages to an already existing narrative. But this argument requires a special article.

W. M. RAMSAY.

(To be concluded.)

OF THE NATURE OF FAITH, PARTICULARLY
IN ITS RELATION TO SIGHT AND REASON.

ONE of the great difficulties attending all enquiries into the nature of Faith arises from the manifold varieties of meaning which, in common language, have gathered round the single syllable, Faith. In books and talk we speak of subjective faith, objective faith, personal faith, historic faith, ethical faith, the sacred deposit of faith, dead faith, the living faith which works by love. In all these, and other cognate uses of the term Faith, it is evident that the shades of meaning associated with the term are manifold and various. In its adjectival forms of "faithful" and "faithless," faith is used almost exclusively in the ethical sense of trustworthy, and unworthy of trust. God is faithful: He keeps faith; His word is sure; His promise immutable. Yet God has no faith: faith is no part of the Divine attributes in that sense of faith which the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews adopts when he says "These all died in faith, not having received the promise."¹ Although God is absolutely faithful, and in all things to be trusted, yet God takes nothing on trust Himself; by reason of His omniscience He is altogether incapable of faith, if by "faith" we mean trust in things unseen and reliance on things which, at most, are but partially known.

This manifoldness of meaning and diversity of use is, I repeat, one of the great difficulties blocking the very threshold of enquiry into the nature of faith. Even the Bible itself does not confine its use of the term "faith" to any single and unvarying signification. It speaks of the faith of devils,² the faith of God's elect,³ the faith of Jesus,⁴ the faith which saves,⁵ and the faith which does *not* save

¹ Heb. xi. 13.

² James ii. 19.

³ Titus i. 1.

⁴ Rev. xiv. 12.

⁵ Ephes. ii. 8.

—"though I have all faith, so that I could remove mountains, and have not charity, I am nothing."¹ These Biblical uses of the term "faith" are obviously very far from being identical, ranging, as they do, from the faith which intensifies the torments of demons to the faith which is the salvation, and peace, and joy of the saints. But leaving aside, for the sake of concentration and perspicuity, all other secondary uses of the term "faith" to be found in the Bible, there remain two primary and fundamental uses—uses which are both mutually distinguished and separately distinct. These two uses are: (1) Faith regarded as a faculty of man's spirit, and (2) *the* Faith regarded as a deposit of doctrine. It is obvious that when the term "faith" is used in such passages as: the faith of Abraham,² hast thou faith?³ we walk by faith,⁴ that Christ may dwell in your heart by faith,⁵ the sense of the term is different from the sense in such passages as—Elymas sought to turn away the proconsul from the faith,⁶ Felix and Drusilla sent for Paul and heard him concerning the faith,⁷ he hath denied the faith,⁸ contend for the faith,⁹ I have kept the faith.¹⁰ In the former class of passages faith is evidently regarded as a personal possession, an individual attribute, the power of spiritual discernment in man; whereas in the latter class of passages, *the* Faith is the sacred deposit of doctrine; the historic and objective Evangel; the form of sound words;¹¹ the things which are surely believed;¹² rather than the faculty which perceives and believes the things. And, for the most part, the writers in Holy Scripture clearly mark this distinction in the two great uses of the term Faith, by prefixing the definite article before the term when it is used

¹ 1 Cor. xiii. 2.² Rom. iv. 12.³ Rom. xiv. 22.⁴ 2 Cor. v. 7.⁵ Ephes. iii. 17.⁶ Acts xiii. 8.⁷ Acts xxiv. 24.⁸ 1 Tim. v. 8.⁹ Jude 3.¹⁰ 2 Tim. iv. 7.¹¹ 2 Tim. i. 13.¹² S. Luke i. 3.

in the sense of the objective body of historic belief—the Faith once for all delivered unto the saints;¹ and omitting the article when faith is used to connote the instrument or faculty of individual belief in man—without faith it is impossible to please God.²

In this paper I propose to omit all consideration of the term “faith” in the objective sense of the things believed; and to enquire only into the nature of “faith” in the subjective sense of the mysterious power possessed by man of believing things: things invisible, eternal, infinite; things super-sensible, super-rational, wholly spiritual.

The creeds of Christendom are largely historic, consisting in great measure of facts and incidents which, when they first transpired, were obvious to sense—to the ears of those who heard the words, to the eyes of those who saw the deeds, to the feeling of those who touched the persons. The manifestation of the Gospel was, in the first instance, a manifestation—*φανερῶσις*—to the senses. “That which was from the beginning, which we have heard, which we have seen with our eyes, which we have looked upon, and our hands have handled of the Word of life; for the life was manifested and we have seen it: that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you:—*ὃ ἑώρακαμεν καὶ ἀκηκόαμεν, ἀπαγγέλλομεν ὑμῖν.*”³ Then after the contemporaries of Christ had passed away, the incidents of the Gospel became matter of history, dependent, like all other matters of history, for their authorization upon tried and rational testimony. The manifestation of the Gospel which, at first, had been a manifestation to the senses, became subsequently, in its purely historic part, a manifestation to the reason of mankind.

And as with the specific tenets of belief proper to the

¹ Jude 3. *τῇ ἀπαξ παραδοθεισῇ τοῖς ἁγίοις πιστεῖ.*

² Heb. xi. 6. *χωρὶς δὲ πίστεως ἀδύνατον εὐαρεστηῆσαι.*

³ 1 S. John i. 1-3.

Historic Gospel, so with the more general tenets of belief common to Natural Religion, and the various world-religions founded on Natural Religion (tenets such as belief in the power and providence of God, in the continuance of man's life after death, in the moral government of the world, and the like) they all greatly depend, for their evidence at least; on the testimony of sense and reason. The invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being *understood* by the things that are made.¹ Sun, moon, stars, flowers, rain, fruitful seasons, the disposition of events; the voice of conscience, the existence of mind, the ordering of the pathways of nations and men—these all testify to sense and reason of the invisibilities which underlie the visibilities of the universe.

Yet although sense and reason combine to bear witness to spiritual facts and spiritual truths; neither sense nor reason can actually grasp, and lay hold of, either spiritual fact or spiritual truth. It is a law, too often forgotten but nevertheless a law, that spiritual things are spiritually discerned.² As sensible things are sensibly discerned, and rational things are rationally discerned, so spiritual things are discerned spiritually, and only spiritually. Neither the physical nor psychical man receiveth the things of the Spirit of God; they are foolishness unto him, and he cannot—he is not able, it is not possible for him to—know them.³ It is only the spiritual man—*πνευμάτικος*—who can discern spiritual things—*πνευμάτικα*.

This great truth of Scripture, like all other Scriptural truths, is in perfect harmony with the experiences of mankind. For upon examination, and in experience, what does man find himself to be? He finds himself to be at once

¹ Romans i. 19, 20. Διότι τὸ γνωστὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ φανερόν ἐστιν ἐν αὐτοῖς· ὁ γὰρ Θεὸς αὐτοῖς ἐφάνησε· τὰ γὰρ ἄβρατα αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου τοῖς ποιήμασι νοούμενα καθορᾶται.

² 1 Cor. ii. 14. πνευματικῶς ἀνακρίνεται.

³ 1 Cor. ii. 14. οὐ δύναται γινῶναι.

single and complex: single in his personality, complex in his constitution. Every student of his own nature discovers himself to be a being compounded of several beings. Man is not, in himself, either one being or two; but three beings combined in one, one being composed of three. He has a body which brings him into communication with the world of sensible things, a soul which brings him into communication with the world of psychical things, and a spirit which brings him into communication with the world of spiritual things.¹ Every properly constituted man dwells concurrently in three worlds, three different planes of gradually ascending existence; and has three beings, each severally fitted for acting in its own world and developing its own distinct existence. Man's body enables him to move and act in the material world; man's soul enables him to move and act in the psychical world; man's spirit enables him to move and act in the spiritual world. And in the combination and development of these three beings is found the *ego*:—the completion and fulness of the trinal unity, the entire self, of each individual man.

It must be noted, however, that, in our present mortal condition of existence, each of these three beings, or natures, in man is dependent for its health and action on the other two. In no man is either body, or soul, or spirit severally independent; they are all three invariably interdependent. The common formula, *mens sana in corpore sano*, is but a very partial formula to denote the perfect and well-rounded man. The full formula for the perfect man is, *sanus spiritus cum sanâ animâ in sano corpore*. And each of these three parts of every mortal man's complete constitution—body, soul, and spirit—interpenetrates the other two. Although at death one part will, for a time at least, be sundered from the other two, yet, during the course of this mortal life, the health and fulness of each part is so in-

¹ 1 Thess. v. 23.

dissolubly associated with the two other parts, that we can hardly even conceive of them as either separate or separable. The body ministers to the soul, the soul to the spirit; and contrariwise, the spirit is rightful lord over the soul, and the soul rightful lord over the body.

Moreover, when we examine more closely into the constitution of man, we find that not only does each whole and perfect man consist of three parts, but each of these three parts is itself compounded of manifold parts. The body is not one member but many, and each member has its own office.¹ Similarly the soul has not one faculty but many faculties, such as reason, conscience, emotion, will, and the like. The spirit likewise appears to consist of a combination of faculties—faith, eternal hope, self-sacrificing charity, *the peace of God* which passeth all understanding, and is therefore a peace distinct from *peace of mind* which by no means surpasses the understanding faculty of the soul.

In endeavouring to pursue this subject a little further still, let us, for the sake of brevity and clearness, segregate from the manifold faculties of the body the single faculty of Sight; and from the manifold faculties of the soul, the single faculty of Reason: and from the manifold faculties of the spirit, the single faculty of Faith. What is the relation, we ask, between these three faculties, or powers in man of sight, and reason, and faith? Sight is sensible vision, reason is intellectual vision, faith is spiritual vision. As the eye is the organ of physical sight, so reason is the organ of intellectual sight, and faith is the organ of spiritual sight. Sight is the power of seeing with the body, reason is the power of seeing with the soul, faith is the power of seeing with the spirit. And as some men are physically blind, and others imbecile or intellectually blind, so some are spiritually defective, blind in spirit. It is to be noted,

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 14.

too, that all forms of sight—physical sight, intellectual sight, spiritual sight—are gifts from God. We have nothing which we have not received.¹ Faith is the gift of God; reason is the gift of God; sight is the gift of God. Why the gift of sight is withheld from some, and the gift of reason from others, and from others the gift of faith, it is not part of my present purpose even to enquire; indeed, I am inclined to think that this is one among the many mysteries whose depths are too profound to be fathomed by any plumb of mortal man. Leaving, therefore, aside both this and all similar inscrutable mysteries surrounding so far-reaching a theme, let us limit ourselves to the things which are intelligible and plain.

1. And among plain things nothing could be, first of all, more plain than that the eye of the body ministers to the eye of the soul. Sight is the servant of reason. Without adopting in its entirety the theory of Locke, that the ideas of the mind wholly depend, in the first instance, on the communications of sense; I think it must be obvious that if a man is born blind, and no means are taken to compensate for his blindness in other ways, that man's reason will be greatly crippled and starved. The beauties of the material world will be a blank to him. And those images of intellectual loveliness which the mind fashions for itself from the analogous beauties of Nature will also be a blank. It is through the window of the bodily eye that visions of natural beauty sweep into the mind of man. Without the assistant light of the bodily eye, even the reason would be partially darkened.

On the other hand, the bodily eye can do little of itself without the aid of reason. You spread the same landscape before the eye of the artist and the clown, yet to the two men that same landscape appears to be wholly different. And why? The mechanism of their eyes is identical. An

¹ 1 Cor. iv. 7.

optician could probably not discern any difference in their physical formation. No; the difference is in the seeing power which lies behind the physical eye: in the rational sensitiveness and self-culture which distinguishes the artist from the clown. Thus reason depends for its food upon sight, and sight depends for its delicacy and richness on reason.

Similarly with reason and faith. Reason nourishes faith, and faith illuminates reason. Nothing could be more untrue than the supposition that faith is irrational. Superstition may be irrational, but faith is fundamentally reasonable. That faith often transcends reason is as true as that reason often transcends sight; but that faith contradicts reason is as untrue, and essentially false, as that reason contradicts sight. We know, of course, that reason sometimes corrects the illusions of sight, as when by illusive refraction a straight staff in clear water appears to be crooked. In like manner, faith sometimes corrects the illusions of reason, as when, to reason, pleasure seems the highest good and self-sacrifice the most stupid folly. But to correct the illusions imposed on a faculty is a quite different thing from contradicting the faculty itself. Although, therefore, faith sometimes transcends reason, and sometimes corrects it, yet it never contradicts it. As from the point of view of reason we call whatever is contrary to sense, senseless; so from the point of view of faith, we call whatever is contrary to reason, irrational. And as no senseless thing is according to reason, so no irrational thing is according to faith.

An easy illustration will clearly set forth what I mean. When, in the days of Isaiah, the idolater felled a tree, and out of the same felled tree made, of the one part, blocks of fuel, and, of another part, carved images of worship, both sense and intellect, sight and reason, rebelled against the vain imagination that, out of the selfsame substance, one

part could be transformed into ashes and heat, and another part into a divinity worthy of worship. And this rebellion of sense and reason was ground enough to Isaiah for denying to wooden idols the homage of adoring faith.¹ For although faith sees beyond reason, as reason sees beyond physical sight, yet reason cannot think in flat contradiction to sight, nor faith believe in flat contradiction to reason.

2. This leads to a second truth connected with the relationship of faith to reason, and of reason to sight. This truth is that the proof of the existence of each of these three faculties alike is in the possession of them. How do men know that the faculty of sight exists? Is it not because they possess the power to see? Similarly, men know that the faculty of reason exists, because they themselves possess the power to think. In like manner, they who feel within themselves the power to believe have in themselves the witness of the existence of faith.

Of course it is no evidence to *B* of the existence of faith that *A* believes, if *B* himself is void of the faculty of faith. But neither would it be any evidence to *B* of the existence of reason or sight, that *A* could both think and see, so long as *B* himself had no capacity for either thinking or seeing. None the less is *A* sure of both his reason and sight, notwithstanding the blindness and mindlessness of *B*. And what is true of reason and sight, is also true of faith. They who believe have the proof of faith in themselves: and the absence of faith in others is no disproof to them of their own faith.

Moreover, faith is not transferable. I cannot give my faith to another, or he his faith to me, any more than I can give to another my reason or sight. But what I can do is: I can give to others *the evidences* of these faculties in myself. I can show the blind man that I can do what

¹ Isaiah xlv. 9-20.

he is unable to do: I can walk fast and firmly where he would stumble and fall; I can find my way where he would be lost; I can rejoice in beauties which to him are invisible. So also I can show to the mindless—in so far as they are capable of being shown the evidences of things—that I can do what they cannot. I can form judgments, weigh evidence, test opinions, solve problems, apprehend laws. In like manner, although I cannot give my faith to another, yet I can give to another *the evidence* of my faith. I can rejoice in infirmities, I can glory in tribulations, I can forgive my enemies and pray for them that persecute me, I can reckon the seen as nothing in comparison with the unseen, I can welcome death as the harbinger of life, though God slay me yet can I continue to trust Him. And if, after these evidences of faith in multitudes of sober, truth-loving, high-minded men, the unbeliever persists in denying the existence of faith, he places himself in the same plight as an unreasoning man who denies the evidences of reason, or an unseeing man who denies the evidences of sight. And yet few things are more common than for unbelievers to set themselves up as authorities concerning faith; although, in truth and fact, men without faith are no more authorities concerning faith than men without reason would be authorities on reason, or men without eyes authorities on sight.

3. A third thing which is very plain, from the correlation of faith with reason and sight, is the complete and absolute distinction between a faculty and the realm in which the faculty operates. My sight is a quite different thing from the things I see. My reason, and the matters in which my reason exercises itself, are utterly, and generically, different. My sight is not the thing I see, my reason is not the thing I think. My sight is the vehicle through which the images of external things pass inward to my reason; my reason is the instrument by means of which these concrete images

are formed and reformed, arranged and rearranged, broken up and combined, into an infinite variety of abstract ideas.

More than this. No single man's sight sees the whole of anything. No single man's reason apprehends the whole of anything. The demonstration of this truth is evident. Take any visible thing you like—a picture, an animal, a tree, a precious stone, a landscape—and show it to half-a-dozen different persons, and each of the six persons will point out some feature, or quality, of the thing unnoticed by the other five. Or let six persons read any book, or listen to some course of ratiocination, and you will find that no two of the six have formed exactly the same impression of the book, or fixed on exactly the same points in the ratiocination. What, *e.g.*, is more common than for persons to differ as to the apparent size of the moon, or as to the logical cogency of a sermon; yet, notwithstanding these differences, the size of the moon is fixed, and the logic of the sermon (if there be any) is fixed also. In both instances the thing itself is fixed; the apparent differences arise, not from the thing, but from the variations, and partialities, and defects, of individual reason and individual sight.

Similarly with faith. What is faith? No better definition of faith has ever been vouchsafed to man than the definition of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Faith is that which gives substance or reality—*ὑπόστασις* as opposed to *ἐμφασις*—to things hoped for: it is the proof of the concrete and important character of things unseen.¹ Or as Dante, in the twenty-fourth canto of his vision of Paradise, has so wonderfully rendered the inspired definition:—

“ Faith of things hoped is substance, and the proof
Of things not seen; and herein doth consist
Methinks its essence.—“ Rightly hast thou deemed,”
Was answered; “ if thou well discern, why first
He hath defined it substance, and then proof.”²

¹ Heb. xi. 1, *πραγμάτων ἐλεγχος οὐ βλεπομένων.*

² Cary's Translation.

Just as sight, with the sister senses, makes the material world real to us; and reason is itself the evidence and proof, not less than test, of the veritable character of the world of thought; so faith makes solidly sure things insubstantial, and actually real things within the veil, and spiritually visible things carnally invisible.

Yet this faculty of faith is wholly distinct from the realm of things eternal, invisible, infinite, in which the faculty lives, and moves, and has its being. The realm of things hoped for is a realm too vast for the faith of any single person, however bright and strong, to fully and completely grasp. As the realms of reason and sight both partake of, and are limited by, the separate individuality of each seeing and reasoning person: so each believer's realm of faith is both limited by, and interpenetrated with, that believer's personality. As no two persons either see or think alike, so no two persons either can, or do, believe alike. And as no single person can either see or think the whole of anything, so no single person can believe the whole of anything. According to my individuality I see, and reason upon one part of some vast whole; and according to his individuality another man sees, and reasons upon, another part. But my part does not exclude the other man's, or his mine. That we see but parts is a proof of the limitations *not* of the thing seen, but of our powers of seeing it. And as the whole is greater than any of its parts, so the whole of any fact, or truth, is greater than any man's apprehension of it, whether by reason or sight.

Similarly with faith. That man has a poor and mean perception of the vastness of things hoped for, and the infinitude of things unseen, who vainly dreams that his own personal fragment of individual faith either comprehends or comprises the whole realm of facts and truths which may surely be believed by men. No! For myself I venture to doubt whether even all the faith of all the

believers who have ever dwelt among men, taken together in its enormous magnitude, has yet realized even more than a small proportion of the things which await our ever-expanding realization throughout the unimaginable ages of an unthinkable eternity. If no man's sight has ever seen the whole of visible things, if no man's reason has ever grasped the entirety of all intellectual things: *a fortiori* has no man's faith ever yet seen or grasped the immeasurable whole, and the inconceivable entirety of spiritual and eternal things. In his triune constitution,¹ man, the human trinity, is made in the image and after the likeness of the Ever-blessed Trinity, Divine; yet, although he resembles God, he is only man, and is bounded with all the limitations of a finite and imperfect manhood.

JOHN W. DIGGLE.

¹ 1 Thess. v. 23.

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

MESSES. HODDER AND STOUGHTON have issued the first volume of their *Anglican Pulpit Library*. This large and sumptuously-produced work promises to contain complete sermons, outlines, and illustrations, original and selected, for the Sundays and Holy Days of the year. The first volume covers from Advent to Christmas. Sermons by all the great preachers are here to be found—Liddon, Vaughan, Keble, Archbishop Thomson, Farrar, Stanley, Illingworth, and a host of others. So that this work, when complete, will form, not merely an aid to preachers, but a repertory of all the best sermons in the language. The illustrations are interesting and apt.—One of the most hopeful signs of the times is the increasing number of sermons which aim at coping with practical social problems. Mr. Elliot Stock publishes a course of such sermons, delivered at St. Martin-in-the-Fields, London, by various preachers. It is called *Religion in Common Life*, or, *Topics of the Day regarded from a Christian standpoint*. It is evident that the preachers of these sermons have honestly faced the actual condition of men and things around them, and that they are doing their best to bring Christianity into contact with life in all its ordinary and extraordinary phases.—Very heartily to be recommended is Ven. Archdeacon Sinclair's *Words to the Laity* (James Nisbet & Co.). These "Words" are on subjects of contemporary ecclesiastical controversy. Wise counsel on such themes was never more urgently called for, and Archdeacon Sinclair's counsel is based on unusual learning and animated by a thoroughly wholesome judgment and sense.—Messrs. Macmillan & Co. send us *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Rochester*, October 29, 30, 31, 1894, by Randall T. Davidson, D.D., ninety-ninth Bishop. It touches almost every point of the Church's relation to its own workers, to the State, and to Society.—*Whispers from the Throne*, by Winifred A. Iverson (Elliot Stock), contains some good religious verse.—The Lost Tribes have once more been discovered and identified with the English; this time the discoverer is J. E. Hendley, who, in *England, Heir of the World* (Elliot Stock), seeks to demonstrate that the Getae of Herodotus are the Israelitish survivors of the deportation.—A much more interesting book is Mrs. Stevenson's *Who are Israel?* (James Nisbet & Co.). The Authoress reads a wholesome and much-needed

lesson in the interpretations of prophecy to all who launch on that perilous sea. His own interpretation is sane and instructive.

Thoroughly deserving of attention is *Oliver Cromwell, A History*, by Samuel Harden Church (G. P. Putnam's Sons). One rather looks askance at a Life of Cromwell appearing after so many seem to have occupied the ground. But Mr. Church's study justifies its existence. It is based on very thorough study of sources, recondite and well-known; it is pleasantly written; it is fair and judicial, and it is published in a most attractive form with a noble likeness as a frontispiece and several plans of battles.—When Mr. Alex. Brown's *Great Day of the Lord* first appeared, it was hailed in these pages as one of the most satisfactory books on the subject. In this new edition (Elliot Stock) considerable additions have been made to the book, so that now it furnishes a complete and instructive survey of New Testament teaching on Christ's coming and cognate subjects. Mr. Brown's conclusions are all the more remarkable because he appears to have reached them independently and in ignorance of some remarkable work done by others on the same lines.—*Tracings from the Acts of the Apostles*, by C. E. Stuart (E. Marlborough & Co.), is an honest and successful attempt to produce a simple commentary on the Book of Acts. It will be appreciated by Sunday School Teachers.—*The Vision and the Call* gives the title to a volume of brief and telling sermons, by Rev. J. M. Gibbon (Elliot Stock). In the latter part of the volume some of the poetical books of the Old Testament are suggestively interpreted.—The Rev. W. H. Tucker, in a volume entitled *Hereafter and Judgment* (Elliot Stock), reviews the information given in Scripture regarding Satan.—Messrs. Adam & Charles Black publish a translation by Dr. J. Gilchrist of Ernest Haeckel's lecture on *Monism as connecting Religion and Science*, which is welcome as an authentic utterance on this modified form of materialism.—Of the many memoirs and histories of the High Church movement in recent years, the most popular and one of the most unprejudiced is Mr. George Worley's six lectures on *The Catholic Revival of the Nineteenth Century* (Elliot Stock). These lectures deserve to be widely read.—Professor Cowan, of Aberdeen, has added to the series of "Guild Text-Books," issued in connection with the Church of Scotland, an excellent primer, *Landmarks of Church History to the Reformation*. It is published by Messrs. Adam & Charles Black.

Among expository works may be reckoned Dr. Stalker's *The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ* (Hodder and Stoughton). The sub-title describes the character of the treatment, *A Devotional History of Our Lord's Passion*. Dr. Stalker has given us a book which no one can read without profit. But he would have done still better had he given us two books, or a book of devotion with plentiful notes. Some of the details and discussions jar upon the devotional sentiment and mar the delicacy with which such a theme must be treated. Besides, important points should not be raised unless they are to be fully discussed; but there are in the trial of our Lord difficulties which have taxed both the legal and the theological mind, and it would have been better either to treat these much more thoroughly or to pass them by altogether. But, as it stands, it is probably the best book we have on the subject.

Messrs. Eyre and Spottiswoode have issued a large and important volume entitled *Lex Mosaica, or, The Law of Moses and the Higher Criticism*, with an introduction by the late Rt. Rev. Lord Arthur Hervey, D.D., edited by Richard Valpy French, LL.D., D.C.L., F.S.A. The volume contains fourteen papers by various well-known scholars and theologians, among whom may be named Principal Wace and Professors Sayce and Rawlinson. All the writers occupy a conservative standpoint, and aim at showing reason for pause before accepting the decisions of advanced criticisms of the Old Testament. The subject is divided up chronologically, so that the whole may readily be surveyed. One of the most interesting papers is the first, which is by Prof. Sayce, and deals with the ignorantly reiterated fancy that writing was not known in Palestine till about the year 500 B.C. Whether one agrees with the writers in this volume or not, it is certainly useful to have the main problems of Old Testament criticism thoroughly discussed, and convenient to have an adequate representation of the conservative contention in an easily accessible form.

Prof. Paul Haupt's critical edition of the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, printed in colours, proceeds with as much despatch as could reasonably be expected. The Book of Leviticus, by Prof. Driver and Mr. White, and the Books of Samuel, by Prof. Budde, have recently been issued. In the latter eight different colours are used, so that the eye can at once recognise

the editor's view of the various strata comprising the book. The notes are translated into English and are extensive although merely critical. This Bible is a triumph of the printing art. Whether it is a triumph of criticism or only an evidence of audacity which will be rebuked by critics yet unborn, it is not for us to say. Certainly one cannot but heartily wish success to so thoroughgoing and international an enterprise.

Another aid to Old Testament criticism is furnished by Canon Girdlestone in his *Deuterographs*, issued by the Clarendon Press. In this volume, as the name suggests, the passages of the Old Testament which exist in duplicate are printed side by side in parallel columns. Thus we have a great part of *Chronicles* set alongside of *Samuel* and *Kings*, so that comparison is facilitated. In his Introduction Canon Girdlestone explains the conclusions he draws from this comparison regarding the composition of the books and the present state of the text.

Another book of considerable importance to the study of the Old Testament is Mr. Joseph Jacobs' *Studies in Biblical Archaeology* (David Nutt). These studies are reprints of articles and reviews contributed to the *Archæological Review* and other journals. They deal with such subjects as Junior Right and Totem-clans, and significantly modify the conclusions arrived at by Prof. Robertson Smith and the Totemist school of critics. Mr. Jacobs' studies should not be overlooked by any who are interested in Old Testament criticism.

Another large work which promises to be of great service to the student of the Old Testament is *History, Prophecy, and the Monuments*, by James Frederick McCurdy, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of Oriental languages, Toronto (Macmillan & Co.). This is really a history of Israel conceived on a large scale, this first volume taking us to the Downfall of Samaria. Another volume will complete the work. The peculiarity of Dr. McCurdy's history is that he aims at setting Israel in a truer perspective, and for this purpose he has spared no pains to exhibit the connection of the Semites and of the Hebrews in particular with their environment. In the present volume their relation to the Babylonians is amply treated, and in the following volume similar treatment will be given to their connections with the Assyrians, Egyptians, Chaldeans and Persians, although necessarily some part of this field is touched upon in the earlier chapters. It is a work of solid learning by a

scholar who shows himself capable of original research. Details will be checked by experts, but it is gratifying to meet with a writer who is of sufficient calibre to take so wide a survey and to carry so weighty a mass of knowledge.

Mr. Elliot Stock has issued a cheaper edition of Dr. Blomfield's *The Old Testament and the New Criticism*, which was noticed in these pages when it first appeared.

MARCUS DODS.

[The Archdeacon of Westminster requests us to say that not the remotest reflection on Mrs. Lewis was intended by his remarks that "the sisters were unaware of the value of their photographs," which, as the context clearly shows, only meant that from Mrs. Gibson's book he had derived the impression that the *unique* preciousness of their find only became clear after the photographs had been studied by Mr. Burkitt and Prof. Bensly. If this was a mistaken impression, it was a very natural and innocent one. It is surely needless to say that he did not mean to hurt Mrs. Lewis by the very ordinary phrase that the ladies developed the photographs at their leisure.]

THE SAMARITAN DOCTRINE OF THE MESSIAH.

At the Oriental Congress of 1889, Prof. Merx read a paper on the discovery which he had recently made, while cataloguing MSS. at Gotha, of a fragment of a Samaritan hymn giving important information on this subject. As the paper was not published till 1893 it was not open to criticism. Last year (1894), however, Prof. Hilgenfeld¹ returns to the subject, reproducing Merx's article in great part, and adding remarks of his own. It is, therefore, only right to point out that two years before Merx's "discovery," not only that fragment, but the whole of the hymn of which it forms part, was published, with many other interesting selections, by M. Heidenheim.² Heidenheim's book is disappointing, and his text faulty, but in this particular passage his readings are more correct than those of Merx and Hilgenfeld. It seems strange that when a learned Professor is cataloguing MSS. the most extensive collection of the texts already printed should escape his notice. It is almost incredible that a *second* learned Professor, after an interval of nearly five years, should still ignore the literature of the subject. But Samaritan studies have unfortunately suffered a good deal from this kind of treatment. Before speaking of Prof. Hilgenfeld's article, it will be convenient to give an emended translation of the fragment in question.³ The hymn, which

¹ In his *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 37th year, 2nd part, p. 233.

² *Die Samaritanische Liturgie*, Leipzig, 1887, p. 85. In the last number of his *Zeitschrift* (published since the above was in type), Hilg. acknowledges this fact, to which his attention was called by Heidenheim.

³ For the text see Heidenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 88. I have collated it with two MSS. in the British Museum (MSS. add. 19,009 and 19,651). The readings are well established, and Heidenheim's text requires only a few alterations.

belongs to the Samaritan service for the Day of Atonement, contains a good deal of interesting eschatological teaching, and was written by Abisha ben Pinhas, who died in 778 A.H. (= A.D. 1376), not as Heid. (quoted in Hilg.'s correction) says, a century later.

"My word shall instruct thee in the memorial of the Taheb¹ and his government. When he is born² in peace, his majesty shall shine forth in the heavens and the earth, and his star in the midst of its heavens.³ When this Taheb groweth up, his righteousness⁴ shall be revealed. The Lord shall call him and teach him his laws. He shall give him a scripture and clothe him with prophecy. Then shall come to pass the saying of the son of Terah in (the passage) 'it shall be when the sun goeth down,⁵ that behold a smoking furnace,' that is, he shall abide in his house; 'and a flame of fire,' that is, he shall abide upon his holy hill. Then the tabernacle shall be discovered and his pegs be fixed: and the pillar of fire and of smoke: the altars and their incense: the table and the candlestick: the ark of the covenant and his tables, with the cherubim on this side and on that, on the right and on the left. The priest shall take the pan and offer his incense, and go into the tabernacle of the congregation to make atonement for himself and for his house, and for all the congregation of Israel, and shall offer his sacrifices. ⁶ Israel shall dwell safely, freed from his fear; ⁶ and shall keep his feasts⁷ in peace, and bring his offerings. Then gladness shall be restored, and all nations shall be subdued. He shall confound the tongue of the Arabs,⁸ and the Hebrew tongue shall be manifested. Then shall be

¹ This name will be explained below. The first line is not in Merx-Hilgenfeld.

² Reading ועת יתילך with M.-H.

³ שמיכותו, M.-H. "Verwüstung." M. adds "Zu שם muss שמוך Wurzel-sein. . . . An שמים kann man nicht denken." But in another hymn for this service (by Abraham Qabâzi, probably a century later), Genesis xxviii. 17 appears as וזה שער שמימותה. Would M. translate "and this is the gate of desolation"? The form is perhaps due to their mistaking שמימה (with ה locale) for a feminine.

⁴ Or "triumph," as M.-H. The word is זכותו.

⁵ Genesis xv. 17, בסרנותו, is difficult. M.-H. have בסרנותו against the MSS.

^{6,6} These words in the Gotha fragment are in the margin. Hilgenfeld thinks them a marginal note. (!) The words האמן מן יראתו are a standing phrase, and difficult. From other places I gather the meaning to be as given above. M. "und ist gläubig." H. wavers between that and "er (der Ta'eb) macht fest unter dem Schutze der Furcht vor ihm [eventuell: seiner Gottesfurcht]."

⁷ M.-H. מויו, which they leave untranslated. Heid. (and the MSS.) correctly מועדיו.

⁸ העברים of the MSS. and Heid. is obviously right. M.-H. העברים, which

raised up the order of the wise, men of understanding, and there shall be¹ nothing hid any more, either above or below. But the kingdom shall continue until the latter day. Then the enemy shall go up upon his tower, and take up his parable. He shall see this glory, and speak, saying: 'How goodly are thy tents, oh! Taheb, how great his dwellings! Water shall flow from his buckets, and his strength be magnified. His king shall be higher than Gog, and his kingdom be exalted.' For he shall be king over eleven nations, which² are mentioned in his Law. The nations and the uncircumcised³ shall say each to his people: 'All that we (trusted) in is false, and this is he whose teaching is the truth: arise now,⁴ let us go to him, that we may enter under the shadow of his beams.' They shall come and believe in him, and in Moses and his law. The Jews also shall say: 'Let us come to his teaching. Cursed be Ezra⁵ and his words which he wrote in his wickedness. Mount Garizim⁶ is holy: there is not its like among the mountains. There the Taheb shall rejoice and answer in his heart of wisdom: 'Blessed be Israel with his seed! There is none like him among the peoples.' Oh! that mine eye⁷ had seen this Taheb and his majesty! Peace⁸ from me be upon him! May he attain unto his prophecy! May he enter into his camp! May he come unto his victory! May he overshadow his habitation! Peace be upon him! until his entering into his house! Peace be upon him! and upon his fathers, the pure, from⁹ whom he shall arise and receive his gifts. The

M. understands of the Jews. H. refers to Nehemiah xiii. 24, *seq.* The meaning is that Arabic, the *foreign* language now used by the Samaritans, shall give place to Hebrew, the national tongue.

¹ M.-H., "and nothing else shall hide him," ? the Taheb.

² H., "this is his memorial in his law," reading זכרו זכרנו. But זכרנו=זה does not exist in this dialect: we should have זכרונו: the letters are written as one word in the MSS. The ת of the passive form is frequently omitted, even in roots not beginning with a dental—זכרו, though Aphel in appearance, is really אזכרו.

³ M. העלים, and translates "those who go up thither (to Garizim)." H. takes M.'s conjecture העמים. Heid. has הערלים, the reading of the MSS.

⁴ מ. קומו בני. M.-H. "Arise, his sons"; בני cannot at least be a plural of בן. It seems to be a sort of complement of the imperative. A variant is בנן.

⁵ Because they hold that Ezra falsified the Law, so as to detract from the sanctity of Mount Gerizim.

⁶ העררלים is always one word (M.-H. write it as two). See the fragment of Eupolemus (in Freudenthal, *Hellenistische Studien*, i. and ii., p. 224, cap. 419, § 5), where Ἀργαμίζ is used as a proper name.

⁷ M.-H. read כיני, and point ענית, translating, "es besitzt etwas, das dem Sinai entspricht. Das ist der Taheb," etc. עמה is a common Samaritan form of the Aramaic חמה.

⁸ In Heid.'s text על here, and in the following lines, should be struck out.

⁹ M.-H. כהם, and translate "der da stehen wird wie sie."

peace of God be upon Moses, son of Amram, and his prayers: who revealed to us in his book this mystery and the secrets of it. He who says 'is there¹ any prophet like to Moses?' shall see what is his (the Taheb's) greatness."

It may be thought that the above are mere corrections of detail, and that over-much time has been spent on them; but in a field in which so few have laboured, we must pick out every stone of stumbling if we would expect a healthy crop of results. We cannot get at a right appreciation of Samaritan theology with such *a priori* readings and translation as the Professors have given. I only regret that, as the texts are not yet in print, I cannot always support my view by reference to parallel passages—a method which is exceptionally necessary in the elucidation of these writers.

After his translation, Prof. Hilgenfeld proceeds to discuss the identity of the Taheb according to Samaritan teaching and the meaning of the term. We may as well follow his arrangement. First of all, however, we must again insist on the necessity of putting aside all preconceived notions, and viewing the matter in a dry light. There is no reason to suppose, until the facts show it, that the Samaritans shared Jewish, and still less Christian, ideas of a Messiah. The question rather is, who and what was the Taheb, and does he bear any resemblance to a Messiah?

The meaning of the term **התהב** (less correctly **השהב**) was first thoroughly discussed in his usual happy manner by Gesenius, whom Hilgenfeld does not even mention. In his *Carmina Samaritana*,² Gesenius gives a list of derivations proposed,³ and finally states his own opinion that

¹ *I.e.*, every one who utters this the Samaritan confession of faith—every true believer. Or, perhaps, as M.-H., "the prophet is like Moses." A variant is **הן נבי**, "behold a prophet like Moses." That it is a general description of the orthodox may be judged from the fact that the phrase is a quotation from the Durrân (Heid., *op. cit.*, p. 144, No. XL.), where the earliest MS. (Vaticanus) has **הנביא**.

² p. 75, note on *Carmin.*, iii. 22.

³ Cellarius takes it from **הש** "hasten," and **הב** "give"; Lobstein from

תָּוִב is a participle of תּוֹב (שוב), commonly meaning *penitent* (i.e. *returning*), but here used transitively, *conversor*,¹ *he who restores*. He considers this not *justo audacius*, comparing the use of שׁוֹב for הַשׁוֹב in Hebrew. Vilmar² holds the same opinion. Merx, on the contrary, will not accept this, and declares for the meaning *rediens*, in which he is followed by Hilgenfeld, supposing that the Taheb will be either Moses or Joshua *redivivus*.³ I would not presume to judge between Gesenius and Merx on a point of grammar, but if one must choose, *malo cum Gesenio errare*, since the meaning *conversor* is in accordance with what is said of the Taheb, while *rediens* is not. Moreover, if as a mere conjecture the meaning *conversor* seems *justo audacius*, it must be remembered that Samaritan usage is not to be conformed to Hebrew or Aramaic laws, and instances of the transitive use of תּוֹב might certainly be found. In support of his view Hilgenfeld argues that in Deuteronomy xviii. 15 and 18, which was used as a prophecy of the Taheb, the promise of "a prophet like unto thee" is no hindrance to our regarding the Taheb as Moses *redivivus* in the same sense as St. John Baptist is Elias which was for to come. But the idea of a Taheb who is Moses and yet not Moses would be quite beyond the powers of the Samaritan mind. As to Joshua, it may safely be said that there are none but *a priori* reasons for bringing him into the question at all. In the

هشاب "bright star"; Bruns from صاحب "master"; Bohlen, seeking, as usual, an Ayran source, from Persian شاه اب "bright king"; Bertholdt misread his dictionary, and proposed an Arabic word هشيب meaning هشيب; de Sacy, with more honesty, gave it up.

¹ It is true that this particular passage (*Carm. Sam.*, iii. 22) is not to be so translated, but that does not affect the general argument.

² Abulf, *Ann. Sam.*, p. xl. sq., quoted by M.-H.

³ Juynboll (*Chron. Sam.*, p. 127) also holds that the Taheb will be Moses, but he has mistaken the passage (cap. vi.) on which he chiefly relies. الرجعة there has its common meaning of "resurrection," and يرتبه refers to Moses' intercession on the day of judgment.

late Samaritan book of Joshua he is a great king, but in their theology he holds a most subordinate position. Moses is unlikely, but it is certainly not Joshua.

Even in the hymn translated above there are passages which tell against Moses: "the Lord will teach him his laws and give him a scripture." It would be derogatory to Moses that he should need to be taught God's law. Again, "they shall come and believe in him (the Taheb), and in Moses and his laws." From these two passages any unbiassed reader would surely gather that Moses and the Taheb are distinct persons. The same may be inferred also from Marqah, a writer of the 4th century A.D., who in a treatise¹ on the death of Moses, though concerned with the praise of the greatest and last of the prophets, makes no allusion to his return as Taheb. Yet this could hardly have been omitted if the view had been current at the time. He even makes Moses say, "after this day I shall never more have dealings among you"; and later on, "and no man knoweth his grave unto this day. What is this day? The day of recompense." That is to say, the day of the general resurrection, when the judgment will take place; but this, as will be shown below, is to be after the death of the Taheb. Thus the identification of the Taheb with Moses or Joshua, to explain the meaning *rediens*, breaks down. As to the opposite view, we have larger evidence now than existed in Gesenius' time, and it abundantly proves that the traditional explanation given by the modern Samaritans is *conversor*. The priest Shalmah b. Tobiah is reported by Bargès,² who conversed with him, to have said, "Hathab (*i.e.* hat-taheb) le Restaurateur: car nous savons qu'il paraîtra pour faire revivre le temps de grâce, rétablir le tabernacle sur le mont Garizim et restaurer le royaume d'Israel"—a succinct state-

¹ *Des Samaritaners Marqah Erzählung über den Tod Moses.* Von E. Muuk, Berlin, 1890.

² *Les Samaritains de Naplouse*, p. 91.

ment of the doctrine, but not a word of Moses. The same account is given by the writer of the letter to Ludolph in 1689, and by the present priest, Jacob b. Aaron, in a letter to Kautzsch¹ in 1884. The Arabic part of his letter is quite clear, though the Samaritan-Hebrew is confused. Jacob also gave me the same explanation, when I visited Nâblus last year, referring to this very hymn of Abisha in illustration.

Before describing the doctrine more fully, it will be well to give the substance of part of another hymn for the day of Atonement bearing on the subject. It is by Abraham b. Joseph haqqabazi, a writer who was held in high esteem about a century later than Abisha, and is interesting as giving the reasons of the faith that is in them.

“I will even make mention,” he begins, “to you who here are gathered, of a word that shall rejoice your heart and comfort your soul, the memorial of the Taheb and the days of favour (or grace), which shall be revealed in the second kingdom; whereof we have witness in the true Law that was received by the light of prophecy (Moses).” The first witness is, as before, Genesis xv. 17, compared with Deuteronomy xxxii. 22. “The burning lamp,” which shall “set on fire the foundations of the mountains,” foreshows the cleansing of Mount Garizim from its defilement. Observe, he says, the distinction between “consume” (which refers to the wicked) and “set on fire.” The second witness is Genesis xv. 18: “to thy seed have I given this land.” In the former kingdom (that of Joshua) they did not possess the land “from the river of Egypt unto the great river,” but they shall possess it in the second kingdom. The third is Genesis xv. 19 *seq.*, to destroy the nations there mentioned. The fourth is Genesis xlix, 1: “Gather yourselves together that I may tell you” . . . all the

¹ *Ein Brief des Hohenpriesters der Samaritaner Ja'kub ibn Harun. E. Kautzsch, 1885 (Berlin?).*

evils of the days of displeasure (Fanuta), as Moses said (Deuteronomy xxxi. 29); "and evil will befall you in the latter days." The word "gather" foreshows the days of favour, as in Deuteronomy xxx. 4: "from thence will the Lord thy God gather thee." The fifth is the sign of Moses' hand (Exod. iv. 6). "Leprous as snow" typifies the Fanuta and the righteous who shall live in that time. With this is to be compared Leviticus xxvi. 42-44. "And behold it was turned as his other flesh" (Exod. iv. 7) foreshows the return of favour. The sixth is Numbers xxiv. 18: "and Israel shall do valiantly" indicates the restoration of the kingdom and Israel's rule over Esau. The seventh is Deuteronomy xxx. 1-6: "when the Fanuta has prevailed . . . the Lord thy God will turn thy captivity . . . and multiply thee above thy fathers . . . and circumcise thy heart." The eighth is Deuteronomy xxxiii. 2 *seq.* Seir is Esau: Mount Paran is the children of Hagar (the Mahommedans) who are to be subdued. The passage also shows that in the days of favour "every one shall receive of thy words" (ver. 3) and say, "Moses commanded us a law" (ver. 4: the beginning of a sort of creed much used in their liturgies), whereas at the first giving of the law they said, We have no strength to perform all these commandments.

These two passages are perhaps the most explicit on the subject in the Liturgies, although isolated references are many. Now in trying to draw out the doctrine implied in them, we are at once met by two allied articles of faith, which can only be very briefly described here: the רהוּתָה or time of favour; the פְּנוּתָה or time of displeasure.

The time of favour has been well described by Vilmar.¹ It prevailed until the end of the priesthood of Uzzi, contemporary of Eli, during which time, according to the

¹ *Ann. Abulf.*, p. xxxviii., *seqq.*

Samaritan book of Joshua and the chronicle of Abulfath, Israel (*i.e.* the Samaritans) enjoyed great power and kept the law. Joshua is described as a great king conquering all the enemies of God and his nation by more or less miraculous means.

Then came the Fanuta¹ or time of displeasure, under which the nation still labours. Its beginning was marked by the disappearance of the tabernacle and of all outward signs of Divine favour, 260 years after their entry into Canaan.

The connexion of these two doctrines with that of the Taheb is obvious. It is the restoration of this original prosperity and of Divine favour which will be effected by the Taheb, the restorer. He is, perhaps primarily, (for are not the things of this world of first importance?) a temporal king, who shall restore the kingdom to Israel: and this is the meaning of our second extract in speaking of a first kingdom (that of Joshua), and of a second kingdom (that of the Taheb). But he is also a prophet who shall restore the religion of Moses, so that the ransomed of the Lord shall return and come to Mount Garizim: and this is the meaning of our former extract in describing the rehabilitation of the tabernacle and its services. The kingdom will be restored, but this is intimately connected with a return to righteousness, and since righteousness implies a previous repentance and pardon, the consideration of the matter fitly forms part of the Atonement service. "Quicumque vult salvus esse," whoever would help to hasten the advent of the Taheb, before all things it is necessary that he repent, for the kingdom is at hand. That seems to be the argument.

The time of the coming of the Taheb is uncertain. "Oh that mine eye might have seen him," the desire of the

¹ The name gave some trouble to Gesenius (*Carm. Sam.*, p. 95, note on § 7), who did not succeed in elucidating it. Etymologically it can only come from פנה in the sense of a "turning away" of God's favour. See a rather pathetic contrast between the two states in Heidenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 152, line 3 *seqq.*

nation, says Abisha. "May the child who is born attain to (the time of) the Taheb," says Marqah.¹ And again in one of the most recent compositions, only found in a Bodleian MS., it is clear still that of that day and that hour knoweth no man, for the writer (Pinhas b. Isaac, still living) says, "May ye return to favour, and the Taheb arise among you"; and farther on, "May the Taheb arise speedily, and may mine eye see his days." Speculation on the matter was natural, but apparently not countenanced by the doctors.

As in pre-Christian apocrypha, from which the Samaritans may have borrowed something, he is in no sense divine. According to Petermann,² the Taheb shall live 110 years. At his death, for he is to die, like the Messiah the son of Joseph among the Jews, "he shall come to his burial, and be gathered to his people, and be buried in a secret place (?) with Joseph, the fruitful bough, his father and progenitor, or with Joshua, son of Nun, as the ancients said. The tabernacle shall not be hid, nor his light be quenched," etc.³ In fact, the lifetime of the Taheb, and the period immediately succeeding, are to be a sort of millennium: "until the Lord turn away (His favour), and His wrath and anger be kindled upon all peoples in their generation, because of the evil deeds which they do in their frowardness. Then shall He smite the earth as in the time of the flood and its day. The light of the sun shall grow pale at the beginning of every month, and the moon and the stars shall not give their light. Every high place shall be overturned, and the valleys and hills, with quaking at the day of vengeance, its glory and its majesty." One cannot but be struck with the likeness of this passage to the descrip-

¹ Quoted by Vilmar, *op. cit.*, p. xliii., but wrongly translated.

² *Reisen*, i. 284, quoted by M.-H., observing that the Tabeb is thus inferior to Moses, who lived 120 years.

³ This and the two following passages are from the continuation of Abisha's hymn. *Heid.*, *op. cit.*, pp. 91, 92, 94.

tion in St. Matthew xxiv. 29, 37, 39—in fact the whole chapter. The difference is that for the Samaritans, the tribulation of those days, after the coming and death of the Taheb, is not succeeded by any second advent. There follows the great and terrible day of the Lord, **יום נקם יום גדול**, with the resurrection and judgment of all creatures. “The people shall be divided in two parts; the division of the holy and righteous shall go into the garden of Eden, and the division of the sinners be broiled before the fire.” Moses is the only mediator, “by whose prayers the fire is quenched.” The world will then apparently come to an end: and this seems indicated by the full name, **יום נקם ושלם**. Much here is no doubt vague and indefinite in detail, but the main outlines are clear enough. It is but natural that the belief should lack precision on minor points. Perhaps parts of it belonged to the esoteric teaching, **כסִי**, as is hinted by Abisha in speaking of the state of the blessed, and in one of the letters¹ with regard to the Taheb, “but the secret things belong unto the Lord our God,” etc. (Deut. xxix. 29).

It would be inappropriate to omit mention of the passage in St. John's Gospel (cap. iv. 7-42) and of the history of the Taheb-doctrine. Moreover the conversation recorded by St. John forms a very remarkable “undesigned coincidence” with the views implied in the Samaritan liturgies. Even in the short passage given above from Abisha we find the Jews regarded as the typical enemies of the Samaritans (as in St. John iv. 9); the opposition between Jerusalem and Mount Gerizim, on which she founds her argument (iv. 20); when the Taheb comes there shall be nothing hid any more (as in iv. 23),² meaning primarily

¹ Quoted by Kirchheim, *Carme Shomron*, p. 18. This is the opinion also of Juynboll (*Lib. Jos.*, p. 129).

² The recently published Syriac Gospels from Mount Sinai have “he will give all things”; perhaps a confusion between **יתן** and **יתני**. It is tempting to conjecture **יתני** with an allusion to the etymology of the name **תהב**.

things connected with worship and the true religion. It was the telling all things that ever she did which most impressed the woman, as we see from the repetition, verses 29 and 39, and it was for this reason that He must be a prophet; but (she would argue) if a prophet, then He must be the Taheb, for Moses was the last prophet; all who came since were false; consequently this one, being true, must be that prophet whom "the Lord thy God will raise up unto thee" (Deut. xviii. 15). As soon as the consequence of her admission (iv. 19) becomes clear to her, she at once tests him on the fundamental point of difference between Jews and Samaritans, the holiness of Mount Gerizim (iv. 20). Even the unusual phrase "the Saviour of the world" (iv. 42) though not found perhaps in the liturgies, is quite in keeping with Abisha's account. Further, the living water and the spiritual thirst, the promise of everlasting life, the spiritual nature of God, the need of worshipping in spirit and in truth,—all these are characteristic of the liturgies of all periods. There is no proof and little probability that any of the liturgies were contemporary with St. John.¹ What is certain is, that while doctrine has been developed in detail, the main character of the theology has been preserved with a tenacious conservatism.

If we may assume then that by Messiah the woman meant the Taheb, whatever be held as to the date of St. John's Gospel, we are justified in believing that the doctrine was already in existence in the first century A.D. It was however no new thing. She states it uncompromisingly. "I know": it is a matter of common belief. Probably the belief had become definite among the Samaritans at about the same time and for the same reasons as among the Jews, as a protest against the flood of misfortune which over-

¹ On the dates see my article in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* for October 1894.

whelmed both nations in the Maccabæan period. As usual in the beginnings of things, we have no documents to help to an understanding of the doctrine in this early stage, but there are indications that it obtained only a gradual acceptance. For Samaritans an article of faith must necessarily be founded on the Law of Moses, since they reject the rest of the Jewish canon. Now it cannot be said that the Pentateuch foretells the Taheb with any clearness, even on their method of exegesis. Meanings had therefore to be read into the text to serve as grounds of faith. But the Samaritan Targum contains, so far as I am aware, no reference to the Taheb. Though bearing a strong resemblance to Onqelos, it does not follow him in the passages which he makes to refer to Messiah. These are Genesis xlix. 10: Mas. שילה, Onq. משיחא, Sam. T. שלה—Numbers xxiv. 17: Mas. שבט, Onq. משיחא, Sam. T. שבט (v. l. מקל). There seems to be sufficient reason for thinking that Sam. T. existed orally, if not in writing, at least as early as the time of Marqah, in the middle of the 4th century, A.D. The explanation of its silence must be that its oral transmission dated from a time before the rise of the Taheb-belief, which did not gain sufficient strength by the 4th century to oust traditional views. For instance, שלה (for שילה) in Genesis xlix. 10 is explained of Solomon, and if this was the early view, it was likely, considering the conservatism of the people, to persist in spite of the new doctrine. In Marqah, though the indications are scanty, the doctrine seems to be taken for granted. There is then a break in the literature till the 11th century. Abu-Said's Arabic version of the Pentateuch, which belongs to that time, has in Genesis xlix. 10 the perhaps earlier traditional explanation سليمان (v. l. مثله) for שלה.¹ The liturgical notices are still very scanty, if there are any. It is not till the 14th century that we find any full statement. The same causes which led to the rise of

¹ Kuenen's edition did not reach Numbers.

the doctrine seem then to have brought about its full development. No doubt it had grown in the interval, but the circumstantial account given by Abisha had its reason. Abulfath (14th century), a contemporary of Abisha, definitely states that he was instigated by the High Priest Pinhas to write his chronicle, in order, by narrating the former glories of his nation, to support them under the troubles which lay hard upon them; and the same was probably Abisha's object in insisting on his eschatological teaching and giving it shape. He took the current notions and defined them; but since he was a man of some power and originality, he may also have contributed of his own, founding of course what was new on the Pentateuch. Abraham Qabâzi and Abd Allah b. Shelomo may have made some advance in the following century, but here the history of the doctrine ceases. The poverty of subsequent writers is lamentably evident. They do but give an uncertain sound, a faint echo of Abisha and earlier authors.

A discussion of the sources of the doctrine and its connexion with Jewish and Christian apocrypha is better deferred until the texts are printed in full.¹

A. COWLEY.

¹ A complete edition of the liturgies, with a translation, has been undertaken by the Clarendon Press.

THE PERSON OF CHRIST :

A PROBLEM IN THE PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

PART II. CAN THE PHILOSOPHY OFFER A SOLUTION?

WE have seen that Jesus was judged and handled as a common man by the Jewish priest and the Roman procurator, but conceived by the evangelists as the Christ, the Son of the living God. Hence came the appeal to history, whether in the process of our collective experience as a race anything has since then emerged that may help us to decide between these opposing judgments. We then saw that religion is the most universal fact of human experience, and the most potent factor of human progress, and so the most powerful persons in history are the pre-eminent religious personalities. Now a new question arises: Where in the order of the great personalities who have reformed, and as it were reintegrated religion, does Jesus Christ stand? His place is indisputably the highest and the foremost. He is not so much a reformer as a creator, and His creation stands in a sort of solitary pre-eminence, forms as it were an order of its own. How, and why this is so, can only be indicated in the briefest way.

I.

1. His action upon our supreme and determinative religious idea: our sense or feeling for the Divine. This idea comes to us by nature; no man made it, no man can escape it; it is implied in all our thinking, enters into all our feeling, and sets an end to all our action. But it may assume an infinite variety of forms, be expressed in the fetish of the savage, the Zeus of Pheidias, the idol of the Hindu, the Jehovah of the Jew, the Allah of Mohammed, and the Unknown of the Agnostic. Yet the quality of the religion

depends on the quality of this, its supreme idea; as the one is the other must be, in kind, in degree, in character and in achievement. The meaner the god the lower the religion, the more majestic the deity the sublimer the faith. But two things have ever been difficult to man,—to conceive God as one, and to conceive Him as moral. These may seem to us so obvious as to be inevitable ideas, attributes without which God cannot even be thought. But how does the case stand? Take the Unity. Monotheism is a very late, nay, an infrequent faith. With that curious subordination of history to theory which distinguished him, Comte made Monotheism the last step in the first of the three stages through which man passes in the progress of his knowledge. But, what is the fact? Monotheism is a belief relatively recent; it has not been uniformly reached, was reached not by any general consensus, but by a small and exceptional fraction of the race, a single desert tribe, from whom all civilized men have received it. To-day Polytheism extends far further than Monotheism, for it is easier and more natural to man to embody in everything the Divine which he finds everywhere, to localize it, to split it up as it were into a multitude of defining and tractable individuals, than to refine it into an infinite personality, too abstract to be felt. But unless God be One He cannot be moral; in a multitude of deities morality is dissolved, for each of the multitude being divine has his own laws and does what is right in his own eyes. As a matter of fact, all Polytheisms are either unmoral or immoral. It is hard for us to conceive any sort of vice as godliness, or a pious man as other than virtuous. But our difficulty, which is due to centuries of Christian discipline, is one no ancient Greek would have felt, and no modern Hindu would feel. We must have one God before we can have the idea of a moral deity whose will is absolute law. But the moment this point is gained we are faced by difficulties of another order.

On the one side the philosopher lays hold of the Monotheistic idea, elaborates it logically, reduces it to an abstraction, translates it into the terms of the schools, names it Substance or Entity, Nature or Humanity, the Infinite or even the Unknown; but the idea so transformed has ceased to be the living God which religion needs in order to live. On the other side operates the sensuous temper and tendencies of the people. They cannot have a God afar off, they must have Him near at hand, manifest, palpable, living to spirit by being real to sense. Hence even within Christianity we find the energies of the Deity and His means of intercourse with man placed in stones, in temples, in images, in rites, nay, in the very garments men may wear as they worship. Men, indeed, will make anything into a god, if so be they can get command of the God they fear.

Now, Jesus took the idea man finds it so impossible to escape and so hard to realize, and gave it life. From His hands it received the shape we know so well, was as it were transfigured into the one personal God, moral, good, gracious, everywhere touching man and capable of being touched by him. We must not say, "This was not His doing; it was done by the Jews"; for they only made it possible, they did not achieve it. The God they conceived was their God, they owned Him, and as it were distributed Him, and their law was, not God possesses the man; but, in order to have our God, the man must become one of us, for the God who is the possession of the Jews only Jews can possess. Their tribal polity and worship reduced their monotheism to a tribal religion. In the hands of Jesus, on the contrary, God became the Father of all men, no distinction of race did He know, man was His and He was man's, and He was a Deity the philosopher could as little evaporate into an abstraction as could the child of sense impersonate and imprison in a symbol. For His name was the most concrete of all names, Father, and as His Father-

hood was necessary and eternal, the moment never was or could be when He was without a Son ; reality and relationship were of the very essence of His being. And, then, the Father could have one fitting image and one only, the Son ; His person was the single yet universal symbol of the God whose life was love and whose joy was the fellowship of His sons. And so the idea man most needed was made perfect for evermore.

2. How He affected the conception of the religious subject. We may say that two things, seemingly most opposite yet near akin, marked everywhere before Christ the idea of man ; the unit was without value and the race was without unity. The value of the individual is a late and Christian idea ; the ancient empires did not know it, nor do the heathen peoples of to-day. What cared the Pharaohs who were the builders of the Pyramids for the lives of the men who built them ? To sacrifice some thousands of men in building a tomb, made it all the fitter a tomb for a king. The English care of life is a curious thing to the Hindu ; his land so teems with the living that he need not too jealously guard or keep life. In China, with its hundreds of millions of men, the waste of man matters little ; there is the more to divide among the living if the mouths to be fed are fewer. But Christ, when He took hold upon and bore human nature, dignified the nature He bore. Man seen through His humanity became a being of transcendent value ; the nature which had been put of God to the most gracious of all uses was a nature that could be no more despised or mishandled. And so it became impossible to the parent to expose his child, or to the crowd to make holiday in the amphitheatre where the trembling man was thrown to the wild beast, or to the freeman to hold a brother man as his slave. But the same act which gave worth to the individual, gave unity to the race. There is nothing so easy as to divide men, and division abolishes the

higher duties. The little strip of silver sea parting island from mainland, the broad bosom of the river whose opposite banks smile to each other in beauty or rival each other in fruitfulness, the differences of speech, here nasal, there guttural, may make a gulf between peoples that even goodwill cannot bridge. And less things than these divide. Is there, for example, anything more divisive than colour? Is it possible to measure the contempt of the white man for the black, of the tawny for the yellow, of the lighter for the darker races? Men say, beauty is only skin deep, but there are few deeper things than skin, more prohibitive of unity, or even of the common intelligibility of man to man. But Christ abolished the distinction of races and families; as He lifted man to faith in one God, He breathed into him the sense of one mankind, causing the peoples in whom His Spirit has found a home to feel in their sane and lucid moments the awful shame of forgetting the brotherhood of their humbler neighbours with all the duties it involves. And so He perfected His first creation, the moral unity of God, by His second, the ethical unity of man.

3. Correspondent to His action on those two ideas was His action on a third, the medium of their union, religion. Before Him religion was the great means of appeasing God by ceremonial and sacrifice; but He made it the method of pleasing God by the service of man. There is nothing so agreeable to sense as pomp in worship, it is the commonest and most imperious of all æstheticisms. All heathenism knew it, and the measure of its ethical deficiency was the luxuriance of its ceremonial. But Christ breathed into religion another spirit; He made its highest function and noblest service the rescue and recovery of man. He was never to be despaired of; though a sinner, he was no mere offender in the hands of an angry God, but a soul to be saved, a brother to be redeemed. Is there anything in

history parallel to this saving power of Christ, and this power to create in the man He saves love of the outcast, pity for the lapsed, the belief that the divine way is not to mend the universe by ending the wrongdoer, but by mending the doer to end the wrong? He is by pre-eminence the Redeemer, and the pre-eminent work of His church is redemption, going into the slums where men lie soaked in sin, going into the palace where men and women live in selfish and luxurious vice, going into the places of religious concourse where the Pharisee avoids the publican and the publican fears to come, and creating in the midst of their death the life divine. If, as Browning said,—

“ A loving worm within its clod
Were lovelier than a loveless God
Amid His worlds,”—

what must be the loveliness of the man who embodies for his own age and society all the love of the loving God for His universe? And this, the loveliness He Himself realized, is what Jesus is progressively creating in the hearts of His people in order to the saving of the world.

4. From this threefold action of His there follows two differentiating characteristics of His religion.

(a) It is in the strictest sense universal,—indeed, it alone has the note of universality. This it has by virtue not only of its constitutive ideas, but even of its formal character. Under this aspect two limiting agencies tend to dominate the more active and aggressive religions, place and polity, or the home and the social framework. As to the first of these place has so set its mark on Brahmanism that it could not live out of India, its thought alike in matter and texture, its gods alike in multitude and quality, in behaviour and relations, in easy capability of increase and extinction, its worship alike in spirit and method and aspect, are so thoroughly and entirely Indian that they could not survive a change either of climate or scene. Buddhism, too, is

Asiatic, the indelible mark of place is stamped upon its very soul, its asceticism, its views of life, its notion of being, its ideal of virtue and dream of beatitude are all of the orient, without actuality, without even intelligibility for the occident. Islam cannot escape from Arabia, its centre is geographical, tribal traditions and customs, local fetishisms and acts form the very warp into which the woof of its monotheism is woven, and bind it to the barren monotony of its home. But the religion of Christ is without the image and superscription of any place; born in Judea, it is yet not Jewish, is indeed, while historically the child of Judaism, yet essentially its very antithesis; formulated in Greece, it still is not Greek; organized in Rome, it yet is not Roman; received by Frank and Teuton, it has never become either Frankish or Teutonic. It has never been subdued to the complexion of any land or people, but has made even the tribal soul cosmopolitan, and transmuted patriotic avarice into a humane generosity. Indeed, Christ's religion has acted like the leaven of a universal ideal in those aggregated masses of selfishness we call the kingdoms and nations of the earth. The only home it needs is the soul of man, and where that soul is, there is the only place it knows.

As with place, so with polity. Its social framework is of the essence of Brahmanism; it is the apotheosis of a society, a system of castes made into an inflexible and inviolable divine law; to break it were to break up the religion. Buddhism, too, is a social polity; its despair of life is expressed in the society it sanctions, its saints are celibates; without monks and nuns it would have no church and Buddha would have no honour. Islam, too, in its fasts, in its pilgrimages, in the very completeness with which it embodies what Gibbon called "an eternal truth and a necessary fiction, That there is only one God, and that Mohammed is the apostle of God,"—is bound to a

polity which compels it to restrict the freedom, retard the development, and prevent the higher civilization of man. But Christ's religion is too essentially spirit and truth ever to become merely a framework or special polity. It has existed, it does exist under the most dissimilar forms. It has been realized under the Papacy, which is simply a political autocracy or kingdom in the religious sphere; under an Anglican episcopacy, which is only the ancient theory of the divine descent of rulers translated into the formula of apostolical succession; under a Presbytery, *jure divino*, which is only the theory of a representative republic incorporated in an ecclesiastical system; under Independency, which is only the notion of the Greek Ecclesia rendered into a religious society; but it has never been coextensive or identical with any one of these. Each may have done justice to some single element in it, but no one has ever either comprehended all its people, contained all its truth, or exhausted all its virtue. As truth it everywhere creates its own distinctive life, as spirit it fashions its own body; but the function of the body is to be the vehicle of the life and to serve the spirit, and its merit is to be measured by its fitness for its end. The religion that is thus above place, and independent of peculiar social forms, is manifestly universal, capable of being realized anywhere by any one.

(b) But even more significant is the second characteristic, what we may call alternatively the permanency or suitability of the religion. Suppose this question were raised:— Since man cannot live without religion, which of all the religions of the world has most proved itself suitable to collective man? Is the question even capable of being argued? There is not an Oriental religion that could live in the occident; our colder climate, our aggressive temper, our insolent intellect, our devouring energy would be their death. They are too fixed in their social types

to create or to tolerate or to be tolerated by the more complex civilizations. Nor is any one of the eclectic faiths which the over-luxuriant phantasies of our decadents so easily turn out, able to do more than amuse the idle hours of a wearied master and his pious disciples. If any religion has a future, it is the Christian ; and if vigour of life, degree and range of intellectual acceptance, have any gift of prophecy, we may safely say that its promise was never so splendid or its future so assured. The creation of Jesus has, in a measure all its own, the qualities of permanent adaptation and effectual adaptability to all men in all their varieties of place and time, of culture and need.

II.

Our limits compel us to leave the picture incomplete ; but broken and fragmentary as it is, enough has been said to enable us to return with more intelligence to the problem with which we started, the relative truth of the two interpretations of Christ.

1. Does the truth lie with the rigorous naturalism of the priest and procurator, or with the audacious supernaturalism of the evangelists? The answer of history may be rendered thus: there were two results, an immediate and an ultimate. The immediate result appeared to justify the naturalism. Jesus suffered death, seemed indeed, feebler and more mortal than the malefactors who were crucified with Him ; but directly, as it were, on the heels of the immediate followed another and very different result—the death of Jesus was the birth of Christianity, and with it He enters upon the stage of universal history not as the obscure Jew or the ill-fated Galilean, but as the Creator of the highest and mightiest of all religions, the main factor of human progress, the maker of a new social order. How then, philosophy asks, is this to be explained? Without Him or through Him? As the result of natural forces or

of supernatural purpose and action? If the former, then we have to explain two series of quite dissimilar yet organically connected phenomena; viz. (a) the rise of the evangelical history and all its related literature with their wonderful religious ideal, and (b) the progressive realization of this ideal through centuries of struggle.

(a) The first problem is serious enough: here is a literature remarkable not simply for its supernatural history, but for its ethical sanity, its intellectual sincerity and integrity, its gracious reasonableness, yet intensity of conviction as expressed in word and conduct. Nor is this all; it does not express the passing mood of certain exalted dreamers, who were yet resolute doers; it is the programme of the vastest, deepest, strongest, most revolutionary yet persistent of all historical movements, and is at once entirely conscious of being such a programme, and possessed of belief in its sure fulfilment. Is then our explanation to be this—the dissolution of the history into a mythology created by the retrospective imagination, under the impulse received from a winsome personality, out of the material supplied by the Old Testament record, and the resolution of the most remarkable portions of the literature into the illusions of a neurotic temper or the fancies of a hysterical nature? It has, indeed, been gravely proposed so to explain the Gospels on the one hand, and the Pauline system on the other; but we cannot deal with the question as if it concerned a literature alone, it concerns still more the religion whose birth the literature describes, the peoples who have believed it, the place it has filled, and the work it has done in the collective life of man. For if the literature be thus conceived and resolved, then the religion appears as a web woven by illusion out of airier nothings than were ever spun by poet's fancy. It becomes, as it were, a sport, a freak of nature, a sort of midsummer madness of the human spirit,—which means that man in all the centuries

through which he has believed and obeyed it, has lived and acted in the highest regions of thought and experience as if he were without any reason. To deal with our sacred history as if it were but a series of phenomena in pathological psychology, is to draw up the most serious indictment ever framed against the rationality of man, for it is a question not simply of how certain things came to be written, but how they have continued to be believed and to accomplish such extraordinary and beneficent results. Nay, more, it is to involve us in a host of inexplicabilities, questions as to how the creation of morbid mental states could be so sane, so healthful and wholesome, so potent to heal the sick of mind and conscience, and to secure realization at the hands of the most critical peoples of both ancient and modern times.

(b) These are not problems for curious literary speculation, they involve the whole order and purpose of history, and through it the whole meaning of man and his universe. For let us consider what is involved in the marvellous relation between the evangelical conception of Christ and His actual place and function in history. What is the principle fundamental to all science? This: we do not live in a world where things come uncaused. We conceive nature as the realm where order and causation reign. Chance is a word science does not know. Accident is a term which only denotes ignorance. It is used because vision has not found the secret it searched for. The growth of science is the decay of chance; when the one has finally prevailed there will be no place for the other. But order cannot reign in the nature now around man, and yet chance govern man himself; and if order reigns in history as in nature, then the great persons, who are in history what forces are in nature, must belong to this order, are indeed the very factors by which it is constituted. But if we hold this most scientific principle, we must mark the inevitable

question, Can Christ stand where He does uncaused, unordered? If He had not been what He was, and stood where He did, could anything in history be as it has been or as it is? Is there any person necessary in the same sense as He is to the higher history of Man? The extension of the Greek empire might have happened without Alexander. It was not any one man, but a multitude of men, who created the supremacy of the Greek spirit in literature and art. Imperial Rome would have been though Cæsar had never lived; but without Christ there would have been no Christianity. It is impossible to conceive it getting into being without Him; and even now that it is, were faith in Him withdrawn, its inspiration would be gone, its hopes, aims, spirit, would die. What can we compare to the power He wields? Love of Him makes the drunkard sober, changes the criminal into a saint, constrains the lustful to become chaste, sends our sons as workers into the slums at home and as labourers into the mission fields abroad. There are no societies that have more graciously served or more deeply offended man than the churches; in some lands the church is an offence alike to intellect and conscience, and hatred of it has made multitudes of men apostatize. But Christ is never hated; He holds men obedient to religion when all other forces have failed, holds them often in face of the offence given by men who all too proudly bear His name. Love of Him is the most godlike love men know, and it has lived as the creator of all those beneficences that stamp the Christian centuries with their only noble and distinctive characteristics.

2. Here, then, we have a most scientific question—what is the reason for the being of this Person, who is of all persons the most necessary to the order and progress of history? Science cannot regard Him as an accident, the rarest of all the sports ever thrown out by chance. So to

conceive Him would be to conceive that history with the nature behind and beneath it, is an inexplicable somewhat, a thing so without a reason that the very note of rationality would be the inability to understand and explain it. Do we seek to bring Him under one or other of the categories which lurk in the large term evolution? Well, as a young theologian I pleaded nearly thirty years ago for its acceptance, and from that early pleading I am not going to retire to-day. But, if we would apply it to the explanation of so transcendent a form as Jesus, we must first ask, what does evolution mean? Can it not only explain the conditions and processes out of which new forms arise, but also reveal the causes of their origin? In other words, does it mean the process which nature follows, her creative method, the mode in which she does her work? Or does it mean the cause which lies behind all processes, and methods, and modes? If the method, then evolution is studied by every man who simply observes how nature does her work; but if the cause, then the observer must get behind the process and ask why nature does her work in this way. Why is it that by this method she accomplishes such results? Now the standpoint of the man in these two cases must be very different. In the one case it is enough that as a chemist he use his crucible and watch his experiments; as a physicist he make sure of his forces and instruments; as a biologist he compare and relate his organisms; as a physiologist he use his microscope, explain his organs and determine his functions; as an anatomist he bring bone to bone and build up his skeleton. But in the other case his problem and method are alike different; he has to seek and to discover the cause which creates the unity yet variety of the objects and fields of all the distinct and several sciences which study nature in detail, but never know her as a whole. And in order to this where must he stand? He cannot get out of himself, and so it must be through

himself. He is the interpreter, but also the interpretation of nature; as it is to him nature shows her forces, so it is through him that nature tells her secret. He is her latest product, her consummate achievement, the final result of her creative process; and he is mind. But if the process has ended in mind, mind must have been implicit in the cause. Science desires continuity in nature, and the only complete continuity is the one which binds together beginning and end. As is the end such must have been the beginning; the reason that interprets nature is the interpretation of its cause.

Now, the same principle that gives us a philosophy of nature, supplies us with a philosophy of history. We see an immense process, the ordered movement of man through the ages, and we conclude that the most efficient factor of the process is the most necessary, which means has the most reason or is most deeply rooted in the order of things. This most efficient factor is Jesus Christ; He is as it were the keystone of the arch which spans the gulf of time. Now can we conceive that the keystone stands there by accident? or otherwise than by operation of the Cause which produced the world and determines the course of history? And can the nature or character of this Cause be known? Causes are known in their effects, for cause and effect ever correspond in quality and character. This Jesus, then, as He stands in universal history, accomplishing those marvels of the Spirit which we have seen indissolubly associated with His person and His name, is an effect, and as He is the Cause of Him must be; *i.e.* must be a Cause in nature as holy, as gracious, as rich in the mercy that redeems, as invincible as the love that saves, as the Christian ages have believed the Christ Himself to be. Nay, more, is not the effect only as it were the cause embodied, the old force, unspent, persisting in a new form? And how shall we express this idea in this case better than

in the evangelical formula, "the Word became flesh, and dwelt among us"? and how better describe His continuous action through all the centuries of our Christian experience than by the verse, "We beheld His glory, glory as of the only Begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth"? The grandeur which thus comes to His person transfigures through it all nature and the whole history of man, and may well bid us adopt as our own the words of the same Evangelist, who did not fear to set his audacious conception in the very forefront of his Gospel, certain that its justification would come in the events which are as the articulated judgment of Providence: "No man hath seen God at any time; the only Begotten Son who is in the bosom of the Father, He hath declared Him."

A. M. FAIRBAIRN.

ON THE SPIRIT OF THE TRUTH NOT
SPEAKING FROM HIMSELF.

"When He, the Spirit of the Truth, is come, . . . He shall not speak from Himself."—*John xvi. 13.*

THESE familiar yet strange words follow close upon the announcement that Jesus had yet many things to say, concerning which the deficient preparation of His followers kept Him silent. But their loss should not be for ever, because, when the Spirit of the Truth should come, He should lead them along the road into all the truth.

It is to this promise that He adds the strange reason, "for He shall not speak from Himself." How does such an assertion help the context?

Before examining this question, let us pause to observe how strong a light this passage throws upon the mystery of the Divine Nature.

It would be vapid and a platitude, if all agnosticism were not an implicit denial of it, to say that we may look, and learn much by looking, into truths of which we never may fathom the abysses, just as, on some desolate ice-field, the eye may gaze into the intense blue depths of a huge crevasse; and although the utmost ray that is flashed back from sharp needle-points of ice does but announce that profounder gulfs lie undiscerned below, yet what is seen is real, and to ignore it is the dullest, the most incurious apathy.

So does the universe declare the glory, and Scripture the nature of Him whom none by searching can find out. So, in this passage, we may discern something, surely not erroneous, both of the Holy Spirit and of Christ. We see that the Spirit of Truth is no mere influence, but intensely personal and masculine; nor does even our English version "He, the Spirit" more than represent, this once, the energy wherewith, in the immediate context, three times over, Christ applied to the Spirit (which is a word in the neuter) as the fitting pronoun, not "it" but "He," *ἐκεῖνος*. "*He* shall convict the world of sin." "*He*, the Spirit, shall guide you into all the truth." "*He* shall glorify Me." No emphasis could be more imperious. And it is only fair to ask the impugnors of Catholic doctrine how they account for a phenomenon so fraught with import as this triple and deliberate expression of our Lord.

Again, if they will have it that the Spirit is only a divine influence, while the Redeemer is something—anything—less than divine, how is it conceivable that this illuminating influence from God should speak not from Himself, but by taking what belongs to a creature in such wise that the glory should be His? "Who then is Paul? or who is Apollos?" said the greatest of the apostles. "He shall glorify Me: the Divine Spirit shall not speak of Himself but shall take of Mine," said the Carpenter, the Son of Mary.

And this self-assertion, which is characteristic, and common to the Meek and Lowly One in all the Gospels, has been so effective that for nineteen centuries the church, obeying His startling injunction, has "gathered together unto (*εἰς*) His name, "that is to say" with Him for its aim in worship. Whom maketh He Himself? The Church which adores Him knows.

Deeply instructive also is it to observe that Christ's name for His Spirit is not the Spirit of emotion, however pure and tender, however rapturous and aspiring.

In these days of hysterical impulse, when the lack of self-control is thought to be a more spiritual thing than gravity and sober-minded wisdom, and when great movements appear to have taken for their watchword the ironical phrase "I am become sounding brass," it is surely suggestive to observe that Christ loved best to call His Spirit the Spirit of the Truth, that in the Old Testament He is the Spirit of knowledge and wisdom, and in the Epistles the Spirit of power and love and a sound mind.

Emotion, which in its place is good, is wisely sought not by cultivating a weak emotionalism, but by pondering on the mighty truths by which God would stir and warm our hearts. The Spirit is the Comforter, but much more than "comfort" is included in the great word Paraclete, and the comfort which it involves is not a gust of impulsive ardour; it is born of deep convictions and noble views of truth, and the spirit of such comfort is essentially the Spirit of the Truth.

We reach our main subject, when we ask, further, what does this expression convey, when viewed from an orthodox and frankly Christian standpoint. What special truth does it suggest to us, commensurate with the remarkable paradox by which our Saviour bespoke our attention for it? For it is a paradox. Who does not feel that with such a teacher, the very Spirit of Truth Himself, the natural assur-

ance would be the reverse : " He shall guide you into all the truth, for He *shall* speak from Himself" ? Can anything be more paradoxical than to say, " He shall guide you into all the truth, for He shall not speak from the Spirit of Truth, nor from Himself" ? This, however, is what Jesus said ; and there underlies it, I venture to think, a meaning full of hope for the Church and for humanity.

Obviously the key to the whole passage, which, therefore, must fit this ward of the lock among the rest, is the fact that what is promised is not omniscience after Pentecost any more than during the bodily presence of Jesus. It is much the reverse. It is a progressive and steady advance in knowledge and discernment. I still possess many things to tell you. He, when He shall come, shall lead-you-along-the-road-into all the truth, all that body of truth which is Mine to tell. And how shall He thus lead the Church ? By acting, (it is a sublime and solemn expression) not as her independent Teacher ; albeit He might reveal all truth if that were well to do ; not thus, but as one who listens, who repeats only great words that are spoken by another in some region beyond mortal hearkening. He shall not speak of Himself, but whatsoever things He shall hear, that shall He speak, and He shall announce to you *the* coming things. And whose voice He hears, we know, since the things which He shall take and reveal unto us are the things of Christ.

And why are these mysteries the things of Christ, in a sense in which they do not belong to the spirit of abstract and ideal truth ? Surely because Christ is the Governor of the world. All things which the Father hath are His. All power is committed to Him in heaven and earth. In the Apocalypse, when every being in heaven and earth had failed to open the sealed book of the history of the future, the Lion of the tribe of Judah—the Lion who is also the Lamb, opened those awful seals which let loose, one by one,

as He broke them, war and pestilence and earthquake and the trumpets of the final judgment.

Thus we are led to the conclusion that Christ, who upon earth graduated his revelations according to the mental and moral capabilities of his disciples, still gives the time for all the revelations of His Spirit; the historical moment is awaited; the fact that something is profoundly true is not a sufficient reason why the Spirit should announce it; He speaks only when the providential hour has struck: when the voice of the King of History is heard to proclaim a truth in heaven, then it is ripe for utterance on earth, and He, the Spirit of Truth, makes it audible to His people's hearts.

Is not this whole interpretation subverted, however, by the words, "He shall show you the things to come"? They certainly refute it if they mean that He is to show, at a flash, all the future of the world; for then there can be no selection of a fit moment for one revelation and for another.

But this is precisely what the original words do not and cannot mean. What they promise is that He shall reveal the things already in motion, actually drawing nigh, the approaching births of time,¹ They tell us that the Church need never be taken unawares by the march of Providence; hers it is to penetrate with a divine insight the purpose and mystery of the world, "the riddle of the painful earth," and when men's hearts are failing them for fear and for looking at the things coming upon the earth, the Spirit reveals them to His people, whose discernment ought therefore to be in advance of all the boasted wisdom of the world.

¹ τὰ ἐρχόμενα. Cf. ὄψονται τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐρχόμενον (Luke xxi. 27), and especially the withdrawal, after the second Advent, of the third clause from the title ὁ ὢν καὶ ὁ ἦν καὶ ὁ ἐρχόμενος. (Rev. i. 17 in the best copies, contrasted with i. 4, 8). The Bishop of Durham says that the phrase τὰ ἐρχόμενα occurs here only in the New Testament (*in loco*). Compare, however, εἰδὼς πάντα τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἐπ' αὐτόν, and προσδοκίας τῶν ἐπέρχόμενων τῇ οἰκουμένῃ (John xviii. 4, and Luke xxi. 26).

In the light of such a verse, how grotesque a thing is all that monastic or Puritan asceticism which averts its gaze from life and its concerns, muttering to itself that the Kingdom of Heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hermetically sealed up, lest the contamination of the meal should come at it. Not so. The people of Christ, as He wills to have them, know more of the meaning of events than other men; and, holding a clue in the labyrinth of affairs, they are profoundly interested, because they are divinely taught.

This text does not stand alone; nor does the companion passage fail to throw a clear light upon its meaning.

On the day when this Spirit actually came, St. Peter hailed His advent as the fulfilment of the promise, "I will pour out of My Spirit upon all flesh; your sons and your daughters shall prophesy; your young men shall see visions and your old men shall dream dreams." And He further said, "Repent and ye shall receive this gift of the Holy Ghost, for the promise is to you and to your children and to all that are afar off, even as many as the Lord your God shall call." But that is the promise of the Spirit poured upon all flesh to give visions and dreams and prophetic insight. And it proves, if proof were needed, that our Lord's own promise of guidance into all the truth, and of revelations of the coming things, was not restricted to the first age and the apostolic order, but announced a world-wide and universal endowment, limited only by the one condition that the Spirit of Truth should not reveal truth merely as such, but as the proper truth for the occasion, ever speaking as He hears.

What has become of this great promise? What can the Church show to justify her claim to it? Or ought she to be covered with confusion if her enemies proclaim her a convicted boaster, because no such endowment actually exists at all?

Reflection will show that sober-minded Christians have a sound and good reply to any such complaint, a reply on exactly the same level with the true answer to all taunts about the disappearance of miraculous powers.

The gift of miracles had a two-fold object. In the relief of human misery they exhibited the benevolent mind of our reconciled God, and also they were an evidence which helped the new religion to take root.

As evidence, they belonged to the childhood of the faith, and when it became a man, they were withdrawn. Miracles in the hand of a few princes or champions of the faith—in official hands—have disappeared.

But when the faith preached to the world the unity of God, and the consistency and beauty of all his plans, it supplied modern science with the germ whence all its wonders of beneficence have been evolved. The unity of nature is deduced from the unity and perfection of God. Moreover, the Church has always been the preacher and inspirer of all the philanthropies, and to-day, in a thousand hospitals and charitable agencies, and, far more, in the burning hearts of all its true disciples, it is the good Samaritan of the race. Nor will any thoughtful man, whatever be his views, deny that to freeze up the love of all Christians in any baptized land to-day would be a far greater loss to that country than if one or two distinguished persons had been moving up and down in it, working miracles like the apostles, and were suddenly withdrawn.

But this is the same thing as to say that we have in the Church still as much physical and humanitarian benefit for the race as ever, only we have it in a form so natural, so easy, and, above all, so diffused, that its evidential and aggressive results, though they are not lost, are indirect, and veiled from hasty observation.

It is quite the same thing with prophecy. When Joel himself, severed from common humanity by his gift,

announced the future endowment of all flesh, of our sons and daughters, our young men and maidens, he proclaimed the coming abolition of his own order and its special function. Its members were like the pools, which, when the tide is down, lie here and there among the rocks, but are merged at high water in the vast expanses of the universal flood. But it is not the loss of anything which has submerged them.

The gift of the latter day should be universally diffused, and therefore should less resemble the glare of lightning than the brooding, unrecognised electric forces which beset us behind and before continually with results we little dream.

We have now worked our way to the verge of a truth which is modern, practical, and all-important. That truth is that the whole Church is endowed with, and does actually exert a steady force, parallel, and, to say the very least, equivalent to the rare and intermittent powers of the prophetic order in the pre-Christian ages. It is neither asserted nor supposed that it is equally surprising. As was said of miracles, so of this: it is no longer needed to dazzle men as an evidence, but to strengthen and edify them as a grace.

But we must remember that even the older prophets foretold future events, not as fortune-tellers, but through their insight into the mind of God. And if human actions and tempers changed so greatly that the operations of His eternal principles (though not the principles themselves) were modified, then came such results as, on the one hand the postponement of Hezekiah's death for fifteen years after its deliberate prediction, and the sparing of Nineveh though Jonah was humiliated, or, in the other direction, the announcement, "I said indeed . . . that I would establish thy throne for ever, but now be it far from Me."

Whatever else these passages imply, they surely teach us not to be disheartened, because the claim now to be set up falls short of omniscience so far that it is not infallibility.

It is simply a straightforward claim to that which the literal words convey, without exaggeration and without flinching from their force, namely, continual progress along the paths of practical truth, a divine perception of the meaning of events and of the tendencies of the history of our time, and so inspiring and elevating a faith in the loving government of the world that our aspirations shall become a reality, and our visions and daydreams shall mark the path along which the world is yet to travel.

This is the God-given prerogative of the Church, how shamefully soever she may have failed of its enjoyment, however far from such visions are the eyes which earthly glories dazzle, and from such dreams the brows that are weighted with a triple crown.

And therefore, when the mightiest practical issues have been propounded to the simple ones of Christ, their insight has been clear and true.

In the primitive ages the questions which moved the Church were concerned with the profoundest mysteries of the revelation of God incarnate: she was half unconsciously verifying the divine credentials of her Teacher; and the decisions then attained shall never be reversed, nor shall the Church retrace the steps along which she was then led.

This we believe, not on the coercive authority of any council whatever, but as being persuaded that the Church in these great decisions was really leaning upon her Guide.

At the Reformation, awaking from the drugged and fevered sleep in which manacles had been fastened on her wrists, she declared that no order and no class could pretend to monopolize the Spirit Who was given to all flesh, and that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty. On many great questions, the rights of the individual conscience, what is called the right of private judgment, but is really far less a "right" than a solemn responsibility and awful

duty, above all, upon the free and childlike approach of man the child to God his Father,—on these and many another vital question the Church of the Reformation spoke in clearer, bolder, and deeper tones than ever the patristic church had heard.

And this is a perplexity and offence to some. But surely nothing short of it is implied in the promise that she should be led along the road into all truth.

And what are the great questions that concern the Church in our own time? What problems really press heaviest upon her heart?

They are not the problems of the higher criticism, so-called, nor yet whether the material of which man was moulded was animated or inanimate dust. Some of us have lived long enough to see, with joy, the comparatively minor place which is now given to all such questions; and to have fared as when one crosses, in a few hours, the watershed of Europe, and feels the winds blowing over other regions, and sees the rivers hurrying to mingle with other seas.

Never was there a time when the Church, in all its developments, felt either so keenly, or at all in the same direction, its responsibility for *social* questions. That these are the questions of the time is felt by all. We hear—all men can hear it—

Amid the strife,
A motion toiling in the gloom—
The spirit of the years to come
Yearning to mix himself with life.

A slow-developed strength awaits
Completion in a painful school,
Phantoms of other forms of rule,
New majesties of mighty states,

The wardens of the growing hour,
But slow of motion, hard to mark,
And round them earth and air are dark
With vast contrivances of power.

Yes, we all acknowledge it, but the new and startling thing is the extent to which the church of God acknowledges its responsibility for all these movements of the public mind, and not only acknowledges but boldly and eagerly claims it. Perhaps the first sign of what was coming was the great crusade against slavery. What was then so remarkable was not the sense of the guilt of traffic in human flesh and blood. Every reader of Longfellow can remember that even in the middle ages the dying Baron was often forced to manumit his thralls. But our fathers did not say that pious folk must not have slaves; they first said, Pious people must cooperate to make the nation emancipate its slaves; and then they said, Pious people must force the nation to suppress slavery all over the world. They were laughed at. They were dreamers and fanatics. But it is coming true, this vision which our young men saw; this dream which our old men dreamed.

Led forward, along the road into all truth, they declared that slavery, because it was demoralizing, was, in the nature of things accursed, and that to be accursed was to be doomed. Our nation was wise and heard them. In America they not only protested but accepted martyrdom. But presently, by tokens that none might gainsay, by the red rain that falls fast on battlefields, and the thunder that peals from cannon, it was proved that the Spirit had indeed shown them the coming things.

And now it is beyond gainsaying that the Church of Christ is entangled with all the mighty questions of which the age is full; the claims of capital and of labour, the rights of employers and employed, and of women, of children, of paupers, and even of the lower animals, and the best means of elevating the submerged and degraded, our poor relations every one of them, being, God help us, our brothers and sisters still.

For better or worse these new ventures of the Church

are now inevitable, and brave hearts may well be glad of it. Glad, not as doubting that she may easily make mistakes, nor for the new stage which is offered for declaimers and hunters of popularity, nor yet on the degrading speculation that it is good policy for religion to flatter the democracy, which is now king. Not so, but because Jesus Christ died not merely to save souls for eternity, but to save men, body soul and spirit, for this world as truly as for all worlds to come. And also glad, because it seems that only the honest and whole-hearted intervention of the church of God can save, at this hour, the national life of England from the gravest perils.

Readers of Matthew Arnold know what is meant by the Time-Spirit. It is the tendency, the belief, the aspiration which is in the air, which all sympathetic and impressionable souls find pressing upon them like an atmosphere. It is the spirit which was sceptical in the age of Gibbon and Voltaire, and just at present it is democratic, scientific, and materialistic. The thought of the Time-Spirit, we are openly told, is irresistible. To contradict it is infatuation and defeat. To be foremost in discerning its tendencies and formulating its mandates—to speak, not of one's self, but as one hears of the Time-Spirit—that is truest wisdom in practical affairs, and above all, in political affairs.

Gentlemen, said Talleyrand to the Senate, there is someone who has more *esprit* than Rousseau or Voltaire, than the Emperor Napoleon or the Academy,—that someone is every one. Talleyrand was thinking of the Time-Spirit, and he was evidently prepared to support to the uttermost its august behests.

And yet he also had *esprit*, who said that heaven was intended for minorities and for those who were defeated upon earth.

And one seems to have heard another and less flattering name for this uncompromising loyalty to the Time-Spirit.

It is surely our old friend opportunism, "the cult of the jumping cat."

To-day, when democracies govern, and yet our most urgent questions are of the rights and obligations of these same democracies, who shall strengthen our various leaders, and us who follow, to be just and calm and fearless, and to declare that majorities have their duties as well as their rights? How shall we dare to set our convictions, if need be, against the rush of multitudes, all going one way? What voice shall we match against the soul-subduing voice of the Time-Spirit?

Only His, who is the Spirit of the very Truth itself, who speaks what He hears within the veil, and whose voice, uttered in the most secret places of the soul, is a genuine revelation of the future, telling His people of a hope for humanity grander and more elevating than all that newspapers are preaching, a hope that maketh not ashamed.

G. A. CHADWICK.

THE BAPTIST'S MESSAGE TO JESUS.

MATT. XI. 2-19; LUKE VII. 18-35.

THE impression which the unbiassed reader would naturally receive from these narratives undoubtedly is that the Baptist, whose function it had been to identify and proclaim the Messiah, was now doubtful of the identification he had authorized. The difficulty of understanding how such a change of mental attitude could arise is forcibly stated by Strauss: "Such a doubt is in direct contradiction with all the other circumstances reported by the evangelists. It is justly regarded as psychologically impossible that he whose belief was originated or confirmed by the baptismal sign, which he held to be a divine revelation, and who afterwards pronounced so decidedly on the Messianic call and the

superior nature of Jesus, should all at once have become unsteady in his conviction ; he must then indeed have been like a reed shaken by the wind, a comparison which Jesus abnegates on this very occasion (Matt. xi. 7). A cause for such vacillation is in vain sought in the conduct or fortunes of Jesus at the time ; for the rumour of *the works of Christ*, which in Luke's idea were miracles, could not awaken doubt in the Baptist, and it was on this rumour that he sent his message. Lastly, how could Jesus subsequently (John v. 33 ff.) so confidently appeal to the testimony of the Baptist concerning Him, when it was known that John himself was perplexed about His Messiahship?"

The difficulty is genuine and all honest interpreters have acknowledged it, while some have sought escape from it by illegitimate methods. Chrysostom and Euthymius among patristic interpreters, and Calvin and Beza among the reformers, emphatically assert that it was not to dissipate doubts of His own but to convince His disciples that John sent them to Jesus. He believed that when they saw the works He was doing they would accept Him as the Christ. This construction of the incident, however, is precluded by the fact that it was the disciples of John who had already themselves reported to him the miracles of Jesus, and there is no hint given that they shared the doubt of their master. The answer of Jesus is also pointedly addressed to John (Matt. xi. 22), and they are instructed to say to him, "Blessed is he whosoever shall not be offended in Me"—words which imply that John was in danger of misconstruing Jesus. The same conclusion is put beyond question by the apology for John which Jesus considers it necessary to make to the people. This apology proceeds on the idea that occasion had been given to doubt whether John was so steadfast and prophetic a man as had been commonly believed.

Several recent commentators, such as Fritzsche, Hase

and others, have supposed that the intention of the Baptist was to quicken within Jesus the Messianic consciousness, to remind Him of the expectations of those who believed in Him, and provoke Him to the definite assumption of kingly powers. So far from unbelief was John, that it was the very certainty of Jesus' Messiahship that prompted the question. This is nearer the truth. It brings out the impatience which John felt, but it fails to emphasize the doubt.

Accepting the question, then, in its obvious and natural sense as implying a doubt in the Baptist's mind regarding the identification of Jesus as the Christ, how is this doubt to be accounted for? In both narratives it is directly connected with the reports of the miracles of Jesus which had been brought to John in prison. Strauss thinks quite an opposite result might have been expected from such a report, and jeeringly remarks: "This is opposed to all psychological probability, that I wonder Dr. Paulus, or some other expositor versed in psychology and not timid in verbal criticism, has not started the conjecture that a negative has slipped out of Matt. xi. 2, and that its proper reading is *ὁ δε Ἰωάννης οὐκ ἀκούσας κ.τ.λ.*"

Notwithstanding these supposed psychological impossibilities which Strauss discovered in the narrative, it must still be maintained with the best recent expositors, that it was precisely these miracles of Jesus, reported to the Baptist in prison, which provoked him to send his embassy to Jesus. John was disappointed in Jesus because these works of His were not the kind of works he had expected the Messiah to perform. He himself "did no miracle"; he had preached repentance and prepared the people for their King. He had come in the spirit of Elias denouncing prevalent iniquity and he had heralded one who was to come in the same spirit but with a mightier manifestation of it. He had shared in the popular expectation that the

Messiah would reign visibly in Israel, and he could not understand why, if Jesus was the Messiah, He refrained from establishing the Messianic kingdom, and contented Himself with healing a few sick folk and preaching, not to the authorities and men in high places, but to the poor. This beneficent, non-aggressive, quiet, genial ministry irritated him.

It was not, then, that the personal misfortunes of the Baptist were clouding his faith; it was not that the hard fare of the prison was blotting out his bright expectations. Against such an interpretation of John's state of mind Jesus emphatically warned the people, reminding them that it was no reed bending now to one wind now to the opposite, they had seen in the wilderness. The man whom they had seen content with a camel's hair garment, and such food as he could gather from uncultivated nature was not likely to feel so keenly the change to prison fare. But no doubt the prison would have its own effect upon him. Day after day, month after month, passed as he lay with his blazing energies pent up, and still there reached him not the shout of a nation proclaiming its king, but the same monotonous tidings of a few lepers cleansed, a few blind beggars restored to sight. He had waited to feel the shock of revolution shake the solid walls of the remote fortress where he lay; let its ruins bury him; if only he knows that God has remembered His people, he will die in triumph. But as when one listens in the dead of night till the ear aches with the silence, so did John wait till his heart grew sick with watching. What could it mean? He had learned how quickly a man must do his work if he is to do it at all. He had learned how short a time would be given to any one who was resolved to root out evil from the land. Why, then, this delay on the part of Jesus? Why did He not complete the work John had begun by denouncing the wickedness of Herod? Why was He content to go about

in villages, talking with unimportant sinners, dining at rich men's tables, helping a few sick women and crippled beggars, while the nation cried out for its King?

With such feelings preying on his mind, John sends to Jesus, saying, "Art Thou He that should come, or are we to look for another?" Had any one challenged his own former testimony, and now assured him he had been mistaken in indicating Jesus as the Messiah, he would probably have maintained His Messiahship as before. But in his own mind perplexities have arisen. He cannot make out why Jesus should act as He does. He cannot rid himself of the belief that Jesus is the Messiah, but he cannot reconcile that belief with the behaviour of Jesus. And the miracles now reported to him only increase his perplexity; for, if this almighty power resides in Him, why does He not use it to sweep away iniquity and revolutionize the nation?

This state of mind can be pronounced psychologically impossible, only by those who fancy that the conviction wrought in John's mind at the baptism of Jesus, precluded his subsequent consideration of the evidence that came before him—a supposition which implies that a continual miracle was wrought on the mind of the Baptist, and that he was a mere mechanical official with no personal spiritual conflict and no trial of his faith. With all his countrymen he had to rise to new conceptions of the kingdom, and this was the path by which he had to travel to those new conceptions. He appeals to Jesus Himself, knowing that He alone comprehended the situation. The authorities had mistaken the Baptist himself for the Christ: Jesus would make no mistake.

From this revelation of an unexpected perplexity in the mind of the prominent witness to the Messiahship of Jesus many reflections arise. We see how entirely Jesus stood alone, how misleading was the counsel, and how fatal the aid He could receive even from such a man as John. We cannot

overestimate the clearness of aim and stability of purpose, which with so much apparent ease, though doubtless with some unseen mental conflict, put aside not only the popular expectation but the grave judgments and suggestions of a man like John. It also becomes apparent that even good, wise, and strong men are tempted to think God is doing nothing if He is not using them. If a religious movement goes on without us, we at once begin to view it critically and with suspicion.

John's mistake is common still. Men can never reconcile themselves to Christ's method. His work seems so slow; one is tempted to say, so inefficient and careless; it disappoints in so many ways the expectations of practical men. He seems so tardy in making any definitely marked impression on the world that a large number of persons use their own methods for reforming society and leave Him to His work. If He actually sat as King in our midst, legislating for us and administering justice and redressing all grievances, we should not be offended in Him. But things go on so much as if no power in Heaven or on earth were His, His help comes so ambiguously, His interference is so indirect, that in times of great stress and need, many are tempted to ask with John, half in doubt half in challenge, whether this is the final and best rule of mankind?

Is it not precisely John's difficulty which is at present hindering many of the most earnest men in the working classes from believing in Christ. His methods bring no immediate revolution, no upturning of social order, no instant setting right of all that is wrong. He claims to be King, and to have a special regard for the oppressed, yet generation after generation of the oppressed pass away, and He gives no sign. It is this which causes many to turn from Him in disappointment and look for "another," generally a hasty demagogue, and it is this which causes many to hate and blaspheme His name.

John's state of mind being apprehended, the answer of Jesus becomes at once intelligible. Virtually Jesus says to the Baptist, I have chosen My method of action. These are the works by which I vindicate My claim to the Messiahship. All that you now urge has been urged before, and I have put it aside as a temptation inviting Me to deflect from the proper work of the Messiah. The Gospel is preached to the poor because the influence I seek is not that of fashion, or money, or power, but a spiritual human influence. It is through the individual I work, and by individual attraction I form the kingdom. The ills common to humanity, permanent and universal, concern Me more than the grievances of the Jewish people. The kingdom I am founding is spiritual and universal: hence My method. And, "blessed is he whosoever is not offended in Me."

Jesus here shows in what spirit He meets honest and serious-minded doubt. He knew that beneath that question of John's which so shocked the bystanders there was a heart more capable of loyalty to Him than was to be found in any of those who gave their easy assent to claims they scarcely understood. That question was of more value to Him than the unreasoning hosannas of thoughtless followers; for through it he saw a man in earnest and to whom the answer was of immeasurable consequence. It is when a man takes the Messiahship of Jesus seriously and proposes to make the mind of Christ rule all that He Himself is connected with, that he begins to question whether this or that method or principle of Christ can be approved. It is through such doubt and such perplexity ultimate faith and true allegiance are reached.

After dismissing the messengers of John, Jesus seeks to improve the occasion to the people. And he aims chiefly at two things, at clearing the character of John from the suspicion of fickleness and weakness which might have

arisen from his message ; and at suggesting to the people that while John did not cordially approve the methods of Jesus it was possible that they themselves approved of the methods neither of John nor of Jesus.

In the course of His address to the people He somewhat abruptly introduces the words : " From the days of John the Baptist until now the kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by force." In Luke xvi. 16 in a different connection similar words are used. " The law and the prophets were until John ; since that time the kingdom of God is preached, and every man presseth into it," where the same word expressive of violent seizure is retained, having fixed itself in the memory. The interpretation of this saying which is most commonly received is that which Alford gives : " The kingdom of heaven is pressed into (or taken by storm) and violent persons (stormers)—eager, ardent multitudes—seize on it " (as on the plunder of a sacked city). This interpretation is inviting. It seems to suit the context. Until John the kingdom was predicted, " all the prophets until John prophesied " ; but when John came, he could say, The kingdom is at hand : the time is fulfilled. The prophet's occupation was gone ; John could say, The King is standing in your midst. The change was as that from the leadership of Moses to that of Joshua. Moses could but see the land afar off from the mountain top ; Joshua took the kingdom by storm.

And this interpretation carries great truths. It is men of earnestness who fight their way into the Kingdom. As Christian, in Bunyan's *Pilgrim*, saw many men in armour keeping the doorway and terrifying all comers, till a man of stout countenance came, and said to him at the gate, " Set down my name, sir ! " and forthwith hewed his way into the palace, giving and taking many wounds, so is it with the kingdom. And also, as in all times of revolution and violent excitement, so in the founding of Christ's

kingdom, it was not the orderly procession of a coronation day that was visible, but rather the rush of a storming party. In a rush through a breach it is every man for himself, and often it is the wild, undisciplined private who finds himself first within the enemy's rampart. Strange people come to the front when it is on each man's native courage, resource, and earnestness success depends. And in great religious movements it is not the martinet or the man who shows best on parade who is always first in the breach. There may be much to shock persons who worship decorum. In critical times, when appeal is made to the elementary forces of humanity, men of violence come to the front, men of the Luther type, who shock and enrage scholars and men of taste like Erasmus, do the requisite storming. And so the Pharisees were sincerely shocked to see the kind of following the Messiah had gathered round Him—a following which seemed to them no better than the troop of desperadoes and gladiators who were told off as a forlorn hope to mount a breach. Among them there was nothing orderly and decorous, no praying at appointed hours, no fasting, no recital of tradition, nothing which had become identified with religion in the respectable Pharisaic mind.

This interpretation is tempting, but there are difficulties in the way of accepting it. Was there any such pressure into the kingdom as is thus implied? And even though there were, would not the language be unduly strong—"Taking by force," "snatching"? This strong language tallies much better with another interpretation—indeed, suggests it. For such language is actually used, in John vi. 15, of the attempt of the people to make Jesus a King. It is obvious, therefore, to suppose that what Jesus meant by the kingdom "being done violence to," is that the people, excited by the Baptist's preaching, sought forcibly to establish the kingdom he had proclaimed; precisely as the

Galileans had sought to take Him by force and make Him a King. And hence the relevancy of introducing the sentence into His apology for the Baptist. For the Baptist also had apparently taken offence at, or been stumbled by, the gentle and quiet methods of Jesus, and he, too, wished to take the kingdom by violence. This saying of Jesus, then, is but another way of calling attention to the fact that His kingdom is spiritual, that it cannot be taken by storm, or established by swift and violent methods, but that it belongs to the meek, to those who, with greater earnestness than the violent, believe in spiritual methods, and can patiently wait till these methods prevail.

The point of the little parable with which the section closes is obvious. Neither John nor Jesus was such a leader as the people desired. They were not sufficiently interested in the spiritual movements of their time to approve of either the severe or the genial reformer. They had adopted the fatal critical attitude: the attitude of unconcerned spectators and judges. John, they said, overtaxed their strength and demanded a purity of life which seemed easy to him but was impossible to them. Jesus was even more unsuitable. In Him indeed there was no asceticism that they could see; he came eating and drinking, sociable, free from care, living a cheerful life among the common people. But when they besought Him to resist the oppressor He went and paid His taxes, and when they would have made Him a king He hid Himself from them. He seemed to ignore the national sorrows. He would not interfere; not even when His relative was basely thrown into a dungeon would He head a rescue. Nay, He would actually accept the hospitality of a publican. What could be made of such a person? The Messiah indeed! He was a mere good-natured time-server, indifferent to the sorrows of His people so long as He could dine well: "a gluttonous man and a winebibber." They had mourned to Jesus, but

He had not joined in their lamentations; they had piped to the ascetic and grim Baptist, but not a step would he dance.

Those to whom our Lord spoke must have seen how exactly this parable hit off their attitude towards the two great forms in which God had been revealed to them in their own day. In the persons of John and Jesus religion and the will of God had taken definite shape before them. But the people approved of neither. They were like petted children who think every one should fall in with their whim, dancing when they pipe and pretending to cry when they whimper or strike them. To some people no religious movement of their time quite responds. They live at feud with their generation because they cannot get their own whim petted. The great movements of their time pass on as if they heard them not. They feel themselves ill-used. They have fallen on evil days and spend their time sulking and grumbling. They are the only survivors of the good old times and accept it as their mission to bewail the degeneracy of the Church. In fact they are only spoiled children sitting in the market-place, much in the way of practical men, and piping their little monotonous tune, wondering that no one listens to them.

Certainly John and Jesus represented opposite poles of human life, and that man had no ordinary breadth of view who could perceive that far from being antagonistic they were forwarding one great movement. Frequently, men of limited vision and narrow spiritual experience fail to see the inner harmony of movements which are superficially diverse. Sometimes they count those the enemies of religion who are indeed its truest friends. They do not recognise how many varieties of type it takes to make a world. And as men could plausibly denounce Jesus as undoing the work of John, so does the truest progress often seem mere demolition of what many have found to be for

their soul's health. By hastiness of judgment and self-satisfied condemnation of all that does not at once commend itself to our preconceived ideas of how God will accomplish His work, we are found to be resisting God and mistaking good for evil. To make our own tastes and expectations the measure of the religious movements of our time is to secure that we get no good from the movements that engage the activities of other people and that we get all the harm, the self-righteous vanity and hardness of heart and blindness to the truth, which must result from opposing the work of God in our own generation. Triflers, playing at religion, may criticise all movements and support none: men will take care that their devoted support be given to one form or other of the work of God in their own time.

MARCUS DODS.

PROFESSOR F. BLASS ON THE TWO EDITIONS
OF ACTS.

II.

THE process of comparing the two texts of *Acts* is a hopeless one, unless we start from the principle that in every case the more sensible and complete explanation is to be preferred. It is necessarily assumed in all other departments of literature that preference must be given to the interpretation which restores order, lucidity, and sanity to the work. Unluckily that principle is far from being admitted in the case of *Acts*. Even of those who admit the book to be composed by one author, many do not permit our assumption; and, in particular, the North-Galatian theorists avowedly base their view on the contrary assumption—that the most striking feature of the book is its gaps, and that therefore it is quite in the author's style to omit what we should expect and to shock our sense of historical

and literary order. In this paper, however, we apply to *Acts* the canons of interpretation that are used in studying the non-Christian works of the period.

Dr. Blass has argued with perfect propriety and great cogency that many "Western" readings bring out in a more complete and explicit way the meaning that is really latent in the "Eastern" readings, and yet, in several cases, the meaning lies so far beneath the surface of the Eastern Text that it was not admitted or even observed until the Western Text was compared. The most striking example of this is the one which he himself puts in the forefront of his case, xxi. 15, 16. Here the Eastern text reads, "We set about the journey up to Jerusalem; and there went with us also certain of the disciples from Cæsareia, bringing us to the house of one Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple, with whom we should lodge."¹ In this passage most readers, alike of the English and of the Greek, understand that Mnason lived at Jerusalem, and that Paul and his companions enjoyed his hospitality during their residence there.²

But, when one reflects, it seems most improbable that Paul should need the help of Cæsarean Christians to introduce him to a friend at Jerusalem, a city where he had lived many years, where he was well known, and which he had often visited since he had made Antioch his centre. Moreover the length of the journey from Cæsareia to Jerusalem, fully sixty-four miles by road,³ makes it im-

¹ The Revised Version, "bringing *with them* one Mnason, with whom we should lodge," seems hardly defensible grammatically, and quite indefensible in sense, as Dr. Zöckler rightly holds in the revised edition of his *Kurzgef. Kommentar*.

² The mistranslation (for that, I think, is not too strong a term, considering how important the proper force of the tenses is in the style of the writer of *Acts*), which renders the imperfect *ἀνεβαίνομεν* in verse 15 by "we went up," suggests and almost compels this understanding of the English Version. Dr. Blass, as usual, has the proper note on the tense.

³ In Roman miles, as Dr. Blass says, the number is sixty-eight. Measuring on the Map in Professor G. A. Smith's *Hist. Geogr. Palest.* one finds the same result.

probable that Cæsarean disciples should go so far merely to introduce Paul to Mnason: if they went to Jerusalem on the day before Pentecost,¹ they would go for the feast; and, if they went for the feast, it was hardly in Luke's style of thought to put the incidental service rendered to his companions as the one important fact.

Now take the proper sequence of thought into consideration. The company resided several days at Cæsareia, having time to do so before going up to Jerusalem for the feast. Then (*v.* 15), "they arranged their equipment and proceeded on their upward journey to Jerusalem": (*v.* 16), "they lodged with Mnason, on the introduction of the Cæsarean disciples": (*v.* 17), they reached Jerusalem. It becomes clear that the Eastern Text, when properly understood, implies (as Professor Rendel Harris has inferred)² that the journey to Jerusalem occupied two days, and that Mnason entertained the company on the evening of the first day.

The Western reading makes this sense explicit, "There went with us also certain of the disciples from Cæsareia, and these conducted us to them with whom we should find entertainment; and when we reached a certain village, we were (in lodging) at the house of Mnason of Cyprus, an early disciple: and going forth from thence, we came to Jerusalem." The question then is—does this reading originate from the first author, or is it the result of addition to and modification of the original text? Dr. Blass recognises here the original hand. I confess that, on ground of style, I do not like the Western reading; but, as our aim is to attend solely to external facts and neglect subjective

¹ I cannot see any reason to doubt that Paul arrived in time for the feast: it seems to lie in the style of Luke that xx. 16 is intended to convey this. If the intention there mentioned had been vain, the failure would have been made clear. Moreover reckoning is all on the side of success.

² So also Blass and Zöckler; all however gathered this first from the Bezan reading.

opinion, we can at least see that, if the original author ever wrote as Dr. Blass makes him write, he was wise to cut down his sentence. On Dr. Blass's own principle (note on xxi. 3), the aorist "conducted us" (*ἡγάγον*) implies arrival at the point aimed at, viz., those with whom the company was to find entertainment: then there follows a statement, "we arrived at a certain village, and lived with Mnason." If we were to press this double statement, we should have two nights spent on the road, but probably no one will doubt that one night alone was spent on the road.

In short, the more closely we press the Western reading the more vague does it become: while the Eastern reading, though harsh and obscure in its superficial aspect, becomes sharper, and more definite and decisive as it is examined more minutely. It is an established rule of criticism *præstat lectio doctior*, and, if we had to choose one or other of the two texts, this rule would decide for the Eastern; but against the view that both texts are right the rule affords no argument. So far, then, we find no clear external reason against Dr. Blass.

Before we pass from this point, it is worth while noticing that Dr. Blass rejects the reading *ἐπισκευασάμενοι* in v. 15,¹ on the ground that (1) there are no other cases where this verb means "collecting one's baggage" (*sarcinis collectis*), and (2) it is strange that packing up should be mentioned here and nowhere else on the journey. But, on the contrary, it seems only natural that the equipment should be mentioned here and nowhere else. Dr. Blass has taken too narrow a view of the process of equipment. The company was changing from sea-voyage to landfaring. Equipment was needed to perform the journey of sixty-four miles to Jerusalem in two days, and this was provided in Cæsareia, and was brought back to Cæsareia by the disciples

¹ He proposes the conjecture *ἀσπασάμενοι*, but wisely refrains from putting it in the text.

from the night's halting-place. Let us look into this carefully and from the proper point of view, and not as travellers in trains or by Cook's excursions, for whom everything is arranged with the minimum of exertion on their part. The company had spent in Cæsareia the time during which they might have been making their journey quietly and easily to Jerusalem; yet they were pressed for time if they were anxious to arrive before a near day. If they waited till the last moment at Cæsareia, as they obviously did,¹ this implies that they were calculating their journey very nearly, and reckoning it to a matter of hours. Now it is an elementary principle of right living in southern countries that one must avoid those great exertions and strains which in northern lands we habitually take as an amusement. The customs of the modern people (whom we on superficial knowledge are apt to think lazy, but who are not so), show that this principle guides their whole life; and it may be taken for certain that in ancient time the same principle guided ordinary life. Moreover, Paul was accompanied by his physician, who fully realized the importance of the principle, and knew that Paul, subject as he was to attacks of illness and constantly exposed to great mental and emotional strains, *must* not begin his duties in Jerusalem by a hurried walk of sixty-four miles in two days.

In a word, *ἐπισκευασάμενοι*, they arranged for horses or conveyances to take them without fatigue over a great part of the long journey; and they had been able to stay so long in Cæsareia because it had been settled with the disciples there that this should be done. The whole journey must

¹ On the one hand it is clear that the fifty days had not elapsed between the start from Philippi and the arrival at Cæsareia, and that, after reaching Cæsareia, they had it in their power to reach Jerusalem in time for Pentecost. On the other hand, by waiting several days (*πλείους ἡμέρας*) at Cæsareia, it is equally clear that they were running it very fine, and were leaving themselves no margin.

have been discussed and planned; and it is just because the method was unusual for that company of travellers, and because it had therefore taken time to settle details, that it is so pointedly mentioned in the narrative.¹ The horses then conveyed the company rapidly along the level coast road to a point where the ascent to the highlands of Judæa began,² probably to Lydda, a distance of forty miles. The disciples returned to Cæsareia, taking the animals with them; and Paul's company could safely perform the twenty-four miles' walk to Jerusalem on the following day. So far, then, from *ἐπισκευασάμενοι* being used, as Dr. Blass thinks, in an unexampled sense here, it is probably used in its proper and commonest sense, "having equipped (animals)";³ and, when we translate it in its ordinary sense in classical Greek, we find the journey described exactly as any common pagan traveller would have made it. But many people write and think about *Acts* as if the early Christians never could have lived or travelled like ordinary men.

Our next test case is found in xxi. 1. Here the Eastern Text has "and from thence (we came) unto Patara (*κακείθεν εἰς Πάταρα*); and having found a ship . . . , we went aboard," while the Western Text mentions both Patara and Myra before it alludes to the change of ship (*κακείθεν εἰς Πάταρα καὶ Μύρα*). In the first place we observe that the two Texts are contradictory. The Eastern Text makes the

¹ One other case occurs in which, as I think, Paul's disciples sent him on by horse or carriage, see *Church in Rom. Emp.*, p. 68, where the evidence is contained, not in *Acts*, which was written by one who had not been present, but in Paul's own words to his entertainers. In this case, also, the conveyance was, I doubt not, provided by the Cæsarean disciples, and not hired by Paul himself. They brought Paul to the village, and took home the horses.

² Every reader of Professor G. A. Smith's *Historical Geography* will recognise how much his lucid pictures help in conceiving this journey properly.

³ Chrysostom clearly understood the word so. He explains it as *τὰ πρὸς τὴν ὁδοπορίαν λαβόντες* (i.e. *ὑποζύγια*); compare Pollux, x. 14, quoted by Wetstein (with a misprint), *ἐπεσκευασμένα ἦν τὰ ὑποζύγια, ὅσον ἐστρωματισμένα*. The ellipsis of *ὑποζύγια* is natural, when we take the word, with Pollux, as "having saddled."

travellers change ship in Patara, but the Western Text cannot be understood in that sense. There is therefore in this case an easier and more objective problem before us, viz., to determine which of two contradictory accounts is correct.

In the second place, Dr. Blass's theory of two equally trustworthy texts written by the same hand can hardly be applicable here. It is in the last degree improbable that a writer who had himself been one of the travellers¹ would make a slip about a point like this in one of his texts (admitting that he wrote two), for such a fact is never forgotten by a real traveller. We must accept one of the two readings as original in this passage, and hold that the other is a corruption. Either the Western reading was written by the author, and all MSS. of the Eastern Texts have lost two words without a trace; or the Eastern reading was written by the author, and two words have been added in the Western Text by another hand. So much seems incontrovertible.

Next comes the question, Which reading is original, and which is the corruption? In this question we are helped by observing that one of the two Texts violates a principle of Luke's style. If we look at xvi. 1, we see there a precise parallel in meaning to the Western Text of xxi. 1: Paul came to Derbe and to Lystra, and there he found Timothy; and verse 2 refers only to Lystra, not to Derbe. So in xxi. 1, 2, "they came to Patara and Myra; and they found a vessel ready to sail across to Syria," verse 2 must refer only to Myra, not to Patara. But while the meaning is parallel, the expression is not parallel. In xvi. 1, the expression used marks that Derbe and Lystra are to be

¹ As Dr. Blass fully admits this, it is quite fair to use it in our argument against him. I hope, however, yet to demonstrate this beyond the reach of rational dispute, though to admit the possibility of it is sufficient, in the estimation of some of my friends, to stamp me as "an apologist of tradition."

kept separate, "He came to Derbe, and to Lystra"; whereas in xxi. 1, the form of expression used conjoins Patara and Myra as a pair, "we came to Patara and Myra."¹ The same writer who used *καὶ εἰς Λύστραν* in xvi. 1 to anticipate the reference of xvi. 2, and mark that reference as applying only to Lystra, would have used *καὶ εἰς Μύρα* in xxi. 1 to mark that xxi. 2 applied only to Myra.²

But, it may be replied, this only proves that the Western Text has been badly transmitted. *Codex Bezae* makes the same mistake in xvi. 1, as in xxi. 1, for it reads in the former place "to Derbe and Lystra" in place of "to Derbe and to Lystra." It may be urged therefore that the correct text in xxi. 1 is *εἰς Πάταρα καὶ εἰς Μύρα*. Let us admit, for argument's sake, that such was the original Western Text, still the Western Text is not as yet proved to be right.

It is most improbable that the words "to Myra" would have been added from mere impertinent lust for making changes; so far we must agree with Dr. Blass, and for a time I thought that his weighty and unanswerable argument was conclusive. But there is an almost equally weighty reason on the other side; the words, if originally written, are not likely to have dropped out from the Eastern Text, causing it to make a false statement.

Both these reasons are correct and good. If we were reduced to choose between them, then our judgment would be a mere subjective balancing of probabilities. But if we find a solution which justifies both and offends against neither, then the solution is not merely founded on subjec-

¹ The difference between *εἰς Πάταρα καὶ εἰς Μύρα* and *εἰς Πάταρα καὶ Μύρα* is very similar in character to that between *τὴν Ἀμφίπολιν καὶ τὴν Ἀπολλωνίαν* and *τὴν Συρίαν καὶ Κιλικίαν*, it is the difference between two taken singly and separately, and two taken together as united for the writer's purpose at the moment. A whole chapter on Luke's style depends on this distinction, which is carried out by him thoroughly.

² Dr. Blass, it must be said, holds that Timothy belonged to Derbe, which would elude our argument; but I shall, if space permits, return to that point.

tive preference, but stands on objective and real ground. There is probably only one way to do this; and that is by supposing that the Eastern Text is original and accurate, but not absolutely complete. The travellers came to Patara and there trans-shipped to a vessel bound for Syria by the over-sea route, as that Text has it; but the vessel touched at Myra by the way. The original author omitted Myra for some reason.¹

But is this supposition probable or possible? As to the facts of the voyage, I believe that it may easily be shown to be probably true, for Myra was almost certainly the great harbour for the direct cross-sea traffic to the coasts of Syria and Egypt. From this reason it was the seat of the sailors' protecting god, who was christianized as St. Nicholas of Myra, the patron of sailors, to whom they offered their prayers before starting on the direct long course,² and paid their vows on their safe arrival. I learn from Dr. Tomaszek that Myra is styled by the pilgrim Saevulf "the harbour of the Adriatic Sea,³ as Constantinople is of the Ægean Sea," and this importance is hardly intelligible till we recognise its relation to the Syrian and Egyptian traffic.

Again, is it probable that the original author would have omitted the visit to Myra? I can see nothing improbable in the omission. A brief narrative like this involves many omissions; the narrator constantly finds himself face to face with the question as to what details of his voyage he shall omit and what he shall mention. After describing the trans-shipment to the direct-bound vessel, the narrator hurries on to the over-sea passage, and did not think that there

¹ On the reason for omitting Myra, see below.

² In estimating their conduct, we must of course bear in mind that the ancients rarely made "a long leg" across the sea, but worked on from point to point of the coast. Only in certain favourable cases they ventured across a long course, and when they did so they had a Zeus Ourios at the point of start (*e.g.* at the entrance to the Black Sea).

³ Adriatic means Mediterranean, as in Acts xxvii. 27.

was any need to mention Myra, the visit to which was a mere incident of the passage.¹

But, some one may say, it added a day to touch at Myra, and the omission affects the reckoning, which is in this passage of fundamental importance. This objection has a superficial plausibility, but no more. It did not add appreciably to the voyage to touch at Myra, for these coasting voyages of the ancients followed the same exact stages year after year; everything was mapped out, and every sailor knew exactly at what point in his voyage he should strike across the sea.² Whether or not the ship actually touched at the harbour of Myra on this occasion, it doubtless spent a day along the coast, and went close up to Myra before striking across to Syria, and the distance traversed from Patara to Tyre (the time of which, about three or four days, is not mentioned) remains much the same in either case.

In the Western Text the words "and Myra" are added, completing the record of the voyage. Did some glossator add these two words simply because he knew that Myra was on the regular line of voyage for Syrian traders? Dr. Blass thinks the supposition unnatural, and I cordially agree with him, as it seems hardly reconcilable with a rational view of the position of *Acts* among the early Christians. Many will think differently; many hold that no amount of stupidity and folly is too great to attribute to the originator of the "Western Text." There would be no more melancholy page in the history of human error than the origin of that Text if, for example, such a theory as that of Rev. F. H. Chase in his *Syriac Element in Codex Bezae* be right. I take on his authority all that relates to Syriac; but after doing so I find

¹ It may illustrate how such a call, though actually made, may become unimportant in some special case, if I mention that though I once called at Myra I did not see it or its harbour, and would probably omit it if I were giving a summary description of my voyage.

² Ernst Curtius describes them admirably in his paper on *die Griechen in der Diaspora*.

that, if one is free to attribute to the glossator and translators as much perversity, ignorance, and positive literary crime as he does, one may explain the origin of the Bezan Text quite as easily by the influence of an English or a Turkish translation, or of no translation at all. Ten parts of pure blunder to one part of Syriac influence would be a not exaggerated statement of the cause to which he attributes the Western Text. Belief in human intelligence and truth refuses to accept such a cause. If folly is admitted as a sufficient cause, anything can be explained by it. The *glossator* can have added these words only because he had independent trustworthy evidence that Myra had been touched at on the voyage; now such a fact is not likely to have persisted in general Christian tradition,¹ and it seems necessary, so far as I may judge, to suppose that it was learned from the mouth of one of the travellers. It would lead too far to go into this subject more deeply, but the words quoted from Papias by Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, iii. 35, make it probable and almost certain that such enquiries were made before the death of the actors in these events for the purpose of recording the information gained.

Further, it is clear that the addition was made with the smallest possible change of the existing text. The words *καὶ Μύρα* were inserted, though this exposes the Western Text, if closely pressed, to the wrong interpretation that the trans-shipment took place in Myra. Dr. Blass holds that here and in xvi. 1-2, the second verse refers back only to the first of the two places mentioned; and, in order to justify his views that Timothy was a native of Derbe, he adopts (and prints in his text) a conjectural alteration of xx. 4. But, though there are some seductive arguments for his change in xx. 4, his view that Timothy lived at

¹ A special Myran legend is possible. A great harbour like Myra was likely to have a church very early in Christian history, and a legend would grow round it, but that carries us too late for the origin of the Western Text.

Derbe leads to the issue that in xvi. 2 Timothy stood in good repute in the cities where he did not reside and where he was least known.¹ This has a sarcastic innuendo; but is not in the style of *Acts*.

Let us now very briefly discuss xvi. 7 and xvii. 15, two readings which are clearly connected. In xvi. 7, Dr. Blass wholly discards the Eastern reading *παρελθόντες* and declares that Luke wrote only the Western reading *διελθόντες*. He argues correctly that Paul could not reach Troas without going through Mysia; but his inference that *παρελθόντες* is wrong does not follow. It is impossible here to read *διελθόντες*, because, as he rightly says on xvi. 6, that term implies preaching in the country traversed, whereas Paul was forbidden to preach in Asia, and Mysia was, as everyone knows, a part of Asia. Hence the original author wrote *παρελθόντες* in the sense of "neglecting," *i.e.* not taking as a sphere of missionary work. But the same reason that makes Dr. Blass prefer *διελθόντες* led a second century glossator to alter what seemed to him the inaccurate *παρελθόντες* (which he took, like Blass, as "passing by" or "alongside of") into *διελθόντες*. But the glossator was evidently unwilling to eject the thought absolutely from *Acts*, and therefore he re-introduced it in xvii. 15, where he inserted "he passed by Thessaly; for he was forbidden to preach the Word to them." The person who wrote this evidently thought that Paul, when he left Beroëa, had made an end of Macedonia, and was planning a new sphere of enterprise in Thessaly, but was diverted from this first plan to make an attempt at Athens. But it is clear from 1 *Thessalonians* ii. 17, iii. 1f.² and *Acts* xviii. 5 and 9 that

¹ Comparison of vi. 3, x. 22, xxii. 12, shows that *ἐμαρτυρεῖτο* indicates "good repute in the districts where he was known," and does not refer to formal enquiries instituted by Paul among Timothy's neighbours. Paul indubitably trusted his own judgment, and not "the clash o' the country," when he selected Timothy.

² I cannot accept the interpretation of 1 *Thess.* iii. 1f. which is given by

Paul still believed Macedonia to be his proper sphere, and that he was merely waiting on for the removal of certain obstacles. Finally he learned in a vision that Corinth was now to be his sphere. I might also argue that the mention of Thessaly offends against Luke's method of defining each intended sphere of missionary duty, and of distinguishing between spheres entered without premeditation and spheres which were definitely aimed at before entrance; but that is a wide subject. In short, the Western Text of *Acts* xvii. 15 contradicts Luke's practice, and arises out of the change in xvi. 7.¹

In other cases also definite external reasons militate against the Western additions, and yet leave to those that concern the Asiatic provinces high value and interest.² But those examples must suffice. A volume would be needed to examine the Western readings accepted by Dr. Blass, and show their true character. How often is an awkward or obscure phrase changed in the Western Text! Take the first variation, i. 2: Dr. Blass calls the Eastern reading "*sententia paullo impeditior*," but the Western Text avoids the awkwardness. Let any one examine the Western Text in ch. xx., for example, and he must be struck with the number of difficulties that are smoothed over, and details that are added. Design, care, knowledge, and judgment, are all evident in the variations. But the spirit of *Acts*

Zöckler and most other commentators. Clemen rightly objects to it; but the contradiction which he finds between *Thess.* and *Acts* seems to me to lie in misapprehension of *Acts*. Paley, *Horæ Paulinæ*, ch. ix. § 4, deserves to be read on this point, but the mutual agreement of *Acts* and *Thessalonians* is far more complete than he has observed. This, again, is a wide topic.

¹ In my *Ch. in R. Emp.*, p. 160, omit a sentence, ll. 5-7.

² Δούβριος xx. 4 deserves a word. It is unique in literature, and yet bears obvious marks of first-hand knowledge. Doubra for Derbe belongs to a class of forms widely spread in Asia Minor, and described in many passages of my forthcoming *Local History of Phrygia*: the best parallel is Soublaion or Silbion or Seiblia. Such a form as Doubrios springs, not from ignorance or mistranslation, but from desire to use the exact form of local dialect. This obscure ethnic was corrupted into Douberios, etc. It may well be original.

evaporates in this handling; and we sometimes find ourselves in the second century rather than in the first. The Western Text is really a second century commentary on *Acts*, the work of one who had no respect for the words, but much for the facts, who wished to make the book complete and clear, who had spoken with some of the actors in the history, or, at least, with those who had seen some of the actors. It is therefore of priceless value. But the Eastern Text is the true text, apart from a certain number of corruptions that have affected it.

We have come to the same result as in my *Church in the Empire*; but in that work the point which most interested me was to show the knowledge of Asia Minor that underlies the Western readings. Dr. Blass confirms my main point, and perhaps this caused in my mind a slight and natural prejudice in favour of his view, which I am now opposing. My reason for first taking up this subject was simply to find trustworthy authorities for the study of Asia Minor; and it is by mere accident that I have appeared as a defender of the historical value of *Acts*. I want to found on its evidence many sections in my contemplated history of the country. In conclusion, let me say that Blass and Wetstein are the commentators on *Acts* from whom I have learned most.¹

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ I regret to find, after this article is in print, that I have omitted an Appendix to Edition VII. of Dr. Salmon's *Introduction to New Testament*, p. 595, discussing Dr. Blass's article on *Codex Bezae*. At present I have no opportunity of consulting that appendix, for it is not easy to keep pace with the rapid sequence of editions of that excellent book. I see also in the *Revue Critique* the statement that Dr. Blass's theory of *Codex Bezae* was maintained during last century by Leclerc.

*ST. PAUL'S USE OF THE ARGUMENT FROM
EXPERIENCE.*

THE place of the opening verses of the fifth chapter of Romans in the general argument of the Epistle has always presented a crux to interpreters. The problem has sometimes been complicated by the intrusion of the textual question of whether the verbs in this passage are to be read as indicatives or subjunctives. The difference in reading is, however, a matter of itacism, and of an itacism from which none of the great witnesses to the text are free. To condition the solution of the problem of the logical sequence of thought upon the discrimination of omicron from omega by such witnesses, would be somewhat like suspending higher concerns upon the correctness of the pronunciation of *S* by lisping lips. Manifestly, the textual question here must itself be resolved by the demands of the thought-sequence; that is, it is the internal and not the external evidence which must here rule. We are safe in throwing ourselves back upon the main problem of the place of these verses in the argument of the Epistle, without allowing ourselves to be confused by the textual question, which is of no more than secondary interest.

The general disposition of the matter of the Epistle is tolerably clear. In the opening chapters, the necessity of a justification by faith and not by works was exhibited (i. 18,—iii. 20). Then the nature and working of this method of justification was expounded (iii. 21—31). Then the Apostle presents a series of considerations designed to show that this method of justification by faith is indeed God's method of saving men (iv. 1—v. 21). It is in this section that our present passage falls. The first consideration offered is drawn from the case of Abraham, and operates to show that God has always so dealt with his people. For that Abra-

ham, the father of the faithful, was justified by faith and not by works, the Scriptures expressly testify, saying that "Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him unto righteousness." This is the immediately preceding paragraph (iv. 1-25) to our present passage. In the immediately succeeding paragraph (v. 12-21) appeal is made to the analogy of God's dealings with men in other matters. It was by the trespass of one that men were brought into sin and death: does it not comport with His methods that by the righteousness of One, men should be brought into justification and life? Our present passage (v. 1-11) lies between, and ought to furnish an intermediate argument that justification by faith is God's own method of saving sinners.

It is because commentators have not seen such an argument in it, that they have found it so difficult to discover the progress of thought at this point. If we are to read the verbs as subjunctives, it is no doubt impossible to understand them as propounding an argument. But if they be read as indicatives, just the intermediate argument for which we are in search will emerge as the most natural sense of the passage, when looked at in the light of the contextual indications. The Apostle had not presented the argument from the case of Abraham in a purely historical spirit. His pre-occupation was with its bearing upon the case of his readers. Its relation to them is therefore very richly drawn out, and culminates in the closing declaration that it was not written for Abraham's sake, only that it was written that his believing was imputed to him unto righteousness, "but also for our sakes to whom it is to be imputed, who believe on Him who raised Jesus our Lord from the dead, who was delivered up for our trespasses, and was raised for our justification." Here is the point of attachment for the new argument. "It is because, then, we have been justified out of faith," the Apostle begins, throwing the participle forward to the head

of the sentence, with, as Meyer puts it, "triumphant emphasis": "it is because, then, we have been *actually and truly justified* out of faith, that we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, and exult in hope of the glory of God." There is obviously an appeal to the experience of his Christian readers here, strengthened by its indicated relation to the normative case of Abraham. The Apostle is not arguing that a Christian ought to have peace and joy. Far less is he exhorting Christians to have peace and joy. He is appealing to their conscious peace and joy. And on their conscious possession of this peace and joy, he is founding his argument. They had sought justification, not on the ground of works of righteousness which they had wrought, but, like Abraham, out of faith; and the turmoil of guilty dread before God which had filled their hearts had sunk into a sweet sense of peace, and the future to which they had hitherto looked shudderingly forward in fearful expectation of judgment had taken on a new aspect,—they "exult in hope of the glory of God." It is on this their own experience that the Apostle fixes their eyes. They have sought justification out of faith. They have reaped the fruits of justification. Can they doubt the reality of the middle term? No: it is because we have been justified, says the Apostle,—*really and truly justified*,—out of faith, that we have this peace with God which we feel in our quieted souls, and exult in this hope of the glory of God in which we are now rejoicing. Not only the case of Abraham, but their own experience as well, will teach them then that it is out of faith and not out of works that God justifies the sinner.

If this be the meaning of the passage, it will be observed that the argument which is here employed is what has of late obtained great vogue among us under the name of "the argument from experience." It is not without interest that we note the prominent use which the Apostle

makes of an argument which some appear to fancy one of the greatest discoveries of the nineteenth century, while others seem to look upon it with suspicion as an innovation of dangerous tendency. Like other forms of argumentation, it is no doubt capable of misuse. It is to misuse it to confuse it with proof by experiment. By his use of the argument from experience, Paul is far from justifying the position of those who will accept as true only those elements of Christian teaching the truth of which they can verify by experiment. There is certainly a recognisable difference between trusting God for the future because we have known His goodness in the past, and casting ourselves from every pinnacle of the temple of truth in turn to see whether He has really given His angels charge concerning us, according to His Word. It is to misuse it, again, to throw the whole weight of the evidence of Christianity upon it, or to seek to enhance its value by disparaging all other forms of evidence. Such exaggeration of its importance is a symptom of that unhappy subjectivism which is unfortunately growing ever more wide-spread among us, which betrays its weakened hold upon the objective truth and reality of Christianity by its neglect or even renunciation of its objective proofs. When men find the philosophical or critical postulates to which they have committed their thinking working their way subtly into every detail of their thought, and gradually taking from them their confidence in those supernatural facts on which historical Christianity rests, it is no wonder that they should despairingly contend that "the essence of Christianity," being vindicated by the immanent experiences of their souls, is independent of its supposed supernatural history. It is needless to say that this desperate employment of the argument from experience has no analogy in the usage of Paul. With him, it does not take the place of the other arguments, but takes its place among them. He appeals,

first, to God's announced intention from the beginning so to deal with His people, and to the historic fact of His so dealing with them. He appeals, last, to the analogy of God's dealings with men in other matters. Between these he adduces the argument from experience, and twists the cord of his proof from the three fibres of God's express promise, our experience, and the analogy of His working. When we unite the Scriptural, experiential and analogical arguments, we are followers of Paul.

But though it may interest, it cannot surprise us to find Paul employing the argument from experience here. It is an argument which is repeatedly given a capital place in his writings. It is to it for example that he appeals, when he cries to the foolish Galatians, "This only would I learn from you, Received ye the Spirit by works of law or by the hearing of faith?" (Gal. iii. 2). They had received the Spirit: of that, both he and they were sure. And they had sought Him, not by works of law, but out of faith: that too they knew very well. Were they so foolish as to be unable to draw the inference thrust upon them, that the seeking that found was the true and right seeking? The Apostle, then, will draw it for them:—"He, therefore, that supplieth the Spirit to you and worketh powers in you, doeth He it by law works or by the hearing of faith? Even as Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned to him unto righteousness. Ye perceive therefore that they which be of faith, the same are Abraham's sons" (Gal. iii. 5-7). An humbler servant of Christ than Paul, and a far earlier one, had indeed long before pressed this argument with matchless force (John ix.). Blind unbelief alone could say to him who once was blind but now did see, "This man was not from God . . . give glory to God; we know that this man is a sinner." The one, the sufficient answer was, "Whether he be a sinner, I know not; one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see. . . . Why,

herein is the marvel, that ye know not whence He is, and He opened mine eyes!" Greater marvel than the opening of the eyes of one born blind, that men should shut their eyes to who, and what, and whence He is, who opens blind eyes: "If this Man were not from God, He could do nothing." What, after all, is "the argument from experience" but an extension of our Lord's favourite argument from the fruits to the tree which bears the fruits? He who is producing the fruits of the Spirit has received the Spirit; he who is reaping the fruits of justification has received justification; and he who has received these fruits by the seeking of faith, knows that he has received out of faith the justification of which they are the fruits, and may know therefore that the way of faith is the right and true way of receiving justification. We must not pause in the midst of the argument and refuse to draw the final conclusion. If the presence of the fruits of justification proves that we are justified; the presence of the justification thus proved, proves that justification is found on the road by which we reached it. This is the Apostle's argument.

The validity of such an argument lies on the surface. It is useless to tell the famishing wanderer that the pool into which he has dipped his cup is but a mirage of the desert, when the refreshing fluid is already moistening his parched lips. Nevertheless, the validity of the argument has its implications; and this is as much as to say that it rests on presuppositions without which it would not be valid. Men may draw water from a well and be content with this practical proof that the pump yields water, without stopping to consider the theory of suction by which the pump acts. But no pump will yield water if it be not constructed in accordance with the principles of suction: and the understanding of these principles not merely increases the intelligence but also adds to the confidence with which we credit the refreshing floods to its gift. In a somewhat

analogous way Paul's argument from experience will grow in force in proportion to the clearness with which its implications are apprehended and the heartiness with which they are accepted. What are these implications?

In the first place, it is implied in this argument, that there is a natural adaptation in the mode of salvation which he is commending to us for the production of peace and joy in the heart of the sinner who embraces it. Whoever seeks justification by faith will find peace and joy; but this could not be if this mode of salvation had no natural adaptation to produce peace and joy; and the perception of this adaptation, while not necessary to receiving its benefits, will greatly increase the confidence with which we assign the benefits received to their proper source. No doubt the peace which steals into the heart and the exultation which cannot keep silence upon the lips of him who is justified out of faith, are the work of the Holy Spirit in his soul. But there is a distinction between the efficient cause and the formal ground of our emotions. The Holy Spirit does not here, any more than elsewhere, work a blind, an ungrounded, an irrational set of emotions in the heart. A set of emotions arising in the soul no one knows whence, no one knows on what grounds, especially if they were persistent and in proportion as they were strong, would only vex and puzzle the soul. A rational account of them must be possible if they are to be probative of anything. The mode of justification propounded by God through the Apostle is one which is adapted to the actual condition of man: one which is calculated to allay his sense of guilt, to satisfy his accusing conscience, and to supply him with a rational ground of conviction of acceptance with God and of hope for the future. It is because this mode of justification is thus adapted to provide a solid ground for peace and joy to the rational understanding that those who seek justification thus and not otherwise, under the quickening influences

of the Spirit, acquire a sense of peace with God and an exalting hope for the future. And it is only because these Spirit-framed emotions thus attach themselves rationally to the mode of justification by faith, that they can point to it as their source and prove that they who have sought their justification by faith have surely found.

The gist of the matter, then, is that the justification which comes out of faith is experienced as actual justification and bears its appropriate fruits, because it alone, of all the methods by which men have sought to obtain peace with God, is adapted to satisfy the conscience and to supply a sufficient ground of conviction of acceptance with God. How many ways there are in which men vainly seek peace, need not be enumerated here: by works, by repentance, by offerings to God of precious possessions or of dedicated lives. They give no peace, because men can find in them no sufficient ground for confidence that they are accepted by God. When they have performed all of which they are capable, they recognise that they are but unprofitable servants. The soul's fierce condemnation of itself in its awakened sense of sin cannot instil peace into the soul. They know that the judgment of God is true and righteous altogether. It is only on the ground of an adequate expiation of sin and a perfect righteousness, wrought out by a person capable of bearing to the uttermost the penalty and fulfilling to the uttermost the requirement of the law, and justly made ours, that conscience may be appeased and peace once more visit the guilty soul. This is what Paul offers in his doctrine of justification by faith. And observe how the whole Epistle on to this fifth chapter operates like a bent bow to give force to the appeal to personal experience which is there shot like an arrow into the soul, and to evoke an immediate and deep response. For what is that proof with which the Epistle opens, that all men are sinners and under the

wrath of God, but a faithful probing of conscience, awakening it to a sense of guilt and to a consciousness of helplessness? And what is that explanation of God's method of justification by means of a righteousness provided in Christ, laid hold of by faith, with which the third chapter closes, but a loving presentation of the work of Christ to the apprehension of faith? And what is that exposition of the Old Testament narrative of the acceptance of Abraham, the father of the faithful, with which the fourth chapter is occupied, but a gracious assurance that it is thus that God deals with His children? And what now is this appeal to his readers' own experience as they have humbly sought God's forgiveness and acceptance out of faith in Christ, but an assault upon their hearts that they may be forced to realize all the satisfaction they have found in believing in Christ? It is to this satisfaction that the Apostle now appeals in evidence of the reality of the justification of which it is the fruit. The argument is from the internal peace to the external peace. You have sought justification out of faith, he says in effect; you have appropriated the work of Jesus Christ; you rest upon Him; and your conscience at last says, It is enough. Your guilty pangs and fears subside, and the serenity of peace and the exultation of hope take their place. Is not this new-found satisfaction of conscience a proof of the reality of your justification? This is the Apostle's argument.

There is yet a deeper implication in the argument which we would do well explicitly to recognise, in order that we may feel its full force. External peace with God is inferred from internal peace of conscience. This involves the assumption that the deliverances of the human conscience are but shadows of the divine judgment, that its imperatives repeat the demands of God's righteousness and its satisfaction argues the satisfaction of His justice. Such an assump-

tion can scarcely be called in question ; for were this correspondence not actual, no valid peace could ever visit the human heart, no grounded hope could ever brighten its outlook upon the future. If our moral sense were so entirely out of analogy with the moral sense of God that what fully meets and satisfies that indignation which rises in us upon the realization of sin as sin should stand so wholly out of relation with God's moral sense as to leave it unmoved, we should be utterly incapacitated to know God, and the foundation of morality and religion alike for us would be destroyed. If there be a God at all, the Author of our moral nature, it is just as certain as His existence that the moral judgment which He has implanted in us is true to its pole in the depths of His own moral being ; that its deliverances are but the transcripts of His own moral judgments ; and that we may hearken to its voice with the assurance that it is but the echo of His decision. The sense of guilt by which the awakened conscience accuses us, speeding on into the remorse that bites back so fiercely on the sinking soul, is but the reflection of God's judgment against sin. But this could not be if an appeased conscience were not the reflection of God's judgment of acquittal. For if conscience could cease to accuse, while God continued to condemn, it would no longer be true that God's condemnation is repeated in our accusing conscience, and our sense of guilt is but the shadow of his overhanging wrath. Conscience must be conceived, therefore, as a mirror hung in the human breast, upon which man may read the reflection of the Divine judgment upon himself. When frowns of a just anger conceal His face, the clouds gather upon its polished surface : and surely when those shades pass away and the unclouded sun gleams once more from its surface, it cannot be other than the reflection of God's smile. Certainly a peace which is so firmly grounded as the reality of this correspondence is rooted so deeply in the nature of

man that humanity itself must perish before that peace can be taken away.

We seem now to have Paul's argument fully before us. Man's conscience reflects God's judgment upon the soul. What satisfies man's conscience satisfies God's justice. Paul's presentation to faith of an expiating and obedient God-man, paying the penalty of our sin and keeping probation before God's law in our stead, satisfies the demands of conscience. The peace that steals into the heart of him who rests upon this Saviour in faith, and the joy that exults upon his lips as he contemplates standing in Him before the judgment-seat of God, are but the proper emotions of the satisfied conscience, and as such are the proof to us that God's wrath is really appeased, His condemnation reversed, and His face turned upon us in loving acceptance in His beloved Son. Lastly, then, His experience of peace and joy is an irrefutable proof that this and no other is the just God's method of justifying the sinner.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

ST. PAUL'S VIEW OF THE GREEK GODS.

LAST Easter (1894) Dr. Willibald Beyschlag published a "Programme," entitled "Hat der Apostel Paulus die Heidengötter für Dämonen gehalten?" In this pamphlet he makes it his aim to show that the free Greek atmosphere which the apostle breathed, his preference of the Old Testament to later Jewish tradition, and especially the purity and dignity of his Christian thinking, saved him from a superstition which was pretty widely prevalent in his day, and prevented him from thinking of the Greek gods as Demons.

Δαιμόνιον is the neuter of *δαιμόνιος*, used as a substantive; and receives its meaning from *δαίμων*, which, by Homer and Greek writers generally, is used as an equivalent of *θεός*. With Pindar and Sophocles Truth, Justice, Modesty are Demons. The Demon of Socrates is a spiritual influence, an inward warning voice. Among the Hebrews the idea of intermediary beings was acceptable, as helping them to understand the existence of evil, and it was natural that to such evil intermediaries or angels the name Demons should be applied. Accordingly, although the prophets spoke with contempt of the idols of the heathen as non-entities, yet where this high superiority was not maintained the heathen were spoken of as worshipping Demons. And thus where the original Hebrew text speaks of worshipping idols, or "nothings," the LXX. translates by *δαιμόνια* (Deut. xxxii, 17; Ps. xcvi. 5, etc.).

Among the early fathers the same tendency is discernible. Justin Martyr speaks of the Demons as being the product of the Angels and women (Genesis vi.), and hence their evil influence on men. Athenagoras believed they had been men. Minucius Felix identifies them with Jupiter, Saturn,

and the rest. Some of the apologists, however, such as Arnobius and the author of the Epistle to Diognetus, maintained the Old Testament prophetic standpoint, and held idols to be nothing but wood and stone. The Book of Wisdom also depicts the absolute nothingness of the heathen objects of worship.

The passage round which the discussion of Paul's view has ranged is 1 Corinthians x. 14-22. [Our R.V. translates "devils" throughout]. Dr. Beyschlag paves the way for interpreting this *locus classicus* by observing that Paul nowhere else uses *δαιμόνια* of evil spirits or fallen angels. He speaks of such but as *πνευματικὰ πονηρίας* (Ephesians vi. 1); he is aware of an *ἄγγελος Σατανᾶ* (2 Cor. xii. 7) of *ἀρχαὶ, ἐξουσίαι, δυνάμεις*, but not of *δαιμόνια*. In Acts xvii. 18, he is supposed to be *ξένων δαιμονίων καταγγελεὺς εἶναι*, a preacher of strange *gods*; precisely as Socrates had been accused of introducing *καινὰ δαιμόνια*. Here it is evident that *δαιμόνια* means "gods." We should naturally expect then that in 1 Corinthians x. the same meaning would suffice.

The words in question are especially those of the 20th and 21st verses: "The things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to demons, not to God," etc. His argument is: he who partakes of the Lord's supper proclaims himself a member of Christ's body, and he who partakes of a heathen sacrificial meal participates in an idolatrous act, and becomes a guest of the gods. That is to say, participation in such a meal is participation in the worship of the gods of the heathen, an act of idolatry. This is all, and no reference to demons as real beings, whether evil angels or the spirits of dead men, is admissible.

Indeed, as if to obviate the possibility of misunderstanding, he says in the 19th verse: "What say I then? that a thing sacrificed to idols is anything, or that an idol is anything? [Certainly not.] Christ, His body and blood

are objective, spiritual realities, and the readers might, from the comparison he draws between these and the idols, be in danger of inferring that the idols also are realities. Therefore he says the food offered and the idol itself were not anything. He could not mean that the food had no existence nor that the stone image had no existence: he could only mean that any presumed presence behind the image, any actual spirit of evil receiving the offering was nothing. He denies to the idols all reality beyond the sensible appearance. He who occupies this point of view, that the gods of the heathen have no existence at all, cannot at the same time hold that they are demons.

In the eighth chapter of the same epistle he similarly affirms that an idol is nothing in the world. Some of the Corinthians shrank from eating sacrificial food, because, "being used until now to the idol, they eat as of a thing sacrificed unto an idol"; that is, they feel as if carried back into heathenism in spite of their knowledge that the idol is nothing. In the 5th verse of the chapter he might seem to admit the reality of the *λεγόμενοι θεοί* first with *εἴπερ* as possible, and then with *ὥσπερ* as actual. It might be said that it is only *Divine* reality he denies to them. But supposing this were so, it does not support the idea that the heathen gods were demons; for it is *θεοί*, not *δαιμόνια*, Paul here speaks of, and if the latter are conceived of as evil spirits they cannot be designated *θεοί*. Besides, they are spoken of as *εἴτε ἐν οὐρανῷ*, but heaven, neither among Jews or Greeks, is ever thought of as the abode of demons. In point of fact the reality which Paul here ascribes to the heathen gods is their existence in the belief and worship of the nations. And the logical advance from the *εἴπερ* clause to the *ὥσπερ* clause does not consist in his first affirming an objective reality as possible, and then as actual, but it lies in the emphatically repeated *πολλοί*; that which is first hypothetically affirmed is abundantly actual, the world in which

the Apostle lives is full of gods and lords. They exist *e persuasione gentium*.

The passage in which the origin and character of idolatry is most fully handled by Paul is Romans i. 21-25. And in this passage it is referred, not to the deluding power of fallen angels, but to human sin and culpable ignorance.

On all these grounds it is time that this idea, that the great apostle of the Gentiles believed that the gods of the Greeks were demons, vanished from our exegesis.

MARCUS DODS.

THE SPEECHES IN CHRONICLES.

IN an article on the "Critical Study of the Old Testament" in the *Contemporary Review* for February, 1890 (p. 216), I happened to make a remark to the effect that in the Books of Chronicles there are speeches attributed to David, Solomon, and different prophets, which can only be the composition of the Chronicler himself, the idioms used in them being constantly of a distinctively late character, and often without precedent in the pre-exilic literature, if not peculiar to the compiler of Chronicles himself. I supposed, in making this statement, that I was merely saying what, though no doubt usually kept back from the ordinary Bible-reader, was nevertheless perfectly well known to every serious Hebrew student. True, however, as my remark was, it has had the misfortune to incur the displeasure of the Rev. Valpy French, who—though not, I believe, previously known either as a Biblical scholar or as a Hebraist—has in these latter days come forward as a doughty antagonist of the "Higher Criticism," and in the volume called *Lex Mosaiica*, of which he is the editor, has done me the honour of devoting a special Excursus to its refutation.¹ The confidence with which Mr. French announces his conclusions, the seeming completeness of his data, and the pretensions of Hebrew learning with which he exhibits them, are well calculated to mislead the ordinary reader; and accordingly we find the *Tablet* complimenting him upon his success "on a point"—the writer naively adds—"which admits of comparatively easy verification." The point does indeed admit of easy verification; and I propose to verify it. In doing this, I may succeed, incidentally,

¹ P. 192 ff. (cf. p. 164 f.).

in placing before students of Hebrew some facts which may interest them.

In support of my position, I remarked in a note: "See 1 Chr. 29; 2 Chr. 13, 5-12; 15, 2-7; 20, 5-12, etc.; and contrast, for instance, the speeches in 2 Chr. 10, which are excerpted nearly verbatim from 1 Ki. 12."

Upon this, Mr. French observes: "The issue is clear. Dr. Driver says in so many words: 'I give you four instances in which you can see for yourself that where the Chronicler relates speeches which are not recorded in the parallel books, the language and thought are both exilic [rather *post-exilic*];¹ whilst in the one instance nearly verbatim quoted, the diversity of style is not apparent.'"

Mr. French objects, however, that I "derive proof of my contention" from 2 Chr. 10, which contains a speech of only seven verses; and declares that he is able to "adduce in evidence to the contrary lengthy speeches which are also nearly verbatim excerpted from Samuel or Kings, and which have quite as many marks of exilic language and thought as those with no parallel references, which Dr. Driver pronounces to be invented." And he proceeds accordingly to take two speeches of about twelve verses each in 1 Chr. 17, derived from 2 Sam. 7, the differences between which he exhibits—or professes to exhibit (for there are several omissions)—in parallel columns. I am of course perfectly prepared to follow him in this. There is not much in the Chronicles with which I am unacquainted: years ago I collated the text, word for word, with that of Samuel and Kings; and Mr. French is greatly mistaken if he imagines that I rest my contention upon seven verses in a single chapter. I merely took 2 Chr. 10 as an example: any other speech would have served as an illustration equally well.

¹ No one in a3nes the Chronicles to have been written *during* the Exile even Ezra did not come to Palestine till eighty years afterwards.

For the purpose of refuting Mr. French the two speeches selected by himself will answer admirably.

The result of Mr. French's researches in the Chronicles may be stated in his own words (p. 165). It is to show that "the speeches for which there are parallels in Samuel or Kings"—as, for instance, those in 1 Chr. 17—"exhibit the compiler's hand as much as those for which there is no voucher, while the latter"—as, for instance, David's speeches in 1 Chr. 29—"bear no stronger impress of his individuality than the former."

This representation is altogether false. The changes introduced by the Chronicler into the text of 2 Sam. 7, in incorporating it into his own work, are virtually *imperceptible*: they consist on an average of two or three words in a verse; in some of them a very keen eye can detect the Chronicler's hand, but they do not affect the general style or texture of the verse in the least. Let me transcribe a few verses, in parallel columns, to show this:—

1 CHR. 17.
 * ואהיה עמך בכל אשר הלכת
 ואכרית את כל אויבך מפניך ועשיתי
 לך שם כשם הגדולים אשר
 בארץ: ⁹ ושמתו מקום לעמי ישראל
 ונטעתיהו ושכן תחתיו ולא ירגז עוד
 ולא יוסיפו בני עולה לבלותו כאשר
 בראשונה: ¹⁰ ולמימים אשר צויתי
 שפטים על עמי ישראל והכנעתי את
 כל אויבך ואגיד לך
 יבנה לך יהוה:

2 SAM. 7.
⁹ ואהיה עמך בכל אשר הלכת
 ואכריתה את כל אויבך מפניך ועשיתי
 לך שם גדול כשם הגדולים אשר
 בארץ: ¹⁰ ושמתו מקום לעמי לישראל
 ונטעתיו ושכן תחתיו ולא ירגז עוד
 ולא יוסיפו בני עולה לענותו כאשר
 בראשונה: ¹¹ ולמן היום אשר צויתי
 שפטים על עמי ישראל והניחתי לך
 מכל אויבך והגיד לך יהוה כי בית
 יעשה לך יהוה:

The two texts are virtually identical: the variations do not affect the general style at all; and the one text is just as idiomatic and flowing as the other. The only word in which the Chronicler's own hand might be traced is מלכותו for כמלכתו (my *Introd.*, p. 503).¹ Mr. French cites indeed

¹ It might have been suspected also in הכנעתי (*humble* (v. 10), had this word been used here in a moral acceptance (*Introd.*, p. 504): but, as it is, it is used exactly as in Judg. 3, 30. 4, 23. 8, 28. 11, 33.

as a "modern" expression; but how he knows this he does not state: it does not occur elsewhere; and as לְמִיּוֹם is a classical idiom, it is difficult to understand why the plural לְמִיָּמִים should not be classical likewise.¹ In parts of the subsequent verses the differences are somewhat greater: thus—

<p>אֵלֶיךָ 18 מֵה יוֹסִיף עוֹד דְּוִיד לְכַבּוֹד אֶת עַבְדְּךָ וְאֶתָּה אֶת עַבְדְּךָ יָדַעְתָּ: 19 יְהוָה בַּעֲבוּר עַבְדְּךָ וּכְלַבְּךָ עָשִׂיתָ אֶת כָּל הַגְּדוּלָּה הַזֹּאת לְהַרְדִּיעַ אֶת כָּל הַיְּהוּדִים: 20 יְהוָה אֵינִי כַמוֹךְ וְאֵינִי אֱלֹהִים זוֹלָתְךָ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ בְּאוֹזְנֵינוּ:</p>	<p>20 וְמֵה יוֹסִיף דוֹד עוֹד לְדַבֵּר אֵלֶיךָ וְאֶתָּה יָדַעְתָּ אֶת עַבְדְּךָ אֲרָנִי יְהוָה: 21 בַּעֲבוּר דְּבַרְךָ וּכְלַבְּךָ עָשִׂיתָ אֶת כָּל הַגְּדוּלָּה הַזֹּאת לְהַרְדִּיעַ אֶת עַבְדְּךָ: 22 עַל כֵּן נִדְּרָלְתָּ יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים כִּי אֵינִי כַמוֹךְ וְאֵינִי אֱלֹהִים זוֹלָתְךָ כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְנוּ בְּאוֹזְנֵינוּ:</p>
--	---

But Mr. French himself describes them throughout as "similar"; and the character of the language remains still the same.² Four passages (*vv.* 5, 10, 17, 18), in which the text of Chronicles reads harshly, are owned by Mr. French to be corrupt: there are consequently no grounds for concluding that they also read harshly in the form in which the Chronicler left them.³ In the whole of the two speeches, as given in Chronicles, comprising nearly 350 words, there is not a single trace of the cumbrous and laboured syntax of the Chronicler, not one of his mannerisms or peculiar idioms, and at most five expressions in which a keen-sighted and attentive reader might succeed in detecting the Chronicler's own hand.⁴ I say "keen-sighted and atten-

¹ On נִטְעָתִיהוּ in *v.* 9 Mr. French informs his readers that it is a "poetic form." Is it to be inferred then that 1 Sam. 16, 1 (מֵאֲכַתִּיו) is prose, while 1 Sam. 16, 7 (מֵאֲכַתִּיהוּ) is poetry? And what account has Mr. French to give of Judg. 4, 7 (נִתְתִּיהוּ), 11, 31 (הַעֲלִיתִיהוּ), 13, 6 (יִשְׁאֲלִיתִיהוּ), which, as they occur in the book on which he writes, he may be presumed to have seen?

² The plural נִדְּרָלְתָּ (*v.* 19) is treated by Mr. French as a "modern" form. But in what material respect does it differ from נִבְרָרְתָּ, which, as it occurs in Deuteronomy, Mr. French would, I imagine, be the last man to pronounce modern?

³ Comp. also the passages cited below, p. 245, note 1.

⁴ God for Jehovah (see my Introduction, p. 20), *vv.* 2, 3, 17; מִן אַחֲרַי, *v.* 7 (before a word without the art. מִן as a separate word occurs more frequently in the Chronicles (about fifty times) than in all the rest of the O.T. together);

tive," for the expressions in question are by no means so strongly marked as many which the Chronicler employs. But it would not embarrass me if they had this character; for they stand quite isolated; and in general the style of both speeches (except in the passages admitted to be corrupt) is pure, lucid, and flowing.

Nevertheless Mr. French closes his synopsis of parallels with these brave words: "We have here two speeches of about twelve verses each, excerpted nearly verbatim from Samuel. Were it not for the parallel in the earlier book, Dr. Driver would no doubt have triumphantly pointed to this chapter as the acme of clumsy invention, for the language throughout is obscure and redundant, the syntax is heavy and awkward; the Chronicler moreover employs modern words and forms," etc. It is difficult indeed to treat Mr. French's lucubrations otherwise than as a comedy: nevertheless, I have a right to protest against an imputation which may be taken by some readers seriously. No doubt, *if* my knowledge of Hebrew idiom were as superficial as his is, and *if* I were equally deficient in the desire to ascertain the facts, or to state them correctly, I might have done what he suggests: it is unnecessary for me to say more. But all that a critic (who was also a Hebrew scholar) would have to say on the speeches in 1 Chr. 17, supposing the parallel in 2 Sam. 7 not to exist, would be that their style was entirely unlike the usual style of the Chronicler, and was in some respects allied to that of Deuteronomy; that there was reason therefore to suppose that the Chronicler had taken them from some earlier source; that in certain places¹ the text seemed to be corrupt;

מלכות, *vv.* 11, 14 (*ib.* p. 503); העמיר, *v.* 14 (*ib.*: contrast 2 Chr. 33, 8 with 2 Ki. 21, 8); the indirect narration לבנות לו בית, *v.* 25 (Ewald, § 338*a*: Sam. has לאמר בית אבנה לך; comp. 21, 18 with 2 Sam. 24, 18). If the speech had been the Chronicler's own composition, the marks of his style would certainly have been both more distinctive and much more frequent.

¹ In addition to the four noted by Mr. French, *v.* 19 הגדלות את כל הנדבות,

allowed to do this for him, and to impart to the reader that information which he has deemed it unnecessary to give him. I will select the speeches in the chapter which I named first, the two speeches of David in 1 Chr. 29. I shall analyse the language of these speeches in some detail: it will speedily appear that it abounds with examples of the late and peculiar usages characteristic of the Hebrew of the Chronicler, which are *absolutely* wanting in the speeches in 1 Chr. 17, excerpted from 2 Sam. 7.

1. שלמה בני אהר בחר בו אלהים נער ורך. "Solomon my son—as a single one¹ did God choose him—is young and tender." An involved and cumbrous sentence, quite out of harmony with the earlier usage of the language, which would have distributed the ideas to be expressed into two (or three) independent clauses. Note that the words *שלמה בני נער ורך* are repeated from *ch.* 22, 5, in a sentence placed in David's mouth, the late origin of which is sufficiently evidenced by the clause which follows, *והבית לבנות ליהוה להגדיל למעלה לשם ולתפארת לכל הארצות*.

כי לא לאדם הבירה כי ליהוה אלהים. Cf. (for the antithesis) 2 Chr. 19, 6 (speech of Jehoshaphat) *כִּי לֹא לְאָדָם תִּשְׁפֹּטוּ כִּי לַיהוָה*.

הבירה: so *v.* 19. A notoriously late word, the Persian *bâru*, found otherwise only in Neh., Est., and Dan. (8, 2), of the *fortress*, or *castle*, in which the Persian kings resided, or of the *castle* near the Temple (Neh. 2, 8, 7, 2). It is used here, no doubt (as Mr. Ball² observes), for the purpose of "conveying to the minds of the Chronicler's contemporaries some idea of the magnificence of the Temple of Solomon as he imagined it." Its occurrence, however, does not suit Mr. French's theory of the Chronicler's literary methods: so, adopting an expedient which, when resorted to by another, he severely censures,³ he proceeds, with the

¹ Cf. Is. 51, 2.

² *Commentary on the O.T. for English Readers*, edited by Bp. Ellicott. So Prof. W. H. Bennett in the *Expositor's Bible*, p. 319

³ Page 134 top.

help of the LXX., to expel it from the text. But why, in *v.* 1, the unusual הַבִּירָה should have been introduced arbitrarily into the text, or why, in *v.* 19, an ordinary word, like הַבַּיִת, should have been, as he supposes, corrupted into it, he does not stop to explain.

2. "Gold for gold (*i.e.* for vessels of gold), and silver for silver, and bronze for bronze, iron for iron, and timber for timber." A genuine example of that "redundant" style which Mr. French affects to discover in the speeches in 1 Chr. 17, but which is not there to be found; cf. similar—not the same—redundancies in *ch.* 28, 14–17 (narrative). For the peculiar mode of expression comp. also 28, 14, "Gold by weight for gold": there is a passage something like it in Jer. 52, 19 (= 2 Ki. 25, 15).

לָרַב. A favourite expression of the Chronicler (35 times): cf. *v.* 21. 12, 40. 22, 3 (*bis*). 4. 5. 8. 14. 15; 2 Chr. 2, 8. 9, 1, etc. In the older language, restricted chiefly to stating the *tertium comparationis* (as Dt. 1, 10; 1 Ki. 4, 20); so 11 times in the books from Gen. to Kings; otherwise in the same books only (with a verb) Gen. 30, 30. 48, 16; and, as here, 1 Ki. 1, 19. 25.¹ Classical Hebrew expresses usually the same idea by הִרְבִּיהָ מְאֹד (as 1 Ki. 10, 10, *changed* in 2 Chr. 9, 9 into לָרַב).

3. ועוד ברצותי בבית אלהי יש לי סגלה זהב וכסף. The words here are all ancient; but is the sentence a classically constructed one?

למעלה מכל־הַכִּינוֹתֵי לְבַיִת הַקֹּדֶשׁ. Two of the Chronicler's solecisms occur in this short clause. למעלה in early Hebrew is used only in the literal sense of *upwards*; its weakened use as a mere intensive (= *exceedingly*) is found solely in the Chronicles, where it is very common, in the author's own narrative (1 Chr. 14, 2. 23, 17. 29, 25; 2 Chr.

¹ It is a characteristic of the later Hebrew that it uses *constantly* words, or constructions, which are rare and exceptional in classical Hebrew.

1, 1. 16, 12. 17, 12. 20, 19. 26, 8), and, as here, in David's mouth, 1 Chr. 22, 5 (cited above, on *v.* 1).

מכל־הכינותי. The omission of the relative in *prose* is in early Hebrew exceedingly rare: ¹ in the Chronicles it is very frequent; 17 cases are cited in my *Introduction*, p. 505, —amongst them 1 Chr. 15, 12, where the extraordinary construction is placed in David's mouth, והעליתם את ארון יהוה אֶל־הַכִּינֹתַי לוֹ —an expression which is the twin-brother of the Chronicler's own בְּהֵכִין לוֹ דָּוִד, 2 Chr. 1, 4; add Ezr. 1, 6, לְבַר עַל כָּל־הַתְּנֻבָּה (cf. Ryle's note); comp. other anomalous instances (in speeches) 2 Chr. 16, 9. 30, 18–19 (בְּעַד כָּל לְבַבֵּי הַכִּיִּן).

5. לִזְהַב לִזְהַב וּלְכַסֵּף לְכַסֵּף. The first ל, in each of these pairs, is very anomalous: it is probably (Bertheau) an example of that peculiar use of ל to introduce pleonastically a new term, of which there is an isolated instance in Dt. 24, 5, but which is otherwise all but confined to the Chronicles: 1 Chr. 5, 2 (Bertheau). 28, 1^b (וְלֹכַל גְּבוּרָה). 21 (לְכָל נְדִיב). 29, 6 (וּלְשָׂרֵי מַלְאכַת הַמֶּלֶךְ). 2 Chr. 7, 21 (לְכָל־עֹבֵר), altered from 1 Ki. 9, 8, (כָּל עֹבֵר). 26, 14^b. Ezr. 7, 28. Otherwise the sentence is another example of the peculiar type noticed on *v.* 2.

מִתְנַדֵּב. In old Hebrew this word occurs twice in poetry, Jud. 5, 2. 9, of warriors *shewing themselves ready or forward* to fight in the cause of their country: here it is used exactly as in the prose parts of Chronicles, Ezr., Neh. (and nowhere else) as a *terminus technicus* for *shewing oneself ready or liberal* in offering gifts (*v.* 6. 9. Ezr. 1, 6. 2, 68. 3, 5. 7, 15. 16), or otherwise coming forward with sacred offices (2 Chr. 17, 16. Ezr. 7, 13. Neh. 11, 2): so in the following prayer of David, *v.* 14. 17.

I pass to this prayer of David, *vv.* 10–19.

¹ See my *Notes on Samuel*, on 1 Sam. 14, 21.

² This and 2 Chr. 26, 14^b might also be explained as instances of the usage noticed on *v.* 12 (cf. 2 Chr. 24, 12^b).

11. כל בשמים ובארץ. In ordinary Hebrew, כל אשר בשמים ובארץ would be said. The construction of the clause is, however, very difficult; for there is apparently no predicate: the reader must choose for himself between the suggestions offered by Bertheau, Keil, Ball, and Oettli.

וְהִמְתַּנְּשָׂא לְכָל לְרֹאשׁ “and the being lifted up over all as head” (Ew. § 160^c, Bertheau, Keil, Oettli),—*הִמְתַּנְּשָׂא* being a strange Aramaizing inf., and the sentence itself a characteristic example of the Chronicler’s uncouth style.

12. *Riches and honour (or glory)*. The words are ordinary ones (1 Ki. 3, 13); but it is, at least, a curious coincidence that the combination is one frequently used by the Chronicler himself, in his descriptions of the wealth and state of kings, *v.* 28. 2 Chr. 17, 5. 18, 1 (in a verse *added* to the narrative of Kings). 32, 27.

מִלִּפְנֵיךְ, “from *before* thee.” A singular usage. “From before Jehovah” means commonly from Jehovah’s presence, whether at the sanctuary (Lev. 9, 24. Num. 17, 11. 24. 1 Sam. 21, 7), or more generally (1 Ki. 8, 25. Ps. 51, 13). In such a connexion as this (with *riches and honour*) the usage can hardly be anything but an example of that late pleonastic use of *from before* for *from*, which had already begun in Aramaic, and afterwards became very prevalent. So König (*Lehrgeb. der Heb. Sprache*, ii. 1. p. 320), who compares 2 Chr. 19, 2. Est. 1, 19. 4, 8 (“to ask *from before*” a king). Eccl. 10, 5 (“an error proceeding—not *from*, but—*from before* a ruler”). Cf. in Aramaic מִן קִדְמָא, Ezr. 7, 14 (“to be sent *from before* the king”). Dan. 2, 6 (“to receive *from before* me gifts and rewards”). 5, 24; and constantly in the Targums.¹

וְאֵתָה מוֹשֵׁל בְּכָל. Cf. (in a Psalm shewn to be late by its Aramaisms) Ps. 103, 19, וּמַלְכוּתוֹ בְּכָל מוֹשֵׁלָה.

¹ *E.g.* Gen. 47, 22. 2 Sam. 15, 3. Jer. 51, 53. Mic. 5, 6—all for the Heb. מִקִּדְמָא; Is. 29, 6. 1 Sam. 1, 17. 27. 1 Ki. 2, 33 for מִקִּדְמָא; Jud. 14, 4. 1 Sam. 1, 20. Job 20, 29 for מִן. It is significant of deference towards a superior.

בַּכֹּל. The use of הַכֹּל (again at the end of the *v.* and in *v.* 14. 16), in the absolute sense of *all*, is almost confined to the later language: isolated instances occur in the earlier books, as Gen. 16, 12, יָדוּ בְּכֹל יוֹד כָּל בּוֹ; but the real parallels are such examples as Jer. 10, 16 (= 51, 19) כִּי יוֹצֵר הַכֹּל הוּא. Ps. 119, 91 הַכֹּל עֲבָדֶיךָ. 145, 9 טוֹב יְהוָה לְכֹל. Dan. 11, 2. 37. 2 Chr. 32, 22, and often in Eccl., as 1, 2. 14. 3, 1. 11. 19. 20. 9, 1. 2. 3. 10, 3 etc. In the earlier language the sense of הַכֹּל is usually limited by the context to things that have been just mentioned, as Lev. 1, 9. 13. 8, 27. 1 Sam. 30, 19. 1 Ki. 6, 18. 7, 33 (16 such cases in Gen.—Kings), cf. Gen. 24, 1. 2 Sam. 23, 5 (בְּכֹל).

ולחוק לכל. The ל in לכל is the *nota accusativi*, which, though it occurs here and there in early Hebrew (cf. p. 248, *note*), is much more common (through Aramaic influence) in late Hebrew: in the Chronicles, for instance, *v.* 20. 22 (*bis*). 4, 22. 16, 37. 18, 5. 21, 17. 22, 17. 19. 25, 1. 26, 27 (with חֹזֶק, as here). 2 Chr. 5, 11. 15, 13. 17, 3. 4. 7. 19, 2. 20, 3. 26, 13. 27. 28, 16. 31, 21. 32, 17. 34, 3. Ezr. 4, 2.

13. מוֹדִים . . . וּמִהֲלִים. A common combination in the Chronicles: 1 Chr. 16, 4. 25, 3. 23, 30. 2 Chr. 5, 13. 31, 2. Ezr. 3, 11. Neh. 12, 24; otherwise only Is. 38, 18 (Hezekiah's Song), and in the Psalms. Both words (as here used) derive their force from their liturgical associations, and presuppose a long-established liturgical use.

14. וכי כִּי. וכי כִּי is (here) untranslatable; either ו or כִּי must, it seems, have come into the text by error.

עֶזְרָה כַּח, to hold in (or retain) strength. Exclusively a late idiom,—with an inf. following = to be able: found elsewhere only 2 Chr. 2, 5. 13, 20. 22, 9. Dan. 10, 8. 16. 11, 6; and with omission of כַּח, 2 Chr. 14, 10. 20, 37.

15. The Hebrew of this verse is smooth and flowing; but it consists simply of two reminiscences, with unessential variations, of Ps. 39, 13 (כִּי גַר אֲנֹכִי עִמָּךְ תּוֹשֵׁב כְּכֹל אֲבוֹתַי), and Job 8, 9 (צֶל יָמֵינוּ עָלֵינוּ אֶרֶץ), followed by a clause introduced

by וַאִין, such as occurs at all periods of the language. The only parallel for מְקוּהָ *hope* (in this application) is, however, Ezr. 10, 2 יש מקוה לישראל (rather differently, in poetry, Jer. 14, 8, 17, 13, 50, 7, of Jehovah). מְקוּהָ does not occur elsewhere: the earlier language would prefer הַתְקוּהָ.

16. כל ההמון הזה. *המון* is properly a *humming* or *confused noise*, such as that of a throng of people (Is. 17, 12), or of the sea (Jer. 51, 42); it is then used often of a *throng* or *crowd* itself (as 2 Sam. 6, 19): in the weakened sense of a collection of *noiseless* inanimate things, it is exclusively a late usage; see 2 Chr. 31, 10 (of tithes and offerings), Eccl. 5, 9 (of wealth), Ps. 37, 16 ("the *abundance* of many wicked"). There seems to be an approximation to this sense in Is. 60, 5 (כִּי יִהְיֶה עֲלֵיד הַמִּזְבֵּחַ יָם).

17. מִיִּשְׂרָאֵל. Except here and Dan. 11, 6, exclusively a poetical word (Pss., Pr., Is., Cant.).

17. התנרבבתי and התנרבב: cf. on *v.* 5.

ועתה עמך הנמצאו פה ראיתי להתנרבב לך. The subordination of an inf. with ל after ראה (in place of כִּי with a finite verb) is almost without parallel in the O.T.: an example with ידע occurs however in the late passage, Eccl. 4, 17; 2 Sam. 18, 29 (compared by Ewald, § 336*b*), is in all probability to be differently construed (see Kirkpatrick's note; and Ges.-Kautzsch, § 114. 2 *note*).

הנמצאו: the art., with the finite verb, with the force of a relative! Every competent Hebrew scholar knows the cases in which this construction is found in the O.T. In classical Hebrew, its occurrence is so rare and so much against analogy, that it is beyond question no true element in the language:¹ the cases being confined to (1) the isolated הַהֲלֹכִים in Jos. 10, 24 (read הַהֲלֹכִים); and (2) the

¹ See Ges.-Kautzsch (ed. 25), § 138, 3*b*; my note on 1 Sam. 9, 24; or A. B. Davidson, *Heb. Syntax* (1894)—an excellent work which I am glad to have this opportunity of commending to such English Hebraists as may still be unacquainted with it—§ 22 R. 4.

cases in which by the change of a point (1 Ki. 11, 9 הַנְּרָאָה for הִנְרָאָה) or of an accent (Gen. 18, 21 הַבָּאָה for הִבָּאָה), the ordinary and regular construction with a participle can be restored. On the other hand, it is a genuine element in the idiom of the Chronicler, the cases (cited in my *Introd.*, p. 505) being 1 Chr. 26, 28. 29, 8. 17. 2 Chr. 1, 4. 29, 36. Ezra 8, 25 (הַהֲרִימוֹ). 10, 14 (הַהֲשִׁיב). 17 (הַהֲשִׁיבו).

18. שמרה זאת לעולם ליצר מחשבות לבב עמך, “preserve this for ever, *namely*, the imagination of the thoughts of the heart of thy people” (*i.e.* may this mind continue in them perpetually: see with what simple grace an early writer expresses the same thought, Dt. 5, 26 [A.V. 29]). Another case of the ל as the *nota accusativi*, introducing the *definite* object, after the *indefinite*: exactly so 2 Chr. 2, 12 ועתה י, שלחתי איש חכם יודע בינה לחורם אבי, “And now I send a wise man, *namely* Hiram my father” (see 4, 16); 23, 1; Ps. 135, 11. 136, 19. 20 (who slew mighty kings,—לְסִיחוֹן—מֶלֶךְ הָאֲמֹרִי וְנֹ): cf. after a suffix—in Syriac fashion—1 Chr. 5, 26. 23, 6. 2 Chr. 25, 5. 10. 26, 14*. 28, 15. Neh. 9, 32. The earlier language uses in such cases regularly את: Gen. 26, 34 ויקם יתרה את יהודית בת בארי החתי; Jud. 3, 15 ויקם יהוה את טבאל בן טבאל; Is. 7, 6 ונמליך מלך את בן טבאל; 8, 2 ויצר מחשבות לבב is of course borrowed from Gen. 6, 5.

19. לשמור מצותיך עדותיך וחקיך: the phraseology being Deuteronomic, the verse naturally flows. But immediately afterwards we have an inelegancy in לעשות הכל—an earlier writer would have here *specified* in what הכל consisted—and the unfortunate בירה, which Mr. French so sadly desires to see extruded from the text (see on *v.* 1).

These, then, are two of the speeches of which the Rev. Valpy French has the boldness to say (p. 195) that they “contain no more traces of exilic [rather *post-exilic*] language than those whose genuineness is vouched for by parallels in Sam. or Kings,” and that, with the exception of הַבִּירָה (above, on *v.* 1), “the language is the same as in

Samuel and Kings"! This lofty superiority to the facts, though, of course, in a "critic" it would occasion no surprise, is startling in the Editor of *Lex Mosaiica*. As the preceding pages have shewn, the language is *not* "the same as in Samuel and Kings": on the contrary, it teems with post-exilic idioms and uses; nor do these resemble the rare and slight touches which just shew the Chronicler's hand in 1 Chr. 17 (p. 244), but which leave the pre-exilic character of the speech as a whole entirely unimpaired; they have, in nearly every case, a strongly marked character; and they are such, moreover, as to affect the *entire texture* of the sentences in which they occur. Of course particular clauses are to be found (as 1 Chr. 29, 10 ברוך אתה יהוה אלהי ישראל (אביו), which are quite classical in style: but this is a characteristic of the later Hebrew:¹ the language is not an *entirely* new one; and so combinations of words sometimes occur, which are not different from what would be used by an earlier writer. But the two speeches in 1 Chr. 29 hold exactly the same relation to the two in 1 Chr. 17 (= 2 Sam. 7) that the narrative of (say) 2 Chr. 19 (without parallel in Kings) holds to 2 Chr. 18 (= 1 Ki. 22); the former (in each case) bearing as distinctly the post-exilic stamp, as the latter (in spite of *slight* and *occasional* traces of the Chronicler's hand) bear the pre-exilic stamp.

The case is similar with other speeches ascribed to David in the Chronicles. Where in the earlier books are such sentences to be found as יהיה לי עליכם לבב ליחד (1 Chr. 12, 18); אם עליכם טוב ומן יהוה אלהינו נפרצה נשלחה על אחינו כי למבַּרְאשׁוֹנָה לא אָתָם (13, 2); ועמד בכל מלאכה (22, 15); ועמי מלאכה (15, 13⁴);

¹ *Introduction*, p. 473 note.¹

² So only in Neh. (2, 5, 7), and Est. (1, 19, 3, 9, 5, 4, 8, 7, 3, 8, 5, 9, 13).

³ *Introduction*, p. 504, No. 14.

⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 504, No. 27 (on the peculiar type of sentence): לְכִי as 2 Chr. 30, 3 only.

לכל נדיב בהכמה לכל עבדה (28, 21). But, if the Rev. Valpy French's contention is true, they are to be found "in Samuel and Kings." I challenge him to produce them.²

In conclusion, lest, in spite of all that I have adduced, the reader should still be of opinion that I am maintaining a paradox of my own, I append two corroborative judgments. The first shall be from an unexceptionable quarter, viz. from *Lex Mosaica* itself. On p. 305, Mr. Watson writes:—

"It must be considered probable that the speeches he puts into the mouth of speakers are *expansions* of the accounts which came down to him, *in his own spirit and with his own colouring*" (the italics are mine).

That is exactly my own view. The second shall be from a Commentary issued under the editorship of the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol, and therefore presumably possessing his sanction. Vol. iii. p. 203, the Rev. C. J. Ball writes:—

"Moreover he does not hesitate, nor would any writer of the time have hesitated, to put appropriate speeches into the mouths of leading personages, some of which betray their ideal character by a close similarity in form and matter."

The most recent English commentator on the Chronicles, Prof. W. H. Bennett, in his suggestive and interesting volume in the *Expositor's Bible*, takes substantially the same view of the aims and methods of the Chronicler that I have done in my *Introduction*. Thus in a chapter headed "Teaching by Anachronism," he writes (p. 117):—

"Israel had always been the Israel of his own experience, and it never occurred to him that its institutions under the kings had been other than those with which he was familiar.

¹ Above, on 29, 5.

² It would have been interesting to point out how the speeches peculiar to the Chronicles reflect, in almost every case, the interests and point of view of the Chronicler himself: but space has obliged me to confine myself to the linguistic argument.

He had no more hesitation in filling up the gaps in the Books of Kings from what he saw round about him, than a painter would have in putting the white clouds and blue waters of to-day into a picture of skies and seas a thousand years ago. He attributes to the pious kings of Judah the observance of the ritual of his own day. Their prophets use phrases taken from post-exilic writings."

The closing days of David's life are filled with thoughts about the Temple (1 Chr. 22-29): "This is how the Chronicler would have wished to die if he had been David, and how, therefore, he conceives that God honoured the last hours of the man after His own heart" (p. 156). His last prayer (1 Chr. 29, 10-19) "states some of the leading principles which govern the Chronicler in his interpretation of the history of Israel" (p. 314). Of course, there is no occasion to doubt either the general fact that David made preparations for the erection of the Temple, or that some particulars respecting them were accessible to the Chronicler: but the representation as a whole is both the Chronicler's conception, and the Chronicler's composition.¹

S. R. DRIVER.

¹ May I be allowed to mention, for the benefit of such readers of the *Expositor* as may be interested in Aramaic studies, G. Dalman's valuable *Grammatik des Jüdisch-Palästinischen Aramäisch*, which has recently appeared? This grammar—which embraces in particular the idioms of the Palestinian Talmud and Midrash, the Targum of Onkelos, and the Jerusalem Targums of the Pentateuch—is distinguished for its careful discrimination of the various Aramaic dialects, for its abundant quotations, and for its philological completeness,—Onkelos, for instance, being cited always with the superlinear punctuation, and the Aramaic of the Inscriptions being frequently compared,—and completely supersedes all previous works on the same subject.

THE WISE MEN.

IT is a singular story, this of the Wise Men ; it is related by only one evangelist ; its facts have about them the rhythm of poetry and the strangeness of romance ; yet it so perfectly fits in with the other draperies of the Advent, and with our view of the proprieties, that if it had been wanting, we should have instinctively felt as if a chapter of the story had been lost. But we have not to mourn a lost chord in the music ; for St. Matthew has caught the " grand Amen," and given it a place at the very beginning of the New Testament. And yet what an air of mystery and of vagueness there is about it ! Who the chief actors are we are not told. They appear upon the stage ; they play their part in this Epiphany, and then they disappear in the oblivion and silence out of which they emerged. The Evangelist does not even stop to individualize, but groups them anonymously in the plural noun, the " Magi." Whence they came we cannot tell, except in a sort of conjectural way ; though their gifts of frankincense and myrrh would almost point to Arabia, where these herbs are indigenous. This, too, would almost be a literal fulfilment of the ancient prophecy, how they " of Sheba and Seba should offer gifts " ; but apart from this we have no certain clue to their nationality, any more than to their names. But if we may not read their history, or hear the accents of their speech, we can tell somewhat of their position and their character. That they were Gentiles both tradition and exposition allow ; and that they were men of intelligence and affluence we may easily detect if we read between the lines. Whether kings or not, they come in a royal way ; probably with a considerable retinue, and certainly with costly presents ; while the commotion into which Jerusalem is thrown by their presence and their strange questions—for the tides of

excitement went flooding streets and bazaars, breaking with suppressed thunders within the palace itself—shows that they were no common travellers, like those who brought the perfumes of Araby to their markets and fairs.

But if we may not read their names or their nationality—these are mere outward accidents that may easily be omitted—the Scripture does lift in part the veil that drapes them, giving us bright glimpses into their inner life, so that we may read their soul, hearing their very thoughts and aspirations. Evidently they were God-fearing men,—men whose eyes and hearts were set heavenward, reading the stars, listening for voices in the silences of the sky, and watching for the signalings of Providence. They were some of heaven's "outside saints"; nameless indeed to us, but not nameless in the Book of Life; members of that invisible communion, who, beyond the pale of Judaism, "feared God and worked righteousness." Nay, it would almost seem as if these men in a certain sense were favourites of heaven; for God speaks to them in direct revelations, warning them in visions of the night, and guiding them by a star. What the star was we cannot say with certainty. Some would explain it in a natural way, that it was nothing more than a remarkable conjunction of heavenly bodies; and Astronomy, reading backward through the centuries, says that there was such a remarkable conjunction about that time in the Zodiac sign of the Pisces. But such an explanation of the star is scarcely in harmony with the probabilities of the case; for any conjunction of the heavenly bodies, however remarkable, would have been fixed and regular in its appearance, and once vanishing, it would not reappear. This star, however, appears in their western sky, sets them on their journey, and then leaves them—as the tense of the verb "we saw His star" would imply. It certainly had vanished in Jerusalem, reappearing, however, as they journeyed towards Bethlehem, and hovering over the very house of the

new-born Christ, as no constellation could by any possibility be made to do except by miracle. And so probably the star was some supernatural light, possibly appearing to their vision only; and heaven, we may be sure, would never lend its lamp except to heavenly-minded, heavenly-hearted men.

But how came they to read so correctly the phenomenon of the star? How came they to know that it was the herald of a birth, a royal birth too, of One who was destined to be King? The same light might have shone for others and have been all meaningless to their vacant stare. It would have spoken in an unknown tongue; and though it had caught celestial accents, it would have been nothing more, in the truths it conveyed, than the spark of a glow-worm, or the dance of some *ignis fatuus* of the bog. The star could only speak into hearts that were prepared, ears that were trained to listening and interpreting. As the plate of the photographer must first be made sensitive to the light, before it can receive and retain the fugitive vision that plays before it, so the hearts of these strangers must have been made sensitive, susceptible to the heavenly vision. That is, there must have been a light in the heart or the light in the sky had been of no use. Nay, the sky may become one burning star, but if there be no light in the soul, no power of vision, the light itself will be but darkness.

And that the hearts of these stranger from the east had been enlightened, sensitized, we can attribute only to one or two causes. Here is the fact: that far away from Jerusalem, amidst the dense masses of heathenism, men's hearts had been set vibrating with new hopes. The expectation of the near coming of the Messiah had taken possession of them; and though around them it was yet night deep and dark, they were ready with their matins, their foreseeing hopes anticipating the dawn, and their eager hearts going

out to meet it. Whence came this expectation, these new and bright hopes? Reason could not give it; philosophy could not find it; none of their astrologies could read it, nor could their alchemies hold it in solution. It could only have been borne in to them by some revelation of God; and we cannot be far wrong if we attribute it to the unconscious influence of the Hebrew scriptures and the Hebrew faith. Judaism was a far-reaching and potent force, spreading itself out like an atmosphere, regardless of national or social bounds, and penetrating deeply into human thought,—conquering its conquerors, as Roman historians avow. To such an extent had the Hebrew faith diffused itself abroad—borne on the red tides of war, or on the wide eddies of commerce—that even in the outside nations there was a prevalent belief that the coming of the King who should redeem Israel, and through them bless the world, was nigh at hand. And so when the star appeared, strange phenomenon as it was, it created no surprise in the mind of these Eastern seers. It came to them in a supernatural naturalness, as a thing quite expected, and for which they were thoroughly prepared. It was in a sense an answering heliogram, or astrogram, if we may use that word—signaling back from the sky, and responding to the hopes and prayers that had long been flashed from the souls of these up-lookers. And directly the star appears, beckoning them westward, they yield themselves up to it. Wasting no time in empty talk and vain speculations, they prepare their gifts, call out the servants and the camels, then moving swiftly westward, as the star of the new Empire leads the way. They turn their faces towards the setting sun; but their hearts are turned towards the new dawn, the “day-spring from on high” which has visited them.

The light in the sky and the light in the heart were parts of the same light. They sang back to each other, as the choristers throw across the chancel the antiphonal strains

of the same sweet anthem. Had there been no light, no longing in the soul, the star had never risen in the sky; and had that light of the soul set, quenched in apathy and unconcern, the light of the sky had disappeared with it, dropping from the firmament like a falling star. It is not the eye that sees; it is the soul that looks through the eye as through an open window; and the outer vision is broadened or narrowed, as the light within is warm and bright or dim and cold. Set a child under the heavens and what does it see? Just an expanse of darkness, sprinkled over with tiny sparks; a pocketful of marbles or a string of beads is more and heavier than all the stars. Take the half-educated mind and bid him look up. He sees stars of different lustre; he sees a kind of order in their movements; he groups them into constellations, and, detecting some fancied resemblance, he calls one the lion, and another the crab. To him the open page of heaven is but a book of nursery tales; and instead of reading the stars, interpreting their language, he reads only the shadows of his own conceptions thrown upon the stars. Set now an astronomer under that same sky, and what a broadening and widening of vision! Each separate star grows into a world vaster than his own; the flat expanse of the child draws back into infinite distances, where worlds beyond all reckoning sweep round in their precise and orderly revolutions. That vision touches the infinite; it makes the very silences sing. Some one has said, "Sight is a faculty, and seeing is an art"; and it is so. The sight ever deepens upon the seer, and here the personal element figures largely in the equation. Speaking generally, we see what we are, the outer vision unfolding certain correspondences with our inner self.

Exactly so is it in our spiritual life. The horizon broadens with the years, keeping pace with the growths and expansions of the soul. The things of God which stood back from us, but dimly apprehended in the far distance,

now approach; the truth which was vague before shapes itself into constellations whose light is both warm and bright. Let us take the Bible for example, and how it has grown upon us! Scientists tell us that our worlds have all existed in a gaseous, vapoury state, and that by processes of cooling and condensation—throwing off their juvenilities—they have gradually assumed their present form of solidity and stability. Whether this be so or not, when we first came to the Bible, looking at it with childhood's vision and childhood's faith, it was a sort of dreamland, all enveloped in luminous ether, a haze of mist and mystery. Not that it was so really; but it appeared so to our untrained vision. Our sight had not yet been correctly focussed; we had not learned rightly to measure our distances, nor to distinguish between substance and shade. But what is the Bible to us now? Not exactly what it was, perhaps. Some things we held as truths have proved to be only misreadings of the truth, as we have called the part the whole; the temporal, eternal; but in the "new thoughts of God" the years have brought us the disenchantment of some of childhood's illusions which has not been loss but gain. There are mysteries in the word we may not yet unravel—for are we not all baffled with the mystery of our own being?—but one thing is sure, the Bible is more to us to-day than it was to the dream of childhood. It is more real, more near; one bright orb of revealed truth, its two Testaments making a rounded sphere, and its meridian lines, whether read backward through the Old, or forward through the New, all measured from the central Christ. Others may see in this Word but a production of human minds, a mechanism of revolving lights; others may see in it but a nebulous comet, moving with eccentric orbit about some unknown centre; but he who leaves heart and soul open to the light, who is content to learn the higher doctrine by doing the higher will—first "coming" in an absolute self-surrender that he may

“see”—will see in the Word, from its first page to its last, another Star of Bethlehem, each beam a tongue of fire calling him to the Christ. What we need is not more light but larger sight.

The shepherds were sent across to Bethlehem by a song in the sky, the Wise Men by a star whose very silence was vocal; but called by different voices, sent on different ways, their paths converge to the same bright shrine, the cradle of the Holy Child. Had the star appeared to the shepherds, they might not have understood its meaning, even though its vivid brightness had paled all the constellations of their Syrian sky. It would have awed, perhaps silenced them. Their thoughts kept low. Like the timid field-birds which flit from furrow to furrow, from hedge to hedge, never soaring high with the lark or striking out far with the swallow, their thoughts could read the sheep better than the stars, and they knew the pastures of the mountain better than the pastures of the sky. And so they needed the plainer verbal message. Heaven must speak to them in their own tongue; giving them directions they cannot misunderstand; telling where the scene of the Advent is—in the “city of David,” which is Bethlehem; and telling who and what is the Child now so strangely set in their midst, multiplying His titles, as “the Saviour,” the “Christ,” the “Lord.” But not thus did the Divine message come to the Magi. Here no word is spoken, no *Gloria* sung, no solitary angel appears. It is only a new and bright star that has shone out in their western sky. But it is enough. It announces to them a great fact, and it indicates the direction, but it does not enter into particulars. It does not throw out any hint of Bethlehem, nor does it announce the Advent of the Divine Child in any of the three titles the shepherds heard, but as “King.” The star did not light up the whole path on to its goal—that is not generally heaven’s wont in dealing with human lives—but it gave them light enough for the

present, for the next step, which is all they ask. And see how heaven speaks to them, as it were, in their native tongue. The skies to them were a familiar page. They gave themselves up to them; for they were, to their up-looking minds, as near and as real as earth. And as night unrolled the volume of their "book," all written over with letters of gold, they bent both mind and soul to spell out its secrets and to hear the stately processional marches of their half-vocal skies. True they threw upon the sky many random guesses at which astronomy would smile; their astrologies were perhaps fanciful and foolish in their minutiae, fiction rather than fact; but they did not study the skies for nothing, they did not seek the companionship of the stars in vain, for they spelled out some truth, even though it might be of an elementary kind. They had at least learned humility, self-littleness, as he always will, be he psalmist or not, who sets himself beneath the stars, "considering" the heavens. They had learned more of God, His greatness, majesty and glory; for what were the far-reaching skies, the countless stars, but the visible things of the great Invisible One? What were they but the embroidered robes, all resplendent and very glorious, of Him whom their inner souls had learned to worship and to love,—the unseen One whose name their lips scarce dare to speak? Yes, they were astral men, star-men, and so heaven speaks to them in their native accents, with a silent, astral voice. And they heard the message, for their heart had been long listening for it; and before Bethlehem had offered its rude and mean cradle, the Magi had set up within their hearts a throne for the Holy Child; while in their thoughts they had woven for Him right royal apparel, garments of purple, blue and gold. Looking into God's heavens they became seers. Reading well the Divine promises and purposes, the star shone in their faces so brightly, it left its light behind; and though we may never know their names, though they soon

retire into the obscurity out of which they now emerge, they can no longer be hid ; for as the sun itself is hidden, lost in its own light, so these anonymous sons of the East, long as time itself will be, will be at once visible and invisible ; at once hidden and revealed by the enveloping light of the star they saw and followed, the star that led them to the greater light, even " the bright and morning star."

It does not matter in what language heaven speaks to us, or what special portent it gives to us—indeed, there may be no portent at all ; it may be in ways so simple, so perfectly natural—but everything depends upon our attitude toward the voice or vision. We may rise and follow, getting into the track of angels and among the echoes of their anthems ; we may kneel before the Christ, spreading out before Him life's most beautiful and most precious things to have them made more beautiful and more precious by His touch. Or we may hesitate and refuse, as, alas ! many are doing now, playing the sackbut around the clay image of our enlarged self, and setting other feet to dance about it, or raking eagerly over the dust and ash heaps of a decaying world. Then heaven's star shines, but in vain, and heaven's angels sing in vain, while all the time the star is growing dimmer, and the music fainter, and the Christ is farther and farther away in the ever-widening, ever-darkening distance ! The wise men showed their wisdom in seeking and worshipping the Christ, who was more to them than all their gold and all their stars ; and shall we not be fools indeed if we hear and see but do not follow, and do not worship ? Will not this be the height of folly—the eternal folly ?

The Magi naturally think the King of the Jews must be born in the nation's capital, and so they repair at once to Jerusalem. What, then, means this uncertainty and doubt ? Like men who are suddenly enveloped in a fog, and who have lost the path, the wise men grope along the streets of Jerusalem bewildered, lost, spelling out the way, and ask-

ing in the bazaars, and in the temple's outer courts, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" What means this abrupt and total break in their correspondence with heaven? Why should the star disappear just when they need it most? Borne onwards, as it were, with wings, why must they now fold their wings and have to take to their feet, falling back on earthly guides, earthly supports? Could not God have led them *by* Jerusalem as well as through it, opening to them the very same path by which they returned? Or could not God have led them through it just as well as to it, lighting them easily through the labyrinth of narrow, intersecting streets? Why, then, should the star disappear? Was it so low down on the horizon that the city—and the temple—walls hid it from their view? for earthly things have a strange way of intercepting heavenly light. Not so; but God took away the star, calling it back to its native depths, because its absence now could do more than even its presence. The expression, "*We saw* His star in the East," implies that the vision was only for a brief time; it had not gone before them across the desert. It had given them an object and a direction, and having thus initialled the way, it had disappeared. But let us suppose that it had accompanied them all through their journey, indicating each turn, as it afterwards indicated the very house out of the hundreds of houses of Bethlehem—a star invisible to others, but bright and vivid to themselves all the way, and what then? They would have slipped through Jerusalem quickly as they could, awaking no interest, and making no impression—at any rate, no more impression than that produced by a passing dream. But God takes the star from them, leaving them, as it would seem, to their own resources; and what is the result? As if they felt the tightening of unseen reins, the force of circumstances—and how conventional is that large word "circumstance," which some use as a blind that they may not

see God—summons them to “Halt!” Eager to prosecute their journey, they are detained by a higher force, telling in the streets their story of the star, and asking, “Where is He?” It is a simple question, but the quiet voice gathers velocity and volume until it sweeps over Jerusalem like a cyclone, or a rushing wind of Pentecost. We read, “Herod was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him.” The voice of the Wise Men beat against the unstable throne of Herod, making it vibrate with alarming fears; it was the spasm and tremor of an awakened conscience, the agitation of conscious guilt, and the fears of coming doom. Jerusalem too was “troubled” when we might suppose that she would have been glad, almost beside herself with joy. True there were some faithful souls within her walls, like those temple saints, Simeon and Anna, whose eyes had grown dim, watching for Him who should bring redemption and salvation to Israel; but, as a city, Jerusalem had grown luxurious, greedy of gain and pleasure-loving. What does Jerusalem want of a Christ? she prefers Herod or Barnabas. What does she want of a King? she hugs her fetters and cries, “We have no king but Cæsar”! And how deep the fair city must have sunk, how far she must have drifted on the backwash of paganism, when she could forget her ancient prophecies, or hope they might not be true; and when the very mention of her new King startles and affrights her like a sudden bolt from the blue! And Jerusalem never had a welcome for her Christ. She gave Him one, but that ovation was more Galilean than Judean, and even then “the city” frowned upon it, and threw the weight of officialism against it. Jerusalem gave the Christ no apostle, gave Him no couch—for we cannot find Him spending even one night within her walls; she only gave Him a few hosannas and broken palms, and then a cross and a grave. And so we are not surprised that Jerusalem, the only city that made Jesus weep—had no welcome for her promised King, and

that the mere mention of His name distressed, and almost angered her.

But this halt of the Magi does more than create excitement and make a perfect storm of fears; for Herod hastily summons the scribes and elders to enquire of them where the Christ should be born. The answer comes to their lips directly; they have no need to search for it—for has it not stood written in their Scriptures for centuries?—nor is there among them a dissenting or questioning voice. It is "In Bethlehem of Judea"; and then probably they unroll the Book of Micah and repeat the whole passage, though not exactly as the prophet wrote it. He spake of a Ruler in Israel, whose goings forth are from of old, from everlasting" (Micah v. 21); they speak of a Governor who shall be "Shepherd of My people Israel," as if they would tone down the tyrant's feelings, explaining the "governor" by a pastoral metaphor, and turning the sceptre of authority and rule into a shepherd's rod. And so the "sure word of prophecy" is attested and stamped afresh with the seal of the temple, and with the signet of Herod. God closed His heavens that His Scriptures might be opened. He covered and silenced the star that Jerusalem's elders and scribes, and even Herod himself, might pay obeisance, however unwilling, to the Christ, the Holy Child now set in their midst. So the loss proved the greater gain; the star which was hidden gave the greater light.

The paradox is still true. There are times in life, in every life, when darkness is our brightest light: for it is the mother of lights to be, the womb of our new mornings. It is well at times that we grope amidst perplexity and uncertainty; it is a check to presumption, an antidote to pride. Next to a perfect knowledge is the knowing that we do not know. The knowledge of our ignorance is the alphabet, the beginning of all knowledge; and sometimes God calls in the star that has shone upon us, that we may look within

and look above to One who is more than all stars. But God never leaves those feet long in doubt that seek to walk in His higher ways, and that are in search of His larger blessings. If He does not light up the path on to the goal, He does give light for the next step, and light for the next step is all we need, and indeed all that we can use. The star was given them back just when they needed it, lighting up the road to Bethlehem, and then hovering over the very door that had such a treasure hidden behind it. So, too, the vanished light will come back to us at the right time, which is God's time, and it will guide us, if not to the full fruition of our hopes, yet to the fulfilling of His purposes, which is still better. He who seeks God's will alone will move forwards on a lighted path to find the Christ somewhere and anywhere.

They dreamed of a king, they inquired for a king; they find a Child born in the stable of a *khan*, first cradled in a manger, and now taken in to the hospitalities of a friendly house; born untimely, as all human reckonings would say, its parents, if not poor, yet following an unremunerative and somewhat lowly calling. But though their dream has so poor a realization, and though the royalties of earth are so signally wanting, where everything, to the unenlightened mind, was ordinary and commonplace, yet their Eastern believers are neither shocked nor startled. They prostrate themselves before the Child, and then, making their camels kneel down by the humble door, they untie their bales, open their "treasures"—for such is the wealthy word—and then they present their gifts, spreading out before the astonished parents and the unnoting child their royal offering—boxes of frankincense and myrrh, and bags of gold. Strange scene! It is Nature's salutation of her Lord, as she so early puts the crown upon His head. Her three kingdoms are here: the vegetable world sending its most precious things, the sweet frankincense, the everlasting myrrh; the

mineral world sending its best and highest—gold ; while the animal world sends the kneeling camels, and that highest, lordliest of all earthly creatures, a prostrating, worshipping humanity. So did Nature sing her *Te Deum* with the accompaniments of gold and perfume,—“Thou art the King of glory, O Christ.” And did not the eyes of the Seers look forward as well as backward and upward ? and are not their gifts in some sort a prophecy as well as a thank-offering ? We shall not put any undue pressure upon the narrative, laying violent hands upon it, if we say that their gift *was* a latent prophecy. In the Old Dispensation frankincense played no unimportant part. It scented the whole tabernacle, it threw its odours far over the outer courts of tent and temple. It was sprinkled on the loaves of the shewbread, and on the sacrifice of the altar ; together with stacte, onycha, and galbanum, it formed the sweet incense. And now as the Priest of a higher order than Melchisedec comes to make an offering of Himself, as the “Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world,” the Magi prepare beforehand the frankincense, in a prophetic way sprinkling Him who is both Priest and Victim in the great sacrifice. So too, the myrrh looked away from Bethlehem to the near Calvary. The only other mention of myrrh we have in the New Testament is the myrrh they mingled with the wine at the Cross, but which Jesus would not take, and the myrrh and aloes of the embalming. And so the offices of the myrrh were friendly. It would have deadened the physical pain—but Jesus would not permit any artificial help in the terrible sufferings of the Cross ; and wrapped about the dead body, it would have helped to preserve it, putting its shield around the sacred dust that decay should not rifle and spoil it. The myrrh was thus a prophecy of the death ; and, borne from the distant East, it comes now to greet the Child—only yet a few days from its birth—and striking in with the gold and frankincense, with the greeting of stars

and angels, it whispers of the death that shall crown the life. For was He not born that He might die? and did He not live that He might die, taking upon Himself our nature, our flesh and blood, that He might go with it to His cross and His grave? Yes; and He took our humanity beyond the grave, for He took it, raised and spiritualized, up to His highest heaven.

Here the sweet idyl comes to an abrupt ending, as with one sentence the Evangelist draws about the chief actors the curtain of silence. We see them, warned of God not to return to Herod, departing homeward by "another way"—God's way, though "another," for all paths open to His sky—and returning nameless as they came. They did not leave their little human names in the Divine story, as some like to carve theirs on the walls of God's temple, so putting a daub of clay upon the gold; none of their words are recorded, save a solitary question and the brief statement of their errand; but they leave behind a deed, fragrant and immortal. These Gentile Seers are first to confess the kingship, the true royalty of Jesus, enthroning Him in their words and deeds, and saluting Him, not as Herod's soldiers did, in mockery, but with a true and reverent "Hail, King!" Their gold found for the Christ-child the safer shelter of Egypt—so becoming a shield of gold that foiled the steel of Herod; and their frankincense and myrrh inspiration has gathered up and embasketed, setting it by the gate of the New Testament, that all who enter to find and to worship the Christ may inhale its fragrance, the sacred perfume of a holy deed. Wise men they were indeed; and he only is wise in the highest wisdom who seeks and worships the Christ, consecrating to His service life's sweetest and most precious things, so giving the "All hail" of a glad, a life-long devotion.

HENRY BURTON.

THE RULERS OF THE SYNAGOGUE.

THE question has been put to me, What cases can be given in support of my statement in THE EXPOSITOR, March, 1895, pp. 224-5, that in the Bezan Text "we sometimes find ourselves in the second century rather than in the first?" Perhaps the most interesting case, though not the simplest, is Acts xiv. 2, where the Bezan Text reads "the Archisynagogoi of the Jews and the Rulers (ἄρχοντες) of the Synagogue brought upon them persecution against the just ones, and stirred up the souls of the Gentiles against the brethren." We pass over the point (which is urged in the *Church in the Roman Empire*, Ed. III. p. 46¹) "that persecution against the just" (διωγμὸς κατὰ τῶν δικαίων) is here used as an established phrase denoting a familiar form of action against the Christians as a class, which is the idea of a later time and quite anachronistic here. The point on which attention is at present concentrated is the administration of the synagogue. This is a very obscure subject, discussed already by Dr. E. Schürer, who, in a pamphlet on the organization of the Jews in Rome, has collected and skilfully arranged the evidence.² M. S. Reinach and Dr. E. Hula have published Asian and Lycian inscriptions that have an important bearing on the subject. The legal aspect is set forth by Professor Th. Mommsen in his usual complete and conclusive style.³

Before A.D. 70, the Jews in any city of the Roman

¹ It is not touched in Ed. I. or II. Some other indications of later character in Bezan readings are mentioned in the same work, pp. 46, etc.

² He, however, has hardly paid enough attention to chronological considerations, when he has quoted the facts mentioned in late Roman inscriptions to illustrate the condition of the Jews in the time of Christ; see his *Geschichte d. Jud. Volkes*, II. pp. 516-520.

³ In the conclusion of his paper on *Religionsfrevel* in the *Histor. Zeitschrift*, vol. xxviii., p. 425f.

Empire formed a separate community, managing their own business according to their own laws by means of their own officers.¹ An unpublished epitaph from Apameia² uses the threat against any violator of the tomb, that "he knows the law of the Jews." M. Reinach writes to me that the "law" here appealed to must be a law of the Apamean Jews, since no provision of the kind exists in the Mosaic law; and his argument can hardly be disputed. This law is an example of the way in which Phrygian customs affected the Phrygian Jews. "The baths and wines of Phrygia had separated the Phrygian Jews from their brethren";³ and they adopted foreign customs and ideas even in regard to the penalties and fines, by which they guarded their sepulchres. The Apamean community was very powerful (see M. Babelon, *Revue de l'Hist. des Religions*, 1891, p. 174). Evidently it had made an agreement with the city as regards penalties to be inflicted for violation, as in the inscription of Tlos (quoted below).

A Jew who gained the Roman citizenship lost this position of mingled isolation and privilege: he passed under the ordinary Roman law, and could not be amenable to the law of another nation. Such was the legal aspect of the case; but in practice there can be no doubt that a Roman citizen of Jewish blood and religion often held office in a Jewish community and acted in many ways as if he were still a member of that community.

The Jewish community was administered by archons. At Tlos in Lycia, there seem to have been two archons, holding office for a definite period (doubtless a year). This follows from Dr. Hula's inscription,—“Ptolemy, son of Lucius, of Tlos, built the sepulchral monument from the

¹ They had a far more favoured position than any other resident foreigners (*metoikoi*).

² It will be published in appendix to ch. xi. of my *Local History of Phrygia*.

³ I quote a passage from Dr. Neubauer's *Geography of the Talmud* by memory, as I have not access to the book.

foundations, on his own behalf and on behalf of his son Ptolemy, on account of the archonship which is being discharged among us Jews, so that the tomb be the property of all the Jews." The tomb was presented to the Jews during the period when the two Ptolemies were archons.¹

Some authority in the synagogue was also exercised by *archisynagogoi*. This is proved by an inscription of Akmonia,² which mentions C. Turronius Klados, ὁ διὰ βίου ἀρχισυνάγωγος. If the title *archisynagogos* had been a purely honorary one, as it became later, Turronius would not have been styled *archisynagogos* for life: this implies a definite appointment.

During this period, therefore, there were in a Jewish Asian community political officers styled archons, and religious officials of the synagogue styled *archisynagogoi*. The former could not be termed with any propriety archons of the synagogue: they were archons of the Jewish community.

After the great rebellion and the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews ceased to be a nation; and Jewish communities in cities of the empire necessarily lost the status which they had hitherto enjoyed. Political distinction and isolation had no longer any legal ground to rest on. Only the religious distinction now remained; but that, of course, was quite as strong as it ever had been. The isolation and separation persisted, but it now rested solely on the religious bond that held together the Jewish community. The Jews in any city of the empire were considered by the Roman law as a body of persons who formed a union to maintain a certain religious worship; and, as Mommsen points out, this union was the *συναγωγή*.

¹ In several respects Dr. Hula's interpretation differs from that which I have given; but for brevity's sake I refrain from discussing the points of difference. Dr. Hula writes in *Eranos Vindobonensis*, p. 100 f. The date seems to me to be certainly about A.D. 70. Dr. Hula places it in the end of the first century.

² It is published from my copy in *Rev. Archéol.*, 1888, II. p. 225. It can be dated with certainty about 50-60 A.D. In it the Jews who are mentioned seem all to be Roman citizens.

It is certain that archons continued to be elected annually in September in Jewish communities throughout the imperial time. These archons, however, were no longer political officers of a distinct community: they could not have any legal existence except as officers of a religious society, *i.e.* of the synagogue.

Again, we may look at the case thus. In any city where a Jewish community existed after A.D. 70, and was recognised by law as a body of persons uniting in a common worship, it was necessary also that the legally recognised body should have legally recognised officials to represent it before the law and to be responsible for its proper and orderly administration. Who, then, were these officials? To that question only one answer can be given: they were the archons. The archisynagogoi, who might also be suggested, do not suit the conditions, for, as M. Reinach has pointed out, the term archisynagogos, after a time, lost its official sense and became a mere honorary title, which was hereditary in some families, and was given even to women. In this late period *les archisynagogues sont les principes, les notables de la communauté Juive*.¹ It is probable that this change in the position of the archisynagogoi was the result of the change in the position of the archons following on the revolution that occurred in the position of the Jews in A.D. 70. The archons began to encroach on the duties of the archisynagogoi; and the latter title soon became a mere honorary term.

In this period, and in the situation just described, the archons in a Jewish community are strictly and correctly the archons of the synagogue; and thus that title, which could not be used before A.D. 70, might quite fairly be used after that date. No proof, so far as I know, exists that it

¹ *Revue des Études Juives*, vii. p. 161 f.; see also xii. p. 236 f., and *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique*, 1886, p. 328 f., also *Church in Rom. Emp.*, pp. 46, 480.

came into use, except in the single passage Acts xiv. 2 according to the Bezan Text. I confess that I can see no way to avoid the conclusion that the Bezan reading of this passage originated later than A.D. 70; and further, that it did not originate until some time had elapsed. Changes of name of this kind do not occur in a moment; this expression implies that the Jewish community was now naturally and regularly thought of solely in its religious aspect, and its officers were simply officers of the synagogue.

Dr. Blass, indeed, finds a way to avoid this conclusion. He omits the words τῆς συναγωγῆς after ἄρχοντες. It must be granted that, by skilful omissions of anachronistic words and terms from the Bezan Text, one can eliminate various second century ideas from it; but my contention is that, as our authorities for the Western Text stand, they mark it as of second century type, whereas our authorities for the Eastern Text have not a trace that is necessarily of second century origin, while they contain many details that could not have originated except in the pre-Flavian period.

The question is here assumed, for the moment, to be between a first and a second century origin for the Bezan reading in xiv. 2, looking on it as an intentional reading, and not as a mere blunder. Another reason also leads to the conclusion that the Bezan reading in xiv. 2 cannot be an original first century one. In the third Gospel viii. 41 and 49, the terms ἀρχισυνάγωγος and ἄρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς are used as synonymous terms, whereas in Acts xiv. 2 there is no rational explanation of the Bezan reading except that the writer considered the two terms to have different senses, and desired to bring out the fact that the feeling against Paul was fomented both by the leading persons in the Jewish community and by the actual officers of the synagogue. The same author cannot be responsible for the two passages. And, further, the writer of Luke viii. 41 and

49 was not acquainted with the term ἀρχων τῆς συναγωγῆς as possessing a strict and definite sense, but used it merely as a rough equivalent of ἀρχισυνάγωγος, more likely to be intelligible to his non-Jewish readers than that rather unfamiliar term.¹ We may therefore fairly conclude that *Luke* viii. 41 and 49 were written before the changed conditions of A.D. 70 had lasted long enough to have caused the formation of a new nomenclature,² while the Bezan reading originated after its formation.

Incidentally we notice that Dr. Schürer's explanation of the officer called ὁ διὰ βίου in the Italian synagogues, as "the (archon) appointed for life," can hardly be maintained in view of the Akmonian inscription quoted p. 274. That "officer for life" was an archisynagogos and not an archon. The archons were annual officials, as Dr. Schürer himself recognises. The Gerousiarch was not strictly an official (as Dr. Schürer calls him). Like Boularch *princeps senatus* and Ephebarch *princeps juventutis*, the Gerousiarch was merely "the leading man of the Gerousia." Prof. Mommsen considers that Gerousia denoted the assembly of the whole community (after A.D. 70) and not a Council of selected members.³

W. M. RAMSAY.

¹ Dr. Schürer points this intention clearly and correctly in his *Gemeinde-verfassung*, p. 37.

² It seems clear from the Roman references that the third Gospel was written in the Flavian period, *i. e.*, later than A.D. 70.

³ Prof. F. Blass mentions to me that the word *Ἰσιδίας* does not occur in the Greek MSS. of Ptolemy V. 5, 4, but only in the Latin (see *Expositor*, Feb., p. 134). This fact was unknown to me, as the edition of Ptolemy which I use gives *Ἰσιδίας* with no mark of hesitation (like several other editions). The reader will see that my opinion was not dependent on that passage; but further, the appendix on "Pisidian Phrygia," in my forthcoming *Local History of Phrygia*, I., p. 316f., will make it pretty clear that the epithet is necessary, and that the Latin text is correct; but I cannot here attempt to show that the word is merely displaced in the Greek MSS. by one line. I regret to have stated my case, however, so as to suggest greater authority for the adj. than the MSS. allow.

THE DOCTRINE OF SCRIPTURE.

THE REFORMERS AND THE PRINCETON SCHOOL.

IN my article on the late Prof. W. Robertson Smith's *Doctrine of Scripture* in the EXPOSITOR for October, 1894, I ventured to show that while it agreed with that of the Reformers it differed from what is commonly called the doctrine of the Princeton School. Want of space compelled me to state the points of difference very briefly. Several American correspondents, personally unknown to myself, have suggested that I should contrast the theories more fully: and the kindness of the editor of the EXPOSITOR has now permitted me to do this.

By the theory of the Princeton School is meant the doctrine of Scripture to be found in the *Systematic Theology* of the late Dr. Charles Hodge—*clarum et venerabile nomen*—in Dr. A. A. Hodge's *Commentary on the Confession of Faith*, and in a suggestive and sagacious article on *Inspiration* written by Dr. A. A. Hodge and Dr. Warfield for the *Princeton Review*, April, 1881. It is the doctrine of Scripture to be found in these treatises that is to be contrasted with that held by the Reformers.

If I am compelled to point out a real departure on the part of these American theologians in this one doctrine of Scripture from the theology of the Reformation, I trust it will not be supposed that I have any disposition to undervalue the massive contributions to Systematic, nor the rich experimental theology which have characterised the Princeton School.

The common doctrine of the Reformers about Holy Scripture, as I showed in my former article, may be summed up under two principal and four subordinate statements. In

the first place, they held, in opposition to mediæval theology, that the *supreme* value of the Bible did not consist in the fact, true though it be, that it is the ultimate source of theology, but in the fact that it contains the whole message of God's redeeming love to every believer—the *personal* message to *me*. In the second place, they held that the faith which laid hold on this personal message was not mere assent to propositions, but personal trust on the personal God revealing Himself in His redeeming purpose—a trust called forth by the witness of the Spirit testifying in and through the Scripture, that God was speaking therein. These two thoughts of Scripture and faith always correspond. In mediæval theology they are primarily intellectual and propositional; in Reformation theology they are primarily experimental and personal. Hence the witness of the Spirit, which emphasizes this experimental and personal character of Scripture, forms part of almost every statement of the Doctrine of Scripture in Reformation theology.¹ The four subordinate statements which are really implied in the two primary ones are, as I explained,—(1) There is a distinction to be drawn between Scripture and the Word of God, or between the record and the Divine manifestation of God, His will and His love, which the record conveys; (2) This true distinction must not be used to imply that the Spirit witnesses apart from the record, nor that one part of the record is the Word of God while another is not, nor must it prevent us saying that the record is the Word of God; (3) But it implies that the infallibility and authoritative character of Scripture belong to it, not in itself, but because it is the record which contains or presents or conveys the Word of God—it is the Word of God which is

¹ First Helvetic Confession, § 5; Second Helvetic Confession, §§ 1, 5; French Confession of 1559, §§ 2, 4; Belgic Confession of 1561, §§ 2, 5; Scotch Confession of 1560, §§ 4, 19; Westminster Confession, chap. i., 4, 5. For a fuller discussion see the Preface to Luther's German Bible, Luther's *Freiheit eines Christenmenschen*, and Calvin's *Institutes*, Bk. I. vii., Bk. III. ii. 6.

primarily infallible and authoritative, and this infallibility and authority are received through faith, not through intellectual assent; (4) God has framed and preserved the record which contains or presents His Word under a singular care and providence.

The explanation and vindication of these points will be found in my former article,¹ but I may be permitted to point out that the distinction stated and guarded in the first three makes provision for the admitted fact, that the personal manifestation of God which is in every part of Scripture is given in a course of events which are part of human history. To apprehend the manifestation we must have faith, whose province it is to apprehend Divine infallibility and authority;² to apprehend the human casing or the historical credibility of the record it is sufficient to use the ordinary means of research. This distinction justifies all historical Biblical criticism or interpretation. The fourth proposition enjoins that all such criticism must be conducted in a reverent spirit, and in full recognition that the record dealt with has been and is under the singular care and providence of God.

When we turn to the systematic theology of the Princeton School, I am somewhat sadly forced to the conclusion that in their statement of this one doctrine of the Scripture the mediæval type predominates, and has thrust the grand Reformation thought into the background. I use the word "systematic" designedly, for the experimental theology of these American divines is richly evangelical, and their experimental use of Scripture is quite free from the mediæval taint.

This approximation to the mediæval type comes out in four ways—in the purely intellectual apprehension which they have of Scripture, in their reduction of the real dis-

¹ EXPOSITOR, Oct., 1894, p. 250 ff.

² Westminster Confession of Faith, chap. xiv. 2.

inction between the Word of God and Scripture to a merely formal difference, in their formal as opposed to a religious reading of the thoughts of the infallibility and authority of Scripture, and in their still more formal relegation of the strict infallibility of Scripture to unknown and unknowable original autographs of the Scripture records.

1. *Their purely intellectual apprehension of Scripture.* We are told, for example, that the main object in revelation is the communication of knowledge, and that the object in inspiration is to secure infallibility in teaching. The effect of revelation is to make men wiser, and of inspiration to preserve the recipient from error in teaching.¹ Then, as if to make the change of view from Reformation theology more emphatic, Dr. Hodge omits in his quotations from the reformed creeds, which introduce the chapter on the Protestant Rule of Faith, those portions which include the thought of the witness of the Spirit as an integral part of the doctrine of Scripture. He omits the fifth paragraph of the Second Helvetic Confession, the fourth paragraph of the French Confession, and the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the Westminster Confession.² He does not ignore this distinctively Reformation doctrine altogether. He brings it forward more than once, especially when confuting the idea that Scripture is to be received on the authority of the Church,³ and when he turns from systematic to experimental theology, as in a powerful essay on the *Ground of Faith in Scripture*.⁴ But this supreme thought of the witness of the Spirit, which marked the personal as opposed to the merely intellectual idea of Scripture introduced by the Reformers, is not made a distinctive and essential part of the doctrine of Scripture. It is not used to make clear the supreme contention of the

¹ Hodge, *Systematic Theology*, ed. of 1871, p. 155.

² *Ibid.*, pp. 151, 152.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 129.

⁴ *Essays and Reviews*, p. 183 ff., cf. *Way of Life*.

Reformers, that the Bible is above all things a record of God's personal dealing in deeds and by words with the saints of old, and therefore with us. On the contrary revelation is treated as if it were concerned mainly if not entirely with the communication of knowledge, which consists of doctrines, facts and precepts. I do not mean to say that the Reformers did not find a communication of knowledge in the Holy Scriptures, and that passages cannot be extracted from their writings which are similar to what is asserted by the Princeton School. But their universal thought is that all such passages describe Scripture not in its primary but in its secondary aspect, and their universal contention is that Scripture is above all things the record of God's words and deeds of love to the saints of old, and of the answer of their inmost heart to God. It is this personal manifestation of God which is the main thing: the knowledge which comes along with that manifestation is important, and makes men wise *unto salvation*; but the doctrine comes from and through the promise, not the promise in and through the doctrine. To say that the main object in revelation is to make men wiser, instead of saying that it is to give personal manifestation of God and the possibility of blessed personal communion with Him, is exactly what Thomas Aquinas declares, when he tells us that "our faith (intellectual assent) rests on the revelations made to the prophets and apostles who wrote the canonical books." The mediæval theologian is consistent, for he thinks that salvation is possible by the existence of a doctrine "*per revelationem de iis quae hominis captum excedunt et nonnullis etiam aliis quae humana ratione investigari possunt.*"¹ The rich experimental theology of the Princeton School, while it has not saved them from the formalist idea that the Bible

¹ Dr. Hodge and Dr. Warfield contentedly place a quotation from the Council of Trent alongside of extracts from Reformed Creeds, as if Scripture meant the same thing in Roman Catholic and in Reformation theology, *Princeton Review*, II. p. 240.

gives us mainly information which can be worked up into doctrines, is certainly free from the corresponding formal thought that man is saved by assenting to the gospel stated in the form of propositions. Yet the two ideas are correlative, and the logical consequence of thrusting the personal element in Scripture into the background is the presentation of Christ in the form of a doctrine rather than of a personal Saviour, and the transformation of faith into assent to a proposition instead of personal trust in a personal Saviour.

2. *Their reduction of the real distinction between the Word of God and Scripture to a really formal difference.* Scripture is the Word of God. This is a genuine Reformation thought. It is because Scripture is the Word of God that it is authoritative and infallible. But the sense put on these declarations depends on the force of the copula *is*, which some theologians insist on reading, as Luther read it in the phrase, "This is MY BODY." The Reformers, however, did not use the copula *is* to denote logical identity. They made it clear that while they could honestly and earnestly say that Scripture is the Word of God, they could nevertheless make a real distinction between the two. Zwingli's use of *Evangelium*, whose sum is, "that our Lord Jesus Christ, the very Son of God, has revealed to us the will of the Heavenly Father, and with His innocence has redeemed us from death and reconciled us to God."¹ Calvin's phrase, "that the word itself, *however conveyed to us*, is like a mirror in which faith may behold God";² the use made in the Scots' Confession of the "Revelation of the Promise";³ the way in which Reformed creeds and other subordinate standards interpreted the copula by such words as *contains*, *presents*, *conveys*, *records*, all show that there was a real distinction in the minds of the Reformers between the Word of God and Scripture.

¹ Zurich Articles of 1523. Art. i. 2.

² *Inst.*, III. ii. 6.

³ Art. iv.

What this distinction is, can be seen in the Westminster Confession of Faith.¹ The Word of God consists of God's commands, threatenings, promises, and, above all, of the Gospel offer of Christ to us, and these are conveyed to us in every part of Scripture. These, and none other, are the things which faith receives as infallibly true and authoritative, and neither the Westminster nor any other Reformed Confession recognises an infallibility and authority which is apprehended otherwise than by faith.

It is somewhat difficult to say whether theologians of the Princeton School recognise this real distinction between the Word of God and Scripture. After careful study of the article by Dr. Hodge and Dr. Warfield, I have come to the conclusion that they do not see any but a merely formal difference. Some passages in that article might lead to an opposite conclusion,² but their purely intellectual idea of Scripture, and the use of italics and small capitals on other pages, have reluctantly compelled me to believe that they do not believe what the Reformers so definitely taught. In reading the article, I was constantly reminded of Luther at Marburg. He chalked *HOC EST CORPUS MEUM* on a table, and whenever Zwingli offered any explanation of the word *est*, he simply repeated the words. They print "The Scriptures ARE THE WORD OF GOD," and the phrase with its capital letters comes in regularly like a refrain. Dr. Hodge's strange explanation of the section of the Westminster Confession (xiv. 2) confirms this view.³ He actually says there, that we must first settle what books belong to the canon of Scripture before we can accept with faith the whole Word of God. He makes faith include: *first*, assent to propositions; and *secondly*, trust in a personal Christ, making in genuine mediæval fashion the

¹ xiv. 2.

² *Presbyterian Review*, vol. ii., cf. pp. 227-229.

³ *Commentary on the Conf. of Faith*. Ed. 1870, pp. 204-7.

promise come from the doctrine, and not the doctrine from the promise.

The Reformers had a vital religious interest in the distinction which is ignored by the Princeton School. All were agreed that Scripture was the Word of God—mediæval theologians as well as Reformers—but the mediæval Church understood God's Word to mean an intellectual revelation giving information about Christian doctrine and precept, and looked in Scripture for that alone, and where no intellectual mysteries were plainly seen produced them out of "dead histories" by allegorical interpretation. The Reformers, on the other hand, regarded God's Word as the sum of His saving activity manifesting itself in a personal converse with man, and saw in Scripture the story of God's dealings with the saints of old which can never be a dead history. Jesus Christ was not merely the Teacher sent from God. He was the Saviour who came to accomplish man's salvation; and God's Word was the opening up of what was in God's heart, the declaration in deed as well as in word of the eternal love on which alone man can rest. This communion between God and man is seen throughout all Scripture which records or conveys it—but the communion is one thing and the record is another.

3. *Their formal as opposed to a religious idea of the infallibility and authority of Scripture.* According to the Princeton School, the infallibility and authority or Divine authorship of the Bible seem to depend on its being an errorless record of matters God designs to communicate, and this inerrancy is due to a continued superintendence of God. This superintendence they call Inspiration. This is very clearly put in the admirable article by Dr. Hodge and Dr. Warfield already referred to, and it seems also taught in the Systematic Theology of Dr. Charles Hodge.¹ The article in the *Princeton Review* is deservedly cele-

¹ *Presbyterian Review*, vol. ii., p. 232. *Systematic Theology*, i., pp. 153, 155.

brated. It is written with great breadth of view, and is one of the ablest treatises on the special theory of Inspiration it defends that can be met with in the round of modern theology. The authors select one of the many theories of Inspiration, define it clearly, and proceed to apply their definition with great skill and sagacity. According to these writers, it would appear that Inspiration largely takes the place of the old reformed doctrine of Scripture, and in this they follow Dr. Charles Hodge, who devotes a few lines to the doctrine of Scripture, and nearly thirty pages to a doctrine of Inspiration. Inspiration is thus defined—"God's continued work of superintendence by which, His providential gracious and supernatural contributions having been presupposed, He presided over the sacred writers in their entire work of writing with the design and effect of rendering that writing an errorless record of the matters He designed them to communicate, and hence constituting the entire volume in all its parts the Word of God to us." The essence of Inspiration, we are told, is superintendence, a superintendence exercised upon the writers of Scripture by the Holy Spirit, and the result of this superintendence is to secure a book free from all error, whether of fact, or precept, or doctrine. This inerrancy is infallibility, and this infallibility gives Scripture its authority and testifies to its Divine Authorship.

It is not quite certain whether the authors of the article mean to use the technical term "inspired" to denote the writers of Scripture or the works written by them. They would probably apply it to both, but primarily to the writers. The writers were under the superintendence of the Holy Spirit, and the books were written by men under this superintendence. What corresponds to inspiration in the writers is inerrancy in the writings. Thus the inerrancy of Scripture is its characteristic, which is the test both of its infallibility and of its Divine origin. We are, of

course, told that the truth of Christianity is independent of Inspiration. "Revelation came in large part before the record of it, and the Christian Church before the New Testament";¹ but the truth of Christianity is one thing and Scripture is another, and it is Scripture that we are now concerned with.

I trust that I have not misrepresented the theory I am trying to state. If not, then the special and distinctive characteristic of Scripture is inerrancy; and when we speak of the infallibility of the Bible, we mean that it contains not even the slightest or most trivial error. Now I ask, is this a theory which can be called religious in the deepest sense of the word? Inerrancy makes no appeal to heart or conscience. It cannot touch the deep springs of sinful human nature. I do not mean to discuss the question of fact. For my own part, I do not care to use "error" as applied to the Bible, but this whole question of the formal inerrancy of Scripture seems to me to be trivial in the extreme. My sense of the infallibility of the Bible is in no way affected by the knowledge that while the author of the Second Book of Samuel says that David bought the threshing floor and oxen of Ornan for fifty shekels of silver, the author of the First Book of Chronicles says that the price was 600 shekels of gold.² I say simply that there is some discrepancy here: how the mistake arose I do not know and I do not much care (*nec anxie laboro*).³ I do not go to Scripture to learn the price of threshing floors and oxen. I go to learn God's wonderful dealings with David, to see the sins, and repentance, and faith, of the man after God's own heart. The purchase of the threshing floor has its place in all this. It is no bit of dead history. It is part of David's biography, and that is all living to me because throughout it all God is with him, promising, commanding,

¹ *Princeton Review*, ii. p. 227.

² 2 Sam. xxxiv. 24; 1 Chron. xxi. 35.

³ Calvin, Com. on Matt. xxvii. 9.

comforting, warning, so that we see how throughout all Jehovah is his covenant God. The small verbal discrepancies, errors if you will, in Samuel and Chronicles are nothing to me: formal inerrancy, if proved, would not make these works more a part of Scripture than they are at present. Infallibility does not consist in formal inerrancy at all, but in the power which compels me to know that God is through this Scripture speaking to me now as He spoke not merely *by* the prophets and holy men of old, but *to* them and in them, and giving me through them in word and picture the message of His salvation.

But whatever my private opinions may be, the formal idea of infallibility which makes it to consist in verbal inerrancy was not that of the Reformers, nor is it the view of the Westminster Confession. The Reformers did not take Inspiration to mean a Divine superintendence exercised over the writers of Scripture in order to produce an errorless record. When they spoke of Inspiration in a strictly technical sense, they applied it to the writings and not to the writers of Scripture. It was the writing that was *theopneustos*, breathed of God, or inspired. This is the use of the word in all the Reformed Confessions, and is its use in the Westminster Confession of Faith. The Canonical Scriptures are inspired, the Apocrypha are not: the Scriptures in the original tongue are immediately inspired, versions are mediately inspired.¹ The use of the word in the Confession follows strictly its use in the proof-text, which tells us how to profit by every inspired Scripture. The universal line of thought is that Scripture is inspired because it conveys the authoritative and infallible Word of God: it is not infallible and authoritative because it is inspired. Hence in the Reformed statements on the doctrine of Scripture, whether in the writings of theologians or in creeds, a theory of Inspiration is seldom

¹ West. Conf., I. 2, 3, 8.

or never given, and what fills the place which that now occupies in the writings of the Princeton School is the doctrine of the witness of the Spirit. The space occupied by their theory of Inspiration proves how thoroughly the Princeton theologians have abandoned the religious for a formal estimate of Scripture. For with the Reformers it is the Word of God which is primarily infallible and authoritative, and Scripture or the record is infallible and authoritative only because it is the record of the infallible Word. The Princeton theory of Inspiration is an attempt to bestow on Scripture, primarily and in itself, qualities which it really possesses, but possesses only because it is the record of God's words to men and of his dealings with them.

Calvin does not require a theory of Divine superintendence which has for its object to produce an errorless record. He asks in the *Institutes* how we can get at the complete credibility and authority of Scripture, and answers that we can only do so when we learn that God is the Author. Then he shows in that wonderful seventh chapter of his how we get this knowledge, and ends by saying, "Let it be considered, then, as an undeniable truth, that they who have been inwardly taught by the Spirit feel an entire acquiescence in the Scripture, and that it is self-authenticated, carrying with it its own evidence, and ought not to be made the subject of demonstration and arguments from reason; but *it obtains the credit which it deserves with us by the testimony of the Spirit.*"¹ The Scriptures are infallible and authoritative because the witness of the Spirit in and with the Word in our hearts, assures us that in these Scriptures God still speaks to us; or, as the old Scotch Confession says in Scripture, the "true kirk alwaies heares and obeyes the voice of her awin Spouse and Pastor."² This is a religious theory of infallibility and authority very different from the merely

¹ *Instit.*, i. 7, 5.

² Art. 19.

formal ideas of the Princeton School, and it is the doctrine of the Westminster Confession, which says that the infallibility of Scripture is something recognised by faith. Faith is not required to recognise inerrancy. Inerrancy, if it exists, is merely a matter of fact to be recognised by the ordinary reason. But the infallibility which compels the conviction that God is speaking to us infallibly, telling us that if we hear and accept this Saviour we shall infallibly be saved, requires faith. And that is the infallibility which the Bible possesses and which man needs.

Of course the Scriptures must be a suitable record of the Divine Revelation, and the Westminster Confession, following in the footsteps of the Reformers, has a theory of Divine superintendence exercised over this record. It is a very different kind of superintendence, however, from that assumed by the Princeton School in their singular theory of Inspiration. Its object was not to ensure a formally errorless record, nor did it cease when the writers had finished the original autographs of the Scriptural writings. It is now going on, and is to go on "in all ages." The Scriptures have been framed and preserved in such a way under "the singular care and providence of God" that they are suited for whatever use God assigns them to have among men.¹ They have been preserved in such a fashion that the Church has had "in all ages" a "pure and authentic" record of the Word of God. If it be asked how such terms can be applied to a record which gives two different accounts of the price paid for the threshing floor of Ornan, or how we can trust a record in the greater things which leaves us in doubt about some small matters of fact, we can only answer that God has not withheld from this imperfect record the witness of His Spirit, commending it to us as His own pure authentic and infallible declaration of redeeming love, and as His own

¹ Chap. i. 8.

perfect rule of faith and life. Formal inerrancy is not required to make Scripture the pure and authentic Word of God. That this singular care and providence has been exercised, is abundantly evident in the history of the Scripture records; may I say that we can now discern its workings in the Textual and Historical interpretation of Scripture which are features of our age?

4. *Their still more formal relegation of the strict infallibility of Scripture to unknown and unknowable original autographs of Scripture.* The Princeton School practically infers that the Scriptures as we have them now are not a formally errorless record. They do so with certain reservations in which most people will agree. They point out the marvellous and minute accuracy in all manner of historical and geographical details which characterise the Holy Scriptures, and which give them a unique position among writings which have descended to us from a remote past.¹ They lay down some simple canons for testing so-called errors or mistakes, and with most of these I thoroughly agree.² They are indignant with critics who do not judge Scripture as they would other books, perhaps forgetting that the claim they themselves make for absolute inerrancy may have something to do in provoking what they object to. But when all is said they are bound to admit that the attribute of formal inerrancy does not belong to the Scriptures which we now have, but to what they call "the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs" of Scripture when these are interpreted in their natural and intended sense.³ It follows that the Scriptures as we now have them are neither infallible nor inspired in their use of these words. This is not an inference drawn from their writings by a hostile critic. It is frankly and courageously said by themselves, "We do not assert that the common text, but

¹ *Princeton Review*, ii. pp. 250, 251.

² *Ibid.*, ii. pp. 245-6.

³ *Ibid.*, ii. p. 238.

only that the original autographic text was inspired." The statement is deliberately made by Dr. Hodge and Dr. Warfield.¹ This is a very grave assertion, and shows to what lengths the School are driven to maintain their theory, and it is one which cannot fail, if seriously believed and thoroughly acted upon, to lead to sad conclusions both in the theological doctrine of Scripture and in the practical work of the Church. It shows where necessity drives men who start with ignoring the great Reformation thought, and go back to the mediæval idea of what Scripture is. The mediæval Church began with the idea that what was given in Scripture was accurate information on doctrine and morals and the Roman Catholic Church has ended with an errorless Scripture, the Vulgate, where inerrancy is guaranteed by the authority of the Church. Where are we to get our errorless Scripture? In the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs. Who are to recover these for us? I suppose the band of experts in textual criticism who are year by year giving us the materials for a more perfect text. Are they to be created by-and-by when their labours are ended into an authority doing for Protestants what the "Church" does for Roman Catholics? Are they to guarantee for us the inspired and infallible Word of God, or are we to say that the unknown autographs are unknowable, and that we can never get to this Scripture, which is the only Scripture inspired and infallible in the strictly formal sense of those words as used by the Princeton School? I have a great respect for textual and historical Biblical critics, and have done my share in a humble way to obtain a recognition of their work, but I for one shall never consent to erect the scholars whom I esteem into an authority for that text of Scripture which is alone inspired and infallible. That, however, is what this formalist theory is driving us to if we submit to it.

¹ *Princeton Review*, ii. p. 245.

I maintain, with all the Reformers, and with all the Reformed Creeds, that the Scriptures, *as we now have them*, are the inspired and infallible Word of God, and that all textual criticism, while it is to be welcomed in so far as it brings our present text nearer the *ipsissima verba* of the original autographs, will not make the Scriptures one whit more inspired or more infallible in the true Scriptural and religious meanings of those words than they are now; for infallibility is not formal inerrancy, but what produces the conviction of infallibly saving power. It is because I believe that the Bible *as we now have it* is the inspired and infallible Word of God that I can take it as my guide for this life and for the life beyond; that I can preach from it; that I can put it into the hands of unbelievers, and of heathen. And if I am asked why I receive Scripture as the Word of God and as the perfect rule of faith and life, then certainly I do not answer: Because it is the slightly imperfect copy of original autographs, which, if I could only get at them, I could show you to be absolutely errorless writings. I answer—Because the Bible is the only record of the redeeming love of God, because in the Bible alone I find God drawing near to man in Christ Jesus, and declaring to us in Him His will for our salvation. And this record I know to be true by the witness of His Spirit in my heart in and with the Word, whereby I am assured that none other than God Himself is able to speak such words to my soul. This is the answer of all the Reformers, and it was also the answer of the Puritans—of Luther, and Calvin, and Knox, and John Owen. It is the answer of Dr. Charles Hodge himself when he is not writing formal systematic but experimental theology,¹ when he is dealing not with theological formulæ but with living men and women.

THOMAS M. LINDSAY.

¹ Cf. Hodge: *Way of Life*.

SELF-POSSESSION AND EFFECTUAL SERVICE.

A SERENE and undistracted temper is necessary, not only for the man who is chosen to be a recipient of Divine revelations, but for the man also who is to be a messenger of those revelations to others. Courage before men is a salient characteristic of the genuine prophet, and a timid, blushing, embarrassed prophet is an impossible compound. The first apostles did much to prove their place in the holy succession by the boldness with which they spake under circumstances which might have abashed less convinced and resolute men. St. Paul recognised the obligation resting upon him to preach the gospel "with boldness."

In the chapters to which the vision of Ezekiel is introductory the prophetic office is illustrated by the duty laid upon the sentinel or watchman. For such work the power of calm, unerring discernment is indispensable. One set apart to this momentous task must be self-collected, able to see clearly, having all his wits under control as well as stout in heart to peal promptly out the unhesitating note of warning. The recruit who has the slightest tendency to hysteria or hallucination, who is inclined to be unduly sanguine or unduly depressed, who may be carried away by panic, struck dumb by strange spectacles, frightened out of his wits by phantom forms or phantom voices, is not the man for the post. He must be master of himself, able to see with his own eyes, to trust the correctness of his own judgments, to hold his own in the world.

Unless a man can have self-command, or at least acquire it by discipline, he is unfit to be God's watchman. The nervous prophet, the self-deprecating herald, the apostle who allows himself to be overborne by the clamour of the world, stultifies his own mission and does not a little to discredit his message.

Presence of mind or self-possession is often a secret of success in common things. In not a few vocations the cool head and uniform self-command are essential to life itself. The man who works at a perilous post on the wharf or in the shipyard, the signalman, the pointsman, the porter who has to cross the line when trains are coming in opposite directions, the commander of the ironclad, the pilot, the surgeon who undertakes critical operations, the advocate who has to win a verdict, must all be self-possessed, alert for every emergency, able to mobilise the wits at a moment's notice, apt to deal with the unexpected when it springs up. In fact, it would be a crime in such cases to lack the art of self-possession, and it is a duty to have it. Sooner or later occasions come to all of us when everything turns upon having ourselves well in hand, never allowing the lapse into momentary forgetfulness, never permitting the mind or the senses to be shocked into inaction. A man must have confidence in the art he has assumed, and in his own aptitude for applying the principles of his art, and above all in the truths to the promulgation of which his art is to contribute. He who has a modest faith in his own resources, be they natural or spiritual, will inspire some degree of that faith into others. If the actor in important events is discomposed, agitated, ill at ease, whilst entering upon his work, not only do the observers find themselves infected with the same temper as they watch him, but they tremble for the results. The man never inspires confidence who cannot command his own faculties at the moment, however vast the stores of knowledge and power with which popular rumour may credit him. It is the working capital in actual view which assures rather than the unrealisable reserves and assets.

We cannot persuade others till we ourselves are not only persuaded, but so absorbed by the subject-matter of our persuasion that all the powers of the mind rise up to em-

phasise it. The duty of self-command implies very much more than subjecting our bad passions to the control of the will; and if we do not learn self-command in the widest possible sense of the term, we inevitably weaken our effectiveness for good. The wisest man is just as much disqualified by fluttered moods and weak wavering accents from swaying others as the ignorant or the imbecile. This lack of robust self-collectedness makes some men ciphers who might be factors of surpassing potency. At critical moments they cannot bring their faculties into action. When the occasion comes their thoughts seem to crack and sink away like thin ice. Coherence goes and the pre-arranged demonstration flies into the frailest splinters or disappears altogether. Nervous embarrassment, inability to bring our best gifts into action at the call of a providential opportunity, palpitations, flusterments, hesitations seem to turn our message into farce and dumb show. Again and again we find ourselves unfit to interpret, and courageously ring out the message of God's will, and others intuitively know our unhappy secret. God wants us for vessels in which His treasure shall be carried, but we allow ourselves to break up into a handful of potsherds, and men are not accustomed to think that potsherds carry precious things. Who of us does not feel that this is a source of lifelong weakness and discouragement? For lack of self-control, however richly dowered for service we may be, we are in a position, like that of the commander in a campaign, one-half of whose forces are either mutinous or have been shut up by some flank movement of the enemy. One faculty we can quietly use at will is better for practical ends than a score faculties which are not under perfect control.

Self-possession is a sign of the quietness of faith. When attained by spiritual processes it becomes a test of that trust in God which is learned in His immediate presence and extends into the daily fulfilment of the tasks he has

fixed. Without this tranquility which grows from faith we can have no power. We need to be assured not only that we are accepted for the Divine service, but of God's good pleasure likewise to uphold us in our work. There can be no confusion or embarrassment where that fixed persuasion exists. The man who is bold at God's word is bold because authority is behind him, and authority means the mighty grace which will not suffer its obedient instruments to be confounded or brought to shame. The consciousness that God is working through every part of the mind will help to keep the faculties of the mind in orderly and undistracted co-operation. Trepidation implies a suspicion that some power of either earth or hell is moved against us, and that the power which thus menaces our efficiency is greater than the power that is on our side. Sacred work is more or less discredited by distraction and soul-relaxing fear, for these things are symptoms of guilty mistrust and unfit our sacrifice for the Divine acceptance. A true faith should enable us to sway our finest powers for God and His service.

It is well to honour man as man, but that honour must not be exaggerated into an idolatry of rank, power, prestige, which debases our independence and incapacitates us for service. Respect for the opinions of others should never lead us to cancel ourselves and the contents of our own consciences. Sidney Smith once said in a vein of characteristic banter that "when he was dining with a Dean he crumbled his bread with one hand and with a bishop he performed the same feat with two, so extreme was his nervousness." The probability is, that if symptoms of that kind did appear on either side, the prelates of those days would not feel quite at their ease with the witty cleric. Some of us cherish a silly and gratuitous veneration for the mere clothes which deck out those who are made of the same clay with ourselves. We need a self-collectedness which is never nonplussed by pomp and parade. We are

sometimes dazed into an ignoble surrender of ourselves and of all that God would teach through us. The chased hare, it is said, may be brought to a dead stand by the sudden shouts of its pursuers, and some of us seem to be so constituted that the hue and cry of inane worldlings, a chorus of anonymous press-writers, the prance of lordly assumption in our track, will stupefy us and root our very feet to the earth. Amazed, overborne, surprised into paralysis, browbeaten out of our self-command, we are quite disqualified for victorious religious life and service. Without the quiet mastery of his own faculties a man can neither learn all he is meant to learn in God's presence nor impressively teach others. It is no shame to us that we are stricken, dumb-founded, unable to keep a tight reign over our own thoughts and emotions when vivid visions of God burst upon our souls, but it is a reproach to us that we should be terrorised into uncertainty, hesitation, dimness of perception and feebleness of testimony by undue deference to the world. The homage we pay to wealth, learning, social status is so abject that our personality, with all its powers, convictions, responsible discernments, is brought to the vanishing point. Heretical forms of worship other than those of Buddhism may land us in the half-way house to a new form of Nirvana, and deprive the world of good that should have been achieved by the force of our unimpaired personality.

Some forms of self-possession are not achieved by a dutiful response to the Divine voice which solicits our trust and bids us be ourselves and they repel us. We meet now and again with blatant, loud-talking persons who have never had to struggle against tempers of oppressive diffidence, and who are rarely at a loss in the presence of their fellows; and their imperturbability arises not from the fact that they trust God with any peculiar fervour, but from the unbounded confidence in themselves that seems to have

been ingrained from the beginning. Such men obviously rate themselves as Titans of the purest caste, and eye the planet and all it contains as though it were a mere wren's nest whose callow fledgelings they may venture to despise. Their self-possession is based on overweening conceit, and they have a comfortable blindness to the learning, virtue and experience which abound on every side, and indeed an ill-disguised contempt for such things. With brows of brass, clattering tongues and speech of unfaltering volubility, they reprove, instruct and exhort without the faintest sense of misgiving; but behind their loudness and indeed the secret spring of it, there is an inexhaustible stock of ambition, denseness and audacity, and a frivolous estimate of everybody's talent but their own. The set determination to make themselves heard, to shine to the top of their capacity, to succeed at any price, enables them when occasion offers to do more than justice to themselves. No struggle or agony or self-discipline has contributed to the result. We feel at once it is the impudence of the charlatan and not the God-fed firmness and courage of the prophet. We recoil from egotism, self-advertisement, the dogmatic cocksureness which is scarcely distinguishable from the crow of conceit; and our haunting fear of being blatant may sometimes make us forget the duty of self-control and so far diminish our power of bearing effectual testimony to truths the world needs. We must have self-command but self-command acquired by altogether different methods from that. The strength and boldness we need in speaking for God must be built up in many cases from its very foundations upon religious principles and experiences. The man whom nature does not help, and who by the power of superhuman influence alone grows bold and manly, will far surpass the other in effectual service for God.

It may sometimes happen that in the physical life there

is a barrier to that self-possession which is a prime condition of usefulness and in one case out of a hundred the barrier may be insurmountable. Excellent and high-principled men and women assume too readily that they are the victims of nervous disorder, weak circulation, faintness. When they have something to say which really ought to be said, the brain gets confused, the heart comes into the mouth, the pulse rises to fever height and the power of utterance fails. Here and there such physical incapacity may actually exist, but do not let us lightly put ourselves into this valetudinarian category or discount our possibilities of useful service. God's family is not quite so rickety as the complaints of its various members about their ailments might lead us to suppose. We may learn a manly mastery of ourselves which will make us worthy channels of God's message. The mightiest of the apostles had sometimes to do his work "in weakness and fear and much trembling," yet recognised an ideal and an obligation to preach the word "with boldness."

Let God's imperative help us. It is a Divine voice which calls us to mental collectedness, to the quiet use and control of all our hidden gifts. He would fain rescue us from our official frailties, from proneness to mental confusion, from a culpable awe of the face of our fellows, from that nervous paralysis which so often has its roots in a morbid or defective spiritual life. It is not His will to have servants who lack the note of courage, competence, effectuality. He does not desire that we should be unduly depressed by the vision of His own majesty, much less by the specious shows of the world and the glamour of a fashionable sciolism. His word is "stand upon thy feet." "Answer Me with girt loins like a man," "Fear not," "Be quiet," "Take breath." Never let us grovel before the face of our fellows and discredit our work by palpitating dumbness. The Most High wants to put us at our ease

in His own presence first and then in the midst of a proud, uproarious world. Our task may be grave and vast, criticism may be rapacious, opposition spiteful, noisy, wide-spread, but let us be calm. God comes to bring virility, fitness, large endowment and not atrophy, dumbness, intellectual paralysis.

By contact with God we shall gain steadiness, confidence of touch, firm, impressive self-mastery for our work. "Now when they beheld the boldness of Peter and John . . . they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus." If we learn presence of mind before God, we shall find little difficulty in maintaining it before men. To achieve self-command when the majesty of the Most High has overwhelmed us is a stupendous task, but a task to which we are helped by the gentle expostulation and remonstrance of the glorious Lord Himself. He gives commensurate help. He is no tyrant who wishes to cow or demagnetise us, no imperial brow-beater who wishes to despoil us of our mental forces. He seeks quietly to lead us into courses of holy reason. He looks with sympathy upon all our efforts to grasp His being and to interpret His will. The pattern of a man speaking to his friend, He makes the code of His intercourse with us, tempering his most stupendous revelations to our infirmities. His influence over us is that of reason which begets reason, and love which begets love. And when we have learned this great task of commanding ourselves in His sacred presence, making our best powers obedient to His intimations, we ought to maintain the habit in the presence of those to whom He has sent us, and speak His message with quiet and unfaltering confidence. God Himself calls us to manly self-possession before His face, that we may illustrate the lesson thus learned in daily service amongst our fellow-men.

"Wait on the Lord, be of good courage, and He shall strengthen thine heart; wait, I say, on the Lord."

T. G. SELBY.

THE OPEN EYE.

STUDENTS of Holy Scripture are well aware of the abundance of illustrations to be found in it drawn from the physical framework of man. If their study is confined for this purpose to the Book of Psalms, how fertile and how suggestive it is in its lessons! Not a limb, not a feature, escapes the poet's fine, imaginative instinct, and each becomes an object-lesson for the spiritually minded. The head and feet, the arm and hand, the back and breast, the face and neck, are not only looked at as parts of the fearful and wondrous handiwork¹ of man's Creator; but furnish types of his richer spiritual endowments, of his capacities of using them, of his freedom, alas! to abuse them. These stand as symbols of powers higher and mightier than physical; they point to analogies where the body of our humiliation lies in the background, to the gifts of mind and heart, to the processes of thought and the energies of love, to obedience and self-control, to duty and service, to enterprise and effort. But if attention is thus drawn for spiritual instruction to these external features of our bodily organization, it will be observed that the teaching becomes at once more frequent and more pertinent when our finer parts and powers come under review. Take, for instance, the senses, and of these only hearing and eyesight. Both, as it were, become vocal. Both become full of lessons to him who is endowed with them and wills to employ them aright. Nor is it true to say that the Psalmists and other poetically-minded contributors to sacred writ do but express ideas common to all didactic literature. For this forcible, nervous, direct application of the features and functions of the human body, so as to teach higher than human lessons, one looks in vain outside Scripture, where also one alone finds the conception

¹ Ps. cxxxix. 14.

of the redemption of the body. It is not to be discovered in Greek, Roman, or other literature until that moment comes when a language is penetrated by Christian sentiment. Then this element of illustration and instruction appears, and its source is plainly and wholly Scriptural, as any one may note who reads the *Divina Commedia*¹ or the poems of George Herbert. It is not a common property of literature; it is, in source and origin, a peculium of inspiration.

Thus with a bold freedom do the writers of both the Old and New Testaments fasten the attention upon the sense of hearing. Throughout, the ear is the symbol of obedience. As by its common use the sense is the medium of interpretation of sounds, whether of nature or of the articulate expression of fellow men, so, by further reference and deeper analogy, it stands as the avenue through which Divine communications may pass to the soul,—it may be in a still small voice. One might suppose, considering the high esteem in which obedience is held in the sacred polity of Israel, considering that obedience is ever regarded in the Old Testament as the test of national and individual loyalty to Jehovah, that the metaphor of the ear would occur more frequently than that of any other sense. Yet it is not so. A glance at any serviceable concordance will show that it is from the eyesight that evangelist and apostle, as well as psalmist and prophet, are furnished with their most telling spiritual illustrations. The reason for this is plain. If the sacred penman made the sense of hearing his object-lesson, it could only be one. It could only help him to emphasise the single conception of the duty and blessing of learning to obey. With the eyesight the manifold character of the teaching answered exactly to the complex faculties of the organ of vision. A concordance, better still an intimate knowledge of Holy Scripture, suggests obedience as the primary lesson of the Old

¹ Cf. Dante, *Purgatorio*, canto xiii.

Testament. The metaphor of the "ear," when found in the New Testament, is commonly discovered in a setting of some Old Testament passage. Another illustration is wanted, correspondent to the greater fulness of a fresh revelation; and this illustration, common indeed to both covenants, is Eyesight.

Ages before science had made its investigations into this sense, men had been struck with awe by it. The wonder will remain, whether one regards the eye in its adaptability to the varying circumstances and conditions of light and distance, or in its actual mechanism, or in its inherent power of expressing the emotions of sympathy and antipathy and the delicate phases of feeling lying between these. It would be surprising indeed if the sacred writers, who were not slow to ascribe the power of vision to the immediate gift of God,¹ should not also find in this sense² many a pertinent lesson for the spiritual life. The force and variety of the teaching thus conveyed are indeed striking.

Intelligence and candour, receptiveness and perseverance, faith, hope, and charity,—such are some amongst the many lessons inculcated through and in the possession of sight. The instruction was put now negatively,³ now positively, now indirectly, now directly; and no faithful Israelite, no devout Christian, could fail to be reminded in the light of the body,³ of the light not physical—the light of the soul; and thus the sense itself received a consecration through faith in God, and in Christ whom God sent.

But passing away from the immediate and direct suggestions of the figure, it will be marked as a note of Scriptural teaching that the spiritual eye is an open eye. Physical blindness is traceable to the unhappy causes of old age, disease, or accident; or sight may be temporarily suspended by the protective fall of the eyelid, or in the action of sleep.

¹ Prov. xx. 12.

² Isa. xlii. 18; cf. St. Matt. vi. 23.

³ St. Matt. vi. 22, and St. Luke xi. 34.

But the spiritual eye knows none of these suspensions; it has in some faint reflection somewhat of the ceaseless watchfulness of the eye of the Lord.¹ It is not the victim of accident or senility, although its clearer powers of vision may often be marred by sin and hampered by indolence. The spiritual eye is an open eye, full of meaning and purpose, cleansed by the tears of penitence, lighted up by faith and love. The eye is open, but not of that pitiful kind that is recognised as vacant. It is bright with significance, clear in its aim, strenuous and persevering in its direction. Since then the eye of the spiritual man is neither blind nor blank, it has certain characteristic ranges of vision, and these, so Scripture and experience alike teach, are threefold. It looks inward, outward, and upward. As its gaze is directed within, it contemplates the soul; as outward, it looks upon the world both of nature and humanity; as upward, to God.

I. First, then, is the inward look. "Know thyself" may be claimed as the earliest and choicest maxim of philosophy; but its teaching had been long familiar to the sages of Israel, as it was current in the Church of the apostolic age. What stress is laid upon its truth by psalmist and prophet, by apostle and evangelist! To look with open, fearless eye upon one's self, upon personal character and conduct, upon wish and motive, yet not in any morbid self-absorption, is regarded, according to both Old and New Testament teaching, as the first step in rising "from the dead self to better things." Herein lies the profoundest wisdom,—the first task of the spiritual eye,—to know the worst, and to know the best of one's self. It is the function of the eye to read, mark, learn, and inwardly discern; and then of the conscience to speak out as the inward monitor of the soul.

The eye first marks the worst within, an evil so general, so potent, that the main feeling is one of despair. The analysis seems to yield nothing else, nothing goes up

¹ 2 Chron. xvi. 9; cf. Zech. iv. 10, and Jer. xxxii. 19.

but a cry of heart-rending significance¹—a passionate longing, at the spectacle of such deep-seated mischief, for deliverance out of the whole scene and circumstance of its energy. But the open eye, in its inward look, is straightway cheered by a more inviting prospect. It has learnt the worst; it may now see the best that lies also within. For here in the human heart it perceives the work of the Holy Spirit, with the expulsive power of a strong affection casting out that which offends, transfiguring the affections, purifying motives, consecrating hopes and aims, ennobling life, confirming feeble knees and strengthening weak hands, placing poor, shipwrecked souls upon a Rock higher than themselves. It is, indeed, from this vision of the work of the Holy Spirit within the heart of man that the Christian faith draws its unconquerable hope. One may read philosophical treatises from Plato down to the latest novel in which philosophy is made palatable to the nineteenth century taste without discovering the trace of a suggestion how the soul of man may be aided in any upward striving. But as to the eye of the spiritually-minded, there beats a fiercer light upon the *θηρίον* within him; so he discerns in himself a “power not his own making for righteousness”; he not only knows, but exhibits the proof of the power of the Holy Ghost.

II. But next, the open eye has an outward look. And here it finds two directions of its vision—it regards the world of nature, and the world of society. It may be that the impression of nature, fierce in tooth and claw, will have its distressing features. Her inexorable laws are painful reading to those who have only mastered the alphabet. Is it not wiser to look up trustfully through Nature to Nature’s God? Are not the poets as good spiritual guides as the scientists? What is the first impression of the open eye as it gazes upon that which is purely God’s handiwork, not

¹ Rom. vii. 21-25.

touched and marred by the finger of man? Let any one possessed of spiritual intuitions take his stand upon the margin of the Lakes of Killarney, or upon some Scotch moor or beside some rushing reach of the Wye, and see if his soul is not enriched by views of God at once more large and more tender.

Again, there is the outlook of the open eye upon the world of humanity. Here, too, there are, by the nature of the case, aspects which are painful to contemplate. But instead of profitless speculations upon the "martyrdom of man" down the ages, the spiritual eye scans the history of the race in the light of the Incarnation. Strip away the cardinal facts of the Gospel, and a dull, cold pessimism is the natural, indeed the logical, attitude for men to take up about mankind. If, however, life is once invested with these facts, it not only becomes pregnant with a new meaning, but the service of man to men is inspired with a fresh and undying hope, and pessimism is impossible. Nor must the inheritance of the past be here overlooked. Time failed when the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews would enumerate the heroes of the faith of Israel; ¹ but the catalogue of the saints of the universal Church has now to be vastly enlarged. That most consolatory doctrine of the communion of saints is one which is ever increasing in its significant value. So to the open eye of the spiritual man the page of history, as "disclosing the critical changes of society," can never be quite dark, because the light of a Divine guidance and discipline is thrown upon them and God is revealed in the annals of the race as He is seen in the face of Nature. Hence it follows that Christians are not "comfortable moles"; they will not lag behind the most ardent politicians and the most enthusiastic philanthropists in watching every social movement of the day, in sacrificing, it may be, health, wealth and happiness, so that out of each crisis the life of humanity may emerge the gladder, freer, purer.

¹ Heb. xi. 32.

III. There remains yet another outlook for the spiritual eye. This is upward, Godward. It has been seen that the inward and outward look must now and again be depressing. The upward look is not merely the antidote to despair, but it is the promise and pledge of love and joy. Seeing is indeed here believing. And despite the mysteries which remain, the vision of God—that is, the knowledge of Him—is ever growing to the Church and to the individual less imperfect. The high courage of the psalmists amazes us in the thought of their distance from the realization of the Messianic hope; but they know the responsibility of clear, spiritual eyesight; nor did they neglect

“The one talent that is death to hide.”

With us it is different; and Christians are the more, and not the less, responsible because the Word is incarnate and God hath spoken to them in these last days in His Son.¹ It is their life to look upon Him; it is their life's work to help others to see Him, whose eyes may yet be holden by ignorance, by prejudice and pride. To help to reveal God must be the noblest enterprise of man, and it is an enterprise denied to none.

Nor is the upward look of the eye of the soul to God merely a passing act of worship,² but the very foretaste of His favour and His aid. His face does not dazzle the worshipper, but promises all that the suppliant asks aright. Nothing is more telling in this regard than those parables in action spoken by our Lord in His miracles upon the blind. In one of the most suggestive of these³ it lies on record that, after Christ had spoken the word of His power, “straightway the blind man received sight and followed him on the way.” The power to see is followed by the capacity to pursue, and discipleship is the true consequence of spiritual vision.

¹ Heb. i. 2.

² Ps. xxv. 15.

³ St. Mark x. 51; St. Luke xviii. 41.

Only as men steadfastly follow where Christ goes before will they win the eternal benediction of the open eye; for it is only the heart which is pure of earthly aims and hopes that shall at last reach the perfect vision of God.

B. WHITEFOORD.

JEREMIAH: THE MAN AND HIS MESSAGE.

III. IDEAL.

SOMETIMES the prophets, besides teaching by words, resorted to symbolical actions, for the purpose of emphasizing their messages. They would appear in public in some peculiar situation or attitude which attracted notice; and, when they were asked to explain what their singular behaviour meant, they obtained the opportunity of pressing home the truth. Thus a prophet might be seen lying on his side for months on the ground, like an Indian fakir, because he wished to enforce a truth which this attitude symbolized.

Jeremiah never did anything so *outré*; but he was fond of this realistic mode of teaching, and he is often seen practising it. His chosen symbols do not, as a rule, strike us as being happy or imaginative; on the contrary, they are generally extremely prosaic. But this may have been intentional. As the prophet Habakkuk, a man of the highest poetic endowment, as his book proves, took a board and set it up in the market-place, with only two or three words written on it, in which the pith of his prophetic message was expressed, so the very bluntness and plainness of Jeremiah's images may have been intended to suit dull minds, which needed to have instruction thrust under their very eyes.

Among the most successful of his efforts in this line was

his adventure with the Rechabites.¹ These were a tribe of nomads, who had maintained themselves in the country ever since the Conquest, when they entered the Land of Promise along with the Israelites, who had picked them up on their way from Egypt. Only once in subsequent centuries had they come into prominence, when their chief, Jonadab, was closely associated with King Jehu in his reforms; this was three centuries before Jeremiah's time. Jonadab had proved a new founder of the tribe, and had imposed more rigorously than any of his predecessors the ascetic rules by which the life of the wandering community was regulated; they were to drink no wine, to plant no vineyards nor possess them, to sow no seed and build no houses. The presence of an invading army in the land in the days of King Jehoiakim, however, drove them for refuge inside the walls of Jerusalem, where doubtless their peculiar physiognomy and manners caused them to be much remarked; and, under inspired guidance, Jeremiah took advantage of the interest thus excited to read his fellow-countrymen a lesson.

Having made the acquaintance of the strange visitors, he invited them one day to meet him in one of those rooms in the temple-area where sacrificial feasts used to be eaten. Perhaps he provided them with a feast; at all events he laid before them bowls of wine and invited them to drink. But at once they drew back and with dignity but firmness declined: "We will drink no wine; for Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, commanded us, saying, Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons for ever; neither shall ye build house, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any; but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live many days in the land where ye be strangers. Thus have we obeyed the voice of Jonadab, the son of Rechab, our father, in all that he hath charged us, to drink

¹ Chap. xxxv.

no wine all our days, we, our wives, our sons, nor our daughters; nor to build houses for us to dwell in; neither have we vineyard, nor field, nor seed; but we have dwelt in tents, and have obeyed, and have done according to all that Jonadab, our father, commanded us." They went on to explain that their presence in Jerusalem, under a roof and within the walls of a city, was not in accordance with their own will, but a measure forced upon them by the appearance of the Babylonians in the country.

Of course Jeremiah had neither wished nor expected them to partake of the wine which he had provided; he was certain that they would resist the temptation to break their principles. What he wished was to bring out their fidelity. Their ascetic habits were probably older than the Exodus of Israel from Egypt and the giving of the Law at Sinai; at all events three hundred years had elapsed since Jonadab had reinforced these regulations; yet time had in no way impaired their reverence for his memory or their loyalty to his precepts; and, even in circumstances of temptation, when one portion of their habits—their abode in tents—having been broken down by necessity, they might have been the more easily moved to let go another, and when the wine was proffered them by a man of God, they stood firm and were not ashamed of their singularity.

Jeremiah was impressed by their conduct, and he was empowered by God to assure them that, as a reward for their fidelity, they should not perish, but have a permanent place in the Land of Promise. They are met with down to New Testament times, and there is an Oriental tribe, even at the present day, which claims to represent them.¹

But Jeremiah's true design was an ulterior one: it was to set in contrast to the loyalty of these Rechabites the disloyalty of his own countrymen. In obedience to the word of a mortal man, these strangers had kept their vows

¹ See Streane, in *Cambridge Bible*, on xxxv. 19.

of abstinence for hundreds of years, and were still able to refuse any temptation to break them; but Israel had forgotten the law of God, and, yielding to the temptations presented by the nations among whom they dwelt, had completely forgotten the vows they had made to Jehovah.

In this incident we are brought very near to the secret of Jeremiah. The element ever present in his prophecies, whether it be prominent or concealed—the thing which explains both the character of the man and the career of the prophet—is the ideal which he had of what Israel ought to be. Around him was the Israel of the present, and he was keenly aware of its defects: it was as bankrupt in character, in resources, and in hope as it could well be—a nation contemptible and ready to perish. But this was not the Israel that Jeremiah saw. He saw it as it existed in the mind and design of God. He saw it as it once had been. He looked away from the present, back across centuries of weakness and dishonour, to a time when Israel corresponded with its ideal and had in its grasp a future of Divine promise.

Israel was the child of God.¹ A child resembles its father, and the father takes upon himself the responsibility of its welfare; no good father would willingly see his child in circumstances obviously beneath its birth and his own resources. Only, of course, if the child, when grown up, quits the paternal roof of his own accord and goes into a far country, he may there bring himself to poverty by his own ill-doing and have to feed on the husks which the swine do eat. Such a prodigal had Israel become; but Jeremiah was always thinking of the golden days when Jehovah's son was still in the Father's house and had not yet gone astray.

There is another relationship, however, which still better

¹ iii. 4, 19; xxxi. 20.

sets forth the connection between Jehovah and His people, and which Jeremiah uses far oftener—that of husband and wife.¹ In the relation of father and son there is no choice on the part of the inferior: a son has no choice of whether or not he shall have a father, or who his father is to be. But in marriage there is a choice on both sides. And this illustrates an important aspect of religion, in which there must be, on both sides, a definite personal choice. Jehovah chose Israel from among the nations by a sovereign and gracious act; from being a band of slaves in Egypt He created it a nation and made it His own. At the same time Israel chose Jehovah, abandoning all other gods to cleave to Him alone and pledging its loyalty and love forever. It is the part of the husband to provide for his wife a home suitable to his own rank and station, and there to cherish and protect her. The home provided by Jehovah for His bride was the land flowing with milk and honey, and He led her to it with a mighty hand. Jeremiah has continually before his eyes the vision of what the Holy Land might have been—how strong in its rulers, how happy in its inhabitants, how perfect in its peace—if the destiny then in Israel's hands had been realised. Gloomy as his genius is, it kindles into poetry as he recalls the promise of Israel's prime: "I remember," he introduces Jehovah as saying, "the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after Me in the wilderness."² He hears the land and all its cities ringing before them with "the voice of joy and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride; the voice of them that shall say, Praise the Lord of hosts, for the Lord is good, for His mercy endureth for ever; and of them that shall bring the sacrifice of praise into the house of the Lord."³ Of course, however, the honour and happi-

¹ ii. 2; iii. 14, etc.² ii. 2.³ xxxiii. 11: common phrase of Jeremiah.

ness of home are altogether dependent on loyalty. If the wife proves unfaithful, peace and prosperity take wings and fly away. Israel had been unfaithful. This is a kind of imagery which we shrink from expanding in detail; but the prophets pursue it with extraordinary boldness, and Jeremiah especially employs it with a freedom which makes us shudder.¹ But it expresses with great force the nature of the sin of Israel, as disloyalty to divine love and as the throwing away of a magnificent destiny.

Another way in which Jeremiah expresses the same thought is by going back to an incident of the Exodus—the scene at the foot of Sinai, when, with appropriate solemnities, a covenant was made between Jehovah and Israel.² By this act the two parties to the covenant entered into union with each other, God assuring His people that they might in the future look to Him for all that was involved in the promise to be their God, while Israel undertook to render to God all the duties announced from Sinai as the conditions of this alliance. Never by any other covenant did such an ally bind himself to any people; never was there an alliance which ensured so many blessings. But of course a covenant holds only so long as both parties are true to their engagements. Israel, alas, had not been true, and so the covenant was dissolved. But the mind of Jeremiah dwelt for ever on that primitive era of divine possibilities.

In many other images he thought and expressed the same idea. Israel was an olive tree, beautiful and perfect, and it should have had a glorious development; but it had been blighted by some unhappy accident and so reduced to a stunted growth, without beauty and without fruit. It had been planted a noble vine, wholly a right seed, but it had changed into the degenerate plant of a strange vine.³

God all the time had not changed. Though his child had become a prodigal, these are the terms in which He speaks :

¹ ii. 20, 33; iii. 1, 3, 6-11.

² Ex. xxiv.

³ xi. 16; ii. 21.

“Is Ephraim a dear son? is he a pleasant child? For since I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still; therefore My bowels are troubled for him; I will surely have mercy upon him, saith the Lord.” Though Israel has proved a faithless wife, Jehovah passionately invites her back. By the written word of inspiration He had constantly held up the ideal before His people; generation after generation he had sent to them His servants the prophets, “rising up early and sending them”¹ with this same ideal burning as a fire in their hearts. But the transgression of Israel was of very old standing. The period during which its life had corresponded to the ideal had been very short. Almost from the time when the Land of Promise was reached the process of degeneracy had commenced. The ideal only survived as the measure of the sin.

This ideal accounts for a great deal in Jeremiah, which at first awakens repulsion. It cannot be denied that many pages of this prophet are gloomy; the superficial reader tires of the monotonous and endless denunciation; you ask whether men can ever have been as bad as he makes them out to be, or at least whether they were all so bad. But this element in his writing assumes a totally different aspect when it is remembered what was behind. To quote a modern parallel, it has frequently been complained of Thackeray, that he unmercifully satirises woman, making her out to be worse than she is ever found in reality. But to this accusation the defence has been offered, that it was because the great novelist's conception of woman was so lofty and pure, that he was so indignant when she fell beneath the place for which nature intended her; the fierceness of his satire was only the reverse side of his reverence. Whether in Thackeray's case such a defence is just or not, something like it is undoubtedly applicable to

¹ Very common phrase of Jeremiah.

Jeremiah. It was because of what he knew Israel to be in the Divine mind and intention that its actual condition appeared to him so deplorable ; it was because he honoured his country so much that at the same time he despised and gloomily accused it. His faith has darkened his pages, but it elevated and transfigured his own character ;¹ and, if it had been found, in even a moderate degree, in his countrymen, the nation would have been saved.

It need hardly, however, be pointed out how completely the opponents of Jeremiah could have gravelled him, if they had been able to prove that the early history of Israel had been such as it is represented to have been by critics of the naturalistic school ; for, according to their teaching, the past contained no such ideal as Jeremiah imagined. Dr. Robertson, in his *Early History of Israel*, has demonstrated from casual allusions in the earliest literary prophets, Amos and Hosea, that they viewed the history of their race as it is represented in the Historical Books ; but this demonstration could be given with far greater fulness in reference to Jeremiah, because his conception of the early history is the framework on which the entire structure of his thinking hangs.

JAMES STALKER.

¹ Duhm (*Theologie der Propheten*) says somewhat extravagantly, "Jeremia ist die edelste Persönlichkeit die Israel je hervorgebracht vor Christus."

SURVEY OF RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

DURING the last few months Biblical literature has received some additions of permanent value. Dr. Swete has completed the manual edition of the Cambridge Septuagint, of which the first volume appeared in 1887. In this last volume we have the Prophets, such books of the Apocrypha as were not given in the second volume, the Psalter of Solomon, and the Old and New Testament Canticles. For the Prophets, the Vatican MS. has been followed. For the Books of the Maccabees, the editor has used the Codex Alexandrinus, as it alone, among ancient Uncials, contains them all. In Daniel the text of the LXX. is preserved in only one cursive, and that not of earlier date than the ninth century, and as the version of Theodotus was used even before Jerome's time in preference to the LXX., Dr. Swete has given both versions. The editor puts on record his indebtedness to three scholars who showed intense interest in the beginning of this great work, but did not live to see its completion, Dr. Hort, Prof. Bensly and Prof. Robertson Smith, but especially to Dr. Nestle, who generously volunteered to collate the whole of the sheets of the Prophets with the photographs of the Vatican MS. And every reader of this beautiful and handy edition will not only feel grateful to Dr. Swete for the enormous toil involved in its preparation, but will join with him in thanking the officers and workmen of the Cambridge University Press.

Attention has already been called by Archdeacon Farrar in these pages to *A Translation of the Four Gospels from the Syriac of the Sinaitic Palimpsest*, by Agnes Smith Lewis, M.R.A.S. (Macmillan & Co.). It need now only be said that apart altogether from questions of text and orthodoxy, this volume is of great interest to the student of the N. T., and gives us what has long been a desideratum, a handy reproduction in English of the Syriac version of the Gospels. The introduction contains an interesting account of the finding of the MS., and some remarks upon the evidence which exists for our Lord's speaking Aramaic. These remarks might with advantage be amplified.

Some months ago the second (American) edition of Prof. De Witt Burton's *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testa-*

ment Greek, was recommended to students. This second revised and enlarged edition is now issued by Messrs T. & T. Clark, of Edinburgh. It need only again be said that it is far the most elaborate treatment of the subject we have, and is in all respects most satisfactory. If the student begins to use it, he will never allow it to be far from his hand.

Along with this Syntax should be bound up, or at any rate read, the fifty pages *On the rendering into English of the Greek Aorist and Perfect* by Dr. R. F. Weymouth, the editor of the useful "Resultant Greek Testament." This pamphlet conclusively shows that our simple past cannot always be used as the equivalent of the Greek Aorist, and also that the revisers of our English version have far too frequently proceeded on the assumption that it does, greatly to the detriment of the R.V. Some years ago Prof. Beet, with much careful scholarship, arrived at the same results in the pages of this magazine. It is a point deserving of attention, and Dr. Weymouth is to be congratulated on his clear exposition. This treatise first appeared in the *Theological Monthly*, and is now published by Mr. David Nutt.

Through the neglect of the very points illustrated by Dr. Weymouth, the value of a recent work is much lessened, *The Greek Tenses in the New Testament with a rendering of the Gospels*, by the Rev. P. Thomson, B.D., Dunning (Edinburgh, J. Gardner Hitt). Notwithstanding this error, much may be learned from Mr. Thomson's translation. From the very nature of the case it is pedantic, but the apparent pedantries and overdone accuracies call attention to the precise meaning, if they do not always give us the best English as a rendering.

To his complete and satisfying edition of the Book of Enoch, Mr. R. H. Charles has added a most scholarly edition of the *Ethiopic Version of the Hebrew Book of Jubilees*. The Clarendon Press publish it as part viii. of the Semitic series of the *Anecdota Oxoniensia*. As the Book of Enoch represents the apocalyptic and mystical side of Pharisaism about the time of Christ, the Book of Jubilees is the chief monument of the legalistic Pharisaism of that period. Hence its importance. The book was originally written in Hebrew, as Mr. Charles conclusively proves, and it is virtually a Haggadistic commentary on Genesis. And as the Ethiopic version, although made from the Greek translation,

is slavishly literal, it becomes an important witness to the Hebrew text of Genesis which was current in Palestine during the century immediately preceding the Christian era. There are four MSS. of the Ethiopic, and upon the two best of these, with reference to the others where needful, Mr. Charles founds his text. But with the undaunted industry of the true scholar he has availed himself of other materials, less obvious and requiring the trained caution and perception of a critic if they are to be advantageously employed. To the delegates of the Clarendon Press all acknowledgment is due for the encouragement they give to research by publishing so costly and probably unremunerative a volume.

The cordial welcome which has been accorded to Dr. James Denney's *Studies in Theology* (Hodder and Stoughton), is no warmer than that remarkable book deserves. The secret of this welcome is mainly to be found in the confidence which is inspired in the reader. That he is in strong and honest hands he feels long before he comes to the last page, and reads: "I have spoken to you from my heart, telling you without ambiguity and without reserve how I have been led to think and feel about [the great things of God]." Nothing is more needed at present in theological discussion than a frank seriousness. We have had too much of tentative speculation: Dr. Denney recalls us to a theology that has been tested and has been found substantial. For such a task wide and exact knowledge, great mental capacity, and force of character were necessary; and of all these we find abundant traces in these *Studies*. No one, however opposed to the old theology, can throw this book aside as unimportant. We feel that this man has earned a right to speak. He knows what has been said and what can be said. To many it will be a rare satisfaction and renewal of faith to find so well-equipped and competent a theologian standing in the old paths.

There will be, however, some who cannot give to this dogmatic treatise the same unqualified admiration they have given to the Author's exegetical writings. Throughout the volume we are haunted by the uneasy feeling that the manifest strength and confidence of the writer is due to the fact, not certainly that he does not know the objections which would tend to modify his statements, but that he has not allowed them due weight. In the chapter on "Man and Sin," for example, he very much takes for granted that man is not a part of nature; but is not this precisely the

point which at present requires to be proved? That the Bible teaches that man is not a part of nature, we know; but what we wish to know is, how this squares with scientific knowledge. Again, in expounding the substitutionary character of the Atonement, Dr. Denney would have made more converts had he not only shown that this is the Scriptural view, but also shown a fuller sympathy with other views which have been held by good men and good theologians. He betrays unexpected forgetfulness or lack of his usual perception when he asks: "In what way can the death of the righteous be an advantage to the unrighteous in virtue of its relation to their sins, unless the divine condemnation of those sins which kept them at a distance from God, fall on the righteous and be exhausted there, so that it is no longer a separate and repellent power for them?" That question can easily be answered, and it has been answered satisfactorily again and again.

This dogmatic tone, which here and there somewhat mars the reader's delight, is all the more surprising in a writer who holds Dr. Denney's doctrine of Scripture. As we read his discussions and recognise that he in each case seems satisfied when he has shown that this or that is the teaching of Scripture, we are prepared to hear him enunciate a very stringent doctrine regarding the authority of the Bible. But, on the contrary, he enounces the purely subjective criterion of authority, and in order to square this with his enforcement of Apostolic teaching, he makes what will seem to many a quite unwarranted statement regarding the extent to which the death of Christ has been regarded as expiatory.

But after all deductions these *Studies* remain one of the most forcible and important contributions to theology. They are timely, and they are so well written that persons who instinctively turn with repugnance from such discussions will be interested. They are the work of a man who is at home in the philosophical ideas which enter into theology as well as with the leading systems of our own and other times. Dr. Denney's volume is one which once read will be often read. It is representative, and not only shows what one master in theology holds, but also demonstrates the reasonableness and solid foundation of traditional beliefs.

MARCUS DODS.

*MODERN RELIGION AND OLD TESTAMENT
IMMORTALITY.*

It has always been felt to be strange that the teaching in the Old Testament regarding immortality should be so obscure, or at least indirect and inexplicit. This seems not only strange in itself, when the case of some other nations, such as the Egyptians, is considered, in whose minds questions of death and immortality occupied so prominent and engrossing a place; it becomes doubly strange when we take into account the very clear and elevated teaching given in the Old Testament regarding other truths of religion and the true conditions of living unto God. The faith in a future life is so important a part of our religion that we are surprised to find it appearing with so little explicitness in the religious thought of the Old Testament saints. This has indeed appeared to some writers, such as Warburton, so surprising, that they have concluded that the revelation of the doctrine was of purpose kept back with the view of serving some other ends. This idea however belonged to the time when views of the nature and methods of revelation prevailed which were rather artificial. In the present day we are more inclined to conclude that the methods pursued by revelation were simple, and, if we can say so, natural, that is, that its great object was to enable men in each age practically to live unto God, and that at all times it gave them light sufficient for this, but that on other subjects it left them very much with the ideas which they had. In other words, it took men as it found them, setting before them at all times and in each successive age what

was needful that they might walk before God in holiness and righteousness, and leaving this to penetrate and transform other modes of thinking on many non-essential matters which they cherished. If therefore we find explicit teaching on this question of immortality postponed, we may infer that it was not unnatural that it should be so, that there was something in the ways of thinking of the people which, for a time at least, supplied the place of it, or at all events made it not a necessity to a true life with God. And we may perhaps also infer that at a later time events occurred in God's providential ruling of the history of the people which modified their former modes of thinking to such an extent that this new idea was a necessity, or that it was created out of the shattered fragments of former conceptions. Undoubtedly our ways of thinking now differ very considerably from those of the ancient Hebrews.

1. Our life now is very strongly individual, and so is our religion. Some make it a charge against Christianity, at least as felt and lived, that it is too individual, that it is so even to selfishness. However this be, it cannot be doubted that a different way of feeling prevailed in Israel. The individual was always apt to lose himself in some collective, such as the family, the tribe, or the people—he was part of a greater whole, and felt himself to have meaning only as belonging to it. It is possible that this way of thinking was a survival from the ancient tribal form of existence, where, on the one hand, the individual's safety and life depended on the tribe, and where on the other all his energies were at the command of the tribal unity and absorbed into it. The idea was favoured by other similar ideas even in the sphere of religion. The correlatives in those days were God and people. What gave a people distinctiveness was that it had a god, and what gave a god existence or at least respect in the eyes of other nations was that he had a people. So

the religious unit in Israel was the people that came out of Egypt. Jehovah was God of the people. The prophets address their words to the nation, to the leaders and rulers in the kingdom of God. It is the destinies of this kingdom that they pursue, out to the perfection of it. The individual shares in the blessings of the kingdom, but he does so only as a member of the people. This conception of solidarity and the repression of individualism is strange, and, as happens with things distinctive, scholars may have exaggerated it. It is a consideration however always to be kept in view in judging the Old Testament. It explains many things, and gives a different colour to some other things. The sweeping away, for example, of the whole family and dependents of a man along with himself, and only because of his sin or offence, was a practice due to this idea of solidarity. The children and household were not regarded as having an independent existence and standing of their own; they were part of the father, of the head of the family, and he was not held fully punished unless all that was his shared his fate. Such a practice would appear to us now an immorality, because of our strong feeling of the independence of each individual, but from the point of view of solidarity then prevailing it had not this aspect. And in the same way the tendency of the individual in early times to sink himself in the collective unity, the tribe or the people, helps to explain what seems to us the defective aspiration of the individual after immortality or life. What Jehovah had founded on the earth was a kingdom of God. This was eternal. In the days of the King Messiah this kingdom would be universal, and the people would be perfect, and the individual had his immortality in that of the people and the theocracy. His great interest was in it. His hopes found realization there. His labours were perpetuated in it, even if he ceased to live. He saw the good of Israel, and he continued to live in the fuller life of his people. But

this immortality of his hopes and purposes was not all. In his children he continued to live. He was there in them, for he regarded them as himself, furthering God's work and enjoying God's favour. So too his remembrance was not cut off—the righteous shall be had in everlasting remembrance. This kind of feeling is illustrated in Isaiah lvi., where the prophet, encouraging strangers and eunuchs to attach themselves to the community of the Restoration, addresses the latter: "Let not the eunuch say, 'Behold, I am a dry tree.'" The feeling of those persons was that, having no children, they would have no permanent place in the community, no endless share in the kingdom of God. To them the Lord replies: "I will give them in mine house and within my walls a place and memorial, an everlasting name that shall not be cut off."

There must have been times however in which this kind of immortality in the perpetual existence of the kingdom of God in which the spirit of the individual lived must have been felt by him to be too shadowy to satisfy his heart. The individual spirit struggles against the idea of being poured out into the general stream or mankind or even of the people of God, and claims a place for itself. And this claim will be the more resolutely pressed the more the individual becomes aware of his own worth and realizes the meaning of the personal life. Now in the providential history of Israel the time came when the state or people in which the individual was apt to lose himself came to an end. At the exile the people ceased to exist, being scattered into every land. But though the people and state had disappeared Jehovah the God of Israel remained, and religion remained, and there remained the individuals of the nation, and that significance and those responsibilities which belonged to the people before were now felt by the individual to belong to him. We might think the downfall of the kingdom of Judah a great

calamity, yet in a religious sense it was perhaps the greatest step towards Christianity taken since the Exodus. It made religion independent of any locality; it showed that a people of God could exist, though no longer in the form of a state or nation; it changed the religious centre, so to speak, making it no more the conscience of the people but the conscience of the individual. Hence in a prophet of the exile we find such words as these: "All souls are mine, saith the Lord, as the soul of the father so also the soul of the son is mine" (Ezek. xviii. 4). To each individual spirit the Lord stands in the same relation. When this stage of thought had been reached the craving for individual immortality would not be long in following. And by-and-by the idea would be extended; even the dead of past generations would be made to share in the blessings of the perfect kingdom of God (Dan. xii.).

2. There is another way of thinking common now, which makes us wonder how the doctrine of a future state could for long be so obscurely indicated in the Old Testament. We wonder how morality and religion could continue to exist without the support of those eternal sanctions supplied to the mind in the faith of a future retribution. Perhaps this way of thinking is less common now than it was in former days. At all events the difference between our way of thinking and that prevalent at least for long in Israel does not lie in any difference as to belief in retribution. It lies rather here: we relegate this retribution to a future world, Israel believed that it prevailed and was seen in this world. The faith of the people is expressed in Proverbs xi. 31, "Behold, the righteous shall be recompensed on the earth, how much more the ungodly and the sinner!" To our minds now the anomalies of providence bulk much more largely than they did to early Israel at least. We may detect general principles in providence, we may see the direction the

movement on the whole takes, but there are many hindrances, and the current is often hemmed, and to appearance even turned aside. In the early literature of Israel such a feeling hardly appears. In the Book of Proverbs, occupied almost exclusively with the doctrine of providence, with God's rule of men's life, there is scarcely one complaint regarding any anomaly of providence, any hardship or infelicity to the righteous or any prosperity to the wicked. The age of the Proverbs is disputed and held by many to be very late, in which case its statements would be ideal, and mere enunciations of the principle, and the fact that Sirach pursues the same line gives some colour to this view. The assumption of a late date for Proverbs would only show how powerfully the principle of retribution had taken possession of men's minds, seeing they could so persistently enunciate it undeterred by the many anomalies with which they must have been familiar. The principle may be said to be just the essence of the prophetic teaching. The prophets apply the principle to the state or people, and some scholars have argued that it was only later that it became applied to individuals. This is no doubt exaggeration, parallel to the exaggeration which maintains that in early times the individual had no consciousness of a personal relation to Jehovah. The early literature of Israel is composed largely of prophetic writings and histories, in both of which the people is the subject, and passages referring to individuals are rarer. Where they do occur however the same principles are applied to the life and destinies of the individual as to those of the people. In describing the fate of Abimelech the very ancient historian remarks: "Thus God requited the wickedness of Abimelech, which he did unto his father, in slaying his seventy brethren" (Judges ix. 56); comp. Acts. v. 28.

It might be made a question how this very stringent doc-

trine of retribution in this life arose. It is probably due, as almost all other doctrines are, to the very powerful theism, or intuition of God, characteristic of the people's mind. God was all in all. Events were all His work, and all immediately His work. All the changes on the earth in history and life were but the effects of an unseen power operating within all things. And this God was righteous, and His rule therefore in each particular event a display of His righteousness. As there was one God there was one world. His rule prevailed alike everywhere. The universe was a moral constitution. The physical had no meaning in itself, it was but the medium and conductor of the moral. And thus that sphere where retribution finds realization and which we have learned to transfer to some transcendental state, early Israel found to exist in the present world. Sin was punished and righteousness rewarded. There was no anomaly here. The anomaly was the existence of evil and that it was permitted to continue. But even this anomaly was overcome in faith and hope. The day of the Lord was at hand. It might break on the generation then living. The glory of the Lord would be revealed and all flesh would see it together. He would come, His arm ruling for Him, His reward with Him and His recompense before Him. He would feed His flock like a shepherd. But the scene of all this was the earth.

Belief in the day of the Lord was a common and unbroken faith, but it was only great movements among the nations that suggested the nearness of the day. There were long dull stretches of history when the earth sat still and was at rest (Zech. i. 11), and men's eyes failed with looking for their God. In those times the anomalies of providence became oppressive, and appeals to God to arise and judge the world importunate. When the state began to stagger under the blows dealt it from abroad, and when after its fall the people continued the "slave of rulers," downtrodden

and despised, the faith in a perfect retributive providence in this world received rude shocks. The fall of the state indeed was its most perfect illustration, when the state was considered as a moral person, as all the prophets from Hosea downwards consider it. But in the disastrous times that followed it was just the righteous individuals that suffered the most grievous hardships, and that often because of their religion: "For thy sake we are killed all the day long." And not only individuals but even the people, which, though scattered among the nations, still had an existence in idea and a consciousness, when it compared itself with the "sinners of the Gentiles," could not but feel itself more righteous than they; and particularly when it reflected that it had in it the true knowledge of the true God and regarded the world-history as a process between itself and the nations, it could not but be perplexed that the decision of the supreme tribunal was so long delayed. It was then that the ideal of a perfect retributive providence in this world began to break up. Men felt it giving way under their feet. And it is profoundly instructive to observe the perplexities, one might say the agitation and alarm, which the discovery occasioned. The unrighteousness prevailing on the earth was transferred to God as the Author of it, for He was the Author of all events. The very sun of righteousness in the heavens seemed to suffer eclipse. The reason of pious minds tottered under the suggestion that God Himself was unrighteous, as Job says: "It is God that makes my heart soft, and the Almighty that troubleth me." Faith and hope might still sustain the community, for the community had a perennial life, but the individual lying at the gates of death, unrecognised or even stricken of God, had no hope here. The question rose, Was not religion a lie? Was not the God-fearing consciousness delusive? If this consciousness refused to deny itself, it must postulate something after death which would be its verification. This

appears to be the meaning of Job xix., "But I know that my Redeemer liveth . . . and after this my body is destroyed I shall see God." We may not attribute to Job belief in what we call a future life, only an assurance of some point or event after death which would verify the reality of religion and of his religion, and show to him and men that the pious consciousness of God is true possession of God.

3. There is another point of view from which to us now the want of clearness in the Old Testament faith of a future life appears somewhat strange. We are surprised that the Old Testament saint seemed satisfied with the conditions, necessarily imperfect, of a religious life with God upon the earth, that he did not feel the need of a closer fellowship with God than is possible amidst the imperfections of earth and demand and believe in a more perfect condition of existence and a nearer vision of God. It is possible that we may have diverged further from Israel here than was necessary. The very axiomatic nature of our belief, that only in a world which is another can full fellowship with God be realized, may lead occasionally to an undue depreciation of this life, and to an unnecessary disparaging of the possibilities it offers in the way of living unto God. If we examine the utterances of Old Testament saints very numerous scattered over the Scriptures, we do find evidence of a very vivid consciousness of the presence of God with them and of the possession of His fellowship, "Whom have I in heaven and on earth I desire nought beside Thee." "When I awake I am still with Thee." "I have set the Lord before me, He is at my right hand." "Nevertheless I am continually with Thee." This consciousness of God's nearness and fellowship seems to exceed that which men ordinarily have now. We might speculate to what it was due. In some respects it might be due to the extremely emotional and the highly intuitive nature of the people's

mind, which realized God more powerfully than our minds do. It might also in part be due to the fact that God did dwell among the people in a house where He had placed His name. When the worshipper came to this house he felt he was near unto God—then he appeared before Him. And we are familiar with the vividness with which God's presence was realized and men's longing to enjoy it: "One thing have I desired . . . that I may dwell in the house of the Lord all the days of my life to behold the beauty of the Lord" (Ps. xxvii. 4). But to whatever this vivid sense of God's presence was due it certainly existed, and the religious meaning of it is not affected. That which constitutes the essence of heaven to men now the Israelite profoundly enjoyed on earth.

Not without bearing upon the question is another thing—the view of "life" held by the Israelite. To him "life" meant what we ordinarily mean by it, life in the body. Life was the existence of man in all his parts, and death was not merely the separation of soul and body, it was paralysis of the person. The person in *she'ol* still subsisted, but his subsistence had no religious or ethical meaning—he was dead. The Israelite was far removed from the philosophical view that the body was a prison-house, released from which the spirit could spread its wings and soar into purer and loftier regions. Neither yet had he attained to the Christian view that there is a perfection of the spirit even apart from the body. His view of life was the synthetic one; he stood before that analysis, so to speak, which death effects, and his view corresponded to that new synthesis which the New Testament teaches, and his nomenclature was similar: he called the existence of man in the body life, as the New Testament names existence in the resurrection body life.

But life being understood in this sense, a physical sphere was necessary for it. Hence the earth was the abode of

man, and was to be his abode for ever. A transcendental sphere of existence, such as we conceive heaven to be, would not naturally occur to the Israelite. He was far from being insensible, on many occasions at least, to the imperfections that accompanied life. Though he enjoyed God's presence, it was not yet His presence in its fulness. In a sense therefore the Israelite believed in a future life and longed for it; but it was not a life in a transcendental sphere—it was a future life upon the earth. In the perfection of the people of God they would not be translated and be with God in "heaven." God would come down and dwell among them on the earth; the tabernacle of God would be with men, and He would be their God and they His people. Then He would make a new covenant with men, forgiving their sins and writing His law on their hearts. And simultaneously with this manifestation of God among men the earth would be transfigured, and all hindrances to a perfect life with God removed—"Behold, I create a new heaven and a new earth, wherein dwelleth righteousness." And this manifestation of God in His fulness was ever felt to be imminent: the salvation was ready to be revealed; He would turn the captivity of His people, and the kingdom would be the Lord's.

If the faith of Israel had differences from modern religion it had also agreements with it. The remark is not without justification: "Not from want of religion, but from excess of religion was this void (specific thoughts of future immortality) left in the Jewish mind. The future life was overlooked—overshadowed by the consciousness of the presence of God Himself.¹ The sense in which Israel longed for a future life has been stated above.

It is evident how largely thoughts of the future are coloured by faith in the destinies of the community. Individualism is only yet half-born. It is real to this extent:

¹ *The Unseen Universe*, p. 9.

the individual realized keenly his own personal life, and longed earnestly to share for himself in the blessings upon which the community would enter—the abode of God among them and eternal felicity. He longed that he, the living man, should see with his people the glory of the Lord revealed, and enter into the joy of God with them. This may be the meaning of some passages in the Psalms, though another interpretation is possible, *e.g.* Psalm xvii. 15: “As for me, I shall behold Thy face in righteousness,” reference being to the revelation of God when He comes in His kingdom. So Psalm lxxiii. 24: “Thou wilt guide me with Thy counsel, and afterward take me in (or to) glory.” There are other passages however where such a sense appears difficult, such as Psalm xlix. 15: “But God shall redeem my soul from the hand of sheòl: for He will take me.” This Psalm seems to repose on the idea that death is universal, in which case redeeming from sheòl would not refer to life here, but to a passage of the person to God in death and escape of sheòl. This interpretation may certainly be supported by reference to the parable of Lazarus in Abraham’s bosom, which shows that the idea of a blessedness of the spirit at death had been reached before the time of our Lord.

It was perhaps the prospect or the fact of death that rounded off individualism and revealed its energies. The life of the community was perennial, but with death before him the individual could not taste of this life. Yet his whole being reacted against death, and in the fellowship of God defied it: “Thou wilt not give over my soul to sheòl.” Possibly some danger threatened the Psalmist, but his words are more than an assurance that he shall be delivered from this danger, they rise to the expression of a principle. Religion is reciprocal. The consciousness of God gives God. And the possession is absolute, unassailable. The prophets and saints of the Old Testament

kingdom of God were not speculative men. They did not reason that the soul was immortal from its nature—this was not the kind of immortality in which they were interested—though for all that appears the idea that any human person should become extinct or be annihilated never occurred to them. They did not lay stress in a reflective, objective way on man's instinctive hopes of immortality, though perhaps they may be observed giving these instinctive desires expression. They could not with the patient eye of inductive observation gather up what we call analogies to the passage of beings from a lower to a higher state, such as we may conceive death to be. They did not reason; they felt, they knew. Their consciousness or intuition of God—it was not faith and it was not reason—was immovable, *inébranlable*, something that amidst the shaking of all things could not be shaken (Rom. viii. 38).

A. B. DAVIDSON.

THE "ELDERS" OF PAPIAS.

PAPIAS says (Eus., *H. E.*, iii. 39. 3, 4) that he learned certain things from "the *Elders*," and that when any one came who had been "a follower of (*παρηκολουθηκώς*) the *Elders*," he used to "enquire into the words of the *Elders*." The question is, does Papias mean, by "*Elders*," (1) the Apostles, or (2) *Elders* appointed by the Apostles? If the generation of Apostles was born, say, about A.D. 1 (Jesus being born B.C. 4), the generation of *Elders* appointed by them in the several churches might be supposed to be born A.D. 30, or earlier (see below): and thus, if Papias was born A.D. 60 or A.D. 70 (as Lightf. suggests, *Sup. Rel.*, p. 150), by the time he reached thirty or twenty years of age, *i.e.* A.D. 90, all the Apostles, with the exception of

John, would probably be dead, and the Elders who had received their doctrine, would be at least sixty years of age. I say, "at least," because, in the first appointment of converts as Elders, the Apostles would naturally select men of authority and standing in the Church, sometimes not much younger than themselves, so that, by the time Papias was thirty or twenty, many of the first-appointed Elders would be above sixty, and most would have died. This is, of course, quite a rough calculation, liable to exceptions more especially in proconsular Asia, where some of the Elders appointed by the aged Apostle St. John might have been born after A.D. 30: still it will serve as a starting-point for an attempt to decide between the two above-mentioned interpretations.

(1) In favour of the interpretation "Apostles" there are two important arguments: (a) Papias says, "When any one came who had been a follower of the Elders, I used to enquire into the *words* of the *Elders*, what *said Andrew?* or what *said Peter?* . . ." and this looks as though no others could be meant by "Elders" except "Andrew, Peter, etc.," *i.e.*, the Apostles; (b) Eusebius, a careful critic, assumes that "Elders" means "Apostles," and substitutes the latter word for the former in paraphrasing the words of Papias.

(2) In favour of the interpretation "Elders appointed by the Apostles," there are the following arguments: (a) no other instance is alleged in which the name "Elders" is given to "Apostles"; (b) the title of "*the Elders*," given at first officially to those appointed by the Apostles, would naturally adhere to them for some time after most of the first generation of them had passed away—it being felt that the depositaries of the Traditions of the Church were 1st, "the Apostles"; 2nd, "the Elders"; 3rd, "the followers" of the latter; (c) Irenæus, in the fifth book of his *Refutation*, almost certainly (Lightf., *S. R.*, p. 202) "bor-

rowed from the exegetical work of Papias," probably quoting, in some places, *the very words of the latter*. Now here, while continuously discussing one and the same subject, Irenæus writes as follows: (v. 5. 1) "the Elders, *the disciples of the Apostles*, say," (v. 30. 1) "as those testify *who have seen John face to face*," (v. 33. 3) "as the Elders have recorded *who have seen John the disciple of the Lord*, that they had heard from him, how that the Lord taught . . .," (v. 33. 4) "Now these things not only¹ does *Papias* attest in writing . . . but he has added (more), saying, 'These things are credible to them that have faith,'" (v. 36. 1) "as *the Elders* say," (v. 36. 2) "*the Elders, the disciples of the Apostles*, say." Commenting on these quotations, Lightfoot says (*S. R.*, p. 197), "it is not clear whether these elders are the authorities whom Papias quotes, or the class to whom Papias himself belongs, and whom therefore he represents. Since Irenæus regards Papias as a direct hearer of St. John, this latter alternative is quite tenable, though perhaps not as probable as the other." We may add, against the "latter alternative," that, as to "the class to whom Papias belongs," we have no evidence that they attested his doctrine, or that he represented theirs; but as to his "authorities," we have his own evidence to show that they were the most ancient that he could procure, those of the generation preceding himself, and as much further back as he could go. Since therefore Irenæus is almost certainly quoting from Papias, and since Papias professed to gather much of his information from "Elders," it is natural to suppose that in the phrases "the Elders say," "the Elders, *the disciples of the Apostles*, say," we have the

¹ "Hæc autem et Papias . . . : testimonium perhibet (ταῦτα δὲ καὶ Πάπιας . . . ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ) et adjecit": the precise meaning of καὶ is not quite certain. If some other author had just been quoted, the meaning might be "Papias, too": but if, as is probable, Papias has been quoted, καὶ might mean "both," "not only."

exact phrases of Papias himself, and that by "Elders" he meant the "*disciples of the Apostles*," *i.e.*, the generation of Fathers of the Church intervening between the Apostles and Papias; (d) Papias says that he learnt and committed to memory, or recorded (*ἐμνημόνευσα*), certain things "from (*παρὰ*) the Elders." Now if, as Eusebius thinks, "Elders" means "Apostles," these words would naturally indicate that he learned certain things directly from the Apostles, *e.g.* Andrew, Peter, Philip, etc.; but Eusebius denies this direct hearing. Presumably Eusebius considered that *παρὰ* meant "(indirectly) from," and was to be explained in the light of what follows, so that he interpreted the passage thus: "I learned from the Apostles . . . or rather, I learned from their followers." But Papias does not say "or rather." What he says is, "I learned from the Elders. . . . *But if also* (*εἰ δὲ καὶ*) any of their followers came, I used to enquire." This being the case, the correctness of Eusebius' inference is very doubtful;¹ (e) if such expressions as "the Elders, the disciples of the Apostles, say," "the Elders have recorded, who have seen John, the disciple of the Lord," etc., were used by Papias, the mistake of Irenæus in supposing that Papias was a "hearer of John" is easily explicable as an inference from them: he took them to mean that Papias was speaking in the name of these "Elders," and was himself one of them, and hence he argued that Papias must have seen John and must have been a companion of Polycarp.

In attempting to decide between these two views it will

¹ Eusebius is conscientious, accurate, and (as compared with most early ecclesiastical writers) singularly free from exaggeration. But he is not free from errors of interpretation. For example, he infers from St. Luke's preface that the Evangelist had "diligently received instruction from the rest of the Apostles (as well as St. Paul)," (*H.E.*, iii. 4. 6, *τοῖς λοιποῖς δὲ οὐ παρέργως τῶν ἀποστόλων ὠμιληκῶς*): and he immediately reveals the source of his error. He regarded *πᾶσι* in the Preface as masculine (*ib.*) *οἱ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς αὐτόπται . . . οἷς καὶ φησιν ἐπάνωθεν ἅπασι παρηκολουθηκέναι*.

probably be felt that, though *a priori* probability and external evidence favour the latter, yet the expression "I enquired into the words of the Elders, what said Andrew, etc.," affords almost irresistible evidence for the former. But it may be explained as follows. All tradition in the Jewish Church was supposed to come, in some sense, through "Elders" (comp. Mark vii. 3, 5, M. xv. 2, "holding the tradition of the Elders"): every one must "receive it" from some preceding authority. Moses (Taylor, *Pirque*, p. 25) "received the Torah from Sinai and delivered it to Jehoshua, and Jehoshua to the Elders, and the Elders to the prophets, and the prophets to the men of the Great Synagogue." Thus St. Paul "received" from the Lord a tradition, which he (1 *Cor.* xi. 23) delivered to the Corinthians; and 1 *Tim.* iv. 6, 2 *Tim.* iii. 10 represent Timothy as having "followed (*παρηκολούθηκας*)" the teaching of St. Paul. Similarly the "Elders" appointed by the other Apostles would have "followed" their several doctrines. Now, in the special circumstances of the early Church, when fictitious documents were already current, assigned to this or that disciple of the Lord, it was surely natural that, when an investigator met anyone who had "followed," *i.e.* received traditions from, Elders appointed by an Apostle the question should be, not "What said your Elders?" but "What said the Apostle who ordained your Elders?" For example, if Papias met a pupil of Timothy, *i.e.*, one who had "followed" his doctrine, the natural question would be, not "What said Timothy?" but "What said Paul?" And in the same way, if he met either an Elder appointed by John the Apostle, or a pupil of such an Elder, in *either* case, the natural question would be, "What said John?" If this or any other solution of this one phrase of Papias can be accepted, the latter view, *viz.*, that "Elders" means the Elders of the generation preceding Papias, will be found to harmonize with facts far better

than the former. It is stated by Clem. Alex. (*Pott.*; p. 959) that St. John appointed "bishops" in many districts of Asia, and "the bishop" in a certain district is immediately afterwards called "Elder." In the Muratorian fragment the "Bishops" (*i.e.* "Elders") are represented as conferring with St. John and his fellow-disciples before the composition of the Fourth Gospel. Thus the "Elders" or "Bishops" in Asia would seem to have been at an early period a recognized class, and Papias might naturally assume that, when he used the term, no one could misunderstand it.

The date of Papias' birth has been mentioned above as (*Lightf.*) A.D. 60 or 70. In fixing this, however, Lightfoot implies that he is influenced by the statement of Irenæus that Papias was a companion of Polycarp. But it could easily be shown that Irenæus' evidence on matters of detail is frequently not to be trusted;¹ and this particular statement is tainted by proximity to another, which Eusebius rejects, *viz.*, that Papias was a hearer of John. Both are probably erroneous inferences. Irenæus may have read in the *Exposition* of Papias, "Those who saw John, say, etc., etc." From this he might infer that Papias, speaking thus confidently in the name of those who "saw John," must have himself seen John and must have been a companion of Polycarp. But had Papias quoted a single saying of Polycarp's in his *Exposition*, Eusebius could hardly have

¹ This could be proved by a collection of his very numerous mistakes. And a comparison of the remarks made by Eusebius about other ecclesiastical writers with his general silence when quoting Irenæus would indicate that, although he could not venture to call the latter (as he calls Papias) "a man of very limited intelligence," he nevertheless cannot forgive his literalism. It is manifest that he rejects the views of Irenæus as to the Apocalypse and its authorship. But, besides this, a close examination of Eus., *H.E.*, v. 7—where he gives a summary of Irenæus' "testimonies," beginning with a significant *ὅτι δὲ* (v. 7, 1) "that, as he says"—would lead to the same conclusion. It is true that he (*H.E.*; v. 20. 3) admired his high standard of the carefulness needful in copying MSS.; but this is quite consistent with a low opinion of his judgment and of his accuracy when not actually copying.

failed to mention it (in accordance with his custom). Again, in giving so early a date, Lightfoot has assumed that Papias was (*S. R.*, pp. 149, 153) "acquainted with the daughters of Philip." But the words of Eusebius do not state that he was acquainted with them, but simply that he had "received (*παρειληφέναι*)" a "narrative (*διήγησιν*)¹ composed, or related, by (*ὑπὸ*) them." If he had known them so as to receive a "tradition (*παράδοσιν*)" "from (*παρὰ*)" them, the sentence would naturally have taken the latter form. And if indeed Eusebius has used these distinctive terms in their precise meaning, they have an important bearing on the date of Papias: for he was (*S. R.*, p. 153) "apparently a native of Hierapolis," where Philip and his daughters lived, and yet he has nothing to tell as coming from Philip; and even as regards Philip's daughters, he only sets down (if the above-mentioned rendering is correct) a narrative made by them but apparently received by Papias from others (*διήγησιν παρειληφέναι θαυμασίαν ὑπὸ τῶν τοῦ Φιλίππου θυγατέρων*). If these daughters died (as Lightf. suggests) about A.D. 100 or 110, and yet Papias, living in the same city, was not old enough to receive a tradition from them, this would point to a date of 80-90 A.D., or even later, for his birth. And such a date suits better with the general drift of facts or probabilities. If, as compared with Polycarp, "the pupil of Apostles," Papias, who could boast no such pupilage, was a mere youth, we can understand the marked difference made by Eusebius in introducing the two: (*H. E.*, iii. 36, 1, 2) "Most illustrious among these in Asia was Polycarp, scholar of the Apostles, entrusted with the bishopric of the Church in Smyrna by those who were eye-witnesses and ministers of

¹ In iii. 39. 14 Eusebius distinguishes between *διηγήσεις* and *παραδόσεις*. Compare Luke i. 1, 2, where *παρέδοσαν* appears to mean oral tradition, and *διήγησιν* written narrative. Does Eusebius mean that the daughters of Philip related the story in writing, and that a version of it was orally transmitted to Papias by some one not mentioned?

the Lord; during whose time there came into note (ἐγ-
 νωρίζετο) Papias—himself too bishop of the community
 in Hierapolis¹—and Ignatius, famous among thousands to
 this day, the second to receive the bishopric of Antioch in
 succession to Peter."² Thus, too, we can understand why
 Eusebius places Papias after Quadratus and the daughters
 of Philip. If we adopt Lightfoot's early date of A.D. 60-70,
 we are confronted with the perplexing question, How was
 it possible that an inquirer after apostolic truth, of mature
 age, and living within the sphere of Johannine influence,
 took no steps (if we may trust Eusebius) to obtain informa-
 tion from the last of the Apostles, who lived past A.D. 98?

¹ The following words ἀνὴρ . . . εἰδήμων are omitted by many MSS., and are probably an interpolation.

² Lightf. says (*S.R.*, p. 150) "The notices affecting his (Papias') relation to Polycarp suggest that he was rather the older man of the two. At all events Eusebius discusses him immediately after Ignatius and Quadratus and Clement, *i.e.* in connection with the fathers who flourished in the reign of Trajan or before; while the notice of Polycarp is deferred till a much later point in the history, where it occurs in close proximity with Justin Martyr." But this does not give a full view of the facts. Eusebius *first* (iii. 36) *makes mention of Polycarp as being the Bishop in whose time Papias and Ignatius flourished*: then he describes in detail the Epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, dropping Papias: then he mentions (iii. 37) Quadratus as contemporary with the daughters of Philip and endowed with the spirit of prophecy. Then (*ib.*) he says that he can only find space for the mention of those bishops or evangelists in the first succession of the Apostles who have left extant memorials of the apostolic tradition. Then (iii. 38) he goes back to Clement of Rome in order to protest against the spurious words attributed to that author. Lastly, *after the words* (*ib.*) "*Now I have (already) mentioned the works of Ignatius and Polycarp,*" he begins (iii. 39) "Of Papias five books are extant." Thus he appears from the first to place Papias *after Polycarp* "*the scholar of the Apostles,*" and he confirms this subsequently by denying that Papias received instruction from the Apostles. His reason for placing (iv. 14, 15) Polycarp's visit to Rome and martyrdom (along with which he repeats a mention of his Epistle to the Philip-
 pians) some pages lower down, is that these events happened much later in the life of that aged saint, and they come more conveniently there along with accounts of the deaths of other martyrs who suffered at the same time, *e.g.* (iv. 16) Justin Martyr and (iv. 17) the martyrs mentioned by the latter. On the whole, the impression left upon us by Eusebius is that Papias was a comparatively young and unknown compiler who was born after Polycarp and died before him, while Polycarp's life covered so long a period and was of such great distinction that he receives two mentions, of which the first determines his chronological order and the second sums up the reasons for his eminence.

But once admit that Papias was not born till A.D. 80-90, and that difficulty vanishes: the aged Apostle died when Papias was little more than a youth of eighteen, or a boy of eight: the "Elders" from whom he obtained information were the disciples of the Apostles, and most of them had already passed away, so that he was forced to depend largely upon the information of their "followers."

No doubt this late date of Papias is inconsistent with the supposition that he obtained direct information from "Aristion and John the Elder, *the disciples of the Lord.*" But there is reason for thinking that the italicised words are spurious and could not have been known to Eusebius.¹ In the next place, even if the words are genuine, it is by

¹ See EXPOSITOR, series iv. vol. iii. p. 245, where Dr. Taylor states that Rufinus omits τοῦ κυρίου and that the Armenian version omits οἱ τοῦ κ. μαθηταί. Several Greek MSS. omit οἱ. The text can hardly be right. For (1) why repeat the phrase "Andrew, etc., disciples of the Lord, and Aristion, etc., disciples of the Lord"? Why not say that all were disciples? (2) Eusebius supposes Aristion and John the Elder to have been living when Papias made his investigations; but the supposition that personal "disciples of the Lord" were living at so late a date (Lightf., S.R., p. 150, n.) "would involve a chronological difficulty." The character of Eusebius justifies us in supposing that he would have been alive to this "chronological difficulty"; and as he takes no notice of it, the inference is that he did not have the words in his text and did not believe Aristion and John the Elder to be "disciples of the Lord." (3) Eusebius is arguing that Papias derived his information not from the Apostles but from their "followers." Now if, in two cases, Papias derived his information from "personal disciples of the Lord," was he not bound to qualify his statement? "Personal disciples of the Lord" could not be called "followers" of any Apostle, and their evidence, if not Apostolic, at all events approximated to that of Apostles. Thus, what Eusebius says, as well as what he does not say, indicates that the words "disciples of the Lord" were absent from his extract, and that they are an interpolation or corruption.

Corruption is more probable than interpolation. The phrase (1) "Apostles and (2) disciples of Apostles" is twice used by Irenæus (iii. 12. 13; 15. 3) to indicate continuity of tradition, and is a natural one for any author. Here, however, instead of "Apostles," Papias has used the word "disciples of the Lord." Hence, the first clause being "disciples of the Lord," the second would become "disciples of the disciples of the Lord." The latter (οἱ τῶν τοῦ κυρίου [μαθητῶν] μαθηταί) whether μαθητῶν were expressed or implied in the original, might naturally be misunderstood. Some might suppress it as unintelligible (as the Armenian version has done). Others might simplify it by omitting τῶν (as in our modern text).

no means certain that Eusebius was justified in supposing that Aristion and John the Elder were still living when Papias was making his inquiries—an inference drawn by Eusebius (it would seem) from the mere change of tense by Papias from "said" to "say" (a change probably introduced (Lightf., *S.R.*, p. 150, n.) "for the sake of variety"). If indeed Aristion and John the Elder were "disciples of the Lord," the probability is that from these, as well as from the Apostles, Papias derived his information, not directly, but indirectly through their "followers."

Reviewing the evidence, we are led to something like the following outline of conclusions. Papias, a native of Hierapolis, born A.D. 80-90, of (Lightf., *S.R.*, p. 153) Pagan origin, found himself perplexed by the inadequacy or obscurity of the authoritative writings containing the commandments of the Faith. He does not, so far as we know, use the word "Gospel." But he found current the "Commandments" (Eus., *H.E.*, iii. 39. 3) "given from the Lord to the Faith," presumably through the Apostles, and probably extant in writing in a form similar to the *Didaché* known by us as "The Teaching of the Lord to the Gentiles through the Twelve Apostles." Besides these, there were notes of the teaching of the Apostle Peter, taken down by his "interpreter" Mark, concerning what Jesus had said or done, but not a regular or orderly treatise. There was also a compilation by the Apostle Matthew in Hebrew of what Papias calls "the Logia." This condensed expression he gives us more fully in the title of his own book *The Exposition of (the) Logia connected with the Lord*,¹ apparently

¹ Λογίων κυριακῶν: the adj. gives a wider meaning ("connected with the Lord") than the genit. κυρίου ("of the Lord"). Lightf. renders the adj. "Dominical." Λόγια probably differs from εὐαγγέλιον in referring rather more distinctly to the words of Christ.

Polycarp (*Phil.* 7) mentions heretics who "tamper with τὰ λόγια τοῦ κυρίου" so as to deny resurrection and judgment. This points to Christ's words rather than to His acts, and so do Justin's quotations of the *Logia* in *Tryph.* § 17. The two extracts from Papias about the Gospels mention first (Eus., *H.E.*, iii.

meaning by *Logia* an account of the life of Christ compiled with special reference to His preaching and prophesying. But this, instead of being "interpreted" (as Peter's teaching had been) by a single "interpreter," had been "interpreted" "as each man could"; whence we infer that the "interpretations" were numerous, various, and non-authoritative, so that it became of great importance to ascertain "what Matthew said." There were also probably current, but not recognized as authoritative, the disputed Epistle of James, and various writings about the acts, or teaching, or revelations, of Andrew, Peter, Philip, James, and John.¹ If a gospel was also coming into circulation under the name of John, there might be additional reasons for seeking such traditions of this Apostle as might throw light upon it. Lastly, there were the voluminous writings of heretics who used the term "gospel" to indicate their gnostic theories—elaborated, for example, by Basilides in twenty-four books. Hence it had become a matter of the highest importance—for the purpose both of understanding the Didaché and the

39. 15, 16) Mark, then Matthew. In the former he mentions τῶν κυριακῶν λογ(ι)ων, in the latter τὰ λόγια. This rather favours the view that Eusebius places the extracts in the order in which he found them in Papias, *i.e.* Mark before Matthew, and that Papias first uses the full title "the oracles (or words) of the Lord," and then repeats it in an abbreviated form as "the oracles." *Iren., Pref.*, has τὰ λόγια κυρίου (can the omission of the article τοῦ denote that he includes O.T.?) and (*ib.* i. 8, 1) κυριακῶν λογίων and τὰ λόγια τοῦ θεοῦ followed by instances taken from the Gospels, St. Paul's Epistles, and the O.T. The phrase "Scriptura Dominica," or κυριακαὶ γραφαὶ is used, presumably about the whole of N.T., by *Irenæus* v. 20. 2, and *Dionysius of Corinth* (*Ens., H.E., iv.* 23, 12).

¹ See *Eus., H.E., iii.* 25, where "the so-called Epistle of James" is described as "disputed," and Gospels or Acts are mentioned as current (though the date of origin is not stated) in the names of Peter, Thomas, Andrew and John. About Philip, resident in Papias' native city, it was most natural that traditions should be current, accessible to Papias, and stimulating him to inquiry (but Eusebius does not mention the apocryphal Acts of Philip). As regards Aristion and John the Elder, there are the disputed second and third Epistles of St. John written in the name of the latter, and there is some slight evidence that the appendix to Mark may have proceeded from the former.

Logia, and also of rejecting spurious gospels and heretical speculations—to ascertain “what Andrew, Peter, Philip, Thomas, James, John, Matthew, or any other disciple of the Lord said.” To Papias, bred in Hierapolis under the influence of John’s “bishops” or “Elders,” it seemed that the best way of going back to the teaching of the Apostles, and, through that, to the teaching of Christ, was to ascertain the Apostolic teaching from these “bishops” or “Elders” directly or indirectly. In the last book of the *Refutation*, which, as I have shown, repeatedly quotes from Papias and sometimes probably uses his words, Irenæus says, after describing the errors of heretics, (v. 20. 1) “Now all these are of much later date than the *bishops* to whom the Apostles committed the Churches . . . (v. 20. 2) Those, therefore, who desert the preaching of the Church call in question the knowledge of the holy *Elders*.” These words so completely represent the attitude of Papias that they might have been taken *verbatim* out of his *Exposition*. He accepts the simple teaching of Christ as preserved in the Church, but is appalled at the number of “the books (*βιβλία*),” whether apocryphal or heretical, with which that teaching appeared likely to be inundated. At the same time he feels that the anecdotes about what Christ said or did, recorded by the “interpreter of Peter,” and the more systematic compilation of the Logia in Hebrew by Matthew, not as yet authoritatively “interpreted,” left room for new “interpretations” (Euseb., *H. E.*, iii. 39. 3, *ἐρμηνείαις*), as well as expositions, of the Logia. These, therefore, he attempts to set forth; and in order to do it, he resorts, where he can, to the traditions of the few “bishops” or “Elders” who could tell him at first hand what the Apostles said, but, where he cannot, to the successors who had “followed their teaching,” and who could give him the same information at second hand.¹ Being

¹ Comp. the language of Clement Rom. (c. A.D. 95). He speaks (§ 44)

probably (*S.R.*, p. 153) not of Jewish origin, not resident in any maritime city, and (so far as we can judge from his own words¹ and from the absence of any mention of journeys to Rome, such as are mentioned in the case of Polycarp, Irenæus, and Ignatius) not given to travel, he may naturally have misunderstood as literal (as Eusebius says he did, and as appears from *Iren. v. 33. 4*) many oriental expressions that were intended as metaphors. He appears to have been younger than Polycarp, yet to have died before Polycarp; this, at least, is probable from Eusebius' insertion of his account of Papias before one part, and after another part, of his account of Polycarp. Compared with Polycarp, he had no claim to speak for antiquity or in the name of the apostolic Elders; but the accident of his comparatively early death caused Irenæus and others to regard him as more ancient than he really was; and his *Exposition*—constantly quoting the Elders or Bishops of Asia, made posterity regard him first as their spokesman and then as one of their number: and so he went down to the readers of Irenæus as "the companion of Polycarp," and by inference, a "hearer of John." The latter error appears to have been confirmed by the fact that Papias recorded several traditions from "John the Elder," whom, in the opinion of Eusebius, many confounded with John the Apostle; and the confusion was all the more easy because

of "those who were appointed by them," *i.e.* by the Apostles, "or, in the next succession (*ἢ μεταξὺ*) by other men of note," and he describes the blessedness of "those Elders who have gone before." But if by A.D. 95 many of the Elders appointed by the Apostles had passed away, it would seem likely that by A.D. 110-5 almost all would have departed. This was probably the case when Papias made his investigations. It is possible that one or two Elders appointed by St. John toward the end of his long life were still living; but, if so, they must have been quite exceptional. It must be remembered that a man 90 or 100 years old may be unfit for active work before the end, and even during the last 10 or 15 years of his life; and this view is confirmed as regards John by the well-known tradition of Jerome concerning his last public teaching.

¹ *Eus., H.E.*, iii. 39, 4, "if any one came." He makes no mention of travelling to seek information.

two of the three Epistles attributed to John the Apostle are written in the name of "John the Elder," while "John the Apostle" is hardly ever so called by any writer in the second century, being almost always named "John the Disciple of the Lord."

EDWIN A. ABBOTT.

THE OLD TESTAMENT QUESTION IN THE EARLY CHURCH.

WE are accustomed to speak of the Old Testament question as peculiarly a question of our own day; but it is not always realised that the earliest age of the Church had likewise its Old Testament question—one as serious and difficult for it as ours can possibly be to us. So far from being novel, the Old Testament question is, indeed, one of the very oldest in the history of the Christian Church,—was, in an important sense, *the* burning question of the second century. We have scarcely left the bounds of the apostolic age before we find the Church plunged into its prolonged conflicts with Ebionitism and Gnosticism, and both of these forms of error—Gnosticism especially—raised the Old Testament problems in their most acute shape. The question, as was natural, was then a theological rather than a literary or critical one; bore upon the substance of the Old Testament revelation rather than on the books which contained it; and the solutions proposed of difficulties were palpably of a kind which the modern mind could not accept. But even here the distinction is not absolute but relative. The newer criticism also has its historical and theological side, and is dependent to a larger extent than is sometimes acknowledged on theories and speculations as to the nature and laws of the religious development in Israel; while the older theorists did not wholly forego criticism, but

struck out hypotheses, often crude enough, yet occasionally singularly anticipative of modern ideas. It is in any case an exceedingly interesting phase of religious thought which is exhibited to us in this conflict of the post-apostolic Church with the early impugnors of Old Testament revelation, and one which well deserves attention on its own account. I shall endeavour to present it in certain of its aspects, as it appears, first, in that remarkable literary product of Essenian Ebionitism in the second century — the pseudo-Clementine writings; and, secondly, in the multiform and influential developments of Gnosticism.

The Clementine writings, usually dated, in one or other of their forms, about the middle or latter half of the second century, are, as just stated, the principal literary monument of that form of Essenian Ebionitism, regarding which our chief informant is Epiphanius.¹ Epiphanius does not name the Clementines, but mentions Ebionite works (the *Ascents of James*, and *Circuits of Peter*) on the basis of which the Clementine books are evidently wrought up, and the general indications agree. It is a probable hypothesis that, after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Essenes, who from this time disappear from history, and who, even at an earlier period, as the forms of heresy at Colosse show, had made considerable attempts at amalgamation with Jewish Christianity, went over in a body to the Pharisaic section of the Jewish Christian Church, carrying with them many of their peculiar ideas and customs.² Thereafter the leaven of their influence seems to have spread somewhat widely, and given rise to a number of vigorous developments. Whether or not, as Ritschl supposes, the Clementine literature emanated from Rome,³ there is force in his suggestion that it

¹ *Adv. Hæc.*, xxx.

² Cf. Ritschl, *Die Entstehung der altkath. Kirche* (1857), pp. 222-3, 234.

³ This is the usual view, but Uhlhorn, Lightfoot, Salmon, and others dissent.

represents a serious attempt to gain for Ebionitism a footing within the Gentile-Catholic Church, whose developed Episcopacy it takes over, and for whose sake it softens down some of its Ebionite peculiarities (*e.g.*, substitutes baptism for circumcision).¹ In the same spirit, the legitimacy of the Gentile mission is no longer contested, but the credit of it is claimed for its own Apostle Peter. On the other hand, the unchanged Pharisaic standpoint of the writings is testified by their attitude of hostility to St. Paul, who, even if we refuse to regard Simon Magus as throughout a mask for the Gentile Apostle, is the object of scarcely veiled attack.² In character the work is a religious romance—the earliest example of the theological novel. It exists in two recensions—the *Recognitions* and the *Homilies*, the latter much the more pronounced in its Ebionitism—and opinion is about equally divided as to which shape is the prior. I need not dwell on the story, which is substantially the same in both recensions, and forms the ingenious and not inartistic framework within which the doctrinal disquisitions and discussions of the book are set. We have as leading features the youth of Clement, his thirst for knowledge, his encounter with Barnabas at Rome (in the *Homilies*, at Alexandria), his meeting at Cæsarea with Peter, whose disciple and amanuensis he becomes, and whose discourses he transmits to James at Jerusalem, the successive recognitions of mother, brothers, and father (hence the title), the set debates with Simon, the pursuit of the heresiarch from city to city, etc. It is not surprising that a work of this description, the importance of which has only come to be fully recognised within the last half-century, should have exercised a powerful fascination on the mind of the early Church, that orthodox recensions of it should have been published, and that

¹ Cf. Ritschl, *ut supra*, p. 264.

² *Recog.*, i. 70 ; *Hom.*, xvii. 19.

numerous features in its representation should have found their way into the general Catholic tradition.¹

The theological ideas developed within this imaginative framework are, as might be anticipated, highly interesting and curious. The centre here is the Christology, which is quite peculiar. It is given most fully in the *Homilies*, and lays the basis for the treatment of the Old Testament, with which we are specially concerned. There is one true Prophet—this is the conception²—who, changing form and name, goes down through the ages, appearing now as Adam, now as Moses, now as Christ, restoring the truth when lost or corrupted by mankind and giving the eternal law by living according to which man shall please God. The True Prophet is omniscient, sinless, immortal, fore-knows all things, and is connected in the *Recognitions* with the idea that God has in the creation given to each class a head of its own kind: for man this head is the Adam-Christ.³ Christianity, in this view of its nature, loses its originality, for it is but the republication by the True Prophet of the one eternal law. With the Clementines, as with the Deist Tindal, Christianity is “as old as the creation.” This brings us to the conception and treatment of the Old Testament. Here, in the first place, the quasi-Gnostic views put into the mouth of Simon are energetically combated, and the identity of the God of the Law with the God of the Gospel—of the Creator of the universe and God of the Jews with the beneficent God of Christ, is maintained in lengthened argument. But in other respects the *Homilies* take up a position singularly approximative to Gnosticism—one which, indeed, might be held itself to

¹ *E.g.*, that Peter was Bishop of Rome, and named Clement as his successor.

² *Hom.*, iii. 20, and *passim*. Nander, Baur, Schliemann, etc., on the basis of *Hom.* xvii. 4, xviii. 13, find the seven pre-Christian appearances in Adam, Enoch, Noah, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses (“the seven pillars of the world,” xviii. 14); but see on this Uhlhorn, *Die Homilien*, etc., pp. 164-66.

³ *Recognitions*, i. 45-47.

show a strain of Marcionite influence, if it were not that the fundamental thesis of the book is so directly opposed to Marcionism. How this apparent contradiction should come about, it is not difficult to see. Apart from the obvious historical and moral difficulties of the Old Testament, to which Gnosticism had already given prominence, there was the question to be faced: If Adam, Noah, Abraham, Moses, etc., are to be regarded as incarnations of the Prophet, or even as perfectly righteous men, what is to be made of the narratives which ascribe to them various sins: as that Adam transgressed in Eden, that Noah was drunken, that Abraham was a polygamist, that Moses murdered?¹ If, again, as Essenes, the writers took up a position hostile to animal sacrifice, how account for the presence of ordinances in the Old Testament commanding and approving sacrifices? These were stumblingblocks in the path of the theory—how were they to be removed? It is here that we come on the characteristic features of this peculiar fusion of Essenism with Ebionitism. To take first the question of sacrifice, we find in the *Recognitions* the comparatively mild hypothesis that sacrifice was no original part of the law of Moses, but a supplementary institute, intended provisionally to curb the idolatrous tendencies of the people, and destined ultimately to be abolished.² To point this moral of its transient character was the object of the limitation of sacrifice to the one central sanctuary, and of the repeated devastations of the Temple.³ In the *Homilies*, however, a much stronger position is taken up, and connected with a general theory which better expresses the genius of the system. It is now boldly affirmed that the pure teaching of the Scriptures has been throughout corrupted by the infusion of false and blasphemous doctrines, which are attributed to the spirit of evil prophecy—this falsification being permitted in righteousness as a trial of

¹ *Hom.*, ii. 52.

² *Recog.*, i. 36.

³ i. 37.

the people's faith and discernment.¹ Epiphanius relates of his Ebionites that they rejected David and all the prophets, and opposed them to the True Prophet as prophets of the understanding; and states that in this way they explained as false everything which contradicted their positions.² Quite similar is the doctrine of the *Homilies*. Over against Adam, the True or *male* Prophet, stands Eve, the bringer in of *female* or false prophecy, of error, and sin, and death.³ She is the mistress of this present world. To her domain belongs everything that is temporary and perishable—all lust, war, unchastity, idolatry, sacrifice, etc. To the circle of error introduced by her, we must attribute everything in the Old Testament which gives unworthy or blasphemous representations of God, the narratives of the sins of the patriarchs, the approval of sacrifice, and all else of like nature. Here, to use a New Testament expression, "is the patience and the faith of the saints";⁴ here is the meaning of that traditional saying of Christ, which is repeatedly quoted—"Be ye approved money-changers,"⁵ *i.e.*, skilful discerners between true and false. The canon is a simple one—whatever conflicts with worthy views of God is to be set down unhesitatingly as belonging to the false prophecy.⁶ But the *Homilies* do not confine themselves to this subjective criticism; they stay themselves upon a species of higher criticism as well, explanatory of how such a wholesale corruption of the Old Testament Scriptures was possible. The Pentateuch, they hold, was not the composition of Moses.⁷ This is proved by the fact that it records the death and burial of Moses—for "how could Moses write that Moses died." The lawgiver did not write down his law, but delivered it orally to seventy wise

¹ *Hom.*, ii. 33, 39, 47-52, etc.

³ *Hom.*, iii. 22-23, etc.

⁵ *Hom.*, ii. 51, etc.

⁷ *Hom.*, iii. 47.

² *Adv. Haer.*, xxx. 15, 18.

⁴ *Rev.* xiii. 12.

⁶ ii. 50; iii. 9, 55, etc.

men; the persons who afterwards reduced it to writing were not prophets, and so were liable to error. The book is first found in the Temple centuries after Moses; is again burnt and lost in the destruction under Nebuchadnezzar; consequently in its existing form is a post-exilian product.¹ In these vicissitudes there is ample room for corruption of the tradition, and for the entrance of false prophecy. Stripping the theory of its mythological vesture, we may perhaps express its meaning by saying that what is proposed is to test the parts of the Old Testament which show marks of imperfection, error, or defective morality, by reference to the underlying unity of revelation, which is assumed to be true, pure, and consentaneous throughout, and the ultimate touchstone of which is the perfect teaching of Jesus Christ. With all its ingenuity, there is no evidence to show that the attempt of the Clementine writers to propagate their peculiar type of doctrine in the Church met with much success.² Other forces were in the ascendant, and the energies of the Church were strained in the conflict with a far more formidable opponent in the intensely active and rapidly multiplying sects of Gnosticism. To this, the really influential heresy of the second century, we now turn.

Gnosticism is one of the most singular phenomena of the second century or of any age. The first thing we have to do in thinking of it is to try to realise how widely spread, many-coloured, and powerful, this Gnostic movement really

¹ Neander observes: "We see in him (the author), the first impugner of the genuineness of the Pentateuch; being in this, as in many other respects, a forerunner of the later phenomena, as also he availed himself of many of the arguments which, independently of him, were again brought forward by later disputers of the genuineness of the work."—*Hist.*, ii. p. 491 (Bohn).

² We find apostles of the kindred sect of the Elkesaites, with their revelation book, at Rome and Cæsarea in the beginning and middle of the third century, but any success they had was transient. They were combated by Hippolytus and Origen (*Hipp., Refut.*, ix. 13–17; Origen in Euseb., *Hist.*, vi. 38). Epiphanius mentions a purely Jewish sect of *Nazaræi*, who rejected the Pentateuch as a forgery.

was. The Clementines were at best the manifesto of a comparatively small section of the Christianity of the time. But the Gnostic sects—some of them rising to the dignity of influential schools—embraced a multitude of adherents who must have formed no inconsiderable proportion of the total number of the Christians of their day. They honeycombed the Church in every direction, and with their alluring theosophic speculations drew off the *élite* of those who sought to combine philosophy and culture with their Christianity. Irenæus speaks of the Gnostic sects as multiplying like mushrooms out of the ground;¹ but how largely Gnosticism in general bulked in the Church consciousness of the time is best seen by observing the space which it occupies in the extant works of the Fathers of the period. Heresy, to the Catholic Fathers of the close of the second century, is almost simply Gnosticism. Practically the whole of Irenæus, more than the half of Tertullian, nearly all Hippolytus, and a good share of Clement of Alexandria (in his *Stromata*, which delineates the true Gnostic in opposition to the false or heretical Gnosis), are absorbed by this controversy. The peril to the Church was indeed great; and it was aggravated by the fact that the Church had as yet no developed creed, no formed canon of New Testament Scripture, and no ecclesiastical court of appeal, such as the Council afterwards became.² Dr. Hatch does not exaggerate the seriousness of the situation when he says: "The crisis was one the gravity of which it would be difficult to overestimate. There have been crises since in the history of Christianity, but there is none which equals in its importance this, on the issue of which it depended for all time to come, whether Christianity should be regarded as a body of revealed doctrine, or as the *caput mortuum* of a hundred philosophies—

¹ I. 29.

² It was the controversy with Gnosticism which led the Church first to set about in earnest defining its canon and rule of faith. Cf. Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. pp. 287-353, and Dorner, *Person of Christ*, i. p. 259 (trans.).

whether the basis of Christianity should be a definite and definitely interpreted creed, or a chaos of speculations."¹

But this Gnosticism, which kept the Church in turmoil during the whole of the second century, was, if not exclusively, yet assuredly in a very large degree, an Old Testament question, and through it the Old Testament question was introduced in a most living form into the heart of the Church speculation of the period. In the bewildering variety of the Gnostic systems, no feature is more constant than the distinction perpetually made between the Demiurge—author of this visible creation, and God of the Old Testament—and the Supreme God revealed in the fulness of time by Christ. So essential does this feature appear to Neander, that he uses it (Baur also to some extent) as the principle of his classification of the Gnostic systems, dividing them according to the attitude they severally take up to the Old Testament, viz., whether their attitude is one of pure negation, or whether they recognise a certain subordinate worth in the Old Testament revelation.² In the one class as in the other, however, the two Testaments are held to have different authors. The God of the Old Testament is an inferior Being—limited, passionate, vengeful; while the God of Christ is the Supreme God, the primal source of goodness, and truth, and beauty. Christ Himself is either a celestial visitant from the abode of Light, who appears in a phantasmal body among men for their salvation; or is the earthly Jesus, with whom this higher power temporarily unites Himself. The essence of the Gospel is here, no doubt, imperilled; but we shall utterly miss the significance of this phenomenon of Gnosticism if we regard it as mere perversity—inexplicable craze and hallucination. Gnosticism is also, in its own way, an attempt

¹ *Organisation of Early Christian Churches*, p. 96. Cf. Baur, *Church Hist. of First Three Cents.*, ii. p. 3 (trans.).

² *Hist of Church*, ii. p. 39 (Bohn).

at the explanation of things, and the problems it deals with under a mythological garb are precisely those which have haunted the brains of men in all ages, and will haunt them to the end; the relation, *e.g.*, of finite and infinite, how there comes to be a world at all outside of God, the origin of evil, how the world has come to be what it is—so full of contrasts and contradictions, of pain and struggle, of strange minglings of joy and sorrow, laughter and tears, the origin of the spiritual principle in man, the purpose of history, the means of redemption. What the Gnostic systems aim at, in fact, in their higher forms, is nothing less than a philosophy of the universe which shall embrace within it also a philosophy of Jewish and Christian revelation. They are the prototypes of those great systems of absolute philosophy which have sprung up in Germany in our own century, and profess to explain everything. Basilides, with his powerful speculative grasp, might fitly be called the Hegel of the movement; Valentinus, with his poetry and rich mythology, its Schelling. The fact that Christianity had entered these speculative circles, and produced the ferment that it did, is a remarkable testimony to the degree in which it had penetrated, even at that early date, into the inmost thought and life of the time.¹

The point of peculiar interest for us in Gnosticism, however, in the present connection, lies, I think, in the bold and suggestive way in which it conjoins into one, two problems usually kept apart—the problem of Nature, and the problem of the Old Testament. Both of these problems lay directly across its path, as they lie across the path of every thinking man still, but the peculiarity of its treatment is in its assertion that these problems are not two, but one. There is the unsolved problem of external Nature,—the alleged flaws and imperfections in Creation, which, in the

¹ Cf. Baur, *History*, ii. p. 1. (trans.); Harnack, *Dogmengeschichte*, i. p. 199 (2nd Ed.)

opinion of many, stamp it as the product of imperfect wisdom and limited power—of such a Being of limited intelligence and power, *e.g.*, as Mr. Mill figures in his *Essays*,¹—the dark mysteries of natural and moral evil, and of the providential government of the world, which drive some to Atheism, some to Dualism, some to Pessimism. There is the cognate problem of the Old Testament, which, professing to come from the same God as the God and Father of Jesus Christ, yet presents, it is alleged, so striking a contrast to the New Testament Gospel,—moves on a lower plane, and abounds with marks of imperfection, and with historical and moral difficulties, which stagger and perplex faith. We are accustomed to separate these two problems; the Gnostic more logically united them. The Church had taken over the Old Testament from the Jews, and by spiritualising had treated it—as many treat it still—as simply an earlier edition of the New. The supreme service of Gnosticism was that it compelled men to face the facts. It stated the problem in its own way, and was not to be put off with too easy an answer. Whereas Butler meets the difficulties of revelation by saying—You find just as great difficulties in Nature; the Gnostic would reply, True, but this only proves what I say, that the God of creation and of the Old Testament cannot be the God of the Gospel. And whereas Deism, on the ground of the same difficulties, would infer that there has been no revelation at all, and yet inconsequentially postulates a perfect Framer of the Universe; the Gnostic would again answer, Yes, there has been a revelation, but the revelation, and Nature too, are the works of an inferior Being—such an one as we picture in our Demiurge. This was the character of the general solution, but the manner in which the fundamental antithesis was presented in the different

¹ *Three Essays on Religion*, pp. 186, 243, 253.

sects and schools of the Gnostic fraternity was, as already hinted, sufficiently various. Sometimes it was angels who created the world, and gave the law; sometimes it was an ignorant and limited, but not absolutely evil Being, as in the Ophite Jaldabaoth;¹ sometimes a Being purely evil, as among the Cainites, who went to the extreme length of glorifying all the wicked characters of the Old Testament as meritorious rebels against the tyranny of the Creator. But the higher schools get beyond this, as in the case of Basilides, who, in keeping with the general comprehensiveness of his scheme, does not set the Old Testament in direct opposition to the New, but seeks to explain it as a lower stage of development. The imperfection adhering to it is, indeed, still accounted for by the hypothesis that it proceeds from a subordinate, inferior God; but this God—the Archon, in Basilides' phrase—is, though ignorant and imperfect, yet unconsciously an instrument of the Supreme Power, who works out his ends through him, and by him prepares the way for a higher revelation.² The ability and grasp of these conceptions is not to be denied, and they undoubtedly exercised an extraordinary influence on many minds in that age.³ We can no longer wonder that it required the most vigorous efforts of the Church teachers to check their advance.

This conflict of the Church with Gnosticism, we may now observe, came to its sharpest point in connection with the great Pontic heretic, Marcion. Marcion proved a formidable opponent to the Church in more ways than one. While other Gnostic leaders founded schools, Marcion took the bolder step of founding a rival Church, or organized society, of his own, which came to have a wide extension and a prolonged existence. Traces of it are said to be

¹ אֱלֹהֵי קַהוּת, Son of Chaos (Herzog, Art. "Ophiten").

² Hippol. vii., 11-13: Clem., *Stromata*, iv. 13. Cf. Neander and Baur.

³ On the ability of the Gnostic teachers, cf. Harnack, *Dogmengesch.*, i. p. 191.

discoverable as late as the tenth century.¹ Marcion differs *toto coelo* from the other Gnostics in his practical bent—in laying stress on faith, not knowledge, in his rejection of cosmological speculations, and of the doctrines of the æons. This, however, rather weakened his position than strengthened it, for it left him without any speculative basis for the tenets which he still held in common with other Gnostic teachers, particularly for his strong contrast between the God of the Old Testament and the God of the New. The root of Marcion's thinking is no doubt to be sought for, as has been generally observed, in his ultra-Paulinism, his glowing sense of the grace and *newness* of the Gospel, and the keenness of his appreciation of the superiority of the new covenant to the old. But these contrasts his somewhat narrow and hard intellect now erected into a harsh antagonism. Identifying, like other Gnostics, the God of the Old Testament with the Creator of the world, he regards Him as an inferior and imperfect Being, and opposes Him to the God of the New Testament as the just God to the good.² But "just" with him here means simply strict and severe in enforcing a law; it does not mean that the law enforced is holy and good. His view, rather, is that the God of the Old Testament is a Being of limited knowledge, wisdom, and power: jealous, capricious, and revengeful,—anything but a Being to be loved. His law is a reflex of Himself, and shares His imperfections, but such as it is, He is strict, severe, rigorous, in enforcing it. The God of the Gospel, on the other hand, is pure love—benevolence without any taint

¹ *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*, iii. pp. 819, 820. On the importance of the Marcionite Church, cf. this Art., and Harnack, i. p. 240. The extensive developments of what would now be called "dissent" in the early centuries is a subject which has received too little attention. I may refer to the Montanist, Marcionite, Novatian, and Donatist Churches in illustration. Some of these were really powerful rival organizations to the main Catholic body, with a wide range of influence, a numerous membership, and a long duration.

² Cf. Tertullian, *Adv. Mar.*, *passim*.

of severity. He is not a being who punishes at all. We have spoken of Basilides as the Hegel, and of Valentinus as the Schelling, of the Gnostic movement; we might almost call Marcion, with his practical bent, his doctrine of faith, and his God of pure love, the Ritschl of the party. Marcion, too, was a critic in his own way, but it was chiefly the books of the *New Testament* to which his pruning knife was applied. His contribution to the discussion of the *Old Testament* was the composition of a book called *Antitheses*,¹ in which he laboured to set forth the self-contradictory character of the *Old Testament* revelation, and to detail its contrasts with the Gospel. If his objections sometimes touch real difficulties, they are often, on the other hand, incredibly trivial, as where he argues the ignorance of the Creator from the question of God to Adam—"Where art thou?"² None the less his procedure may be taken as a necessary protest against the allegorising treatment of the *Old Testament* by the church writers. It was again a neglected truth coming in unpleasant fashion to its rights. The Church had too much equalised the *Old Testament* with the *New*; Marcion, rejecting the allegorical method altogether, and insisting on taking each text literally as it stood, brought out into wholesome relief the contrasts between them. In this he undoubtedly did service.

The gain to the Church from this acute forcing upon it of *Old Testament* problems, and from its conflict with Gnosticism generally, was not slight. Apart from the direct stimulus given to theological reflection on the most fundamental questions of religion, of which we have the fruits garnered in the writings of the *Old Catholic Fathers*; apart, further, from the impulse given in such directions as

¹ *Adv. Marc.*, ii. 28, 29; iv. i. 36. Marcion's book was widely used by other sects: Harnack, i. p. 197.

² *Gen.* iii. 9, 11. *Adv. Mar.*, ii. 25.

the fixing of the canon, an important step was taken towards a juster conception of the Old Testament itself. We see this in Tertullian. The extremely acute and able polemic of this fiery Father against Marcion—disfigured as it often unfortunately is by injustice and controversial bitterness—has both a negative and a positive aspect. It was easy for Tertullian to press Marcion with the contradictions in which he involved himself with his doctrine of two Gods, and to show how untenable his theory was in the light of Christ's own teaching, as well as how shallow and unfair were many of his criticisms on the earlier Scriptures. The Old and New Testaments, he ably shows, are bound in indissoluble union, and stand or fall together as revelations of the one great Being. But Tertullian has a far more fruitful conception to bring to the solution of the difficulties raised by Marcion. This is the idea of an organic growth and of stages of development in revelation. We find this conception already employed by him elsewhere in the interests of Montanism. It is one which a writer like Basilides could hardly have refused, for it underlay his own philosophy. As in nature, so argues Tertullian, we have first the seed, then the shoot and shrub; then branches and leaves, till the formation of the tree is completed; then the swelling of the bud, the opening of the flower, and the growth and mellowing of the fruit; so is it also in the development of revelation. It began with rudiments; in the law and prophets, it advanced to infancy; in the Gospel, it grew up to youth; now by the Paraclete it has arrived at maturity.¹ It is this conception which Tertullian now applies with convincing effect in his reply to Marcion. Revelation has its stages; in comparison with the higher, the lower must always present the aspect of imperfection and contrast.² We need not pursue his argument in detail.

¹ *De. Vir. Vel.*, c. i.

² *Adv. Mar.*, iv. 1.

The key which he here puts into the hand of the Church is the only one by which it can hope even yet to unlock the riddles of this perplexing subject.

JAMES ORR.

THE CONTINUITY OF LIFE.

WHEN William Blake, the painter-poet, lay dying, "he said he was going to that country he had all his life wished to see," and just before he died "he burst into singing of the things he saw." It was the passion of a saint, whose heart had long been lifted above the present world; it was the vision of a mystic, whose imagination had long been exercised on the world to come. Few outside the Bible succession have been inspired of the Holy Ghost like him who wrote the Songs of Innocence and illustrated the Epic of Job. But common men share in their measure this instinct of the eternal, this curiosity of the unseen. One must be afflicted with spiritual stupidity or cursed by incurable frivolity who has never thought of that new state on which he may any day enter, nor speculated concerning its conditions. Amid the pauses of this life, when the doors are closed and the traffic on the streets has ceased, our thoughts travel by an irresistible attraction to the other life. What like will it be, and what will be its circumstances? What will be its occupations and history? "God forgive me," said Charles Kingsley, facing death, "but I look forward to it with an intense and reverent curiosity." He need not have asked pardon, for he was fulfilling his nature.

One is not astonished that this legitimate curiosity has created a literature, or that its books can be divided into sheep and goats. Whenever any province transcends experience and is veiled in mystery, it is certain to be the play of a childish and irresponsible fancy or the subject of

elaborate and semi-scientific reasoning. Were it possible to place a foolscap on one of our most sublime ideas, and turn immortality itself into an absurdity, it is done when a vulgar imagination has peddled with the details of the future, and has accomplished a travesty of the Revelation of St. John. From time to time ignorant charlatans will trade on religious simplicity and trifle with sacred emotions, whose foolishness and profanity go before them unto judgment. Heaven is the noblest imagination of the human heart, and any one who robs this imagination of its august dignity and spiritual splendour has committed a crime. Certain thoughtful and reverent writers, on the other hand, have addressed themselves to the future existence and its probable laws with a becoming seriousness and modesty. The *Unseen Universe*, which was understood to be written by two eminent scientists, and Isaac Taylor's *Physical Theory of Another Life*, are books worthy of a great subject, and a fit offering on the altar of Faith. Within a limited range science and philosophy are welcome prophets on the unseen, but at a point they leave us, and we stand alone, awestruck, fascinated, before the veil. No one has come from the other side and spoken with authority save Jesus.

One who believes in the pre-existence of our Master approaches the Gospels with high expectation and sustains a distinct disappointment. Jesus' attitude to the other world is a sustained contradiction because His life reveals a radiant knowledge and His teaching preserves a rigid silence. As Jesus moves through the Gospels, the sheen of Heaven is visible upon Him. Below the mixed noises of earth the voice of the eternal fell on His ear; beyond the hostile circle of Pharisees He saw the joy in the presence of God (St. Luke xv. 7). Once and again came the word from heaven, "This is my Beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (St. Matt. iii. 17), and in His straits the

angels ministered unto Him (St. Matt. iv. 11). He lived so close to the frontier that His garments were once shot through with light, and His relations with the departed were so intimate that He spake with the past leaders of Israel concerning His mission (St. Matt. xvii. 2). It does not surprise one that Jesus should suddenly disappear any more than that a bubble should rise to the surface of water, or that He ascended from the earth any more than that a bird should open its wings and fly. It was not strange that Jesus should pass into the unseen; it was strange that He should appear in the seen.

Jesus had established in His own Person that communication which ancient ages had desired, and modern science is labouring to attain. One may be pardoned for anticipating some amazing results—a more complete apocalypse. What unsuspected applications of natural law, what new revelations of spiritual knowledge, what immense reaches of Divine service, what boundless possibilities of life, might not Jesus have revealed in the sphere of the unseen. We search in vain for these open mysteries—this lifting of the veil from the occult. Whatever Jesus may have seen, and whatever He may have known, were locked in His breast,

“ . . . or something sealed
The lips of that Evangelist.”

No believer in the pre-existence of Jesus can affect indifference to this silence; everyone must desire some relief from its pressure. Most likely Jesus recognised that frequent references to the circumstances of the unseen world would have obscured one of the chief points in His teaching. He was ever insisting that the kingdom of heaven was no distant colony in the clouds, but an institution set up in this present world. He was ever hindered by the gross conceptions of the Jews, who could not compass any other Utopia than a conquering Messiah and a visible Theocracy.

It was hard enough to cleanse the sight of His disciples from a religious imperialism, and to possess them with the vision of a spiritual society. Had He once excited their imagination with an Apocalypse of gold, then they had never grasped the fact that the kingdom of God is within, and they had been quite unsettled for the labour of its establishment. They must understand with all their hearts that where Jesus and the men of His Spirit were the kingdom stood, whether in some obscure village of Galilee or in the many mansions of His Father's house. There are moods in which we should have liked a chapter on heaven from Jesus, in our wiser moments we see it would have been premature. When the kingdom had been fairly founded on earth an apocalypse of glory would be a reinforcement of hope. While it was only an ideal it had been the destruction of faith.

Jesus broke His reserve on the last night of the three years' fellowship, when He was about to depart from His disciples' sight by the way of the Cross, and they would be left to face the world in His name. They had come together to the veil, and before He passed within, through His rent body, He must give His friends an assurance of the unseen that their hearts may not be troubled. As often as He had spoken of the Ageless Life, He had touched on the life to come, now He gave His solitary deliverance on the sphere of that life, and the form is characteristic of the Master. There could never be competition or comparison between Jesus and St. John; the magnificence of the apocalypse fades before one simple word of the last discourse. Jesus utilizes the great parable of the Family for the last time; and as He had invested Fatherhood and Sonhood with their highest meaning so He now spiritualizes Home. What Mary's cottage at Bethany had been to the little company during the Holy Week, with its quiet rest after the daily turmoil of Jerusalem; what some humble house on the

shore of Galilee was to St. John, with its associations of Salome; what the great Temple was to the pious Jews, with its Presence of the Eternal, that on the higher scale was Heaven. Jesus availed Himself of a wealth of tender recollections and placed Heaven in the heart of humanity when He said, "My Father's House."

It is, however, one thing to be silent about the circumstances of the future and another to be silent about its nature. The reticence of Jesus about the next world has an ample compensation in His suggestions regarding the next life. Jesus was not indifferent to surroundings—He was grateful for the home at Bethany; Jesus was chiefly concerned about life—He counted it of the last importance to give a right direction to life. During all His ministry Jesus was fighting ideas of life which were false, not so much because they were wicked as because they were temporary. He was insisting on ideals of life which were true, not only because they were good but because they were eternal. His conception of life was open to criticism just because it was so independent of time and space. It was not national, it was human; it was not for His day, but for ever. You are impressed by the perspective in Jesus' teaching, the sense of beyond, and it is always spiritual. Neither this world in its poverty nor the next in its wealth is to be compared with life, any more than a body with a soul. The great loss of the present is to exchange your life for this world, the great gain in the world to come is still to obtain life (St. Mark x. 30). The point of connection between the seen and the unseen—the only bridge that spans the gulf—is life. In this state of things we settle its direction, in the next we shall see its perfection. According to the drift of Jesus' preaching, the whole spiritual content of this present life, its knowledge, skill, aspirations, character, will be carried over into the future, and life hereafter be the continuation of life here.

This assumption underlies Jesus' words at every turn, and comes to the surface in the parables of Service and Reward. They imply the continuity of life: they illuminate its conditions. The Master commits five talents to the servant, and the trust is shrewdly managed. The five become ten, and the Master is fully satisfied. What reward does He propose for His servant? Is it release from labour and responsibility—a future in contrast with the past? Is it, so to say, retirement and a pension? It would not be absurd, but it would be less than the best. Something more could surely be done with this man's exercised and developed gifts—his foresight, prudence, courage, enterprise. The past shapes the future, and this servant, having served his apprenticeship, becomes himself a master, "ruler over many things." So he entered into the joy of his Lord and the joy for which Jesus endured the Cross is a patient and perpetual ministry. Life will be raised, not reversed; work will not be closed, it will be emancipated. The fret will be gone, not the labour; the disappointment, not the responsibility. Our disability shall be no more, our capacity shall be ours for ever, and so the thorns shall be taken from our crown.

This conception of the future as a continuation under new and unimaginable forms of present energy, has hardly been allowed full play. The religious mind has been dominated by a conventional idea which is taught to our children, which is assumed in conversation: which is implied in sermons, which inspires our hymnology on the "Last Things." Heaven is a state of physical rest—a release from care, labour, struggle, progress, which more thoughtful people represent to themselves as an endless contemplation of God, and less thoughtful reduce to an endless service of praise. We fulfil the Divine Will here in occupation, there we shall fulfil it in adoration. We shall leave the market-place with its arduous, yet kindly business, and

enter a church where night and day the ceaseless anthem swells up to the roof. Upon this heaven the mystics, from St. John to Faber, have lavished a wealth of poetry, which we all admire and sing, and this is its sum :—

“ Father of Jesus, love’s reward,
What rapture will it be
Prostrate before Thy throne to lie
And gaze and gaze on Thee.”

It is the Christian Nirvana.

If this Paradise of inaction be the true idea of Heaven, then it invites serious criticism. For one thing, it can have only a lukewarm attraction for average people (who are the enormous majority of the race), and may be repugnant to those who are neither unbelieving nor evil-living. Cloistered piety may long for this kind of life as the apotheosis of the monastic ideal, but all God’s children are not cast in the mould of A’Kempis. What, for instance, can an English merchant, a respectable, clean-living and fairly intelligent man we shall suppose, think of the conventional Heaven? He will not tell any one, because a sensible man rarely gives confidences on religion, and he may feel it wise to crush down various thoughts. But one has a strong sense of incongruity between the life he lives here and the life it is supposed he will live hereafter, and this without reflection on his present useful and honourable way of living. One imagines how he will miss his office and his transactions and his plans and his strokes of success, not because he has lost the machinery for making money, but because he misses the sphere for his strongest powers—his shrewdness, perseverance, enterprise, integrity. It were ludicrous to suggest that this excellent man even in his old age longs for death as the passage to that new world where he may begin life afresh, or that he wishes to be set free from the duties of this world that he may give himself, without hindrance, to the

exercises of devotion. If he were to tell you so, you would detect the unreality, but in justice to this type, he does not cant when death comes to his door. He will brace himself, as a brave and modest man, to face the inevitable, and will resign himself to Heaven, as one does to a great function from which exclusion would be a social disgrace, to which admission is a joyless honour. Certainly this man is not a St. John, but it does not follow that he is quite hopeless. The conventional heaven is antipathetic to him not because he is unspiritual but because he is natural.

It must also strike one that an office of devotion would be an inept and disappointing conclusion to the present life. For what purpose are we placed and kept in this world? Faith answers, in order that we may be educated for the life to come: this is how Faith solves the perplexing problem of the life which now is. Providence endows a person with some natural gift, arranges that this gift be developed, affords it a field of exercise, trains it within sight of perfection. There is something which this person can do better than his fellows, and that is his capital for future enterprise. Two possessions we shall carry with us into the unseen: they are free of death, and inalienable—one is character, the other is capacity. Is this capacity to be consigned to idleness and wantonly wasted? It were unreason: it were almost a crime. How this or that gift can be utilized in the other world is a vain question, and leads to childish speculation. We do not know where the unseen universe is, nor how it is constituted, much less how it is ordered, but our reason may safely conclude that the capacity which is exercised under one form here will be exercised under another yonder. "It is surely a frivolous notion," says Isaac Taylor, "that the vast and intricate machinery of the universe and the profound scheme of God's government are now to reach a resting place, where nothing more shall

remain to active spirits through an eternity but recollections of labour, anthems of praise, and inert repose."

This uninviting Heaven owes its imagination to two causes—the tradition of asceticism, and an abuse of the Apocalypse. Fantastic ideas of religion, which were reared under monastic glass, have been acclimatised in certain schools whose favoured doctrines have no analogy in life and whose cherished ideals make no appeal to the heart. Sensible people agree that character is the pledge of goodness, and that work is a condition of happiness, and that a sphere where good men could do their work without weariness in the light of God's face would be an ideal heaven, but sensible people are apt to be brow-beaten by traditions and to say what is not real. Unfortunately a really preposterous Paradise has been also credited with the glory of St. John's new Jerusalem, which cometh down "from God . . . as a bride adorned for her husband," whose foundations were "garnished with all manner of precious stones," whose street was "pure gold, as it were transparent glass." This is the vision of a Jewish mystic, very splendid poetry to be read for the sound and beauty thereof, and they are not to be lightly forgiven who have reduced it to bathos in certain pictures and books. St. John imagined the kingdom of Jesus in its glory moving like a stately harmony before the eyes of God, and cast his imagination into the ancient symbols of Jewish literature. He intended the age of gold.

Any view of the future may be fairly tried by this criterion—does it strengthen, gladden, inspire us in the present? Whenever this question is put, we turn to Jesus with His doctrine of continuity. Where the traditional forecast fails is in the absence of Hope. It takes all purpose from our present effort, whose hard-won gains in service are to be flung away. It takes all opportunity from the future, which is to be a state of practical in-

ertia. It is the depreciation of the market place, the workshop, the study; it is the vindication of a Trappist monastery. Where the forecast of Jesus tells is in the spirit of Hope; it invests the most trivial or sordid details of this life with significance, changing them into the elementary exercises of a great science; it points to the future as the heights of life to which we are climbing out of this narrow valley. One of the most pathetic sights in this life is to see a dying man struggling to the last in his calling, putting another touch to his unfinished picture, adding another page to his half-written book. "Art is long; life is brief" comes to his mind, but how stands the case? If the monkish heaven be true, then this foolish mortal had better be done with art or letters, for they can have no place in the land to which he hasteth. If Jesus' heaven be true, then he is bound to gather the last penny of interest on his talents, and make himself fit for his new work. Jesus heartens His followers by an assurance that not one hour of labour, not one grain of attainment, not one honest effort on to the moment when the tools of earth drop from their hands, but will tell on the after life. Again, one is tempted to quote the sagacious Taylor: "All the practical skill we acquire in managing affairs, all the versatility, the sagacity, the calculation of chances, the patience and assiduity, the promptitude and facility, as well as the highest virtues, which we are learning every day, may well find scope in a world such as is rationally anticipated when we think of heaven as the stage of life which is next to follow the discipline of life."

It follows upon Jesus' suggestion of the next life,—the continuation of the present on a higher level,—that it will be itself a continual progress, and Jesus gives us frequent hints of this law. When He referred to the many mansions (*μοναὶ πολλαί*) in His Father's house, He may have been intending rooms—places where those who had been

associated together on earth may be gathered together; but He may be rather intending stations—stages in that long ascent of life that shall extend through the ages of ages. In the parable of the unjust steward Jesus uses this expression in speaking of the future, “everlasting tents” (*αἰωνίους σκηνάς*). It is at once a contradiction and an explanation, for it combines the ideas of rest and advance—a life of achievement, where the tent is pitched, a life of possibilities, where it is being for ever lifted.

“Will the future life be work,
Where the strong and the weak this world’s congeries
Repeat in large what they practised in small,
Through life after life in unlimited series,
Only the scales be changed, that’s all?”

Does not this conception of the future solve a very dark problem—the lives that have never arrived. Beside the man whose gifts have been laid out at usury and gained a splendid interest, are others whose talents have been hid, not by their own doing, but by Providence. They realized their gift; they cherished it; they would have used it; but for them there was no market. Providence, who gave them wings, placed them in a cage. Round us on every side are cramped, hindered, still-born lives—merchants who should have been painters, clerks who should have been poets, labourers who should have been philosophers. Their talent is known to a few friends; they die, and the talent is buried in their coffin. Jesus says No. It has at last been sown for the harvest; it will come into the open and blossom in another land. These also are being trained—trained by waiting. They are the reserve of the race, kept behind the hill till God requires it. They will get their chance; they will come into their kingdom,

“Where the days bury their golden suns
In the dear hopeful West.”

The continuity of life lifts the shadow also from another

mystery—the lives that have been cut off in their prime. When one is richly endowed and carefully trained, and has come to the zenith of his power, his sudden removal seems a reflection on the economy of God's kingdom. Why call this man to the choir celestial when he is so much needed in active service? According to Jesus, he has not sunk into inaction, so much subtracted from the forces of righteousness. He has gone where the fetters of this body of humiliation and the embarrassment of adverse circumstances shall be no longer felt. We must not think of him as withdrawn from the field; we must imagine him as in the van of battle. We must follow him, our friend, with hope and a high heart.

“No, at noonday, in the bustle of man's worktime,
Greet the unseen with a cheer;
Bid him forward breast and back as either should be,
“Strive and thrive,” cry “speed, fight on, fare ever
There as here!”

JOHN WATSON.

PROBLEMS OF THE PROPHETIC LITERATURE.

II. HABAKKUK.

OF latest critics it is admittedly Professor Stade to whom we are pre-eminently indebted for a fresh and fruitful impetus in the investigation of that extremely difficult section of Biblical literature, the Prophetic. This is the case with regard to the small but specially beautiful and remarkable Book of Habakkuk. In 1884, in a brief essay in his *Zeitschrift*,¹ Stade brought forward detailed proof of his view, that the passages ii. 9-20 and chap. iii. cannot be assigned to the prophet of the close of the seventh century. In ii. 9-20 he found a prophetic denunciation of a small Pales-

¹ *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, iv. pp. 154-9.

tinian tyrant; in chap. iii. a Prayer of the faithful community, after the manner of the Psalter, both pieces being of postexilic date. His view of chap. iii. was not only adopted by Kuenen in 1889,¹ but was corroborated by additional proof and by evidence for the fact, that the Prayer must have been taken from a postexilic hymn-book. In the same year Cheyne² put forward a similar view. Wellhausen³ supplied, in 1892, excellent elucidations of what still remains a very obscure and difficult poem. I do not know that there is anything of importance to be added to what he has said on chap. iii., and may therefore pass on.

The section chap. i. 2-ii. 8 was not disputed by Stade in any way, but was accepted as "the prophecy of a prophet of the Chaldean period; the thoughts harmonious and well arranged, and the text, except in a few places, well preserved." But it is precisely with this section that a series of recent investigations have been occupied, and to these we must now give our attention. Afterwards we shall have to speak of ii. 9-20.

Giesebrecht⁴ was the first, in 1890, to show convincingly that i. 12 immediately connects with i. 4. On that account he removed the verses i. 5-11 from their present position and placed them before verse 1, as an oracle complete in itself, containing the first announcement of the Chaldeans, as it appears, under the form of the Scythians. The remaining piece, complete in itself, i. 2-4, 12-ii. 8, he still regarded, as before, as a prophecy against the Chaldeans, probably written in the exile under their oppression. There was no reason why the prophet should mention their name to his readers here, least of all if he had placed i. 5-11 as an introduction at the beginning of his book. Well-

¹ *Hist.-kritisch Onderzoek*, ²ii. pp. 389 sqq.

² *Bampton Lectures*, pp. 147, 156 sq.

³ *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten*, i. pp. 166 sq.

⁴ In his book, *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, pp. 197 sq.

hausen¹ accepted fully Giesebrecht's discovery, save that at the same time he seems to consider i. 2-4, 12-ii. 4 (this is his division) pre-exilic, which is certainly necessary (comp. i. 2-4).

It is only from its bearing on the critical question that I attach any value to the fact that I had myself independently separated the verses i. 5-11 from their present context and had worked out a complete theory of the structure of the Book of Habakkuk before I was made aware by Wellhausen's book of Giesebrecht's views.² My essay has since been published in the *Studien und Kritiken*.³ Without here repeating the reasons which I there gave in detail for the separation of i. 5-11, which are for the most part additional to those urged by Giesebrecht and Wellhausen, I will only indicate briefly my further conclusions and the solution of the problem of the book based thereon. It is evident that i. 5-11 do not form a complete oracle. The fact that the introduction is wanting may be explained from the misplacement of the verses; but the invasion of the nations announced lacks the reference to Judah which we must expect in the case of a Hebrew prophet. On the other hand, the prophecy i. 2-4, 12 sqq., ii. 1 sqq., regarded as a prophecy against the Chaldeans, has no intelligible conclusion. This cannot be better proved than by Wellhausen's words, "In connection with the following sentence [ii. 4], the question comes to our lips, Is it such an utterance as to require a revelation? If this is all, Habakkuk's vision was meagre indeed, although he was greatly exercised about it!" The *announcement* of the overthrow of the oppressive world-power is wholly absent; all at once ii. 6 opens a hymn in which the destruction, of which we have as yet

¹ *Ut supra*, pp. 161 sq.

² It appears from Kuenen, *Hist.-krit. Onderzoek*, 'ii. (1863) pp. 362 sq., that, unnoticed by any of us, de Goeje, following von Gumpach, was as early as 1861 upon the same track.

³ 1893, pp. 383 sqq.

heard nothing, of that power is presupposed. Moreover, if a powerful nation is to be overthrown, a second nation is required to effect the overthrow (according to the Divine purpose); Habakkuk must therefore speak of two nations. Now, as i. 5-11 announces to the Chaldeans not their destruction, but their conquest and possession of cities and kingdoms, they are manifestly in Habakkuk's oracle, to use Goethe's simile, not the anvil but the hammer. In that case, the proper place of i. 5-11 is not, as a piece complete in itself, *before* i. 2, but after ii. 4, as the needed conclusion, thus filling the hiatus which Wellhausen had rightly felt, but wrongly charged upon the prophet. With the view of overthrowing the oppressor of the present, Jahweh will *raise up* (i. 6) the Chaldeans and make them victorious. In that case the oppressor of that time is of course none other than the power *actually* overthrown by the Chaldeans, *i.e.* the Assyrian empire, and Habakkuk's prophecy is not directed, as had hitherto always been supposed, against the Chaldeans, but against *the Assyrians*. In my essay I have shown in detail that the history of the time and the description of the enemy of that period confirm my solution of the problem, and I have also supplied the corrections of the text rendered necessary by the corruptions incidental to the misplacement. The explanation of this displacement lies in the fact that Habakkuk's prophecy remained unfulfilled. The invasion of the Chaldeans did not bring to Judah life, freedom, external and moral religious prosperity, but destruction, vassalage, and misery. Undoubtedly this was not due to any want of essential truth in the prophecy itself, but to the evil policy of Judah, which defied all the prophetic warnings of a Jeremiah. But the abstract view of the nature of prophecy and its fulfilment prevailing at a later time could not be satisfied by such considerations. Accordingly by the transposition of the section i. 5-11, or strictly 6-11 (see below), perhaps also by the

erasure of the name Assyria, it was made to appear that the prophecy announced the overthrow of the Chaldean Empire, and with it the deliverance which actually occurred under Cyrus. Originally the book thus far consisted of the following passages: i. 2-4, 12-17, ii. 1-4, i. 6-11, ii. 5, and in this order.¹

For this solution Professor Rothstein,² of Halle, proposed in 1894 another, differing in essential respects, at which he arrived in the main independently of Giesebrecht and myself. At the same time, the most important of the textual changes which he makes are almost exactly the same as those I have proposed. He removes i. 5-11 from its present context, and places i. 6-10 after ii. 5^a; i. 5, 11 he considers editorial additions. After the removal of all such additions, the restored prophecy is as follows: i. 2-4, 12^a, 13; ii. 1-5^a; i. 6-10, 14 (read וַיַּעֲשֶׂה), 15^a. But it is not directed against the Assyrians, but against the *sinners in Judah*, being an oracle after the manner of Jeremiah, of about the year 605. By a process similar to that above supposed, a subsequent editor, of the time of the exile, sought to convert it into a

¹ As to the text, the following points may be noted: i. 12, perhaps the rest of the verse to begin with *לא נמות* should be deleted (Wellhausen) as a premature tentative for a solution, only the two words cited might be kept according to old tradition as *לא תמות*; instead of *צור* read *וצר*, i. 13, supply *בבגוד* before *בונדים* (Wellh.).—i. 17, with Giesebrecht and Wellhausen, for *יהרג להרג* read *העלם*; and perhaps for *הרמו*, *הרבו*; lastly, for *להרג*, with Wellhausen. In ii. 1-4 the inscription on the tables extends through verses 3 and 4, *כי* serves merely as quotation mark.—ii. 1 read *ישיב* for *אשיב* (Wellh.); ver. 3 *ויפרח* for *ויפה* (Bredenkamp and Wellh. after LXX); ver. 4^a has suffered serious mutilation; probably it uttered a warning against want of faith and impatience. i. 5 must (with Rothstein) be deleted, as interpolated when the passage was displaced; minor emendations of verses 6-10 are given by Wellh.; instead of *imperfectiva consecutiva*, point simple imperfects with *ן* in verses 9-11. i. 11 read *אז יחלה* *קרחה*, after which *רשע* may have slipped out. But perhaps in *ואשם*, which is impossible, and for which Wellh. proposes *וישם*, there lies an *אשור*, Assyria, so that the enemy of the time may have been named originally. ii. 5 read with Bredenkamp and Giesebrecht *באין ואפם* instead of *כי היין*; with Wellh. *ינוה* for *יורה*.

² *Über Habakkuk Kap. 1 und 2 (Theol. Stud. u. Krit. 1894, pp. 51 sqq.)*.

prophecy against the Chaldeans. In the same way, ii. 6-20, originally a prophecy against king Jehoiakim, was transformed into one against the king of Babylon and his empire. We shall revert to this later on.

Rothstein conducts his investigation with no less boldness than thoroughness. Had he succeeded in establishing his positions, it would have been a triumph of Old Testament criticism. It would not be easy to discover elsewhere in the Bible another instance of such far-reaching changes in the text as he supposes to have been made, and such a complete restoration of the original as he proposes. I do not believe the facts are as he thinks, and will briefly state the grounds on which his theory is based, and those in favour of my own solution of the problem.

The solution attempted by Rothstein starts from the supposition that the complaint of the prophet in i. 2-4 cannot possibly have as its subject wrongs inflicted by a foreign enemy, but can only relate to a domestic opposition within Judah itself between the righteous and the wicked, the oppressed and the oppressors. On this one point his attempted solution is based. If this point is established, the prophecy threatens neither Chaldeans nor Assyrians, but the wicked in Judah. Undoubtedly the strength of Rothstein's argument lies in the parallels from Jeremiah to i. 2-4. He refers specially to Jeremiah xi. 18-xii. 6; xv. 10-12, 15 sqq.; xvii. 14-18; xviii. 18 sqq.; viii. 8, 9; xx. 7 sqq. Certainly these complaints are very similar to Habakkuk i. 2-4, particularly if we read *המס ושד*, Jeremiah xx. 8, and *שד וחמס*, Habakkuk i. 2. But Rothstein overlooks essential differences. Jeremiah complains everywhere of wrong which he had suffered personally. Habakkuk, subjectively as verses 2, 3 are expressed, is a spectator of wickedness which goes on around him; according to verse 4 he is not himself the victim of violence, and the mischief has not advanced anything like so far as in the case of Jeremiah.

The cry for help of i. 2 is explained by ii. 1, where the prophet stands on his watch-tower and looks out into the far distance; his complaint (תוכחה), Jahweh's answer to which he is there expecting, is no other than that of the previous chapter, beginning with i. 2-4. But according to ii. 3, it is to him not a chronic calamity, such as domestic corruption in his own nation, against which he desires help, for such a calamity cannot be removed by any sudden event which has to be waited for in patience. I have purposely first brought forward the beginning of chap. ii.; the case is still clearer when we pass from i. 4 directly to verses 12 sqq., as indeed Rothstein does himself. Thus verses 13-17 supply the authentic interpretation of the רשע and צדיק of verse 4. The "wicked" is the irresistible world-power, compared to a fisherman who sits with his angle and net on the world-sea and draws nation after nation, or all mankind, like fishes from the deep, slaying and devouring them with satisfaction. His victims did not deserve this; they are "more righteous than he" (verse 13); in particular the nation to which the prophet belongs is contrasted (verse 4) with the oppressor as "the righteous." As long as verse 4 was separated from verses 12 sqq. by a long section, the necessity of this interpretation of רשע and צדיק might not appear;¹ but when once it is perceived that they stand in direct connexion, it is no longer possible to call it in question. Nor are there any intrinsic reasons opposed to this interpretation of the terms. It is not necessary to resort to the comparative righteousness expressed in verse 13 in order to suppose the צדיק of verse 4 (and ii. 4) to represent the people of Judah as a nation. The period in question, if the Chaldeans were really only just appearing on the horizon, as I have shown, that is about 615 or a few

¹ So Kuenen, Reuss, and many others. But as early as 1873, long before he was convinced that i. 5-11 must be removed elsewhere, Wellhausen perceived that רשע and צדיק must be taken in the same sense in verse 4 as in verse 13.

years earlier, was that which closely followed upon Josiah's reformation (621), when the nation, in the consciousness of its good intentions and of the adoption of the Deuteronomic legislation, felt itself righteous under the rule of a truly religious king. So much was this the case, that even after the fall of Judah, after the evil days of a Jehoiakim and Zedekiah, the popular opinion still was that the nation had been punished for the sins of Manasseh (2 Kings xxiv. 3, Jer. xv. 4), or of "the fathers" (Jer. xxxi. 29, Ezek. xviii. 2, Lam. v. 7) and not for its own sins. Our book is of such eminent value on this very account that it is a prophetic utterance from this brief period of an approving conscience. The text of i. 2-4 itself presents still stronger proof that our interpretation is correct. The oppression and tyranny, the strife and contention, of which the prophet complains in verses 2, 3 are not in his view themselves a perversion of law and justice, but only the cause of the latter. "Therefore the law halts (?), and judgment cannot make way; for the wicked nets¹ the righteous, and therefore judgment goes forth perverted." This twice-repeated "therefore" ought to receive its full emphasis. If the sole point were the oppression of the common people in the administration of justice, this has been already represented in the words און, עמל, שר, חמס, verses 2 and 3, and is not the result thereof. But if what is meant by these words is the incessant acts of interference, violence, exaction, injury, and the instigation of factions and contention with which the Assyrian suzerain had for a century past tortured his vassal Judah, it is then easy to understand why the prophet should see in such treatment the *cause* of the little progress of true religion, of the rapid decline of the enthusiastic reformation of the year 621.²

¹ Read (Wellhausen's conjecture) מכמיר and comp. מכמרת, verses 15, 16.

² The unusual and difficult expressions in verse 4 (לא יצא לנצה, תפוג) (לא יצא מעסל) are intelligible if an unusual *agens* is concerned.

Let us now see what account Rothstein can give of verses 12 sqq. He has to pay the penalty of his interpretation of i. 2-4 exclusively after the model of Jeremiah; to suit it he is compelled to treat all that follows most arbitrarily. He is obliged to make the complaint of the prophet end with verse 13, since in verse 14 plainly enough it is not the righteous in Judah, but mankind at large who are the victims of the "wicked" oppressor. The removal from the context of i. 5-11 is accordingly not enough; verses 14-17 must also be removed, and i. 13 must immediately precede ii. 1. Is Rothstein in a position to assign an obviously suitable place for verses 14-17 elsewhere? He seems to feel that if i. 6-10¹ were placed after ii. 5^a they would have no satisfactory conclusion; he seeks, therefore, to make use of verses 14 sqq. in that position. To effect this, he has, in the first instance, to change ותעשה, which is connected with תחריש, verse 13, into ויעשה. This is the contrary of an improvement, for as Jahweh, while all this wrong is done, looks on without interfering, although He could prevent it, so it is *He* also—and therein the declaration is intensified—who *makes* men like the fishes, in order that the world-tyrant may be able to catch and devour them. But, surely, the simile of the fisher, who sits comfortably on the shore and draws fish after fish out of the water, does not fitly describe the cavalry-nation of verses 6-10, which comes up like the storm and casts down everything before it. It is impossible that a writer and poet of Habakkuk's eminence should make such mistakes. But to proceed: it is only verses 14 and 15^a that Rothstein can use; in 15^b, 16 the accusation is heard again, in verse 17 the complaint. Neither is permissible, of course, if the

¹ As to verse 11 he is compelled to delete it as an editorial addition, instead of restoring the text, since 11^b speaks again of the impious tyrant whom the Chaldeans will overthrow. But it is precisely the difficulty of the verse that is an argument against an editorial origin, and is in favour of the supposition of its being due in part to intentional alteration.

fisher is the Chaldean, that is, the promised deliverer from the distress. Accordingly Rothstein, without any substantial justification,¹ deletes verses 15^b-17. Really, it needed no other proof of the inadmissibility of his theory. Than these exquisite verses, there is nothing in the whole book of Habakkuk more truly genuine; no editor could have invented them. Moreover, verses 14, 15^a are incomplete without these verses, and the tone of accusation, of which Rothstein wishes to get rid, is already heard in them.

And what is gained by all this? Only a wholly unsatisfactory result. The Chaldeans are to be the deliverers from the distress of which the prophet complains. They might be this were the distress caused by an external enemy: as Deutero-Isaiah announces deliverance from the Babylonian captivity by the Persians, so the Chaldeans might rescue Israel from the Assyrian oppression. But a foreign nation cannot by a victorious war save the righteous in Judah from the hands of the wicked. Whenever the prophets bring an impending war into connexion with the internal conditions of their people, it is as a means of punishment and not of salvation. But Habakkuk is not in i. 2-ii. 1 looking for punishment and vengeance, but for help and deliverance. Undoubtedly, punishment is also announced in ii. 5; but still the deliverance of the righteous remains, as in verse 4, the chief consideration. But it is impossible to imagine how the prophet could conceive the crushing subjugation of the people of Judah in war as the means of bringing judgment and deliverance to the righteous and punishment to the wicked. For there is not the slightest reference here to the view, to be met with elsewhere in the Prophets, particularly in Isaiah, Zephaniah, and Jeremiah, that a purified, converted, righteous remnant will come forth from the crucible of national trial. The

¹ The most specious is the triple occurrence of על בן, and that is removed by Giesebrecht's admirable emendation העלם in verse 17.

psalmist may expect from the direct interference of God a righteous separation of the godly from the ungodly, but the prophet cannot expect this from the invasion of Judah by the Chaldeans. And granted that this had been plainly declared. Before the principal evil-doers of the higher classes in Jerusalem could be reached, the unfortunate people in the open country and in the city itself must already have suffered the visitation. These calamities would no doubt be a matter worthy to be mentioned. But, as a fact, though the storm of war, i. 6 sqq., passes over many kingdoms and cities, and also reaches the chief offender, after all it spends itself in the far distance,—“hinten weit in der Türkei,”—and anything rather than the impression is left that it touched the vitals of Judah and Jerusalem.

But the case is entirely altered if by “the wicked” the Assyrian is meant, and by “the righteous” Judah as a nation.¹ When Rothstein maintains² that in the description of the enemy “nothing whatever points to Assur,” he has not taken note of what I have said on the point.³ The point might, undoubtedly, be much more fully worked out and presented more decisively. The description which is especially decisive is that of the fisher, i. 14 sqq., and it is not at all appropriate to the Chaldeans, but only and eminently to the Assyrian. The Assyrian drew the fishes, at one time with his angle, at another with his net, singly or collectively, from the water, with continued, patient labour; the Chaldeans came into possession of the nations of the earth as by easy inheritance without exertion. On this point this reference must here suffice.

¹ Which does not imply, of course, that all individual Judeans are pronounced righteous. Only much of their unrighteousness is explained and excused by their dependence on Assyria, and a change for the better is expected from the restored freedom.

² *Ut supra*, p. 64, note 2.

³ *Ut supra*, p. 386, note 1, and particularly pp. 391 sq.

After the above discussion of i. 2-ii. 5, I can deal more briefly with the next section, the series of "woes" to the end of chapter ii. I need not repeat the reasons against Stade's view, particularly as Wellhausen considers that the section refers to the Chaldeans, as I to the Assyrians. Rothstein's treatment of it is based simply on the results of his view of the first section. He states¹ it point blank as his "guiding point of view" with regard to ii. 6 sqq., "that all those sentences and parts of sentences which have as their aim the tyrannical procedure of the Babylonian power and the judgment about to come upon it are *ipso facto* exposed to the suspicion of being the work of an editor." As in our view the exact contrary holds, a few observations will here suffice. Rothstein seeks to interpret the section as referring to king Jehoiakim, as Hitzig had previously interpreted the verses 9-14. Again the parallels from Jeremiah are very striking, and were we not to go beyond *vv.* 9-11 (comp. especially Jer. xxii. 13-19) we might almost approve of Rothstein's view. But of this very first "woe" Rothstein is compelled to ascribe *v.* 10^b (קצות עמים רבים) to the editor, and in addition the entire verses 8 and 17; therefore, in the latter again, one of the finest and most characteristic sentences of the entire section (the destruction of forest and game on Lebanon by the Assyrians), which no editor could have made up. He finds himself, therefore, with reference to chapter ii. precisely in the same predicament as with chapter i. But with all this he has not yet deleted enough; neither can verses 6^b and 7 refer to Jehoiakim. For however many creditors this king may have made for himself by his robbery and injustice, they were confined to his own nation. But the creditors of these verses are described as themselves demanding their debts. This is the case, if the Chaldeans and their allies subdue their former rulers and plunderers, the Assyrians;

¹ *Ut supra*, p. 70.

but it is not so, if these same Chaldeans vanquish Jehoiakim. There is nothing else for it, then, than to consider the reference is here also to the Assyrians, as I have shown at length in my essay. The expressive passage, after the additions have been removed, belongs therefore certainly to Habakkuk.

We cannot therefore accept Rothstein's main contention. Nevertheless his essay has not been unproductive. In the first place, the very fact that a new and original interpretation of these two chapters, and an interpretation which is probably the one remaining combination of the facts possible, has failed, is a corroboration of the immensely simpler and more productive solution which I have proposed, viz., that the prophecy threatens the Assyrian tyrant of the time with overthrow at the hands of the Chaldeans. In the next place, beyond question, Rothstein has done good service in the purification of the text from additions and interpolations, although his erroneous interpretation of i. 2-4 has led him into hypercritical scepticism. He has probably rightly perceived that i. 5 is only a connecting link, which was found necessary when the section was removed to its present place. But we are chiefly indebted to Rothstein for what he has done in the case of the second section, ii. 6-20. At present the section appears as a triumphal song of the subjugated nations over their fallen oppressor. "Surely they will all take up taunts against him, and a mocking and derisive song against him, and will sing: Woe," etc. There is no want of examples in the Prophets of this poetic form; we need only refer to Isaiah xiv. But in the passage before us we have not such an instance. For when the fallen oppressor is the subject, the perfect tense is used, while in this passage all the verbs are imperfects, denoting an unfinished, or, as in this case, a future action. What we have here, therefore, is not a de-

risive song, but a prophetic threat in the form of a catalogue of offences, the chapters of which are introduced with *הוי*. A similar instance is not Isaiah xiv., but Isaiah v. 8 sqq. Accordingly 6^a, as far as *וַיִּאמְרוּ*, must, with Rothstein, be deleted, and 6^b sqq. follows, as the prophet's word, immediately upon the announcement of Jahweh.

Rothstein's extremely careful comparison of the little book with Jeremiah is also of great value. The agreement in detail is often close. This proves that the prophets were contemporaries, and thereby establishes the *substantial* genuineness of the first two chapters of Habakkuk. But at the same time Rothstein acknowledges¹ that with all this close relationship no such thing as dependence on Jeremiah is implied. And together with all this pervasive relationship in details to Jeremiah, in the broad distinctive features Habakkuk yet belongs undoubtedly to Isaiah's school. To i. 13-17 no better parallel passages could possibly be found than Isaiah x. 5 sqq.; other parallels are: ii. 2-4 with Isaiah viii. 1 sqq.; i. 6-10 with Isaiah v. 26 sqq.; ii. 6^b sqq. with Isaiah v. 8-23, x. 1-4. Thus Habakkuk has been assigned his secure place in the body of prophetic literature and, as it seems to me, a not less secure place in the political and religious history of his people.

Strassburg.

K. BUDDE.

THE WORDS IN ACTS DENOTING MISSIONARY TRAVEL.²

IN his admirable book on the *Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul*, James Smith has pointed out the studied variety of terms used in *Acts* "to express the progression of a ship," and the appropriateness with which each is selected at the

¹ Especially pp. 61, 83; on p. 70, lines 6, 7, the expressions are somewhat different.

² The following article enlarges, without essential change in the theory, some pages printed in January, 1894.

proper occasion "to indicate the particular circumstances of the ship at the time." Thirteen verbs¹ are used in *Acts* in this way, all with such strict precision that his brief descriptions are found more significant in proportion as they are studied more minutely and critically. The purpose of this paper is to examine the terms in *Acts* that denote travel by land, or travel in general, and to show that the same quality of strict appropriateness can be detected in their use. The subject is important, and much of the peculiar and delicate art of the author of *Acts* is concealed if we neglect it.

The most important, and at the same time the most peculiar and characteristic usage, is that of *διέρχασθαι* or *διελθεῖν* with the accusative of the region traversed. Of the usage the following nine examples occur in *Acts*.

(1) xiii. 6, "When they *had gone through* the whole island (Cyprus) unto Paphos" (*διελθόντες*).²

(2) xiv. 24, "They *passed through* Pisidia" (*διελθόντες*).

(3) xv. 3, "They *passed through* both Phœnicia and Samaria, declaring the conversion of the Gentiles" (*διήρχοντο ἐκδιηγούμενοι*).

(4) xv. 41, "He *went through* Syria and Cilicia, confirming the churches" (*διήρχετο ἐπιστηρίζων*).

(5) xviii. 23, He *went through* the Galatic region and the Phrygian (region) in order, stablishing all the disciples (*διερχόμενος στηρίζων*).

(6) xix. 1, "Paul *having passed through* the upper country, came to Ephesus (*διελθόντα*).

(7) xix. 21, "Paul purposed in his spirit, when he *had passed through* Macedonia and Achaia to go to Jerusalem" (*διελθών*).

(8) xx. 2, "When he *had gone through* those parts, and had given them much exhortation, he came into Greece (*διελθών*).

(9) xvi. 6, They *went through* the Phrygian or Galatic region"³

¹ Viz., πλέω, ἀποπλέω, βραδυπλοέω, διαπλέω, ἐκπλέω, παραπλέω, ὑποπλέω, εὐθυδρομέω, ὑποτρέχω, παραλέγομαι, φέρομαι, διαφέρομαι, διαπεράω. A fourteenth, *καταπλέω*, occurs in the Third Gospel viii. 26; and *πλέω* also occurs in the Gospel, though none of the other twelve are used in it. The difference of subject and circumstances explains the paucity of terms in the Gospel as compared with *Acts*.

² Where the rendering of the Revised Version is adopted *verbatim*, it is given in inverted commas.

³ *καί* is used in Greek, where in English we should use "or," between two

(διήλθον), *i.e.*, the region that is Phrygian by race and Galatian by provincial division.

Along with these nine cases, we must take the only other example in the New Testament.

(10) 1 *Cor.* xvi. 5, "But I will come unto you when I shall *have passed through* Macedonia; for I do *pass through* Macedonia" (ὅταν διέλθω, διέρχομαι γάρ).

The question demands consideration and reply whether the verb in these ten cases merely indicates that the persons spoken of passed across the country, or whether it implies that they passed through it in execution of their purpose of preaching. It is obvious that, in a description of missionary enterprise, there is needed some term to describe the process of going over a country as a missionary for the purpose of evangelizing. When Paul was travelling, he, of course, had in view always the one purpose of preaching and converting. The same may be said in general of all the Apostles and travelling Christians, even though some of them confined their preaching to Jews;¹ but, with regard to Paul especially, we can hardly doubt that, where he was not actually forbidden to preach, he was at every stage on the outlook for "an open door."² This sort of travelling through a country was Paul's normal method, and a well-expressed account of his work must necessarily have some way of indicating it. As we look over the examples just quoted, it is indubitable that most of them describe this kind of travelling, and my aim is to show that

alternative epithets applied to a person or place: thus, *e.g.*, the Heracleotic or Canopic branch of the Nile (which bears indifferently either name) is called τὸ Κανωβικὸν καὶ Ἡρακλεωτικὸν (στόμα), Strab., p. 788: so here in *Acts*. But where two mouths are mentioned, the right order is τὸ Κανωβικὸν στόμα καὶ (τὸ) Σαῖτικόν (cp. *Acts* xviii. 23).

¹ xi. 19, "speaking the word to none save only to Jews."

² 2 *Cor.* ii. 12, "Now, when I came to Troas for the gospel of Christ, and when a door was opened unto me in the Lord": cp. *Acts* xiv. 27, "he had opened a door of faith unto the Gentiles."

all do so.¹ As to example (1), probably no one has ever doubted that Paul preached in city after city on his way through Cyprus from Salamis to Paphos. As to (8), the case is even clearer, and the same circumstances are referred to in (10) by the actual traveller, Paul, who uses the same verb. Example (7) is perhaps the most conclusive case: Paul intended to go through Macedonia and Achaia,² and thereafter to visit Jerusalem. Here it is beyond doubt that Paul's intention was to make a preaching tour in Macedonia and Achaia; and the Greek *διελθὼν τὴν Μακεδονίαν καὶ Ἀχαιίαν* is used to convey that sense.

Examples (3), (4), and (5) are of slightly different character. In them a participle is added in order to bring out the purpose which was executed on the journey, stage by stage. But in them the writer wishes to express a more precise and definite idea than that of a simple missionary tour, and he therefore adds the defining participle.³ These three cases show that, in the four examples, (1), (7), (8), (10), there is really another verb latent in the thought, viz. *καὶ εὐαγγελίσσατο*: the writer's mind is so entirely filled with the idea of missionary effort, that he assumes the idea as always present, and expects the reader to look from the same point of view as himself.⁴ In one case the participle denoting simple preaching is added

¹ This sense of *διελθεῖν* has more resemblance to the classical usage of *διεξελεθεῖν* than of *διελθεῖν*.

² Compare (10); he executed the intention, example (8).

³ It lies in the distinction between present and aorist tenses, that in these three cases the present (imperfect) is used, in the other the aorist. The author of *Acts* was more sensitive to delicacy of tense usage than Paul shows himself in xx. 25.

⁴ The author of *Acts* always expects his readers to do this. He wrote for a public familiar with the surroundings and accessories of the action (*i.e.* for a public of the same country and period), and he always assumes this knowledge on their part. If the reader wishes to appreciate the realism of *Acts* (at least in xiii. f.), he must always imagine himself a spectator, and reproduce in his thought the scene, and the surroundings, and the relative position of the actors; he must stand on the deck of the ship in xxvii. and in the proconsul's hall xiii. 5f.

to the verb, viz., in the speech of Paul at Miletos, xx. 25, "Ye all, among whom I went about preaching the kingdom," ἐν οἷς διήλθον κηρύσσων τὴν βασιλείαν. It would be difficult to find an exact parallel to this example; but the unusual construction arises from the substitution of the persons for the locality where the preaching was done. It was impossible to say διήλθον ὑμᾶς, and therefore ἐν ὑμῖν had to be substituted; but otherwise the example is similar to the preceding ones, and it is clear that διήλθον κηρύσσων coalesces into a single idea, and that the Greek is practically equivalent to "among whom I was a preacher." In speaking to the Elders, Paul lays special emphasis on his evangelizing purpose in his travels. His words in this case bring out the sense of example (6) "having passed through the upper country." Paul spoke to the Elders about missionary travels in Asia,¹ and the only journey through Asia² when preaching had been permitted to him was the excursion from Pisidian Antioch along the higher lying regions (as distinguished from the low and level but longer road³ through Laodiceia) to Ephesus. Paul therefore had preached stage by stage along that journey (as we should naturally expect); and διελθὼν τὰ ἀνωτερικὰ μέρη has its usual Pauline sense of a missionary journey.

Example (2) "they passed through Pisidia" is a peculiarly interesting one. These words, xiv. 24, describe the journey back from Pisidian Antioch to Perga. Why then, a critic may ask, is the upward journey from Perga to

¹ It is probable that the words "among you" should not be restricted to the Ephesians; they denote the provincials of Asia (hence the emphatic "ye all"). Paul's intention for the future was evidently to go on to the central and western provinces of the Empire, and to return to the province Asia no more.

² In xvi. 6-8 he went through Asia, but was forbidden to preach in that province. The journey in xx. 1, when Troas was evangelized, 2 Cor. ii. 12, was doubtless only a coasting voyage.

³ On the sense of "the higher regions" see the second or later editions of *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 94. It is not explained in Ed. I.

Antioch passed over so slightly in xiii. 13, 14? If Paul regularly evangelized stage by stage on his journeys, why is he described as evangelizing on the downward journey, while the upward journey is slurred over? Does not the discrepancy prove that I am refining over much when I press the sense of *διήλθον* in this way? I shall not have recourse to the supposition, so much favoured by some writers, of "a gap" in the narrative, xiii. 13, 14. On the contrary, I find in the discrepancy between xiv. 24 and xiii. 14 a conclusive proof of my position. Let us survey the circumstances of the two cases.

It is pointed out in the *Church in Roman Empire*, p. 62f., that Paul's journey from Perga across Taurus and his entry into the province of Galatia were caused by physical infirmity, as he states in his Epistle to the Galatians iv. 13. When convalescent from a sharp but short illness¹ at Perga, he sought the recuperative atmosphere of the high lands beyond Taurus. In such a journey he naturally went straight on to the *sanatorium*; and, moreover, he was probably unfit for the severe strain of a preaching journey immediately after such an illness.² Hence the writer says that they went across³ from Perga and arrived at Antioch; but, when he returned in better health along the same road, he made a missionary journey through Pisidia and came into Pamphylia.

¹ The conditions of time show that it must have been short, while the facts of his life prove that it was sharp. It was, probably, a sharp attack of a disease that was, or afterwards became, constitutional.

² Formerly I inferred this illness and the consequent interruption of the work intended in Pamphylia merely from *Gal.* iv. 13. I hope at no distant time to point out that three separate trains of reasoning, founded on peculiarities in the language of Acts xiii. 13-15, prove that there was such an interruption of a definite project in regard to Pamphylia, and that the writer knew this and brings it out in his own style.

³ *διελθόντες*, without an accusative, is used here to denote the crossing over an intervening obstacle, viz., Taurus (see *Ch. in R. Emp.*, p. 18f.). Similarly in xviii. 27, *διελθεῖν εἰς Ἀχαΐαν* describes the crossing over (the sea) to Achaia. Compare xii. 10 (passing the watch, accusative), ix. 38, Luke ii. 15, iv. 30. This sense of *διελθεῖν* is quite classical.

The exact sense of example (5) xviii. 23, (he went through the Galatic region and the Phrygian region in order, establishing all the disciples), is explained by Asterius in his Homily on Peter and Paul as follows: *μετῆλθεν οὖν ἐκ Κορίνθου πρὸς τὴν τῶν Πισίδων χώραν εἶτα τὴν Λυκαονίαν καὶ τὰς τῆς Φρυγίας πόλεις καταλαβὼν, κάκειθεν τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐπισκεψάμενος, εἶτα τὴν Μακεδονίαν, κοινὸς ἦν τῆς οἰκουμένης διδάσκαλος.*¹ This important passage, for which I am indebted to my friend, Mr. A. F. Findlay (once, I am proud to say, my pupil in Aberdeen), describes St. Paul's missionary work from the time when he left Corinth (xviii. 18) until he went back to Macedonia (xx. 1); and it defines his purpose excellently to be "teaching the civilized world."

Incidentally it is worthy of note that one, or perhaps two inaccuracies occur in it. In the first place, Asterius takes the Antioch of xviii. 22 as Pisidian Antioch. This curious misapprehension seems to have been common in the fourth and the fifth centuries, for I find in the account of Paul's travels composed by the Egyptian deacon Euthalius, about 458 A.D., that from Corinth Paul went to Ephesus and Cæsareia (Acts xvii. 19, 22), *εἶτα δεύτερον εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν τῆς Πισιδίας, εἶτα εἰς τὴν Γαλατικὴν χώραν καὶ Φρυγίαν, εἶτα πάλιν δεύτερον εἰς Ἔφεσον κτλ.*² In the second place, Asterius probably uses Asia in the Byzantine sense to indicate the smaller province Asia of his time, whereas in *Acts* the province Asia has the wider limits that existed in the first three centuries. But, allowing for these misconceptions, the passage is instructive as regards the inter-

¹ I cannot in Aberdeen find a complete edition of Asterius, and depend entirely on Mr. Findlay's quotation. Asterius, bishop of Amaseia, in Pontus, about 360-400, is an authority of great weight; and here he defines *Γαλατικὴν χώραν* as *Λυκαονίαν*.

² Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, vol. lxxxv., p. 650. It is worth note that in xvi. 6 Euthalius reads *τὴν Φρυγίαν καὶ Γαλατικὴν χώραν*, whereas the published text of Chrysostom's commentary has the false reading *τὴν* before *Γαλατικὴν*.

pretation of Paul's travels that prevailed in the fourth and fifth centuries; and it is necessary to suppose either that Asterius had never heard of the North-Galatian theory, or that he expressly rejects it and declares his adhesion to the South-Galatian theory.¹

In all these examples therefore we find that in *Acts* the making of a missionary tour through a district is expressed in Greek by *διέρχασθαι* or *διελθεῖν* construed with the accusative of the district traversed. There remains only one more example of this construction, viz. (9), xvi. 6, "they traversed the Phrygian or Galatic region." On the South-Galatian theory² this example corroborates the rule, for it describes Paul's progress from Lystra over the converts made during his former residence at Iconium and Antioch; and this part of his journey was a continuation of the same process that is described in xv. 41 by the same expression (example 4). After finishing this region, he entered Asian Phrygia, but, essaying to preach there³ in his usual fashion, he was "prevented by the Holy Spirit."

If we press closely this sense of the Greek verb, we may render xvi. 6 thus: they made a preaching tour through the Phrygian country, viz. the Galatic part alone (neglecting

¹ After Mr. Findlay's letter reached me, I consulted Chrysostom's commentary on the passage, but it gives no clue to his conception. His commentary on xvi. 1-6 is also inconclusive—at least in this sense that, whereas his words show good geographical conceptions, if interpreted on the South-Galatian view, they show very hazy ideas if interpreted on the North-Galatian view.

² At least as I understand it. Dr. Gifford works it out differently in *Expositor*, July, 1894, p. 1f. His view on this point is syntactically and topographically possible, but seems to me open to certain objections (notably, it sacrifices the strict sense of *Γαλατικὴν* in local usage).

³ The studied difference in expression between xvi. 6 and 8 shows that Paul was actually in Asia (*i.e.* the region Phrygia as part of the province Asia) when he was prevented from speaking, but was stopped from even setting foot in Bithynia. I find myself unable to depart from what I have said on this point in my *Church in R. Emp.*, p. 75 (except that in the first edition I thought that the prohibition might have been made known to Paul in Pisidian Antioch, which I now see to be impossible: the prohibition is implied to have been imparted in Asia).

the Asian part), because they were prohibited from preaching in the province Asia.¹ It is quite within the ordinary limits of Greek expression to leave part of the thought latent in this way, and to expect it to be completed by the intelligence of the reader. I prefer, however, as being more simple, the construction which is advocated in my book, p. 89; but it is apart from the present subject to state reasons.

Prof. Blass agrees as to the sense of *διέρχομαι*. In his note on xvi. 6 he says, *mirus error est eorum qui verbo διήλθον eam vim inesse putant ut praedicatio excludatur*, though in his reading and interpretation of xvi. 8 he disregards this sense of the verb.

If the author of *Acts* denotes in this way a missionary tour through a country, the questions suggest themselves, were there any cases in which Paul traversed a country rapidly without preaching in it but pressing on to a point beyond; and, if so, how is such a journey indicated in *Acts*? We have just seen such a case, viz., xiii. 14, where Paul went across Pisidia from Perga to reach Antioch. In that case Pisidia is not mentioned; it is simply left out of the narrative. Take again xv. 41-xvi. 4, Paul is there described as making a missionary tour through the province of Syria and Cilicia, and then as arriving at Derbe and at Lystra. The large country ruled by King Antiochus, which he must have traversed, is left out of the narrative.² Here

¹ This interpretation was referred to in my article in the *EXPOSITOR*, Feb., 1894, p. 139, *note*. "I shall in due time proceed to show that the South-Galatian theory is perfectly consistent with taking *κωλυθέντες* in xvi. 6 as giving the reason for *διήλθον*; and several friends, who accept or regard favourably the theory, prefer to take it in that way; but I shall also set forth the reasons that lead me to prefer the interpretation given in my book."

² In the map in my *Church in R. Emp.*, the kingdom of Antiochus is represented too small. It is given as two separate parts, one in Lycaonia and Cilicia Tracheia, the other in North Syria; but these two parts were continuous, for the intervening region of Taurus and its passes belonged to Antiochus. Before Paul, on leaving Tarsus, reached the Cilician gates, he had entered the realm of Antiochus.

the reason is the same. Paul preached in Syria, which was Roman; he passed rapidly over the non-Roman territory; and he began again to preach when he reached Roman territory once more at Derbe. Similarly, on his first journey, when he reached the limit of Roman territory at Derbe, he turned and went back over the churches that he had already founded.

We see, then, that such omissions in the narrative are in accordance with the author's plan: he omits all that is not essential to his purpose, and his purpose is to describe the missionary enterprises of St. Paul. Many cases, where the supposed "want of proportion in Acts" is criticised, are specially instructive with regard to the author's circumstances, his intentions, and his attitude towards his subject. Similarly in xvi. 6, 7, Paul traversed as a sphere of duty the Phrygo-Galatic region (*i.e.* the region round Iconium and Antioch), and then no further geographical information is given till he came *κατὰ τὴν Μυσίαν* and was approaching the Bithynian frontier with the intention of entering that province and preaching there. A considerable journey across Asia is here passed over almost in silence, being only hinted at in the words "being prevented from preaching in Asia." In the brief, pregnant style of Acts this must be understood to imply that, being in Asia, he found himself prevented from preaching there.

Only in one case does the author describe more carefully a journey across a region where no preaching was done, *viz.*, in xvi. 8, *παρελθόντες τὴν Μυσίαν*. It is obvious to any one who looks at a map that Paul and his company could not reach Troas except by passing through Mysia; therefore either *παρελθόντες* is a false reading, or it must be translated "neglected," *i.e.* "did not treat as a sphere of duty." In his recent edition Prof. Blass takes the former alternative,¹ and reads *διελθόντες* (with *Cod. Bez.*);

¹ He says, "*παρελθόντες* sensui adversatur; non prætereunda sed transeunda erat Mysia."

but, according to our previous results, that reading would imply that he preached through Mysia, whereas we learn from v. 6 that he was forbidden to preach in any part of Asia.¹ We are therefore forced to the other alternative. The writer desired to lay special stress on this peculiar non-preaching journey;² and his reason for that is obvious. It is clear that the writer of the paragraph beginning xvi. 6 was filled with the idea of the marvellous and miraculous way in which Paul was led to Europe at this time.³ This idea dominates the narrative and guides the expression. This episode was personally most deeply interesting to the writer. There are perhaps no two paragraphs in Acts that are written so carefully and with such minute delicacy and studied expression as the opening part of the narrative of the second journey; if they are read in South Galatia, every word will bear pressing to the utmost, and the vivid realism becomes clearer the more we press the phraseology. And the reason for this minute elaboration lies in the conclusion of this part of the narrative, viz., the meeting of Paul with the author of *Acts*, and the spread of the new religion to his own country.⁴

¹ In accordance with this prohibition, we find that the evangelization of Troas was reserved for a later journey, 2 *Cor.* ii 12, *Acts* xx. 2. That, of course, would not preclude Paul from converting any individual who came into closer relations with him on the journey.

² It deserves note that this journey impressed itself deeply on popular tradition; but the Mysian tradition about St. Paul would require a separate article, I have touched on it in the *Expositor*, Oct., 1888, p. 264, and April, 1894, p. 295.

³ Bishop Lightfoot has an excellently conceived and beautifully expressed passage to the same effect as the following sentences in his *Biblical Essays*, pp. 237-8. I might simply quote his words to serve my purpose; but I prefer to leave my words as they were printed in January, 1894, long before I read his essay.

⁴ That Renan was right about Luke's European and Macedonian origin I cannot doubt. *Acts* is the composition of a Greek and specially of a Macedonian; its peculiar tone and emotion can be explained or appreciated on no other view (as I venture to believe, and will elsewhere try to prove at length). This gives one of the many concurrent arguments against Prof. Blass's view of the Lucan origin of the Western Text (see xi. 28 in *Cod. Bez.*).

The direct intervention of the Holy Spirit turned Paul away from the natural path forward, a path that he afterwards trod on his third journey, and one that seemed peculiarly suitable. The same action over-ruled his next idea, and guided him, step by step, down to Troas, where he met his destiny, and learned at last what was the Divine will. He was called onwards to Macedonia. Nowhere else in Luke's narrative is the Divine guidance introduced three separate times in a short paragraph.¹ The connexion of ideas, the pressing on of the narrative to this conclusion, gives the tone to the whole paragraph; and the phrase, "he neglected Mysia" (an idea never elsewhere expressed in *Acts*) is one of the impressive details that contribute to the general effect. Prof. Blass and the Bezan Reviser sacrifice this telling point, and force *παρελθόντες* into xvii. 15, where it has no special effect, but at the best would be an interesting little detail (but it is in fact inconsistent with the purpose of Paul and of the historian).

On the North-Galatian view this paragraph is mere rhetoric, for that immensely important historical event, the evangelization of Galatia, is interposed in the midst of the narrative, and the first Divine guidance was directed, not to Europe, as the narrative suggests and implies, but to Galatia. Either the narrator, thinking that the evangelization of Macedonia utterly outshaded and dwarfed that of Galatia, deliberately minimised the place of the latter in order to give prominence to the other, sacrificing historical accuracy to rhetorical effect, or he was ignorant that any visit to Galatia took place at this time. Only the obscurity

¹ In xiii. 1-12 the Divine action is three times mentioned, but (1) it really manifested itself only twice, and (2) its different manifestations do not lead towards one single issue as in xvi. 6-10. But it is important to note that these two great steps in Paul's work are introduced by similar insistence on the Divine purpose, whereas the author is silent about any Divine origin for the journey to Jerusalem and the Apostolic Council in xv. (but he insists on the Divine origin of the journey in xi. 23-xii. 25).

in which Asia Minor was enveloped could have prevented Lightfoot from seeing all that was involved in his own reasoning.

In xvii. 23 the verb is used in an instructive way by Paul: "as I was going through and surveying your cults" (*διερχόμενος καὶ ἀναθεωρῶν τὰ σεβάσματα ὑμῶν*). The speaker's intention was to suggest to his audience that, like other visitors to their famous city, he had gone about examining the numerous temples. The old view that, in passing by, he chanced to see the altar of the "Unknown God," seems quite unsatisfactory. There is no reason to think that Paul would be devoid of interest in this centre of the world's education, or that he merely pretended to have been surveying its objects of interest in order to catch the attention and please the feelings of his audience. He went through the city from point to point, with a definite purpose in his mind; but his attention always turns towards the religious side, and suggests to him means and ways of appealing to the population and presenting to their favourable consideration that gospel which, as he travelled, he preached. This is confirmed by the words used immediately before, *v.* 16, "his spirit was provoked within him, as he beheld the city full of idols."

Our view of Paul's method and spirit as a traveller seems not to be shared by all scholars. According to the most careful exponent of the North-Galatian theory,¹ the apostle, as he traversed Galatia, "was bewildered. He allowed himself to drift. He moved from place to place waiting on Providence"; "he intended, so far as he had any plan at all, to pass through the cities in the west corner of Galatia, and so to journey further north to the cities on the east of Bithynia and of Pontus." "He was quickly, almost aimlessly, passing through 'the Galatian district.'" Such was St. Paul's way of travelling in a country where

¹ EXPOSITOR, Dec., 1893, p. 415.

he was not forbidden to preach, and where indeed he might construe the absence of a prohibition, following immediately after the express prohibition with regard to Asia, as equivalent to a permission to preach! But this is an accurate statement, I think, of what necessarily follows from the North-Galatian theory. Only on the South-Galatian view can we find harmony, purpose, and order in St. Paul's action.

It is remarkable that this construction of *διέρχομαι* never occurs in *Acts* i.-xi., though the idea of a missionary tour several times requires expression. When that idea comes up, the verb is used intransitively, viii. 4, 40, xi. 19 (*ἕως Φοινίκης*), also x. 38 in Peter's speech; and in these cases it is accompanied by the verb *εὐαγγελίζεσθαι* or *λαλεῖν*, defining the purpose of the journey; and in ix. 32 (*διὰ πάντων*) it is used absolutely in the sense of "going over all the saints, place by place" (with the intention of confirming and encouraging them). This intransitive construction is found also in the Third Gospel, *Luke* ix. 6 (*κατὰ τὰς κόμας εὐαγγελιζόμενοι*, cf. xi. 24, where the purpose is a different one, but the use of the verb is exactly similar).

This difference (like some others which have been alluded to elsewhere) points either to difference of authorship, or to the difference of circumstances and time in which the same author was placed. The former alternative appears to me to be negatived by numberless signs of unity of purpose and literary character, and we are reduced to the supposition that in describing the Pauline journeys, the author used almost unaltered the account which he had written long before, and in which he had employed almost as a technical term a word caught from Paul's own lips. Finally it may be noted that the Pauline technical term is more remote from classical Greek usage than the construction adopted in *Acts* i.-xi. and the Third Gospel.

An interesting word occurs in *Acts* xvii. 1: taking their way through (*διοδεύσαντες*) Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica. The word is strikingly appropriate. The writer implies in his narrative that he was with Paul in Philippi, but not in Thessalonica. He would therefore naturally be present when Paul, Silas and Timothy were receiving directions for their journey (*διοδεύειν*) along the main Roman road (*ὁδός*) of the province. In *Luke* viii. 1 the same verb is used with the participles *κηρύσσων καὶ εὐαγγελιζόμενος*, where it seems to be a mere synonym for *διέρχεσθαι*,¹ but there is a clear difference between the connotation of the two verbs as used in *Acts*.

The sense of *χωρισθείς* in xviii. 1 is connected with the difficult question of Paul's Athenian speech, and would require a whole article to itself.

W. M. RAMSAY.

RECENT BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

To Prof. Armitage Robinson's *Texts and Studies* (Cambridge University Press) Mr. F. C. Burkitt has contributed *The Book of Rules of Tyconius*. Mr. Burkitt claims that "the *Liber Regularum* is here printed for the first time in something of the form in which Tyconius wrote it." There is no MS. extant of greater antiquity than the ninth century; but whatever can be done by ascertaining the family relationship of extant MSS., and by careful collation, has been done by the present editor. And, according to his own account, the previous editions by Grynæus, Schott, and Galland were not hard to beat in accuracy. To produce a trustworthy edition of Tyconius is undoubtedly a good work, although we do not sympathize with Mr. Burkitt in his estimate of its intrinsic, apart from its historical, importance. But the use Mr. Burkitt makes of the scripture quotations found in Tyconius is of very great importance as shedding much needed

¹ Perhaps, if we had Luke's original authority in this passage, we should find that some reason dictated the employment of *διοδεύειν*. There seems to be nothing corresponding to it in the other Gospels.

light on the old Latin versions. There is no room here to mention all the conclusions regarding text which are to be drawn from Tyconius, and they will be discussed by experts. Suffice it to say, that the investigation of Mr. Burkitt goes to prove that "in the Old Testament as in the New the text of our oldest MSS., as a whole, is . . . immensely superior to the later eclectic texts commonly used in the Greek-speaking churches from the middle of the fourth century." It is important also to notice that Mr. Burkitt's investigations seem to show that B may not give us uniformly so immaculate a text as it is sometimes credited with.

Dr. Joseph Parker may be congratulated on being within sight of the conclusion of his *People's Bible*, although a book which has given so much pleasure to its readers can have been anything but a tedious burden to the writer. The present volume contains "Romans to Galatians." The last-named epistle receives scant justice. Containing as it does the quintessence of Paulinism, it deserved both fuller and more exact treatment. It is needless now to say that all that Dr. Parker writes, exhibits his extraordinary freshness, fertility and force.

To the *Expositor's Bible* (Hodder and Stoughton), Archdeacon Farrar has contributed the volume on *Daniel*. There has been for many years a crying need of a trustworthy and popular introduction to this book. Dr. Farrar has supplied precisely what was wanted. His work is learned, and shows that he has spared no pains to get at the truth, but his results, and even the steps by which these results are reached, are presented attractively and intelligently. This should be one of the most widely read volumes of the series.

Attention may also be directed to the Rev. Robert G. Balfour's *Central Truths and Side Issues* (T. & T. Clark), a volume in which are contained acute and valuable discussions of the Incarnation, the Atonement and the Resurrection. An ingenious interpretation is also propounded of the clause which speaks of "Baptisms and the laying on of hands" in Heb. vi. The keen interest which Dr. Balfour himself takes in theological questions he succeeds in imparting to his reader. He writes from a conservative point of view, but is by no means obscurantist.

MARCUS DODS.

*THE MIRACULOUS CONCEPTION AND VIRGIN
BIRTH OF CHRIST.*

THE historical fact of the supernatural birth of Christ is definitely asserted in the Apostles' Creed, which for many centuries has been the baptismal Creed of Western Christendom. That venerable formulary teaches us to profess belief "in Jesus Christ, the only Son of God, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary."

During the last two years a great controversy has been raised in Protestant Germany about the Apostles' Creed. It has been maintained by Professor Harnack, whose dissertation on the subject has run through thirty editions or more, that many of the Articles of this Creed are of late origin, and some of them distinctly in excess of apostolic teaching. Now it is perfectly true that some of the clauses of the Creed were of comparatively late introduction into the formulary, such as "the descent into hell," and "the communion of saints," though this is no proof that the doctrines implied in these clauses were not held by the ancient Church. But when it is alleged that the doctrine of the miraculous conception and the Virgin birth of Christ does not belong to the earliest Gospel teaching, and was a poetical or mythological invention of the second century of the Christian Church, we are compelled to ask ourselves, Is this true? Are we to surrender our belief in the first fact of the miracle of the Incarnation? Have we been mistaken all along in supposing Jesus to have been born in a way different from other men? Are the first two chapters of the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Luke historically untrustworthy, filled with fables and poetical imaginings,

We go still further back in time, and we find Ignatius, the martyr of Antioch, equally distinct in his assertion of the mystery. "The Prince of this world," he declared in one of his letters (Ephesians, ch. 19), "was ignorant of the virginity of Mary and of her child-bearing. This was one of the mysteries which were wrought in the silence of God, but are now to be proclaimed to the world." To the mind of Ignatius it was as certain a fact as the Crucifixion. He asserts its reality as a proof that Jesus was not, as some heretics alleged, a mere phantom and illusion. There is then adequate evidence that at the beginning of the second century the miraculous conception and the Virgin birth both formed part of the belief of the Church in such great centres of Christian life as Antioch and Ephesus.

Working backwards from the Christian writers of the second century, we come to the books of the New Testament. The Scriptural authorities for the belief are undoubtedly the Gospels of S. Matthew and S. Luke. If the first two chapters of each of these Gospels are trustworthy, controversy is at an end. These early chapters are integral parts of their respective Gospels. They are not found wanting in early MSS. The opening chapters of S. Luke are known to have been omitted with many other portions of the same Gospel by heretical writers (*e.g.* Marcion) with a definite purpose served by the mutilation. Consider more particularly the testimony of S. Luke's Gospel. Impartial and learned critics, balancing all the available evidence, have arrived at the conclusion that the date of the publication of this Gospel cannot be put later than A.D. 80, *i.e.* scarce fifty years from the Crucifixion. The author professes to be writing a grave historical document. He claims attention for it, because he has carefully collected the information of the Christian beliefs and facts from those who had been from the beginning eye-witnesses and ministers of the Word, and he describes himself as "having traced the

course of all things accurately from the first" [R.V.]. His object in writing is that Theophilus, and with him all other disciples, might be assured of the certainty of the truths in which they had been orally instructed. There is no exception made for any part of the narrative which follows. It is a historian of accurate research, not a poet or a romancer, who is writing. When we look more closely into his narrative of the events of the infancy of Jesus, we notice a marked difference of style. The preface is an elaborate literary production, such as is natural for Luke, the beloved physician, a highly educated Christian of Gentile or possibly half-Gentile birth. But what immediately follows is all thoroughly Jewish in thought and style and language. It looks like a translation of some Hebrew or Aramaean document or fixed oral tradition. From whom could have been derived the accounts of the birth of John the Baptist, and of the annunciation to the Virgin Mary, and of the salutation of Elizabeth by Mary, and of the incidents of the birth of Jesus at Bethlehem, the song of the angels, and the visit of the shepherds, the prophetic utterances of Simeon and Anna at the presentation of the infant in the temple, the visit to Jerusalem twelve years later, from whom save from Mary, the mother of the Lord? We know that she lived on after the period of the Resurrection and the Ascension [Acts i. 14], whereas Joseph never appears on the scene after the Lord's ministry had once begun, and had in all probability died in the interval. "A cycle of narratives must have formed itself around Mary in the retreat in which she ended her career. In the record as given by S. Luke, she certainly assumes the principal part. It is she who receives the visit of the angel, to her is communicated the name of the child, her private feelings are brought out in the narrative; it is she who is prominent in the address of Simeon, and in the history of the search for the child."¹ There is certainly a strong presumption

¹ Godet, *Commentary on St. Luke*, vol. i. p. 162.

that S. Luke had obtained in his researches access to this source of information. Is it altogether fanciful to suppose that the original source is hinted at in the narrative itself? What is the natural inference from these two verses—“Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart” (ii. 19); “His mother kept all these sayings in her heart” (ii. 51)?

An attempt has been made to invalidate the historical veracity of S. Luke's narrative by saying that it is utterly inconsistent with that of S. Matthew. In S. Matthew it is to Joseph that an angel appears announcing the coming birth and allaying his scruples. There is no mention there of Elizabeth and Simeon and Anna, no story of angels singing in the sky, and shepherds adoring the infant Saviour. From aught that appears there it would seem that the holy family had no connexion with Nazareth before they went down there after their return from Egypt. This discussion is too long to enter upon in any detail, but I venture to say that it has been proved satisfactorily that there is no inconsistency between the two Evangelists, only entire independence. Their narratives must be derived from different sources. What more probable than that S. Matthew's came from Joseph, the reputed father of Jesus, some of whose family were living in the earliest days of the Church, one of them, James, being president or (as later phrase would say) bishop of the Church at Jerusalem? S. Matthew's primary object in his first two chapters was obviously not to give a full history of all the particulars of the infancy and childhood of Jesus, but to notice specially those incidents thereof which might be regarded as fulfillments of ancient prophecy, and so tended to prove that Jesus was no other than the promised Jewish Messiah.

It has been objected that two of the Gospels, S. Mark's and S. John's, omit all mention of the miraculous conception, and therefore it cannot have been true. But it is

an unwarranted assumption that whatever is not recorded by all four Gospels is necessarily unhistorical. The Gospels are not four repetitions of exactly the same facts and discourses. It is easy to see why S. Mark does not refer to the Virgin birth. His Gospel is a record only of the public ministerial life of Jesus, "beginning from the baptism of John till the day that Jesus was taken up into heaven" (Acts i. 22), and therefore omits all description of the first thirty years after His birth. S. John wrote after the three other Gospels had been published, and it was sufficient for him to presuppose among the Christians for whom he first wrote a knowledge of the history recorded in those earlier documents. It was his mission to write a spiritual rather than a fleshly gospel, explaining how Jesus had a divine pre-existence as the Son of God, who in the fulness of the time became flesh. He too begins his historical narrative with the ministry of John the Baptist, and passes over the infancy and childhood of Jesus. But again and again he records those mysterious discourses in which Jesus spoke of Himself as the only begotten Son of God sent into the world, as having God for His Father in a pre-eminent sense, as the bread which came down from heaven, as about to ascend up where He was before. If he tells us that the Jewish people said, "Is not this Jesus, the Son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know?" he tells us also how Jesus, without formally disclaiming this description, speaks immediately of His heavenly Father God: "No man can come to Me except the Father which hath sent Me draw him." He tells them of the living Father by whom He Himself lives (John vi. 57).

Again, it has been urged as a very strong objection to this article of our faith that S. Paul knew nothing of it: he never makes any reference to it in his writings: he never counts it among the primary truths which he has been commissioned to preach: he never founds

any argument upon it. In estimating the worth of objections based upon these considerations, we are bound to remember the peculiar position of S. Paul.

He was not an original Apostle. He had not been, like the twelve, an eye-witness and an ear-witness of what Jesus had done and said. Partly from special revelation, and partly from the testimony of the original Apostles, he had received the knowledge of the great facts of the Crucifixion and Resurrection and Ascension of Jesus Christ. We do not know for certain whether he had ever seen a written Gospel, most probably not, or even any written document which had subsequently been incorporated with the written Gospel. We may remember that there is no reference in any of his letters to any of the special miracles of healing recorded in the Gospels. S. Paul's chief mission was to preach Christ crucified and Christ risen, and therefore these two critical facts in the life of Christ were those on which he most insisted as the basis of Christian hope and faith, and upon which he rested the grand theological doctrines of atonement, regeneration, justification, sanctification, and future glory. The proclamation of the Virgin birth of Jesus in and by itself, without any reference to the holy life and sacrificial death and the triumphant resurrection of Christ, would not have been a fit argument to address in the first instance to the heathen world nor to the unbelieving Jew. It might have led to gross misrepresentation or even to atrocious calumny, as it did before the end of the second century. But because this doctrine was not a suitable argument at the first preaching of the Gospel, it by no means follows that it was unknown to the first preachers of the Gospel. In regard to S. Paul particularly, it is hard to think that he who held so firmly the belief in the sinlessness of Jesus, and yet taught that every descendant of Adam by natural generation was involved in inherited sinfulness, could have been ignorant of the truth that Jesus was ex-

empted from this congenital fault of nature by being born a Man in a way different from other men, and therefore supernatural. It may be unsafe to lay stress, as some have done, on such a passage as that in the Galatian letter, "God sent forth His Son *made of a woman*," as referring to the miraculous conception: this need not mean more than the assumption of human nature. But when, writing to the Corinthians, S. Paul draws a contrast between the first man Adam as being of the earth—earthy, and the second Man Christ, as the Lord from heaven, we have language which presupposes as its foundation not an ordinary parentage as of Joseph and Mary, but an extraordinary phenomenon, such as is expressed in our Apostles' Creed, "conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary," and in our Nicene Creed, the Lord Jesus Christ "was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary."

We may observe that the Gospels, when describing *the ministry* of our Lord, make no reference to the miraculous conception. They do not record that either Jesus Himself or His disciples corrected the false impression of His birth when the people spoke of Him as the Son of Joseph, though we may do well to remember that this popular language is only quoted three times in all the four Gospels, if we exclude from calculation the chapters recording the events of the infancy. But the real facts of the birth could have been known only to Mary and to Joseph, and Joseph as before observed, almost certainly was dead before the ministry of Jesus began. And we reverently ask, Was it likely that Jesus Himself would tell the fact of His miraculous birth to those who saw Him for the first time? Was there nothing more cogent to teach those who were just yielding to His influence? As has been thoughtfully asked by the Swiss theologian already quoted (Godet), "Who cannot understand why Jesus should allow the words of the people to pass without announcing such a fact as this to the cavil-

ling, mocking Jews? Jesus testifies before all what He has seen with His Father by the inward sense, and not outward facts which He had from the lips of others. Above all, He knew well that it was not faith in His miraculous birth that would produce faith in His Person. On the contrary, that it was only faith in His Person that would induce any one to admit the miracle of His birth. He saw that to put out before a hostile and profane people an assertion like this, which He could not possibly prove, would only draw forth a flood of coarse ridicule which would fall directly on that revered person who was more concerned in this history than Himself, and that without the least advantage to the faith of any one. Certainly this was a case for the application of the precept, "Cast not your pearls before swine, if you would not have them turn again and rend you." A very similar reply has been given by an eminent English theologian. "It has often been asked why, if our Lord could have referred to His supernatural origin, if His mother could have borne witness to it, if He were really the Son of David born under miraculous circumstances at Bethlehem, He should have allowed, as He more than once did in the course of the history, objections to remain unanswered, which would at once have been removed by an establishment of these facts? The answer may well be, that the facts, from their essentially private and delicate character, could never have been established to the satisfaction of persons who were not predisposed to believe them by the conviction, based on other grounds, of our Lord's divine, or at least superhuman character. The calumnies afterwards circulated on the subject are alone sufficient justification of the reticence which our Lord observed on this subject in the presence of hostile or unbelieving crowds. On such a topic the principle is eminently applicable. "If they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded though one rose from the dead." If men

rejected His moral and spiritual claims, He refused to show them signs from heaven; and still more sacred considerations must have debarred Him from appealing to His mother to answer their cavils.¹

With regard to the special question which has been occupying our attention, we shall not be in the right attitude for meeting the objections urged against the old faith of Catholic Christendom, unless we recognise that there is a due order in which the preaching of the Gospel must present the facts of the life of Christ. Naturally in the Creeds the chronological historical order is followed. They begin with the birth, they end with the Resurrection and Ascension. But in evangelical teaching we begin with the Resurrection, as did the Apostles. They were first and above all things witnesses of the Resurrection: that admitted was a proof of the unique superhuman character of Jesus: that led back to the immediately preceding fact of His death by crucifixion, and the revelation therein of human guilt and Divine love and reconciliation between God and man. Then the life of heavenly teaching and beneficent activity would corroborate the impression of the stupendous facts in which it had culminated, and so the starting point of the Divine Incarnation taught by the Church would naturally be found in an unique birth, a new beginning of the human race, from which was to germinate the new creation of man. The miraculous conception, the miraculous Resurrection, are seen as perfectly harmonious parts of the Divine intervention for man's regeneration. When voices around us urge us to adopt the simplest form of Christianity, which would reduce Christ to human proportions, ascribe to Him an ordinary birth, and construe His resurrection as a spiritual metaphor, we reply, This is not a simple explanation of the facts: it is unintelligible, irrational. It does not account for the history of Christ

¹ Dr. Wace: *The Gospel and its Witnesses*, p. 56.

or of Christianity. A supernatural and a miraculous Christianity is the only rational Christianity. The central truth of the Gospel is "The Word was made flesh." It will be wise for us in presence of this deep mystery to imitate Mary, the meek and submissive Virgin mother, by keeping all these things and pondering them in our hearts.

WILLIAM INCE.

THE "CURSING OF THE GROUND," AND THE
"REVEALING OF THE SONS OF GOD," IN
RELATION TO NATURAL FACTS.

THE subject treated in the following pages cannot claim the charm of novelty. It is one of the oldest topics of theological discussion, it is more or less noticed in every commentary on Genesis, and in some of those on the Epistle to the Romans and on the Book of Revelation, and it has been a subject of special treatises, some of them of great value, as, for example, McDonald's *Creation and the Fall*, and Ellicott's sermons on the *Destiny of the Creature*. It has also been treated of by several writers on the relations of religion and science, and recently it has been ably discussed by Dr. Phillips in the *Expository Times*,¹ and in one of its aspects by Dr. Agar Beet in the *EXPOSITOR*.² It might seem, therefore, to require no further treatment. It appears, however, to the writer that many misconceptions still exist as to the relations between the teaching of the Bible and the natural phenomena open to our observation; and it is from this point of view or "in relation to natural facts," as at present known to us, that I would venture to present it to your readers. In doing so I shall take the liberty of assuming as a working hypothesis

¹ April, June and August, 1894.

² December, 1894.

that in nature and revelation we are dealing with sources of information having one author, though reaching us in different ways, and that the early chapters of Genesis relating to Eden and the Fall record actual history of events witnessed, it is true, by few persons, but transmitted by them to their successors truthfully as they understood them, and communicated to us through men qualified and commissioned to that end by the Spirit of God. Taking thus the legitimate results of science as accurate representations of nature, and the Bible as the authoritative history of man in his relation to God, we shall divest the subject of many complexities, and shall be able to test our hypothesis by the facts as they develop themselves.

The terms of our title may thus be held to cover the questions of a physical kind that arise respecting the story of the fall of man and its immediate results, and respecting the predicted reversal of these penal consequences in the later days of human history. These questions may be stated to be principally the following:—

(1) What were the conditions and environment of man before the Fall?

(2) What must have been the consequences of the Fall in relation to these conditions and environment?

(3) What changes in relation to these consequences may have occurred in the course of human history?

(4) What are the prospects and character of the final restoration predicted in the Bible?

We may not be able to keep strictly to this order, but may sometimes have occasion, for the sake of clearness, to anticipate details coming more properly under subsequent heads. If, however, we can clearly comprehend the conditions required under the first head, these will clear the way for less lengthy discussion of the remaining topics.

I. MAN BEFORE THE FALL.

The problem of absolute creation is at present insoluble, and may always remain so. Lotze well suggests that in some sense this must be the case under any imaginable conditions. If we suppose a naturalist, whether agnostic or theistic, to have actually witnessed the first emergence into being of low forms of life in the primeval waters, we cannot suppose that he would see any manipulation, or hear any command. He might perceive the appearance of living animals where there were none previously, but by what means inorganic atoms had been induced to arrange themselves in protoplasmic molecules, how they were enabled to shape themselves into organs, and how these became endowed with life, would be as inscrutable to the actual spectator and as much a matter of inference as they can be to us. If an agnostic, the witness of the fact might at once say, "This is an example of purely spontaneous generation of an accidental or fortuitous character." If a theist, he might say, "This is the finger of God"; but the evidence for one view or the other would be exactly what it is to-day. Even if we were to suppose a biologist to be a witness of the origination of man from the dust of the ground or from inorganic molecules, or if, on the other hand, he were to witness the production of a human child, however imperfect, from an anthropoid mother of however advanced type, he would have no clue to any merely material or physical explanation of the phenomenon, and it would not make any essential difference whether the process was sudden or gradual. In either case he could not see the manner of the divine action nor account for the results by mere necessity or chance. In point of fact, whatever forms of words we may invent to conceal our ignorance, we are no nearer the solution of this great problem than was the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews when he said, "By faith we perceive

that the ages were constituted by the Word of God, so that things seen (*τὰ βλεπόμενα*), were not made out of physical appearances (*ἐκ φαινομένων*).¹ In accordance with this, the late Sir Richard Owen, when pressed by a friend to state his views as to the introduction of life, wrote, "As I do not know the secondary cause by which it may have pleased the Creator to introduce organised species into this planet, I have never expressed orally or in print any opinion on the subject."²

But though the actual fact of creation may thus be as much unknowable as the essence of God Himself, the laws and conditions of such an occurrence are not unknown, and in the case of man we may ascertain certain of these conditions which have been fulfilled in his appearance on the earth. These may be stated here shortly, and as received results of scientific inquiry, without any elaborate proof or illustration, except when this may seem to be required.

(1) Man is not known among the earliest of animals in point of time, but appears only after, for vastly extended periods, living things of lower types had existed, and after the continents of the earth, with their mountains, plains, rivers and climatal conditions, had been brought by long and complex physical processes very nearly into their present condition.

(2) Man thus appeared at a time when the earth was already stocked with plants of the highest rank and with the highest grades of merely animal life. Nay, there is good geological reason to believe that at the time of his first appearance the land was more richly peopled with plants and animals than it is at the present day, for there has certainly been extinction of many important species since the beginning of the human period, without a corresponding introduction of new forms in their place.

¹ Chap. xi. v. 3.

² Biography, vol. i., chap. x. p. 309.

(3) More especially we may affirm that at the time of man's introduction the organic world had attained to completeness in regard to those vegetable productions which are useful and beautiful. The ancient floras of the older geological periods were not so suited to human needs, and they had passed away and had been replaced by flowering and fruit-bearing plants pleasant to the eye and good for food.

(4) In the animal kingdom the great and ferocious reptilian monsters of the Mesozoic or age of reptiles had disappeared, and the low and brutal mammals of the earlier Tertiary; and though there still remained great and dangerous beasts of prey, all the forms of higher mammalian life which have proved most useful and congenial to man had been introduced.

(5) In these preparations nothing was done for man beyond what, with due allowance for the lower needs of humbler creatures, had been done for previous forms of life; for it is an established law that the physical and vital developments of the world have gone on *pari passu* from the dawn of life, and that new types of animals have not appeared until the conditions were favourable to them; and as a rule the occurrence of such favourable conditions did not long continue till appropriate forms of life were introduced. This as a law is altogether independent of any opinions which may be entertained with reference to the development of animals or the possible causal relations of the environment to changes in organic beings.

(6) It is also a law of the succession of life that lower and older forms of living beings are removed to make way for those that are newer and higher. For example the more varied and complex vegetation of the middle and later Tertiary could not have occupied the world without the previous removal on a great scale of the more monotonous and lower vegetation of earlier periods, nor could

the mammals of the Tertiary have co-existed with the enormous development of reptilian life in the previous period. This again is independent of the question whether we regard the succession as a result of repeated extinctions and creations or of any process of slow and gradual development.

It follows from these statements that death and physical suffering must have existed from the introduction of animal life. The individual must die. Even the species is ultimately mortal. This is, in so far as we can understand, inseparable from the multiplication and succession of animal forms, and is indeed essential to their continued and happy existence. Let it be observed, however, that in lower animals the way is prepared for dissolution of the organism with a minimum amount of pain and without any of those aggravations which in man arise from a conscious and spiritual nature. It is most unreasonable to read into past states of the world conditions which spring from the peculiarities of man, and from his special relation to the world around him and to a future life. This is particularly unfair on the part of those who would practically deny an ethical and spiritual element in man himself. It is also to be observed here that it is the conscious individuality and the progressive rational and spiritual nature of man that alone warrant the idea stated in the Bible that man was to have been exempted from the law of mortality. This however is a subject to be discussed in the sequel.

The stress laid on the doctrines of natural selection and struggle for existence has of late thrown into the background another principle which, because of this and of its vital importance, requires a more full illustration than those previously noticed. This is the paramount influence of facility for expansion in the introduction of new forms of life. In point of fact, it seems to have been this more

than any other condition of the environment that has been potent in the introduction of new species of living beings in geological time, not as the primary cause, but as furnishing the combinations of circumstances in which alone such introductions are possible. The continents of the earth, or those portions of its surface which project above the general ocean covering, have in the main continued from the first in the same positions. Their foundations, once laid, have been those which continued to be built upon. They have however experienced many vicissitudes in the matter of elevation and depression. At certain periods their lower levels have been submerged and then re-elevated, and this has occurred again and again. These pulsations of the earth's crust have synchronised with the great changes of fauna and flora marking geological periods, and it is in consequence of them that so very great a proportion of the stratified deposits of the continents are proved, by the fossil remains which they contain, to have been deposited under the sea. An example taken from the American Continent may make this plain. The great triangular internal plateau of North America between the Apalachians and the Rocky Mountains has preserved very continuous records of these earth-movements. At different periods of geological time, indicated by successive beds of fossiliferous limestone, it has been a vast Mediterranean Sea extending from the Gulf of Mexico almost to the Arctic Ocean. In these times of submergence any land animals or plants which inhabited it have been destroyed or have had to take refuge on the island heights remaining above water, while the new inland sea has become the theatre of the development of swarms of marine creatures not known in previous periods, and coming in to occupy the new and favourable habitats provided for them. At one of these periods of submergence marked by the "Corniferous" limestone of the Devonian Period, nearly two hundred

species of corals, most of them not previously known, sprang into existence to take advantage of the facilities offered them. When the land rose again into the plains and swamps of the Carboniferous age, a crowd of strange and previously unknown plants, insects, land-snails and batrachian reptiles appeared to take up the vacant ground. The testimony of geology thus is that while compression and struggle depauperate and finally kill, elbow-room and freedom for expansion are connected with multiplication and improvement. The great physical changes of submergence and elevation of the continents thus constitute veritable epochs in the succession of life. Each new marine fauna is the product of a time of extensive submergence. Each land fauna and flora belongs to a time of continental elevation. The times of submergence are those of great extinction of land-life whether animal or vegetable, and the times of elevation are marked by similar fatality to marine creatures. The whole may be stated under the two great laws: first, that living creatures are introduced or perish in accordance with great physical changes in their environment; secondly, that new forms of life are produced in the times and places favourable to their comfortable subsistence, multiplication, and extension. Such views as those above stated may seem to some to tend toward the exploded idea of cataclysmal extinction and renovation. Of cataclysms involving universal destruction of living creatures, it is true, we have no evidence; but, on the other hand, it is perfectly certain that wide-spread physical changes, more especially of subsidence and elevation, have been connected with the outgoing and incoming of successive faunas and floras in geological time.

These considerations enable us to form some idea of the conditions under which man would most probably be introduced on the earth. It would surely be fair to suppose that this last and crowning type of the animal creation

would be as well provided for as the swarming lower animals that had preceded him. We might go farther than this, and suppose that since man is a creature not endowed with instincts adapting him unfailingly to his environment, but requiring to work out for himself by reason, imagination, and habitude even the means of comfortable subsistence, and needing time to attain to this, he would be even more bountifully provided for. This would be only analogous to the remarkable fact of the long infancy and childhood of the individual man. The species must also have its protected childhood to acquire the knowledge and the capacity needful to enable it to exist and assert its place at the head of creation; because deficient in those natural instincts and powers, whether of locomotion, attack, or defence, which enable the lower animals each to play its part in nature without any special training.

More than all this, man constituted a new departure in the progress of the organic world, the introduction of a higher rational and moral nature; and this new departure is marked out not merely in his physical frame and his large brain and erect position, but by those very deficiencies in swiftness and power and natural weapons, to which reference has already been made, and which mark him as the ruler and friend, not the enemy, of the lower creatures.

We should therefore *a priori* expect man to appear in some favoured region affording supplies of vegetable food throughout the year, and not requiring protection either from excessive cold or heat, and exempt from the attacks of the more formidable predaceous animals. At the same time there should be facilities for extending his range as his numbers increased, and it might be expected that older forms of life belonging to previous periods and unsuitable for the new anthropic age would be removed out of his way. This would only be in accordance with the arrangements which existed in all previous cases of a similar

kind, as we now know on the best geological evidence. I may quote here a saying of the late Hugh Falconer, one of the ablest of English palæontologists, and who made so wonderful discoveries in the Tertiary mammals of India: "Here (in the newer Miocene era) was clear evidence physical and organic that the present order of things had set in from a very remote period in India. Every condition was suited to the requirements of man, the lower animals which approach him nearest in physical structure were already numerous; and the wild stocks from which he trains races to bear his yoke in domesticity were established; why then, in the light of a natural inquiry, might not the human race have made its appearance at that time in the same region." Here Falconer recognises what we may call the Edenic conditions for the appearance of man, though they may perhaps not have been realized quite so early in geological time as he supposes.¹

Man would thus appropriately appear not in a period of submergence but of continental elevation, in an age when a mild climate existed over large portions of the world, and when plant and animal life had been developed in a high state of perfection. The Bible idea of an Edenic plain, watered by large rivers, and therefore a part of a great continent, in a temperate latitude, stocked with trees and plants pleasant to the sight and good for food, and free from the more formidable wild beasts, comes as near as possible to what may be termed the natural requirements of the

¹ *Quarterly Journal Geological Society*, vol. xxi., 1865, p. 386. The occurrence of flints, supposed to be worked, in upper Miocene or Lower Pliocene beds in Burma has been reported by Dr. Noetling (Rupert Jones, *Natural Science*, Nov., 1894). The skull and femur more recently found by Dr. Dubois in river alluvium in Java belong to a much more modern period, and do not warrant the conclusions based on them as to a species intermediate between men and apes. Should farther discoveries show that they really represent a primitive race of men, their characters would not be surprising, as we cannot suppose the earliest men to have been equal in brain development to the antediluvian giants of some of the cavern deposits, who were probably a hybrid race, and of exceptional physical power. (See *Nature*, Feb. 28, 1895.)

case, as we find them exemplified in the introduction of the lower animals which approach most nearly to man.

But man, as we know, is not limited by unchanging instincts. He has the capacity to provide himself with many appliances, and to make up for his inferiority in natural tools by the devices of his inventive mind. Therefore, if we forecast his history, we must make some allowances for these peculiarities. The climatal conditions of our continents have also differed in different periods. In some a warm climate has extended nearly to the poles. In others cold conditions have prevailed far toward the equator. Man may have been introduced in a period of exceptional warmth, or of temperate climate tending to further improvement. On the other hand, his advent may have occurred in a time of temperate climate tending perhaps toward refrigeration. In the latter case his possible habitat would be limited. In the former he would have wide scope for extension without increasing his artificial appliances. If he had to migrate, as population increased, into more severe climates, or into regions tenanted by formidable beasts, if he had to destroy or to tame animals and to enter on laborious cultivation, he must invent weapons and implements, provide clothing and shelter, obtain the aid of fire, and in many other ways change his condition. If, on the other hand, he was to have had his way prepared for him, as it had been for his predecessors, he might have been spared all this trouble, though the work of ameliorating the world and extending his Eden might have been slow and gradual, involving perhaps physical changes and the extinction of some animals, with the increase and migration of others, suitable to the companionship and service of man. Even in this case, however, his knowledge and capacities must have greatly increased in process of time. He must have become acquainted with many new and interesting, as well as useful, natural

facts. He might, even if exempt from the practice of arts necessary to subsistence, have exercised his inventive powers and manual dexterity in a variety of pleasing ways conducive to his greater happiness. The increase of men would have produced a variety of new social and political relations, as well as need for facilities of communication, transmission of intelligence, preservation of records, determinations of time, distance, and direction; and hence inquiry into the laws of nature and scientific, literary and æsthetic culture. What all this might have become in an unbroken golden age of primitive innocence, though we may infer somewhat from the principles already laid down, it would require the imagination of a poet to conceive fully. We may, however, readily fancy that it would have been something very different from the actual history of humanity.

That such extension and improvement of man in his primitive state of innocence is implied in the Bible we learn from the statement that he was not only to serve and to care for his garden, but also to increase and multiply and replenish the earth, and to subdue or bring it into subjection; as well as from the mention of gold, pearls and stones for implements or ornaments (gold, bedolach and shoham stone) in connection with one of the rivers of Eden.

If we ask in what precise geological period the conditions necessary to the advent of man actually occurred in any part of the world, geology informs us that this could not have been till the later part of the Miocene Tertiary, and in the warm temperate zone, as suggested in the above extract from Falconer. Possibly this time is too early, for all the known species of Miocene mammals are now extinct, so that if man, or any similar being existed then, we might suppose the species to have perished and to have been replaced by another. Further, the succeeding Pliocene, though a time of continental elevation, was also one of

vast aqueous erosion and of gigantic volcanic eruptions and earth-movements, which could not fail to have been injurious or locally destructive to men had they been numerous at that time. The next age also, that of the Pleistocene, was one of unusually frigid climate, and also of great local vicissitudes, a glacial age in short, most unfavourable to human interests. Thus the earliest time in which the required conditions can be certainly assumed would be the post-glacial continental period, which is that in which we actually find the earliest certain remains of men, and the date of which does not conflict with the ordinarily received ideas of human chronology.

It now remains for us to inquire whether anything occurred to interrupt the normal development of the human species in accordance with the principles above stated, and what testimony we have in Bible history or in nature of such an occurrence as the "fall of man." This we may take up in our next paper, in the first place from the Biblical or historical standpoint, and then in the light of our knowledge of early man from his actual remains.

J. WILLIAM DAWSON.

ST. JEROME ON THE PSALMS.

DOM MORIN needs no introduction to readers of the EXPOSITOR. To liturgical students he is known as the editor of *Liber Comicus*; patristic students owe him a greater debt for the recovery of an early Latin version of the Epistle of St. Clement. His latest work, while dealing with another patristic text, contains materials of special importance for the student of the Old Testament. It is from that point of view that I propose to offer a few remarks upon it here.

The new part of the *Anecdota Maredsolana*¹ is not, strictly speaking, an anecdoton: the greater part of Jerome's Notes on the Psalter has long been accessible in the *Breviarium in Psalmos* which appears among his printed works. From a table supplied by the editor of the *Anecdota* (III. i., p. xii.) it appears that not more than two-fifths of the *Commentarioli* are actually new. But the Hieronymian matter of the *Breviarium* is so interlarded with later comments, that hitherto it has been precarious to claim any part of the book as the genuine work of Jerome. Only in the case of a single Psalm (cxxxviii.) has the *Breviarium* preserved the original text without adulteration. This fact may be taken as the measure of the gain which we derive from the present publication even in regard to those portions of the Notes which are not now printed for the first time. The comments upon some fifty psalms, chiefly in the second half of the Psalter, are absolutely new.

Cardinal Pitra (*Analecta Sacra*, ii. 395) calls attention to a passage in which Jerome (ep. cxii.) furnishes a text of Greek

¹ "Anecdota Maredsolana vol. iii. p. 1 . . Sancti Hieronymi presbyteri qui deperditi hactenus putabantur commentarioli in Psalmos. Edidit, commentaria critica instruxit, prolegomena et indices adiecit D. Germanus Morin, Presbyter et monachus Ord. S. Benedicti Maredsolensis. Maredsoli . . 1895."

and Latin expositors of the Psalms anterior to himself. Of Greek commentators, Jerome counts up six—Origen, Eusebius, Theodore of Heraclea, Asterius, Apollinaris of Laodicea, Didymus; of Latins, three—Hilary of Poitiers, Eusebius of Vercellae, and Ambrose. Origen was not, however, as Pitra points out, the earliest of the Greek expositors; he was preceded by Hippolytus, whose name frequently occurs in the *catenae*. Yet if Origen was not first in the field, his works were certainly the source upon which the Greek expositors who followed him principally drew; and as for the Latins, Jerome fully admits their obligations to the great Alexandrian. Jerome's Notes plead guilty to the same indictment. He professes himself dissatisfied with the *Enchiridion*, but admits that his book is more or less a compilation from Origen's larger works upon the Psalms; "ex quae in tomis vel in homiliis ipse disseruit . . . in hunc angustum commentariolum referam." It would be easy, however, to overestimate Jerome's indebtedness to Origen. Much in these Notes bears the stamp of the Latin Father's own mind; his learning shews itself in references to Josephus, Tertullian, Lactantius; more than once he refers to his personal study of the Hexapla, and the criticisms passed upon the text of the LXX., the citations from the other Greek versions, the corrections of the Greek based upon the current Hebrew, are probably due, at least in great part, to Jerome himself.

As we might have expected, the Notes are largely occupied with *allegoria* and *prophetia*, and supporters of the *historia* who neglect the deeper sense are condemned (pp. 10, 39, 42, 75, 78). Many of the Psalms are characterized as Messianic. Psalm i. is to be interpreted, not in reference to Josiah, but as fulfilled in the *adsumptus homo*; a severe censure is passed upon expositors who regard Esther as the speaker in Psalm xxi. (= xxii.); Psalms lxviii. (= lxix.) and lxxi. (= lxxii.) are considered as exclusively

applicable to Christ. Yet an effort is made to determine the occasion of each psalm from its title, and sometimes the historical interpretation is the only one allowed, even when it involves a quaintness which borders on absurdity (cf. *e.g.* the explanation of Psalm lxxvii. (=lxxviii.) 66 by a reference to 1 Sam. v. 6, 9 (LXX.). In the same spirit the traditional interpretation of Psalm xcvi. (=xcix.) 5, *προσκυνεῖτε τῷ ὑποποδίῳ τῶν ποδῶν αὐτοῦ*, is, notwithstanding the authority of Athanasius, rejected in favour of a more natural exegesis.

The Notes contain interesting remarks on various topics connected with the Psalter, such as the division of the Psalms into books (pp. 46, 59), and the existence of alphabetical and metrical Psalms (pp. 37, 81, 82, 85, 98). Historical and geographical information is occasionally interspersed; there are references to the age of persecution (p. 23), and to the ancient discipline of the Church (p. 93); we learn (p. 90) that Bethlehem still bore the name of Ephrata; Psalm lxxiii. (=lxxiv.) 4 is explained by a Babylonian custom of fixing trophies over city gates; there is a liturgical note of some importance (p. 76 f.) on the Jewish and Christian use of *Alleluia* in the recitation of the Psalter. Lastly, several passages possess dogmatic interest, *e.g.* a condemnation of Traducianism (p. 41); a statement that the wrath of God is purely corrective (pp. 7, 51); references to the doctrine of the "captivity of souls" (pp. 58, 93). Psalm ciii. (=civ.) 24 is quoted against Marcionite and Manichean error; Psalm cxlv. (=cxlvi.) against Novatianism; Psalm cix. (=cx.) 1 is defended against Arian misinterpretation.

Several of these incidental remarks are attractive, and deserve careful handling. But for the present I must be content merely to direct attention to them, limiting myself to the materials which the Notes supply to the student of the text of the Psalter. These will fall under two heads:

(1) corrections or elucidations of the Greek Psalter from the current Hebrew ; (2) contributions to our knowledge of the Hexapla.

(1) *Corrections of the LXX. from the Hebrew.*

- ii. 12. δράξασθε παιδείας. "The Hebrew may be rendered *adorate filium.*" Jerome does not refer to the alternative *adorate pure*, which he adopts in the "Hebrew" Psalter.
- iv. 3. *Selah* is either a musical note, or, as Aquila's ἀεί suggests, a sign of perpetuity. It is not a pause in the music, since in ix. 17 we meet with ᾠδὴ διαψάλματος, which implies the opposite.
- vii., title. Χουσεὶ υἱοῦ Ἰεμενεΐ. Not = X. ὁ τοῦ Ἀραχει (2 Regn. xvii. 5), whose name, Jerome says, is spelt with a Ϟ. *Cush* here = Αἰθίοψ, *i.e.*, Saul, who as a Benjamite was a υἱὸς Ἰεμενεΐ, and who is called an Ethiopian "propter sanguinarios et tetros et crudeles mores."
- vii. 10, 11. The Hebrew punctuates after 𐤇𐤍𐤔, "The righteous God trieth the hearts and reins." The LXX. wrongly transfers it to the beginning of the next verse (δικαία ἡ βοήθεια μου).
- vii. 12 (= 11). LXX. μὴ ὀργὴν ἐπάγων. Aquila's ἐμβριμώμενος is truer to the Hebrew (𐤇𐤍). As interpreted by the LXX., the clause is read by Jerome interrogatively: *nunquid irascitur?*
- xviii. 6 (= xix. 5). LXX. ἐν τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκῆνωμα αὐτοῦ. The Hebrew suggests τῷ ἡλίῳ ἔθετο τὸ σκ. ἐν αὐτοῖς.
- xix. (= xx.) 10. LXX. καὶ ἐπάκουσον ἡμῶν. Hebrew, "Who (*i.e.* the King) shall hear us."
- xx. (= xxi.) 13. LXX. ἐν τοῖς περιλοίποις σου ἐτοιμάσεις τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῶν. Jerome wishes to sub-

stitute ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς σου ("pro reliquiis in Hebraeo bonis habet"). He is probably thinking of Aquila's rendering, which Field prints ἐν τοῖς κάλοις; in the Syriac, however, it is given as ἐν τοῖς καλοῖς. Perhaps the two senses of קָלִי led to a confusion. In the "Hebrew" Psalter Jerome translates correctly: *funes tuos firmabis.*

- xxi. 2 (=xxii. 1). There is nothing in the Hebrew to answer to πρόσχες μοι, and the Gospels justify the omission (ἐλωί ἐλωί λεμὰ σαβαχθανεῖ). So Euseb. *ad loc.*, ἀκριβῶς καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς φωνῆς τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν περιλέλειπται.
- xxiii. (=xxiv.) 7, 9. LXX. ἄρατε πύλας, οἱ ἄρχοντες ὑμῶν. Hebrew, "Lift up your heads, ye gates."
- xxxvi. (=xxxvii.) 38. LXX. τὰ ἐνκαταλίμματα τῶν ἀσεβῶν. Hebrew, "the latter end (תְּחִלַּת, *novissima*) of the wicked."
- li. (=lii.) title. Jerome, who reads in his text of the LXX., εἰς τὸν οἶκον Ἀχιμέλεχ, remarks that in 1 Samuel xxi. and in the Hebrew of this Psalm the name is spelt Abimelech; the confusion, he adds, arises from the interchange of א and ב. Eusebius (cited by Morin) makes the same statement.
- lxxvi. (=lxxvii.) title. LXX. ὑπὲρ Ἰδιθούμ. The Hebrew (וְיִתְּנֵה לַעֲבָדָי), according to Jerome, means "by Idithun," *i.e.*, a Psalm of his composition. Jerome goes on to say that the words τῷ Ἀσάφ ψαλμός are wanting in *veris exemplaribus*. They are present in nearly all our MSS. of the LXX., and neither KenNICOTT nor De Rossi notes their omission by any Hebrew MS.
- lxxxvi. (=lxxxvii.) 4. The spelling of Rahab here is stated by Jerome to be identical with that of the name in Joshua ii. He seems to have been misled by the LXX., which has Ραάβ in both places.

- lxxxvii. (=lxxxviii.) 11. LXX. ἡ ἰατροὶ ἀναστήσουσιν ; Jerome notes that אִפְּאִי, “aut gigantas significat aut medicos.”
- xciii. (=xciv.) has no title in the Hebrew. The interesting liturgical note in the LXX. (ψαλμὸς . . τετραδί σαββάτων) is consequently dismissed without comment (“unde superfluum est de titulo disputare”).
- xcix. (=c.) 3. LXX. καὶ οὐχ ἡμεῖς. Hebrew, “and we are His.” Jerome does not recognise the reading of the K'thib (אִלֵּי).
- cxiv. (=cxvi. 9). Hebrew, “I will walk” (אֶלְכֶּנָּה). LXX., εὐαρεστήσω. Cf. Genesis v. 22 (Heb. xi. 6).
- cxv. 2 (=cxvi. 11). LXX. πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ψεύστης. Hebrew, “falsehood.” Jerome follows Symmachus (? Aquila) in taking כֹּזֵב as a noun, yet he represents it by *Kiuzhb*, which is nearer to כֹּזֵב (as D. Morin suggests), or even to כֹּזֵב, than to כֹּזֵב.
- cxix. (cxx.) 4. LXX. σὺν τοῖς ἀνθραξιν τοῖς ἐρημικοῖς. Jerome would correct after the Hebrew τοῖς ἀρκευθίνοῖς. The correction, which is given in Greek, is probably from Aquila. See Field *ad loc.*
- cxxiii. (=cxxiv.) 5. LXX. τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ ἀνυπόστατον. The comment is: “Verbum ἀνυπ. apud Hebraeos ambiguum est et potest sonare ‘quod non subsistat’ et ‘quod intolerabile sit.’” Correct, from the *Breviarium*, “apud Graecos”; the Hebrew (הַיְדוּלִי) presents no such ambiguity.
- cxxvi. (=cxxvii.) 4. LXX. οἱ υἱοὶ τῶν ἐκτεταγμένων. Jerome compares 2 Esdr. xiv. 16 (=Neh. iv. 10), where ἡμισυ τῶν ἐκτεταγμένων represents הַצִּי נְעָרֵי. He might have added Nehemiah v. 15, οἱ ἐκτεταγμένοι αὐτῶν (נְעָרֵי); in both places, however, there is a variant (iv. 10, ἐκτεταγμένων NA, v. 15 ἐκτεταγμένοι N*).

cxxxvi. (= cxxxvii.) 8. Hebrew, "O daughter of Babylon" ("pro genetivo casu vocativum in Hebraeo habet").

(2) *Contributions to knowledge of the Hexapla.*

- i. 4. ἀπὸ προσώπου τῆς γῆς: "nec hoc quidem in veteribus habetur exemplaribus," *i.e.*, in the Hexapla and in copies taken from it.
- iv. 8. καὶ ἐλαίου αὐτῶν: "nec in Hebraeo nec in ceteris editionibus (Aq., Symm., Th., etc.) nec apud ipsos quoque LXX. interpretes (the Hexaplaric recension) repperi."
- vii., title. "Aquila...*pro ignoratione David, quod cecinit Domino pro verbis Aethiopsis* (= ὑπὲρ ἀγνοίας τῶ Δ. ὃν ᾗσεν τῶ κυρίῳ ὑπὲρ τῶν λόγων [τοῦ] Αἰθίοπος). Symmachus...*pro ignoratione David q. c. D. p. v. Chusi filii Iemini* (= ὕ. ἀ. τῶ Δ. ὃν ᾗσεν τῶ κ. ὕ. τ. λ. Χουσεὶ υἱοῦ Ἰεμειεί).
- xi. (= xii.) 3. Symm. *in corde aliud est et aliud loquitur* (? = ἐν καρδίᾳ ἄλλο καὶ ἄλλο λαλεῖ). Field after Chrys. gives for Symm. ἐν κ. ἄλλη καὶ ἄλλη λ.
- xxi. (= xxii.) 2. "Quinta et sexta editio *verba clamoris mei*." Field's note is Θ. Ε'. οἱ λόγοι τῆς βοήσεως μου.
- xxi. (= xxii.) 3. "Aquila ... *et non tacebis* (καὶ οὐ σιωπήσῃ)." Field quotes from Montfaucon: 'Α. καὶ οὐκ ἔστι σιγή, but Jerome's statement is confirmed by the margin of a Vatican MS. cited by Pitra, *Analecta Sacra*, iii. 558.
- xxi. (= xxii.) 17. "Aq. et Th. *venatores interpretati sunt*." Field, after Montfaucon, gives 'Α. Σ. θηραταί, Θ. κύνες," adding from the same source, "Drusius vero 'Α. Θ. *κυνηγέται*." He remarks: "Vereor ne utriusque lectiones pendeant a Pseudo-Hier." For

- the present it must remain uncertain whether *θηραται* or *κυνηγέται* is the true representative of Jerome's *venatores*; possibly Aq. had *θ.*, and Th. *κ.*
- lxxiii. (=lxxiv.) 4. "Symm. *posuerunt signa sua manifeste in edito introitu portarum.*" Field gives (from Eusebius) Σ. ἔθηκαν τὰ σημεῖα αὐτῶν ἐπισήμως γνώριμα κατὰ τὴν εἴσοδον ἐπάνω (=γνώριμον εἰς τὴν εἰσ. ὑπεράνω in Cord., *Caten.*, ii. 531).
- lxxxvi. (=lxxxvii.) 5. According to Jerome, the true reading of the LXX. is *μὴ τῇ Σειῶν*, and *MHTHP* is a scribe's error. Comp. Pitra, *Anal. Sacr.*, iii. 559, τὸ ῥῶ κατὰ προσθήκην ἔκειτο εἰς τὴν τῶν ο' ἐν τῷ τετρασελίδῳ· ἐν δὲ τῷ ὀκτασελίδῳ *MH TH Σ.*
- lxxxvii. (=lxxxviii.) 11. "Symmachus...*transtulit aut Rafaim theomachi resurgentes confitebuntur tibi?*" (=ἡ 'Ραφαεῖμ θεομάχοι ἀνιστάμενοι ἐξομολογήσονται σοι). Field, who gives the above rendering without 'Ραφ., suggests that Symm. may have had *γίγαντες θεομάχοι.*
- lxxxviii. (=lxxxix.) 11. "Aquila *impetum* (=ὄρμημα; cf. Ps. xxxix. 5, lxxxvi. 4, Isa. xxx. 7, li. 9), Symmachus *adrogantiam* (=ἀλαζονείαν; cf. Job ix. 13, xxvi. 12, Isa. li. 9), Theodotion *superbiam* (=ὑπερηφανίαν), *sexta tumultum* (= ? θόρυβον).
- lxxxix. (xc.) 9. LXX. τὰ ἔτη ἡμῶν ὡς ἀραχνη (ἀράχνην B^N) ἐμελέτων. "Melius Aquila . . . *anni nostri similes loquenti*" (= ? τὰ ἔτη ἡμῶν ὁμοια φωνοῦντι).
- cvii. (=cviii.) 10. LXX. ἐπὶ τὴν Ἰδουμαίαν ἐκτενῶ τὸ ὑπόδημά μου. "Aquila *proiciam*" (=ρίψω, cf. Aq. in Ps. xlix. 17).
- cxv. (=cxvi. 10-19). "Hunc psalmum quinta et sexta editio cum superioribus copulant, Symmachus vero et LXX. interpretes dividunt." Field quotes this, but as from "Pseudo-Jerome."
- cxv. 2 (=cxvi. 11). "Symmachus *mendacium*" (=διά-

- ψευσμα). Field, following Theodoret, attributes *διάψευσμα* to Aquila, and *διαψεύδεται* to Symmachus.
- cxxiii. (cxxiv.) 5. “Aq. et Symm. et Th. et omnes interpretes *superbas aquas et adrogantes*” (= τὰ ὕδατα τὰ ὑπερήφανα).
- cxix. (cxxxii.) 15. “Pro *vidua, χήρα*, et *Hebraea volumina et ipsi LXX. θήραν habent...Symmachus et Aquila cibaria interpretata sunt.*” Θήραν appears to have been the reading of the Hexaplaric Psalter. Theodoret (see Field) vouches for Σ. τὴν σίτησιν, but ἐπισιτισμόν was the general rendering in Genesis xlv. 21 (Jerome *ad l.*), and is attributed to Aquila here.
- cxix. (= cxxxiv.) 1. The words ἐν αὐλαῖς οἴκου θεοῦ ἡμῶν have no place, according to Jerome, in the true text of the LXX., or in any other Greek version, and have been interpolated from Psalm cxxxiv. (= cxxxv.)
2. In the chief existing MSS. of the LXX. we find two readings (a) οἱ ἐστῶτες ἐν αὐλαῖς οἴκου θεοῦ ἡμῶν (B^N*); (b) οἱ ἐστ. ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου ἐν αὐλαῖς οἴκου θεοῦ ἡμῶν (N¹ART). Origen, in the surviving fragment of his commentary on this Psalm, deals only with ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου, and Hilary writes: “repperi quosdam ambiguos circa hoc in atriis domus Domini fuisse . . . dicentes hoc a translatoribus primis adicetam esse.” On the whole the facts suggest that the pre-Origenic text of the LXX. had the reading of B^N* and that Origen prefixed ἐν οἴκῳ Κυρίου, obelizing the rest of the sentence. The reading of N¹ART will thus represent the Hexaplaric text with the obelus omitted.
- cxix. (= cxxxv.) 4. LXX. Ἰσραὴλ εἰς περιουσιασμόν αὐτοῦ. Jerome renders *Israel in substantiale sibi*, adding that Aquila and the *quinta* translated “similarly.” Probably they had περιούσιον; cf. Aq. in Malachi iii. 17.

- cxxxvi. (= cxxxvii.) 8. LXX. ἡ ταλαίπωρος. "Symm. *depopulata atque vastata* (= ? ἐκπεπορωμένη). Field gives ἡ ληστρίς, from Syrohex. (ⲗⲁⲗⲁⲓⲱⲣⲟⲥ).
- cxxxviii. (= cxxxix.) 11. "Symm. *et nox lux circum me* (= καὶ νύξ φῶς περὶ ἐμέ). Field gives this as the Aquila's rendering, and, following Theodoret, represents Symmachus by ἀλλὰ καὶ νύξ φωτεινὴ περὶ ἐμέ.
- cxliv. (= cxlv.) 14. The words πιστὸς Κύριος... τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ are, according to Jerome, an addition made by the LXX. to the Hebrew text with the view of assigning a verse to the letter ς which the composer had overlooked in an otherwise alphabetical Psalm. The clause was obelized in the Hexapla; see the scholion cited by Field.

The Latin version of the Psalms employed in the *Commentarioli* is on the whole that of the Roman Psalter. There are however a number of readings which belong to earlier versions, and some which seem to be direct renderings from the Hebrew; a few of the latter re-appear in the *Psalterium Hebraicum*. The impression left on the mind by a careful study is that Jerome had before him his earliest revision of the Latin Psalter, and was already feeling his way towards the second, and even the third; yet while he keeps his eye open to the Hebrew, his aim still is to translate from the LXX.—the Hexaplaric LXX., which he regards as the purest form of the original work. His citations from the rest of the Old Testament are also based on the LXX., or derived from the Old Latin; even in the Books of Samuel there is no trace of the influence of the new Vulgate, although in the passages which he quotes from the New Testament I have noticed tokens here and there that the revised Latin was in his mind.

These considerations enable us to fix approximately the date of the Notes on the Psalter. The learned editor points

out that they must have been written before Jerome's change of feeling with regard to Origen, *i.e.*, before 393. The facts just mentioned point to a date previous to the commencement of the Vulgate O. T. (391) and the publication of the Gallican Psalter (388), but later than the appearance of the Roman Psalter (383), later also than the revision of the New Testament which was begun at Rome in 384. In the interval Jerome had settled in Palestine, consulted the Hexapla at Caesarea, and begun his Hebrew studies at Bethlehem. Dom Morin's new *Anecdote* belongs, we may feel fairly sure, to the first years of Jerome's *otium Bethleemiticum*; it will hardly be rash to assign it provisionally to A.D. 387-8.

H. B. SWETE.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE MEANINGS OF
"BELIAL."

How much depends on the right choice of a starting point in philological inquiries! It seems to me that many losses have arisen to Biblical exegesis by the premature assumption of etymologies. Take the cases of the word so familiar to us in the Authorized and Revised Versions of the Old Testament as "Belial." A theory has grown up according to which the Hebrew word thus represented is a common noun, meaning primarily worthlessness, *beliya'al* (בְּלִיָּעַל) being derived from *beli* "not" and *ya'al* (probably) "use," as Mühlau and Volck, in their edition of Gesenius's *Handwörterbuch*, give it. So prevalent is this theory that it has been adopted in the Anglo-American Hebrew-English Lexicon, now being printed at the Oxford University Press, and even in the margin of the Revised Version, where "sons (or, men) of Belial" becomes "base fellows," with an additional marginal note on "Belial," "that is, worthlessness." We are at once struck, however, by the fact that for the literal meaning "unprofitableness" no example is given (contrast the case of Lat. *nequam*). Again and again there were opportunities for the use of *beliya'al* in this sense in connexion with idolatry or with the foreign alliances of Judah, as, *e.g.*, Isa. xxx. 5, 6; Jer. ii. 8, 11; Isa. xlv. 9, lvii. 12, but the opportunities were not taken by the Hebrew writers. Why not? Another singular fact is that the writers of the Book of Proverbs, who, one would have thought, would have welcomed a term susceptible of such fruitful didactic applications, only use *beliya'al* three times (Prov. vi. 12, xvi. 27, xix. 28). Upon these occasions the Revised Version renders the phrases in which the word occurs thus: "a worthless person," "a worthless man," and "a worthless witness." It is plain,

however, that in each case the conception is a positive, not a negative one; it is malignity or dangerous wickedness which is meant. Turning to the narrative books, it is plain that the rendering "base fellows" (Rev. Vers. margin) by no means suits the context. It was not merely "base fellows" who bore false witness against Naboth (1 Kings xxi. 10, 13), but utterly depraved persons who despised the best traditions of Israelitish morality. It was not merely "worthless men" who opposed David's fair-minded distribution of the spoil after he had delivered Ziklag (1 Sam. xxx. 22), but "evil men," as the phrase is explained, who were deaf to the claims of that brotherly feeling without which David's "troop" would have melted away. They were not merely contemptible but actively dangerous, though by his personal influence David neutralized the danger. So too in 1 Sam. x. 27 it was not merely "baseness" which showed itself in the withhold- ing of an offering to the new king, but a dangerous inclination to rebellion.¹

In the legal portions of the Old Testament the word *beliya'al* occurs but twice—Deut. xiii. 14, xv. 9. This is only natural, for the phrase "sons of *beliya'al*" implies a moral judgment more suited to a teacher or a narrator than to a lawgiver. In the first passage the Revised Version renders "base fellows," in the second "a base thought" (בְּלִיעַל and דְּבַר in apposition). In the latter case, the rendering is conspicuously unsuitable; the

¹ There is one occurrence of בְּלִיעַל which is only known to us from the Septuagint. It is in 1 Sam. xxix. 10, where, as Wellhausen and Driver have pointed out, the words *καὶ πορεύεσθε εἰς τὸν τόπον οὗ κατέστησα ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖ καὶ λόγον λοιμὸν μὴ θῆς ἐν καρδίᾳ σου, ὅτι ἀγαθὸς σὺ ἐνώπιόν μου*, retranslated, supply what is painfully missed in the Massoretic text. *Λοιμὸς* is one of the renderings of בְּלִיעַל in LXX. (which nowhere favours "baseness"). But I do not see how the version in Kautzsch's Old Testament—"think not evil of me"—can be right. Surely Achish is begging David not to allow thoughts of revenge and rebellion to arise in his mind. Mere hard thoughts could scarcely be expressed by בְּלִיעַל.

"thought" spoken of is seduction to idolatry, which was no mere "baseness," but the highest act of rebellion against Jehovah. In the prophets, too, the word occurs but twice, viz., in Nah. i. 11 and ii. 1. But, as the combined researches of Bickell and Gunkel have shown, Nah. i. 2-ii. 3 is not a prophetic but a poetic composition. It is really an alphabetic psalm, describing Jehovah's speedy appearance for judgment on Israel's enemies, and is one of the numerous insertions of the post-Exilic editors of the prophetic records.¹ *Beliya'al* there means no mere "baseness," but the highest degree of wickedness, or rather hopeless ruin; indeed, in Nah. ii. 1, where the word stands alone with a personal reference (as elsewhere only in 2 Sam. xxiii. 6; Job xxxiv. 18), we are on the way to the use of Belial for Antichrist. Among the acknowledged psalms the word occurs thrice, viz., in Ps. xviii. 5 (4), xli. 9 (8), ci. 3. Here the Revised Version has only once found it possible to render "base." But every reader will feel that "base thing" cannot be the right parallel to "the work of them that turn aside." Since the Psalm betrays the influence of the Book of Proverbs, we may assume that *beliya'al* has the same meaning here as in that book, *i.e.* malignity or dangerous wickedness. In Ps. xli. 9 the Anglo-American Lexicon admits the possibility of the meaning "a base, or wicked thing," but it is difficult to find any recent commentator who does not prefer the sense well conveyed by Delitzsch in the words "*ein heillos Uebel*," "an incurable disease." The parallel line seems, indeed, to permit no other sense; it runs, "and now that he lieth, he will arise no more." In his own commentary the present writer put the meaning

¹ In my *Origin of the Psalter*, p. 228, I followed Bickell. In 1893 (Stade's *Zeitschrift*, pp. 223, 224) Gunkel completed the argument for the psalm-theory, and drew the natural inferences. Both Bickell and Gunkel have since returned to the subject elsewhere.

thus, "'Lit., a matter of perdition,' *i.e.*, something which must sink him in perdition or the world of the dead (see on xviii. 3)." There only remains Ps. xviii. 5 (4). Here the Revised Version has made no change in the Authorized, which gave "the floods of ungodliness." At any rate, it is seen that mere "baseness" will no longer pass muster. *Beliya'al* may indeed mean that degree of evil which is without any "soul of goodness," but even this sense will not do here, on account of the parallelism of Death (*i.e.*, the realm of Death personified) and Sheól. Might we not render "Perdition"? Compare Milton's—

"Hurl'd headlong down
To bottomless Perdition, there to dwell."¹

Passing over the remaining Old Testament passages, let us now ask what is the fundamental meaning, and what may be the etymology of the word? One thing seems clear—the primary meaning and the etymology given by Gesenius and his followers are erroneous. The word is found in two senses—(1) hopeless ruin, (2) great or even extreme wickedness.² Though the second is by far the more common of the two, the first, which occurs only in Ps. xviii. 5 (=2 Sam. xxii. 5), xli. 9; Nah. i. 11, ii. 1, must, according to analogy, be the more original. If so, can we suggest a probable derivation? It is not likely that one of the ordinary words for "ruin" would be a compound. But it is perfectly possible that a word belonging to cosmogonic speculation should be, or should be thought to be (cf. בְּלִימָה, Job xxvi. 7, and, according to Nöldeke, צִלְמֹת). I think, then, that in the age in which בְּלִיעֵל could be used of the subterranean watery

¹ *Paradise Lost*, i. 45-47.

² In *Sanhedrin*, 111b, a playful connexion is suggested with 'ol "yoke," as if Belial meant "throwing off the yoke." This shows insight. Cf. the assurance of בְּלִיעֵל and בֵּלְע in Prov. xix. 28

abyss¹ (cf. Jon. ii. 3, 4), it was probably understood to mean "the depth which lets no man return" (בְּלֵי יַעֲרֹב), as Baethgen explains in his note on Ps. xviii. 5.² Cf. the Babylonian title of the under-world, *irqit lâ târat*, "the land whence there is no return." How early the idea of the great abyss existed, is a question which it would take too long to discuss here.

T. K. CHEYNE.

OUR LORD'S IDEAL OF PRAYER.

IN His discourse on the Mount, after warning against the prayer that is wrong in motive, Jesus goes on to inhibit the prayer that is mistaken in method. Prayer may sometimes bring down but a stinted blessing, or, indeed, be entirely barren, because it is defective in aim, temper, knowledge. The prayer of the secret chamber must be informed by right views of God and of the freeness of His grace, unless it is to be as disappointing as the ostentatious prayer of the synagogue or of the street corner. The spirit of pietistic pride did not flaunt itself before men only, but courted God's favour by a redundant religiousness. Men's prayers, no less than their characters, need the pruning knife, and morbid excesses must be thinned away if there is to be a due degree of fragrant and satisfying fruitfulness. "Use not vain repetitions, as the heathen do."

Our Lord's familiarity with the genius of heathen worship suggests questions which admit only of conjectural answers. Did He draw His information from the Old Testament Scriptures, and have we here a reminiscence of the frantic cry on Carmel, "O Baal, hear us, O Baal, hear us"?

¹ Since the abyss is the proper abode of Satan, he may well be designated Belial (2 Cor. vi. 15, Βελιαρ).

² Similarly Halévy. The true derivation may be irrecoverable.

Did the sojourn of Joseph and Mary in Egypt bring them into contact with Egyptian idolatries or with the idolatries of the colonists settled there, and were stories of these days sometimes told in the family circle at Nazareth? Had glimpses of Phœnician temples caught the eye of His eager boyhood as He wandered on the Galilean highlands and strained His vision to north and north-west, and had He asked about the services celebrated there? Had Greek and Roman temples on the western horizon, backed by the thread of silver sea, awakened a pitiful interest in His young heart, and had the characteristic rites observed there been described to Him? To what extent had our Lord been a student of comparative religion? He had never entered as a curious visitor even a heathen temple, for He was restrained by the strictness of those Jewish customs to which He was always loyal when no principle was sacrificed. After taking up His abode in Capernaum, he must many a time have looked with pain and humiliation to the roof of a heathen temple which rose high in one of the towns immediately across the lake. From the mixed populations of Galilee He may have heard something of the rites practised there, and of the terms in which the pity of these unheeding images was invoked. At any rate, He had correctly interpreted not only the characteristic note of the worship offered in temples upon which He sometimes looked from afar, but one of the most conspicuous traits of heathen worship through the length and breadth of the known and unknown world. In every Pagan religion the repetition of some prescribed form of invocation has been made the rigid condition of power and spiritual efficacy.

There are some things in the devotional life which the great Teacher could not intend to discourage in these words. The same elementary needs recur day by day, and He Himself taught us to pray for the providential gifts which meet them. Prayer offered under a new sense of

need, although it may sound like an echo of the prayer of yesterday, cannot possibly come under the condemnation of Christ's words. In many cases the repeated use of the same phrases may be an intellectual necessity, and the kind friend and comrade of all classes was incapable of reproaching any man because of the poverty of his vocabulary. And we are graciously permitted to repeat those prayers to which no obvious response has come in the way of guidance, illumination, fulfilment. It is only by reverentially reiterated supplication that we can be brought to know God's will and won into patient accord with its behests. Paul prayed thrice for the removal of the thorn in the flesh. On the night of His passion, our Lord prayed thrice, using substantially the same words. The prophet on the mountain in Galilee is not discrediting the pale, overwrought suppliant under the gloomy olives of Gethsemane. Not infrequently we may have to repeat our prayers, so that through successive stages of spiritual struggle we may attain the intense earnestness and the prevailing faith which are the conditions of victory. In all such cases, however, the struggle is with our own torpor, and selfishness, and unbelief, and with the shadows they project upon our conception of God, rather than with God Himself. Groans, and struggles, and oft-urged cries are not blamed in our Master's words, and yet it is well to remember that these do not enter into the deepest essence of prevailing prayer. Victory is attained by the climactic moment of faith reached through the steps of repeated and persistent wrestling.

It is not sufficient to say that it is heathenish repetition our Lord condemned, or the repetition of those merit-making forms of prayer which had such vogue amongst the contemporary Pharisees. Such practices could only be denounced because of some false principle they embodied.

Why do men repeat themselves in their converse with each other? What thoughts are in the mind of the man

who falls into this irritating infirmity in common life? A speaker repeats himself because he assumes his hearers are ignorant and inappreciative, or because of the undue sense he has of his own importance, or because of morbid timidity, which, after all, has the closest possible relation to vanity and personal pride. The nervous stutterer sometimes has to thank his own unhealthy and inordinate self-consciousness for the unhappy affliction to which he has become subject. These facts define the lines upon which the interpretation of Christ's words must proceed.

Repetition conveys an insinuation of ignorance or in appreciation against the man who is compelled to listen to it. The laboured tautologies and much speaking of heathen worship are suggested by the character of the gods addressed. There are the voluptuous and self-occupied gods who are absorbed in the excitements of hunting, and harping, and love-making, and need to be recalled to the needs of their suppliants by piteous and unceasing cries. And there are the impassive gods of the higher Pagan philosophies, the gods whose existence is like a vague opium dream—sparks of half-faded consciousness needing to be fanned into fervent and sympathetic sensibility by the worship of unceasing clamour. And there are also gods personifying wrath, malevolence, destruction, gods hard to appease, and needing to be softened, conciliated, won by perpetual rounds of service. In the worship of such beings, it is inevitable that repetition should have a significant place. Ignorant and unheeding gods must be instructed, apathetic gods must be stimulated, merit must be patiently built up before implacable, despotic, and extortionate gods.

Jesus felt that worship with this heathenish taint in its methods was an insult to the character of His Divine Father. It implied that the Infinite and Eternal love was slow to apprehend, unwilling to sympathise, unready to help. The prayer of vain repetition covertly accused the

prayer-hearing God of imperfect knowledge, imperfect sympathy, imperfect grace.

Closely connected with this misconception of God which gave rise to the prayer of vain repetition, there is the pride of the worshipper in the intrinsic worth of his own prayers. The man who perpetually repeats himself has an exaggerated sense of the value of his own utterances. And the redundancies of a self-righteous worship betray a desire to exalt self and a sense of the worshipper's own competence in the long run to conciliate God. In the prayer of vain repetition there was no room for grace, sacrificial vicariousness, mediation, the Father's redeeming love in the Son. It assumed that the worshipper, by the patient and punctilious observance of multifarious forms, could put value and saving efficacy into his own service.

Empty reiterations not only ignore the doctrine of grace, but are inconsistent with the serenity of faith. The man who has said something, and tries to say it over again, does so because he imagines at the first attempt he has not said it effectually and well. And there is something not unlike that in heathen worship and in that semi-heathen mood of soul into which even Christian worshippers are prone to fall. Heathen prayer, with its never-ceasing repetitions, is what the etymology of the word our Lord used implies—a painful and age-long stammer which never succeeds in saying what it desires to say and is entirely contenting to the soul. The faith that perfectly pleases God soars into the high assurance that we are heard and accepted, and then there is no need to repeat the prayer. Much speaking is the sign that the highest ranges of confidence have not been reached. Our Lord seems to say, If you can brace yourself to the great spiritual achievement, ask once, and then fix the hope on an all-faithful Father, and steadfastly watch till the answer comes.

The Lord's prayer is almost immediately given as a con-

crete illustration of this perfect ideal. In those few quiet sentences, colossal in their strength and child-like in their simplicity, there is no sign of fevered struggle, no trace of noisy reiteration, no word caught up and echoed again and yet again, as though it had not quite done its work. We start our children with that prayer, and rightly so, but it needs a rare maturity of faith if it is to be used in complete sincerity and appreciation. Every succeeding sentence is like a sceptre of superhuman conquest wielded over some new domain of life. To us it seems that we must needs traverse much ground and review many truths before we can come into complete and believing communion with God. But when prevalency is at last reached, it is reached by the gracious inspiration of a moment, and much speaking embarrassed rather than invigorated the decisive act of faith.

Our Lord's short prayers were the products of His own vivid and unbroken fellowship with the Father. His prayer, as He stood before the rock sepulchre of Lazarus, is the best comment we can have upon His own ideal as set forth in the Sermon on the Mount. "Father, I thank Thee that Thou hast heard Me. And I knew that Thou hearest Me always." Prayer never reached a sublimer altitude than that, and to such an assured habit of soul repetition would have been a blemish and a backsliding.

Ideal prayer is suggested by the announcement of a fact to which it must correspond rather than directly described. "Your Father knoweth what things ye have need of before ye ask Him." There is a link of inviolable sacredness between the lowly suppliant and the loftiest heaven. He is no spiritual claimant of uncertain antecedents whose rights must be urged through weeks of argument and persuasion. And the Fatherhood to be invoked is a Fatherhood of adequate knowledge and sympathy. The Divine pity anticipates the first cry for help. Did the primitive

transgressor request the coming of a promised seed to bruise the serpent's head, or were the accents of Love's evangel heard before a single prayer for mercy had rent the air? Where is the supplication, for spiritual gifts at least, which outruns God's promise? The Divine Father abounds in knowledge, wisdom, sympathy, eager and timely inclination to help and to save. An apprehension of these facts is the staple of ideal prayer.

The great practical end to which Jesus is seeking to lead his disciples by this protest against much speaking is an active and a present faith. He seeks to take them away from the superfluities of prayer, lest they should be tempted to trust therein. Acts of piety must not be so magnified as to be made substitutes for God's all-sufficient grace. The Master is seeking to constrain His disciples to a conclusion of immediate and whole-hearted trust. If prayer gains no effectuality through its cumulative reiterations, it must prevail through the intensesness of its present faith, and the sublime fact of God's wise and pitiful Fatherhood, which inspires faith, is always with us and in us, if we will but receive it. In the kingdom of grace the possibilities of to-morrow are the equal possibilities of to-day. Much speaking will not create a better God than He who reigns for our help and salvation in the passing hour. Prayers are heard in virtue of something we are led to recognise in God, and they may reach the climax of their prevalency even now.

It is said to be the property of a crystal to assume precisely the same form into however many fragments it may be broken up. The infinitesimal particle, for the study of which a magnifying glass must be used, is a precise facsimile of the parent crystal from which it came. If we could take God's eternity and break it up into æons, if we could take the æons and break them up into ages, and the ages into centuries, and the centuries into years, and the

years into days, and the days into hours, and the hours into moments, we should find each separate moment of God's life to be just as resplendent with benignity, compassion, redeeming grace and helpfulness, as His sublime eternity itself. God's moment is the perfect miniature of His everlasting days.

If that be so, whatever gift prayer can win from God's free mercy it can win at once. It is true, there may be difficulties in ourselves needing time to subdue, but not in God. Looked at from the Divine view-point, faith may reach its meridian now. Before the beat of the next moment has come, it may attain its culminating victory. Our Lord's teaching on prayer is a veiled declaration of the doctrine of present forgiveness, present renewal, present sanctity, present heaven.

It had been said God would answer His people while they yet called, and hear while they were yet speaking. The prayer of vain repetition emptied that evangelical promise of its meaning, and practically made God forswear Himself. It was in the order of God's grace that blessing should come before the hour of prayer had struck. But the Pharisee put the finger on the dial backwards, saying that the blessing would come at a fixed point after supplication, with due thanksgiving, had been presented and repeated a prearranged number of times. This idea of laboured and merit-making reiteration pushed the moment of blessing into a dim and uncertain future. A systematically measured repetition and much speaking is the devil's doctrine of procrastination engrossed on vellum, bravely illuminated, and smuggled into the ark which is before the mercy-seat.

But does not the fact that the Divine Father knoweth what things we have need of before we ask Him prove too much? Does it not imply that prayer is needless, and tend to an ignoble and stupefying quietism? The temptation to restrain prayer because God anticipates our needs can only

come to one who thinks of God in much the same light as the pupils in a famous training school of pickpockets thought of the dummy suspended from the ceiling, out of whose pockets they were to extract as many things as possible whilst minimising to the finest degree their contact with the figure itself. If our object is to possess ourselves of God's gifts, and to have as little as possible to do with God Himself, our Lord's words may perhaps tempt us into languor and spiritual supineness. But prayer is something more than the process by which we make our requests known unto God and God sends doles down to us. The truth that God knows our need before we ask Him, and is prepared to meet it, is announced for the express purpose of quickening the activity of human faith, and not to stultify and displace it. Indeed, by the want of faith we forego our claim for the time being upon the noblest bounties of God's Fatherhood. When our sense of need is penetrated by a sense of God's vivid, practical sympathy with it, perfect prayer has been achieved. True prayer is the vision of an open heaven from which stream down supplies that never fail, rest from every care, help for every frailty, cleansing baptism for every spot, munificent satisfaction for every need.

T. G. SELBY.

A NEW PATRISTIC FRAGMENT.

IT is well known that in the first centuries of the Christian Church there was a steady succession of teachers, amongst whom will be found some of the most renowned and venerated names, who held the doctrine of the millennial reign of Christ with His Saints on earth. They based their beliefs, as far as we can judge, mainly on the statements of the Apocalypse, but supported them strongly from the Gospels and from the Prophets. And it must, I think, be admitted that they have good ground for some of their interpretations, which harmonize very well with Apostolic doctrine, and dispense with the necessity for the allegorisation of many of the promises in the Old and New Testament Scriptures. Nor did they confine themselves to demonstrations from the canonical Scriptures, but in one notable instance, at least, they built up the belief in a redeemed natural order and a paradisiacal world out of an *agraphon* of the Lord Himself, who was represented as teaching the marvellous fertility of the renewed world in terms of vines with 10,000 stems, stems with 10,000 clusters, and so on, with a similar multiplication table for the produce of single grains of wheat, a parable of fertility which we are told that Judas, not unnaturally, treated with some degree of scepticism. Now whether we refer this story to the Lord, as Papias did, is not of immediate importance; what is important is to remember that Papias must have been handling early material, so that if we are not carried back into beliefs which belong to the direct intercourse of our Lord and of His apostles, or to Jewish beliefs of a day earlier than theirs, we are certainly carried back into a very early period of stratification of the Christian doctrine.

We can support this statement by a study of the legendary saying to which we have referred, which may be shown

to have been the product of a Semitic atmosphere. Any one who reads the passage in Papias to which we refer will see that the key-word to its composition is the repeated 10,000 (10,000 vines, shoots, clusters, grapes; 10,000 stalks, ears, and grains of wheat). Now this promise of a ten thousand-fold yield of corn and wine is a mere misunderstanding of a passage in the blessing of Isaac, where the patriarch foretells for Jacob and his descendants the benediction of the dew of heaven and of the fatness of the earth, and an abundance of corn and wine. Here the word רב (abundance) has been understood as רבוי, and translated as "ten thousand of corn and wine." The parable in Papias is the explanation of the text so understood. And it must be clear, if this be the correct genesis of the passage in Papias, that we are dealing with very early non-Hellenic matter in the Christian traditions. And that our interpretation is not a product of pure imagination (I know, however, that we can prove anything by Semitic variants) may be seen from the fact that when Irenæus tells us the story from Papias and the Elders, he prefixes to the legend a long discussion of the benediction of Isaac, concluding with the words:—

"Creatura renovata et liberata multitudinem fructificabit universæ ex ære ex rore cœli et ex fertilitate terræ; quemadmodum Presbyteri meminerunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis docebat Dominus et dicebat, Venient dies in quibus vineæ nascentur, singulæ decem millia palmatum habentes," etc.

Amongst the writers who constitute the Chiliastic tradition we reckon Papias and the Elders, of whom Irenæus speaks, Irenæus himself, Nepos of Arsinoe in the third century, Victorinus of Pettau in the close of the third century, to whom Jerome adds as a leader and arch-heretic no less a name than that of Cerinthus. Whether he had any ground for this statement, we do not know; it was not

unnatural for Jerome, who regarded Chiliasm, perhaps not unjustly, as a Jewish heresy, to father it on a heretic who was supposed to represent the attitude of the Judæo-Christian Church at the end of the first century.

Let us now turn to the verification of the opinions ascribed to these Fathers so far as they can be determined from their own writings, and we shall find that almost all the Chiliastic library of the early Church has disappeared. Of the elders who followed St. John we know nothing, their great book of Gnosis is not extant. Papias is only known by an extract or two; Nepos, who wrote the Confutation of the Allegorists in defence of Chiliasm, has disappeared also; and the commentary of Victorinus is only current in the reformed dress which Jerome gave it, of which presentation Chiliasm is no feature, though we know from Jerome's own confession that Victorinus was a Chiliast, and therefore could not have commented on the Apocalypse without disclosing his true opinions. We are left, therefore, with little more than the passages of Irenæus, in which he defends the ancient (and perhaps at one time universal) Chiliastic belief of the Church. In view of this unhappy poverty of materials for the reconstruction of primitive Christian beliefs, it seems to me to be matter of great satisfaction that Prof. Haussleiter, of Greifswald, who is occupied with a new edition of Victorinus for the Vienna Corpus of Latin Fathers, should have discovered the closing portion of the commentary of Victorinus in the original form, apparently with no corrections from the hand of Jerome, and with abundant Chiliastic references and arguments. His announcement of the find may be read in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* for April 26, from which we gather that the MS. which furnishes the new material is in the Vatican Library (Codex Ottobonianus latinus, 3288A). If one can judge from the sample which Haussleiter gives, the MS. in question must be one of the most corrupt texts in existence,

worse even than the Muratorian Canon, which is the ugliest piece of patristic Latin that one has to read. The transcription seems to have been made by a scribe who was unacquainted with the nature of the abbreviations in the book before him, and not well acquainted with the language in which the book was written, so that he seems often to have confused letters formed by vertical strokes and similarly with the rounded letters, the result being something fearful and wonderful. To the task of decipherment of this corrupt fifteenth-century text Haussleiter has set himself with great courage, and the result of his investigation (incomplete though it necessarily is at present) will be to set before us a piece of Latin commentary on the Apocalypse, full of early turns of speech and archaic interpretations which may be safely set down to Victorinus. Some of his corrections are very felicitous, for example :

Post mille annos dimitti propter gentes, quae *seminent antuhasto* (read *seruient antichristo*).

Luminibus solis non esse propter animatiorem gloriam. Agnus enim, inquit, id est Deus lux eius est—

for which we should restore

lumen ibi solis non esse; propter agni maiorem gloriam. Agnus enim, etc.

These extracts will show the textual confusions with which the editor has to deal. We make a further contribution to passages which he has failed to read correctly :

Nos qui vivimus simul *ragonemus* cum eis in nubibus in obviam *domino erimus*.

Haussleiter reads *rapiemur* for the corrupt word *ragonemus*, but he rejects *erimus* at the end of the sentence; wrongly, I think, for the word is an indication that a sentence has been lost by transilience; we should read :

domino [et sic semper cum domino] erimus as in 1 Thess. iv. 18.

In the following sentence from the MS. :

In hoc regno promisit se dominius *rediturum* pro *annis* quibus comedit lucusta et *vrurhus* et *corruptelia*,

the editor rightly corrects the spelling *rediturum*, recognises the Greek idiom in *pro annis quibus*, but makes a wrong correction of *annis* to *omnibus* (= *περὶ πάντων ὧν*), restores for the unintelligible *vrurhus* the word *scorpius*, wrongly, as I will show, and finally emends the spelling of the concluding word to *corruptela*. But he does not recognise that Victorinus is quoting from Joel ii. 25, and that the proper word to restore is *bruchus* (the winged locust?). And since the text of Joel is a reference to the years which the locust has eaten, it is evident that *annis* must not be corrected to *omnibus*; *pro annis quibus* is the exact rendering of the LXX. ἀντὶ τῶν ἐτῶν ὧν κατέφαγεν ἡ ἀκρίς καὶ ὁ βροῦχος κτέ.

Other suggestions might be made: for instance the MS. tells us—

Hoc loco *videbant famem contra famem*,
et unus alterum non requisivit—

the editor omits the underlined words, having failed to decipher them; read—

videbunt facie[m] contra faciem,

and make the reference for the first part of the sentence to 1 Cor. xiii. 12, and for the latter part to Isaiah xxxiv. 16.

I am not, however, writing these few pages for the sake of exhibiting textual corrections which will be sure to be made presently, but to draw attention to Haussleiter's notice that in this recovered fragment of Victorinus we are face to face with earlier material borrowed from either Papias or the book of the Elders. And in either case the suggestion is so important and the evidence for it is so strong that patristic scholars will do well to pay early

attention to it. If I remember rightly, St. Jerome says in one place that Victorinus in his *Comments on Genesis* followed Origen so closely that it was more like a translation than an original work. It is very interesting, therefore, to have our suspicions aroused as to the existence of common matter with Papias or the Elders, which may be extant in a form not very remote from the original. The proof of the borrowing must be left until Prof. Haussleiter's edition comes out; but in the meantime he has published sufficient text to enable us to recognise that the writer was following a biblical argument for Chiliasm which made the same quotations as Irenæus, and was in harmony with the interpretations given by that Father. At the same time, it is pretty certain that he is not retailing Irenæus, of whom he shows himself, as far as we can judge at present, quite independent.

It is interesting to see the arguments which the Chiliasts employed in defence of what their critics called "the thousand years of carnal delight on earth." One of these arguments was based upon our Lord's words at the Last Supper, "I will not drink any more of the fruit of the vine until I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom." "In this kingdom," says Victorinus, "they will drink wine. Our Lord made mention of this kingdom before He suffered." The inference is that He was not speaking of the world to come. A reference to Irenæus (lib. v. c. xxxiii.) will show the same argument: the chapter opens with—

Propter hoc autem ad passionem veniens ut evangelisaret Abrahamæ et iis qui cum eo apertionem hereditatis, cum gratias egisset tenens calicem, etc. ;

and it ends with the Chiliastic comment—

Carnis enim proprium est et non spiritus qui ex vite accipitur potus.

I think it will be recognised that the prospect of a closer

acquaintance with the proof-texts and arguments of Chiliasm will throw much light on the history and on the party lines of the earlier Church.

There is one other very important remark of Prof. Haussleiter to which attention should be drawn : he points out that a comparison of the Hieronymized text of Victorinus with the recovered fragment shows that Victorinus had a different interpretation of the four living creatures in the cherubic chariot to that which was current in Western MSS. and Fathers. He interprets the Man, Lion, Ox and Eagle of Ezekiel's vision to prefigure the four Evangelists ; but instead of representing St. Mark by the Lion and St. John by the Eagle, he reverses the symbols. St. Jerome corrects his text, but it is clear that Victorinus had an older form of the interpretation of the living creatures. Not only so, but, as Haussleiter points out, Irenæus shows traces of an acquaintance with the form given by Victorinus ; for he takes the figures of the four living creatures as given in the Apocalypse (in the order Lion, Calf, Man, Eagle) and interprets them of the four Evangelists (in the order John, Luke, Matthew, Mark), and especially speaks of the winged and flying form of the Gospel of Mark. And it will be seen that very interesting questions arise in connexion with the proof that there has been a revision of the symbols assigned to the four Evangelists.

In the first place, there is a probability that the identification of the four Evangelists with the four faces of the Cherubim is not, as is commonly supposed, a piece of ingenuity due to Irenæus ; it has the appearance of coming from an older and earlier stratum, in which case the quadriform character of the Gospels must have been recognised before the time of Irenæus.

In the next place, it is singular that the order of the Evangelists in the earliest MSS. shows a misplacement of St. John and St. Mark exactly consonant with the interpretation

of the symbols. In most MSS. we have Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, but in Western MSS. we have Matthew, John, Luke and Mark. There is ground, then, for a suspicion that the Western MSS. preserve the original order of the symbols, in which St. John is the Lion and St. Mark the Eagle: but the interpretation involved in this order is practically unknown in the West. The Western order of the Gospels can hardly be due to interpretations borrowed from the chariot of Ezekiel, and it is open to suspicion whether it may not turn out to be the primitive order. The importance of these considerations will not escape textual critics.

J. R. HARRIS.

THE BREAKFAST ON THE SHORE.

WHEN Jesus said to Simon, "Thou art Simon, the son of John; thou shalt be called Cephas (which is by interpretation Peter)," the surname, or added name, was a prophecy of his after life; the new name that waited for him, and which his changed character should deserve, in the pentecostal days. In the Gospels he is still "Simon." Instead of being Peter, the rock-man, standing out unmoved amid all the storms of passion and of hate, he is uncertain, weak, "a reed shaken by the wind," all agitated and unnerved by the taunt of a servant-girl. Nay, he has thrice denied the Lord, tossing away his Master on his hot and false words. Yet there is the making of an apostle in him, those granitic materials of strength and sparkle which only need the touch of heavenly fire upon them, and the cooling of heavenly winds, to become set and enduring, a living stone of the new temple. And so, like the scholar with the "turned" lesson, Simon is sent back to Galilee, to receive a new commission in place of the one he has forfeited and lost. It is a repeat in the music of his life, a sort of *da capo* movement, with the same accessories; the same lake shore; the same weathered boat and nets; the same companions with three others added, and the same vain toiling all the night. So far the story is but a repetition of the older scene, now three years ago; but here the unison ends and the "parts" come in variations which are still harmonies with new and deeper meanings.

After the sad scene of the palace yard, Peter retires into comparative seclusion. We see him, it is true, now hastily going out to weep bitterly, and now running with John to the emptied sepulchre: and that Jesus has forgiven him we may gather from the facts that he alone was mentioned by

name in the angelic message (St. Mark xvi. 7), and that Jesus appeared personally to him, giving him a private interview, though what passed between them then we are not permitted to know. But if Jesus has forgiven him, he has not forgiven himself; as if those guilty lips of his were stricken with dumbness, he moves here and there—as far as any record is made—a silent apparition, but the shadow of his former, forward self. Before, he was quick-worded, always the first to speak, and as by common consent generally the spokesman for the rest. But not so now. We hear the words of Cleophas and his companion, of the Magdalene, and of Thomas, who was slow of speech as he was slow of faith, but Peter's voice is hushed. Even when the "eleven" are gathered together—and so Peter must have been one of them—when the two Emmaus travellers return all breathless to them, to tell of the Lord's appearance by the way, Peter has no word; it is the others who tell even his own secret, how "The Lord is risen indeed and hath appeared to Simon" (St. Luke xxiv. 34). And when the Lord Himself appears among them, the denier has no word to say. Like Zacharias, he is stricken with dumbness, stricken by his own bitter grief. The chosen vessel of the Lord, moulded though it has been by the Master's hand, is alas! marred; but a broken—

"Vase of chilling tears,
That grief hath shaken into frost."

But back in Galilee, away from the scene of painful memories, and again breathing his native air, Peter recovers his lost self, and regains his lost position. All the old confidence is given back to him, the confidence of his brethren, and the old leadership is resumed—for some men are born to lead as others are born to follow and be led,—and when he says to his six companions, "I go a-fishing," they say directly, "We also come with thee." Fishing was

not exactly after the bent of Thomas's mind; and Nathaniel seems to us more at home sitting under his 'fig tree, than dipping his oar into the lake; but as they had no plans of their own, nothing definite before them in this interval of waiting, they fall in easily with Peter's plans, allowing themselves to drift out on the current of his impulse. Besides, as the sons of Zebedee are with them, and two others who may have had a sea-training, they have nothing to fear; and better they should go a-fishing than do nothing. Some expositors have thought that in Peter's blunt and positive words they could detect a halting mind; and that, impatient at the Master's long delay, he was half inclined to give up the apostleship, and to take up again the old life where it was so abruptly broken, as he attached himself to the person of Jesus. But Peter's language does not of itself imply this. It is rather Peter's way of speaking, with a tinge of hastiness in his words. He has a home to keep up, a wife, if not children; and why should he not improve these few days of leisure in providing for himself and for his own? He cannot mean anything more than this, surely, after the bitter lesson of the past few weeks. He has broken for ever with his past; he has no wish to go back to it. The bridge behind him was all burned up in that one "look" of Jesus, and the charred fragments of it were swept away in the hot flood of tears.

The angel has said, "He goeth *before* you into Galilee"—as if the good Shepherd, who had given His life for the sheep, and now had risen from the dead, was still the same good Shepherd, leading out His flock into new pastures, anticipating all their wants and preparing their way before them. It is a new lesson that they have to learn—that the unseen Christ was to them all that the seen Christ had been, and even more. Hitherto they had walked mainly by sight. The sacred person of the Lord was close by them, visible, tangible; needing the same earthly supports as

did their own; and so they had only known Christ after the flesh, and by the natural eye alone had they discerned Him. But they must learn to walk by faith. The eyes of their understanding, or rather the eyes of their soul, must be opened by some new "Ephphatha," and they must see Christ with the deeper, higher vision. There would be a "little while" of eclipse and darkness, and then an open vision which need nevermore be overshadowed. The Pentecost, with its filling of the Spirit, would be to them a new Epiphany, when the unseen Christ would be manifest; not as now, localized, shut into one narrow manger, or one circumscribed spot, but as here and there and everywhere in His spiritual but real presence. And this was one meaning of the forty days—the *interregnum* which came between the crucifixion and the ascension. The many appearances of the Lord—all sudden and all brief—were a sort of divine drill; the frequent absence leading them on towards the abiding Presence, accustoming their eyes to the new light, and teaching them to see Him who was invisible. And Jesus *had* gone before them into Galilee. They had come northward, to breathe again their native air, borne on the breath of His word, as the winged seeds are carried on the current of the wind. And was not Peter's sudden impulse to go a-fishing itself a divine interjection cast within his soul from above, as when, once before, the higher will had bade him "Launch forth into the deep"? From the way in which his purpose works out, with its crowning apocalypse by the shore, we may see a mind beyond the mind; and Peter's words are in some sense but an echo of the higher Voice—the Word who is already near them, with them, though they know it not.

Slowly the night had passed, and the stars that were overhead had dropped silently below the horizon of their western hills. But probably the seven fishers would scarcely spare a thought for the stars, for their eyes were

bent steadily and intently on the deep below them. Their little world is swinging round in the zodiac of the *Pisces*. But though they tack 'about here and there, now throwing out their nets, and now casting their spears, it is a vain, disappointing toil; for when the fourth watch strikes, and the sky crimsons over the hills of Gadara, they have taken nothing. Tired and wet, they are turning homeward, skirting the shore, when a Stranger accosts them from the beach: "Children, have ye any meat?" It is a courteous and very homely way of speaking, and "children" is not perhaps the most happy rendering of the word; it is rather the "my lads" of our colloquial and familiar speech. But the disciples, disappointed and wet through as they are, are in no very courteous mood, and they answer with an abrupt and monosyllabic "No," whose sharp ring had within it a tinge of petulance, as if they were half vexed to be so reminded of their failure. But when the Stranger bids them to cast the net on the right side of the ship, with the promise that they shall find, they do not hesitate. The Stranger probably had seen the shoal; at any rate His words spur on their lagging energies to one venture more, and the nets are let down. Drawing them in, they find enclosed within their meshes a wonderful take. The water teems with life, as the hundred and fifty-three fishes dart and plunge within their narrowing prison. From the narrative it would seem that Peter and John and probably two others were in the ship, or large boat, as we should call it, and that the other three were in the "little ship," or punt, from which the net was paid out. But John and Peter had no eyes for their spoil; they could only see the Stranger who had so accosted and so commanded them; and when John,—the disciple of the swift foot and the quick vision—said, "It is the Lord," Peter lost himself in a delirious joy. Hastily putting on his coat—the garment worn between the inner tunic and the outer robe—he

plunged headlong over the ship's side into the water; and rising again to the surface, and shaking the wet out of his eyes and his tangled hair, he made straight for Jesus, stepping up on the sands all drenched and dripping. The others stayed to secure their large harvest, which they did—much to their wonder—without breaking the net.

Coming to land, they see a “fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon, and bread.” It was not what we should call an out-door fire of hastily gathered weeds and driftwood, but a charcoal fire, which was the usual fire of the hearth and home, and which there was generally burned in a brazier. Is it simply a coincidence, or is it something more, that the only other “fire of coals” mentioned in the New Testament is in St. John xviii. 18, where we read of one in the palace yard, at which Peter stood and warmed himself? That “fire of coals” lighted him on his downward path; all his professions and promises were thrown into it, to disappear like the crackling of thorns, or the vapour of smoke: out of that “fire of coals” the viper crept which fastened on his heart, and which, alas! he had not the courage to throw off, but which stung him into a moral paralysis and insensibility. And now Jesus calls him to sit down at *His* “fire of coals” on the sands, and to bring of the fish they have now caught; for what they saw broiling on the fire was but one small fish (St. John seems to emphasize this, drawing a marked distinction between the “great fishes” of v. 11 and the diminutive word of v. 9), and near the fire one loaf of bread. It is as if Jesus would reproduce the scene of that sad night—at least as far as the altered surroundings would allow; but as Peter responds to the invitation, “Come and breakfast,” and seats himself all wet and cold by the Master's fire, it is with changed companionship and a changed self, for the forward heart has learned humility, and ambition has given place to love. St. John passes over the breakfast in silence, only telling us that Jesus took

His old place as Master and Host, multiplying the bread for His disciples and Himself now, as He did once before for strangers; for when Jesus "taketh bread and giveth them, and fish likewise" (v. 13), it is *the* loaf, and *the* fish (the little one) of v. 9, and not the large fishes which they have just caught.

And now we come to the central scene of the narrative, around which these other incidents group themselves as accessories and approaches. When the breakfast is over Jesus turns to Peter, and startles him with the question, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me more than these?" and Peter replies, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." A second time Jesus puts the same question, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me?" and a second time Peter replies, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." Still a third time Jesus puts His question, "Simon, son of John, lovest thou Me?" and Peter, grieved that his word should be taken so doubtingly, that the question should be asked a third time, answers, "Lord, Thou knowest all things, Thou knowest that I love Thee." In these questions and answers our version uses but one verb, "love," and so a delicate bit of colouring is omitted. In the Greek we have two words, with related but slightly different meanings, one a broader and the other a deeper word—one generic, the other more specific, more distinctly personal; and through the conversation there is a subtle logomachy, or word-combat, as between two rival contestants. When Jesus first puts the question, He uses the broader word, which, as compared with the stronger word, we might render, "Simon, do you care for Me?" as in our colloquial mode of speech. But this word is too cold, too distant, for Peter's passionate soul, and when he replies he uses the deeper word of strong personal attachment, "Thou knowest that I *love* Thee," putting all stress of accent upon the changed verb. A

second time Jesus uses the farther-off word, "Simon, do you care for Me?" and a second time Peter alters his Lord's word, substituting his own, "Thou knowest that I *love* Thee." But when Jesus puts the question the third time, as if standing corrected by His disciple, He Himself uses Peter's deeper word, "Simon, lovest thou Me?" It is all through a delicate bit of word-fencing; and the stronger word, which sounds the depths of the human heart, and tells of its deepest, holiest affection, wins.

We have a similar interchange of words in the three commands which follow the three questions and answers. Here again we have two words, both pastoral and closely related in the meanings; but one is the generic, and the other the specific word. It is first, "Feed My lambs," where the meaning is narrowed to the one duty of providing food, for etymologically "feed" and "food" are the same word. It is secondly, "Tend My sheep," where it is the broader word, which includes all pastoral duties. It is strictly, "Shepherd My sheep," and shepherding means more than feeding. The flock needs a fold as well as a field, shelter as well as sustenance, and the shepherd must be defender, guide, as well as provider. He must choose the pasturage, and himself show the way to it. He must put all around his flock the unseen fences of his thought, his unremitting care; and if need be, he must place between his flock and the ravening wolves which threaten the barrier of his strong arms, or the barrier of his own life laid down for the sheep. But in the third command Jesus reverts to the former, narrower word, as He says to Peter, "Feed My sheep." He underlines the emphatic word by the repetition, and at the same time He emphasizes the shepherd's primary, cardinal duty, which is to provide food for his flock; for what is a fold after all without a field? Its walls may be secure and beautiful as heaven, so that no beast of prey can break them down, and no robber can

climb them ; but if there is nothing to eat, the poor sheep will bleat piteously while they starve ; and they might just as well be devoured by wolf or bear, as be slowly eaten up of their own hunger.

But returning from this etymological diversion, why should Jesus question Peter about his love, repeating the question three times? Did Peter's words weigh so light that they must needs be heaped up one above another in repeated avowals before they made up the standard weight? Or was Jesus Himself at a loss how accurately to appraise this man, the erratic, enigmatic disciple? No; but there was evidently some deep purpose hidden in the thrice repeated question ; and if we throw the light of the "fire of coals" upon it, we may, perhaps, detect that hidden purpose. By the fire of the palace yard Peter had been questioned as to his relations to Jesus, and three times he had disavowed his Lord, the last time backing up his disavowal with oaths and curses—the oaths and anathemas that even Religion sanctioned. And now Jesus calls him to *His* fireside, and puts the three questions to him, that in the three avowals and protestations of his love the three denials may be in part atoned for, and then forgotten. But did not Peter love Jesus before? or is this love some new affection that has blossomed suddenly in his heart and life? We can scarcely call it a new affection, for evidently, even in the old days, there was a nascent love growing up within his soul. But while there was a strong, personal attachment to Christ, if we examine it closely, we shall find that it was not a pure affection. It was a blending of gold and clay, the higher love intermixed with a lower love of self. It was not the character of Jesus so much that had won him, though they could not have lived three years in such intimate association with Him without loving Him as a Man. But they were possessed by the dream of an earthly kingdom, and this coloured, or rather discoloured,

their attachment, and threw a warp into their lives. The glitter of right and left-hand thrones was in their eyes, and so they were constantly struggling for pre-eminence and prominence, giving themselves up to their little jealousies and bickerings, and asking, Who shall be greatest? even when Jesus has set His face to go up to Jerusalem, and the dark shadow of the Cross has filled His soul. And Peter had not loved the "Me" purely and utterly; he had loved himself in the "Me." Instead of putting Christ in the centre, letting all his thoughts and plans gravitate towards Him and his life revolve about Him, he set himself in the centre, and the Christ on some far circumference, as if He were but some satellite of a moon, shining for his little world alone. But a change has come over the spirit of his dream. Calvary has transfigured his love, taking all the earthiness, the selfishness, from it; for self now is as if it were not. Henceforth in his purified affections there is no room for vain and proud ambitions, no room for any selfish purposes; Christ was all and in all; and when Peter answered, "Yea, Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee," it was but the language of an absolute, whole-souled devotion—a love that through the future years should be all-absorbing and all-commanding.

And how this love, so passionately avowed upon the lake shore, grew and ripened, we may see if we turn to the two Epistles of St. Peter. Written in his later years, when life is mainly a retrospect, when the charm of novelty has long since faded away, and the tides of impulse have settled down into a more quiet, and, perhaps, deeper flow, yet how they sparkle with the precious Name! "Christ, Jesus Christ"! He cannot write many words without inserting the Name that is above every name; and no matter what his subject—what circles of duty he describes, or what heights of privilege he climbs—he leaves his Christ in the centre of those circles and on those loftiest heights.

And if we compare the two Epistles, we find a deepening and heightening of Peter's affection, with "more of reverence," as "knowledge" has grown "from more to more." In his first Epistle it is "Christ, Jesus Christ," until we may count the simple Name thirty times; while once he speaks of "the Lord Jesus Christ." In the second Epistle, however, he speaks of "Jesus Christ" once only; now it is "Jesus, our Lord," "our Saviour Jesus Christ," or "the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." It is as if he beheld Him with the nearer vision—now the Lamb in the midst of the throne—and he casts at His feet his crowning words, or he bids us listen to the music of the Second Advent, "the revelation of Jesus Christ" which draweth nigh!

And here we touch a foundation truth, and one that is applicable to all times and all places alike. It is this: that love to Christ is the qualification for all service. So far Peter has been a learner rather than a teacher. He has had special privileges accorded him, as, together with James and John, he has been admitted to that inner circle of Christ's friendships; but he has not yet been a "fisher of men," nor has he rendered any signal service. His duties so far have lain down in the lower planes of ministry, such as lending his boat to the Master, casting his hook into the sea to fish for the silver stater, untying and leading down the ass, or preparing the guest-chamber. This was his work, among the "common tasks," which demanded neither skill nor strength of soul; and only once did he strike out in ways of his own, and that was when he too hastily drew his sword and cut off the right ear of Malchus. Now, however, he is to be promoted to a higher service, and one distinctly spiritual. He is to be a leader, the Moses of the new Exodus, seer of heavenly visions, and interpreter of Divine laws; and this higher ministry he cannot undertake—he cannot even understand—without love. Whether he be the speaker of the Pentecost, the

apostle of the circumcision, or the shepherd to fold and feed the flock, love must be his inspiration, and words and deeds must be the overflowings and outflowings of a full heart.

So is it to-day and every day. In all the fields of service that lie open to us—and the Master's fields are many as they are wide—the work that tells the most and that lasts the longest is the work that has most of heart in it, most of soul. It is not labour which in Heaven's reckoning counts so much, but the love in the labour. We may do a great deal of work for Christ, if we set it down in hours and days; we may busy ourselves, and even weary ourselves, with multiplied activities, running here and there, and yet accomplish little, perhaps nothing. The lips may speak correctly and fluently enough; our words may be well chosen and well spoken, and yet they fall lightly on the air and ear; they do not reach the consciences of men; they do not rouse the soul to action, leaving behind them the echoes of sustained reverberations. Our message, carefully prepared though it is, leaves no impact upon the life, and makes no more impression than the flap of an insect-wing! Because the impelling force is wanting. The heart is cold and dead; there is no glow of hidden fire, no consuming, constraining love. And it is only the heart which speaks to the heart; as Goethe says,—

“ You never can make heart throb with heart
Unless your own heart first has struck the tone.”

True words! and true alike for the pulpit as for the stage. Isaiah in his vision saw the angel take the live coals from the altar and put them on his lips, that they might be fit channels for the Divine message. But Heaven's angel cannot touch our lips with fire unless he can find the live coals on the sacred altar of our heart. But if the heart be right—if it has caught in some measure a sympathetic beat

with the Divine heart of infinite pity and infinite love—it is wonderful how mighty even weak, frail man becomes, and how far-reaching is his influence. The beat of a consecrated heart can shake the world. An apostle of love will always command a hearing; for when he speaks, whose heart is “afire with God,” men unconsciously take off their shoes, stilling the noise and clatter of their own thoughts even, as they listen to the Voice within the voice, the still, small Voice of God!

But a weary task it is to put on the shepherd’s dress and to borrow the shepherd’s attitudes and voice without the shepherd’s heart! We may indeed call ourselves apostles; we may learn to speak in ecclesiastical tones and oracular ways; but if love be wanting, we only beat the air with our vain endeavours, and our wisest words are but sounding brass or tinkling cymbal. How can we feed the flock of Christ if we ourselves are strangers to the heavenly pastures, with no key to unlock them, and no eye even to discern them? Alas for us who profess to be seers of heavenly things and yet ourselves are blind! Like Samson Agonistes, we may punctually and punctiliously keep up our round of religious duties, grinding at our mill, and so preparing the bread of life for others, and yet all the time we ourselves sit in darkness, not knowing the light of day, and not so much as tasting the heavenly bread! Strange shepherds of the flock are we when Duty takes the place of Love! when the soul which should be an altar for the sacred fire is nothing but a funeral urn, enclosing a few dead ashes! The flock may thirst and pant for the living waters, their hearts crying out for “God, the living God”; but all we can do is to conjure up some illusive mirage over their desert, or to lead them up some old water-courses, now hot and dry! Hungering and pining for heavenly food, something that will make their soul patient and strong, quiet and glad, and all we can do is to toss them a

stone as they cry for bread, or to feed them with windy words! But the hireling shepherd, the self-installed pastor, is zealous only about his so-called "orders" or his "living." As to tending or feeding the flock, he knows little, and cares less; but he is diligent and skilful at shearing—keeping his feast of St. Nabal with much self-gratulation and with very prolonged rites!

But how Peter loved, and how well he shepherded the flock of Christ, the sequel of the Acts of the Apostles shows. Not only was he the preacher, he was the pastor too; and such was his remarkable power and fame, that he was called here and there—now by heavenly visions and now by earthly voices, now to the abode of death and now to the house of life, where Cornelius and his kinsmen stood waiting by the gate of a new dawn. Indeed, such was his influence, that even in Jerusalem, where he had denied his Lord, along the very streets where he had slunk away in shame and sorrow that dark, sad night, the people brought out their sick and laid them down in the way, that, perchance, "the shadow of Peter" might fall upon them and heal them! Strange transformation! Losing his life, he has found it; losing his self—or, which is the same thing, hiding self in Christ—he has found a higher, a multiplied self, speaking as with cloven tongues, and living a thousand lives in one. And as Peter—himself "an elder" now—writes to the strangers of the Dispersion, this is the exhortation he sends to the elders, "Tend the flock of God which is among you, exercising the oversight, not of constraint, but willingly, according unto God; not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind" (1 Peter v. 2). The flock is thus his last thought, as it has long been his only thought; and as he passes on to them his own commission it is as if the fire of coals still lighted up his soul; for he uses the very word Jesus then addressed to himself, and he speaks of another morning that is soon to break over him and

them, and of another appearing of the exalted Christ: "And when the Chief Shepherd shall be manifested, ye shall receive the crown of glory that fadeth not away." As the tones of the bell linger in the air long after the hammer-stroke, so the word of Jesus, striking upon Peter's inmost soul, had set all his being vibrating, while the music lingered in his ear and heart on and on through all the after years.

The strange interview was now drawing to a close. The three interrogatives have been followed by the three imperatives, and now these are followed by a double Amen: "Verily, verily I say unto thee, When thou wast young, thou girdedst thyself, and walkedst whither thou wouldest; but when thou shalt be old thou shalt stretch forth thy hands, and another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not"; St. John adding, "Now this He spake, signifying by what manner of death he should glorify God." And so the life of love and service is to have its crown and consummation in sacrifice; finding its Calvary somewhere—though Jesus gives no hint as to where the cross will meet him, or when, except in the far distance, "when thou shalt be old." But why should Jesus mention it at all? for He does not so forecast the future of James and John. And why should it be mentioned now of all times, when Peter, forgiven and restored, is stepping up to the old place of pre-eminence and authority, and stepping forwards to a future all bright with promise? Does not the prophecy at first sight seem superfluous; and is it not something of an anachronism that the shadow of Peter's cross should fall on this Galilean shore, dropping darkly within the dawn of a new life? Perhaps we shall best discover its meaning and its timeliness if we read it—as indeed the whole narrative should be read—in the light of the denial. Peter had spoken boldly, "Lord, with Thee I am ready to go both to prison and to death" (St. Luke

xxii. 34). But the sad fall has had its rising again; though it was a dark eclipse, it was but brief—but for one night, or rather for one hour—and now that the deep shadow has disappeared, and all the old brightness has returned, it is as if Jesus wished to forget it. Henceforth it must be unmentioned, one of the “things behind” which must be forgotten; and now Jesus, as it were, cuts out the fracture of the cable where the divine sparks were arrested, and muffling into silence the shrill cock-crow, He joins the new life to the old just where the sad fault came, answering Peter’s words of ready devotion with His own prophetic affirmation. “You say that with Me you are ready to go both to prison and to death. You speak truly, for you are ready now, if not before; and you *shall* go with Me even unto death, for you shall indeed drink of My cup, and with My baptism of blood shall you too be baptised. So come, follow Me; the way is open, even forwards to the cross.”

And so Simon Peter, like Simon the Cyrenian, becomes a cross-bearer; but unlike the Cyrenian, Peter must bear his own cross, and not his Lord’s, and his “compelling” will be, not the constraint of force, but the deeper constraint of love. And Peter accepted the prophetic guerdon. Is his reward for tending and feeding the flock, for years of unremitting toil, to be a martyrdom, a crucifixion? So let it be. Dying for Christ is better and sweeter than living for the world, or even for himself; and as just now his forward-stepping arms struck through the water to go to Jesus, so henceforth, impelled by a love he cannot put into the poor, broken words of earth, the arms of his soul reach out to the things that are before, embracing the cross that awaits him, for the sake of the Christ who is above and beyond it. And Peter steps forward lightly, rejoicing even in tribulation, and singing along his *via dolorosa*; counting it double honour that he may share his Master’s sufferings and shame.

“Follow Me,” said Jesus as He rose from the ground and moved away, strangely withdrawing from the seven disciples, now that the lesson was over. And Peter, stumbling at the word, and reading it in the lower instead of the higher sense, stepped after Him, as did John also—for Peter was quickest to start, though John was swiftest in the running. Peter, seeing John too following, must speak one word for him, the disciple who has loved and not denied; “Lord, what of this man?” he says in his quick, nervous speech. But there must be no further uplifting of the veil; and Peter’s pointed question, like his keen sword, must be put up into its sheath of silence; for this is the only answer, “If I will that he tarry till I come what is that to thee? Follow thou Me.”

“If I will.” So does the risen Christ step within our human lives, guiding their currents, measuring their times. We throw ourselves here or there; we think, we plan, we act, we suffer; but there is an unseen Mind in which our little thoughts and purposes play—just as the all-embracing sky holds within itself alike the flight of all the birds and the sweep of all the worlds. “If I will,” one must tarry, and one must go; one must live, and one must die; for to Him who is the Life, life and death are one. And so a true love follows Christ, and does not question Him. She does not seek to know all, but is content to know that *He* knows, and that, somehow, His will is written on everything; and, rejoicing or sorrowing, doing or suffering, love endures as “seeing Him who is invisible.” He who loves and follows ardently and utterly, having nothing, yet possesses all things: things present, and things to come; heights, depths; life, death—all are his, since he is Christ’s.

HENRY BURTON.

INDEX.

	PAGE
Rev. Edwin A. Abbott, D.D.	
The "Elders" of Papias	333
Rev. Professor Karl Budde, D.D.	
Problems of the Prophetic Literature :	
Habakkuk	372
Rev. Henry Burton, M.A.	
The Wise Men	257
The Breakfast on the Shore	456
Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D.D.	
On the Spirit of the Truth not speaking from Himself	189
Rev. Professor T. K. Cheyne, D.D.	
Problems of the Prophetic Literature :	
Isaiah	81
The Development of the Meanings of "Belial."	435
A. Cowley, M.A.	
The Samaritan Doctrine of the Messiah	161
Rev. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D.	
Modern Religion and Old Testament Immortality	321
Sir J. William Dawson, C.M.G., F.R.S.	
The "Cursing of the Ground," and the "Revealing of the Sons of God" in Relation to Natural Facts :	
I. Man before the Fall	411
Rev. J. W. Diggle, M.A.	
Of the Nature of Faith, Particularly in its Relation to Sight and Reason	143

	PAGE
Rev. Professor Marcus Dods, D.D.	
Survey of Recent Biblical Literature	156, 317, 399
The Baptist's Message to Jesus	201
St. Paul's View of the Greek Gods	237
Rev. Professor S. R. Driver, D.D.	
The Speeches in Chronicles	241
Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D.	
The Person of Christ. A Problem in the Philosophy of Religion :	
I. The Problem	94
II. Can the Philosophy offer a Solution?	175
Ven. F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S.	
The Sinaitic Palimpsest of the Syriac Gospels	1
J. Rendel Harris, M.A.	
A New Patristic Fragment	448
Rev. Professor William Ince, D.D.	
The Miraculous Conception and Virgin Birth of Christ	401
Rev. Professor Thomas M. Lindsay, D.D.	
The Doctrine of Scripture: The Reformers and the Princeton School	278
Rev. Professor James Orr, D.D.	
The Old Testament Question in the Early Church	346
Professor W. M. Ramsay, D.C.L.	
Professor G. A. Smith's "Historical Geography of the Holy Land"	55
Professor F. Blass on the Two Editions of Acts	129, 212
The Rulers of the Synagogue	272
The Words in Acts Denoting Missionary Travel	385
Rev. H. R. Reynolds, D.D.	
Ideals and Grace	73
Rev. T. G. Selby.	
God's Call to Self-Possession	44
Self-Possession and Effectual Service	294
Our Lord's Ideal of Prayer	439

	PAGE
Rev. Professor George Adam Smith, D.D.	
The Twenty-Third Psalm	33
Rev. James Stalker, D.D.	
Jeremiah : The Man and His Message.	
I. His Call	66
II. His Times	108
III. Ideal	309
Rev. Professor H. B. Swete, D.D.	
St. Jerome on the Psalms	424
Rev. Professor B. B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D.	
St. Paul's Use of the Argument from Experience	226
Rev. John Watson, M.A.	
Fatherhood the Final Idea of God	20
The Foresight of Faith	118
The Continuity of Life	361
Rev. Prebendary Whitefoord, M.A.	
The Open Eye	302

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
Genesis ii. 4	14	Psalm xxv. 15	308
iii. 9	359	xliii. 3	74
xv. 17	167	lxxx. 1	24
xlix. 10.	173	cxxxix. 14	302
Exodus xxiii. 14-19	64	Proverbs xx. 12	304
Leviticus i. 7	64	Isaiah ii. 2-4	85
Numbers xxiv. 17	173	xlii. 18	304
xxviii., xxix.	64	xliv. 9-20	151
Deuteronomy xxix. 29	171	Jeremiah i. 18	71
1 Samuel vii.	246	vii. 16	110
2 Samuel xxxiv. 24	287	xi.	111
2 Kings xxiv. 14	92	xi. 18	327
1 Chronicles xxi. 35	287	xii.	117
xxix.	242	xxiii. 29	72
2 Chronicles xvi. 9	305	xxxv.	310
Ezra iv. 6-23	91	xxxvi.	111

	PAGE		PAGE
Hosea ii. 14	24	Jchn iii. 6	11
xi. 50	24	iii. 14	119
Micah iv. 1-3	85	v. 17	28
v. 21	268	vi. 53	119
Habakkuk ii. 9-20	372	vii. 47	94
Matthew i. 16	12	viii. 37	11
i. 25	12	xi. 47	95
iv. 11	363	xvi. 13	189
vi. 22	304	xviii. 31	96
vi. 25	120	Acts x. 30	15
vii. 11.	25	xvii. 1	399
xi. 2-19	201	xxiv. 24	144
xvi. 2, 3	10	Romans i. 19	146
xvii. 27	121	i. 21-25	240
xx. 18	120	v. 1-18	226
xxi. 8	95	vii. 21-25	306
xxiii. 11	10	1 Corinthians ii. 14	146
xxiv. 29	171	iv. 7	149
xxiv. 36	10	vii. 5	15
xxvii. 16	11	x. 14-22	238
xxvii. 24	96	xii. 14	148
Mark vii. 3	337	xiii. 2	144
ix. 29	15	2 Corinthians v. 7	144
ix. 44	10	Galatians iii. 5-7	230
x. 50	11	Ephesians ii. 8	143
x. 51	308	1 Thessalonians v. 23	147
xvi. 9-20	9	v. 23	155
Luke i. 1	9	2 Timothy iv. 7	144
ii. 6	8	Titus i. 1	143
ii. 14	11	Hebrews i. 2	308
vii. 18-35	201	xi. 1	153
viii. 3	121	xi. 13	143
xi. 2-4	9	xi. 32	307
xiii. 1	96	James ii. 19	143
xix. 35	95	1 Peter v. 2	469
xxiii. 4	97	Revelation xiii. 12	351
xxiii. 37	11	xiv. 12	143
xxiv. 51	11		



A 000 518 336 3

