€1095

THE

# AMERICAN JOURNAL

OF

# THEOLOGY

EDITED BY
THE DIVINITY FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

VOLUME I
1897

CHICAGO
The University of Chicago Press
1897

# TABLE OF CONTENTS.

## JANUARY.


PAGE

THEOLOGICAL AGNOSTICISM. Alexander Balmain Bruce. - - - - - 1–15

BERNHARD WEISS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. Caspar René Gregory. - 16–37

THE SCOPE OF THEOLOGY AND ITS PLACE IN THE UNIVERSITY. Charles A. Briggs. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 38–70

THE NATURAL HISTORY OF SACRED BOOKS: *Some Suggestions for a Preface to the History of the Canon of Scripture.* Allan Menzies. - - 71–94

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF F. J. A. HORT. W. Sanday. - - - - - 95–117

RECENT TENDENCIES IN THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT. Augustus H. Strong. - 118–136

CRITICAL NOTES: *Habakkuk 3 : 10, 11, 15,* William Hayes Ward.—*Suggestions concerning the Original Text and Structure of Amos 1 : 3—2 : 5,* William R. Harper.—*Peter's Sojourn in Rome,* Arthur C. McGiffert.—*St. Paul's Use of* δικαιοῦν, E. P. Gould. - - - - - - - 137–158

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - 159–246

CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - 247–270

BIBLIOGRAPHY. W Muss-Arnolt. - - - - - - - - - 271–288


## APRIL.


THE SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHINESE. William A. P. Martin. 289–297

APOLOGETICS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY. A. M. Fairbairn. - - 298–311

STYLE AS AN ELEMENT IN DETERMINING THE AUTHORSHIP OF OLD TESTAMENT DOCUMENTS. Samuel Ives Curtiss. - - - - - - 312–327

THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE INQUIRY CONCERNING THE GENUINENESS OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES. Bernhard Weiss. - - - - - - 328–403

IS CHRISTIANITY FITTED TO BECOME THE WORLD-RELIGION? John Henry Barrows. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 404–423

DOCUMENTS. *Protevangelium Iacobi.* From an Armenian Manuscript in the Library of the Mechitarists in Venice. Edited by Fred. C. Conybeare. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 424–442

CRITICAL NOTES: *On the Forensic Meaning of* δικαιοσύνη, William Arnold Stevens.—*A Stricture on Schaff's Account of Servetus,* S. C. Mitchell.—*The Need of a New Theology,* Lyman Abbott. - - - - - - 443–464

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - - 465–534

CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - - 535–554

BIBLIOGRAPHY. W. Muss-Arnolt. - - - - - - - - - - 555–576

## JULY.

PAGE

THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD. Charles M. Mead. - - - - - - 577–600

THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE QUARTODECIMANS. James Drummond. - 601–657

THE MORAL EVOLUTION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. James Frederick McCurdy. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 658–691

THE SCOPE OF PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF GRACE. George H. Gilbert. - - 692–699

THE HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL PURITAN THEOLOGY OF NEW ENGLAND, 1620–1720. Frank Hugh Foster. - - - - - - - - 700–727

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE ISRAELITES. Frants Buhl. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 728–740

THE CONCEPTION OF THE FUTURE LIFE IN HOMER. Arthur Fairbanks. - 741–757

CRITICAL NOTES.—*The So-called Agrapha*, James Hardy Ropes.—*The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus*, Hope W. Hogg. - - - - - - - - 758–786

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - 787–847

CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - 848–857

BIBLIOGRAPHY. W. Muss-Arnolt. - - - - - - - - - 858–882

## OCTOBER.

THE GROWTH OF THE PESHIṬTÂ VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT. Illustrated from the Old Armenian and Georgian Versions. Fred. C. Conybeare - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 883–912

THE FALL AND ITS CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO GENESIS, CHAP. 3. H. G. Mitchell. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 913–926

ALEXANDRIA AND THE NEW TESTAMENT. James Stevenson Riggs. - 927–949

JONATHAN EDWARDS' "IDEALISM." *With special reference to the essay "Of Being," and to writings not in his collected works.* Egbert C. Smyth. - 950–964

ETHICS OF THE STATE. D. B. Purinton. - - - - - - - - 965–997

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - 998–1115

CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - 1116–1129

BIBLIOGRAPHY. W. Muss-Arnolt. - - - - - - - - 1130–1150

INDEX. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1150–1162

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume I JANUARY 1897 Number 1

# THEOLOGICAL AGNOSTICISM.

By ALEXANDER BALMAIN BRUCE,
Glasgow.

"AGNOSTIC" is a modern epithet. It was invented some forty years ago by the late Mr. Huxley to distinguish his religious position from that of theists, pantheists, atheists, and to indicate that he, for his part, was not able to make any affirmations of any sort about God; not even that he is, or is not, still less what he is. Thus used the epithet denotes an attitude antithetic to that of the ancient gnostics who believed that an unlimited knowledge of God and the supersensible world was possible, and that its attainment was man's chief good. Since Huxley first coined the term it has steadily gained ever-increasing currency, and, following the fate of all new words, it has been used with various shades of meaning. In strictness it should be applied only to those who, like that distinguished scientist, profess absolute, unqualified agnosticism concerning God. But there is an agnostic *Zeitgeist* which influences many men who have not reached that extreme position. And so we have to reckon with a modified, partial agnosticism, professed not by unbelieving men of science, or by skeptical philosophers, but by religious men or theologians, and consisting in a severe *restriction* of the knowledge of God attainable by man. It has its ultimate unconscious source in the spirit of the time, and its conscious grounds in philosophic theories of knowledge, in particular views as to the idea

of religion, and in certain convictions cherished concerning the characteristics of the Bible and the proper use of the sacred literature. It is of this modified type of the modern phenomenon in question I mean to speak under the title of "theological agnosticism." Its proper home is Germany, but sympathetic movements of thought are not lacking in English literature.

The slightest sketch of German theological agnosticism must take into account the epoch-making influence of *Schleiermacher*, who has largely shaped the course of theological opinion since his time in many ways, but very specially through his conception of the nature of religion. According to this great theologian religion consists not in morality, as Kant imagined, nor in theoretic knowledge, as Hegel taught, but in feeling; in the feeling of absolute dependence on the Great Being who manifests himself in the world. Religion, he said in effect, appears in connection with morals and with metaphysics, but it is neither the one nor the other, nor a combination of the two. It consists in conscious contact with the Infinite, the whole, and in the sense of entire dependence which the august presence of the divine awakens in us. This conception of religion determined Schleiermacher's whole method of handling theology which, in his view, had for its distinctive task to observe, describe, and classify the various modes, or affections, of the Christian consciousness, *i. e.*, of the feeling of dependence as modified by faith in Christ. Theology thus viewed is not the science of God as he is in himself, but the knowledge of God as he affects us through the world and through Christ, or the knowledge of our own mental states as thus affected.

This view of the function of theology is simply an extension of the Kantian theory of knowledge in general to the special sphere of divine knowledge. Of things in themselves, Kant had taught, we know, can know, nothing, but only of things as they affect us through our senses, and as these sense affections are reduced to system by the categories of the understanding. Thus was the world out of relation to our senses reduced to an unknown $x$, and in a similar manner the soul and God were removed beyond the sphere of the knowable; God most of all,

because, unlike the world and the soul, possessing no distinctive media of self-manifestation. In Schleiermacher's system God does not labor under this exceptional disability, as he is the Being who awakens in us that sense of absolute dependence wherein the essence of religion lies. But in that system God is knowable only as the world and the soul are. As the world is knowable through the phenomena of sensation and the soul through the phenomena of thought, so God is knowable through the peculiar feeling of dependence of which religious natures are conscious. Hence the attributes we ascribe to God do not describe anything special in God, but only something peculiar in the form which the feeling of dependence assumes towards him.

Ritschl, who flourished a generation later than Schleiermacher, assumed the same general attitude. He did not indeed accept Schleiermacher's idea of religion without modification. Admitting that religion consists in a unique feeling, he maintained that the feeling which constitutes religion, while determined in us by God, is not an isolated relation between God and the soul, but is always conditioned by our relations to the world. He declined to regard religion as an affair of mystic raptures, and mysterious fellowship with the divine. He rather regarded it as the world-dominating disposition of man, the necessity laid upon him to assert over against the world the claims of his spiritual personality. The stimulus to religious life, though coming ultimately from God, comes to us directly through the world. And it comes to us through the world in virtue of that in it which is out of harmony with the needs and rights of our spiritual nature. For there is much in the world which tends to crush our personality, and it *will* crush us if we tamely yield. But the legitimate, divinely intended effect of the untoward element is to rouse us into a conflict not to be terminated otherwise than by the victory of the spirit over the brute force of the world.

Common to Ritschl and Schleiermacher is the placing of the essence of religion not in theoretic knowledge but in emotional affections; in the sense of absolute dependence, or in the sense of dissatisfaction with the world. Common to both also is the limitation of theology to our estimate of God in relation to the

root feeling of religion under all its manifestations. Ritschl adopted as his philosophic basis the Kantian theory of knowledge as modified by Lotze, which may be summed up thus: We know things (1) as the causes of the characteristics which act upon us, (2) as the ends which these subserve as means, (3) as the law of their constant changes.[1] Applied to theology the theory restricts theological formulations to what God is in relation to us. In relation to us God is *love*. This, therefore, is for all legitimate theology the fundamental characteristic of the Divine Being. God's love, not God's personality, or his omnipotence, or any other transcendental attribute, should be the starting point of all Christian theology, as it is at that point that God touches us, and it is only as deductions from the attribute of love that the metaphysical attributes of deity are to be dealt with by the theologian if he has any concern with them at all.

This general position Ritschl resolutely applied to all details. One of the most characteristic and important applications is that which relates to the *person of Christ*. To our Lord, Ritschl assigned the religious value of God, because in him God's will of love found adequate expression, and the victory over the world to which man is destined was fully achieved. But metaphysical knowledge of his divine nature he conceived to be unattainable. Hence the dogma of Christ's preëxistence forms, in his view, no proper part of Christian theology. If it be a reality the preëxistent state belongs to the region of the thing-in-itself, and as such it cannot be a matter of revelation. The notion of it is not a religious idea, because in it Christ has not been revealed to us. Neither is the doctrine of the preëxistence the complete expression of Christ's divinity ; at most it is but a buttress to the traditional theological conception of that divinity. In a similar manner is the state of exaltation disposed of. It is regarded as having no contents for thought, because it has no direct bearing on our experience. The final result is that for all affirmations concerning Christ the fact-basis must be his earthly history. If we call him divine it must be with reference to the impression the gospel narratives make on our minds

[1] STÄHELIN, *Kant, Lotze and Ritschl*, p. 158. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark.

without regard either to the preëxistent or to the postexistent state.

Postponing in the meantime critical comments on this theological agnosticism of Ritschl, I add a few paragraphs descriptive of the school founded by that theologian, a school now flourishing vigorously in Germany and characterized by great religious earnestness not less than by theological ability. The members of the school, while exhibiting considerable theological individuality, have two salient features in common: a rooted aversion to metaphysics in theology, and an earnest conviction that God is known only in so far as he reveals himself to men in their experience, aiding them to realize their chief end and to attain the *summum bonum*. The aversion to metaphysics embraces in its impartial scope both the ancient metaphysics of the Greeks utilized by the fathers in the construction of the ecclesiastical creeds, and the modern metaphysical systems of Germany, especially that of Hegel. The use of metaphysics in theology is condemned as resting on a false idea of religion, as consisting very specially, if not exclusively, in theoretic knowledge of God and on an equally false theory of knowledge as embracing not only the world of *phenomena* but the world of *noumena*. Theology is severely restricted to its sole legitimate function of estimating what God is found to be in religious experience. It consists, that is to say, of what are called *value-judgments*, setting forth not what God is, *per se*, but what he is worth to us. An outside critic might think knowledge thus reached illusory, but not such is the opinion of the school. In their view value-judgments have real value as revelation. Surely, they argue, it is worth knowing what God is to us. What more worth knowing? The knowledge thus gained is as real as that we have of the external world through our senses. We know the world through the senses as the cause of our various sensations; we know God as the Being who helps us to gain a victory over the world, in so far as it threatens to oppress our moral nature, and enables us to realize our destiny as his children.

Some members of this anti-metaphysical school absolutely limit our knowledge of God to that which comes to us through

Jesus Christ. Dr. Herrmann, of Marburg, has made himself conspicuous by the vigor and persistency with which he has advocated this position. Through Christ alone, he contends, do we know so much as that there is a God at all. The so-called proofs for the being of God may appear very convincing to men already convinced, or whose life has been smooth and pleasant. But they yield no real aid to faith in a living God for men burdened with a sense of sin, or with the manifold miseries of human experience. Faith that God is, and that he is good, comes to such only when they get their eye fixed on Christ, and see in him one who realized the moral task of man, and who, in spite of all the darkness of the world, believed in a Supreme Being who wills the good and works unceasingly for its realization. Through faith in this unique man, the Sinless One, and the Proclaimer of a Divine Father, we at length learn to hope for ourselves and to believe in a good God.

In proceeding now to offer some critical observations on this modern theological movement I must begin with expressions of cordial appreciation of it in several aspects. The mere names of some of the men most prominently associated with it command at once our sympathy and respect. Foremost stands Harnack, whose great work on *The History of Dogma*, now happily appearing in English in an unabridged translation,[2] must make on all competent readers the impression that the new school of theological thought as represented by the author is full of fresh impulse, energy, and insight, and cannot fail to leave its mark on theology for generations. From not a few of his opinions we may dissent, some of his positions may appear to us very insufficiently supported, but on the whole the effect of his historical studies must be to throw open for fresh consideration the whole question of the Christian origins and of the genesis and value of ecclesiastical dogmas.

The anti-scholastic spirit of the movement commands our hearty approval. The revolt against dogmatic legalism is evangelic in spirit and in harmony with the religious temper of multitudes who have never heard the name of Ritschl. It is never

[2] London: Williams & Norgate. Two volumes have appeared.

out of season to emphasize the truth that religion does not consist in dogma but in life, and to enter a protest against the theological gnosis which puffeth up in the interest of the charity which buildeth up. Nothing probably has done Christianity more harm than the dogmatic spirit which makes salvation depend upon opinion, unless it be sacramentarianism which turns poetic symbols into fetishes and depositories of magical power.

No one who understands the spirit of the New Testament can have any objection to offer to the postulate that all legitimate theology be based on religious experience. By this salutary requirement divinity is preserved from wandering into airy speculation and from attaching indiscriminate importance to all theological theses supposed to be capable of Scripture proof, and is kept in touch with vital practical interests. At this point modern theology is in sympathy even with Saint Paul, the most dogmatic of all New Testament authors. The apostle was not a scholastic theologian, however much protestant system-builders may have labored to make him appear such. His theology was rooted throughout in his religious history, and the discovery of this fact is making his epistles undergo a species of resurrection in the minds of many thoughtful ministers of the Word at the present time. They sit down to study the epistle to the Romans with a prejudice inherited from a traditional exegesis in which the writer appears a dry-as-dust theologian, and rise with the surprised, glad conviction that they have made the acquaintance of a truly prophetic man whose thoughts are ever transfused with heroic, pathetic feeling.

The stress laid on the normative value of the *historical foundations* of Christianity is wholly to be commended. That the Christ of the gospel history is the ultimate authority in religion is a proposition which, far from disputing, many will be inclined to pronounce a commonplace. It may be a commonplace, but it is a much neglected one. It has been much neglected throughout the whole history of the church. Many in our generation have wakened up to the fact, and with a zeal not unmingled with indignation have made it their business to restore the Great Master to his place of sovereignty.

When the religious history of the nineteenth century comes to be written no small meed of praise will be due to the Ritschlian school for the service which they have rendered to this good cause. They have said to their time with memorable emphasis: "Christ is the sole foundation; take heed, ye theologians, what ye build thereon."

The jealous protest of the school against metaphysics in theology is, all things being considered, not without justification. It is not wise to express the Christian faith too exclusively in terms of any philosophy, whether ancient or modern. Philosophies are subject to fashion, and have their day. While they are in vogue they seem to be of signal service for statement and defense, but when they have fallen into discredit or oblivion the categories and formulæ borrowed from them grow foreign, distasteful, and even unintelligible save to experts in antiquarian research. Take as an instance the term *Logos*, applied to Christ. It may not have been borrowed from Philo by the author of the fourth gospel, but it certainly belonged to the vocabulary of a contemporary philosophy which conceived the Deity as transcendent and able to communicate with the world only through an intermediary. Its use by John and by the early apologists served a purpose. But how little we care for the word, or the idea it expresses, now, compared with the more human universal title *Son*, suggestive of the more winsome conception of God as Father!

These things said by way of earnest commendation, I must now offer some words of respectful criticism.

Exaggeration, undue emphasis, natural, not blameworthy in view of the theological environment, yet to be guarded against by all tempted to abject discipleship, may be charged against the school at various points.

The horror of metaphysics is a reaction to be transcended. Metaphysics have wrought mischief in the formulations of Christian dogmas, yet they are not entirely to be repudiated. The Christian religion, while it does not formally teach, *implies* a theory of the universe, a certain way of conceiving God, man, the world, and their relations, which it is well for believers

to be acquainted with, were it only as an antidote to false theories like materialism, pantheism, or deism. Acquaintance with the speculative presuppositions of Christianity helps to keep the head clear and to make faith self-consistent.

The denial of all possible knowledge of God save through Christ is a signal instance of exaggeration. That as a matter of fact not a few have reached the only sure valuable knowledge of God they possess through Christ I doubt not, but it is going too far to say that not otherwise can any knowledge of God, however small, be attained. How did the writer of the seventy-third psalm, after long and serious doubt, reach the conclusion, "Yea, God is good"? The facts brought out by the comparative study of religion show that men can attain some real, useful knowledge of God independently of the special revelation accessible to Christendom. The world without and the soul within both speak to the human spirit concerning the Divine Being. Man's very position in the universe, as the crown of the creative process, justifies important inferences regarding the nature of the Creator. Natural theology is by no means a purely imaginary science, and it is mistaken policy so to treat it. The programme *Outside Christ nothing but agnosticism* plays into the hands of the absolute agnostic quite as effectually as the attitude of Cardinal Newman, whose watchword was: *No knowledge of God except through the church.* To Newman the agnostic reply was in effect this: Your position means that to follow reason lands in agnosticism as the only creed possible or rational for all outside the Catholic church. Why, then, should we cease being agnostics and become Catholics? Those who maintain that no knowledge of God is possible save through Christ must be prepared for a similar response. Instead of shutting agnostics up to faith in Christ the thesis is more likely to confirm them in their agnosticism. "Why," they may not unreasonably ask, "should we become theists at the bidding of Jesus of Nazareth when there is confessedly nothing in all the universe bearing witness to God's being and benignity? If Jesus be in possession of the truth, how is he so isolated? Is the isolation not rather a proof that he was mistaken in his doctrine of a Divine Father who cares

for those who, like himself, devote their lives to the doing of good? That the doctrine is *beautiful* we do not question. But is it not simply the poetic dream of a man endowed with rare sweetness of nature, who somehow contrived to combine in his character the careless simplicity of a child with the insight of a sage? That it would be well for all to be like him, both in faith and in spirit and in conduct, we acknowledge. He had, we gather from the gospels, little or no struggle with the baser elements of human nature and to believe in a heavenly Father came apparently as easy to him as it comes to a child to trust in its mother. What a happy world if all could be like him in these respects! Exemption from perpetual warfare with the passions were an immense boon, and faith in a Divine Father were very soothing amid life's cares. But these advantages are not at the command of everyone. It is all a matter of idiosyncrasy. It is not in the power of every man to be either a saint or a poet. Most men must be content to fight on as best they can with moral evil, and to get through life without the fair dream of a Father in heaven. We perceive the moral excellence of Jesus, and we feel the pathos of his words when he reminds careworn men of the guardianship exercised by a paternal Providence over even birds and flowers; yet we cannot follow his example or make his poetic creed ours." I do not see what answer can be given to this by the *Christian* agnostic who goes the whole way with the *absolute* agnostic until he comes to the school of Jesus, and then says to his companion: "Good-bye: I enter here, and henceforth call Christ my master."

If Christ's doctrine of God be true, and not merely a poetic dream, there ought to be something in the world to verify it. There can hardly be a *real* Divine Father in the gospels, unless there be some traces of that Father, outside the gospels, in the universe. The optimistic theism of Jesus cannot be accepted as sober truth if pessimism be the truth of *nature*. Nor can a man with any comfort or with harmony in his spiritual life be a pessimist in his reading of nature and at the same time a professed believer in the Father-God of Jesus. There must be constant conflict between the two parts of his creed, till either

has prevailed over the other. Either his philosophic pessimism will extinguish his Christian faith or his Christian faith will make him see the dark facts of nature and history in a new and truer light. I say a *truer* light. Herrmann, to be consistent, would have to say new, happier, but not objectively truer. The Christian, on his theory, in the might of his own spiritual life, invests the world with an aspect which does not really belong to it, and imputes to its author a goodness which science and history fail to verify. He brings to the world and its cause what cannot be seen there save by a *Christianly biased* eye. As I conceive the matter the Christian brings to the study of nature and history not a biased but an *opened* eye, and sees what is really always there, though not lying quite on the surface. If Christ's doctrine of God be valid the new light is the true light. Everyone who accepts that doctrine must in consistency hold that in teaching it Jesus was not *inventing*, but *discovering*, seeing below the surface into the real heart of things, seeing what any other man might see if he had clear vision. That is to say, the disciple of Jesus must hold that while there is a superficial aspect of the course of nature which makes for agnosticism there is a deeper aspect which makes for Christian theism.

The true interest of the Christian faith is to make Christ appear not isolated in his views of God and the world, rather the true interpreter of the universe, therefore in touch with wise teachers of all times and peoples, while excelling all in the clearness of his vision and the felicity of his utterance. I am inclined to maintain this position even in connection with what is most distinctive in his teaching. I hold, *e. g.*, that a gospel of pardon in at least rudimentary form is not wanting in nature. I make this remark with special reference to a statement to the contrary effect contained in the recently published collection of essays by Congregational ministers entitled *Faith and Criticism.* The statement emanates from one who confesses his indebtedness to Herrmann and makes it his business to expound Herrmann's doctrine that Jesus Christ is the sole source of knowledge concerning God. "If we will use words carefully there is no revelation in nature. There can be none because there is no

forgiveness. We cannot be sure about her. She is only æsthetic. Her ideal is harmony, not reconciliation. She may hold to her fitful breast her tired child, soothe her fretful sons, kindle her brilliant lovers to cosmic or other emotion, and lend her imagery to magnify the passions of the heart; but for the conscience-stricken or strong she has no word. Therefore she has no revelation. For revelation is not of thought, structure, or force, but of will and purpose. Nature does not contain its own teleology, and for the moral soul that refuses to be fancy-fed Christ is the one luminous smile upon the dark face of the world."[3] No forgiveness in nature: what if that should mean that forgiveness cannot be realized? A Hebrew psalmist writes "who forgiveth all thine iniquities, who healeth all thy diseases."[4] The psalmist, like all Jews, is a realist, and by diseases means bodily ailments. The healing of these he looks on as the sequel in the physical sphere of divine forgiveness. And our Lord, after saying to the palsied man, "Courage, child, thy sins be forgiven thee," added "Arise, take up thy bed and walk," so making the pardon penetrate the physical sphere. If that be possible, then there is such a thing as pardon in nature. Nature's laws do not work all and only against the sinner. Up to a certain point, as even Butler with all his somberness taught, nature leaves an open door for repentance. Broken bones knit again. There are remedies in nature's pharmacy for many, perhaps for all, diseases. The healing power inherent in vital organisms is as marvelous as it is beneficent, as beneficent as it is marvelous. It speaks to me of the pity of God.

As a final instance of the infirmity of the Ritschlian school—the exaggerated assertion of ignorance—may be mentioned its treatment of the person of Christ. A few brief notes must here suffice. If through Christ alone we can know God, according to the Ritschlian, the knowledge we are allowed to have even of Christ is very limited. We can know the historic man, that which rises higher we cannot know, we should not even try to,

[3] P. T. FORSYTH on "Revelation and the Person of Christ" in *Faith and Criticism*, p. 100.

[4] Psalm 103:3.

but be content to leave it a mystery, while assigning to the man the religious value of God. It may be questioned whether in taking up this position the Ritschlian does full justice to his own method. The method limits knowledge to experience. But does experience itself not give us that in Christ which points to something beyond and stimulates inquiry as to its nature? Spiritual intelligence discovers in Jesus not only a thoroughly human personality, but something unique: sinlessness, saving power. Can we help asking whence this difference? It was in this way the Christology of the apostles, of St. Paul, *e. g.*, arose. It was not a purely objective revelation sent down to them out of the clouds. It sprang out of their perception of the uniqueness of Christ's character, and out of their consciousness of redemption. "The Sinless One, and my Saviour, therefore my Lord and my God"—such was the logic of the apostolic church. Facts forced them to find for Jesus a place in the divine sphere. What they say on this subject consists of mere hints coming far short of the full-fledged dogma of the Nicæan creed. But that dogma was simply the final stage of an inevitable dialectic process which could not rest till it had found what seemed an adequate expression for the divine value faith assigns to the man Jesus. The church fathers did what they could. Their formula may not be adequate or final. There may be reason to suspect that the ancient creeds and the use made of them ever since have done more justice to the divine than to the human in Jesus, extinguishing *the* man and leaving only the dead abstraction, "man." In that case they must be dropped, and thought must commence anew. But the point is that thought cannot rest. If the past efforts of believing thought are unsatisfactory then we must begin *de novo*. The uniqueness of Christ acknowledged by all compels inquiry. How true this is may be seen in such a book as *The Christ of Today*, written by a man who is no slave to traditional creeds, but, being an able, believing thinker, has brooded long over the person of Christ, and in this valuable work offers thereon some very fresh suggestions.[5] The modern church is quite entitled to think out the question for itself, *bound*,

[5] GEORGE A. GORDON, *The Christ of Today*, pp. 112 ff.

indeed, if it is not satisfied with past solutions; and if it fail, in turn, some future generation must go over the whole process again, starting always with *the Man* and taking care that the rights of the humanity shall not be abridged. For if the Man disappear the divinity ceases to have any value.

There is no space left to treat of theological agnosticism of native growth. In England it is more a tendency than a well-defined attitude. The late Mr. Matthew Arnold did much to foster the agnostic temper in relation to theology by his well-known work *Literature and Dogma*, in which he combated the traditional view of the Bible as a quarry of texts out of which to build an imposing edifice of dogmas, and contended that it should be regarded rather as an incomparably valuable collection of religious literature. Allowing for exaggeration, it may be said that this position is now in the main generally accepted. More and more men are seeking in the Bible guidance in life rather than initiation into theological mysteries. It is seen that it teaches not many things, but a few things very thoroughly. One of the things it teaches with due emphasis and iteration is that which Mr. Arnold exclusively insisted on, viz., that righteousness is the supremely important matter, and that the power at work in the world is on the side of righteousness. Another thing is a truth he missed, yet equally vital; that in the history of the world is being evolved a divine purpose of grace, manifested first in the vocation of Israel and finally and supremely in the mission of Jesus Christ. All other truths contained in Scripture are but corollaries to these two, and possess importance proportional to the closeness of their connection therewith.

Thus in the English-speaking world, as in Germany, there prevails a strong anti-dogmatic bias, a disposition to repudiate metaphysics in theology and to restrict the number of affirmations concerning God. It is a wholesome reaction against a conception of the Christian religion which made it consist almost wholly in holding an orthodox system of theological opinions. But it may be carried too far, and that it has been may be inferred from the interest with which fresh, competent contributions within the sphere of dogma are welcomed by the public.

Particular systems of theology may have outlived their day, but zest for theological inquiry has not died out. Let a man only think vigorously, and above all *sincerely*, on dogmatic problems and no fear that he will lack readers, even though he be conservative in tendency. What honest men object to is not conservatism, but zeal for orthodoxy having another source than intelligent, pure love of truth. Such zeal is not unknown. There is an *antiquarian* orthodoxism springing out of devotion to all that the *church*, especially the prereformation church, has taught. There is also an *opportunist* orthodoxism which affects adhesion to old ways because such policy is believed to be safest for a church whose position is in danger. Neither of these *isms*, least of all the last named, is entitled to more than a very moderate measure of respect.

# BERNHARD WEISS AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY,
Leipzig.

SCHOLARS are continually tantalized by all manner of announcements touching the birthday festivals of men whom they delight to honor, announcements that reach them a month or six weeks after the happy day, at a time at which they can either no longer send their congratulations, or at best can only send them in a limping way. Besides, even where the theological reader does not feel inclined to venture a letter of good wishes, he likes to know of the day beforehand, and to be able on the day to think of its interest for him and for theology in general. The great scholar whose name stands at the head of this article is one of those who draw upon the feelings of an extremely wide circle of men, men that have sat at his feet in one or other of the universities at which he has taught, or, and these are still more numerous, that have devoured the books written by him. It will therefore give pleasure to his many admirers in America to learn that he is soon to celebrate his seventieth birthday, and to think that they can, according to their fancy, send him word of their thoughts of him, or can mark the day for themselves and their immediate surroundings. Professor Bernhard Weiss, of the University of Berlin, has perhaps studied the New Testament in some respects more thoroughly than any other living man. There are two or three who stand near him in this respect, but they have, after all, given their thoughts free play in other directions, or have not been able to reach the same amount of work that he has been so happy as to accomplish. Nor is it probable that his work is by any means at an end, humanly speaking. The writer had the privilege, a few weeks ago, of doing ten hours' work with him, and found that his crispness and freshness in seizing a thought and in formulating it were still such as might excite the envy of younger men.

It is worth while at a milestone like this to look back over the life and work of the leader, and to sum up the results attained, so that we may the more vividly feel and express our sense of thankfulness to him. Bernhard Weiss was born on the twentieth of June, 1827, at Koenigsberg, that eastern and northern city of Germany that reminds us of Kant, and that in spite of its Labradorian latitude rivaled New York in the sunstrokes of the summer of 1896. His family showed the frequent union between theology and the school that is found all the world over and especially in Germany. His great grandfather was a teacher in Silesia, and his grandfather was a clergyman and teacher at Koenigsberg. His father was a councillor of the Consistory at Koenigsberg. We must remember that with his grandfather we reach far back into the religious movements of the closing eighteenth century. His grandfather was a rationalist, whereas his father became one of the most zealous champions of the returning piety, a very severe man, a man of an enormous power of work (we shall find the same power in the son), a Christian who leaned somewhat towards a pietistic cast of religion, and withal a man who had a strong sense of humor. That was a good field for the planting of a theologian who was to stand in the hard battles of these latter days. If we remember the date and the fact that but few years had passed since the Corsican devastator had wasted and oppressed and insulted Prussia, it is easy to see that a child growing up at that day would have to endure hardness in many ways, and would early learn to work. The school-days over he had at once to support himself by giving lessons, and the material care for his family, for the old home, lay upon him until the time of his moving to Kiel. But we anticipate. He studied at Koenigsberg and then a short time at Halle and finally at Berlin. At the age of twenty-five he habilitated, as the phrase goes, that is to say, he offered the necessary dissertation and passed the colloquium or examination and the other formalities for gaining permission to become a member of the teaching body of the University of Koenigsberg, and he thus became what is called a *privatdocent* of theology. A *privatdocent* can lecture as much as he pleases. The lecture

rooms of the university are open to his use, and his lectures are announced in the university catalogues and on the university bulletin boards. He has a right to the fees for the lectures held by him, but it must be remembered that the older professors are likely to have the most of the students, especially as they also have more influence in every way upon the further course of the students. A *privatdocent* has to struggle for all he gets, and he cannot dream of receiving a salary. Now, however, in some cases the government gives a stipendium to *privatdocents* who do well. In his thirtieth year, in the year 1857, he was appointed as extraordinary professor. An extraordinary professor may receive a small salary from the government, if the minister of public instruction is satisfied with him. It is, of course, then easy to understand how hard he had to work to bear the burden that lay on him. He taught at the University, that is to say, he held his lectures there, but at the same time he gave courses of religious instruction in several schools, and for a time he was division chaplain in the army. In the year 1859 he married, and these varied occupations continued.

Now that we have arrived at the beginning of his own family, let us turn back for an instant and ask what influences, outside of the already mentioned family influence, had thus far especially affected him; for the personal associations of a man usually determine or conversely betoken to no small extent his aims and his longings, his likes and his dislikes, his weaknesses and his strength. He was rich in a delightful circle of young friends of both sexes that found a common interest, not only in literary and æsthetic occupations and discussions, but also and particularly in religious contemplation and exchange of thought. One of these youthful friends was the historian Georg Voigt, for many years a professor at Leipzig, who died a few years ago. The letter which stands like a preface to Weiss's *Life of Jesus* shows how intimately they were bound to each other. In that letter, written fourteen years ago, Weiss refers to their common studies in youth and to their dream of some day teaching in the same university, a pleasure that they never were to enjoy. One token of their studies exists in the translation of Thompson's

*Seasons* that they made together in pursuit of their English likings. The theological professors who had the most influence upon his studies were probably Neander, Dorner, and Tholuck. But there were other friendships and other interests than the merely scientific ones. He stood very close to Wichern, and once, towards the end of the forties, made a long journey with him.

It was part and parcel of this friendship that Weiss from the first had a deep interest in what is called in Germany "Inner Mission," a combination of the American Home Missions with every description of care for the poor, ignorant, sick, and in any way needy. Thus his theological thoughts did not run in a dead rut of books and libraries, and pen and ink, and university discussions, but were as closely bound up with the life of the church as was possible—with the life of the church and not merely with the organs of ecclesiastical authority. As a student he busied himself with these living questions and with these living deeds. Of his friends out of these early years we may further mention Oldenberg who renewed and deepened if possible the old Koenigsberg friendship when they were both again in one city, in Berlin. The lamented church historian, W. Moeller of Kiel, was also one of his warmest friends. They knitted together during a journey in Switzerland in the year 1848. This will be enough for the present in reference to the person of the rising professor as he begins to unfold his wings. Let us turn to his literary productions.

In the year 1855 appeared his book on the *Petrine Doctrinal Conception*, a book that was honored by much attention, and that not only on the part of friends but also on the part of opponents. It is especially interesting to observe how Ferdinand Christian Baur, the eminent Tübingen professor, criticised it. In the Tübingen *Theologische Jahrbücher* for 1856, pp. 193–240, he discussed it very thoroughly. The most striking thing in the review was the light it threw upon Baur's way of thinking Everyone knows how Baur determined by examination of the New Testament writings precisely what each writer had in mind as he wrote, precisely what party he belonged to, and precisely what the special purpose of the particular book was. Laudable

as Baur's thought and industry were, he went too far in his divination and found out parties that did not exist. Now it is really amusing to see how Baur applied the same plan to Weiss's book and discovered a plan of operations in it. And the matter grew better still with one of Baur's friends, for he attributed on the same principle to Weiss an opinion that Weiss did not in the least cherish, and when Weiss declared that he did not think anything of the kind, the critic insisted upon it that he did. One could imagine Baur's saying: "I can tell just what an apostle or a Christian in the first century is at, when he writes a book, and it is twice as easy for me to tell what this *privatdocent* in Kiel thinks when he writes." But nevertheless Weiss was unable to agree with him and we must conclude, on the contrary, that if Baur was so thoroughly unable to tell what the purpose of a *privatdocent* of his own day was, he was a hundred times less able to tell what the apostles and the Christians of the first centuries thought. But we are wandering. In the year 1859 Weiss followed up the Petrine volume by one on the epistle to the Philippians, and in the year 1862 by one on the *Doctrinal Conception of John.* This was his last book as extraordinary professor, for the next year, 1863, he was appointed ordinary or full professor at the University of Kiel. The next book that appeared was his *Biblical Theology* of the year 1868, the completion for the whole New Testament of the doctrinal review begun in his *Petrine Doctrinal Conception* thirteen years before. This *Biblical Theology* remains today in its later editions one of the most useful works in that department. Let no one, however, take it up under the impression that he has before him a conversational, elementary, fluently written treatise on the thoughts that Weiss conjured up to himself about what the New Testament writers might have said. It is a thorough presentation of all the material that the New Testament contains, ordered according to the approximate time of the composition of the books, though without tearing apart the writings that belong together. It presupposes in the reader the intention to read with his New Testament open and to look at each text that is cited, if he does not know it by heart. In short it is a book for

profound occupation with the subject and not one to be taken up like a novel after dinner.

His next books were two large ones of the same solid character. The relation of the synoptic gospels, Matthew, Mark, and Luke, to each other is of vital moment for the due understanding of the gospels. Treatise after treatise has been written upon the subject during the last hundred years, but none has been more exhaustive and more instructive for the theological world than the books and the articles of Weiss. The volume in the year 1872 took up the *Gospel according to Mark and its Synoptic Parallels.* To this day it remains the best introduction for a careful scholar to the intricacies of these discussions. The different accounts are put each in its own column, and then the fragments out of the various sources, so far as at present they can be separated, are made distinct by certain kinds of type. The whole is then clearly explained. The printing in the different kinds of type was very expensive, and of course such a work could not count upon as large a public as if it were a book of travel, and it did not sell very fast, even in spite of the tribute paid by critics to its usefulness. If I am not mistaken, it was in consequence of this circumstance that the same publisher did not take the second book in this field, and, besides, the publisher who did take it refused to let it be printed in such an expensive way. This second book on this question was the *Gospel according to Matthew with its Parallels from Luke.* As we have said, the way it is printed does not help make the matter plain, as was the case in the former book. Still it is a clear treatment of the new form of the problems and is at the same time a valuable commentary for the two gospels. No one who wishes to study the subject at length can afford to neglect the articles which Weiss contributed to the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie* in the years 1864 and 1865, and to the *Theologische Studien und Kritiken* in the year 1866. In spite of the later books, these articles are not at all useless; they are still really necessary. A pamphlet of about twenty pages closed the books published while he was at Kiel. It was a discussion *Of the Importance of Historical Considerations for the New Theology.*

Now comes the time for his full activity in the university of the capital of Germany. He entered upon his work at Berlin in the year 1877, twenty years ago. It might be supposed that the large university, with the many calls of the large city upon the professor, would prevent his doing any more bookwork of importance. We shall see that that was not the case. He had scarcely taken root in Berlin before the volumes of *Meyer's Commentary* that he rewrought began to appear. We need not touch upon the single volumes. It will be enough to sum up this part of his work all at once. Its importance can only be understood by one who considers in what large numbers these volumes of *Meyer's Commentary* are scattered over the earth, for they are not at all confined to Germany. He took in hand the commentaries on Matthew, on Mark and Luke, on John, on the epistles of John, on the epistle to the Romans, on the epistles to Timothy and Titus, and on the epistle to the Hebrews. That is a task that might well satisfy a man for a number of years even if he had no lectures to give. Of the excellence of these commentaries it is not necessary to speak. Weiss had the courage finally to do away with the usual weak manner of patching up the writings of a dead scholar, and he remodeled the volumes, very much to the satisfaction of the users of them. We may say just here that he has begun to shake off this work, and has passed over the commentary on Mark and Luke to the care of his son, Professor Johannes Weiss of Marburg. In among all this he issued in the year 1882 his *Life of Jesus*, in two large volumes, and it reached a second edition in two years (the English edition, published by Clark, is in three volumes). This is the book which he dedicated, as we have said above, by a long letter, to his old friend Professor Georg Voigt. One point is worthy of note in regard to the *Life of Jesus*, namely, that Weiss here shows how well he can write a fluent style when the book calls for it. The present writer has heard men complain that Weiss's style, in his writings on Synopsis for example, was excessively dry. Dry? Do they suppose that scientific treatises are only good when they are clothed in a popular style? Weiss's books on Synopsis are not for the uneducated; they are for

people who are intimately acquainted with the Greek Testament. And then, too, they are of necessity very much condensed. If he had aimed to make them popularly intelligent and pleasing, attractive, as the phrase runs, he would have had to make a dozen volumes of them and even then not give as much as he has given to the world of scholars. This *Life of Jesus* shows us Weiss in the character of a writer who can write easily and attractively. No wonder, then, that a third edition was called for in 1888.

In the year 1886 Weiss published his *New Testament Introduction.* On occasion of this book we may call attention to a leading trait of the author and of his writings. If this were a German article, this would be the place to put in the words subjective and objective. Weiss is extremely subjective in one way and that in general a very good way. Comparisons are odious or odorous, but I may venture to make one here, since the comparison will unfold the virtues of two great scholars at the same time. Professor Heinrich Julius Holtzmann of Strassburg has treated the New Testament almost as fully as Weiss, although he has done a world of other work in several directions. Now Holtzmann is in the particular in question "objective." The Introductions of these two scholars to the New Testament put these two qualities of writers before us in an unusually distinct manner, and this fact makes these two books really each a complement to the other. Holtzmann takes up the questions in an impersonal way and discusses the history of the case very minutely. He tells us what Augustine and Calvin and Luther, what Hilgenfeld and Holsten thought about the point in hand, and he is so little impressed with the fact that we care to know what Holtzmann thinks about it after he has studied all these views over, that he either does not say at all what he has finally decided upon as most likely, or he does it in such a modest and unobtrusive way that it is often as hard to find out his opinion on a question as it is to find a needle in a haystack. Weiss is the reverse in his habit of thinking and writing (and, we may add, of lecturing). For him everything is immediately interesting in the point of view that he himself

takes of it. He never cares a fig for what anyone else says, if it does not commend itself to his mature judgment. In Holtzmann's *Introduction* you find out how the questions have been treated by all the world. In Weiss's *Introduction* you may find out something about the opinions of other people, but the main thing that you get is Weiss. Everything is for him a matter of course in the way that he sees it. Doubt is seldom necessary. There is in this style of thinking a certain fervor and incisive power that impresses itself upon the reader, when he is sure that the author understands the subject under discussion. Put this then down to the account of the personality and you have a weighty element in the sturdy make-up of this unwearying champion of New Testament truth.

As if we had not yet had enough, there is still another series of books to be mentioned in which our septuagenarian has presented, or we may say is still presenting, to the theological world the results of his researches in the New Testament. In the year 1891 he published *The Apocalypse of John: Text-Critical Studies, and Determination of the Text.* Many a critic who saw the remarks upon the criticism of the text, in the numerous writings of Weiss, thought to himself in a self-satisfied way that Weiss had done all of this work on the text just as negligently as he himself was in the habit of doing his textual work. Indeed, once a scholar said to the present writer directly: "I suppose that Weiss when he decides about readings simply takes the Eighth Edition of Tischendorf and says to himself: "BCR and so forth are on the side of that reading and DEHS and so forth on the side of the other reading; the first is the reading that is to be chosen." By these words he intended to say that Weiss doubtless did not bother his head much about the readings, and did not know much about the manuscripts. He was surprised to hear that Weiss's notes on the text of the gospel of John alone filled a large pile of quarto leaves, on which the lightest deviations that could be of moment were carefully written down and compared. The critics who did not happen to hear thus privately of his work must have been stunned when they saw the book on the text of the Apocalypse. The first 156

pages of it give a minute discussion of the readings and manuscripts, distinguishing between an older and a younger text and showing the relation of the most important manuscripts to the emended text. The rest (pp. 157–225) offers the Greek text with brief philological notes. The Apocalypse was followed in the year 1892 by the *Catholic Epistles*, treated in the same manner. The book of *Acts* was issued in the year 1893. Thus far the textual criticism had been accompanied in the same volume by the text and a brief commentary that was merely intended to support the determinations of the text-critical discussions. Now, in the year 1896, in the case of the Pauline epistles, a change has been made and the textual criticism of the Pauline epistles appears all by itself in a volume of iv and 161 pages. And then something altogether new, in form at least, is added in the totally independent volume entitled: *The Pauline Epistles in the Corrected Text, with a Short Commentary for Handy Use in Reading the Scriptures.* This volume contains vi and 682 pages. Before taking up the text-critical part of the matter it may be well to say a word or two about this new book.

For years the present writer has tried to persuade Professor Weiss to make a clear commentary of his own on the whole New Testament. At first he was urged to put into the Meyer series, on his own responsibility alone, all the New Testament books that he had not yet discussed in that series. This proved to be impossible. And still it was and is desirable that the world of theology have a complete display of the second part of Holy Writ as it presents itself to a scholar who has spent so many years upon its study. No one need hereupon think that the present writer has any wish to swear by the word of a set master. It is, without any regard to authority, of use to have a connected presentation of such a collection of writings from one practiced hand. It is desirable to be able to touch clearly Weiss without admixture with numerous other scholars. A glance at the work he has done upon the New Testament makes this plain. A Biblical Theology, an Introduction, and commentaries on the chief books must render him able to deal in an uncommonly fruitful way with what is left; and, more than that, must fit him to say what he

thinks about each verse, independent of the constant intercalation of the view of a hundred other scholars. It will then be possible for each man who takes up the Weiss commentary to study the New Testament in all simplicity, to think for himself over against Weiss, instead of having a dozen contrasting views before him which almost of necessity preclude any healthy reaction of his own mind in reference to what Weiss suggests. It is high time that biblical scholars distinguish between exegesis and the history of exegesis, between the explanation of a given passage and the history of all the more or less sensible views that have ever been taken of the passage. If I am not mistaken, the tendency to make such collections of views and to add long lists of names for one view and another, has arisen partly from an often unconscious desire of commentators to see their names in the pages of every book upon the subject and to have them seen; a commentator has, for example, been known to cite all manner of other books without any regard to necessity but only upon the plan of touching every page which contained his own name. The commentary thus must serve the purpose of an advertising medium, a thing that does not in the least further biblical research. Another reason has been that commentators have felt bound to put down by every sentence the names of the men who had expressed a similar thought before. This is a misplaced honesty, and a totally unhistorical modesty. Were this method alone honest, no one could say "Two and two are four" without producing his predecessors in this most weighty statement. And modesty, thought of one's own self, should not come in here at all. It is a matter of business. The point is to explain Scripture, and that must be done purely and simply. Every special aid may receive mention in a preface, but the analysis of sentences must not be interrupted by the statement that A or B or C thinks thus and thus about it.

In this volume of Weiss's, which, as I write in October 1896, has only just appeared, we have precisely what theological students and all who can read Greek need, for the cursory reading of the Pauline epistles. Pages 1–19 give an excellent short introduction with a summary of the historical points necessary

to the understanding of the probable time and possible place of the origin of the epistles. No one will be surprised to see in this introduction that Weiss still finds no reasons to speak definitely about the authorship of the Pastoral Epistles. If some things in them are unlike the contents of the other letters of Paul, and if we do not know where to place them in the life of Paul, it is just as sure that we have not yet discovered a source in time, place, and author that offers to us fewer difficulties than the traditional source. "Therefore it is quite proper to try to explain these letters upon the supposition that they are, what they profess to be, letters from the unknown period of Paul's life after his release from the Roman imprisonment." That is enough about the volume in itself. All we need to add is the wish that Weiss give us precisely in the same form a commentary upon the gospels, the Acts, the catholic epistles, and the Apocalypse. Perhaps he could, with slight modifications, but better with none than not at all, simply cause for the Acts, Catholic Epistles, and the Apocalypse his brief commentary in the text-critical volumes above mentioned to be reprinted and sold separately for general use. I confess to one earnest wish, in case Weiss completes, as I hope, the commentary, namely, that the whole New Testament then be issued in the Greek order: Gospels, Acts, Catholic Epistles, Pauline Epistles, Apocalypse. It is greatly to be desired that some day in the dim future of nearer intercourse between all Christian churches we may reach the point of having our New Testaments throughout the world printed in the one order, and that the commonest older Greek order. The English version transposes the Catholic Epistles, and the German New Testament, in an altogether unjustifiable adherence to the consequences of Luther's arbitrary determinations about the canonical value of the books, mixes things up still more. External order is not to be compared to internal sense and contents, but it is nevertheless not to be neglected. If adherents of the other arrangements despise the value of order, then they may well let the old order be restored; it cannot matter much to them, and better is better.

Should Professor Weiss dislike to take up the gospels text-

critically because he has already done so much synoptical work and has spent so much time both upon the text and the explanation of all four gospels, I should like to urge upon him the claims of the world to the complete short commentary above described. And in giving this short commentary he will at least give us, as in the case of the Pauline epistles, his mature determination of the text. If he can, however, go still further, and as for the Pauline epistles, present us a thorough text-critical discussion of the text of the gospels, thus completing also the text-critical treatment of the New Testament, I wish that he would combine with the textual criticism of the synoptists a brief treatment of the synoptic questions in an introduction and a continual reference all the way through to the various sources of the synoptic composition, as more or less certainly to be discerned.

Let us now turn to the textual criticism and especially to the latest volume of it, the *Text Criticism of the Pauline Epistles*. What little we have to say about this volume within the brief space allotted to us will suffice for our opinion in regard to all the textual volumes. A word may first be given to the reception of the previous volumes upon the text. On the one hand they have not been received with open arms, for the very simple reason that only an extremely limited number of theological scholars, whether professors or pastors or teachers, have gone so far into the study of the text as to be able to deal easily with such researches. Therefore the majority of scholars have not the courage to dive into the mass of detailed discussion of manuscripts and their readings. Happily the number of those who have learned to appreciate the value and the interest of such work is increasing, and philologians are waking up to the fact that the New Testament presents for them problems in palæographical research and in textual tradition such as are scarcely to be found in the whole range of non-biblical Greek literature. In the next place, some few scholars who have another way of looking at textual questions have rather disparaged Weiss's work. One, Paul Corssen of Berlin, the learned friend of Latin texts, attacked Weiss furiously in a long review in the *Göttingen Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1893, No. 15. Let me hasten

to say that the "fury" was of no personal character. It is said and believed—I have not asked Corssen about it—that when he wrote the article he had not the remotest idea that it was the celebrated commentator against whom he was advancing. The zeal was altogether "scientific." Professor Weiss replied to the critics in a brief article in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, 37, 3, pp. 424–451.

The preface to this volume opens with a justification of his right to pursue his aims in textual criticism and to set them for himself according to his needs and to his powers. He emphasizes the fact that detailed exegesis has been his main point of interest and that he has been annoyed constantly in his work by the uncertainty of the text. He declares that neither the usual reasons of the commentators for determining the value of the various readings, nor the modern editions of the text appeared to offer him a satisfactory and certain path towards a decision. So he collected material year after year, grouped it now in this way and now in that, studied over it, and tried to open up for himself a path out of the difficulties. These collections and these studies are the basis of the textual volumes now before the public. Weiss is not in the least ignorant of the value of the many discussions already published by others, and as little does he forget the fact that a great deal still remains to be done to secure certainty touching the testimony of the manuscripts, and particularly of the versions and of the patristic quotations. He refers also to the need of verifying anew the collations in Tischendorf's apparatus. This is quite right. Tischendorf's apparatus must be verified anew, like every other apparatus. I should only like in passing to lay stress upon the fact, however, that the faults in Tischendorf's apparatus are not due to willful carelessness on his part. No one who has not tried to print sheet after sheet with countless detailed statements, and who has not then had the advantage of seeing the printed book verified in detail by a friendly, or better still by an unfriendly critic, has a thorough conception of the impossibility of securing infallible accuracy in such publications. Aware as Weiss is of all that must still be done for the apparatus, he still and quite

correctly declares that exegesis with her daily needs cannot wait for the distant fulfillment of all such desires. It would indeed be the height of absurdity to insist upon anything of the kind, any delay of exegesis until textual criticism has completed its task perfectly; textual criticism will remain human, fallible, and imperfect so long as we remain men; the infallibility of the pope does not extend to the determination of the right readings in the Greek text of the New Testament. Therefore Weiss has taken up the work and trusts that, in spite of all deficiencies and disadvantages in the condition of the tradition of the text, he has been able to reach in almost all essential points a great degree of surety, and that in the rest he has at least reached a high degree of probability as a result of the work of years. Moreover, he is perfectly right when he asserts that even those who do not agree with him will find his disposition of the material and his discussion of it useful.

It is necessary to observe, before we go further, that after a brief introduction Weiss takes up the "exchange of words" of various classes, then "omissions and additions," then "changes in the positions of words," and finally "orthographical variations," and it is clear that these categories include almost all the various differences that are to be weighed. Everyone has his own logical fancies and the classes are not harmed by the above arrangement, but still I should have preferred an advance from more external to more internal variations and have put the trifles of orthography first, then the changes of position, then the changes of words, and finally the most radical things—the omissions and additions.

The brief introduction, pp. 1–5, treats of the manuscripts. The text of the Pauline epistles is relatively well kept and the uncial manuscripts only have a little more than 6100 variations in 2000 verses. The codices KLP, with some further fragments, bring an emendated text. They have about 1250 errors peculiar to themselves, but the most of these errors are peculiar to the individual codices and only 155 are common to K L and P. A second group of codices DEFG gives both the Greek and the Latin text. Of these, E is a copy of D, and F and G only represent

one text, whatever the relation of the volumes to each other may be. D is the most weighty of this group. As for DE over against FG, the points of agreement between the two pairs result from the fact that FG or their source were corrected according to a text which was the source of the errors in DE. A similar state of affairs is found when we compare these two groups KLP and DEFG together. They have about 460 errors in common and these spring not from a direct connection of one group with the other but from an older emendated text. The reader will please remember that an "emendated" text is not really an "unfaulted," "bettered," "corrected," and therefore "truly correct" text, but a text or a reading which somebody has in innocent ignorance changed, supposedly for the better, but actually for the worse. A colloquial German word, "*Verschlimmbesserung*" "badbettering," would be the appropriate term for such "emendation." If we pass on to the older codices, we find that ℵ AB have also a large number of what we may call private errors, each for itself. B, the Vatican manuscript, has just as many errors of writing, specimens of carelessness, and arbitrary or thoughtless changes as ℵ and A, although it shares fewer errors with other codices. According to Weiss's judgment the right reading is found twenty times in the younger groups, ℵ alone has the right reading only three times, A alone only once, where B is mutilated. B alone has the right reading eighty-five times. I dislike to copy this statement of Weiss's about B, because I know how easily a reader is brought by such a curt statement to believe finally in the absolute preëminence of B; still I let it stand as an expression of Weiss's opinion. So much for this interesting introduction.

When we turn to the following four divisions of variations that are discussed in full, we must of course repeat what the last sentence but one states for a special case. It is totally impossible for any scholar to find a positive standard of excellence for the readings. Had we such a standard, we should have the right text, which we as men can only ever tangentially approach without actually touching it. In consequence each scholar studies out for himself what may be the right read-

ing in each case and then, by unalterable necessity, counts the faults or the virtues of the manuscripts according to the standard which he has himself set up. I see at this moment no cure for this. The only thing is that every reader of every critical work must remember that these groups of numbers endow the one who has counted them up, according to his own plan, with no infallibility. And here I touch one point that I fear is often forgotten by scholars, namely, that positively everybody, every single scholar who determines readings by the use of his brains, is "subjective," falls under this dreadful reproach. There is no help for it. The one thing for which there is help is that each man cease to imagine that by some special fiat of omnipotence he has himself succeeded in avoiding subjectivity, succeeded in getting outside of himself and in deciding with absolute impartiality precisely according to the testimony. He cannot do it. If a man imagined that he could avoid "subjectivity" by weighing the avoirdupois of the codices and letting the "divinely determined" weight upon the one side and the other settle the case, he would, precisely in the determination of this method of deciding, be the most crazily "subjective" of all.

Of course it is not desirable that we should here go at length into the details of the various readings as Weiss presents them. The reader must take the book in hand and delve for himself. The first division, the "Exchange of Words," fills pages 6–70, the "Omissions and Additions" pages 71–127, the "Changes of Position" pages 128–137, and the "Orthographical Variations" pages 138–148. Pages 149–161 contain an index of the passages which are more fully treated. At this point the reader will be surprised to learn that Romans 9:5 does not appear in this list of passages, but he will then perceive the reason for the limitation we attached above to the completeness of the categories used by Weiss. Few New Testament scholars will fail to insist upon it that the passage in question is of great moment and that the critic of the text must say what he thinks about it. But punctuation is not found in those categories. I looked for it under "Orthographical" but in vain. It is of no

avail for anyone to say that the oldest codices have no punctuation of importance. Our text is now edited by a textual critic and he must punctuate and he must know why he punctuates. Still, Weiss's view upon this point is clear from the commentary volume, and I do not in the least agree with him. I believe that after the manner of the larger number of Greek manuscripts we should put a full stop after σάρκα. I believe that the doxology is one of the ejaculations addressed to God and that it is not connected, as a relative clause, with what goes before. That is my "subjective" opinion, just as Weiss's is his, only that I am inclined to consider the manuscripts as an "objective" support for my side.

If we turn to page 6, the first page of the "Exchanges of Words," we learn that θεός and κύριος are most frequently exchanged, and it is an indication of the reserve shown by Weiss that he does not allude to the contracted forms $\overline{\Theta C}$ $\overline{KC}$ as doubtless influential in facilitating this exchange; Weiss wishes to speak as an exegete and not as a palæographer. This first case of exchange brings me to another external matter which I regret, namely, that the Greek is not accented. Greek may once in the manuscripts have been written without accents, but for centuries, for a thousand years, it has been written with them, and, what is more, it has never ceased in the living intercourse of ecclesiastical and civil life to be written with accents. To me, therefore, the practice of writing Greek without accents, is similar to the neglect to put on a coat, and I deprecate the growth of the practice in scientific works. This first page gives a specimen of the "subjective" certainty of the author. From the fact that θεός occurs for κύριος even in the oldest codices (I find it on the contrary strange that the change only occurs twice in ℵ) and that in 2 Thess. 3:3 ADFG 71 and almost all Latin codices read θεός instead of κύριος, is drawn the "certain" conclusion that in 2 Tim. 2:14 ℵ CFG the Memphitic, a few minuscules, and the Latins have put θεός for κύριος, and although the author here differs from Tischendorf and from Westcott and Hort he does not give any further reason than the assimilation with two other passages. Now he may be

right, but I do not know that he is right, and I certainly do not think that he is. Pages 22–26 deal with ἡμεῖς and ὑμεῖς, which, as Weiss says, are often changed in the codices in a way that makes no sense at all. It would be necessary for the palæographer to refer to the pronunciation as helping confound the words and to say that the variation in the case of single codices is scarcely worth discussing, and that, even where the codices stand favorably for one or the other, an exegete who has any really good reasons may riot in "subjectivity" without fear of the palæographers. Many a reader would have liked to see some discussion of the doxology and of its position at the end of the whole epistle as contrasted with the placing of it at the end of the fourteenth chapter. Doubtless Weiss was guided here by the large agreement between the uncial manuscripts. It is with me a question whether a clearer view of the textual condition of given books could not be secured by a discussion, prefaced or appended to the groupings given by Weiss, that should adjust itself more nearly to the "geography" of the book, a discussion that would be like a skeleton of the textual commentary perhaps, that would lay before us in a nutshell the condition of the text in chapter after chapter. Were some such addition before us, a casual or a new student would not stand so good a chance of running through the textual criticism, for example, of the epistle to the Romans without suspecting that Rom. 9 : 5 or that the doxology were of peculiar interest. But we must stop picking flaws in this excellent book. The vast amount in which Weiss agrees with others need not be displayed at length. There is page after page that offers food for long study and reflection. Every page shows the great exactness of the author, whether he place before us the kaleidoscopic changes in the readings, say, for example, in ἰησοῦς χριστός and χριστὸς ἰησοῦς, or whether he tells us what particles are lacking in certain manuscripts.

Let us turn from the details of the book and glance at the whole. We need not lay stress upon the fact that perhaps too much is doubted, or upon the much more frequent fact that too much is settled with apodictic certainty. The book has one

point of great value, is in itself, in its existence, of vast importance for the science of textual criticism. Thus far, for decade after decade, we have heard the changes rung upon the theme: "Textual critics are subjective in their decisions." And this phrase has come to be as certain as the mewing of cats and the milk-giving of cows. Exegetes have in general viewed the battle of varying readings from afar. They have only noted here and there, usually at second or at tenth hand, an event or so from the fray, and have comforted their souls that they were absolutely impartial, and the necessary inference was that if they by any chance became critics, that if any exegete by any revolution of fate became a critic of the text, the state of affairs would be changed; subjectivity would cease and all would be as in the best of worlds. How often have I heard the words: "If Tischendorf had only been an exegete, he would have decided otherwise." Now in Weiss we have an exegete of the first order, one who of course as an exegete has his opponents, but one whose very opponents by their own high rank declare to be a prince. And Weiss has entered upon the field of textual criticism. He has not taken up palæography as Tischendorf did, and he has not gone into reading consecutively and collating published manuscripts, or the works of the fathers, as Westcott and Hort did, but he has taken the variations noted by others, and has with the most unwearying zeal, with unsparing diligence, with ceaseless toil, for many years studied the text. I insist upon it that the text of the New Testament determined upon by such a man, with such preparation, is an event in the history of textual criticism, and I wish that his text could be printed in a handy edition by itself so that everyone could conveniently refer to the text of an exegete. It is perfectly true that in respect to a large number of passages I do not agree with Weiss. But then I am not infallible. He may be right. And at any rate it is well to know what fits his "New Testament sense," for one who has so long studied the New Testament should have some special intuitions at last guiding him to the right issue.

The one circumstance which is a comfort for textual critics

who are not exegetes, much as it may be a pity for the New Testament text, is the outflow of what we have said above about human or scholarly subjectivity. Weiss is one of the most subjective of men, that is to say, he is a strong character and no prattler; he is never lukewarm, rarely uncertain. What he sees is what is to be seen. He needs no chromatic correction. And of course this shows itself in his decisions upon the text. His reasons for accepting or rejecting given readings are precisely the same kind of reasons that have been used before. He has not discovered a new theory of perception that prevents subjectivity. He has not entered a fourth dimension that places him above his predecessors. He only applies the reasons in another way in the given case.

In this glance at Weiss's newest books we have for the nonce lost the thread of our contemplation of his person as a whole. We have come down to details and in these details we have shown that to love and to honor him is quite compatible with disagreement, with failure to agree with him, in given scientific determinations. Let us return to the man. We have seen how much he has written, and the reader will imagine for himself what hours of patient labor, what incessant occupation with the New Testament, the books we have counted up must have demanded for their production. Nevertheless the tale is not complete without another page. The student who was so devotedly attached to Wichern, who began then to work for "Inner Mission," finds his counterpart in the man who year by year, now in one city, now in another, marshals in a congress for Inner Mission for all Germany the ever-growing throng of those who apply themselves to this work. From textual criticism to Inner Mission seems to some men to be a long stride. He who takes up exegesis and textual criticism because the New Testament is to him the Book of Books cannot fail to have a heart for the people, cannot fail to have a fountain of mercy in his heart that flows for the people. When you think of Bernhard Weiss as a severe scholar do not forget that he has a warm heart.

Our picture in its hasty, rude lines is nearly done. The daily professional activity and the official activity as ministerial counselor are all that remains to be spoken of, and these two activities, important as they are, seem trifling after what we have already said. Take the latter first. For the ministry of worship he has to attend to all that concerns the appointing of professors of theology in the numerous universities of Prussia. At any moment he may have to let his work drop and go off to Giessen or to Basel or to Bern, anywhere, and see what a *privat-docent* or a professor is like. He listens to a lecture or two and if possible attends a seminary exercise and then reports at Berlin for or against the candidate, as the case may be. While at home he of course must often go to the minister, for there is scarcely ever a time at which some theological professorship is not waiting to be filled. As for the lectures, they are of the usual amount and variety for a German professor, embracing a number of topics. The summer term for 1896 was filled up by him with lectures on the Biblical Theology of the New Testament five hours each week, on the Epistle to the Romans four hours, on the Passion one hour, and to that must be added once a week the exercises of the New Testament seminary. During the present winter term, 1896–7, he lectures five hours a week on New Testament Introduction and five hours on the Synoptic Gospels. Weiss lectures in the same decisive way in which he thinks and writes. He does not doubt his results, and he gives them with firmness.

May the vigor that Professor Weiss now shows in his seventieth year be long continued to him, and may his happiness in his home and in his work increase as the years flow on !

# THE SCOPE OF THEOLOGY AND ITS PLACE IN THE UNIVERSITY.

By CHARLES A. BRIGGS,
New York.

THE development of theological education in the United States of America has been in three stages (1) in the college; (2) in the professional school; (3) in the professional school in alliance with, or in organic union with, the university. We have only recently entered upon the third stage and theological education in the immediate future will advance in university lines.

The American colleges have been gradually casting off the bonds of ecclesiasticism and dogmatism which enslaved them to denominationalism and made them the citadels and prisons of sectarianism. The elimination of the theological seminary from the college removed the chief difficulties in the way of the liberation of the college: but at the same time it resulted in increasing the bondage of the theological seminaries; so that these became the strongholds not merely of denominationalism but of schismatic tendencies in the denominations themselves. The theological seminary may gain its freedom either by a gradual appropriation of the spirit and life of the university with which it may be affiliated or by itself throwing off the bondage of denominationalism and sectarianism and becoming a theological university. The former is the easier and simpler method, the latter is the more difficult and complex; but on this very account possibly the more fruitful. If the two methods could combine, the best results would be attained. The theological seminary is entering into closer relations with the university in many of the great cities of our land. These relations are of very great importance both to the university and to the theological school. There are opportunities of mutual helpfulness and also of mutual injury. On the one hand it would be a calamity if any of our great universi-

ties should take the theological seminary to its bosom, warm the serpent of sectarianism into new life and give it such an influence in the university body as to again imperil the freedom of the university. The university should guard its freedom by perpetual vigilance lest it again put on the bonds of denominationalism. On the other hand there is peril to the theological seminary lest it merge itself and become lost in the larger life of the university.

The theological seminaries which have enjoyed the greatest prosperity and have had the largest number of students and the most extensive public influence during the last thirty years have been the theological seminaries which have stood apart as independent institutions. Several of the older colleges have grown into universities with theological faculties. But the most of the American universities are without theological faculties, either by original design to avoid sectarian complications, or else for the reason that they have grown into universities from schools of arts and sciences, without provision for theological instruction. Both these universities and the theological seminaries have been greatly injured by this separation and they have much to gain by a reunion.

The university, so long as it has no theological school, cannot be a real university, because it neglects one of the four faculties of the historic university; because it does not recognize that department of learning which is the highest, the deepest, the most comprehensive, and the most far-reaching of all. Theology is and must always be the mother and queen of the sciences. All the sciences spring from theology as their common mother—they tend to theology as their common goal. Theology is the science of God in his own being and in all his relations. As God is supreme over all, the fountain of being, the spring of all movement, the end of all the evolutions of nature, the science of God is the comprehensive science, and theology is the universal science. Apart from the universal science there can be no real university. An institution of learning without theology is not and cannot be a real university. A real university must be a theological university, not theological

in the restrictive sense of merely giving professional theological training but in as comprehensive a sense as university itself, embracing all departments of learning.

A. THE RELATION OF OTHER UNIVERSITY STUDIES TO THEOLOGY.

The various departments of instruction in the university cannot accomplish their full purpose unless they are in touch with theology, which underlies them, pervades them, and beckons them on. We shall consider several departments as specimens.

I. *Philology.*—(1) The colleges teach the ancient classic Latin language and literature. This is important for general culture to make an educated man. But the great mass of Latin literature is subsequent to the classic literature and is chiefly ecclesiastical and legal. The Latin department in the university must advance into the field of ecclesiastical and legal Latin, or else the Latin departments in the colleges will be only preparatory schools in Latin to the theological seminary and the school of law where the later and more extensive ecclesiastical and legal Latin are used. In olden times all educated men were taught to speak Latin and to read it at sight. Now more attention is paid to the finer qualities of the language and literature, and few college men can read Latin at sight; fewer still can speak it and write it. It is to be feared that our colleges overlook the fact that professional men need ecclesiastical and legal Latin much more than the classic Latin; and that for their purposes the ability to read simple Latin prose at sight is the main thing, the lack of which cannot be atoned for by any amount of study of the masters of classic Latin literature and style.

(2) The Greek department may teach the ancient classic Greek language and literature, but if it neglect the Hellenistic Greek with its valuable literature, and the Byzantine Greek with its enormous literature, can it truly be said to be doing the work of the university? It will be only a preparatory school in Greek to that professional school which will give instruction in the Hellenistic Greek and in the Byzantine Greek. For the purposes of the theologian a very different course of study in Greek is required from that taught at present in our colleges.

The New Testament professor finds that his students coming from college or university are not sufficiently prepared in the Greek language to understand the Greek of the New Testament. The reasons are probably that so large a proportion of college students do not take Greek in the Junior and Senior years; or, if they pursue their studies in Greek it is in the more difficult poets and dialects which do not increase their ability to read Greek prose, and they forget the technical rules of grammar. It is necessary as things now are, in the Junior class in the theological school to review the study of the elements of Greek grammar and to give the instruction in Hellenistic Greek which college students ought to bring with them from college. As things now are, the college graduate is far from that knowledge of Greek which the study of theology requires.

(3) It is well known that the American universities have done very little for Semitic languages. And yet these languages are of immense importance in many branches of learning. The Hebrew language is the language of the Old Testament Scriptures and of the Mishna, the fundamental law code of the Hebrews. The Syriac is the language of the earliest version of the New Testament and of an extensive literature which is of great importance for many different branches of learning. The Arabic is the richest and most comprehensive in vocabulary of all languages, spoken by more people at the present than any other; giving the literature of one of the greatest of the religions of the world; one of the most important of the sacred books, the Koran; the choicest collection of tales, the *Thousand and One Nights;* and a literature whose extent in poetry and history, in philosophy and in science vies with those of the Greeks and Latins. The Aramaic with its Talmuds and rabbinical literature based thereon, is an ocean of learning, in some respects the most prolific in the Middle Ages. The Assyrian with its brick libraries, revealing the literature, history, and religion of the ancient world, where lie the roots of the civilizations of Greece and of Palestine, is so extensive at the present time in the museums of the world and increases so rapidly with fresh discoveries that it is estimated there are not assyriologists in the world sufficient in number to

decipher the tablets for years to come. The theological schools are in a measure doing the work in these Semitic fields which our great universities ought to do. Thus far few universities have a Semitic department, and these are doing chiefly elementary work. Few of them give elementary instruction even in Hebrew. In the whole Semitic department at present university work is to be sought in the theological seminaries more than in the American universities.

The professors in theological seminaries who work in the Old Testament are obliged to teach the elements of the Hebrew language, and therefore so large an amount of valuable time is consumed in preparation for the study of the Old Testament that it is difficult within the limits of the three years' course to give the average student a sufficient acquaintance with the entire Old Testament to enable him to continue his studies and to maintain the grade already gained, in the midst of the difficulties and perplexities of ministerial life. The colleges ought to give instruction in the Hebrew language, and it ought to be presupposed and required as a condition of entrance upon a theological course. For the purposes of theological education it is more important that the colleges should give this study to students who have theology in view than many other things that are regarded as essential to the college course. Our colleges should offer courses in Greek and Hebrew in the Junior and Senior years as electives for theological students which will prepare them for the work in the Hebrew of the Old Testament and in the Greek of the New Testament. If this could be done it would in effect give an additional year to the study of the Bible in the original languages, and would double the training of theological students in the original Scripture.

The languages of the far East are also of some importance to the theological seminary. The languages and literatures of India, Persia, China, and Japan are necessary acquirements to missionaries, merchants, or scholars who would pursue their callings in these countries, and also for students of the ancient religions. Thus in the whole department of philology the theological seminary asks much more of the universities than they are doing.

II. *History.*—History comes into contact with theology at every step. Even the histories of Greece and Rome ought not to neglect the mythology, the religious beliefs and ceremonies and the ethics of those great races of antiquity. The history of the Hebrews is essentially religious history. Nothing can be done with the histories of Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Phœnicia, and Persia without knowing their religions, their doctrines, and their morals. The same is true of the history of the nations of Eastern Asia, China, India, Corea, Siam, and Japan. The history of the world since the advent of Jesus Christ is dominated by Christ and Christianity. If the historians in the universities teach history without giving Christ and Christianity their place and importance, they do not teach real history, but a very partial and one-sided history. That history must be a very small affair which leaves out the history of the Jews, the life of Christ and his apostles, the history of the Christian Church, and the religious development of the heathen world. In point of fact the average student, who comes with a bachelor's degree from our colleges and universities to the seminaries, comes without a sufficient knowledge of general history and its principles to give him the proper preparation for the scientific study of church history. At the present time the theological seminary is the university for the department of history in many of its most important sections. The philosophy of history lies at the root of all biblical history and church history. How few of our universities know of it! The theological seminary as it advances to the study of the ethnic religions enlarges its scope from biblical history to universal history. Where shall the universal history of the future be taught—in the so-called university which neglects theology or in a theological seminary which has been transformed into a theological university?

III. *Philosophy.*—In the theological seminary the department of systematic theology is dependent in large measure upon the teaching in the colleges in the department of philosophy. The graduates of our colleges, on the average, have not that elementary training in psychology, metaphysics, and ethics needed to begin the study of systematic theology. In fact the question has

been under consideration whether there should not be a preparatory year in the theological seminary in order to give that instruction which is not given at present in our colleges, and which theological students need preparatory to their theological studies.

The theological seminaries are deeply interested in all ethical and sociological questions at the present time. New professorships are being established. Others are in contemplation. There is danger lest the practical side should outbalance the scientific side and so crude and wasteful enterprises be undertaken. The university may greatly aid the theological seminary at this crisis. But it can aid it only by looking at these matters in such a comprehensive way as will satisfy the interests of the theologian as well as the interests of scientific investigation and statement. In the near future will the university supply these needs of the theological seminary and so bind it to the university, or will the theological seminary in its own interest be compelled to enlarge these departments?

IV. *Physical Sciences.*—Theology has thus far had the least connection with the physical sciences. But the time is at hand when theology will be so reconstructed in accordance with a sound and comprehensive view of nature and a true theory of the universe that the whole realm of nature and the physical sciences will come within its sweep and contribute to the solution of its problems.

Astronomy raises the question whether there are other worlds than ours—other worlds inhabited by intelligent beings—other sinful creatures—others who need atonement and salvation. A theology which was constructed in view of the history and civilization of Western Asia, Northern Africa and Europe, a small portion of our earth, is reconstructing itself in view of the whole of our world. But how much greater that reconstruction will be so soon as astronomy can tell us with decision that there are other worlds of beings like ourselves. Every department of theology will transform itself in order to comprehend such new knowledge of God and his universe.

The sciences which unfold the history of life on our globe,

and of the globe itself, have destroyed the old forms of dogma as to the origin and early history of the earth and man. There are scientific men who try to explain the early chapters of Genesis in accordance with the results of modern science. But most biblical scholars refuse to misinterpret the records of Holy Scripture. They prefer to face the facts of the discrepancy between the stories of Genesis and the results of science. The more the real situation becomes a part of the common property of theologian and of student of nature, the greater will be the transformation in theology resulting therefrom.

There is at present a disinclination both on the part of men of physical science and of theologians to discuss theology in relation to physical science. But the time is at hand when a master in physical science will strike the keynote, and a chorus will burst forth from universal nature in the *Benedicite* of a new theology—new in form because transformed by a more comprehensive view of God and of man and of nature, and yet old in substance because it is the science of the same God over all, blessed forever.

Will the theological seminary be obliged to do this work, and so become the university for the physical sciences also, or will the university enlarge itself as a real university to do this work for theology and so bind the theological school to itself in bonds of everlasting obligation?

V. *Medicine.*—The higher branches of medicine are coming into closer connection with theology than ever before. Dr. Wm. Adams, once president of the Union Seminary, gave it as his opinion, after a long life of pastoral experience, that a large amount of morbid religious experience was due to diseases of the body. He took pains that the theological students under his care should have frequent lectures from eminent physicians on these subjects. It is quite evident that the work of the pulpit is determined to a great extent by the condition of the liver, and the circulation of the blood, by the temperament and physical habits of the minister. The observance of the laws of health and the prevention of disease cannot be accomplished by the medical faculty alone; they need the help of the theologian and

the preacher to reinforce medical laws by moral and religious sanctions. Faith Cure, so-called, has not won public confidence. Christian Science seems to misname itself in both noun and adjective. But the advocates of these methods are earnest Christian people who are laying stress upon an important principle which has been too much neglected by both the medical and the theological faculties, namely, that cures depend to a very great extent upon gaining the confidence of the patient, so that faith in the physician or in a fictitious remedy may sometimes accomplish more than a real remedy when accompanied by disbelief in its efficacy. Here medicine comes into the field of religion where theology and medicine should work in harmony for the solution of its problems.

The new science of hypnotism has an important influence upon theology as well as upon medicine and psychology. There are those who claim that all the biblical and ecclesiastic miracles and prophecies may be explained by the phenomena of the new science. This theory will attract great attention ere long. If hypnotism may be used for medical therapeutics, why not for the healing of religious maladies also? Theology cannot safely be ignored in this investigation. It will study the phenomenon in its own way.

These are but a few of the many ways in which theology and medicine come together. They give an intimation of what the medical faculty might do for the theological faculty. It is not unlikely that the theological faculty might repay the medical faculty in good measure if they would give them an opportunity. There is a border-land of great importance for them both. There are bridges which the university might man with helpful teachers.

VI. *Law.*—Law is the common field of church and of state. Civil and ecclesiastical law are sometimes parallel, often identical — largely having the same origin and development. The legislation contained in the Pentateuch has exerted a powerful influence upon all the ages. The history of its legislation, as determined by the modern biblical criticism, has set that legislation in a new and important light which cannot be safely disregarded by the legal faculty. It sheds light upon legal and social questions in

our day. In the Roman Catholic church canon law is one of the most important of theological studies. It is recognized in the universities of Europe. But in American theological schools it has been ignored. There is usually instruction in the principles of church government and discipline and the practice of the denomination. But the history of canon law, its institutes and its practice are little known. That is the reason why American ecclesiastical bodies are so often nothing more than conventions carried by popular majorities under the impulse of ecclesiastical demagogues who have no interest in law but are only concerned for their party. There can be little stability, or orderly procedure in the church unless the canon law, which is the product of centuries of ecclesiastical experience, is known and followed. The canon law is older than modern denominations. It is closely associated with civil law in its development. The university may greatly aid the theological seminary by giving instruction in it.

The minister and the lawyer are alike concerned with domestic relations. Marriage is a civil and a religious institution. The care of children, their education and their rights, the duties of husband and wife, of master and servant — all these are theological questions as well as civil questions. They may be viewed as sociological questions, or as questions of civil, or of ecclesiastical law and practice. It is of great importance that the theologian should know these matters in their civil relations and that the jurist should know them in their ecclesiastical and ethical relations. Here is a bridge on which a university professor should take his stand and mediate between the legal and the theological faculties.

Questions of property are ecclesiastical questions also. It is not equitable to consider them merely in their civil relations. Great injustice is often done in our country because of the reluctance of the judges to consider questions of ecclesiastical right, and of their ignorance of ecclesiastical relations. The church may be a religious club in the eyes of the civil law; but it is in fact more than a religious club and its historic right is more ancient than any of the modern states. The civil law cannot deal

with the church as a mere social club of yesterday, without at times doing grave injustice and wrong to the most important interests of mankind. The ultra-protestant point of view which dominates common law in America often does injustice to great historic interests. The Roman church is entitled to great sympathy in its grave difficulties in our country. It cannot be that it should yield its ancient and venerable laws to the legal maxims of yesterday or today without a struggle.

The legal rights of clergymen and the laws relating to ecclesiastical property are of great importance in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs. The university has an obligation to give instruction in this department and to train a sufficient number of men, either lawyers or ministers, who may be competent to consider all the intricate questions which may arise in these relations. Law and theology are so entwined that there ought to be a considerable number of lawyers and ministers who may be able to take a comprehensive view of both departments.

The present situation in our country as regards the relation of the school to the church and state is an unstable situation. The three great interests are entwined and they cannot be untwined without serious damage to them all. There are areas of independence for each department. But there are also inevitable points of contact and interdependence between the three. Neither the church nor the state can safely take hands off from the school. Theology cannot possibly exclude the school or the state any more than the family and the church from the scope of its learning and teaching and activities. The theologian will be blind to important interests if he looks only at the churchly side. The lawyer will be still more blind if he looks only at the side of civil and political law. Comprehensive study of both sides—of all sides—of these questions is needed, and the university is the proper place for it. Our country is in great peril just at this point. There is one-sidedness in almost all discussions of these subjects.

We have shown that the great departments of learning in the university lead up to theology and that there are bridges uniting them, or rather vital organs connecting them, with their mother

theology. The disjoining of university and theological school has been mischievous in the main, though it has been productive of some minor temporary advantages. The neglect of the theological bearings of the other sciences dwarfs them all. That is one of the reasons of the agnosticism of some of our universities. The teachers pursue their studies until theology or the Bible come within their bearing; then, instead of facing the Bible and theology and working out the questions in their own department in view of Bible and church, honestly seeking alone the truth of God whether there be conflict or not; they either, following the interpretation of traditional dogma, see the conflict and timidly withdraw from further consideration of delicate and dangerous problems; or, seeing the conflict, advance boldly and without discrimination to attack Bible and church; or, in simple agnosticism, abstain from further study of the unknown and the supposed unknowable. This dwarfs the sciences by retarding their development in one direction after another. But it also does grave injustice to theology which needs all the light that every department of science can give it; which, notwithstanding all the outcries of the ignorant and the bigoted, welcomes every contribution of learning; and which is able to transform itself under the guidance of the divine Spirit and adapt itself in every age to every truth and every fact, to the whole universe of reality.

Thus in all its departments the university leads up to theology — it cannot gain completeness in any of them without theology. This is the reason why so many universities have been organized in recent years under the control of the great religious sects. The state universities generally ignore theology, not only by omitting a theological faculty, but also by avoiding theological questions when they arise in the other faculties. This ignoring of theology gives the appearance of agnosticism even when it does not really exist. The state universities cannot fairly be charged with agnosticism and yet from the circumstances in which they are placed they seem to be obliged to avoid theology. Accordingly we see springing up in our land Roman Catholic universities, Methodist universities, Baptist universities, Presbyterian universities, and so on. Such universities aim to be not simply

theological universities, but denominational and sectarian universities. This can only be regarded as a decline from the true ideals of education. The theological faculty should be relieved from the bondage of ecclesiasticism and sectarianism. Theology is a science, the queen of the sciences, and should be studied and loved as such. It will be no gain to theology to enslave the other faculties. It will not make a university theological to denominationalize all learning. A true university will rise above all denominationalism and sectarianism. A scientific theology will animate and pervade, hallow and glorify all departments of learning.

### B. THE DEVELOPMENT OF THEOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY.

We have been looking at the study of theology from the point of view of the university and have shown that all the departments of the university are so interrelated to theology that they cannot do their full work without theology. We are now prepared to look at the study of theology from the point of view of the theological seminary. The theological seminary has been limited and cramped by shutting itself off from university life. Theology is so transforming itself that it is bursting through these limitations. It is reaching out in all directions and demands the larger, freer life of the university.

Theological encyclopædia is deeply concerned with the classifications and methods of theological science. The common classification for our generation has been (1) Exegetical theology; (2) Historical theology; (3) Systematic theology; (4) Practical theology. This was a convenient classification for a long time; but it was not born either of inductive or deductive logic, or of historic genesis. It was made for convenience. Therefore, with the more recent transformations of theology and the rich development of branches in all directions, the classification is no longer convenient. Why call the range of biblical study exegetical theology? The historian must make an exegesis of his sources, the dogmatic theologian must make an exegesis of the creeds, confessions, and dogmatic treatises. In practical theology the liturgies and the hymns and the historic homilies

and catechisms must be expounded. Exegesis pervades all departments. Church history is no more historical theology than biblical history, and what can you do in apologetics without the history of religions, or in dogmatics without the history of dogma, or in homiletics without the history of preaching? History also pervades all these departments. Is dogmatic theology to arrogate to itself the exclusive predicate of systematic? Is there no practical theology apart from preaching and pastoral work, from catechisms and liturgies? These adjectives are not distinctive or even characteristic of different departments of theology.

It is not proposed to present a new classification of theology, or to discuss others which have been suggested. Attention is called to the fact that theology is so transforming itself that it is no longer possible to include its wealth of learning in any of the proposed classifications.

At the threshold of the study of theology there should be a general survey, a systematic outline and guide to its several departments. This study is the discipline named theological encyclopædia and methodology or propædeutics. It is indeed a general introduction to theology. This discipline is taught in most German universities. But this study is conspicuous by its absence from the catalogues of most theological schools in our country.

I. The student of Christian theology usually begins with the study of the Holy Scriptures. The greater portion of the time devoted to this department is given to an elementary study of the original languages of the Scriptures. Little time is left for the study of the Scriptures themselves. That is the reason why the ministry in the American churches know so little about their Bibles. In recent years the study of the Bible has been transformed in many of our theological schools, so much so that we have a new Bible. It is new, because it is enveloped in a new light and a new meaning. The older study of the Bible was dominated by dogmatic theology. Everywhere in the Bible the student was taught to interpret by the rule of faith, that is, the traditional dogmatic opinion of his sect; and so he always saw

in the Bible his rule of faith, nothing more, nothing else. Now the student is taught to study his Bible by scientific principles of interpretation and to correct the rule of faith by the Bible. The Bible is dominant, the rule of faith is subordinate, and so subordinate that it is sinking in the ocean of biblical learning. The study of Holy Scripture opens up fruitful fields of study in many directions.

(1) The study of the canon comes first, for we must determine what are the Holy Scriptures before we can study them in detail as Holy Scripture. This involves a history of the canon, a determination of the successive layers in which the canon was framed, the laws which determined its formation, and the principles by which we may determine its correctness and decide the questions which have ever been in dispute.

(2) The study of the text is a difficult, intricate, and complex work. The original manuscripts, versions, and their citations in ancient writers must all be carefully collected, arranged in the order of their historic genesis; and so we must work our way back to the parent reading, the original words themselves. No one can form any conception of the enormous labor involved in this work. In the New Testament it is sufficiently difficult in the collection of the readings from the great uncials and the cursives, the examination of the early Syriac, Latin, and other versions, and the citations in the fathers and early ecclesiastical writers. The labors of a number of modern scholars, such as Tischendorf, Westcott and Hort, and Gregory have opened up great highways for their successors. But the textual criticism of the Old Testament is a vastly greater work, in which large numbers of modern scholars are now engaged. They need the assistance of learned men in all departments. The professors of Greek have as great interest as the theologians in the text of the Greek Septuagint version of the Old Testament. The professor of history shares with them an interest in the text of Josephus. The philosopher joins them in the study of the text of Philo. The professor of oriental languages has a joint interest in the Syriac version, the classics of the Syriac language, and the Syriac and Ethiopic pseudepigrapha. The Hebrew

and Aramaic scholar cannot neglect the Targums and the Talmuds. The historian, the philosopher, and scientist have an interest in the rabbinical literature of the Middle Age. On what grounds of justice or right can the professors in the colleges and universities throw all the responsibility for these studies upon Christian theological seminaries or Jewish rabbinical schools? The colleges and the universities have a joint interest with the theological faculty in the study of the texts of these writings, upon which so much depends for the textual criticism of the Holy Scriptures.

(3) The text of Scripture having been determined, the student next devotes his attention to the higher criticism, or literary criticism, of Holy Scripture. The criticism of Holy Scripture has been crippled because of lack of support in our colleges. If the universities had trained the present generation of ministers in the literary criticism of the Greek and Latin classics, and of the early English, German, French, Italian, and Spanish literatures, the outcry at the literary criticism of Holy Scripture would have been avoided, and the church would not have been torn by a great controversy. Some of our best universities are doing the work of textual, or the lower criticism, of literary, or the higher criticism, and of the historical criticism; but, so far as can be determined from the catalogues, they still lag behind the universities of Europe in the entire field of criticism. There will be no peace in the church until the literary problems of Holy Scripture are all thoroughly worked out and solved. In some respects the universities could do this work better than the theological schools—the professors being free from those denominational and schismatic influences which obstruct the pathway to all scientific study of the Bible.

(4) The exposition of Holy Scripture is a work of the utmost delicacy and difficulty. This is due in part to the difficulty of the themes, the obscurities of the symbolism of the prophetic writers, the ancient modes of reasoning and rhetorical expression, and the unfamiliar environments of the writers. But the chief difficulty is due to the obstructions which have been

placed in the way of the student by the traditional way of looking at the Scripture. These obstructions are, however, gradually being removed, and the exposition of the Scripture is in our times making such great and rapid advances that it is exceedingly difficult even for the teacher of the Scriptures to keep pace with it. It is of great importance to be able to expound the original Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Scriptures; but it is also important to be able to expound the English Bible. The theological schools have not given undue attention to the former, they still lag behind the ideal; but they certainly have neglected the latter. One of the greatest needs of the theological school at the present day is a thorough study of the English Bible and training in its exposition. The university has a common interest with the theological school here.

(5) You will find on the catalogues of the theological seminaries biblical history, that is, Old Testament history, life of Christ, the apostolic church, and the like. But so far as one can see from the catalogues these are taught in methods and ways which have long been antiquated in Europe; and without having appropriated the higher criticism and historical criticism of the Bible they are in great measure unscholarly and false to truth and fact. Moreover, biblical geography, the natural history of the Bible, and biblical archæology need separate treatment in independent and optional courses. The contemporary history of the Old Testament and the New Testament are new and fresh lines of study from which rich fruit may be gathered. Here are great opportunities for the university to aid the theological school.

(6) The crown of biblical study is biblical theology. This is a modern study which has had a century of development in Germany but which is a recent arrival in America. The aim of biblical theology is to ascertain the religious, doctrinal, and ethical views of each biblical writer, to arrange them in the order of their historical development, and to state the result of the process as the sum of the biblical teaching. The working out of the discipline of biblical theology will eventually result in the clear recognition by dogmatic divines of the sources of

their opinions. It will clearly appear that the major part of all dogmatic theology is speculative, the minor part biblical. So soon as this is recognized then the line may easily be drawn between that which is of divine authority and that which has been established on merely ecclesiastical or scholastic warrant.

II. *Church History.*—There are many important divisions and branches of church history.

(1) The church historians have given their chief attention to the ancient church and the period of the Reformation. The middle ages and the modern church have been neglected and commonly overlooked. The field is indeed too vast for any one man.

(2) The historians have worked on the great lines of church history. Accordingly the Greek church and the oriental churches have been too much neglected in the interest of the Latin church, and the comprehensiveness of the church narrowed thereby. The minor sects of the Reformation have been neglected until recent times. They are now seen to be the precursors of great modern movements in Christianity. So soon as the sources of history were searched by historical criticism many important fields of study were marked out, such as Christian inscriptions, Christian archæology, monumental theology, patristics, diplomatics, symbolics, and the like.

(3) Symbolics is one of the most fruitful branches of theology at the present time—for on its right hand stands its youngest child Irenics who is outshining at present the older brother Polemics on the left. Through the neglect of symbolics all the Christian bodies have in a measure drifted from their symbols into traditional opinions and practices. The symbols define the orthodox faith of the denominations and of the national churches; and the ancient creeds set forth the one catholic faith of the church. The study of this unity and variety opens up one of the pathways to church unity.

(4) Efforts have frequently been made for the study of patristics in seminars, but the lack of time and teachers has stood in the way. There ought to be opportunity for the study of the Greek, Syrian, and Latin Fathers in the original in all of

our universities and seminaries. There ought to be opportunity for some theological students to study the apostolic fathers, the Apology of Justin, and the history of Eusebius and the great theologians of the early church in their original Greek. The Syriac hymns, homilies, and commentaries of Ephraem, and the histories of Bar Hebraeus are fruitful for the theologian and ought not to be neglected. If Ephraem had been better known the crude eschatology of later times might have been avoided and a sounder exegesis would have prevailed in the Christian church. The reading of Augustine's *De Civitate*, Anselm's *Cur Deus Homo*, the *Summa* of Aquinas, the *De Imitatione Christi* and other rich specimens of the theology of the Latin fathers, schoolmen, and mystics are of incalculable value to the theologian which nothing can replace. It is one of the blessings of the Oxford movement that it led to a better study of the fathers. But the American universities and theological schools are far behind the British and the German in this regard.

(5) Monumental theology was greatly advanced by Dr. Ferd. Piper of Berlin, and the study was prosecuted by Dr. Bennett in this country, whose valuable work on *Christian Archæology* was the fruit of years of faithful study. The Oxford movement tended in that direction, but apparently it used the monuments of Christian history for purposes of ritualistic worship rather than for the sources of the history of the church. The schools of art and architecture might aid the theological seminary in this department. No one who has not studied in this field can estimate the value of the Christian monuments for purposes of history. The witness of the catacombs and the tombs of the ancient churches with their mosaics and statuary and paintings, their baptistries and sacred vessels—give us the history of the church in its organization, in its ritual, in its doctrine, and in its life; sometimes in the cold outlines of sculpture, then in the terse language of inscription, the massive proportions of architecture, and the rich colors of painting.

(6) Church history reaches out in all directions and unfolds into an indefinite number of departments, for everything in a measure belongs to Christian history. The history of dogma is

one of the great divisions of topics of church history according to the scheme of Neander, a department cultivated by few scholars in our country or England, but chiefly in Germany. It is indispensable for a sound system of Christian dogma. It has been recently transformed by the labors of Hatch and Harnack who have in a marvelously brilliant way separated the genuine Christian material from the ethnic types and forms of thought.

(7) The history of Christian institutions is of increasing importance in recent years. It sheds abundant light, and indeed searching, critical, and destructive light, upon those institutions which are merely traditional; but penetrating, interpreting, illuminating light upon those institutions which are truly historical.

(8) The history of the papacy discloses the secrets of its power, the reasons for its permanency, the grounds for hope in its transformation.

(9) The history of councils gives the great landmarks of ancient ecclesiasticism, the successive clashing of forces, the shocks which produced the fractures in Christendom and the avalanches of denominationalism. The history of modern synods, councils, and assemblies continues the story and works out in the realism of history the principles of division and the lessons for the reconciliation of unity with variety in organization, liberty of conscience with canonical obedience, fidelity to the voice of the Holy Spirit with consent to the decisions of the church.

(10) The history of the Inquisition unfolds the story of ecclesiastical persecution, detects its primary fallacies, and enables us to trace the serpentine windings of its fundamental principle as it reappears in other churches in our day and generation.

(11) The history of the monastic orders shows us the working out of the principle of self-sacrifice and consecration to Christ and his church in those magnificent enterprises which are in some respects the beacons of ages which would have been dark and barren without them. The modern orders have avoided the ancient corruptions, but have not in all respects avoided abuses of their own. And yet the Jesuit order saved and in a measure reformed

the Latin church and has borne the banner of the cross with Christian heroism into the most distant parts of the earth. The Paulist fathers have exerted a great influence for good upon the American type of Latin Christianity. Modern protestantism owes much to the Kaiserswerth deaconesses and the Knights of St. John and the kindred Anglican orders. The Salvation Army is a new military protestant order which in some respects puts to shame the ancient Templars. I am convinced that the modern church needs still other and more churchly orders which will consecrate themselves to the specific demands of our modern world.

(12) The history of the religious guilds is also of increasing importance in the light they shed upon the modern guilds for Christian work. It seems as if the Christian world were entering upon a period which bears the same relation to the great Reformation as the Middle Ages did to Nicene Christianity.

(13) The histories of the sects and of the hundreds of Christian denomination and societies give important contributions from each one of them as it works out an important principle either to absurdity, decay and death, or to a rich and fruitful life. The test of history is the judgment of God to which all should give heed.

These will indicate in some measure the branchings out of church history. How is it possible for one teacher to do all this vast work of investigation and of instruction. It is a department in which several professors should work together. Will the university rise to this ideal in coöperation with the theological school, or will it be necessary for the theological seminary itself to rise into a theological university and cover the ground of Christian history?

III. *The System of Theology.*—The system of theology embraces the three great divisions, Religion, Dogma, Morals.

(1) *Religion* is the primary department of the system of theology. It was buried in dogma by the older theologians. It has emancipated itself in part and it already exhibits a vigorous and fruitful life.

(*a*) We begin with the history of religions which will embrace

in their historic order and place all the historic religions of mankind. This involves a study of all the sacred books of the great religions and inquiry into the customs and practices of the lesser religions. It seems to be necessary for the university to do this preparatory work. The gathering of all this vast material of the history of religions must be done by a large number of university men. But the trained theologian may gather up all this material and make it into a history of religions. The religion of Israel and its fulfillment in the religion of Jesus cannot be thoroughly understood until it is set in the midst of the historic development of the other religions of the world.

(*b*) The philosophy of religion is another modern study of increasing importance. Here religion and philosophy come into helpful contact. Religion must be rooted and grounded in the nature of man, in the variety of temperaments and races of men, and its development must be explained in accordance with its historic environments and the civilization of which it forms a part. It is of great importance to know what place Christianity has in the philosophy of religion.

(*c*) Comparative religion springs from the results of a history of religion and the philosophy of religion. It is of importance to know how Christianity stands the test of comparison. This discipline shows the essential features of all religion, it eliminates one religion after another as we rise in the scale of religions until at last Christianity is seen grandly towering above all in its heavenly uniqueness.

(*d*) The theologian who has made these preliminary studies is prepared to learn from biblical theology the religion of the Old Testament and the religion of the New Testament; and from church history the religion of Christianity in its unity and variety. He may then for the first time with safety construct a firm and abiding system. He may put it in the form of apologetics on the one side or of polemics on the other; but he will act more wisely if he construct it into a system of Christian religion.

(*e*) Apologetics is now and long has been the bane of modern theology. Self-constituted defenders of the faith, Uzzahs

trembling for the ark of God, religious demagogues eager for notoriety have raged in this field. Many eminent scholars have endeavored to construct the defense of Christianity on a solid basis and entrench it in defensible lines, but the history of modern apologetics has been a *mêlée* rather than a holy war. Christianity is its own best defense. The problem is to state it truly and accurately—to remove from it all the stains and accretions of mere tradition and to exhibit it in its historic evolution under the impulses of the divine Spirit.

> "For Truth has such a face and such a mien
> As to be loved needs only to be seen."

This word of Dryden applies to all truth, much more, then, to Christ and Christianity. To know Jesus Christ and his religion,—to hold them before the world in their simple truth and their profound reality,—to set them on the pinnacle of exact and comprehensive scholarship, in the midst of all the religions of history, and of all the speculative systems of philosophy, in the blaze of universal knowledge, that is to see the Christ invincible and regnant and his religion the universal religion.

(2) *Dogma.*—The central division of the system of theology is dogma, the system of the faith of the church. I have no sympathy with the prevalent hostility to dogmatic theology. There are excellent reasons for the hostility to the systems of the sectarian theologians who have dominated modern theology. But it is necessary that we should learn that these systems are misstatements of the Christian system of dogma and are not the Christian system itself. These systems are speculative elaborations of traditional dogma with a capricious use of such modern learning as seemed appropriate and a studied neglect of everything that could not be assimilated. The system of dogma of historic Christianity, the one catholic faith of Christ's church, has been overwhelmed, obscured, and buried under the mass of provincial elaborations and sectarian interpretations. The reconstruction of the system of theology, which is so greatly needed, is to be accomplished by the elimination of all material that is merely speculative, all that is merely provisional, all that has sprung from the circumstances of a single denomination, or

from a peculiar epoch of history, in order to gain that which is the sacred deposit of historic Christianity, the one holy catholic faith of the church.

(*a*) It is necessary to begin with a study of the doctrines of the historic religions. The three great topics of dogmatic theology are God, man, and redemption. It is important that we should learn what is the Greek idea of God, what the Roman idea of man, what the Assyrian conception of redemption. We need to learn the common faith of mankind as expressed in all the historic religions and to distinguish the special faith of each one of them. The doctrines of God and of man and of redemption as they are derived from Holy Scripture, placed in the midst of the faiths of the ethnic religions, appear in new light and significance as we rise from the common faith of mankind through all the variations to the unique faith of Holy Scripture and of the Catholic church.

(*b*) Philosophy has its contribution to make to dogmatic theology, so important, indeed, that without it a system of dogmatic theology is impossible. (*a*) The reason has its place in theology. Its voice cannot safely be ignored. Who is the God of reason? What sort of a God speaks the imperative of the conscience? How does he satisfy the religious feeling? Do his existence and activity explain the constitution and order of nature? The God of the system of theology must be the God of a sound and comprehensive philosophy. The God of the Bible and the church may be beyond the comprehension of the reason and the utmost attainments of the human conception, imagination, and fancy; but there cannot be any valid doctrine of God which the reason excludes, which the conscience condemns, and from which the religious feeling shrinks, and which the conception and imagination cannot frame without violation of the laws of human thought. The God of the sectarian theologian is not the God of modern philosophy. The dogma of God should be so reconstructed that the Godof dogma and of philosophy shall be one and the same God.

(*β*) The anthropology of dogmatic theology must embrace all the results of modern psychology. The dogmatic theolo-

gians have always constructed their doctrines of man in accordance with the psychologies of their own age. Every dogmatic statement about man, whether in the treatise of the theologian or in the confession of faith or catechism, bears with it psychological conceptions. Modern philosophy has made enormous strides in the department of psychology. This involves an entire reconstruction of the doctrine of Man in the dogmatic system. Even in the Bible itself we must take account of biblical psychology in considering the biblical doctrine of man. It is necessary in the history of dogma to distinguish between the psychological form of the doctrine of man and the substance of the dogma, the sacred deposit itself. The problem for dogmatic theology in our age is to take that sacred deposit and reconstruct it in the forms of modern psychology.

(γ) In the whole immense field of the doctrine of redemption, the ethical philosophy of modern times must be considered. The traditional dogma offends against ethical philosophy in many respects in its doctrines of the atonement, and of justification and of imputation and of good works. The substance of the doctrine is true and real as the legitimate product of Christian experience in the evolution of dogma in the church—the sacred deposit is there behind these dogmatic modes of statement. The modes of statement must be changed. The form of the dogmas must be reconstructed so as to harmonize with ethical philosophy. In all this great field of the relation of philosophy to dogma there is great weakness at the present time, especially in our country. Flint and Fairbairn are working in this field in Great Britain. Henry B. Smith started out in that direction in his address on "Faith and Philosophy," but the circumstances in which he was placed stayed him from making much progress in it. Here is a magnificent field for the future in which the department of philosophy in the university has as great responsibility as the teachers of dogmatic theology in the theological school.

(*c*) Biblical theology makes its contribution to dogmatic theology in the form of biblical dogmatics. Biblical dogmatics will give the complete statement of Holy Scripture as to

any dogma which may be under consideration, eliminating from it all that is temporal and circumstantial in the evolution of the doctrine in the successive stages of divine revelation, and presenting the holy, eternal substance of the doctrine as the divine word to man.

(*d*) Church history gives its contribution to the system of dogma into the hands of historical dogmatics. The history of dogma, the history of councils, the disciplines of symbolics and patristics, all have important contributions to make. The problem is essentially the same as that in biblical dogmatics, to eliminate the sacred deposit of the catholic faith of Christ's church, which it has kept and unfolded under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, from all that is temporal, provincial, local, denominational, and sectarian. This field was a favorite one of my greatest teacher, Isaac A. Dorner. In his system of the Christian faith, his criticism of the historic statements of the faith and the discrimination by which he separates the essential substance from the formal envelope, are to my mind the most fruitful parts of his work.

The statements thus far made are sufficient to show the reasons why dogmatic theology has fallen into contempt not only on the part of the people who dislike to hear of it in the pulpit, but also of students for the ministry and of ministers themselves who are weary to death with its scholasticism and merely traditional modes of statement. An immense amount of preparatory work is necessary before the system of dogma, the system of the faith of Christ's church, can be successfully reconstructed. But so soon as the man of faith and intellect shall stand up at the call of God and use all the material from the history of religions, from philosophy, from biblical dogmatics and historic dogmatics, and with constructive genius organize all this material into a system—then we shall have a system of theology that will be fresh, grand, magnificent, inspiring, and transforming in its influence. It probably will accompany the coming reformation of the entire church.

(3) *Ethics.*—The final and culminating part of the system of theology is the system of Christian ethics. This is a modern

theological discipline which has been highly cultivated in this century on the continent of Europe, but has received little attention until recent times in Great Britain and America.

The system of Christian ethics depends upon the same preparatory work as Christian religion and Christian dogma—namely, the ethics of the religions of the world, the ethics of philosophy, the ethics of the Bible, the ethics of Christian history. Only on the basis of all this preliminary and preparatory work can a true and abiding system of Christian ethics be organized.

One of the most remarkable developments in recent years has been in the field of ethics as it branches out into such extensive reaches that it seems impossible to keep up with its expanding lines, which ultimately comprehend all things. We are coming into an ethical period of the world, and especially an ethical epoch in theology—for everything in the world will ere long be considered chiefly in its ethical relations. Christian ethics goes wherever ethics goes. There should be no separate system of Christian ethics. In the order of historical development you may distinguish Christian ethics from the ethics of other religions. In the department of philosophy you may give ethical philosophy which in its lower stages may not be Christian. In practical ethics you may establish yourself on pre-Christian ground and on principles which underlie Christianity and other great religions as well—but so far as your ethics is true, so far as it is real, so far as it is substantial, it is yet Christian, for Christian ethics includes it in its sweep—you are simply taking your ground on the lower planes and more elementary principles which Christian ethics recognizes and maintains. Where will you go and escape from Christian ethics? —to the individual?—Christian ethics claims every man, woman and child in the world:—to the family?—Christian ethics gives the law to the father and child, brother and sister, husband and wife, servant and master, and presents the model for all these relations in the heavenly father, and in the Christ who is at once the son and the brother, the servant and the husband:—to society?—Christian ethics enters into every phase of society in order to transform it.

Men are saved according to Jesus not by their profession of faith or knowledge or opportunities or birthright, but because Jesus can say to them, "I was an hungered and ye gave me meat, I was thirsty and ye gave me drink, I was a stranger and ye took me in; naked and ye clothed me; I was sick and ye visited me, I was in prison and ye came unto me." He who knows not Christ by personal acquaintance and yet does these things is yet a Christian—those who know of Christ and do not these things are not accepted as Christians by Christ himself. Christian ethics must, if it would justify its name, enter with relief into all the problems of modern society. Hospitals, schools, public charities, college and university settlements, guilds and labor organizations, public parks, lavatories—everything that would improve the condition of society is in the field of Christian ethics.

The church and the state cannot be so separated that the one may safely ignore the other. The church is in the state in a sense—but there is also a sense in which the state is in the church. The church is larger, more comprehensive in time and in place and area of influence. The Latin church rises on this principle to a dominion over all the states. Protestantism, while it recognizes the supremacy of the state in all matters which come within certain definite lines of jurisdiction, yet forbids the state from intrusion into other lines of jurisdiction where the church is supreme. The state is free from the dominion of the church, but it is not and must not be free from the moral obligation to adhere to the principles of Christian ethics. Christian ethics illumines all the activities of the state with the light of Christian principles and with Christian examples. There cannot be one ethical principle for the state, another for the church, and still another for the individual. Where the lines of duty coincide that which is wrong for the one is wrong for the others—that which is right for the one is right also for the second and the third. Christian ethics will not permit the state to steal any more than one of its own citizens. It will not permit the state to lie any more than the church—it will not permit the state to make idolatrous worship any more than the churchman. Here

is a fruitful field of investigation which, from the circumstances of our century, can best be made in the university.

The church falls within the range of Christian ethics also. The church has been considered too much from an ecclesiastical point of view—less from a doctrinal point of view—still less from an ethical point of view. One of the most fruitful studies that could be made at the present time would be to trace ethical principles through all the varied forms of the organization and activity of the church, to test them all in the mirror of the life and teachings of Jesus. It is easy to see that the result would be such a transformation that the church would hardly know itself. Christian ethics has the unique advantage of Jesus Christ as its teacher, exemplar, and ever-living guide. Looking to him as the holy King reigning on his throne, from which he directs all the evolutions of man and nature towards the accomplishment of the sublime purpose of grace, Christian ethics enlarges its scope until it takes in the whole realm of universal nature, the vast reaches of intelligences in other worlds than ours—it expands beyond the limits of this world and this life and comprehends the church of the dead as well as the living and the whole sweep of the divine government of our universe from the morn of the first creation until the day of ultimate doom. Christian ethics rises to this comprehensive position—and all its principles and methods are in the category of eternity and in the measures of God the Father and Jesus Christ his Son. Inscribed upon the portals of Christian ethics are the words: "Be ye perfect as your father which is in heaven is perfect." Enthroned at the center of all its avenues is the Holy Messiah.

Christian ethics is only in its beginnings in our theological seminaries. Some of them have established chairs of Christian sociology or of applied Christianity. There may be room in a theological university eventually for several professors in this department. But the coöperation of seminary and university will lead eventually to the best results.

IV. *The church.*—The church is an organization of Christians under the headship of Christ with ministers appointed by Christ to lead the people in worship, life, and work. The doctrine of

the church is wrought out under the Christian system of theology. We have now to consider the church as an organization.

(1) It is organized as a government with an historical constitution and an historical ministry. The church is one in its divine constitution and plan. Every division in the church has been the result of a sin of violence either on the part of the church itself or of the separating bodies. The sins of the fathers have been visited on the children through many generations. Eventually all the wounds of Christ's church will be healed, all schisms repaired, and its divine plan and constitution carried out in reality and entirety. The historic ministry of the church will eventually be eliminated from all denominational and schismatic accretions. When the mother churches repent of their sins of excision and open the doors of welcome, then the exscinded daughters will not long remain absent from the maternal home. This is the great problem in church government at the present time, to find the basis in the historic ministry for a unity which will be consistent with many various modes of adaptation to the needs of the different races, nations, and communities.

(2) The historic church has its canon law, the formulation of the legal experience of centuries. The canon law lies at the basis of all the canons, church orders, and church disciplines of the national churches of modern Europe and of the separating and dissenting denominations. The study of canon law is of very great importance for theologians at the present time. So long as it is neglected the denominational disciplines are hanging in the air apart from the historic law of the church.

(3) The church is organized for worship under the lead of the historic ministry. Sacred places have to be considered and Christian architecture becomes important. Sacred times demand attention—the Sabbath, the Christian year, thanksgiving days and fast days and their proper observance. Sacred things come into view—the baptistries—the holy table and its vessels—the use of painting and statuary, missals, illuminated texts and pictorial windows. The worship of the churches is dependent upon the ordering of ceremonies, whether we think of the elaborate worship of the Greeks or the bare worship of the Friends.

Liturgies must be studied, and that whether we use forms of prayer or the traditional language of extemporary devotion in accordance with an order of worship. Sacred song and music must all be investigated that Christian worship may be enriched by melody and harmony. The Oxford movement has been a blessing to the entire English-speaking world by its enrichment of Christian worship in all denominations. Few of these studies in the department of Christian worship which have been mentioned are pursued in our seminaries. Little if any attention is given to these matters in most of the theological schools. The university might engage in some of them for the common welfare.

(4) The church is organized for purposes of instruction This instruction is given in various grades. The primary is catechetics—the training of the young in the essential principles of the Christian religion in preparation for the sacred mysteries. The discipline of catechetics includes a study of the historic catechisms of the church and of the history of catechetics, and it results in the principles and methods of a practical catechetics. Cathechetics has been enlarged in the last century so as to embrace the modern Sunday school which aims especially to give elementary training in Holy Scripture; and the charity and industrial schools which are essentially mission schools for the training of the children of the poor and the outcast. Great attention is given in our country to the Sunday school; but little attention, so far as I know, has been paid to catechetics in its original and most important work.

(5) The training of the people is chiefly from the pulpit and through the preacher. The discipline which has to do with this department is homiletics. More attention is paid to this department in our American theological schools than to any other in connection with the church itself; and yet the history of preaching is commonly neglected.

(6) The training of the ministry is a department which needs more thorough study and comprehensive views. The training of ministers in school, college, seminary, and university has to be carefully considered. The training of deaconesses and lay workers of various grades is opening up new problems. The min-

istry of the protestant churches will have to follow the example of the more ancient churches and enlarge itself by the additions of various grades of trained helpers who should be an official part of the organization, even if it is necessary to distinguish them from the orders of the historic ministry. The question of aid to students for the ministry is also a burning one at the present time.

(7) Pastoral theology or the care of souls is taught in most of our theological schools. But the history of the discipline is ordinarily neglected and it is usually taught in unscientific methods, and often in the form of practical hints from the retired ministers who usually give instruction in this department.

(8) The church should be organized for Christian work The Roman church is stronger here than the national churches of protestantism and their dissenting children. The Roman church took up into itself organizations of every variety of form for aggressive work. She is doing the same thing at the present time. Any new organization for good work may receive the sanction of the church and become incorporated into the church. It has ever been difficult for protestantism to do this. Accordingly the great organizations for good work among protestants are commonly outside the churches, although in general sympathy with them. The Church of England and the Church of Scotland have overcome this defect in a measure by the organization of churchly guilds, and institutions for deaconesses and orders of various kinds for Christian workers. These point the way for the future practical development of the church. The guilds and churchly institutions have to supplement the pastoral work of the ministry in teaching the ignorant, in relieving the poor, in comforting the troubled, in reforming the depraved, in alleviating suffering and in caring for the dying and the bereaved —in all those multitudinous ways of doing good which are opening up in all directions for Christian men and women. The theological schools are weak here—some of them, are however, rising to the situation and are equipping themselves for this work. The universities have an important field of coöperation with them.

(9) The church is also organized for the propagation of the gospel in the work of missions. The work of foreign missions,

the work of home missions on the frontiers of our country, the work of city missions, are three well-organized departments of missions.

Great advance has been made in recent years in the practical work of missions; but the church lags behind its tremendous opportunities in our age, when the whole world is open for evangelization. The church is wasting her energies and abusing her vast resources in inter-denominational strife, when it should economize them and concentrate them for the conversion of the world. Instruction in missions in theological schools has not kept pace with the advance on the practical side, and is far from holding up the great ideals of Christianity. Few theological schools give systematic instruction in mission work. Nowhere is adequate training given.

We have gone over the several departments of theology without any effort at completeness, and have seen many fruitful branches reaching out in all directions, entwining with all departments of human knowledge and covering the whole of human life. No theological school at present existing pretends to cover the whole ground of theology. Only by a combination of several of them would it be possible at the present time to approximate the demands of the science. Will it be practicable for our theological seminaries to enlarge themselves so as to cover this vast field? It is impossible for all of them to do it. A few of them might, by doubling and trebling their resources, rise with enthusiastic effort towards its accomplishment. But it is impossible that any of them can do it without the coöperation of the great universities; for only in the great university can the highest ideals of theology be attained where a truly scientific and truly practical theology, free from denominational restraint and bias, shall pervade, influence, and point all the energies of the university; and where a theological faculty will coöperate with a legal, medical, and philosophic faculty, and so push university work into all the reaches of theology, and explore the whole realm of universal knowledge and universal life.

# THE NATURAL HISTORY OF SACRED BOOKS.

## SOME SUGGESTIONS FOR A PREFACE TO THE HISTORY OF THE CANON OF SCRIPTURE.

By ALLAN MENZIES,
St. Andrews.

THE study of comparative religion is destined to exercise a profound influence on every branch of Christian theology. We are coming to see that many of the cherished doctrines of our own religion are not peculiar to Christianity, but have their parallels in other faiths. This must in time lead us to form new estimates of them and to recognize in our own beliefs not only the result of a special revelation to ourselves, but the outcome of forces and tendencies of human nature which have been at work in many lands. The Christian student must more and more be led to admit that he cannot fully understand a doctrine in his own religion till he has studied the parallel instances in which it is found, and has tried to trace the root in human nature which has produced the same or similar fruits in different races and in far separate climes. To take an example, the teacher of Christian theology will come to treat the Christian doctrine of a future life in connection with the Chinese worship of ancestors and the belief of the old Egyptians as to the journey which awaited them through the dark underworld, with the Elysian plains of Greece and the Valhalla of the Norsemen, as well as with the Buddhist Nirvana. In setting forth the essential nature of Christian worship, he will discuss the instinct which prompted the sacrifice of primitive times as well as those present in the elaborate rituals of India and of Greece and Rome. Thus theology will become a much broader study than it has been apt to prove; it will ally itself with more various learning, and it will grow more universal, more humane, and will interest many more minds. Nor in this wider study of theology is there any danger, rather is there the

strongest possible safeguard, to what is deepest and most substantial in our own most dear religion. When we find that a doctrine which we hold is common to us with men of other faiths, we have discovered an additional evidence of its truth and value. If Christianity should prove to possess many such doctrines, it will not be the less but the more entitled on that account to be considered the consummation of all the religions of the world, the goal which they have all been seeking, the attainment in which all who have hitherto adhered to them may be called to receive their share.

In what way may these remarks be applied to the doctrine of sacred Scripture which we hold? There is no need to insist on the importance of a trustworthy foundation for this doctrine. To the Christian it is a matter of no slight moment to be assured that the books of Scripture occupy the place they hold by a good warrant and that no mistake of great importance has been made regarding them; and the heathen also who are invited to accept Christianity may reasonably ask for evidence of this. The Bible, it is well known, is not the only collection of sacred writings; other religions also have their bibles and have claimed for them divine inspiration. And it is becoming more and more difficult, both on historical and on moral grounds, to maintain the old position that the doctrine of divine inspiration is true in the one case of the Christian Scriptures and false in all the other cases in which it is made. The problem stands as follows:

A number of religions possess among their sacred treasures collections of written works which are held to have come into the world in a different way from that in which books are commonly produced.

Among the Indo-European races this phenomenon presents itself twice on a large scale in India, where we have the two sacred collections of Brahmanism and of Buddhism; and it also presents itself in the case of Persia. Among the Semites we meet with it in Israel and Islam. It is also found in Christianity, in connection with a community which is not, as in most of the other cases, national in its origin, but shares the cosmopolitan character of the Roman Empire. These are the principal

cases, but there are many others. How is this phenomenon to be accounted for? What makes books sacred? Can we point to any general law in the growth of religious communities which implies that a religion should at a certain stage in its development form a collection of sacred books? If we were in the company of a Brahman, a Mohammedan, a Buddhist, a Jew and a Christian, and if we put to each of them the same question, On what grounds do you consider your religious books sacred? How did they come to be so, and what do the books you hold so sacred do for you, to justify the character you give them?—would the answer returned to the question contain any common principle? Is the sacredness of books due in all cases to the same cause, or may sacredness be added to books in more ways and from more motives than one?

These questions could not be answered fully without extensive investigations and discussions on a considerable scale. Neither of these would be in place in the pages of this journal, and what is offered here is no more than a few suggestions as to the lines which, if I see rightly, the inquiry must follow. I trust that young and able hands will be attracted to a field so full of promise.[1]

There are two things to be accounted for: in the first place, the sacredness of words or books, and, in the second, the formation of sacred collections. In some cases forms of words are recognized as sacred long before they are brought together in a canon. Canonization sometimes confers sacredness, but sometimes it is no more than the recognition of facts already existing. Our first inquiry then is, How do words become sacred? Is this always due to the same motive, or may it arise from a variety of considerations? Here we must evidently go back to an early period and consult the student of early societies and practices as well as the historians of known times. Our second inquiry, What are the conditions under which the canonization of books takes place? is concerned with facts which are not in general very obscure.

[1] For a short statement of the positions occupied by the various sacred collections in their respective religions, I may be allowed to refer to the chapters of my *History of*

### I. HOW DO WORDS ACQUIRE SACREDNESS?

Many people would answer this question, if it were put to them, by saying that sacred words are the words of sacred or inspired persons. The books of the New Testament are said, in their titles, to be the works of "Saints" or of holy men; and these saints are supposed to have written under the direction of a sacred influence or "Holy Spirit." But this explanation does not apply to all the cases we have to consider. Especially if we begin at the beginning, as we must do if we are to obtain a rational view of the whole subject, we shall find that it scarcely helps us at all. We are met at the outset of our inquiry by a class of words of power which are, generally speaking, anonymous. It is difficult to say of the words held in reverence by the earliest men whether anyone knew or pretended to know who had first uttered them, and it is safe to say that it was not on account of their origin that they possessed their power. Authority has here little to do with authorship. I refer, of course, to that host of spells, charms, curses, and incantations which plays so great a part in early history and legend. These are the earliest sacred words.

Their character is in accordance with that of the period of religious growth to which they belong. We shall find afterwards that along with each advance made to a higher religious principle a higher type of religious discourse also comes into view. Now the spells and charms of which we are speaking here belong to the animistic period of religion; to the age, that is to say, preceding that of the worship of gods, or of religion properly so-called; when many spirits filled the place afterwards occupied by regular gods, and magic stood in the place afterwards occupied by stated worship as the method of communicating with unseen beings. To deal with spirits one does not require histories or treatises or psalms; something shorter and pithier answers the purpose much more effectively. What the sorcerer, who comes before the priest, requires in the way of words for his transactions with the powers of the air with whom he has to deal

*Religion* (Murray, 1895, University Extension Series; American publishers, Charles Scribner's Sons).

is a good strong phrase or two; if it be unintelligible it counts as a mystery, and it is none the worse for its purpose, but rather the better. As for the authorship of the sentences so used, it is a matter of perfect indifference. One does not ask who first spoke it, but whether it will serve the purpose. This is the characteristic of the sacred words of early times. They are words which have virtue in them. When spoken at the proper time and place and with the accompaniment of the due gift and gesture, they have an intrinsic power to bring about the desired result. Thus the wishing-well has its appropriate formula of words without which the visit to the well cannot be successful. The door of the cave opens only to "Sesame." He who gathers herbs for a good or for an evil purpose (at a certain state of the moon) must recite some old form while he does so. In Grimm's *Fairy Tales* or in any collection of folklore the reader will find many such old forms.

We may mention specially the forms of words used in ancient times in the imitative worship of nature. The mysterious ceremonies resorted to in time of drought had their appropriate words to be chanted by the procession or at the moment of the central act. Everyone has heard of the Arval brothers of Rome, who went to the country at certain seasons and performed ceremonies bearing on the fertility of the soil, and who used rhymes which the literary Romans no longer understood. Formulæ used for the same purpose may still be heard in some of the more backwood countries of Europe. Nature is assisted by being shown what she is desired to do, in some rude imitative act, or a spell is used which has power over the spirit supposed to be in charge of the particular natural operation which is in question; while in many cases the aim is to thwart and drive away the evil spirits believed to be always at hand and bent on working mischief.

We should also notice the old saws, warnings, and forecasts current among every old people, handed down from former generations and traceable to no known author, but believed to be prophetic and to be big with a meaning which is to be disclosed when the man or the event appears. Many of the tragedies

both of ancient and of more modern times turn upon some motive of this kind. The "Œdipus" of Sophocles, Shakespeare's "Macbeth" and Scott's *Guy Mannering* afford some notable instances.

Such were the earliest words of awe. If in primitive times there was little or no continuous discourse believed to come from a higher being, words were not wanting in which men felt themselves brought near to the mystery of things, and furnished to some small extent with instruments of relief from the pains and ills threatening their existence. It may be thought trifling to open a discussion on sacred books by pointing to such old tatters of superstition. But they must be spoken of in this connection, because they do not come to an end with the passing away of the religious age to which they are appropriate, but survive and play an important part in religious literature proper. Forms of words which are revered not for their authorship, of which nothing is known, but on account of the virtue thought to reside in the words themselves, still make their appearance in some religious books which have been much extolled. The oldest of the Babylonian hymns are those which are aimed at evil spirits and are thought capable of driving such spirits away and keeping them at a distance. When a man was sick these ancient Babylonians had recourse to a hymn, one hymn being good in the case of fits, another for toothache. And other sacred books have had their chapters used in the same way. The Egyptian Book of the Dead, so much admired for the moral exaltation of a few of its chapters, is for the most part nothing but a set of charms written on the dead man's coffin that he might have them at hand to open the gates he had to pass through, and to gather together the scattered elements of his person, in order that he might not fail to have a happy life beyond. In these cases we have sacred words of the very earliest kinds embedded in writings of later age and higher character and so preserved. The Sibylline Books preserved at Rome were a collection of old prophecies and warnings from which it was thought possible to obtain guidance for the state in times of public emergency. The name and the idea of such prophetic books were afterwards

employed in other ways, and in connection with prophetic works which enjoyed a high reputation. Thus do old ideas on the subject of sacred words survive. After discourse of a much higher type has made its appearance, words are still held sacred because of the occult power thought to reside in them. They are valued not for any truth or beauty they possess; that indeed could scarcely be, but for what they are able to do when properly applied.

From the innumerable swarm of spirits, the beings thought of by the earliest men in their dealings with the unseen world, the gods gradually raise their heads. A god is a being of definite character settled at a certain place, sought of those who believe in him by stated rites, surrounded by a regular body of worshipers, be they tribe, family, or nation. And this new worship produces along with other things its own sacred words. It produces them in two ways and of two kinds. First it has the words which are the result of growth and long tradition, and are sacred without being connected with any human speaker. And then it produces words of a more personal nature; for it is in this form of religion that the phenomenon of inspiration proper takes its rise.

Around these great beings whose rise brings to human society a new principle of unity, and to the imagination new ideas of strength, grandeur, and tenderness, various forms of words gradually gather, which on account of their connection with the gods come to be held sacred. These products are also for the most part anonymous and belong rather to the things which are developed by long-continued natural processes than to those which are produced by individual minds. In the first place a set of stories is formed about the gods. They become a center round which all sorts of old tradition and legends, often repulsive enough, crystallize. A kind of history begins, with the gods for its principal heroes. The origin of the god is explained by a narrative; if he is a solar god the experiences of the sun are turned into a story of the great being who dies to live again; or some curious usage belonging to his worship or geographical peculiarity connected with the place where he is found has a legend

to account for it. A mythology thus grows up; and among a people of active minds it may in time assume enormous extent and complexity. In time many of the stories composing it grow unintelligible, and some of them prove revolting to improving taste. The original motives are lost; what is left is but a set of rude remains. But the mythology does not lose its sacredness because it is no longer understood. As the gods rise in dignity and in character the stories relating to them are invested with deeper mystery. When reason turns away from them, they become objects of faith, and the pious, not able to discard them, resort to mystical and allegorical interpretations such as simpler generations would have scorned. The obvious meaning of the divine legends is abandoned, but they are held to have a hidden or mystical meaning, and this serves for a time to keep them alive.

And if the early state, for it is at that stage of social growth that we now are, sees the stories and legends of the gods grow into sacredness, it also finds its laws grow sacred. The view prevails throughout the whole of the ancient world that the structure of society, the acquisition of which adds so immensely to the dignity and effectiveness of human life, is a divine work, and that the rules and maxims of conduct which are generally recognized are divinely given. In communities where church and state are still one, this must be so. The king when he acts as judge represents the god who is the unseen head of the state, all offenses are committed against God, and the important sentences pronounced by the judge in various cases become principles of a law which has more than merely human sanction. Thus a body of statutes or judgments is formed which God is believed to uphold, and the unwritten code which thus arises has a religious character and will when written down take rank as a sacred book. Laws are apt to be handed down in an anonymous form; as the community accepts them they are ascribed to a source higher than any human lawgiver and continue to exist and to be in force though their author is not named. It is later that the codifier comes and gathers into one *corpus* the various laws and smaller codes he finds existing. Then the finished

code may be called by his name or by that of an older, perhaps a partly mythical, lawgiver. In some cases this is the first sacred book existing in the nation and becomes the nucleus of the religious collection afterwards formed. Every sacred literature contains more or less material of this kind.

The words connected with religion which we have met with up to this point are all of an impersonal character. They are held in reverence for their own sake rather than that of their reputed author. It is a great step in the development of the subject when we come to the phenomenon of direct inspiration, and to the character of the prophet or specially inspired person. The prophet succeeds, in the higher plane of the religion of gods, to the position occupied by the sorcerer in the worship of spirits. He stands in the same place socially as his predecessor, and practices some of the same arts; but the resemblance ends there. The prophet is the organ of an unseen power much greater than any known to the sorcerer; a god speaks through him as no spirit could, and his utterances have a new character. They have to do with keeping up the bond which exists not sporadically but permanently between the god and his people, and aim at making the connection living and effective. The words of the prophet have therefore a moral character. While he may often be consulted in trivial matters, such as the recovery of strayed asses or the hard case of the workman who has dropped his axe into the water, he also has the power of appealing to king and people at great crises; he can rebuke an arrogant ruler and can remind the people of the claims their god has on them, when these are being forgotten. At this point, therefore, sacred words of a new class come into view; those spoken by known persons under the inspiration of known gods, and afterwards preserved in memory or by writing. The oracles of Greece, some of which were of great influence both in shaping the policy of states and in raising the moral tone of the nation, belong to some extent to this class of sacred words; but it is among the Semitic peoples that the character of the prophet is most developed, and that he acts most independently. What large additions are made in this way to the world's sacred lore, every

one knows. Words spoken at first perhaps to meet an immediate practical purpose or in answer to some inquiry are remembered long after their occasion has passed away. The prophet may not have thought them so sacred as they afterwards appeared. Mahomet probably stands alone among the great figures of the prophetic order in having regarded his own utterances from the very outset as possessing authority for all men. But the prophet's authority for inspiration once established, his words rise in authority. The judgments and laws he pronounced are held sacred as well as his oracles; when his words are written, the book rapidly advances in sacredness, and the words it contains are thought to be pregnant with divine truth, and as they cease to be understood, with recondite mysteries, to be interpreted by processes with which sound exegesis has little in common.

The Vedic hymns occupy a peculiar position in the subject we are discussing. They are sacred for two distinct reasons which are scarcely compatible with one another. The authors of these venerable poems did not at first claim any special guidance from above. They describe their own work of literary production in words which show them to consider their hymns, wonderful as they are, as the fruit of their own efforts, and not as the gift of any supernatural afflatus. Later generations, however, took a different view of their work; the hymns were regarded as being of divine and not of human origin; they were classed among the "s'ruti" or hearing, as if the human poets had had nothing to do but to take down what was brought to their ears. But there is another reason for the sacredness of these poems. The hymn was an integral part of the Vedic sacrifice, that apparatus of stupendous magnitude and inexpressible cogency by which the harmony of heaven and earth, and even the regular course of nature itself, was believed to be maintained. Without the hymn the sacrifice was not complete, and could not secure the desired result; and thus the hymn was a kind of supernatural spell or incantation. The words then are sacred not only as being produced by inspired writers, but on account of the potency they possess in themselves; and thus, while the

Vedic hymns belong in their origin to the higher level of sacred writings, their use degrades them to the earlier and lower. They derive sacredness from their employment and from the effects they produce in the sacred ritual. In practice they are held sacred on both grounds; on the one hand they are due to an inspired author, and on the other they possess virtue in themselves. Persian religion in the same way appears to have possessed hymns before Zarathustra, which were esteemed because of the effect they produced. Zarathustra is found praying in one of the Gathas that it may be given to men to offer the best sacrifices accompanied by the most effectual hymns. The reader may possibly think of more recent instances in which a religious ceremony is believed to produce a supernatural effect, and act coöperates with spell to make the effect sure, with the result that the spoken words come to possess an ineffable sanctity.

A further step in religious development, and new motives for holding writings sacred come into play. Religion ceases to be a branch or an aspect of the state, is organized into a separate establishment of its own, and freely giving effect to its own impulses builds up a great edifice in which nothing is wanting. This takes place when the community as a whole comes afresh under the power of religion so that the state is transformed into a church, and its resources, material and intellectual, are enlisted in the service of the deity. It also takes place when a new religion is founded which is energetic enough to create a set of new forms for the expression of its own spirit, and to place upon the world a great religious institution. When this comes to pass books can become sacred in a new way, and religious books of a new type or of more than one new type are called into existence.

In the first place the new religious community has a set of new institutions, new laws, and a new ritual. As soon as the institutions, laws, and ritual cease to be new, or as soon as a new generation is born after the first believers and finds these great things existing in the world, clothed with the power of mighty facts and powerfully engaging love and reverence—as soon as

this takes place books are called in to satisfy the curiosity of the faithful as to the origin and history of their movement and of their various practices. There are many things to be explained. Members wish to know what is the reason of such and such an obscure point in the ritual, or of the position in the community of such and such families and guilds, or of such and such conditions of admission to the order. These explanations naturally take the form of history, and even when the history supplied in this way is not genuine, but made up to serve the purpose, the books containing it have a strong chance of obtaining favor with the faithful and becoming part of the archives of the religion. Thus the ætiological tradition spoken of before, which aims at accounting for interesting things and practices, has a new lease of life in connection with some of the great religions. In primitive times there were ætiological traditions or legends to explain why the rabbit had so short a tail, or why a certain rock had a peculiar shape. Now, such legends are produced to explain why this victim rather than that is chosen for a certain sacrifice, or why the members of the religious order observe a certain practice. The Brahmanical sacred books are full of divine legends explaining various points in the sacrificial ritual. The works narrating the life and teaching of Gautama are full of stories which are evidently intended to settle disputed points as to conditions of entrance to the order, or as to its discipline, by showing what view the master himself took of them. The adherents of an infant faith naturally look for further light than they have received at first as to what is required of them. Difficulties occur which the original teaching does not solve, and new situations arise in which the path of duty is not plain. In many a form the question presents itself, whether the primary rules of the community are to be rigidly carried out in all cases, or whether, from the weakness of human flesh and for the sake of attracting those outside, some compromise may be allowed. Stories about the founder may exist which bear on such points; and if they do not exist at first they may be invented, or there may be stories bearing on the point which though connected with a later period of the faith may yet

be worthy of attention. But while the ætiological motive is undoubtedly responsible for large parts of some of the sacred collections, religious histories are also written in which that motive has little share. Every religion, at least, which has a personal founder is strongly interested in having a true history of its beginnings. Every spiritual movement must of necessity look back to its origin in order to realize itself and to gain strength for the accomplishment of its task, and in accordance with this law there is the deepest desire in every such community to know all about the prophet or the master, to hear his words and observe his actions. It is at the source, where the ideal was actually touched which all religious effort afterwards strives to reconquer, that the spirit of the community feels itself at home. This is with some qualifications a truly historical motive, and the books produced in obedience to it become the most precious treasures of the religious body. The books which place the believer where the first disciples stood, which enable him to listen to the Master's words, and overhear perhaps even his secret thoughts and prayers, so that he feels for himself what that spirit was which reached the Master from the upper region and passed forth from him to other men, those books soon grow dear to all the faithful, and are used more and raised to a greater height than any others. They may be prized for other reasons than this, and regarded as oracles, as one of the earliest Christian collections (the λόγια) was, but the genuine historical interest is not wanting. On the same principle, though in a less degree, narratives about the first disciples and about the early struggles of the faith are soon irradiated with a sacred light. And works written by the companions of the Master or by those who stood near to him, if they taught the doctrine or explained its practical bearings, or made any sketch of a constitution to embody it, these also are enshrined in pious regard.

And here we observe that such historical books as we have now spoken of are received from higher motives than those which led to the recognition of some other classes of books spoken of above. Histories of the founder and of his followers

are not accepted by the faithful because of any outward effects they can produce. They work no charms; they do not, except very indirectly, keep demons at a distance; they do not reveal the future; they are not supposed to act as spells when read at public worship, or to compel heaven and earth to be in harmony. Even if they were not used in worship at all they would still be cherished with the warmest affection. Nor are they prized for the explanations they furnish of existing views and usages; that, indeed, they are often very far from doing. The effects they produce are not outward, they have apparently no inherent virtue; what they do is only in the mind of the believer. They bring him near to the source and the object of his faith, which they renew in him as at the first. They light no fires outside, but light up in his heart the fires of enthusiasm and love. They unite him to what he feels to be most vital in his religion, and he therefore holds them dear, even though he should recognize in them no supernatural character and should even be in doubt as to their authorship.

The devotional and didactic books which find their way into the sacred collections stand, from the ethical point of view, on the same plane as those just spoken of. They are loved before they are thought sacred; they would not have been held sacred had they not become the vehicle of the holy thoughts of multitudes, or had they not set forth views of the faith generally held by the believers. At the late stage of religious growth at which such works appear a dominant motive of their recognition as sacred must be held to be that of moral and intellectual approval. Other and earlier motives are no doubt still operative even at this stage. Books are held sacred because they bear, truly or untruly, the names of apostles or saints, because they are orthodox, because they bear out existing church usages, because they are thought to be oracles. Such considerations may no doubt carry a book into the canon which does not strongly recommend itself to moral and spiritual instincts. But as a rule books are not received at the stage of religion now before us unless they have secured the moral approbation of the body of the faithful and are felt to be in the main true and useful and edifying.

One more method we have to mention by which additions are made to sacred collections. When commentaries are written on books of acknowledged authority, and are themselves in due time accepted as valid interpretations of these works, the comment comes to partake of the sacred character of the text; the tradition of the elders takes its place beside, and may even to some extent supplant, the law of God. The Zend is the commentary on the Avesta, and the name Zendavesta indicates that the commentary was accepted as an essential part of the sacred collection. In Indian sacred literature this principle is responsible for the most enormous additions to the earlier books.

It may be convenient to sum up in a tabular form the results of the foregoing discussion. We have seen that the world has possessed at various times words and books held sacred from a number of different considerations. These may be arranged in the following classes:

A. *Words not attributed to any individual author.*

1. Words containing a charm and enabling him who uses them aright to obtain the fulfillment of his wishes, to cope with evil spirits, to assist or call forth the operations of nature, etc.

2. Words containing a prophecy, the fulfillment of which is still to come, and which may, if properly interpreted and applied, guide human conduct and policy.

3. Old myths and legends.

4. Laws setting forth the fundamental duties of individuals, and the conditions of the welfare of societies, held to have been given by the deity and to have his sanction.

B. *Words uttered by known persons, in early stages of religion.*

1. Oracles given by a deity through his stated representatives at his accustomed seat; in many cases still awaiting their accomplishment.

2. Words and discourses, preserved in tradition or in writing, of men believed to be inspired.

3. Hymns and formulæ connected with worship and considered essential to the due and effective performance of religious functions (A. 1 at a later stage).

C. *Books connected with the early stages of great religious movements.*

1. Historical: (*a*) ætiological stories and legends; (*b*) historical narratives.

2. Devotional and didactic works.

3. Works dealing with the ritual and with the constitution of religious communities.

4. Commentaries on books already sacred.

For the purpose of classification we may enumerate all these different classes of religious discourse, but in practice they are found like geological strata, overlapping and mixed up together, though s ill recognizable. Each set of sacred books, with the exception of those of Christianity, contains materials belonging to the remote past and to different subsequent periods. The stock of religious sentences, legends, and narratives is liable to be taken up by one hand after another, each framing them in a new setting belonging to his own day and thus making them appear in a new light. The Pentateuch finally obtained sacredness as a book of law and as the constitution of a community, but materials are embedded in it which obtained sacredness originally in most if not all of the ways spoken of above. History and legend, anonymous words of ancient wisdom, oracles yet unfulfilled, stories explaining religious usages, devotional and didactic discourse, all are there along with ritual matter which, if critics tell us truly, came into the collection last of all.* The Babylonian texts contain, along with the deeds of kings, very ancient spells and legends. As long as the sacred words of a nation remain in flux and are not fixed in a canon, they are subject to incessant modification and rearrangement. Nor is the older matter always assimilated to the character of the newer setting. Tales of which the savage origin is but thinly veiled lie ultimately side by side with the laws of a highly civilized constitution and with the loftiest spiritual aspirations. The principles of different epochs, though in reality inconsistent with each other, are both stated in the same collection. All the miscellaneous property the nation has acquired in the way of religious narrative or discourse, in its passage through the

different stages of civilization and by its borrowings from various neighbors—all this, as well as the record of its own special experience in sacred things, lies at last stored up together in its sacred literature.

### II. WHAT ARE THE CONDITIONS UNDER WHICH THE CANONIZATION OF BOOKS TAKES PLACE?

Every country and every religion has its store of sacred words and stories. The production of these takes place in every land; and whenever they survive till the arrival of a literary age they become the themes of authors and are woven together and set forth in written books. Nor can any fresh religious movement take place in a civilized country without setting in motion a literary movement of its own and producing its own narratives and treatises. But while every people possesses such properties in connection with its religion, not every people makes the same use of them. In some cases the existing religious lore is gathered together in a sacred canon. The religious organization, that is to say, draws up a catalogue of the books which are recognized and received, and these belong thenceforward to the sacred things of the religion. They are exalted above other books, perhaps above others which are very like them; they are regarded as inspired in a way in which no others are. These books become an integral part of the religion; in them it sees its standard, and recognizes the secret of its strength and the guarantee of its historical continuity. They form the official expression in writing of what is believed and aimed at, and when any dispute arises they are appealed to for their verdict. The outsider who wishes to know what the religion amounts to must go to them for satisfaction. So it is in the case of some of the great religions; but in the case of others it is not so. Some great religions have never formed a canon. If at one time there were books setting forth their belief and practice, these books have never been accepted by the religion as a whole or adopted as its standard, and in consequence they have been forgotten and have disappeared. These religions have accordingly no official documents by which they may be known. The student has to

collect his knowledge of them in other directions. From the spirit they impressed upon their peoples, from what is known of their rites and ceremonies, from their artistic remains, and from the evidence supplied by secular writers—from these and other such quarters he has to find out about them what he can.

What is the reason of this great difference in the use various nations have made of their religious lore? How does it come that Greece and Rome, in whose religions so much is found that is of value for all time, formed no collections of religious literature? The same is the case with China, in spite of her imposing ritual continued for millenniums. Books China has which all educated men must study, but they are not sacred books; they make no claim to a religious character. Why are these religions so poor in this respect while Brahmanism has an immense collection of sacred books, and Islam was embodied in such a book from its very cradle?

Let us consider first the case of those religions which formed no sacred canon. If the question be asked why China, Greece, and Rome formed no collection of religious books, in which the norm of their religions was to be recognized, it might be enough to reply that the books are wanting which might have lent themselves to such a purpose. No collection of sacred books can be made where there are no sacred books to collect. Not every book, not every religious book, will serve the purpose of a sacred collection, and in Greece and Rome, at least (of China I am not able to speak in this connection), the right kind of book appears to have been wanting. Writings which are to find their way into a canon must be about religious subjects in which all the faithful feel an interest and with regard to which they are at one, and they must be written in the interests of the religion as a working system and capable of nourishing enthusiasm for the cause and assisting faith. If no such books exist, religious collections may be made, indeed, but the people in general will not care for them and they will not live long. Now in Greece literature was not under the influence of the working religion, and stood as a whole quite apart from it. The literature of Greece worked powerfully for the religion of subsequent ages, but was of little assistance to

the priests of its own day. The philosophers who were to rule the belief of after times moved in a world of thought quite apart from that of the church of their own neighbors, as philosophers are apt to do. The attempts made by the Orphic writers, and afterwards by the tragedians under their influence, to weld the religious thought of Greece into a system and to infuse into it a new life and enthusiasm, did not succeed. In Greece, as also in Rome, where the same relations were reproduced between the system of worship and the world of thought and literature, religion produced no books suited for a canon, no books in which the nation as a whole was interested and which the living church could acknowledge as expressing her own thought.

The explanation we have offered of the absence of any canon of scripture in the religions of Greece and Rome differs somewhat from that which is usually given. What is generally said on the question is that a sacred canon is the work of an organized priesthood, and that neither in Greece nor in Rome was the priesthood sufficiently organized to impose its will in this way upon the nation. That is undoubtedly the case. In neither of these instances did the priesthood take the form of an organized national hierarchy. Religion never came to be either in these cases, or it may be added in the case of China or in that of Egypt, a homogeneous, national system. In none of these countries did the priests ever find themselves at one in their teaching or combine to recognize one special doctrine as that which was to be propagated throughout the nation. Greek religion, to take it as typical of the others in this respect, remained to the end local, devoid of system or combination. Greek priests formed no presbyteries or synods and recognized no sovereign pontiff or convocation. In Rome there was plenty of organization but there was no life-giving or unifying spirit, as there was no generally accepted creed, to make the various priesthoods and colleges realize their membership with one another in one body. The same might be shown, if we had time, of China and Egypt. And so it came to pass that none of these countries came to have a bible, a definite collection of books embodying the doctrine of the national religion. There was no

body with authority enough to form and hand over to the nation such a collection.

We see, then, that there are two essential conditions of the formation of a canon. The first is the existence of books which the nation is prepared to recognize as the norm of its religion. The second is the existence of a religious authority of sufficient power to prescribe to the nation what books it shall receive as that norm. In the cases we have named neither of these conditions has been fulfilled. And it takes no great insight to recognize that these two conditions are intimately connected with each other. Where no religious doctrine is attained which dominates the mind of the nation as a whole and prompts the writing of works embodying the essence of the national beliefs and aspirations, there the priesthood have no central standard around which they may feel themselves one body, they remain isolated from each other and disunited, and cannot possibly present for national acceptance any religious law or sacred canon.

And now we are in position to consider the case of nations which have canons, and to attempt a brief and tentative statement of the conditions under which sacred collections are formed. The soil from which such a plant is reared is a nation which has taken religion for its central interest either by natural predisposition and from the earliest times, or at some later period of its history, under the stress of some terrible reverse, or at the commanding word of a great religious reformer. In a nation which turns its mind principally to religion, social and intellectual growth must follow certain well-known lines. Those who devote themselves to religious acts and studies will be regarded by those who labor at other callings with respect and deference. Their families will stand in honor, their leisure will be thought to be their due, their words will be of weight. They, in their turn, will devote themselves to that which has exalted them, and will do all they can to make religion great, splendid, and awful. Especially will they treat the sacred words and legends of the nation with what literary power they possess, fitting the old words for the use of the new age, stripping them of grossness

and obscurity and making them worthy vehicles and incentives of living piety. Thus the highest intellectual power of the nation will be engaged in the service of religion, and by degrees a new literature will arise which will quickly grow dear to the nation as the expression of its truest thoughts and deepest feelings. This literature may not at first be thought to be inspired; the writers may be too well known, and their methods of working too well understood by their neighbors for such a view to be held about them. But when the figure of the author disappears, and the hymn or narrative he wrote still continues in use, enshrined it may be in acts of worship, and rising gradually to a height where it is beyond criticism and irradiated by the sacred lamp that burns within the shrine, then the hymn or narrative begins to rank as sacred. It is not like other writings; it cannot have been produced, men begin to think, in the ordinary way. The writer did not produce it as common writers produce their works; it was shown to him, revealed to him, by a higher power.

Here the conditions exist for the formation of a sacred canon. The act itself takes place when the religion realizes that it has come to have a settled place in the world and that a great future lies before it. The early struggles and persecutions are over, and the doubts and uncertainties which accompany the first stages of every spiritual movement—these also are overcome. The cause has fought its battles and has won some measure of peace from its enemies round about, and now it begins to see that it has conquered a kingdom for itself, not only in the spiritual world, but in the world of earthly dominions and policies. That kingdom has now to be set in order. The confusions of the time of struggle are to be succeeded by the orderly arrangements of a time of peace. The available resources are counted up, offices are adjusted, rules are made. And among the matters which call for regulation is the matter of sacred books. Doubts may exist which books among a number of existing religious works are to be regarded as authoritative. The limits must be drawn. Books everywhere received and used obtain official sanction; with regard to others the authorities may

express themselves as being in doubt, and may leave over a final decision for time and further experience. And the books received must be arranged. The Buddhist canon consists of three baskets, or collections. In other cases there is but one catalogue, perhaps with an appendix of those books whose position is not yet finally determined. Some canons are fixed definitely, once for all, so that no addition is afterwards possible. The Koran was completed in a few years. Some remain more open, so that for centuries afterwards the canon may receive successive extensions. But the first step once taken in the process, the first catalogue of authoritative books once drawn up by the leaders of the religion and accepted in principle if not in every detail by the community, a change of momentous importance and irrevocable in its nature has taken place. That these books are the canon of the religion is thenceforward a fact of history which cannot be got rid of. Whether it be possible for the adherents of a religion in an enlightened age long afterwards to go behind some of the sacred books and to attach their faith more closely than even some of the sacred writers did to the spirit of the founder we need not now discuss. Where this is attempted with any likelihood of success a great schism in the religion is probably at hand. As the formation of the canon is not the work of a day, but the outcome of a long growth which has its roots deep in national character and history, so the change or reform of a canon is so large a matter as not to be easily conceivable. So long as a religion remains alive it must carry with it this essential member of its structure.

What was undertaken in this paper is now, in a sense, fulfilled. Suggestions have been made as to the various ways in which words and discourses are attached to religion and acquire authority and sacredness. And an attempt has been made to point out the conditions under which a religion draws up a catalogue of its sacred collection of materials. A few considerations are offered in conclusion as to the distinctive peculiarities of the Christian collection of books as compared with other sacred canons. What most of all gives our Bible its hold upon our imagination and our heart we do not attempt to

set forth, but only those of its merits which men of all religions must in reason recognize.

1. The outstanding feature of the Christian Bible is that it contains the canons of two religions. The church adopted the Bible of the synagogue before it made any collection of its own, and the Jewish Scriptures count as the first division of the sacred books of Christianity. All attempts to dissolve this union and to limit the Christian Scriptures to books of Christian origin have failed signally. Now one consequence of this is that the Bible as a whole is not a national book. As Christianity prevailed not as the religion of a nation, but as the religion of an empire embracing many nations, so the Christian Bible as a whole is not the work of any one nation but of the catholic church, and has thus a cosmopolitan character.

2. What is national in the Bible belongs to the Jewish nation. Now the Jewish canon is singularly free from what we may call pre-ethical religious matter, from writings belonging to the stage before religion became a moral relationship. Perhaps spells and exorcisms may be found in the Bible; perhaps it contains legends of a somewhat rude and primitive kind; but these do not stand forth prominently; they have to be looked for. Whether the makers of the Jewish canon eliminated such matters, which are found so plentifully in other sacred collections, or in whatever way it came about, the Old Testament gives no countenance to superstition, but places before us in the main a religion which is moral, in which God and his people are related together as king and vassals, or as father and children. The chief purport of the book is to narrate the history of this relationship. The books are mainly historical and what they tell us is how God has dealt with man.

3. What the Bible contains of ritual and priestly matter belongs to the Jewish books, and such parts of these books are to the Christian of less importance. What the Christian cares for in the Jewish books is what in them points to Christ, or the preparation they describe of that new relation between God and man which came in Christ to full reality. The Bible, as Chris-

tians regard it, is not, accordingly, a ritualistic book nor a book of law.

4. The specially Christian books which are nearest to the believer are all new, that is to say they are the products of the early Christian movement itself. They do not, therefore, consist in any appreciable degree of *impedimenta*, but are all, broadly speaking, quickening to Christian faith.

5. The Christian Scriptures do not impose a creed. They contain several types of theology and the believer is placed by them in this respect in a position of freedom.

6. The Christian Scriptures do not contain any commentary. No commentary of the New Testament has ever imposed itself on the church as a whole, and the Christian church of each age is in a position to deal with the books at first hand and to form its own views of them.

7. The Christian Scriptures are mainly historical. They bring us face to face with many, at least, of the original facts of our religion, and enable us to be personally intimate with its Founder, and to nourish ourselves on the bread and the water which he himself dispensed to those who saw and heard and touched him.

# THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF F. J. A. HORT.[1]

By WILLIAM SANDAY,
Oxford.

THE motto for a biographer should be μηδὲν ἄγαν, nothing in excess, above all not too much of the biographer himself. This condition is admirably fulfilled in Mr. Arthur Hort's personal contribution to the biography of his father. He has kept himself wholly in the background and has allowed the figure of his father to define itself by degrees, mainly in his own words. Fortunately a great number of Dr. Hort's letters have been preserved, and a copious selection of these has been printed with brief connecting summaries by the editor. It is just these which we think could not have been better done. Easily, gracefully, clearly and reticently written, it seems to us that they at once leave nothing unsaid that ought to be said, and yet do not say a word too much. The heightening of the lights and the deepening of the shades, the general enforcing of the impression, is done by the father himself, and not by the son.

This is as it should be, and the merit of the performance is great because it is by no means easy — not the more easy from the fact that the qualities most required are in a sense negative qualities, the instinctive tact and good feeling which tells a writer what he ought not to say. The son has in this case discharged his duty as we may be sure that the father would have wished to see it discharged. We could not give it higher praise.

There is perhaps more room to question whether the canon μηδὲν ἄγαν has been strictly observed in the other contents of the volumes, the letters which do so much to draw the portrait of the writer. It is no doubt the fashion to publish rather long

[1] *Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D.*, etc., by his son, ARTHUR FENTON HORT. 2 vols. London: Macmillan. 1896.

biographies—even of scholars, whose lives are as a rule not eventful; and the biography before us does not exceed the standard length. Still we are inclined to think that much might be said for making the standard one octavo volume of some five hundred pages rather than two. The temptations that a biographer is under are intelligible enough; it is easy to see how he must be drawn different ways. He has in fact several distinct publics to satisfy which it is difficult if not impossible to satisfy all at once. There is first the domestic circle, then the wider circle of friends, then the local interests, then the *Fachgenossen*—and where, as in the present instance, the subject of the biography has more than one *Fach*, the interest of colleagues in each—and last of all the educated public in general. We speak under correction and as expressing merely an individual opinion, but it seems to us that the present life concedes rather too much to some of the smaller of these classes. We should have been inclined to cut down the correspondence so as to bring it within a single volume. And we should have done so by omitting (1) a number of letters the interest of which is mainly domestic, and (2) a number of others which are taken up with details of travel—especially botanical details and those which relate to mountaineering in the Alps. In regard to the first class we are exceedingly glad that some of the letters should have been included. We are exceedingly glad that a picture should have been given of what Dr. Hort was in his home. Those who, like the writer of this, have had a glimpse of that home may well regard it as the very ideal of what the domestic life of a scholar ought to be—a combination of "plain living and high thinking," absolute simplicity with absolute refinement, in the spirit of Dr. Hort's own words printed on the title-page, "A life devoted to truth is a life of vanities abased and ambitions foresworn." Such a life with the quiet orderliness and discipline with which it was surrounded—a discipline which in spite of its tender and affectionate domesticity had yet, one could see, a certain severity (*cf.* what is said in vol. ii, 189)—was well worth portraying. We think, however, that a rather smaller selection of letters would have been

sufficient. And in like manner as to the botany and mountaineering, we are inclined to think that one or two typical letters might have conveyed the impression. We say this from no jealousy of the subjects in themselves. Dr. Hort was an observer as well as a critic, and we have no doubt of the accuracy of his observations. Still where these relate to facts otherwise fairly well known, it does not seem to us to have been so necessary to record them. The most unique and valuable attitude of his mind was the critical; and for ourselves we should have been tempted to take this as a test. All expressions of opinion we should have tried to preserve, even in descriptions of travel where the facts might otherwise be got from a guide-book (*e. g.*, on the French tour ii, 295 ff. and the Italian ii, 346 ff.). The criticisms of music, painting, and architecture, though coming from an amateur, nearly always seem to us valuable. But there seems to us to be a good deal less of really permanent interest, *e. g.*, in the Alpine letters of vol. i, 327 ff. They are simple records of transitory incident such as might have happened to anyone else.

The practical upshot of what is in our mind would be this—that while we are by no means sorry that the two volumes should have been published for the public satisfaction of those who desire it, we should be still more glad to see by the side of them an abridged edition in a single volume which we should think distinctly better adapted for two important uses, (1) to put into the hands of young students, and (2) to put into the hands of foreign scholars as showing what manner of man our greatest English theologian of the century was.

Our greatest English theologian of the century! It is, we are aware, a somewhat audacious phrase, and one which perhaps only a limited circle would consent to use. The *Memoir* begins by saying that he "was little known outside the world of scholars," and that his published work could give but a partial view of the man. Those who measure greatness by tangible and immediate results would of course not choose such a subject for their highest homage. By "greatest theologian" we do not mean the one who has moved the greatest number of minds, or

the one who has wielded the most powerful and effective pen, or the one whose finished work is greatest in bulk and general utility. We mean rather the one whose insight into truth was at once the largest and the most penetrating; we mean the one who was possessed of the most extended knowledge and who combined with that knowledge the surest method; we mean the one who while not behind the foremost in depth of religious feeling united with this a higher and a juster claim to the epithet "scientific" than any of his fellows. If we were to take the most moving of English theologians of the century, the most distinguished before the world as preacher and writer, the first name must be Newman's. If we were to take the greatest mass of satisfactory production and work done, the first name should probably be Lightfoot's. There are other names of weight, such as Keble, Pusey, and Church on the one side, and Arnold, Stanley, and Jowett on the other. But if we look not so much at achievement as at power, if we think of originality and depth, and if we measure the quality and inner coherence of truth perceived, then there would at least be some of us to whom the name of Hort would be second to none. His own two teachers, Coleridge and F. D. Maurice, might to some extent enter into competition. They both influenced some of the minds which were best worth influencing, and they both had the philosophical gift as he had. But he had an equal grasp on philosophy, scholarship, and science. He was not less great in exactness of detail than in largeness of view. And the consequence is that as a constructive thinker his work is more sound. When all has been allowed that needs to be allowed for, difficulty of expression and comparative scantiness of published material, it seems to us still that Hort stands first. He saw further than any other English theologian, and saw as we think on the whole more soundly, at least within the range within which we can follow him.

There are five points to which perhaps it is right for us to bestow particular attention: (1) As these pages are addressed to transatlantic readers a few words, but only a few, should be said as to the outlines of his life and career. (2) It will be

interesting to note some of the special influences to which he was indebted. (3) A special interest also attaches to the causes which limited the amount of his production. (4) Some estimate should be made of the work actually produced. (5) And lastly, if we may take Hort as a typical English theologian, we may well ask ourselves both what there was distinctive in his position, and in particular how that position compares with the position commonly taken up by leading theologians on the continent and more especially in Germany.

(1) The story of the life is soon told. It had very few external events. Hort would count as an Irishman, having been born at Dublin on the 23d of April, 1828. But the blood in his veins was mainly English. His great-grandfather, Josiah Hort (who had been a nonconformist and a schoolfellow of Isaac Watts), crossed over to Ireland in 1709 and ultimately became archbishop of Tuam. He and his second son, John, both married Irish ladies of good family. This son spent much of his life in Portugal and was knighted for political services there. Sir John's third son, Fenton, married the daughter of a Suffolk clergyman, who was believed to be descended from Dean Colet and bore his name (Collett), and these two were the parents of the Cambridge professor. There were thus two Irish strains in his ancestry; the rest were English.

Hort was educated at Rugby, partly under Arnold and partly under Tait. He became a scholar of Trinity College, Cambridge; and under some disadvantages from illness was bracketed third in the classical tripos besides being placed in the first class in each of the two newly instituted schools of moral and natural sciences. To gain such high honors in such widely separated subjects was in itself a remarkable feat, and was characteristic of the extraordinary range of Hort's mind. He became a fellow of Trinity in 1852.

The years which he spent in Cambridge as a graduate till the end of 1856 were evidently a time of intense activity. It would be too much to say that he was for once producing knowledge as fast as he was acquiring it, but he brought out a number of papers in the *Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology* (of which

he was one of the editors) and an essay on Coleridge in the *Cambridge Essays*, all of which were strikingly mature. It is to be feared that besides broadening the foundations of his vast erudition he also laid the seeds of future ill health at this period.

In 1854 Hort was ordained; in 1857 he married, and from that year till 1872 he held the small college living of St. Ippolyts, Great Wymondley, near Hitchin, in the pleasant county of Hertfordshire. About the middle of this period (1863–65) he was seriously disabled in health and compelled to give up parish work for a time.

This work, although he threw himself into it with zeal and earnestness and with a thoroughness which distinguished everything that he did, was yet not the kind of work for which he was best fitted. His true vocation was in the university. And by a happy inspiration on the part of the master and fellows of Emmanuel College — the old Puritan foundation which sent out not a few of the "Pilgrim Fathers" across the seas, and among them the founder of Harvard — he was called back to Cambridge in 1872 as tutorial fellow of Emmanuel. At last in 1878 he entered upon the position which was his own by right through his election to the Hulsean professorship. In 1887 he became Lady Margaret professor, and, after two years of very broken health, on the morning of St. Andrew's Day, November 30, 1892, he died.

(2) What, it may be asked, were the influences which made him what he was? It is necessary to go far back for them; for Hort was one of the most independent of men, and he formed himself much more than he was formed. But in his case more than in most it is worth while to look at his home and at his school. Here is a charming sketch by Hort himself of his father:

"The points in his character which seem to me to stand out above the rest, as I look back over more than forty years, are, I think, his simplicity, his strong patience, and his unselfishness. He thought little about himself, and still less did he talk about himself. He had no small restless vanities. He never craved to be admired; he did not even crave to be appreciated. He

had no regular profession in life, but that did not make him idle or self-indulgent. All his life long, as I remember it, he worked hard in his own way without expecting or wishing any reward, partly at public business, partly in charitable and such like institutions, partly in long and anxious private business as a kindness to relations who trusted his faithful justice and affection. All this he did quite quietly and as a matter of course as the plain duty and honor of a Christian man and a gentleman, without taking any credit for it" (ii, 200). Elsewhere we are told that "he bequeathed to his son a fastidious love of order and method" (i, 6). We may see here and in the "strong patience" and hard work of which mention has just been made the raw material of the scientific habit of mind. And yet more forcible must have been the influence of the mother.

"In bringing up her children she was strong enough to be able to combine the enforcement of very strict domestic discipline with close sympathy in all childish ways and interests. The very keynote of her character was truthfulness; untruth in any shape was her abhorrence. Almost equally characteristic was her hatred of all half performance. 'I hate mediocrity' was one of her many favorite sayings"(i, 8).

Now the master motives with Hort were just this "hatred of half performance" and the same intense veracity—a veracity which puts to shame many who would not be called untruthful, but with whom truthfulness is a far more conventional thing and not by any means so much part and parcel of their being.

These were qualities in part natural, but strengthened by education, which Hort brought with him from his home. They must have been driven in and others must have been added to them at school. Hort had the advantage of what must have been the very best training possible for an English boy in his day. He was educated first at Laleham,—a well-known preparatory school founded by Arnold himself,—and then at Rugby in the last days of Dr. Arnold and the first of Tait, afterwards bishop of London and archbishop of Canterbury. The mere atmosphere of Rugby at this time must have been much. We are told incidentally that he entered at the same time as H. J. S. Smith

(afterwards Savilian professor at Oxford, a most accomplished man, capable of the greatest things but cut off too soon), W. H. Waddington (the epigraphist and French ambassador and premier), and J. B. Mayor (ex-professor of Latin at King's College and editor of the *Classical Review*). It is evident that Hort entertained a high regard for both his head masters; but there are two significant sentences in the *Life*:

"Of Mr. Bonamy Price's teaching (in the Twenty) my father always spoke with enthusiasm; he regarded him as the man who, at school at all events, had taught him more than anyone else; 'To him,' he said in 1871, 'I owe all my scholarship and New Testament criticism.' Mr. Bonamy Price, in his turn, after an interval of more than forty years, remembered him as the brightest pupil whom he had ever had, and delighted to recall the boy's keen eyes, the thoroughness of his work, and his eagerness in the pursuit of knowledge" (i, 28).

In the seventies and eighties Mr. Bonamy Price was a conspicuous figure at Oxford, where he became Drummond professor of political economy; and the writer of this has often thought that for boys especially he must have been an ideal teacher. He had all the keenness of his pupil and a somewhat more assertive vivacity. He was a formidable person to meet in the street, as the chances were that you would be put through a Socratic cross-examination on some question, more or less profound, which happened to be in the mind of the speaker, but which, in the way in which he handled it, seemed painfully to bring out the nakedness of your own. Perhaps for men this Socratic method too much took the place of deeper reading and study, but it is easy to see how admirable it would be for boys.

In later life the strongest influence that Hort came under was from F. D. Maurice. His *Cambridge Essay* (1856) shows how deeply he had studied the writings of Coleridge. He was thus fortified in what must have been a natural bent towards a spiritualistic philosophy. At the same time his thorough acquaintance with more than one branch of natural science gave him an insight into its methods which is unusual on that side of the question. Accordingly he welcomed Darwin; and his grasp

on the whole materialistic argument is seen in a note of singular breadth and boldness (*Hulsean Lectures*, 187 f.).

The fact was that Hort was disciple to no man. He learned from every side, and digested all that he learned; but he took nothing on a simple *ipse dixit*. Full of enthusiasm as he was for anything that he felt to be really great, the attitude of his mind was essentially critical, and he applied the same strictness of judgment to nominal opponents and to those whom he admired and loved.

Read with all its context and with one part of the life balancing another, the character of Hort was evidently capable of much sympathy. He was especially sympathetic towards the latent germs of real merit in unpopular men and unpopular causes. His catholicity of view nothing could surpass; but at the same time his own standard was so exalted, and he applied it so entirely without respect of persons that many of his judgments will have the appearance of being severe.

Again, Hort was really a man of humble mind. But the standard by which he measured men and things, himself included, was his own. If he was humble it was because he was well aware that his performance fell short of his ideal. He was as free as possible from the illusions of unacknowledged vanity, and his keenness of insight made him aware of shortcomings which to most people would have been invisible. "I don't in the least know what that means" was, we are told, a familiar phrase of his over the Revision table (ii, 233), where it is probable that others would not be conscious of any special obscurity. But all this was compatible with great strength of quiet conviction when once his mind was made up. He was a wise man, he did see further than most of the rest of the world, and he could not help knowing it. Of him, if of anyone, it was true (omitting only the complacency implied in *dulcius*):

> Sed nil dulcius est, bene quam munita tenere
> Edita doctrina sapientum templa serena,
> Despicere unde queas alios passimque videre
> Errare atque viam palantis quaerere vitae.

Further, it should be borne in mind that the vast majority of

the letters contained in these volumes were written in the closest intimacy of friendship, without the slightest thought of publication. It is very often clear that the writer "let himself go" in a way which he certainly would not have done in any public utterance. And, as has been said, he had no respect for persons apart from the respect which they won for themselves by their own intrinsic merits.

These considerations will account for nearly all the instances in which we feel inclined to invoke them. There are two letters addressed to his parents which do not quite hit the perfect tone. One is a controversy with his father on the subject of spelling. The other is a letter, admirable *in substance*, in which he announces to his parents his decision to take holy orders. On these points let him who is without sin cast a stone.

American readers will find it harder to forgive two pages of a letter written early in their Civil War. Hort was a Liberal in politics and a great admirer of Gladstone, though at the end of his days a Unionist. But he was no friend to democracy. Of anything like mob rule he had a perfect horror. The loftiness and refinement of his own ideals made him at heart an aristocrat; and these deep-seated feelings nowhere else come out so strongly. There are two pages which a wellwisher would rather had not been written; and yet to have suppressed them would have given an imperfect picture of the man. It is greatly to be hoped that no American whose eye happens to fall upon them will be deterred from reading further. The excellences of a man like Hort are just those which the members of a young and vigorous nation would find best worth their contemplation. It would be difficult to grow such flowers except in an old and long-tilled soil.

The passage in question might almost claim the privilege of the confessional, as the writer says to his correspondent (Mr. Ellerton, the hymn writer), "I am afraid you will think all this rank heresy, and I confess I should be puzzled to know how to speak wisely before the public." It should also be mentioned that in the latter part of his life Hort had many friends and was much appreciated in America (ii, 369). After the death of

Ezra Abbot he became the constant helper and adviser of Dr. Gregory in his great work, the last volume of which contains a warm and ungrudging tribute of gratitude to him (*Nov. Test. Græc.*, *Prolegomena*, iii, pref. viii).

(3) It is a matter of very general regret that Hort did not produce more during his lifetime. Referring to the wish that he had done so, the master of Emmanuel said at the meeting held after his death: "I cannot so wish it myself. It is to wish him other than he was; to wish him, it seems to me, smaller; unless indeed it be a weakness to be careless of any conspicuous personal achievement, caring only to be true to his principle, *Fidelis in minimis et maximis*, in all that he wrought" (ii, 476). This is a natural feeling for a Cambridge man who had had the oracle at his side for twenty years. It might well be a natural feeling for one who considered only the question of personal dignity. But it was not the feeling of Hort himself. We are told that in the last years of his life "he suffered much distress from the feeling that on the highest debated questions of the time he had something to say, but could not say it. . . . . Among those who knew him best there had long been a feeling that he ought to make his voice heard, and the consciousness that the claim was a just one caused often deep depression" (ii, 370).

Let us say at once that the biography before us with its free expressions of opinion on such a variety of subjects has done something towards supplying what was wanted, and that we are proportionately grateful for it. Let us say also that the last complaint that could possibly be made was a complaint of indolence. Hort was in truth always working. If ever there was a case in which the blade wore through the scabbard it was his. And when we consider the total amount of his life work in all its varied departments it was really very far from small. And yet it was a long way from being all that he was capable of doing. The *Life* is a melancholy record of schemes that came to nothing or did not get beyond beginnings. Some fragments of these are being gathered up by the loving care of disciples since his death. But what we miss most of all is a fuller presentation of the leading ideas which lay behind his work.

There is something to be explained, and we ask what is the explanation?

The writer of this notice ought to have been able to supply it in a more satisfactory manner than he can. He was one of those who had ventured to urge upon Dr. Hort the immense value of a public utterance from him on the many searching questions by which men's minds were agitated. He did this in an article in the *Contemporary Review* for July 1889, in reply to some criticisms by Mrs. Humphry Ward. And the article drew from Hort a long and pathetic letter of the nature of an *apologia*, confessing his own wish to respond to the appeal made to him and setting forth a number of the hindrances which had stood in the way of his doing so. Most unfortunately this letter is not forthcoming, though a portion of a rough draft of it is printed (ii, 405 ff.). The letter is supplemented by other statements in the volumes before us, so that the full state of the case is now sufficiently apparent.

It is clear that ill health was one terrible drawback. This began even before Hort took his degree. He attributed much of it to the late hours which he kept after this event at the time of his most eager study. He used to point by his own case the warning which so many scholars need.

Then Hort was one of a large family and had a large circle of intimate friends. There is reason to think that he succeeded to not a little of the "long and anxious private business" in which we have seen that his father was involved. He took nothing lightly, and it is easy to understand the inroads which were thus made upon his time. These volumes alone would show that many hours in each week must have been spent upon correspondence.

To private business was added public business. Those who are familiar with the working of universities know what an amount of labor falls to the lot of certain individuals with little to show to the outside world. Hort was a member of many syndicates, and was especially active on that which managed the affairs of the university press, and he threw himself into work of this kind with the most conscientious thoroughness.

In an estimate of Hort's life a large place must be given to his work on the Revision of the New Testament. There was probably no one to whom the English Revision owed more. He was one of the most regular attendants at the meetings, and took a leading part in the discussions, especially on points relating to the text. In view of what we know of Hort's method of preparing himself for work of this kind it is easy to understand that the Revision will have used up most of the available margin of the ten years during which it was going on.

All this time he was most lavish in the help which he gave to other scholars and students. It is truly said that the only record of much of Hort's work is to be found "in the little-read prefaces of obscure books" (ii, 192). And his letters show at once the readiness and the thoroughness with which he set himself to answer the questions that were put to him. In this, as in some of the prominent qualities of his mind, he resembled the great American scholar, Ezra Abbot.

When we remember all these things we can see only too well how the years of a life might ebb away with less direct production than might have been expected. But there were yet deeper hindrances than these. There were hindrances which were not external, but part of the man.

One was the extraordinarily high standard which he set for everything that he did. And this high standard was not merely the fastidiousness of a great scholar jealous of his own reputation—that kind of fastidiousness was not Hort's. His jealousy was not for fame but for truth. He comments thus upon his articles on Gnostics for the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, which involved a cruel consumption of time. "*A perfunctory sketch taken from the surface would be simple falsehood.* As far as I can see, none of the German investigations can be even roughly and provisionally trusted; they are full of good pioneering and no more. Minute verbal criticism appears to give the most hopeful clue" (ii, 107). And here is another extract from a letter which may help to define a state of mind which is very rare and very noble, though no doubt an impediment to the kind of rough makeshift performance which most of us are content with.

"I am afraid you still do not quite understand my Dictionary difficulties. They do not arise from too high a standard of completeness. I am quite content to come short there. But I cannot write anything on gnostic subjects, however roughly and broadly, without considerable minute study, *because otherwise what I wrote would be substantially untrue*. I doubt whether you can fully enter into the embarrassments of a slow reader with a wretched memory" (ii, 109).

It is this inexorable sincerity, this severe and lofty ideal of truthfulness which stands in the way. Hort's attitude to everything which he took up was the same.

At the end of the last extract he speaks of certain "embarrassments" which hindered rapid progress in study. We may no doubt discount these a little. To be a "slow reader" only means to be one of those who really read; and the "wretched memory" is only another instance of his exacting standards of comparison.

"He often complained of a bad memory; it was indeed true that he had not a memory like Macaulay's or Conington's, but he knew where to look for required information, and could at a moment's notice turn to the right passages in the right books. Nor could his memory be called bad in any save a relative sense; the knowledge which he had acquired seemed always to be ready at hand. I can remember, for instance, his giving in the course of conversation a clear twenty minutes' sketch of the history of the Scotch Established Church, and of its offshoots" (ii, 375 f.).

There was another more serious difficulty than this. Among all his remarkable gifts and powers Hort had only in a limited sense the gift of "utterance." He had it, and he had it not. It would hardly occur to anyone who took up these copious volumes that he was in any way tongue-tied or slow of speech. He was not in letter writing or in conversation; but it was another matter when it came to formal composition for the press. The contrast, indeed, is strange. Dr. Westcott bears witness to what he was in the one sphere: "Keen, fluent, fertile, subtle, he raised point after point in a discussion, and where

he failed to convince at least quickened a fuller sense of the manifold bearings of the question in debate."[2] And yet the note in which these words appear serves to introduce a course of Hulsean lectures delivered in 1871, but, though always more or less in hand, not published, and then in an unfinished state, until after his death in 1893. This fact alone tells a story. And the *Life* has many others to the same effect. Indeed nothing could be more pathetic than the way in which this great man was hampered by the want of the gift of speech.

"It was in the production of sermons that the difficulty of finding expression for his thoughts was most felt. It seemed as though the message which he longed to give lay too deep in his own heart to be uttered abroad. The difficulty was also doubtless of physical origin. The subject of a sermon was generally chosen early in the week. It was thought over perpetually, and towards the end of the week he began to write; but he had hardly ever finished before the early hours of Sunday morning, and he would often sit hour after hour, pen in hand, but apparently dumb till the words came at last, sometimes in a rush. Extreme fastidiousness was in part the cause of this remarkable *aphasia*, a habit of mind which, while it secured that nothing from his hand should see the light which he might afterwards wish to recall, yet deprived his hearers of much which they would have welcomed, even in what he considered an imperfect shape, since the perfection at which he aimed was always indefinitely beyond his present achievement. But it would be easy to exaggerate the importance of this fastidiousness; at all events the peculiarity was more moral than intellectual, the sense of responsibility was almost crushing. Nor did the difficulty decrease with time; he had always felt it, and he came to feel it not less but more as time went on, and the greater the occasion the more terrible became the struggle to put his thought into words" (i, 360).

The suggestion is probably true that the cause of this extreme though partial difficulty in production was in large measure physical. Those who in any degree share Hort's highly strung

[2] Prefatory note to *The Way, the Truth, the Life*, p. xii.

and nervous temperament will know how much the power of writing varies at different times; they will not be unacquainted with the sensation of sitting with pen in the hand unable to string coherent sentences together. And the special weakness from which Hort suffered seems to have had its seat originally in the brain (i, 178). The sense of responsibility and the harassing pressure of having to complete work in a limited time may account for the difference which is so marked between set and informal composition. It is not as if Hort was a bad writer. He was always scholarly and accurate in style; and we are told expressly that in his village sermons (though no doubt by an effort) he succeeded in attaining to a real and unforced simplicity. We are glad to see that some of these sermons are to be published. It could not be said that the style of the famous *Introduction* is altogether happy. The difficulty there (as in most of Hort's writing, but conspicuously in this technical region) seemed to be caused by the endeavor to express in abstract terms facts and tendencies which would be more easily handled in the concrete. But in the *Hulsean Lectures* there are many passages which are nothing short of classical in their grave and measured eloquence. The temptation is great to quote examples, but this article is reaching such a length that the temptation must be resisted. The difficulty in these lectures arises mainly from the novelty and originality of the ideas and our imperfect knowledge of the hidden context in the mind of the writer. By revealing this to some extent the *Life* will often throw back light upon the earlier work. In the posthumously published lectures (*Judaistic Christianity*, and *Prolegomena to the Romans and the Ephesians*) the style is for the most part remarkably clear, direct and appropriate, though some of the subtler distinctions and conclusions are not always formulated altogether successfully. But in all the writings which have been mentioned (least perhaps in the *Introduction*, most in the *Hulsean Lectures* and the *Letters*) the reader cannot help being struck by the terse and aptly chosen epithets. He will not fail to note a great number of felicitous and memorable phrases. And we cannot resist the remark in passing that if the father could have seen the handiwork of the son he would

have rejoiced at the cultivated yet unaffected ease which he aimed at but found it so hard to attain to himself.

(4) Having reached this point it appears to be our duty to attempt some estimate of Hort's actual production in his own name. We heartily agree in the verdict that the man was greater than his work, and that the work does not do him justice. What might he not have done with ten more years of vigorous health? Still, when every deduction has been made, the work, too, is great, and we ought to try to summarize it.

In the first place, there is the one great and complete achievement on the text of the New Testament, built up throughout from beginning to end. We do not forget that this work was shared with Dr. Westcott; and both authors must have their full meed of praise. This work is the one most satisfactory piece of critical and scientific construction that in the present century English theology has to point to. Some demur to it may still be heard in England. On the continent it is very generally if not quite universally accepted. The various efforts which are being made to penetrate yet deeper into the character and relations of single authorities and groups of authorities are only what Hort himself would have encouraged. He would have been the last to claim finality. And yet it is extraordinary how little the mighty edifice has been shaken by the discoveries of recent years. The last discovery of the Sinaitic Syriac falls into place in it most exactly.

*The Life and Letters* enables us to trace the growth of this work on the textual criticism of the New Testament from its inception to its close. In Hort's career it forms a large parenthesis. The following is, we believe, the passage which traces the genesis of the idea. The year is 1851, and the age of the writer twenty-three.

"I have been two nights at 2 Thess. 2, and have at last got some light, which has much pleased me and encouraged me; I find it altogether a most interesting and all-ways profitable study. I had no idea till the last few weeks of the importance of texts, having read so little Greek Testament, and dragged on with the villainous *Textus Receptus*. Westcott recommended me to get

Bagster's *Critical*, which has Scholz's text, and is most convenient in small quarto, with parallel Greek and English, and a wide margin on purpose for notes. This pleased me much; so many little alterations on good MS. authority made things clear, not in a vulgar, notional way, but by giving a deeper and fuller meaning. But after all, Scholz is very capricious and sparing in introducing good readings, and Tischendorf I find a great acquisition, above all because he gives the various readings at the bottom of the page, and his Prolegomena are invaluable. Think of that vile *Textus Receptus* leaning entirely on late MSS.; it is a blessing there are such early ones" (i, 211).

The definite plan of a joint revision of the text of the Greek Testament was agreed upon in the course of a walk with Dr. Westcott in 1853 (i, 240). It is well known that the completed edition appeared within a few weeks of the Revised Version of the New Testament in 1881. The editors showed their wisdom in taking no notice of the attacks upon them. They could afford to leave the vindication of their work to time.

By the side of this masterly treatment of the textual criticism of the New Testament we have a number of detailed contributions to theological scholarship, all of them absolutely at first hand, several breaking new ground, and those which do not do this restating old arguments with conspicuous freshness, exactness and thoroughness. Perhaps the most important of these contributions would be the *Two Dissertations*, published in 1876, especially that on the Constantinopolitan Creed and the article "Basilides" in the *Dictionary of Christian Biography*. Incidentally there was also the brilliant little confirmation of de Rossi's discovery in regard to the Codex Amiatinus; along with which may be mentioned the identification of the Latin version of the commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on St. Paul's epistles.[3] In the way of thorough and searching, if less original and less decisive works, we have the essays on Justin Martyr, and on the close of the epistle to the Romans (reprinted in Lightfoot's *Biblical Essays*) with the recent volumes on *Judaistic Christianity*, and on the *Introduction to the Epistles to the Romans and Ephesians*.

[3] SWETE, *Theod. Mops. on the Minor Ep. of St. Paul*, i, xv.

The vindication of the Pauline authorship of this last epistle is notable not only as the fullest, most carefully weighed, and best in English, but also from the interest of the question as a turning point in critical controversy. We look forward still to the lectures which are promised on the *Conception of the Ecclesia* and on the epistles of St. James and St. Peter. It is much to be regretted that the greater part of this material should not have had the revising hand of the author; but he set down nothing carelessly and hardly anything that had not been the subject of long reflection.[4]

Of all this mass of work — which when complete will be found to be far from inconsiderable — the value is patent and certain. There may be something rather more problematical about the contributions to speculative thought, which Hort had nearest to his heart. We are told expressly in several places in the biography, and indeed it would be evident to the reader without telling, that the textual researches with which his name is most generally associated were only secondary with him and undertaken as a step towards the discussion of larger questions. What he had to say upon these is chiefly embodied in the Hulsean Lectures entitled *The Way, the Truth, the Life*. We have seen under what difficulties these were brought even to their present imperfect condition. A large part remains in the form of aphoristic notes which were never worked up into the texture of the book. There is also an obvious disadvantage in making the presentation of a far-reaching philosophy of religion dependent upon the exegesis of two verses. And it must needs strike the reader as surprising that, while the discourses on which the discussion is based belong to a portion of Scripture which is a direct object of critical assault, there should hardly be a word of criticism proper in the book. It is impossible that this should not suffer from the fact that the form was given to it quite a quarter of a century ago.

These drawbacks are serious, and they are increased by the

[4] The slightest of all his productions (doubtless not intended for publication) is the *Six (Popular) Lectures on the Antenicene Fathers*, which, however, contains a few specially valuable sentences on Tertullian.

nature of the contents, which by their combination of profundity and boldness excite interest and curiosity to the utmost, while rarely giving it complete satisfaction. We have said that some very welcome help is afforded by the publication of the letters; and there can be no doubt that the admirers of Hort will go back to the study of the earlier work with the assistance of the later. In any case it is most deserving of study. Thus much is evident, that if the leading ideas of this volume should hold good we should have in our hands an *apologia* for Christianity more powerful and more comprehensive than anything in English since Butler's *Analogy*. But it may be doubted whether there is anyone as yet who understands its drift sufficiently to form a judicial estimate of it.

However that may be, the book is full of wise and penetrating sayings. The question is how far they are capable of being combined into a coherent and satisfactory whole. One section at least of such a whole seems to stand out. The writer of this does not know anywhere a philosophy of the formation of opinion and belief which commends itself to him as at once so lofty and so true. Though even here we long to be able to consult the oracle afresh, and to ask for a little farther explanation or concrete illustration. We have before us a torso—in any case a striking, perhaps a magnificent torso; but some years must elapse before the world will know the real value of the legacy bequeathed to it.

(5) Hort was one of those writers whom an Englishman need not be ashamed to put in competition with the great theologians of the continent. He was not only eminent in himself, but his influence is, and is likely to be, great on his younger countrymen. This makes it natural to institute something of a comparison, and to ask how one of our best typical English theologians would differ from his peers in continental Europe, and more particularly in Germany. We might take, *e. g.*, such representative names as Harnack and H. J. Holtzmann. The latter writer has criticised English theology more than once with a certain condescension. Nor can we quarrel with him for this. Our standard is not the German standard. And the number of

our writers for whom, as for Hort, no standard is too high, is not large. Dr. Holtzmann, however, does not so much take up the ground of superior knowledge as of a different kind of superiority—that which is thought to come from an uncompromising acceptance of "modern criticism." In England a similar position is taken up by Mrs. Humphry Ward and her allies, not so much perhaps as a direct result of conscious experience as from reflecting in different degrees the attitude of their continental authorities.

The main points in which Hort's position would differ from such an one as Holtzmann's would be these:

1. He would start with a much greater respect for the past, and would use a greater effort to keep up the continuity of Christian thought. The view which Hort took of the great conciliar decisions of the church is interesting. He certainly did not regard them as above criticism. This would appear in particular from a letter addressed to Dr. Stanton (ii, 434 f.). At the same time it is evident that not only they but the movements of which they formed the culmination had been to him the object of much close and sympathetic study. This may be seen conspicuously in the second of the *Two Dissertations*. There can be no doubt that the effect of these historical discussions sank deep into Hort's mind, and it would have been impossible for him to throw them over so lightly as some of the critics we have mentioned would be prepared to do. In the last resort every conclusion which he formed was based upon reason; but it was reason into which historical data largely entered. The important letters which deal with a section of the Articles of the Church of England (ii, 324–338) are a good specimen of his method.

2. The skepticism with which a German of Holtzmann's stamp would approach any historical formularies Hort would have turned rather upon the purely modern substitutes for them There was nothing to which he would not give a fair hearing, and nothing that he would not accept if it really carried conviction. But it is not to be denied that there was a conservative leaning in his mind, and that he was slow to admit results some-

times put forward with no little confidence. This temper comes out in the *Introduction to the Ephesians* and in the treatment of the pastoral epistles in *Judaistic Christianity*. How bold Hort was capable of being may be seen in the notes and illustrations, representing material not worked up, which are collected at the end of the *Hulsean Lectures*. But in the working out of critical theory he proceeded *pedetentim*, with much caution and circumspection. Nor would it be wrong to say that this is the prevailing attitude of English students of the New Testament and church history.

3. It cannot be at all surprising if writers like Holtzmann should be somewhat impatient of this and should find it difficult to understand. There is a difference between the position of English students and their own which they are hardly likely to appreciate. It is expected of every German, especially of every German professor, that he should "have a theory," and not only a theory but a "rounded" or "complete theory"—*eine geschlossene Anschauung* is the phrase used in a pamphlet which shows the state of opinion on such matters.[5] The possession of such a theory Hort, we may feel sure, would have disclaimed. One who was prepared as far as he was *stare super antiquas vias* would not need it. He has a standing ground under his feet from which he can strain forward as far as sight may carry into the unknown. This is what Hort was always doing. He was constantly winning new conclusions, new generalizations, constantly reclaiming bits here and there from the waste. But there was much even in the central region which he was aware that he did not know, and was content not to know. The state of the data very often does not allow of positive conclusions, and in such a case Hort could be trusted as few besides could be trusted not to go beyond the evidence.

The German critic is less able to acquiesce in such a position. He has (at least in the more extreme cases) left himself so little to fall back upon that he is compelled to construct theories of his own covering all the most vital questions. But where this

[5] WEIFFENBACH: *Herrn Dr. Stade's Wahrheit und Dichtung*, p. 8, Braunschweig, 1894.

has to be done the temptation is very great to give to the evidence a fictitious completeness, to make it prove more than it does, to treat as proved propositions of which the real proof is very imperfect. Dr. Holtzmann is a very learned and a very able man—but do not his writings present examples of this? He possesses the art of balanced statement, and he frequently sums up the case on the two sides with much impartiality. But, unless we are much mistaken, when it comes to the general view he does not strike the balance so equitably. He treats the surplus of argument on his own side as far greater than it really is. He obtains his main position by a *tour de force*, and the facts must be accommodated to it as best they may.

It seems to us that such a position is like Napoleon's retreat from Moscow. The army is still fairly compact, and it seems as though it still had strength to overthrow obstacles in its front; but it does not know what swarms of Cossacks (in the shape of unanswered difficulties) are gathering in its rear, and its safe return behind the frontier line is rather a forlorn hope than a matter of assured confidence.

For our own part we believe that the methods and temper of Hort and his Cambridge colleagues are not only sounder in themselves, but more in accord with the genius of the Anglo-Saxon peoples. And we conclude with the hope that students of theology on both sides of the Atlantic may not desert them.

# RECENT TENDENCIES IN THEOLOGICAL THOUGHT.

By AUGUSTUS H. STRONG,
Rochester.

THEOLOGY claims to be a science because it is the recognition, classification, and interpretation, by reason, of objective facts concerning God and concerning God's relations to the universe. Theology, however, is a product of reason, not in the narrow sense of mere reasoning, but in the larger sense of the mind's whole power of knowing. Man does not consist of intellect alone; and, paradoxical as it may seem, man does not know with the intellect alone. States of the sensibility are needed to know music; a feeling for beauty is requisite to any understanding of plastic art; and the morally right is not rightly discerned except by those who love the morally right. In a similar way there are states of the affections which are necessary to know God. It is the pure in heart that see God. He that loveth God knoweth God. And this is the doctrine of Immanuel Kant: "This faith of reason," he says, "is founded on the assumption of moral tempers. If one were absolutely indifferent to moral laws," he continues, "religious truths would still be supported by strong arguments from analogy, but not by such as an absolutely skeptical bent might not be able to overcome."

Theology is based upon faith, but theology still claims to be a science, because faith is not speculation or imagination, but the act of the integral soul, the exercise of reason in this larger sense. Faith is not only knowledge,—it is the highest knowledge; because it is the insight not of one eye alone, but of the two eyes of the mind, intellect on the one hand, and love to God on the other. With one eye you can see an object as flat; but, if you wish to see round it and get the stereoptic effect, you must use two. It is not the theologian, but the undevout astronomer, whose science is one-eyed, and therefore incomplete. Faith brings us in contact with, and gives us understanding of,

realities which to mere sense alone are as if they were not. The errors of the rationalist are the errors of defective vision. What he cannot see he declares to have no existence, and what he does see lacks truth and proportion. A woman of rank once said to Turner, the painter, that she could not see in nature such effects as he depicted upon his canvas. The artist only replied: "Ah, madame, do not you wish you could!" He had a sense of beauty which she had not. So the Scripture speaks of the eyes of the heart, and intimates that they must be enlightened, before we can come to a knowledge of religious truth.

Now theology is in large part the effort to justify to the one eye what was originally seen by the two; or, in other words, to find rational confirmation and explanation of the facts certified to us by faith. It is not wonderful, it is only natural, that, with this twofold origin of our religious knowledge, there should be at different times a predominance of the one element over the other. Insight at one time overtops logic, and logic at another time overtops insight. For this reason the history of theological thought is, like the history of thought in general, a history not of rectilinear but of spiral progress. Excessive confidence in one source of knowledge provokes revolt. Advocacy of the other goes to the extent of utter denial of the first. The next generation comes back to the element that had been denied, but grasps it now more intelligently, in an organic synthesis with truth gotten from the other source. But theology stands now on a higher plane than it did before. It not only sees with both eyes, but the astigmatism that saw things double is corrected, and it is perceived that a true science is inseparable from religion.

It is, I believe, in the interest of no sect or school, but only in the interest of simple scientific truth, that I purpose to discuss recent tendencies of theological thought. I call attention to them because the element of truth in them gives to them a certain value, though the element of error needs to be eliminated if we would get from them an unqualified result of good. We must acknowledge that the exaggerations of mediæval and of post-Reformation theology, and its pretense to a knowledge

beyond what is written, have by natural reaction given place to a questioning of much that is true and fundamental. Gnosticism has given place to agnosticism, not so much with regard to the existence of God, as with regard to the person and work of Christ. The raw sailor who was ordered to steer toward the north star was found to have lost his course and to be driving his vessel toward quite a different quarter of the heavens, but his excuse was that he "had *sailed by* that star." Current theology for the last twenty years in Germany, and now at length in this country, has sailed by the pole star that used to guide it — the deity and atonement of our Lord — and it becomes a serious question whether the star has changed its place or whether theology has gotten off its proper track.

Though this theology presents a conception of our Lord quite new to this generation, its watchword nevertheless is: "Back to Christ." This phrase expresses a revolt from the old orthodoxy, and at the same time suggests a reason for the revolt. Supernaturalism on the one hand and dogma on the other are held to be accretions, if not excrescences, upon original Christianity. Science, it is thought, must strip off these integuments and go back to the earlier Jesus, who was only a moral teacher and the best of men. Some would call this Jesus the historical Christ, others would call him the ideal Christ; but both classes would agree that we must give up the Christ of supernaturalism and dogma, and must go back to a Christ who can stand the tests of modern scientific investigation.

When Professor Blackie of Edinburgh was asked to go back for his church government to the fathers, he replied that he had no objection to antiquity, but that he preferred to go back still further, to the grandfathers, namely, the apostles. So there is a great truth in this phrase, "Back to Christ," and the main purpose of this article is to vindicate it. I, too, would go back to Christ, but in a larger and deeper sense than the phrase commonly bears. I would go back to Christ, as to that which is original in thought, archetypal in creation, immanent in history; to the Logos of God, who is not only the omniscient Reason, but also the personal Conscience and Will, at the heart of the uni-

verse. I would go back further than to the birth of the Son of Mary, namely, to the antemundane life of the Son of God. I would go back to Christ, but I would carry with me and would lay at his feet all the new knowledge of his greatness which philosophy and history have given. I would reach the true Christ, not by a process of exclusion, but by a process of inclusion. And this I claim to be an application of the methods of science, when science possesses herself of all accessible facts and uses all her means of knowledge.

We must judge beginnings by endings, and not endings by beginnings. Evolution only shows what was the nature of the involution that went before. Nothing can come out, that was not, at least latently, in the germ. I must interpret the acorn by the oak, not the oak by the acorn. Only as I know the glory and strength of the mighty tree, can I appreciate the meaning and value of the nut from which it sprang. "We can understand the amœba and the polyp," says Lewes, "only by a light reflected from the study of man." It is only an application of this method of interpreting the germ by what comes out of it, when Christian faith sees in Christ the source of the whole modern movement toward truth and righteousness, makes his historic appearance upon earth the beginning of a spiritual kingdom of God, and so recognizes him as divine Wisdom and Love incarnate. I would go back to Christ; but I would let nature and humanity and the church tell the true nature of him from whom they all derived their being and in whom they all consist.

There is an insight of Christian love which rejects the conception of Christ as a merely ethical teacher—a teacher who made no claim to supernatural knowledge and power—and to this testimony of experts science must give heed. It is very plain that the Christ to whom recent theology bids us go back is not the Christ on whom the church has believed, and who has wrought the transformations which have been witnessed in individual lives and in Christian history. It is not such a Christ as this to whom the penitent has looked for forgiveness and the sorrowing for comfort. It is not for such a Christ as this that the martyrs have laid down their lives. The insight of love has

through all the ages recognized Christ as a miraculous and divine Saviour. Can that be a true theology which ignores the testimony of these centuries of Christian experience? Is it not more likely that the naïve impressions of a two-eyed reason may be more trustworthy than the critical perceptions of a one-eyed intellect? I do not quarrel with efforts to bring incarnation and resurrection within the domain of a higher order. To say that "all's love" does not prevent us from saying in the same breath that "all's law." All I claim is that there is as much evidence of divine freedom as there is of human freedom; that nature does not prevent surprising and unique acts of God, any more than it prevents surprising and unique acts of man; and that intellect enlightened by love can not only recognize but defend the rationality of the incarnation of God in Jesus Christ, and of an atonement for the sins of men made by him who is the original Author and the continuous Upholder of their being.

The gospels and epistles of the New Testament afford trustworthy evidence that these Christian convictions have a sound historical basis, are justified by the actual teachings and events of Jesus' life, conform to the essential beliefs of the earliest followers of Christ. Of all our present gospels, the gospel according to Mark is acknowledged to represent most nearly the first Christian tradition. If Christ had been what the recent theology supposes, of what sort should we expect Mark's gospel to be? Surely it should consist mainly of an account of Jesus' life; it should be devoid of miracle; it should be replete with moral teaching. But what are the facts? The Sermon on the Mount, the fullest statement of our Lord's ethical instruction, is wholly lacking in Mark's gospel; miracles are crowded into it so thickly that it is justly called the Gospel of the Wonderworker; instead of the life of Christ being the dominant thought, the reader gets the impression that Jesus is hurrying onward to his death, and that his death, instead of his life, is the work which he came to accomplish. If we are to determine what Christianity originally was by the testimony of the earliest gospel, it would appear that its main characteristics were not our Lord's holy life and ethical teaching, but rather his supernatural power and his atoning death,

If it be said that even Mark gives us more than the original gospel, and that we cannot absolutely rely on anything in him which is not also found in the other synoptics, I call attention to the fact that the briefer triple tradition, vouched for by all three evangelists, contains the narrative of the healing of the leper and the paralytic, the casting out of the Gadarene demons, the raising of Jairus' daughter, the multiplying of the loaves, the walking on the sea, and the transfiguration. All three gospels declare Christ's power to forgive sins, his lordship over the Sabbath, his giving of his blood for his disciples. They predict his resurrection, his second coming, the eternal validity of his words, the final triumph of his kingdom. Here is dogma as well as miracle; in fact, the words deity and atonement are only the concrete statement of the impressions which these facts and utterances make upon us. Unless, then, the whole of this earliest story was fraud or delusion, to go back to Christ is to go back to a being of supernatural power, whose mission is not so much moral teaching as it is dying for men's sins.

In the four great epistles of Paul we have even earlier witnesses than the gospel according to Mark, for these epistles were composed before Mark put the gospel story into written form. Paul indeed wrote at a time when there were still living a multitude of persons who had seen Jesus and who could contradict any erroneous account of him. Yet Paul asserts Christ's resurrection as an indubitable fact,—the one fact, indeed, upon which Christianity itself was based. Not only is this greatest of miracles declared, but it is made comprehensible by Paul's teaching with regard to our Lord's divinity and incarnation. In Paul we have already the germs of the Logos doctrine of John's gospel. The epistle to the Philippians tells us that, before the incarnation, Christ was in the form of God; the epistle to the Colossians tells us that it was he through whom the universe was made and upheld. Though the epistle to the Hebrews is not directly from Paul's hand, it only expresses the substance of Paul's doctrine when it expressly gives to Christ the name of God. Nor is there in all these utterances any evidence that

such doctrine was new. They declare only what was incontrovertible matter of faith in the days of the apostles.

When we come to John's gospel, therefore, we find in it the mere unfolding of truth that for substance had been in the world for at least sixty years. That the beloved disciple, after a half-century of meditation upon what he had seen and heard of God manifest in the flesh, should have penetrated more deeply into the meaning of that wonderful revelation, is not only not surprising,—it is precisely what Jesus himself foretold. Our Lord had many things to say to his disciples, but then they could not bear them. He promised that the Holy Spirit should bring to their remembrance both himself and his words, and should lead them into all the truth. And this is the whole secret of what are called accretions to original Christianity. So far as they are contained in Scripture they are inspired discoveries and unfoldings, not mere speculations and inventions. They are not additions but elucidations, not vain imaginings but correct interpretations. If the Platonizing philosophy of Alexandria assisted in this genuine development of Christian doctrine, then the Alexandrian philosophy was a providential help to inspiration. The microscope does not invent,—it only discovers. Paul and John did not add to the truth of Christ,—their philosophical equipment was only a microscope which brought into clear view the truth that was there already. Human reason does impose its laws and forms upon Scripture and upon the universe, but in so doing it only interprets their real meaning.

When the later theology, then, throws out the supernatural and dogmatic, as coming not from Jesus but from Paul's epistles and from the fourth gospel, our claim is that Paul and John are only inspired and authoritative interpreters of Jesus, seeing themselves and making us see the fullness of the Godhead that dwelt in him. If we go back to Christ, we must go back with all the light upon his being and his mission which Paul and John have given. Instead of stripping him of supernatural and dogmatic elements, we must clothe him with them, for they are his own. Without them, indeed, Christ is no Saviour. Mrs. Browning said well in Aurora Leigh:

"The Christ himself had been no Lawgiver,
Unless he had given the Life, too, with the Law."

He could not *give* the life unless he *were* the Life. Those who would go back to Christ, in the sense of discarding the supernatural and the dogmatic, deprive us of the very essence of Christianity, and leave it without authority or efficacy. They give us simple law instead of gospel, and summon us before a tribunal that damns us. To degrade doctrine by exalting precept, is to leave men without the motive or the power to obey the precept. The Alexandrian philosophy enabled Paul and John to interpret Christ better than this,—it enabled them to see in him the life of God, and so the life of man. Not only the Alexandrian philosophy, but all subsequent philosophy—yes, all science, all history, all art—has its part to play in enlarging and classifying our conceptions of him. And so we come to our proper task. Let us go back to Christ, with the new understanding of him which modern thought has given us. We propose to go back from deism to Christ the Life of Nature; from atomism to Christ the Life of Humanity; from externalism to Christ the Life of the Church.

Deism represents the universe as a self-sustained mechanism, from which God withdrew so soon as he had created it, and which he left to a process of self-development. It insists on the inviolability and sufficiency of natural law, as well as on the exclusively mechanical view of the world. The solar system is regarded as a sort of "perpetual motion," which God made, indeed, but which does not need God to uphold it. I do not claim that the Christian church or the Christian pulpit has consciously adopted this view, but I do claim that both church and pulpit have unconsciously been far too greatly influenced by it. We have fallen in with modes of thinking caught from the skepticism of the past century, and are only gradually coming to realize how irrational and unscriptural they are. Modern science and modern philosophy have been teaching us better. The fact of the dissipation of energy shows that the universe can be no "perpetual motion," and that mere mechanism can never explain the forces which are presupposed in it. Force itself

can never be understood except as the exercise of will. Dead things cannot act. God must be *in* his universe, in order to any movement or life. The living God must be the constant source of power.

Thus the thought of the world inclines more and more to the conviction that no merely mechanical explanation of the universe suffices; that biology is more fundamental than physics; and that underneath physics must be pyschology. The system of things cannot be conceived as a Universe, without postulating an omnipresent Reason and Will. The Christian believer goes further than this. He instinctively identifies this omnipresent Reason and Will with him from whom he receives the forgiveness of sins, who dwells as a living presence in his soul, and before whom he bows in unlimited worship and adoration. In all this he only follows the lead of Scripture, for the Scripture, too, identifies the omnipresent, living, and upholding God with Jesus Christ. In other words, the eternal Word through whom the universe was created is still the life and sustainer of it, and this eternal Word took bodily form and manifested his fullness in Jesus Christ. The deism that separated nature from God and virtually denied his omnipresence is demonstrated to be error, only when we recognize Christ as Immanuel, God with us. It is none other than the Creator and Upholder of the universe, that has died to save us. All nature assumes new significance now, as instinct with the same love and care that led our Lord to endure the Cross. Nature is not itself God, and we are not pantheists. But nature is the constant expression of God. In it we hear the same divine voice that spoke from Sinai under the old dispensation, and that uttered the Sermon on the Mount under the new. Ruskin once wrote: "The divine mind is as visible in its full energy of operation on every lowly bank and moldering stone as in the lifting of the pillars of heaven and settling the foundations of the earth, and to the rightly perceiving mind there is the same infinity, the same majesty, the same power, the same unity, and the same perfection manifested in the casting of the clay as in the scattering of the cloud, in the moldering of dust as in the kindling of the day star." But

how much more sacred and beautiful does the world become when we get back to Christ its Maker and its Life! When we recognize him therein, nature may well be called a great sheet let down from God out of heaven, wherein is nothing common or unclean. The smallest diatom that clings to the waving reed is worthy of profound study because the wisdom and will of Christ are displayed in it, and the Milky Way is but the dust thrown aloft by the invisible chariot wheels of the infinite Son of God, as he rides forth to subdue all things unto himself.

In this recognition of Christ as the Life of Nature, I see the guarantee that theology and science will come to complete accord. They are but pictures of Christ's working taken from different points of view. Theology tells us the *Why*, while science tells us the *How*. We need have no fear of evolution, for evolution is only the common method of Christ, a method, however, which does not fetter him, because his immanence in nature is qualified by his transcendence above nature. Immanence alone would be Christ imprisoned, as transcendence alone would be Christ banished. Reason and faith are not antagonistic to each other. They are working toward the same end—the discovery and unfolding of the truth as it is in Jesus. When the great tunnel of St. Gothard was constructed, workmen bored simultaneously from either side of the Alps. For nearly ten years they worked on in the dark. But, in 1881, one of the parties began to hear, through the lessening thickness of intervening rock, the sounds of the hammer and the voices of the workmen from the other side. Then it was a small matter to break through the barrier, and to clasp hands. It was a wonderful feat of engineering to bring together those two sets of workmen in the heart of the mountain and in the center of a tunnel nine and one-half miles long. But Christ our Lord is accomplishing a greater wonder in bringing together in himself the forces of reason and of faith, of theology and of science, that through all the Christian centuries have been blindly approaching each other. Their union is possible, simply because theology has been seeking Christ and Christ is the truth, while science has been seeking the truth and the truth is Christ.

As I proposed to go back from our modern deism to Christ the Life of Nature, so I now propose to go back from our modern atomism to Christ the Life of Humanity. Atomism, in my use of the word, may be defined as that system of thought which regards men merely as individuals, and which ignores the organic unity of mankind on the one hand, and its connection with God on the other. The New England theology is a striking illustration of the lengths to which this atomism could go. It came to regard each human being as an isolated unit, completely detached from others. The members of the race, if indeed there could be said to be a race, were separated from each other as bricks set up on end that tumble only as they are influenced from without, or as grains of sand that have no other union but that of mere juxtaposition. A sign of this method of thought was creationism, with its origination of each human soul by separate divine *fiat*. Another sign was the maxim that all sin consists in sinning—a denial that there can be any corporate sin, or race responsibility, or organic unity in the primal transgression. And still another sign was the declaration that each man must make his own atonement—which means that there can be no atonement at all; for, unless Christ shares our humanity and we share his, there can be no escape from our own personal guilt and penalty.

Modern science and philosophy have been gradually undermining this atomistic system. Evolution, with its doctrine of the common origin of the race; traducianism, with its declaration that soul as well as body is derived from our ancestry; sociology, with its recognition of corporate good and evil; political ethics, with its attribution to the state of a quasi-personality; all these have been working to the advantage of Christian theology. Visiting the sins of the fathers on the children was thought to be most irrational so long as it was seen only in Scripture; but, now that it takes the name of heredity, it is just as vigorously applauded. It once seemed harsh to say that the soul that sinneth it shall die, but when this is called the reign of law, the only danger is that even God will be denied the power to save the sinner. We have taken at least this step

forward: We see that humanity is one, that it has a common origin, a common evil, a common destiny. Realism has superseded the scheme of arbitrary imputation. Humanity is a great tree which is not to be viewed from above, as a mere collection of separate leaves rustling in the breeze, but from beneath, as all the outgrowth of one trunk and root, and as all throbbing with one common life.

Thus far we have gotten, but there is another step to take, and to take that step is to furnish the principle of unification to both philosophy and theology. This common life is the life of God in Christ. Humanity is not a congeries of independent units,—it is an organic whole because the life of Christ is in it, and it is a manifestation of himself. What Origen in the third century said of the universe at large, we can apply to humanity: "As our body, while consisting of many members, is yet an organism which is held together by one soul, so the universe is to be thought of as an immense living being which is held together by one soul, the power and Logos of God." I hardly need to point out how greatly this relation to one another and to Christ exalts our human nature. We are interrelated, because we are related to Christ, who is the life of humanity. Pelagianism saw man's dignity in isolation. It was man's declaration of independence — independence of his fellows, and independence of God. But that independence was a false independence, —it was sin itself, separating the creature in will and purpose from the Creator. The true dignity of man is in his union with God; and that union, both natural and moral, is mediated only by Christ. We are coming to see that man lives, moves, and has his being only in Christ, the Word and Life of God. The individual, so far as his activities are rational and normal, is only a part and a manifestation of a greater whole. His ideals, his conscience, his inspiration, when he is inspired, come from a higher and larger Reason than his own. Freedom and holiness are found only in voluntary union with Christ. As we are one with him by creation, and receive from him a physical and natural life, so we may become one with him by re-creation, and receive from him moral and spiritual life.

In his light alone we see light, and without his life our spirits die.

I am here tempted to undue expansion in expounding the relations of my theme to atonement and to justification. I feel assured that, when we get back to Christ and recognize him as the life of humanity, we have found the key to these deepest problems of theology. I have hope for theology when I read in a recent non-theological review[1] such words as the following: "Christ is not only the goal of the race which is to be conformed to him, but he is also the vital principle which molds each individual of that race into its own similitude. The perfect type exists potentially through all the intermediate stages by which it is more and more nearly approached; and, if it did not exist, neither could they. There could be no development of an absent life. The goal of man's evolution, the perfect type of manhood, is Christ. He exists and has always existed potentially in the race, and in the individual, equally before as after his visible incarnation, equally in the millions of those who do not, as in the far fewer millions of those who do, bear his name. In the strictest sense of the words he is the life of man, and that in a far deeper and more intimate sense than he can be said to be the life of the rest of the universe."

This quotation prepares us for still another statement. As we have tried to go back from deism to Christ the Life of Nature, and from atomism to Christ the Life of Humanity, so we now propose to go back from externalism to Christ the Life of the Church. Humanity is not itself the church, although many recent theologians would almost identify the one with the other. And humanity is not itself Christ, although some would almost persuade us that there is no Christ but the gradually developing divine idea in human nature. Both of these views fail to take seriously the fact of sin. Sin is confounded with weakness or disease or ignorance, instead of being regarded as self-perversion. It is regarded as the result of heredity and environment, the survival of animal traits, the negative condition of progress,

[1] EMMA MARIE CAILLARD, on "Man in the Light of Evolution," in the *Contemporary Review*, December 1893, pp. 873–881.

instead of being frankly recognized as willful violation of law and departure from God. In short the blame of sin is laid upon the Creator. But sin comes not from the Creator,—it comes from the creature. It is not a manifestation of Christ, but of the individual will. It is self-chosen moral separation from Christ, the soul's true life. But the Christ, from whom the soul cannot physically and naturally separate itself, still works within, to enlighten the conscience and to renew the will. There is an original grace, as well as an original sin. And Pfleiderer has well said, in reply to Kant's sole dependence upon the individual will: "The Christian doctrine of redemption is that the moral liberation of the individual is not the effect of his own natural power, but the effect of the divine Spirit, who, from the beginning of human history, put forth his activity as the power educating to the good, and especially created for himself in the Christian community an organ for the education of the peoples and of individuals."

This divine Spirit we would call Christ. The church is valuable as representing him, but when we hear the church spoken of as if it were the one organ through which Christ manifests himself, we see in this an externalism against which we feel called to protest. We would go back of the church to the life hid with Christ in God which the church only expresses. Not first the church and then Christ, but first Christ and then the church. Not church ordinances make men Christians, whether the water of baptism or the wine of the supper, but only the regenerating Spirit of Christ within the soul. Man can destroy himself, but life and holiness can come only from another and a higher than himself. While it takes only one to do evil, it takes two to do good. King Alfred a thousand years ago expressed it with laboring quaintness of phrase: "When the good things of this life are good, then they are good through the goodness of the good man that worketh good with them,—and he is good through God." And Oliver Wendell Holmes, with all his dislike for Calvinism, could write:

> "Our midnight is thy smile withdrawn;
> Our noontide is thy gracious dawn;

Our rainbow arch thy mercy's sign;
All, save the clouds of sin, are thine."

Here are unconsciously proclaimed the doctrines of grace. And the God who cannot be tempted of evil and who tempteth no man, but who is the only source of redemption and of righteousness, is Jesus Christ. Even Pfleiderer can say: "That the divine idea of man as 'the son of his love,' and of humanity as the kingdom of this Son of God, is the immanent final cause of all existence and development even in the prior world of nature—this has been the fundamental thought of the Christian gnosis since the apostolic age, and I think that no philosophy has yet been able to shake or to surpass this thought—the corner stone of an idealistic view of the world."

I am not now concerned to point out the exaggerations of which this doctrine is susceptible. It is possible to make ideal humanity, rather than the divine Christ, the center and source of redemption. It is possible to call the whole of humanity an Immanuel and Son of God and its whole history a continual incarnation of God, while at the same time denying the actual preëxistence and the essential deity of Jesus Christ, and refusing to give to him the divine name. But the power that works in universal humanity for good cannot be simply the power of an idea. It must be the power of a present living person, with his people, according to his promise, even unto the end of the world. As it is possible to substitute for this present Christ a mere abstract and ideal conception, so it is possible to substitute for him a historical Christ, in the sense of a Christ of the past, a remembered Christ, who now exists only in the fancy or imagination of the believer, with no more present life and power than the ideal Christ of whom we have been speaking. What else, indeed, can the so-called historical Christ be but an imaginary Christ, when the history of that Christ in the gospels is accounted mere legend and myth? Those who would take us back to this ideal Christ or to this historical Christ, in the senses in which they use these terms, ignore Christ's exaltation, and give us only the humbled Son of God. With Matthew Arnold, they might utter their lament:

"Now he is dead! Far hence he lies
In the lorn Syrian town;
And on his grave, with shining eyes,
The Syrian stars look down."

The Christ to whom I would go back is a different Christ from either of these. He is not simply a being of the past. He is Lord of the present and Judge of the future. He is the Eternal Word of God, the King of the Ages, the Prince of Life, the Worker of all Good, the same yesterday and today and forever. The militant church, filled with his Spirit and moving forward to the conquest of the world, is proof that he is risen from the dead, and that all power in heaven and earth is given into his hands.

So from deism we go back to Christ the Life of Nature; from atomism to Christ the Life of Humanity; from externalism to Christ the Life of the Church. I would have you notice that I have not used the word substance, but the word life. It is a mark of progress in philosophy that it has outgrown the old scholastic terminology of substance and qualities, essence and accidents, and has gone back to the far simpler and more scriptural category of life and its powers. It is good to get back to Christ, for he is the Life. Christ has his representatives, indeed. Church and ministry, Bible and doctrine, are his servants. But the servants have sometimes taken the vineyard for themselves and have driven out the Lord. Church and ministry, Bible and doctrine, are not themselves Christ, and they cannot save. It is only Christ who is the Light, and they are worthy of reverence only because they reflect his light and lead to him. Just so far as they usurp his prerogative, and claim for themselves the honor and the power that belong to him, they injure his cause, and substitute a subtle idolatry for the worship of the true and living God. A large part of the unbelief of the present day has been caused by the unwarranted identification of these symbols and manifestations with Christ himself. Neither church nor ministry, Bible or creed, is perfect. To discover imperfection in them is to prove that they are not in themselves divine. The remedy for unbelief is the frank confession that perfection lies not in

these, but in him of whom they are the finite and incomplete representatives.

> "They are but broken lights of Thee,
> And Thou, O Lord, art more than they."

From all these means and agencies our Lord draws our thought to himself. "I am the Way, and the Truth, and the Life,"—the Way and the Truth, because he is the Life. "I am the Resurrection and the Life,"—the miracle and doctrine of the resurrection are possible only because Christ is the Life.

What, then, is the relation of theology to Scripture on the one hand, and to philosophy on the other? Some would say that no theology is valid which is based upon either. Others would make theology a mere form of philosophy. But the solution of this problem, as of every other, is found in Christ. The grain of truth in both these views is their protest against the elevation of media to the place of source, of means to the place of ends. The fault of current evangelical theology is that it treats Scripture as the original source of truth, instead of regarding it as the mere expression of Christ who alone is the truth. The result is that we have had a double standard, and Scripture has been played against Christ and Christ against Scripture. There can be but one standard of truth or of right, even as there can be but one standard of commercial values. Not creed, but Christ; not conscience, but Christ; not Scripture, but Christ.

Now Christ is not shut up, for the expression of himself, to Scripture. Philosophy and science are expressions of him as well as Scripture. Our rational being is his work; his life pulsates through our mental processes; our ideals, our aspirations, our sympathies, just so far as they are just and true, are his voice. Because Christ is immanent in all men, their visions of truth and beauty and righteousness reveal him who from the beginning has been the light of the world. Sin has curtailed and perverted these sources of truth, and therefore Scripture furnishes a rectifying principle, and we test our conclusions by comparing them with the law and the testimony. But that is not to say that Scripture is itself the only and the perfect source of doctrine. Even Scripture is the incomplete manifestation of

One who is greater than it—even Christ, who alone is the wisdom and the truth of God.

To the man who has wearied himself in seeking for the truth amid abstract doctrines and formal creeds, it is an unspeakable relief to find that the truth is a personal Being, and that Christ himself is the Truth. This, as I interpret his book, was the experience of Berdoe. He was a student of medicine. He became an agnostic. Entangled in the toils of unbelief, yet eager to find some satisfaction for conscience and heart, he asked a certain theological professor where he could find light. And the professor wisely said to him: "Buy a set of Robert Browning." Browning's continual insistence that Love is the central secret of the universe, and that this love is demonstrated in Christ, turned the medical student from an agnostic into a believer, and his recent book, entitled *Robert Browning and the Christian Faith*, is his own confession of faith. It is an illustration of the extent to which Christ is entering into modern literature and is turning poets into prophets. Not first doctrine and then Christ; not first creed and then Christ; not first inspiration and then Christ; not first Scripture and then Christ; but first Christ and then Scripture, inspiration, doctrine, creed,—this is both the order of logic, and the order of experience. Only Christ in us, a principle of life, makes Scripture, inspiration, doctrine, creed intelligible; only the truth within enables us to understand the truth without.

We need not only truth, but power. If truth be not a person, if it be not one with the life and will at the center of the universe, then it is only vain poetizing to say:

> "Truth crushed to earth will rise again,
> The eternal years of God are hers;
> While error, wounded, writhes in pain,
> And dies amid her worshipers."

Truth, without God, is an abstraction and not a power. In all moral conflicts there is an inward unsusceptibility, arising from the perversity of the affections and the will, which renders the work of truth's advocate long and arduous. When we look within and without we shall be pessimists, unless we believe that this truth is one with the reason and will of God which has been

manifest in Jesus Christ. Only they have a right to say that truth is mighty and will prevail who believe in the cross as God's judgment against moral evil and in the resurrection as God's pledge that this evil shall be overcome. He who goes back to Christ as the life and power of God can have no doubt as to the issue of the struggle between good and evil, truth and error, for the secrets of all hearts are known to Christ, and he is the omnipotent force that works for good in human history. The solid globe is in his grasp, and when our prayer touches the hand that upholds the western hemisphere, the other can instantaneously answer that prayer in India or in Japan. His will is the electric current that throbs through the universe, and the faith of the humblest Christian can work wonders simply because it brings the soul into connection with that inexhaustible source of power. Light and movement are possible to the church of God, because the faith of the church, like the trolley, lays holds of him in whom is all the fullness of the Godhead, and to whom all power in heaven and earth is given. And we have hope for the race, hope for a kingdom of God in human society, hope for a purified nationality and state, hope for a parliament of man and federation of the world, because our Christ is not confined to the church, but is the universal Life of humanity, the Principle of all ethical and spiritual evolution, the one and only Revealer of God in the universe.

# CRITICAL NOTES.

## HABAKKUK 3:10, 11, 15.

THE third chapter of Habakkuk is full of problems for the textual critic. It is the purpose of this little paper to throw some light on vss. 10, 11, 15 by comparing them with Psalm 77:17–20. These two passages have more in common than seems to have been recognized.

Psalm 77 is made up of fragments welded together. In verse 17 there is a change of meter from trimeter couplets to trimeter triplets. That is, the prevailing measure of the first sixteen verses is a verse or line of six main words, or feet, divided into two parallel members of three main words each, as, vs. 16:

גאלת בזרוע עמך ‖ בני יעקב ויוסף.

But with the next verse begins a new section of four verses in which the meter requires verses, or lines, of *three* trimeter members each, of which the first two are normally parallel, while the third develops or extends the thought.

The third chapter of Habakkuk is not thus frankly composite, although it has suffered interpolations and dislocations. As a whole, and with these exceptions, it is of singular unity. It is a prayer offered to Yahveh in anticipation of great danger from a foreign foe. It begins with a petition for the divine theophany for protection. That theophany immediately follows. Yahveh comes from his sacred seat in the mountains of the south, driving his chariot of thunder through the clouds, wielding his shafts of lightnings, accompanied by his dire attendants, Pestilence and Fever, filling the river torrents and trampling the seas. The prophet is affrighted at the vision, and yet trusts the divine goodness. The meter is generally trimeter couplets, except where, as in vs. 13, b. 14, the measure is entirely lost by the insertion of an incompatible passage, probably from a marginal note. The tenth and eleventh verses, which are a part of the passage to be considered, carry on directly the description of the theophany, telling its effect on the waters; and then how the sun and moon disappeared from view, and how the lightnings were shot abroad. By a dislocation

of thought, and very likely of text, the description of the theophany is interrupted with vss. 12–14 to tell its purpose, which was to stamp down the heathen oppressors and save the faithful nation. This digression interrupts the parallel with Psalm 77; but the description of the theophany is resumed in vs. 15, and with it the parallel with Psalm 77. In comparing these verses of Habakkuk's prayer with the passage in the psalm we must keep in mind the contrast in the purpose of the writers. Psalm 77 is wholly reminiscent. It looks back to the deliverance of Israel from Egypt, and expects similar deliverance in the future; while the prophet makes not the slightest allusion to past deliverances, but simply describes the appearance of Yahveh in his chariot of storm, as he comes from Teman to overwhelm his foes.

The two passages which are substantially common to the prayer of Habakkuk and Psalm 77 may be put in parallel columns as follows, the words or parts of words common to both being printed in larger type.

| Habakkuk 3:10, 11, 15. | | Psalm 77:17–20. | |
|---|---|---|---|
| ראוך יחילו הרים | 10. | ראוך מים אלהים | 17. |
| זרם מים עבר | | ראוך מים יחילו | |
| | | אף ירגזו תהמות: | |
| נתן תהום קולו | | זרמו מים עבות | 18. |
| רום ידיהו נשא: | | קול נתנו שחקים | |
| | | אף חצציך יתהלכו: | |
| שמש .... .... | 11. | | |
| ירח עמד זבלה | | קול רעמך בגלגל | 19. |
| | | האירו ברקים תבל | |
| לאור חצציך יהלכו | | רגזה ותרעש הארץ: | |
| לנגה ברק חניתיך: | | | |
| | | בים דרכך | 20. |
| דרכת בים סוסיך | 15. | ושביליך במים רבים | |
| חמר מים רבים: | | ועקבותיך לא נודעו: | |

The comparison hardly leaves it doubtful which form more nearly represents the original. The substantial unity of sustained thought in the Habakkuk chapter, as contrasted with the cento form of the psalm, gives the priority to the former. The congruous metrical arrangement in Habakkuk, compared with the insertion of this bit of trimeter in the psalm, points to the same conclusion. Yet more conclusive is the

literary construction of the verses, which are less natural and more padded out in the psalm. We have substantially the original form in the prophet, while the compiler of the psalm has introduced the passage from Habakkuk rewritten in a different meter, and applied to a different topic, looking backward to the deliverance from Egypt by the Red Sea, instead of forward to a future theophany and deliverance, yet preserving as far as possible the characteristic expressions. Where the two texts differ we cannot slavishly correct one by the other, but each may suggest where misreadings or omissions of copyists have taken place in the other.

In comparing the two we first observe that where the Habakkuk version has הָרִים the psalm has מַיִם. Here the Habakkuk text is probably right. While either mountains or waters might properly be said to *writhe*, it is rather more appropriate that the mountains should be said to *see* Yahveh as he approaches; and the figure of shaking, trembling, or leaping is familiar as applied to mountains and hills rather than to waters. Besides there is good reason why the compiler of the psalm, who had in view the deliverance of Israel from Egypt by way of the Red Sea, should have changed הָרִים to מַיִם, but the reverse would be a less likely change. In Psalm 97, in which there are phrases from these two passages, the mountains *melt* before the appearing of Yahveh, while it is to the earth, and not the waters, that the two verbs of our passage are applied, רָאתָה וַתָּחֶל הָאָרֶץ.

The second member of this couplet, זֶרֶם מַיִם עָבָר, corresponds to זֹרְמוּ מַיִם עָבוֹת, of verse 18 of the psalm. Here we must give the preference to the psalm. The parallelism gives us first the mountains writhing and trembling as the storm reaches them, and then the clouds which gather about them pouring down streams of waters. The *passing over*, עָבָר, of the flood is not germane. The poet must show its intensity, not its cessation. We may then correct Habakkuk by adopting this member just as it stands in the psalm.

The first couplet of vs. 11 is mutilated, and there is no parallel passage in the psalm from which we may restore it. As it stands now it is a tetrameter instead of a trimeter, and has no parallel member. The full original form would probably have told how the sun retired to his chamber, or concealed himself, while the moon stood still in its (his, *masc.*) habitation. The personal suffix of זְבֻלָה is not feminine but masculine, as elsewhere in Habakkuk.

In the second member of vs. 11 the shorter term חִצֶּיךָ may well be retained against the חִצֵּי of the psalm. But in the same line

יתהלכו would seem preferable to דילכו. The meaning of the couplet is, "For light" (*i. e.*, in place of the light of the sun and moon which had retired during the storm), "thine arrows were going abroad; for brightness, the lightning of thy spear."

Verse 15 of Habakkuk cannot be corrected by the corresponding verse 20 of the psalm. In the latter the word אלהים has probably dropped out at the end of the first member, where it was used for padding out the passage by the somewhat mechanical versifier, just as in vs. 17. With this correction the parallelism is too good to be disturbed by accommodating it to the Habakkuk form. The noun דרכך is required by שבילך and עקבותיך; and yet בים דרכך אלהים was suggested by דרכת בים סוסיך, two words being nearly the same in both, while the parallel members have מים רבים in common. Instead of the noun חמר a verb form is required, חמרו or הומו.

WILLIAM HAYES WARD.

NEW YORK CITY.

## SUGGESTIONS CONCERNING THE ORIGINAL TEXT AND STRUCTURE OF AMOS 1:3—2:5.

ONE always approaches with hesitation the work of correcting the Old Testament text. But if we rightly consider the matter, we shall see that the hesitation is ungrounded. The evidence is overwhelming that the present text has suffered countless changes at the hands of careless scribes and interested editors. I am, at present, particularly interested in the help for the reconstruction of the text which is furnished by the strophic structure, and it is from this point of view that the following suggestions are offered. The problem is a most interesting one, and if the main proposition is true, the field opened is a wide one. I am not unmindful of what has already been done in this direction by students of Hebrew poetry.

The passage proposed for consideration is a unit, whether we regard it from the point of view of author or editor. Nowhere may we find better evidence of poetic skill than in the writings of Amos, whose work falls in the earliest period of written prophecy. An examination of these sections, seven in all, reveals clear indications, at the same time, of the artistic character of the original structure and of the violation of the same. For the sake of convenience of treatment, a convenience which grows out of the structure itself, I desire to present the sections in three groups, viz., (1) the sections concerning Damascus and

Gaza, 1:3–5 and 6–8; (2) the sections concerning Ammon and Moab, 1:13–15 and 2:1–3; (3) the sections concerning Tyre, Edom, and Judah, 1:9, 10; 1:11, 12; 2:4, 5. I shall restrict myself to a presentation of the text as restored and in the case of each group to a few remarks upon the more important changes.

*Judgments upon Syria and Philistia.*

| 1:6–8. | 1:3–5. |
|---|---|
| (1) כה אמר יהוה<br>על־שלשה פשעי עזה<br>ועל־ארבעה לא אשיבנו<br>על־הגלותם גלות שלמה<br>להסגיר לאדום | (1) כה אמר יהוה<br>על־שלשה פשעי דמשק<br>ועל־ארבעה לא אשיבנו<br>על דושם בחרצות הברזל<br>את־הגלעד |
| (2) ושלחתי אש בחומת עזה<br>ואכלה ארמנותיה<br>והשיבותי ידי על־עקרון | (2) ושלחתי אש בבית חזאל<br>ואכלה ארמנות בן־הדד<br>ושברתי בריח דמשק |
| (3) והכרתי יושב מאשדוד<br>ותומך שבט מאשקלון<br>ואבדו שארית פלשתים<br>[אמר אדני יהוה] | (3) והכרתי יושב מבקעת־און<br>ותומך שבט מבית־עדן<br>וגלו עם־ארם קירה<br>[אמר יהוה] |

The changes proposed are the following:

(1) In 1:3–5: (*a*) To connect "ושברתי וגו (1:5) with str. 2, instead of with str. 3, as indicated by M. T. This line completes the thought of str. 2, forming its culmination, and is really shut out of str. 3, both on account of the syntax which binds closely together lines 1 and 2 of str. 3, and by the rising thought of the str., which is suggested in the climax, "inhabitant" (*i. e.*, common people) (l. 1), "ruler" (l. 2), "whole people" (l. 3). (*b*) To omit "אמר י (v. 5) as superfluous.

(2) In 1:6–8: (*a*) To transpose והשיבותי ידי על־עקרון (v. 8$^b$) to follow the last line of v. 7 (see above). This brings the lines beginning with והכרתי into the same position in this section as in the corresponding section; the lines beginning with ותומך are also brought together, and, still further, there is thus secured a climactic arrangement for str. 3. (*b*) To omit here as before the superfluous אמר אדני יהוה.

With these slight changes, the two sections exhibit the most striking parallelism in structure. This is seen in both sections, (1) in the trimeter movement which prevails throughout; (2) in the strophic division, 5+3+3; (3) in the first line of str. 1; (4) in the use of על at the beginning of lines 2, 3, 4 of str. 1, with a change in l. 5; (5) in the short line (dimeter) closing str. 1; (6) in the verbal forms beginning lines 1, 2, and 3 of str. 2; (7) in the similar language used throughout strophes 2 and 3.

It is impossible to suppose that the poet was not striving for this similarity. The changes suggested make the parallelism as strict as it could well be made with a different subject for each strophe.

*Judgments upon Ammon and Moab.*

| 2:1–3. | 1:13–15. |
|---|---|
| (1) כה אמר יהוה<br>על־שלשה פשעי מואב<br>ועל־ארבעה לא אשיבנו<br>על־שרפו עצמות מלך־אדום<br>לשד המת בשאון מואב | (1) כה אמר יהוה<br>על־שלשה פשעי בני־עמון<br>ועל־ארבעה לא אשיבנו<br>על־בקעם הרות הגלעד<br>למען הרחיב את־גבולם |
| (2) ושלחתי אש במואב<br>ואכלה ארמנות הקריות<br>בתרועה בקול שופר | (2) והצתי אש בחומת רבה<br>ואכלה ארמנותיה<br>בתרועה ביום מלחמה |
| (3) והכרתי שופט מקרבה<br>וכל שריה אהרוג עמו<br>אמר יהוה | (3) והלך מלכם בגולה<br>הוא ושריו יחדו<br>אמר יהוה |

The changes proposed are the following:

(1) In 1:13–15: (*a*) To treat as a gloss בסער ביום סופה (v. 14) because it is only a weak repetition of the preceding clause, and has nothing to correspond to it in the parallel section on Moab, the parallelism between the two sections being otherwise perfect.

(2) In 2:1–3: (*a*) To restore לשיד (2:2) to לשד (*cf.* for a similar use of the objective genitive Ps. 12:6, and note the use of this word in Amos 3:10, 5:9 (*bis*), and (*b*) to join with it המת וגו׳ (for ומת); the rendering would be, *for the violation of* (= *thus violating*) *the dead, in return for desolation to Moab;*[1] this makes the number of lines in both

[1] I confess that this is not satisfactory; but it is no worse than the text, or the many emendations which have been suggested, and which I cannot here take up.

sections the same, allows the lines beginning ואכלה and בחרונה to stand together, provides a parallel line for the purpose-clause 'למען וגו, and removes the inexplicable לשחית from a line to which it cannot belong.

*Judgments upon Tyre, Edom, and Judah.*

Line 3 of str. 3 may or may not be retained.

1:11, 12.

כה אמר יהוה
על־שלשה פשעי אדום
ועל־ארבעה לא אשיבנו
על־רדפו בחרב אחיו
וישחת לעד אפו

ושלחתי אש בתימן
ואכלה ארמנות בצרה

1:9, 10.

כה אמר יהוה
על־שלשה פשעי צר
ועל־ארבעה לא אשיבנו
על־הסגירם גלות שלמה לאדום
ולא זכרו ברית אחים

ושלחתי אש בחומת צר
ואכלה ארמנותיה

2:4, 5.

כה אמר יהוה
על־שלשה פשעי יהודה
ועל ארבעה לא אשיבנו
על מאסם את־תורת יהוה
וחקיו לא שמרו

ושלחתי אש ביהודה
ואכלה ארמנות ירושלם

As thus constructed, the three sections stand together and differ radically from the four which have already been presented. In each of these cases str. 1, like str. 1 of the four preceding sections, includes (1) the divine authority (line 1), (2) the use of the symbolical numbers marking the transgression in a general way as one often repeated (ll. 2, 3), (3) the more specific change (ll. 4, 5). Str. 2, in each of these cases (1) has two lines instead of three, (2) predicts destruction by fire which shall devour the palaces, (3) corresponds literally to lines 1, 2 of str. 2 of the four preceding sections (except that the first section uses והצתי for ושלחתי). There is nothing here to correspond to line 3 of str. 2, or to str. 3 of the preceding pieces. The explanation of this striking variation of form will be discussed later. The changes which have been made are as follows:

(1) In 1:9, 10, none; this being the original type of the shorter section.

(2) In 1:11, 12; (*a*) the omission of the gloss ושחת רחמיו; (*b*) the omission of the gloss ועברתו שמרה נצח (these phrases bear upon their face the character of the gloss); (*c*) the restoration of וישרף to וַיִּשֹׂר (*cf.* Syr. ).[2]

(3) In 2:4, 5; (*a*) the omission of the gloss ויתעם כזביהם אשר הלכו אבותם אחריהם, which is comparatively late in the thought expressed (*cf.* Ex. 32:1, Dt. 9:12), very awkward in its syntactical connection with the preceding, and plainly the interpretation of what precedes by a later writer.

We have now four pieces of very similar form on Syria, Philistia, Ammon and Moab; and three pieces of similar form, distinct from the four, on Tyre, Edom, and Judah. Is there any evidence that the last three are interpolations?

*The Edom sections:* (1) The names Teman and Bozrah occur elsewhere only in late writings (so Wellhausen). (2) Edom, in early times, was subject to Judah, and suffered more from Judah than Judah from Edom. How could a prophet from Judah reproach Edom for cruelty? The cruelty which furnished the basis for ill-feeling on the part of Israel, came with the exile when Edom "behaved shamefully towards Israel." It was not unnatural, therefore, that a later writer, devoid of historical perspective, and thinking that Edom deserved denunciation, should frame a section which in due time secured a place in the text of Amos.[3]

*The Judah section:*[4] (1) The introduction of this section removes entirely the force of surprise which the Israelites would otherwise have felt; (2) it seems impossible to suppose that Amos would have treated Judah so cursorily and in a manner so like that with which he treated the outside nations; (3) the times of Judah's sin are of a Deuteronomic character and of a later origin (*cf.* חקיו לא שמרו, Dt. 4:6, 6:24, 16:12, 17:19) with the frequently recurring phrases *to observe to do, to observe and do;* (4) the transgression of "instruction" and "statutes" was too indefinite and not so flagrant as to call for its introduction in this place; (5) there is a "certain tameness and vagueness of state-

[2] See OLSHAUSEN, on Ps. 103:9.

[3] See recent commentaries, especially GUNNING, WELLHAUSEN, GEORGE ADAM SMITH, *in loc.*

[4] GEORGE ADAM SMITH, Vol. I, p. 135.

ment, which contrasts remarkably with the usual pungency of the prophet's style."

*The Tyre section:* This is mentioned last because it is least clear. Suspicion has attached itself to (1) the fact that Tyre alone is mentioned, the other cities being passed over (*cf.* on the other hand, Gaza, Ekron and Ashkelon in the case of Philistia); (2) the similarity of thought and language in the judgment upon Gaza; (3) the absence of the usual formula; (4) the similarity in form to that of Edom and Judah. The answer of George Adam Smith [5] is not satisfactory.

If these considerations are valid, we find that one strophic construction prevails in the original material and quite a different one in the later addition. Here *form* confirms the suspicions which had already been aroused as to the authenticity.

In conclusion: (1) Whether the seven sections or only four of the seven are treated as authentic, the evident purpose of the author (or authors) is to put the material in poetic form, and in the treatment of each section to use essentially the same form, and, so far as possible, the same words. (2) This being true, we are warranted in supposing that radical variations, for which no other explanation may be offered, and in which the entire symmetry of the piece is destroyed, are the result of textual corruption, or editorial change. (3) If in the piece as a whole, two entirely different strophic types appear, we must suppose that this is due either (*a*) to the desire of the author for mere variety, or (*b*) to a distinct purpose in connection with the thought of the piece, or (*c*) to the fact that it is the work of a different author. The last explanation would have force only if strengthened by other considerations.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. WILLIAM R. HARPER.

## PETER'S SOJOURN IN ROME.

IT is not my intention in this brief note to discuss the fact of Peter's presence in Rome. That he found his way thither in the latter part of his life, and met his death there, is now so generally recognized among scholars that it would be gratuitous to argue the matter. But though the fact itself may be regarded as established, the date of the apostle's arrival in Rome and the length of his stay there demand, it seems to me, renewed investigation.

The prevalent opinion is that he did not reach Rome until after the close of Paul's two years' imprisonment, which is commonly put

[5] *The Twelve Prophets*, Vol. I, p. 128.

into the year 63 or 64, and that he died in the persecution of Nero, which occurred in the summer or fall of 64. This leaves at most but a single year for his residence in the city. But it must be confessed that it is very difficult, if he was there so short a time, to account for the early and widespread tradition that he was bishop of the church of Rome for many years; and still more difficult to explain the fact that in the memory of that church his figure overshadowed Paul's from an early day. Dogmatic considerations undoubtedly had much to do with the growth of Peter's reputation and authority, but dogmatic considerations alone do not account for it. Long before the Christian world had assigned him an official preëminence in the apostolic college, he was honored as the founder of the Roman church, and it must be evident to every careful student of primitive Christianity that the subsequent history of that church remains a mystery unless some commanding figure, animated with the conciliatory and practical spirit which we know Peter possessed, and representing quite another than the Pauline type of Christianity, made his influence powerfully felt in its early development. But the condition of things in Rome, as depicted in Paul's epistle to the Philippians, was hardly such as to make it possible for Peter or anyone else to gather together the various discordant elements and start the church upon that consistent and confident career which was already well under way before the close of the first century, unless he spent a long time in the city. A few months or a year would not have been sufficient to give him that controlling and permanent influence which both history and tradition seem to presuppose. Under these circumstances it is worth asking whether the opinion as to the duration of his Roman sojourn, commonly shared at least by Protestant scholars, will not bear revision.

That Peter suffered martyrdom is too well attested to admit of doubt (*cf.* John 20:21, Clement, *ad Cor.*, 5 f.); and though it cannot be certainly proved that he met his death in the great persecution of 64, it is altogether probable that he did. It was the common belief of the church, at any rate, from the second century on, that he suffered under Nero, and it may be seriously doubted whether, after the outbreak in 64, Nero in any way concerned himself with the Christians during the remainder of his reign. The connection in which Peter's martyrdom is mentioned by Clement of Rome may also be taken as an indication that he died either in the great persecution or before it; and the tradition that he was crucified (Tertullian, *De præscr. Haer.*,

36) and the statement of Caius of Rome (quoted by Eusebius, *H. E.*, II, 25) that he was buried in the Vatican, which was the scene of the butchery, both go to confirm the assumption that he was one of its victims. Though it is possible, therefore, to suppose with Professor Ramsay that he lived until a later time (*Church in the Roman Empire*, p. 282, f.) it is by no means easy to do so.

On the other hand it may be regarded as absolutely certain, in the light of the situation in the Roman church presupposed in Romans, Philippians, and 2 Timothy, that Peter did not come to Rome before or during Paul's imprisonment there. The question then is, if he suffered martyrdom in 64 and did not reach Rome until after the close of Paul's imprisonment, can his sojourn in the city be made of sufficient length to satisfy the conditions referred to above? Or, in other words, can Paul's imprisonment be put some years earlier than commonly supposed?

It is well known that the date of Paul's imprisonment depends upon the date of the accession of Festus as procurator of Judea, for almost immediately thereafter Paul left Cæsarea for Rome, where he arrived in the following spring. The accession of Festus is commonly put into the year 60. Schürer, who accepts that date, closes his careful discussion of the subject with the words: "Am correctesten ist es, mit Wurm zu sagen: frühestens 58, spätestens 61, wahrscheinlich 60." But there is good ground, it seems to me, for cutting loose from the prevailing opinion, thus expressed, and for pushing the date of Festus' accession back to the year 55. Josephus records that Festus' predecessor, Felix, was accused before Nero by prominent Jews of Cæsarea, and that he escaped punishment only because of the influence of his brother Pallas, who at that time enjoyed especial favor with the emperor (*Ant.* XX, 8, 9). But Tacitus reports that Pallas fell into disfavor with Nero and was relieved of his offices before the end of the year 55 (*Ann.* XIII, 14), and the historian's account of Nero's attitude toward Pallas, and his silence touching any reconciliation between them, to say nothing of the emperor's treatment of Agrippina, with whose fortunes those of Pallas were so intimately bound up, make it very difficult to believe that the latter again acquired influence at court. That Pallas was acquitted of the crime of conspiracy a few months after his dismissal from office (Tacitus, *Ann.* XIII, 23) cannot be urged as a proof that he subsequently enjoyed Nero's favor, for he had expressly stipulated at the time of his dismissal that he should not be questioned for any part of his past conduct (*Ann.* XIII, 14), and Tacitus remarks

that his "acquittal was not so gratifying [evidently meaning to the emperor] as his arrogance was offensive" (XIII, 23).

But the accusation from which Felix was relieved by the good offices of his brother was made after his departure from Palestine and after the accession of his successor, Festus (*Ant.* XX, 8, 9). It seems, therefore, that the latter must have become procurator in 55, for before the end of that year Pallas was in disgrace, while Nero ascended the throne too late in the previous year (October 13) to send Festus to Palestine before the early fall, when Paul was dispatched to Rome (*cf.* Acts 27 : 9).

Against this opinion no valid objections can be urged. The fact that most of the deeds ascribed to Felix by Josephus are related in connection with the reign of Nero (*Ant.* XX, 8; *B. J.* II, 13) has no significance, for, all told, they are very few, and of the same general character, and may easily have been accomplished within a few months or even weeks. Nor do the words addressed by Paul to Felix two years before the close of the latter's term of office ("Forasmuch as I know that thou hast been for many years a judge unto this nation," Acts 24 : 10), prove anything. For even though Cumanus may not have been succeeded by Felix until 52, as Tacitus and Josephus seem to imply (*Ann.* XII, 54; *Ant.* XX, 7, 1), Tacitus expressly says in *Ann.* XII, 54 that Felix had already been for a long time (*jam pridem*) governor of Judea, including Samaria, while Cumanus was governor of Galilee. Josephus, to be sure, says nothing of such a division of the province, but his account at this point is so improbable in many of its features and contains so many palpable inaccuracies that we can hardly hesitate to follow Mommsen in preferring the authority of Tacitus to that of Josephus (so also Ramsay, *St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 313). Paul's words, therefore, might have been uttered in 53, when, if the view presented in this paper be correct, he was taken a prisoner to Cæsarea, as well as in 58 or any other year. No objection to the view here maintained can be deduced from the chronology of Paul's life, for if the period between his conversion and his second visit to Jerusalem (Gal. 2 and Acts 15) be made fourteen instead of seventeen years there is no difficulty in putting that visit, with the Apostolic Council, five years earlier than the date commonly adopted.

But if Festus became procurator in the year 55, as I have endeavored to prove, Paul must have arrived in Rome in the spring of 56, and his death, with which his two years' imprisonment closed, must have occurred in 58. It is quite possible, then, to suppose that Peter

came to Rome very soon thereafter, and spent six full years in the city. A stay of that length is abundant to satisfy all the conditions referred to in the beginning of this paper.

The earlier date for Festus' accession adopted in this note has been maintained also by Kellner in the *Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie*, 1888, p. 630 f. (and in other articles according to Schürer), also, according to Schürer, by Weber, in his *Kritische Geschichte der Exegese des 9ten Kapitels des Römerbriefes*, 1889 (a work I have not seen), and more recently (1895) by O. Holtzmann, in his *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, p. 128 f.; but, so far as I am aware, no one has deduced from it the conclusion that Peter may have come to Rome some years earlier than ordinarily supposed, and that, therefore, even though he perished in the persecution of Nero, he may have spent a long enough time there to influence permanently the development of the Roman church. That this consideration in turn lends confirmation to the proposed revision of the accepted chronology of Paul's later years will hardly be denied.

ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York.

## ST. PAUL'S USE OF δικαιοῦν.

THE meaning of δικαιοῦν in the epistles of St. Paul is a matter about which biblical scholars have come to a general agreement. And it seems therefore a rather bold matter for anyone to reopen the question. And I should not do so if there had not seemed to be a curious kind of iteration in the recent treatment of the subject, indicating that the conclusions had been reached without any particular independence or freshness of investigation, as if later students had stood in awe of such concurrent opinion. The main points in this traditional view are, first, that the verb does not mean to make righteous, probably never means that, even in other writings; secondly, that in St. Paul's epistles it does mean to judge righteous; and, thirdly, that in the case of believers this judgment is not on the ground of their righteousness, but solely for reasons outside themselves. On the contrary, I affirm with but little hesitation that it is simply impossible to carry the meaning, *to judge righteous*, through St. Paul's writings with any attention to grammar or context; that there are whole classes of passages in which a rational exegesis makes this use absurd; secondly, that the discarded sense, to make righteous, is the very fundamental meaning

that we want, and which will satisfy both grammar and context; and, thirdly, that in those passages in which a judicial act is meant the ground of the judgment is δικαιοσύνη in its proper sense of righteousness. Under the second of these heads, it is not meant that the verb means *to make righteous* necessarily in the ethical sense, as the Holy Spirit creates righteousness where before it did not exist. That is only one of the ways in which a person or an act may be made righteous, among others being a judicial act by which he is constituted a righteous person in the sight of his fellows. But even in the cases where a judicial act is denoted, the construction is often such that the general meaning *to make righteous* will alone justify that, though analysis reveals that the specific manner of the general act is that of judgment.

Coming now to the passages which justify, or even demand this view, we will consider first those which present such a grammatical construction as to exclude the meaning to judge righteous. Rom. 3 : 28 says that a man is justified by faith without the works of law, the dative πίστει being used. Now, if it is a judicial act that is under consideration, the only natural relation of faith to the act is that of cause, διὰ τὴν πίστιν. The dative expresses agency, and the only agency is that of judge. It is an understatement of the difficulty created by this consideration, to say that it throws doubt upon the judicial sense. If there is no rebutting evidence, it simply makes it impossible, and if there is reason to accept the meaning on other grounds, it involves a very anomalous elasticity of language. Besides the judicial and the ethical meaning of the verb, there is only one other possible, viz., to show or prove right, an office never sustained by faith, since it is essential to the Pauline thought that faith produces the state of righteousness, whether it be ethical or judicial, instead of being included in it in such a way that the faith can be taken as proof of the righteousness.

In Rom. 3 : 30, Gal. 2 : 16, a man is said to be justified through faith, διὰ τῆς πίστεως. The difficulty in this construction is of the same kind as in the use of the dative πίστει. The relation is that of instrumentality, whereas the only proper relation of faith to a judicial act is that of cause. It is significant, certainly, if not demonstrative, that both of these constructions which properly belong with the meaning to make righteous should be used with δικαιοῦν, whereas διά with the accusative, the only proper construction with the judicial meaning, never occurs.

In Rom. 4:2 we have the statement that if Abraham was justified by works he has ground for boasting, but not before God. Seeing that God is the judge, if it means that he was judged righteous (by God) because of his works, it is precisely with God that he would have reason to boast in that case.

In Rom. 6:7 it is stated that he who died has been justified from sin. In the context this is used to confirm the statement that our old man was crucified with Christ in order that the body of sin might be done away, that we should no longer serve sin. That is, there is a positive and a negative side to this death, a resurrection to a new life as well as a death of the old man, vs. 5. This positive side is given in vs. 7; he who died has been rectified from sin. The laying aside of the old sinful life involves the putting on of a new life of righteousness, δεδικαίωται. Thus the whole context shows that it is not the judicial act which frees us from the bondage to sin, but the rectifying act. An acquittal from the accusation of sin does not destroy the body of death, and do away with the bondage to sin: it is the change from sin to holiness, the rectifying act, which does that, and this is therefore the probable meaning of δεδικαίωται here. This has been felt to be a difficult passage by those who assume that the judicial act underlies all the Pauline usage of δικαιοῦν, and they really give the verb in this case the ethical meaning by translating it "has been freed," but they profess to approach it through the idea of acquittal, progressing from the special meaning of freeing by acquittal to the general meaning of freeing. The difficulty is that the freedom attained in this case is the ethical freedom, which was precisely what they attempt to exclude. Certainly, in such a case, the short road, the direct way, is the more natural.

In 1 Cor. 6:11, we have the apostle's statement that the Corinthian Christians, who had been variously sinful, were washed, made holy, and justified in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, and in the Spirit of our God. In this passage, the other verbs are both ethical in their signification, and of the agencies, the Lord Jesus Christ and the Spirit of God, the former is indeterminate, but the other, the Spirit, is always associated with moral rather than judicial rectification. Moreover, the context requires this, rather than the judicial meaning. St. Paul tells them that they had been, some of them at any rate, fornicators, idolaters, covetous, drunkards, and the like, but that all this had been changed. Now, in describing this change, the presumption is very strong that the apostle will use expressions that denote a moral change;

for here again, it is being one or the other of these various sorts of sinner that is in question, and it is not acquittal, but moral change, that will rectify that. Starting in with this presumption, then, we have two verbs at the head of the statement which denote that kind of change, and it is fairly easy, therefore, if the other verb gives you the choice between the two meanings, to determine between them. Moreover, if you have here the two acts, and one of the agencies, the Holy Spirit, is impossible with the justifying act, then the statement ought to be classified so that each class of verb shall be connected with its proper agency. But this is not done, a fact which greatly strengthens the presumption with which we started. In Gal. 5:4, St. Paul states that as many as were justified in law were severed from Christ, and fell away from grace. The justification is of course only assumed, but what is it that the apostle assumes; that they have the righteousness of the law, or that they are judged by God to have this righteousness? I think that this is settled by the ἐλπίδα δικαιοσύνης in the following verse. If that is a hope that they will be declared righteous in the judgment, then δικαιοῦσθε is used also of the judicial process. But if it is a hope of righteousness as an ethical state, instead of a verdict of acquittal, then the contrasted ἐν νόμῳ δικαιοῦσθε denotes the same. We shall have to deal later on with the improbability that δικαιοσύνη denotes other than an ethical state, but here, even assuming that it had the supposed legal sense elsewhere, the nature of this statement would require the other. For δικαιοσύνη is here a matter of hope, a thing eagerly expected, whereas the apostolic justification is a past and sure fact. There is a judgment, to be sure, in the future, but the apostle never hints that that is to be on the basis of faith, but always of works. Moreover, the Spirit comes in here again in an inconvenient way for strict Lutheranism. It is by the Spirit from faith, that we expect this righteousness, and the Spirit is always the agent of moral rather than legal rectification. To be sure, Meyer treats this as the agent of the hope rather than of the righteousness, but this divides the statement hopelessly. For ἐκ πίστεως belongs logically with δικαιοσύνης, and it would be desperately confusing to join Πνεύματι with ἐλπίδα therefore. To quote from the epistle to Titus is to travel outside of undoubted Pauline sources. But the epistle represents Paulinism, if it is not by the apostle himself. Now, in Titus 3:7, God is said to save us through the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit, which he poured out upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour, that we, having been justified by his grace, may become heirs in the way

of hope of eternal life. There is a possibility of translating δικαιωθέντες *judged righteous*, but the probability is the other way. Probably δικαιωθέντες sums up the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit in the preceding part of the verse.

Other passages might be cited, but none of which those quoted do not give us examples. One consideration has been suggested, however, that merits further examination. While it is worthy of careful consideration that δικαιοῦν elsewhere rarely means *to make righteous* in the ethical sense, it is a still more considerable fact that δικαιοσύνη never elsewhere has the meaning attributed to it in St. Paul. This noun has properly the meaning of personal virtue, as a consequence of which one occupies the position of a righteous man among men and before God. Now it is assumed that St. Paul, when discussing this matter of personal righteousness, maintains that the only righteousness possible to a man is not the personal virtue with the accompanying state, but the position before God without the quality. The quality is impossible, unattainable, and only the position is bestowed on men gratuitously by God. This is called δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ because it is thus gratuitously bestowed, and it is contrasted with ἡ ἰδία δικαιοσύνη, the righteousness won by man's own endeavor. It is also called δικαιοσύνη πίστεως because faith is the condition of its bestowal, but the idea is carefully excluded that faith has in it the quality of righteousness. This would be to deny the fundamental position that God gratuitously bestows the position without the quality. Against this it is surely a grave objection that this meaning of δικαιοσύνη is a solecism. Moreover, while the alleged misuse of δικαιοῦν, consisting in giving it the ethical sense, is justified by the natural meaning, this assumed Pauline use of the noun is a clear departure from the proper meaning, and in no way deducible from it. It is a denial of the essential quality of righteousness to introduce fictions into the meaning of the word. If the apostle really means that God treats as righteous an unrighteous man, he could scarcely have chosen a fitter way of travestying this act than by calling the state into which the man is introduced by such a divine clearance, righteousness. Righteousness is not only primarily, it is all the way through, a matter of personal quality, of reality therefore, and to introduce a modified meaning here is to involve a contradiction of the original sense in the further development of the meaning. But let us examine the facts. Does St. Paul really give this fictitious sense to δικαιοσύνη? When, *e. g.*, he says that there is no respect of persons with God, he means that no

consideration can avail with God as Judge, except the possession of the quality which is made the matter of inspection and judgment (Gal. 2: 6). If it is the matter of beauty, he does not call the person beautiful because he is rich; if it is honesty that is in question, he does not favor the Jew rather than the Gentile in his judgment; if it is righteousness, he does not regard circumcision or baptism in his decision of the case. Now, then, to apply this principle to the case in hand, does St. Paul mean that God makes an exception of faith, by judging the possessor of it righteous, when faith itself is a non-moral quality? Would not this be respect of persons, pure and simple, merely another example of calling a man beautiful because he was rich, or wise because he was an Englishman?

Again, the apostle calls this righteousness of God a righteousness of faith, and says that faith is counted to the believer as righteousness. The natural interpretation of this phrase, righteousness of faith, makes it analogous to the phrase, righteousness of honesty, or purity, or love. That is, it affirms righteousness of faith, instead of making it merely the non-moral condition on which an unrighteous man is put into the position of righteousness. It is acknowledged that faith is what approves a man to God, but it is denied that it is because he is righteous. It is singularly and fatuously misleading, then, to call it a righteousness of faith. It may be anything else than that, but that it is not, evidently. Moreover, the apostle argues the case of Abraham, showing that it was the greatness of his faith, the admirable quality of it, its persistence under difficulties, and its strong hold on God, that caused it to be counted to him for righteousness. But it is another aspect of this case of Abraham that is especially significant. His faith is not Christian faith, and yet it is counted to him for righteousness. It is recognized in the dogma of justification that there is a flaw in it, that inasmuch as the quality of righteousness is not found in the faith, there must be something outside the faith that causes it to be accepted as righteousness, and this is found in the propitiatory work of Christ. The real ground of acceptance with God is this, and the faith comes in only as that which makes this available for us. But St. Paul ascribes righteousness to faith where the object of faith is not this, but, *e.g.*, the resurrection of our Lord, the promise of a seed to Abraham, and so on where it is the faith itself that is accepted (Rom. 4: 16–22, 25; 10: 9).

Once more, faith is spoken of as coming through hearing, and hearing through the word of God (Rom. 10: 17). That is, it is evoked

by its object, and this object is the word of God. Now it is of the very nature of faith that it is the response of man to the qualities fitted to draw it out. My belief in goodness, in truth, in love, the trust which they awaken in me, means the awakening in me of the same qualities. The fourth gospel states this quality of faith in chapter 3: 18–21. He who believes in him (Jesus), it says, is not condemned, but he who believeth not has been condemned already because he has not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God. And this is the condemnation, that light has come into the world, and men loved darkness rather than light because their deeds were evil. Belief in our Lord, that is, shows affinity with the light that he brought into the world in his own person.

In 1 Cor. 1 : 24, faith is said to be that by which the Corinthian Christians stand. Their steadfastness in the Christian life is due to their faith. But if steadfastness is itself good, it cannot spring from a quality not possessing moral character. Or rather, to state it more exactly, St. Paul, before he finishes his argument, shows his anxiety to trace everything in salvation to God, and in this case their steadfastness is due to him, and faith is here, as everywhere, the organ of communication with him. But evidently the organ of this communication must belong to the highest things in man, and can scarcely be of that indifferent character, that God is purely gratuitous in ascribing righteousness to it.

But it is reserved to the epistle to the Galatians to make the strongest statement of the righteousness of faith. In Gal. 2 : 20, St. Paul states that the life which he now lives he lives by the faith of the Son of God, who loved him and gave himself for him. Faith is here again made the very basis of the Christian life, giving it whatever value it possesses. What is not only good in itself, but is the very spring of goodness, can scarcely count for so little in what St. Paul calls the righteousness of faith that the word righteousness in the expression has to be taken in a strictly fictitious sense. Again, in Gal. 5 : 6, faith is described in the same way as that which works through love. Here, for life in the previous statement, is substituted the specific principle of that life, which the apostle himself recognizes as the fulfilling of the law. Love is not only righteousness, it is the principle of righteousness, and yet it is recognized as the working out of faith, the fruit of faith. It would be a modifying circumstance if the general statement into which this characterization of faith is introduced were different from the one in which we have been examining its meaning, *i. e.*, if it

were not the matter of justification. But it so happens that it is just this question between the righteousness of faith and the righteousness of law with which the statement is concerned. It reads, "Neither circumcision availeth anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love." And circumcision is not only a part of the law, it is the part of the law about which the whole question debated by the apostle started.

A consideration of a still more general kind in this matter is the necessity of this view of the act of justification in order to maintain the consistency of the apostle's thought in regard to judgment. It is already significant that he contends for the righteousness of God in this act of justifying him who believes in Jesus. It would be a singular inconsistency if God were so careful to maintain his own righteousness in an act in which he ignores the righteousness of the man who is judged. But the matter is still further complicated by the fact that when St. Paul speaks of further acts of judgment by God, the test which is applied is the common test of life, or deeds, or righteous qualities. In Rom. 5:8, where St. Paul says that there is now no condemnation to those who are in Christ Jesus, the reason given is not something outside of the man, but that the law of the Spirit of life in Christ Jesus set him free from the law of sin and death, and that, while those in the flesh cannot please God, those in the Spirit can please him. And when he speaks of the final judgment, God is described as rendering to every man according to his works, eternal life to those who are patient in welldoing, and wrath and indignation on every soul of man that works ill. It resolves itself into this, therefore, if the judicial sense is given to δικαιοῦν, and the δικαιοσύνη is not a real righteousness, that wherever else St. Paul speaks of the judgment of God it is according to the ordinary rule of righteousness, but in this one episode he sets that aside and introduces a standard which denies that on principle. And it becomes of no use that God acts in this entirely gratuitous way, since it is the final judgment that counts, and that is on the normal basis. And the absence of condemnation meantime, in the life that lies between these two points, is because the man, living the life of the Spirit, and no longer of the flesh, is able to please God. If there is any way, therefore, to bring the judgment at the beginning of the Christian life into accord with these other judgments at the middle and end of life, it is every way desirable.

Returning now to the meaning of δικαιοῦν, we think that several things have been established. 1. That the verb does mean in some cases *to make right*, *e. g.*, in passages where the faith is itself made the

agent, a relation impossible if the act is judicial. 2. That this matter of construction makes it better to give this general meaning, even in cases where judicial action is meant, as this meaning gives us a root out of which the various special meanings can grow, as *to judge right* certainly does not. The manner of making right, whether it be proof, judgment, or ethical action, can then be determined in each case. 3. That an examination of St. Paul's treatment of πίστις and δικαιοσύνη, and of their relations to each other shows that the righteousness of faith is an inward, ethical quality, a real righteousness, and not an outward position contradictory of the inward state, a fictitious righteousness. And 4, that, therefore, where δικαιοῦν does denote a judicial act, the judgment is based on the possession of actual moral quality by the person judged, not on external considerations which would make God a respecter of persons.

That is to say, in the apostle's thought, faith is reckoned for righteousness, not such a righteousness as that of works, which is self-derived and constitutes a claim upon God, but still a righteousness, *i. e.*, the right attitude of a sinner toward God, the very starting point of which is the consciousness and acknowledgment of his sin, and the acceptance of Christ as the Redeemer from sin.

The prime difficulty in the theological aspect of the purely forensic view of δικαιοῦν is that it denies δικαιοσύνη of the act of faith. St. Paul does not deny moral quality to faith, he affirms only that it is not the righteousness of works. He not only does not deny it, he affirms it, and in the very connection of our subject, saying that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision avails anything, nor uncircumcision, but faith working through love. This righteousness is carried over into the life and becomes the basis later on of the favor with God in Rom. 8, and in the final judgment. The reason why it justifies is because it contains in itself the spiritual power which the law lacks. It energizes through love, which with St. Paul, as with Jesus, is the essential principle of righteousness. And it is through faith that Christians receive the Spirit, which is the divine source of righteousness in man. At the same time, we must not forget that what the apostle emphasizes is the gratuitousness of God's justification of the sinner, and the demerit of the man himself. There is a sense, and it is this which the apostle emphasizes, in which justification amounts to an acquittal of the unrighteous, a something which demands a defense, a restatement of the divine justice which seems to have been relaxed in it. For, after all, the normal standard of righteousness in the apostle's view is the law.

The reason why it does not justify is not because of any defect in the law itself, which is holy and just and good, but rather the moral perfectness and stringency of the law over against the moral imperfectness of man. The law which is fulfilled in the love of God and man is the perfect rule of life and the standard by which the life is to be judged. The man who does not live up to that is a sinner, not only a sinner according to law, but a sinner. And so, if you substitute for that any other standard of righteousness, and under that declare a man righteous who by the law is unrighteous, that is justifying the unrighteous. It is God's grace that appears in the transaction, and man's demerit, and the justification is gratuitous. Only, and this is the thing which adjusts it to a true theodicy, it is not the sinner as such who is declared righteous, but the sinner who believes, and it is his faith which is reckoned to him for righteousness.

E. P. GOULD.

EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Philadelphia.

# RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM, being the Gifford Lectures in 1894–5. By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER, LL.D. 1st Ser. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. 3+333 pp. $2.50 *net.*

THIS work of a veteran metaphysician — Professor Fraser was born in 1819 and succeeded Hamilton in the chair of logic at Edinburgh in 1857 — embodies the reflections of a lifetime on the greatest of all themes. They are the reflections of an able as well as a studious man, who knows what has been said in the past on the subject by the foremost thinkers since philosophy had its birth, but whose wide knowledge has operated to stimulate his mind to independent thought. It is a mind as far as possible from being inert, but, at the same time, is in no haste to make premature avowals. The author's excellent editions of Berkeley and Locke contain introductions and notes which disclose his leanings on controverted points of highest moment, and his other writings, comparatively few in number, are, also, in this respect enlightening. What strikes us first and last in this volume, which is not a copious one, is that here we have ripe fruit. Nothing is immature, nothing bears marks of crudity. An unaffected consciousness of the gravity of the task that is undertaken is expressed at the beginning, and appears in every stage of the discussion. There is no effort to present novel forms of statement; the language is simple and natural, yet fresh from the mint. In style and method this volume is a model of philosophical clearness and sobriety, and, it may truly be added, of depth.

The problem is concerned with the meaning and purpose of the universe in which we find ourselves, or with the Infinite Reality, God. It is formulated by the author in a form partly suggested by the statement of Locke. The three existences which are recognized in common belief, and are taken into account when "the enigma" whose solution is sought is inquired into, are our own personality, the material world, and God. Each of them is differently conceived by different minds. Yet these three existences are postulated in all investigations of the kind here attempted. Supernatural revelation cannot be dogmatically assumed.

Miracles require proof, and there would be no warrant for assuming that any possible miracles would be departures from a rationality pervading the universe as a whole. Is the universe reasonable? Is there an immanent reason, an all-embracing order? "Anterior and independent of philosophy, a spontaneous faith in self, in external nature, and in God seems to pervade human experience, mixing, often unconsciously, with the lives of all; never perfectly defined, but in its fundamental ideas always and necessarily incomplete; latent often intellectually, yet never without a threefold influence in human life." The "unbalanced recognition" of one of the three over the other two is the fountain of error and moral disorder. The philosophical theories, the great generic solutions, which are examined and criticised by Professor Fraser, are examples of a like over-emphasis in the field of thought and speculation. First, we have universal materialism where God and the human ego are submerged in matter. Secondly, we have panegoism, where God and matter are alike swallowed up in the subjective consciousness. Thirdly, we have pantheism, wherein the personality of God and of man are sacrificed, and all things are brought under one or another scheme of necessity and unity. The one-sided character of each of these theories, what things are left unexplained by each, are set forth in four well-reasoned chapters, in which, as elsewhere, cogency of reasoning is associated with temperance in language. Then follows (in chap. vii) a searching criticism of the doctrine of "universal nescience," from its foundations in the writings of Hume to its latest forms as presented by Huxley, Spencer, and other recent writers. The reader who has time to study but one section of Professor Fraser's book would do well to devote his attention to this seventh chapter with the summary at the beginning of the preceding course of thought. In the chapter (x) on "God in Nature" it is shown that "natural causation is a term expressive of the interpretability of the world in which we find ourselves; and the interpretation of nature implies interpreting mind dependent on the correlation of that mind with Mind immanent in Nature." "If we are to form any conception of the substance or supreme principle of the whole, it must be the conception either of substance that is unconscious and extended, or of substance that is intelligent and foreign to extension." The materialistic hypothesis wholly fails to account for spiritual states. We are brought (chap. ix) to the subject of "Man Supernatural." We find in him the *sui generis* fact of self-determination. Both "science and morality in man imply more than natural sequence."

"An *immoral* act *must originate* in the immoral agent; a physical effect is not *known to originate* in its physical cause." Matter, inorganic and organic, presupposes mind; but the reverse is not equally true. The conscience and the religious consciousness in man are the starting point of religion within us. It is no more true of religion than it is of science, with its presupposition of order and purpose in nature, that it is a "leap in the dark in faith and hope." "Self-determining intelligence and responsibility for what is personally determined, seems to contradict the presupposed universality of natural causation, and puts us face to face with an originative cause, as that to which alone power is rightly attributed." This is a pregnant sentence. The observations of Professor Fraser on the partial comprehensibleness of that with which both cosmic faith and religious faith are concerned and which attaches, therefore, to both natural science and to theism, are extremely interesting and suggestive. In this notice of these valuable lectures nothing more has been attempted than to present their claims to the attention of all earnest inquirers into the philosophic basis of faith in the fundamental doctrines of religion.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL. GEORGE P. FISHER.

SCIENCE DES RELIGIONS DU PASSÉ, ET DE L'AVENIR, DU JUDAÏSME ET DU CHRISTIANISME. Par F. RÉTHORÉ. Paris. 1894.

No detailed account of this book is necessary to give a clear conception of the task which the author has set for himself, and of the manner in which he has accomplished it. Let it be noticed that the title announces a "scientific" rather than a historical or philosophical treatment of religious phenomena. The distinction is defined in an introduction of two pages on the "Plan and End of this Work." *History*, . . . . "by the aid of observation, establishes, describes, and coördinates the religious phenomena." *Science*, "by the aid of the critical history, ascends to the origins of these phenomena, examines the laws to which they are subject, compares and pronounces upon them." Then *philosophy*, "by the aid of the psychological and rational method, separates and selects the irreducible elements of religious thought, studies them in their genesis and logical development; but above all estimates them from the point of view of their certitude as well objective as subjective; or, in other words, evinces the principles of knowledge, of faith, and of doubt, upon the subject-matter of religion." There is something to commend itself in this way of

making the distinction; although the separate place for a so-called science of religion is much the most difficult both to find and satisfactorily to fill. But this is just the self-appointed task of the author of this book.

As to the spirit in which the task is undertaken, and the method which will be followed, we are not left in doubt. A serious and critical study of religious phenomena is proposed; and that method is to be followed which contemplates all the history of humanity as falling under causes and laws—a development occurring under the inevitable conditions of space and time. Indeed, this "rational method" does for religion what the applications of algebra and geometry have done for the mathematical sciences. Its discoverer and most masterly exponent was Voltaire, to whom the "learned and profound Buckle" gave the credit of writing one of the greatest books of the eighteenth century, and the best book on the subject up to the present time. By English readers the French critic of all religions is today so little known at first hand that few will be able to justify the dissent they will inevitably feel from this estimate of Voltaire. There are many more of these readers, however, who will intelligently reject M. Réthoré's high estimate of Buckle and his *History of Civilization.*

A fairly correct conception of the thoroughness of this attempt at a science of religion may be had from the fact that 359 pages in all are devoted to a host of difficult and complicated questions in no fewer than forty-eight separate chapters! This is an average of somewhat more than seven pages to each topic. We would by no means deny the possibility of compressing no little historical research, and even inductive proof of scientifically determined laws, into so small a space. But the exceedingly sketchy and second-hand character of the historical treatment is no less manifest than are the correspondingly slight foundations upon which the boldest generalizations of laws are made. More and more, as it seems to us, is the now old-fashioned science of civilization and its cognate study of anthropology, with its classification of "ages" according to the uses of the metals, or by some other equally arbitrary standard, proving its incompetency to handle the material in any truly scientific way. We have even less faith in the conclusions similarly gathered and woven into a so-called science of religion.

Perhaps no more effective way of briefly setting forth the nature of the conclusions at which M. Réthoré arrives can be followed than to quote the titles of several of the chapters. These titles themselves leave the author's opinions in no equivocal shape. They sound like

voices from a Daniel come to judgment in condemnation of views which a large portion of the modern Christian world, and that certainly not the most ignorant and immoral, has cherished as having almost the place of self-evident historical and experimental truth. Here are some selections from a group of similar titles: Section III, chapter xii, "Christianity has borrowed from preceding religions its ritual, its festivals, and its ecclesiastical organization;" section IV, chapter iii, "The conception of God, under Christian sacerdotalism, leads to atheism and irreligion;" chapter v, "The sacerdotal religions have falsified theoretical morality;" chapter viii, "The Christian theories of grace, of predestination, and of the eternity of punishment, have compromised the doctrine of immortality;" chapter x, "Christianity has constantly been opposed to the development of reason" (proved in three pages); chapter xi, "Christianity has been opposed to the experimental sciences;" chapter xii, "Christianity has not regenerated the world; it has even falsified practical morality."

In few words, and to hear the conclusion of the whole matter, the Semitic religions of Judaism and Christianity have been, and still are, the chief enemies of the true and natural religion; and, as well, the chief enemies of the welfare and progress of the race. Even the latter is giving way, is tottering to its fall. But "beside this fatal tree there grows a young plant, watered with the tears and often with the blood of sages from the beginning of time." This is a natural theism which is destined to replace Judaism and Christianity.

Comment is unnecessary. But we are moved to ask the simple question: "Is, then, history about to repeat itself? Is Voltairism about again to take possession of the so-called educated classes in France; and is what once followed to follow yet again in the opinions and deeds of the nation?

GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

BUDDHISM, ITS HISTORY AND LITERATURE, being the American Lectures on the History of Religions. First Series, 1894–5. By T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, LL.D., PH.D. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. 1896.

THESE lectures, delivered in various centers of the United States, by a great Pali scholar, under the auspices of a recently formed American association, are much the same, in substance and form, as the

Hibbert lectures delivered in 1881, in England, by the same author. As the object of the association is to provide opportunities for bringing to the knowledge of the American public the methods and results of specialists who have devoted their lives to a sympathetic study of the non-Christian religions, a better beginning could hardly have been made than with Dr. Rhys Davids and Buddhism. His style is admirable and general readers will get from him a warm sketch of all that is good in Buddhism without the sentimentalism and the Christian coloring so freely given to its doctrines by Sir Edwin Arnold. Of course we must expect the defects, as well as the excellencies, of the expert; and there is perhaps something in Dr. Davids' own nature, which makes the oriental pessimistic view of nature and life so attractive that he admits, only with reluctance, the inadequacy of Gautama's solution even of the problem of practical ethics. He actually puts forward a kind of *argumentum ad hominem* to enlist our sympathies on his behalf. "Gautama," he says, "was the only man of our own race, the only Aryan who can rank as the founder of a great religion. Not only so, but the whole intellectual and religious development of which Buddhism is the final outcome was distinctively Aryan, and Buddhism is the one essentially Aryan faith." All authorities would not accept this claim. Professor Beal, on the contrary, "has scarcely any doubt that the great outline of the Buddhist system was brought to India by perhaps the very first settlers in the country; that it was repressed and hidden under the paramount authority of the first Aryan invasion; and that after a time there was an upheaval of old beliefs as the new doctrine was corrupted." There can be no doubt either that it was to Sudra Emperors—Chandragupta and Asoka—who certainly were not Aryans—that Buddhism owed its temporary conquest of India; and Fergusson (*Tree and Serpent Worship*) affirms "that no Aryan race, while existing in anything like purity, was ever converted to Buddhism or could permanently adopt its doctrines." The same assertion may be made regarding the utter rejection of it by Semites. It has found its home only among the feebler members of the race and the lower forms of civilization, and though conferring signal benefits on these, it has not impelled them forward along the path of general progress.

The main question, however, to be asked is not concerning the origin but the fundamental truth of Buddhism, and here the best representatives of the modern spirit have no difficulty in pronouncing a verdict of one-sidedness. The characteristic of our age is faith in the rationality of the universe and the consequent blessedness of self-real-

ization. With Gautama, existence is an evil, and therefore the annihilation of self the only worthy aim. His profound conviction in an eternal moral order suggested the doctrine of Karma, but the doctrine is a mystery not a revelation. In strenuous work in the world, not in mendicancy and idleness; in the family, not in the monastery, is man perfected. The Christian conception of the world and of God as Father, Redeemer and Sanctifier, means that all life is to be divinized. Art is possible, for the seen is the veil of the unseen, and the impermanent a form of the eternal. Science is rational and history the revelation of a divine purpose. Industry is honorable and patriotism a duty. But a sympathetic study of Buddhism is desirable, and as Dr. Rhys Davids gives us that, he deserves our best thanks.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY,
Kingston, Canada.

GEO. M. GRANT.

RELIGIOUS CERTAINTY: Vindication of Some Fundamental Religious Beliefs. By PROFESSOR DUNLOP, D.D. Dunedin. Pp. 83.

WE welcome these six lectures on leading apologetic topics by our old friend, Professor Dunlop, formerly a well-known minister and public-spirited citizen of Dundee, Scotland; for the last ten years professor of theology in connection with the Presbyterian Church of Otago, New Zealand. The lectures are worthy of the man whom the members of the Angusshire Theological Club, in old days, regarded as their strongest metaphysician, whose talk on all subjects theological and philosophical ever showed the qualities of knowledge, grasp, and weight. They are fitted to be helpful to inquiring minds everywhere, and especially in the colonial world, where we understand agnosticism has taken a strong hold. The topics discussed are central and vital. They are these: 1. Religious Certainty; 2. Religious and Scientific Beliefs; 3. Argument from the World's Order; 4. Arguments from Intelligence and Conscience; 5. The Internal Witness of the Spirit; 6. Self-evidencing Power of the Christ of the Gospels. Within the prescribed limits the treatment is thorough, as is Dr. Dunlop's way, but the style is lucid and the interest unflagging. The train of thought commands the reader's attention and respect, not merely by the manifest competency of the lecturer, but by the rarer qualities of candor and transparent sincerity. We who live nearer the great centers of intellectual life may be inclined to think that the utterances of one living in so remote

a corner can hardly be up-to-date. The fact is not so. Professor Dunlop knows all that is going on in the theological world. In these days knowledge runs quickly to and fro over the whole earth, and good books soon find their way to every continent and island. Balfour's book on the *Foundations of Belief*, *e. g.*, finds very appreciative recognition in these pages. Balfour and Lotze are among Dr. Dunlop's favorite writers. But the chief value of these six lectures lies not in the use made of other men's thoughts, but in the author's own thoughts. His religious attitude is sufficiently indicated in these sentences from the last lecture: "For myself, I believe that greatly too much stress is laid on historical criticism as an instrument which may help either to confirm Christian belief or to shake it. He who has seen Christ in the deep sense of the word cannot be seriously disturbed even if he should be convinced that the gospels are not free from errors of detail. Mere specks of dust passing across our field of vision do not affect our belief in the reality of the sun, or alter our estimate of his illuminating powers."

A. B. BRUCE.

FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
Glasgow.

RECHERCHES SUR LE BOUDDHISME. Par I. P. MINAYEFF, traduit du Russe par R. H. ASSIER DE POMPIGNAN. Paris. 1894.

IT was well known in the circles of Buddhist scholars that Mr. Minayeff, Professor of Sanskrit at St. Petersburg, had been engaged for years on a work on Buddhism in which he would gather together the results of the numerous articles he had published since 1872. The first chapters had indeed been already printed before his last voyage to the East in 1885. At last, in 1887, the first volume appeared. But it was in Russian, and therefore a sealed book to scholars. They could see it contained citations from little-known Pāli and Sanskrit books. But they felt rather like Tantalus at the sight of those fruits until they could come to understand the propositions these fragments of texts were intended to support. Great therefore was the desire to see the translation into French, which was shortly announced, and appeared, after long delay, in 1894.

Great was the disappointment when the volume appeared. It was then seen that Professor Minayeff's long-continued studies on the materials he had collected during his travels in the East had not enabled him to add anything of much importance to the elucidation

of any of the many still undecided points in the history of the rise and development of Buddhism.

After setting out in chapter i the plan of his work the author proceeds, in the following chapters, to controvert the most generally received opinions concerning the well-known Buddhist councils, and puts forward in their place the bare statement of the astounding proposition that because, some seven or eight centuries after the Buddha's death, there arose a sect of Buddhists who rejected the orthodox canon, therefore the account of that canon given by the orthodox writers must have been drawn up *after* the appearance of this sect, and is therefore quite late and unreliable. He admits (pp. 73–4) that the tradition of these councils is common to all schools of Buddhism, and that it bears witness to a historical fact, but it is not stated what, in the author's opinion, that fact is. He confines himself entirely to the position of a denier who sneers at the "holy personages" who held the councils, and has no view of his own, or any explanation to offer of how or why the Buddhist community or doctrine came to be.

At the commencement of chapter v the author lays great stress on the importance of the many Buddhist sculptures and inscriptions in the Asoka character (found at Bharhut, Sanchi, and elsewhere), as affording evidence of what Buddhism was at the time when these sculptures and inscriptions were put up, which is universally admitted — and also by the author himself — of being at least as early as the second century B. C. He thus raises the hope that, though he rejects the literature, he will at least trust the ancient bas-reliefs and inscriptions, and will proceed now to give us, as his own positive view, a detailed account of what they contain. But this hope also is doomed to disappointment. Instead of a complete account of what they *do* contain, the author devotes two chapters to certain selected specimens only with a view of showing (as is already universally maintained) that the language of the inscriptions is not quite the same as Pāli, and that the titles of the Jātakas illustrated on the bas-reliefs are not always quite the same as those given in Professor Fausböll's edition of the Pāli text. He does not seem even to be aware that the same result had been pointed out — only in a much fuller and more complete manner — years before, and that the very same uncertainty as to the titles of the Jātaka stories is found also in the text itself.

The concluding chapters of the book contain a discussion of one or two points in the traditions as to the eighteen schools into which the Buddhists were divided before the days of Asoka. These traditions

are well known (most of them having already appeared in translations easily accessible), and the author has not been able to throw any new light upon the origin of these schools or upon the history of the development in them of Buddhist doctrine. As an appendix to these chapters is printed an edition of a Pāli bibliography in Pāli which the author discovered in Burma. This would have been a valuable addition to our knowledge if it had not already appeared *in extenso* in the journal of the Pāli Text Society. As it is, it is difficult to see the advantage of this reprint.

It is a curious result of the length of time during which this volume was being put into shape that Pāli texts, now long since published, are referred to by the pages of a manuscript, neither the author nor the translator having taken the trouble to add the reference to the page of the printed edition. Indeed a positive statement has been allowed to pass on page 14, that the introduction to the *Sumangala Vilāsinī* (published by the Pāli Text Society in 1886) can still be consulted only in Turnour's translation published in 1834.

The book has no index — an unpardonable defect in a work purporting to be a serious contribution towards the reconstruction of one of the most interesting chapters of the history of human thought.

T. W. R. DAVIDS.

A GRAMMAR OF THE DIALECTS OF VERNACULAR SYRIAC. By A. J. MACLEAN. Cambridge. The University Press. 1896.

NOTHING can be more interesting to a student of oriental literature than to hear as a spoken tongue the language used by Abraham in his father's tent, and forever consecrated on the lips of Jesus. We therefore have pleasure in commending Mr. Maclean's book as a handy and useful guide to such a desirable pleasure. The author, in carrying on the work begun by Dr. Perkins, Socin, and others, acknowledges his indebtedness to the researches of Nöldeke. Five years' residence in Eastern Mesopotamia, in charge of the Anglican Mission, has enabled him to study the Syriac dialects, which differ in each village, and must therefore be as troublesome as the Greek of the Archipelago. Mr. Maclean considers that the vernacular is not derived from the classical language, but we can see no evidence of this in his book. We are glad to hear that all the mission presses eschew phonetical spelling, which in the case of Syriac, so closely pressed by Arabic, would

be peculiarly objectionable, as concealing the analogies and derivation of words. We recommend those who study Syriac, even if for purely missionary purposes, to begin with the classical tongue. This, as is the case also with Greek, gives a foundation to work from, and the dialectical variations can then be easily learned, whereas a classical language is never grasped with any satisfaction after one of its modern forms has been acquired.

The book is written and compiled with much simplicity and clearness. Paragraphs and words referring to the ancient language are marked O. S., and those referring to each dialect with a distinguishing letter. Much that is written of the dialects applies of course also to the classical tongue, the differences of construction between the former and the latter being, as in Greek, in the way of greater modern flexibility. Yet, save in a few colloquial expressions, such as ܒܠܫ for ܠܥܠ and ܨܠܚ for ܐܬܐ, the classical scholar will not meet much that is altogether strange to him. One of the most notable innovations is the formation of the causative in verbs by prefixing ܫ, and even that has its root in Afel participles.

The classical student will find this book both instructive and interesting. There is something charming in the sound of many of the quadriliteral verbs, a long list of which is given, and this, as well as the instances of metathesis which follow, will often be found useful in clearing up puzzling points in manuscripts. The chapter on Hardening is indispensable for easy intercourse with the people. A few pages of proverbs add to the human interest of the volume.

CASTLE BRAE,
Cambridge, England.

MARGARET C. GIBSON.

GEOGRAPHIE DES ALTEN PALÄSTINA. Von D. F. BUHL. Freiburg i. B. u. Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr. 1896.

DR. BUHL'S *Geography* forms one of the series of summary handbooks entitled "Grundriss der theologischen Wissenschaften," and chiefly known to Old Testament students by Cornill's *Einleitung in das A. T.* and Benzinger's *Archäologie*. It is a worthy fellow of these eminent works. Within the narrow limits imposed by the plan of the series Dr. Buhl has succeeded in producing a rich, and almost exhaustive, work of reference. For years he has been known as an expert in the subject. Not only has he contributed solutions to a number of

problems in the topography of Hauran and Gilead, but in the twelfth edition of the Lexicon of Gesenius he has treated the whole of the place-names of the Old Testament with a fullness and accuracy never attempted in any previous dictionary of the Hebrew language, and excelled only by Dr. Francis Brown of New York, in the opening parts of the current Oxford Dictionary. Occasionally the summary plan of his volume has prevented Dr. Buhl from an adequate statement of the conclusions of other scholars from whom he differs, and I propose, therefore, to devote the most of this review to a discussion of some relevant matters in which I have taken some interest. His deficiencies on these points, however, are but slight drawbacks to a work the wide and accurate information of which will be admired most of all by those who have busied themselves with the details of so crowded and, in parts, so confused a field.

But first it will be right to note the fresh contributions which Dr. Buhl has made to our knowledge of names and places in Palestine. At a point in the history of Palestinian research, where we are confronted with a mass of hasty and unreasonable identification, it is a positive merit in Dr. Buhl's book that he has so few new proposals to make. The English survey of the surface of the country covered so many regions hitherto only partially investigated, and collected so many new place-names, that the temptation to over-identification naturally proved too strong to some of its leaders; and while we rejoice in the very numerous additions which they provided to the certainties of our knowledge of the topography of eastern Palestine, we must be excused from feeling the duty of even discussing a considerable number of their proposals. The Reduced Map of the English Exploration Fund, with the historical names of various periods in differently colored letters, is still quite the best map for students to work with or travelers to use in their tours through the land; but one has only to glance at its crowd of colored names to see that a large proportion of them must be ignored by those who wish to proceed not arbitrarily but with caution. Till excavation becomes general in Palestine her fields present the gleaner with but few and scattered opportunities of adding to the harvest of previous research, and the spirit of doubt will be more useful to him than that of adventure. Dr. Buhl is eminently sober and sound. Where so many are tempted to be original, he has passed the "self-denying ordinance" which, while it may limit the suggestiveness of his work, enables it to achieve the wholesome and reliable reputation of the rest of the series to which it

belongs. His proposals are almost exhausted by the following list: Ḥaṣer-'enon of Ezek. 47:17 he identifies (67) with Banias; with the Ḥarerim of Jer. 17:6 he compares the stony tracts in the Arabian border now known as Ḥarra (118); for Argob he proposes the district of Ṣuwet (119); for the Brook Cherith the Wadi el Ḥimar (121), rightly rejecting the W. el 'Ajlun as too much of a thoroughfare; he identifies (185) Sebbe, the modern name of Herod's Maṣada, with the Ḥaṣar Gadda of Josh. 15:27, and the ford over Jordan now called El-ḥenû with Pesîlîm of Judges 3:19, 26 (180); he takes (203) Tirṣa for the Tirathana of Josephus and both for the modern Et-ṭire on the Maḫne plain; he favors (217 f.) the probability that the Aphek of Sharon of Josh. 12:18 lay on the plateau between Tabor and the lake where Sârônâ is still the name of a village, and that it was the same as the Aphek of the Syrian wars (1 Kings 20:26, 30; 2 Kings 13:17), and he proposes to find it in where Ṭamre now lies on the caravan route from Jezreel to east of Jordan; in North Galilee 'Umm el 'Awâmid is proposed (229) for the Hammon of Josh. 19:28; east of Jordan where the rational identifications are by no means so exhausted as they are on the west, Buhl repeats the valuable proposals he published a year ago in his *Studien z. Topogr. des nördl. Ostjordanlandes:* the more southerly of the two 'Aštĕroths he places (248 ff.) at Muzêrîb, a site the features of which in my opinion correspond very exactly with the descriptions of the ancient Casphon or Caspis, *cf.* 1 Macc. 5:36 with 2 Macc. 12:13 ff.; Raphon or Raphana of the Decapolis he seeks (249 f.) in Tell esh-Shehab', in the Wadi Tell-esh-Shehab; Ephron or Hephron of 1 Macc. 5:46 he makes identical (256) with the Gefrun taken by Antiochus the Great and properly places at the Kasr Wad el Gafr; Kamum of the same campaign of Antiochus he combines with Kamon of Judges 10:5, the city where Jair was buried, and seeks at Kumem, between Hephron and Pella, the third town taken by Antiochus (a double combination that I had already arrived at independently); Teṣil in Hauran he takes for the Tirsa of 2 Kings 15:14, LXX Tharsila (247), he places (262) Ramoth Gilead at El Jala'aud, three miles south of the Jabbok, and identifies it with *the city of Gilead* of Hosea 6:8; in Moab he interprets (269) 'Ar or 'Ar Moab (Num. 21:15, 28; Deut. 2:9, etc.; Isa. 15:1) as the name not of a city but of a region, probbly that to the south of Amon.

It is important that Dr. Buhl adheres to the following already advanced opinions. As against Sayce and others he accepts, as most probable, (164) the identification of Eḍ-ḍahariye with Kiriath-Sepher;

he prefers (167) the combination of Kiriath-Jearim with Kirjat el 'Enab, to that by Dr. Henderson with 'Erma; he takes (169) the usual view that Sanballat was from the Beth-Horons and not from Horonaim in Moab. He adheres (181) to the opinion, now almost universal, that Ḳoreâ is to be sought for in Ḳurawa and Alexandrium in Ḳarn Sartabeh; and counts it probable (199) that Antipatris is Kal'at Ras el 'Ain. He could hardly help approving (202) of the recent identification of the much questioned Gilgal of Deut. 11: 30 over against which Ebal and Gerizim lay, with Jûleijîl, southwest of Shalem. He adopts (242) the conclusion that there was but one Bethsaida of Galilee, that on the east side of the Lake of Galilee; yet he identifies it not with Et-Tell the site of the ancient Julias but with the ruin el 'Araj on the coast of the lake and still connected with Et-Tell by the remains of an ancient causeway. He prefers (244) the identification of Kal'at el Ḥösn with Hippos to that with Gamala, and accepts (263) Schlatter's proposal of a second Gadara at Es Salt, where there is a well named Jâdur or Jêdur, which Gadara may have been that twice taken by Antiochus the Great, and once by Alex. Jannæus and called by Josephus (*Wars* VII : 3) the capital of Peræa.

There remain to be considered one or two points which have been and are likely to remain subjects of controversy.

On page 104 Dr. Buhl gives a number of reasons against the narrower definition of the Shephelah, which confines it to the detached range of low hills between the Judæan range and the Philistine plains, and in favor of the wider definition which includes within it the whole of the latter to the coast. He admits that it is expressly separated from Philistia in 2 Chron. 28: 18, but he thinks that the following reasons make for the inclusion of the plain: (1) 2 Chron. 26 : 10 in which Shephelah is taken in parallel to the Mishor, east of the Jordan, as pasture ground; (2) the LXX translation of it by πεδίον or ἡ πεδινή; (3) passages like Deut. 1 : 7; Josh. 9 : 1, in which the whole land of Israel is described, and the Shephelah stands in parallel with the Hoph ha yam, *i. e.*, the seacoast north of Carmel; (4) Josh. 11 : 2 where the Shephelah actually signifies this stretch of coast; (5) the definition of Eusebius; (6) the list of towns in Josh. 15 : 33 ff. especially verses 45–47 (which include the towns of Philistia). Now no scholar, who adheres to the narrower definition of the Shephelah as the more usual, will deny the occasional and very natural extension of the name across the whole maritime plain. In Palestine names were always more or less elastic, and as one looks down from the hill country of Judæa it is very easy

to comprehend the whole country, sweeping to the sea, under a common name. This would explain the definition of Eusebius, and the obvious intentions of one or two other writers. But against these one has to put the list of passages in which the Shephelah is definitely separated from Philistia. Buhl mentions only one, 2 Chron. 28:18. But Obad. 19 is another. 2 Chron. 7:1 recalls a time when the *Jews inhabited the Shephelah*, yet they never inhabited Philistia. 1 Macc. 12:38 describes the town of Adida *in the Shephelah;* while 1 Macc. 13:11 places it *over against the plain.* In Josh. 15:33 ff. the verses which include the Philistine towns, 45–47, are admittedly a later insertion. And the passages, Deut. 1:7, Josh. 9:1, which Dr. Buhl quotes as proving that the Shephelah included the maritime plain, because they distinguish it from the Hoph ha yam which he confines to the coast north of Carmel, may be adduced in support of its limitation to the low hills, if as seems more probable the Hoph ha yam includes the coast south of Carmel. The first reason quoted above that Shephelah is used in 1 Chron. 25:10 in parallel to the Moabite Mishor as pasture ground surely tells against—rather than for—the inclusion of Philistia, because Philistia was not a pasture ground like either the Mishor or the low Shephelah hills, but wheat country throughout. On these scriptural grounds, along with *first* the geographical isolation of the low hills, and *second* their frequent political separation from Philistia, it would seem to be certain that the name Shephelah was oftener used for the low hills alone than for the low hills *plus* the maritime plain.

On page 238 Buhl characterizes as impossible a recent attempt to revive the early Christian theory that Banias and not Tell el Ḳaḍi represents the ancient Laish or Dan. He puts the case of Tell el Ḳaḍi on the usual evidence. Josephus says that Dan lay by the sources of the little Jordan; Eusebius says that Dan lay four Roman miles west of Paneas; Ḳaḍi may be taken as a translation of the Hebrew Dan; and the name of the stream Leddân may possibly contain an echo of the same. But against all this we have to place, before coming to a conclusion, three very important facts: (1) Jerome (*Comm. aa Ezek.* LXVIII, 18) appears to identify Paneas and Dan: "Dan ubi hodie Paneas." (2) Deut. 33:22 speaks of Dan as *leaping from Bashan;* it is not possible to interpret this phrase of Tell el Ḳaḍi, which lies well out on the floor of the Jordan Valley, but it suits admirably the position of the castle hill above Banias. (3) No local power could have held the neighborhood from the weak and unhealthy

position of Tell el Ḳaḍi: Dan must have required to have its center and citadel at and about Paneas. No doubt the tribe held both of the sites, whose claims are thus contestant, but Paneas must have been the essential position; and we may account for the name Tell el Ḳaḍi, if, indeed, it be a translation of Dan, by the habit of drifting which names in Palestine have always exhibited. In any way Buhl's characterization of the case for Paneas as "impossible" is not justified. The case is, to say the least, as strong as its rival. If this volume have faults they are found in such summary dismissals of strong arguments. The question of the site of Capernaum is another instance. Buhl supports Tell Hum, but unduly depreciates both the ancient and modern support of the claims of Khan Minyeh.

Another point which is sure to provoke discussion is Dr. Buhl's acceptance of the theory of Blanckenhorn that the climate of Palestine has within historical times decreased in humidity and increased in heat. He seeks proof for this in the decay of forests of cedars upon Lebanon. But we may surely find adequate cause for the latter in the exportation of cedar from the Lebanons, of the constancy and large scale of which we have reports from very early Assyrian times down to the times of the Romans. In all the rest of Palestine we have no proofs that the climate is different from what it was in the period of the Old Testament.

Again, while Dr. Buhl in one passage seems aware of the fact that politically the east coast of the lake of Galilee was reckoned within the Province of Galilee, he yet calls (82) the lake the eastern boundary of the province; and in his section on the towns, villages, etc., of the land separates Bethsaida Julias, Khersa, Hippos, etc., from Tiberias, Capernaum, Chorazin, etc., a separation which lends awkwardness to the plan of his treatment.

But these faults, whether of method or conclusion, are very few, and do not detract from the value of a very thorough and almost exhaustive piece of work.

GEORGE ADAM SMITH.

FREE CHURCH COLLEGE,
Glasgow.

ENTSTEHUNG UND GESCHICHTE DES TODTEN MEERES. Von DR. BLANCKENHORN. 4 Tafeln und 8 Abbildungen im Text. Leipzig. 1896. Pp. 59.

THE book here noticed has to do with the most remarkable body of water on the globe. The surface of the Salt Sea is 1300 feet below

the level of the Mediterranean and it is 4000 feet below the summits of the mountains which inclose it on either side. The depth of the sea is 1300 feet, while the valley in which it lies presents, geologically and historically, more features of interest than are found grouped in so small a space anywhere else in the world. The deposits of sulphur and bitumen found here, the great salt mountain, the hot springs, the intense heat of the region, have always attracted curious and perhaps superstitious attention, and in fact it is only sixty years since this wonderful valley and lake emerged from the region of mystery (Schubert, Robinson, and others, 1836–37); but during this period they have been investigated in the most careful manner till today we have become so familiar with the facts of their "origin and history" that they have almost ceased to awaken surprise.

Dr. Blanckenhorn's book belongs to a literature that is already extensive, which American and English scholars, and scholars belonging to several different countries of Europe besides Germany, have had an important share in creating; hence in this as in many similar instances it is difficult to discriminate between the restatement of familiar facts and others that should be accredited as new to the most recent writer. The geological charts are valuable, but of the eight full-page illustrations from photographs only two or three are satisfactory. The present writer is aware, however, from actual experience some years previous to Dr. Blanckenhorn's efforts, that the south end of the Dead Sea is a most difficult place for successful camera work, owing to the fact that contrasts are wanting, earth, rocks, mountains, and sky being all of one color.

The Dead Sea, dating from the Tertiary period, was originally a part of the Mediterranean, but as the land which is now Palestine was gradually elevated it was separated from the Mediterranean and has ever since remained without outlet. All explorers have noticed at different points in the Jordan valley old shore lines of the Dead Sea showing how, little by little, it has receded to its present limits.

Another fact to be noticed is that the strata in the mountain wall east of the Dead Sea are horizontal. These strata appear again on the west of the Dead Sea, but they are many hundreds of feet below the level of those on the east side; like gigantic arches they are traced over the mountains of Western Palestine to reappear on the seacoast. The cleaving from north to south and the dropping down of the strata on the west side is called a "fault." This vast basin receives all the

wash from the surrounding mountains, and the water of the Dead Sea holds many mineral substances in solution.

The deepest popular attention will no doubt be centered upon that point where this subject touches sacred history. The subsidence of the earth in the region of the Dead Sea was gradual. The catastrophe mentioned in Genesis was an event sudden and unexpected. It occurred in historical times and was reported by competent witnesses. From the details given its character seems to have been not that of a violent earthquake, but that of an eruption of bitumen accompanied by fire and dense columns of smoke. The catastrophe had no connection with the origin of the Dead Sea. As to the arid nature of this region, it is not probable that there has been any marked change in historical times.

The "cities" which Lot chose and in which he dwelt were called the "cities of the plain." They were in the Jordan valley which Lot saw from near Ai. It is therefore certain that they could not have been at the south end of the Dead Sea, where Dr. Blanckenhorn would place them, for that region had historically no connection whatever with the Jordan valley.

SELAH MERRILL.

ANDOVER, MASS.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON JUDGES. By GEORGE FOOT MOORE, Professor of Hebrew in Andover Theological Seminary, Andover, Mass. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Pp. 1 + 476. $3.00. Vol. II of "The International Critical Commentary," Old Testament Section.

THIS is the second volume which has appeared of the Critical Commentary upon the Old Testament. The first, that of Canon Driver upon Deuteronomy, has already been recognized as a most finished and scholarly production, second to none upon that book. This volume is worthy of its predecessor, and is a piece of workmanship reflecting honor upon American scholarship and upon its author, showing that he happily, by the right of his attainments, as well as *ex officio* in his professor's chair, is a true successor of Moses Stuart, the father of American Old Testament exegesis. The wideness of research and investigation exhibited is remarkable. Nothing of value bearing upon the subject-matter of Judges seems to have been overlooked. But the material of others has not been merely gathered but thoroughly

digested, and the author in independence of judgment is the peer of all who have preceded him.

Old Testament criticism properly begins with the text, and in this volume a more extensive textual critical apparatus has been applied than ever before for Judges. We have not simply the ancient translations under one standard text, but their different versions and editions. The Greek translation Professor Moore has found to exist in two distinct versions, represented in several well-defined groups of MSS. (a discovery made also by Lagarde and demonstrated in his *Septuagint Studien*). Hence as a critical apparatus we have not simply G = Greek, but $G^{SAPV}$ (the uncials) $^{LMO}$ (groups of cursives) representing one version, and $G^{BG}$ (uncials) $^{N}$ (a group of cursives) $\mathfrak{k}$ (Coptic Sahidic) another. In a similar exhaustive manner different editions of the Syriac ($S^{PLAOH}$) and of the Targums ($T^{Ven.\ 1,\ Ven.\ 2,\ reuch.\ m.}$) have been consulted. Hence we have here the first systematic attempt made by an American, English, or even German scholar for the emendation of the Hebrew text of Judges. The only previous attempt is that of the Hollander A. V. Doorninck, which covers only chaps. 1–16. The full fruit of Professor Moore's textual criticism will doubtless appear in the forthcoming Critical Edition of the Hebrew Text of Judges in the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament*, edited by Professor Haupt.

From textual criticism we pass to the literary and historical. The book of Judges has long been known as a compilation. The ordinary reader observes three distinct parts — I, chaps. 1—2:5; II, 2:6—16:31; III, 17—21; and also in the second part a pragmatic framework distinguishable from the stories. The critical reader notices also the suggestion of more than one original story in the accounts of Barak and Deborah, of Gideon, and of the extermination of Benjamin. The task of the critic is to determine the character of these separate parts and the method and date of their union. Our author's conclusion is essentially that of Budde. The substratum of the book of Judges is from the prophetic historical source of the Hexateuch and the books of Samuel, known as JE of the seventh century B. C., from whose component parts arises the suggestion of the double narratives mentioned above. Extracts from this were edited first by a Deuteronomist early in the sixth century, who provided part II with its pragmatic framework. In the fourth or fifth centuries additional material was taken from JE by another editor, who added chaps. 1—2:5; 9; 17; 18; 19—21, and possibly also the minor Judges 10:1–5; 12:8–15. The only serious question which can be raised in reference to this theory of

composition is whether the substratum of Judges should be found in JE, or in unknown ancient collections of tales (the theory of Kittel). The evidence for assignment to particular sources can in no case be very strong. This is recognized again and again by Professor Moore, and it is one of the admirable traits of his commentary that uncertainty is freely allowed in many instances and that probability is all that is claimed for many conclusions.

The dates mentioned for the various strata and for the compilation of Judges, following the modern critical view of Israel's religious and literary development, are based upon the striking affinity between part II in its framework and Deuteronomy and kindred Old Testament writings, and upon a similar affinity between part III., especially chap. 20, and Chronicles and the priestly narratives of the Hexateuch. The book of Judges contains only one historical notice that at all fixes its date, *i. e.*, a reference to the captivity of Northern Israel (18:30), hence the book was written at least some time after 722 B. C., and there is nothing in its contents to place its final composition earlier than the post-exilic period. These facts serve to confirm the dates derived from the religious pragmatism.

The value of the literary criticism, such as is presented in this commentary, which to the ordinary reader may be puzzling with its R's and D's and J's and E's, can scarcely be overestimated, because only through such criticism is the book of Judges given its rightful place in literature. It is not properly a history of the period of the Judges but a collection of tales of that period grouped together to convey religious lessons and to give in outline Jehovah's method of government. This fact removes at once any embarrassment arising from questions concerning the reality of specific incidents. The stories are to be judged as folk tales; the religious teaching, as the church practically has always done, in the light of subsequent divine revelation. Through such literary criticism the Old Testament writings become plain and reasonable to intelligent readers and gain in moral force, and the highest debt of gratitude is due from the church to the scholars who with immense toil and labor have worked out these problems.

But of greater interest than the literary criticism of an Old Testament book is the historical, although the two are mutually interdependent. The literary character of Judges shows at once that its material requires careful investigation to obtain the exact history behind it. We give briefly the conclusions expressed in this commentary: Chapter 1 is one of the most precious monuments of early

Hebrew history, but the title 1:1 is of no authority, for what immediately follows does not relate things which took place immediately after the death of Joshua, but is an account of an invasion of Canaan parallel to that in Joshua but giving a wholly different representation, and one of vastly greater historical value (pp. 7 ff.). Vss. 8, 18, 21 cannot be reconciled with other statements in the chapter and subsequent history. The subjugation of Canaan at this time by Cushanrishathaim, king of Mesopotamia (3:7–11), an enemy from so remote a quarter, his conquest involving not only that of the Israelite tribes but of Canaanites with their strong cities, is highly improbable, if not beyond the bounds of possibility; its liberation by Othniel, a Kenizzite clan in the extreme south, scarcely less improbable (p. 85). In this connection respects are paid to Professor Sayce, and his "verdict of the monuments" (*Higher Criticism*, p. 297 ff.) against the critics on this passage is shown to be entirely baseless, being nothing more or less than ingenious conjecture without any real monumental evidence (p. 85). The events in the story of Ehud are in no wise improbable; there is no difficulty (*contra* Nöldeke) in supposing that a clan in Benjamin in later times bore the name of the hero Ehud (p. 90 f.). Jabin (chap. 4), king of Hazor, has nothing to do with the story of Deborah. Two narratives have been combined; one an account of a war waged by Zebulon and Naphtali against Jabin of Hazor (*cf.* Joshua 11:1–9), and the other of the war with Sisera, the subject of the song of Deborah (p. 108 f.). This song is the oldest monument of Hebrew literature and the only cotemporaneous monument of Hebrew history before the foundation of the kingdom (p. 132). In the story of Gideon, while two narratives are to be recognized (6:1—8:3; and 8:4–21), the former (6:1—8:3) is not historically worthless (Wellhausen *et al.*). That Gideon had a wrong of his own to avenge is not incompatible with the representation that he was called of God to deliver Israel from the scourge; the sharp severing of natural and religious motives is more in the manner of the modern critic than the ancient story-teller (p. 176). The objections (of Wellhausen, Stade, *et al.*) to the historical character of Jephthah and the main features of the story do not seem sufficiently well founded. That circumstances of his victories are not more fully remembered or narrated does not prove that nothing of the sort happened. The mythical element in the story of Jephthah's daughter does not exclude her real sacrifice. This explains the translation of myth into legend (pp. 284, 305). The basis of fact in the stories of Samson is difficult to determine. The name of the hero and various traits of the story invite mythical

explanations. But it is probable that the legend, a very old one, has its roots in the earth and not in the sky (pp. 315, 365). The historical value of chaps. 17–18 relating the story of Micah and the migration of the Danites is hardly inferior to any in the book. Their picture of the religious and social state of the times bears every mark of truthfulness (p. 370). The story of chaps. 19–21 has a historical basis; chaps. 19 and 21:19 ff. have eminently the note of antiquity, but in the description of the war, chaps. 20—21:14 there is scarcely a semblance of reality (p. 404 f.).

We have given these historical judgments at this length because they present the most interesting feature of a commentary on Judges and because they illustrate the discriminating insight of the author. While to some these judgments may seem radical (although in comparison with much criticism they are conservative), and while we might possibly wish to question some of them, yet they are nearer the truth than that view which simply accepts the statements of the stories of Judges as entirely historically correct, as though one were relieved from the task of criticism because there are no cotemporary records.

In grammatical and philological exegesis this commentary at once takes the highest rank and will command the attention of every future Hebrew grammarian and lexicographer. The grammatical references are quite full, and there is special discussion of many Hebrew words. The geographical notes are also a special feature. They are very complete and show a thorough acquaintance with every detail of Palestinian topography and topographical research.

While we have found so much to commend in this work we find it also lacking in a few particulars. A section in the introduction on Israel's political history or tribal development during the period of the judges, summarizing the results reached in the commentary, is needed. Another section, also treating similarly of Israel's religious condition or development, would have been in place, and also one discussing more fully the place of the book as a whole in Israel's religious thought and its permanent religious value. In the minute literary analysis the impression and religious force of a work as a whole must not be overlooked. These topics certainly have a place in a commentary whose plan includes historical questions and questions of biblical theology. There is some attempt, it is true, at answering them, but their treatment is too meager. A milder tone, also, toward the old and antiquated views and questions of the wise and good men of the past would have made this book more winsome, and thus have

served to convert more persons to the true exegesis of the Old Testament—something very much needed now. But these are slight and minor defects in a work of marked erudition and great permanent value.

YALE UNIVERSITY. EDWARD LEWIS CURTIS.

ENTWICKLUNGSGESCHICHTE DES REICHES GOTTES UNTER DEM ALTEN UND NEUEN BUNDE, AN DER HAND EINER ANALYSE DER QUELLEN. Von H. J. BESTMANN, Pastor in Mölln. I. Das Alte Testament. Berlin: Verlag von Wiegandt und Grieben. 1896. Pp. 491. M. 8.50.

THE author is known as the editor of J. C. K. Hoffmann's *Encyclopædie der Theologie*, and the writer of a history of Christian morals (*Geschichte der christlichen Sitte*) as well as of other minor works; but this is his first effort, as far as we know, in the domain of strictly biblical learning. That it is a bold effort will be very apparent to everyone when he discovers the specific aim of the book and the standpoint of the author.

We have joined these two items thus together, because the author himself does not separate between them, but announces the one as he describes the other. In general, the task he sets before him may be said to be the tracing of the development of biblical religion as a purely spiritual movement. But is not this the very thing aimed at in the writings of our most recent historians of the religion of Israel, such as Smend, Kuenen, and Wellhausen? How does he differ from them? In answer, his own standpoint may be stated as follows: Both the critical and the traditional attitudes towards the religion of Israel are beset with difficulties. On the one side, it is attempted to explain the ethical monotheism of the prophets of Israel on purely naturalistic assumptions as the result of a process of evolution, excluding the extra-natural factor of miracle; but this leaves the transition of the purely natural into the spiritual and moral altogether unaccounted for. On the other side, the historian starts with an originally pure and perfect state of spiritual life in Israel, and as he traces this meets with the difficulty of a lapse into natural religious life in the pre-exilic period; a fact which is either not to be explained, or to be explained with great difficulty. The first of these standpoints purchases its purely naturalistic evolutionary view at the price of an assumption of an inward or spiritual miracle in the later age. The second purchases

the consciousness of a latent revelation of God at the price of a lapse from a high original state, which falls altogether out of analogy. What, then, is left for him who would solve the problem? To trace the religious life of Israel just as it is given in the records. But does not one need to test the trustworthiness of the records? Yes; but this cannot be done in the way of literary criticism, as purely literary facts give us no hint regarding the order of the succession of events. It may be done, however, by means of historical methods. In fact, to attempt to trace the development of the spiritual life of Israel is to test the records of Israel historically. No separate section treating of the criticism of the sources is needed. On this basis the author takes the Psalms as a starting point, because they give the earliest expression of the religious life of the individual in Israel. From the Psalms he passes to the didactic sections of the Old Testament as showing the socializing of the religious or spiritual feeling. The religious ideals of individual leaders are pressed upon the community by a special class of teachers—the prophets. The communal religious life thus attained next finds its expression in the law, and the growth of the law is recorded in a definite history. Finally, the system thus formed wins its way to complete acceptance during the period of the new Israel. The result of all this is a unique view of the development of the religion of Israel.

On the question of the Pentateuch the author recognizes the necessity of an analysis, and agrees to the accepted view that there are four main documents; but differs totally from the current school of criticism as to the order of these documents. This order is E. J. P. D. instead of J. E. D. P. "It was a serious error," he says, "in method when criticism in the analysis of the Pentateuch arbitrarily took Genesis as its starting point. The first question must always be: In what light did its immediate origin put the people of Israel? As there appear to be several representations which are easily recognized as elaborations of one original account, the next task would have properly been to ask: Can this original be now disentangled, and can we obtain a true view of the evolution of the various derivative representations? Instead of that, there has been devised in criticism, without further trouble, a system of documents, E. J. P., and then a mythical redactor who has been made to do the work of weaving these together: a mechanical procedure through which one can never reach beyond simple and abstract possibilities."

Thus, also, with reference to the Psalms, Bestmann sets aside as

utterly inadequate the critical theory of their post-exilic origin, and finds in the existing grouping of them a natural order and sequence, following a psychological law of evolution. Hence he considers this order the true one, and all attempts to fix upon another as futile and unjustifiable. Consequently, the Davidic origin of those Psalms which appear under David's name is an established fact with him.

In order to trace the development of Israel's religion, then, all that is needed is to expound the contents of the books of the Bible in a sort of running commentary or paraphrase, taking them in the following order: the Psalms, the wisdom literature, the prophets, the law, the historical books.

The question may now be asked: How does the author justify his unique conclusions? The answer cannot be very clear, for the author is not a clear writer. His main dependence in the argument, however, is the naturalness of the process of development he assumes. But this is one of the arguments of the critics, and with them it is only one of several; while with Bestmann it is the only one used. The difference of method, therefore, between him and them is not so much one of the kind of considerations taken into account, as of the validity of some and the comparative value of one over the others. He rejects as irrelevant considerations which they accept as primary. He accepts as conclusive considerations which they regard as partial and inadequate.

We shall not undertake to pass judgment in this dispute between Bestmann and the critics. While we cannot regard his reasoning as entirely convincing, we may commend it as quite plausible. It demonstrates that the same facts may lead to one set of conclusions, viewed from one standpoint, and to another set viewed from a different angle, and, this being the case, it may be safe to infer that more light, and light of a different nature, is needed for the solution of the problems of biblical criticism which will satisfy all the parties at present so far apart from one another.

A. C. ZENOS.

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

STUDIES IN JUDAISM. By S. SCHECHTER, M.A., Reader in Talmudic in the University of Cambridge. New York: The Macmillan Co. 1896. 8vo, pp. xxv + 366.

THE essays which are collected in this volume were originally published in the *Jewish Quarterly Review* and the *Jewish Chronicle*. They

cover a somewhat wide range of subjects, and differ considerably in interest and value; one or two of them, like those on "The Jewish Boswell" and "The Earliest Jewish Community in Europe," might have been omitted without loss.

The article on "The Hebrew Collection of the British Museum" gives some idea of the wealth of that great library both in printed books and manuscripts. In reprinting it, the author might have noted that, since it was written, a descriptive list of the Hebrew and Samaritan manuscripts, by G. Margoliouth, has been published (1893). In "The Titles of Jewish Books" Mr. Schechter has collected a number of the curious and fanciful titles in which Jewish bibliographies abound, and which often seem to have been chosen expressly that no one might guess, from the name of the book, what it was about. The fondness for such titles is, of course, not distinctively Jewish; other oriental literatures furnish parallels in multitude, and the comparison might not be uninstructive. The essays on "The Child in Jewish Literature" and on "Woman in Temple and Synagogue" deal in an instructive way with these sides of the social life of the Jews.

The chief importance of the volume, however, lies in the essays which have a more distinctly theological character. One of the best of these is the sympathetic study of Rabbi Moses ben Nachman (d. *ca.* 1270). The sketch of Nachmanides' theology is of peculiar interest as showing how in mediæval Jewish thought, as in contemporary Christian theology, by the side of the intellectual systems which were philosophically dependent on Aristotle, like that of Maimonides, there ran another current in which the immanence of God was central. Chassidism, to which another very interesting essay is devoted, shows how spiritual needs, as well as theological reasoning, may bring men to the same truth of the divine immanence. Mr. Schechter describes the rise of Chassidism; the life of its founder, Baalshem; its early teachings; and the swift degeneration which seems to be the fate of mystical sects, its lofty ideas being materialized in the vulgar superstitions of Zaddikism.

The life of Rabbi Elijah Wilna, one of the most strenuous opponents of Chassidism, presents another side of Jewish life and thought in the eighteenth century. The influence of this great scholar in introducing a sounder method in the interpretation of the ancient authorities, and in directing the attention of students, who had occupied themselves almost exclusively with the Babylonian Talmud, to the wealth of material to be found in the Halachic Midrashim, the

Tosephta, and the Jerusalem Talmud, cannot easily be exaggerated. A man of very different type was Nathan Krochmal, who is the subject of the second essay. Krochmal's only published work, the posthumous *Guide of the Perplexed of our Time*, is, as the title indicates, an attempt to do for those involved in the philosophical and critical difficulties of the nineteenth century what Maimonides did for his own age. And like Maimonides—and many another—his attempt to resolve doubts was branded as heresy by those who had no doubts. Mr. Schechter gives a brief synopsis of the contents of this interesting apologetic treatise. But Krochmal's great influence was exerted through his friends and disciples, among whom were some of the most eminent of recent Jewish scholars.

Two of the essays in the volume deal with doctrinal subjects. That on "The Dogmas of Judaism" controverts the common assertion that Judaism is a religion without dogmas; and gives an instructive synopsis of the various attempts to define the essential articles of Jewish faith, from the Mishna to the end of the seventeenth century, with especial attention to the controversies of Maimonists and Antimaimonists. The other, on "The Doctrine of Divine Retribution in Rabbinical Literature," deals chiefly with the discussions of the problem of the sufferings of the righteous. There is no more agreement upon this question among the rabbis than among other men. If one affirms the stern doctrine, "No suffering or death without sin," others as emphatically deny it. It may perhaps be noted as a defect in the treatment of the subject that the compensations of the future life are scarcely touched on, though it is in the introduction of this factor that the rabbinical discussions of the problem most plainly go beyond the standpoint of the Old Testament—take for a single example the saying of R. Eleazar ben Zadok (*Kiddushin* 40 b). On the other hand, the author brings out very clearly the higher teaching of the Talmud, that disinterested goodness is true goodness,—right is not to be done for reward, either here or hereafter.

The essay on "The History of Jewish Tradition" is a review of Weiss's great work on that subject (*Dōr dōr we-dōreshaw*), which, beginning with the Old Testament itself, comes down to the compilation of the code of R. Joseph Caro. Of especial interest is the excellent translation of Weiss's résumé of rabbinical theology (pp. 197 ff.).

"The Law and Recent Criticism" is a somewhat desultory review of Professor Toy's *Judaism and Christianity*, the chief point of which seems to be that, though Professor Toy is less prejudiced than most

Christian writers, Jewish legalism is judged too unfavorably. It cannot be proved, Mr. Schechter avers, "that legalism or nomism has ever tended to suppress the spiritual side of religion." I think that students of the history of religions would agree that it has been proved a great many times.

As a whole this volume is a valuable contribution to that better understanding of Judaism which cannot fail to result in a juster appreciation. To the same good end the author's articles on "Aspects of Rabbinic Theology" which have appeared in the *Jewish Quarterly Review*, and are shortly to be issued in a volume of the Jewish Library by the same publishers, will also do their part. It should be added that notes at the end of the volume give references to the literature and to the passages cited. Some of these do not appear to have been verified with sufficient care, and there are occasional omissions; for example, on p. 105 an important passage from Nachmanides' *Date of Redemption* is said to be quoted by Azariah de Rossi, but the reader is left to discover for himself that it is at the end of chap. 43 of *Imre Bina*. There is also an index of names, but none of subjects.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. GEORGE F. MOORE.

THE EPIC OF THE FALL OF MAN: a Comparative Study of Cædmon, Dante and Milton. By S. HUMPHREYS GURTEEN, A.M., LL.D. New York and London: Putnam's Sons. 1896. pp. x + 347.

THIS book is of a type that has become popular of late years; one very easy to produce even with inferior preparation, but of value only when prepared by one who has thoroughly mastered the topic treated. There has been a deluge of lectures on comparative literature, most of which have been of little value, no doubt, but which have not been printed and consequently have done but little harm. Mr. Gurteen's work might well have remained in the obscurity of manuscript, for it is a very shallow and shabby specimen of its class.

The word "shabby" is chosen intentionally, because it seems to be the proper term to apply to a writer that takes up a topic on which many are now seeking information and offers his readers a synopsis of what was said by editors and critics more than half a century ago, much of which has been totally disproved by later investigations or by recent discoveries. If Mr. Gurteen thinks that Conybeare's *Illustrations* (pub-

lished 1826) or Thorpe's *Cædmon* (published 1832) contain the latest on the subjects treated in them, and that the sixty or seventy years that have since passed have contributed nothing to our knowledge of Old English, either he is mistaken or all scholars of repute today are so. But these are the books, he tells us in his preface, which he has used for the *Beowulf* and the *Genesis*, and his book shows that he has made use of no others.

It would take too much space to enumerate all the errors of the book, some of which are taken directly from his authorities, and might have been corrected by reading the originals, now that better editions and more helps are to be found. As specimens of these errors, we refer to the statement about Beowulf's sword, Hrunting (!), Thorkelin's transcripts of the MS., the extraordinary grammatical theories on page 48, and various other faults of a similar character. Even if one is inclined to regard these as not likely to lessen the value of the main theme, they are nevertheless an index of the writer's fitness to treat a subject that calls for a thorough knowledge of Old English poetry, and Mr. Gurteen's lack of this knowledge becomes still more apparent when he reaches his theme. We find repeated in his book the old theory that Cædmon's Hymn, as we find it in the Old English version of Bede, was a versification of Bede's Latin, made by Alfred, though the original Northumbrian hymn has been discovered in a MS. where it was written a century before Alfred was born. Furthermore, Mr. Gurteen maintains, as others did before this older version was found, that the hymn is taken from the opening passage of the *Genesis*, an utter impossibility. He speaks of Cædmon throughout his book as if no one had ever raised a doubt of his authorship of the poems in the Junian MS., and shows no sign of ever having heard of Sievers' *Der Heliand und die angelsächsische Genesis*, in which it is distinctly proved that the story of the Fall of the Angels and of the Temptation and the Fall of Man is an interpolation. He does not seem to have read Sievers' argument that this whole story is a translation from Old Saxon, or to know that this conjecture was proved true two or three years ago by Zangemeister's discovery of fragments of the original in the Vatican Library. He is apparently unconscious that it is now proved, as clearly as anything of the kind can be proved, that whether we ascribe other parts of the *Genesis* to Cædmon or not he is surely not the author of the part that contains the story of the Fall.

There is much more that might be cited in justification of the epithet "shabby," which we have given to the book. We are strongly

tempted to apply the same word to the reputable journals that have favorably reviewed it. Had they placed the work in the hands of Old English scholars, they would not have subjected themselves to the charge of helping to mislead those that are seeking for information in regard to the older monuments of our mother speech. At the present time, when the interest in Old English literature is reviving, there are many that cannot go to the originals and must trust to books like the one under consideration for their information, and a favorable review of a worthless book does not lack much of being a moral wrong.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. F. A. BLACKBURN.

JESU MUTTERSPRACHE. Das Galiläische Aramäisch in seiner Bedeutung für die Erklärung der Reden Jesu. Von LIC. ARNOLD MEYER. Freiburg. 1896. xiv + 176 pp. M. 3.

THERE are three reasons for which our author claims that his investigations are important. (1) They are in thorough accord with the genuine spirit of Lutheranism, which objects to permit any incrustation of tradition or of authoritative interpretation to gather over the Scriptures, but insists that each generation should go direct to the written Word and interpret it for itself. (2) They are in accord with the spirit of the age, which is undoubtedly "Back to Christ;" and this desire to know what Jesus of Nazareth really did teach cannot rest satisfied with what is well known to be merely a translation of his *ipsissima verba;* men yearn to hear the very Galilean utterances which the common people heard so gladly, and which were stored so affectionately in the breasts of the fishermen of Bethsaida. (3) Since Meyer has persuaded himself that our gospels in their present form are of late authorship, and that they contain many sayings of Jesus which he did not literally utter, but which were rather due to the inspiration of the risen Lord and to *verbatim* reminiscences of Christ's literal discourses, he feels the need of some criticism to determine which is of earlier and which of later origin, and he fondly supposes that a knowledge of Galilean Aramaic will, by revealing the terseness and alliteration of Christ's veritable words, supply, to some extent, the needed criticism.

Meyer, in his first chapter, gives an excellent résumé of the views held by many post-Reformation scholars, who have, more or less vaguely, surmised that the Greek gospels do not present to us the

words of Jesus in the language in which they were spoken. Then we have a profitable chapter on the introduction of Aramaic into Palestine, and the indications of its prevalence in the first century, with an examination of the Aramaic words found in the New Testament, culled chiefly from Kautzsch and Dalman; but with some original work as to the testimony of Josephus. Then the author examines the theories of Resch and Weizsäcker as to a Semitic gospel embedded in our synoptics; and he also gives us a lengthened criticism, intelligent and for the most part sympathetic, of previous attempts to retranslate individual utterances of Christ into Aramaic or Hebrew, made by such men as Michaelis, Bertholdt, Bolten and Nestle. The omission of the name of the present writer from this list has awakened the surprise both of Resch and Dalman. The latter scholar, who is *facile princeps*, as an Aramaist, says in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* for August 15, 1896, that he is surprised that "vor allem die für das Aramäische eintretenden Aufsätze von Marshall in *The Expositor* 1891" are not noticed.

The personal contribution of Meyer to retranslation are disappointing from their extreme paucity. They do not cover thirty pages of the volume. First he cites eight sayings of an aphoristic character, and culls from Levy's *Wörterbücher* and Wünsche's *Neue Beiträge* passages out of the Talmud which elucidate the words of Christ. The words of Jesus which Meyer claims to elucidate by the help of Aramaic are fifteen, all told. Of these, in three cases the elucidation consists in showing that in Aramaic the words yield a pleasant alliteration, and in two instances the originality confessedly lies with a predecessor. Of the remaining ten, the one to which Meyer attaches most importance is on the Aramaic usage of the phrase בַּר־נָשׁ = son of man, in the sense of *ἄνθρωπος*. He also infers from Dalman's Grammar that בַּר־נָשׁ can also mean "I" (Dalman, however, repudiates the inference) and hence maintains that "Son of Man" is often used for "a man," as in Matt. 12:32, Mark 2:10, Mark 2:28, or for "I," Matt. 11:19. He insists that when Christ said "This is my body," his words were, דֵּין בִּשְׂרִי הוּא, and this would mean "This is myself." Standing, however, in antithesis with "my blood," it is very much more probable that Christ said דֵּין הוּא גוּפִי. On Mark 7:19 he remarks that *ἀφεδρών* = תַּדְכִּירְתָא, from root דכי, to cleanse; and that we have reference to the rabbinic dictum that in latrina nothing is unclean. In *μετὰ παρατηρήσεως* (Luke 17:20) he sees a bad translation of בְּנִסְתַּר "secretly;" in Matt. 7:6 *τὸ ἅγιον* קוּדְשָׁא he sees (as Bolten) an error for קְדָשָׁא "a ring";

and in Luke 4:26 χήρα אַרְמַלְתָּא should be Σύρα אֲרַמִּיתָא. As an alternative elucidation of Luke 16:16 I would refer to the *Critical Review*, Vol. VI, 48.

J. T. MARSHALL.

MANCHESTER, ENGLAND.

THE QUOTATIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT FROM THE OLD: Considered in the Light of General Literature. By FRANKLIN JOHNSON, D.D., Professor in The University of Chicago. Philadelphia and Chicago: American Baptist Publication Society. 1896. Pp. xix + 409. $2.

THE realm of biblical investigation does not present a more difficult nor a more multi-faced problem than that of the quotations in the New Testament. These difficulties are found at the very first step of the student, and multiply at an alarming rate up to the final conclusion.

But their importance, from many points of view, both for the student of the Old and of the New Testament, demands for them a large amount of attention. They touch, among other questions, textual criticism, historical criticism, the unity of Scriptures, inspiration, the humanity of the New Testament writers and their relation to rabbinical thought. Scholars have not neglected this field in the past, but have given their attention chiefly to the critical questions involved in the discussion. Professor Johnson boldly blazes a new way through this forest of giant oaks and thick undergrowth. This new way is the first attempt to make a comparative study of the methods of the New Testament quoters and those in the secular literature of all times and countries. The stupendous amount of research necessary to undertake such a comparison is seen on every page of this volume. The books quoted or referred to number 301, while the authors quoted foot up 163, and the authors referred to, present a total of 213. The whole number of quotations will run up into a thousand. The book sets out to discuss eleven fundamental questions dealing with quotations in the New Testament. These are: (1) the Septuagint version; (2) quotations from memory; (3) fragmentary quotations; (4) exegetical paraphrase; (5) composite quotations; (6) quotations of substance; (7) allegory; (8) quotations by sound; (9) double reference; (10) illogical reasoning; and (11) rabbinic interpretation. The discussions under each separate chapter present themselves as the ripe fruit of mature and careful thought, arranged in logical and natural order, with, as a rule, neither a lack of

sufficient evidence nor an overplus of examples. The importance of each theme, and the comparative number of quotations demanding examination determine the length of the chapters. The method of the author, varying slightly with the topic in hand, is to state a proposition as to the usages in general literature, then to prove his proposition by an abundance of quotation from writers of recognized standing in various nationalities and ages of the world. Many of these are from Greek and Latin classics, presented both in the original and in translation. After having established his proposition, the author proceeds to examine in the broad, full light of general literature, the New Testament quotations which fall under the division in hand. In these examinations he handles without fear or favor the statements of such critics as Kuenen, Toy, and Döpke. His advantage over those men lies in the fact that, in addition to a critical knowledge of the text as presented by the best New Testament exegetes, he brings in a new and hitherto almost forgotten element to help solve the problem. This general literary element, too, cannot be cried down, if we are to regard the Bible as literature. It demands a place, both for its own intrinsic value and for the light it throws on certain problems in the New Testament.

It could scarcely be affirmed that Dr. Johnson wins his case in every discussion, but some notable cases of strong positions may be cited, as in his full and complete treatment of the chapter on "Double Reference" (pp. 186–335). His discussions of Isa. 7 : 14 (p. 276 f.), of Zech. 11 : 13 (p. 311 f.), of Ps. 110 (p. 340 f.), and of Hosea 2 : 23 (p. 350 f.) are particularly striking. The whole book strikes one as fair in its treatment; though conservative, it is ready to recognize truth from all quarters.

Many vital points impress themselves on the reader of this volume. One of them is this, shown especially in the discussion of the chapter on "Quotations from Memory," that the New Testament quotations from the Old are of slight and uncertain value in determining the original text of the Septuagint. Again, is the literature of the Old Testament of such a character as to permit a comparative study of it, somewhat similar to that presented in this volume? Just how far and no further may this comparative method be pursued with fidelity to the questions involved? But Dr. Johnson has pioneered the way in a masterly manner, and done with consummate skill what he set out to do.

IRA M. PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE TRADITIONAL TEXT OF THE HOLY GOSPELS. By BURGON and MILLER. London: George Bell & Sons. 1896. 10s. 6d. *net.*

THIS book should be of great interest and value, as it gives us the defense of the traditional text of the New Testament by Dean Burgon, its principal champion, edited by Mr. Miller, himself a textual student, and author or editor of several books on the subject. It is a great disappointment, therefore, to find the book so singularly inconclusive; not that there is any probability that the main positions of textual criticism of the New Testament will ever be discredited, but that a book showing so many evidences of minute scholarship should after all be so many things that a book of this kind ought not to be; *e. g.*, so ignorant of the laws of evidence, so blind to the true reading of facts, and above all so garbled in its presentation of the evidence.

What are the facts, as our authors themselves present them? First, the ancient witnesses to the text of the gospels are the MSS. BℵACDE; the Fathers; and the ancient versions, viz., the Old Latin, the Syriac, meaning by this the Peshito, and the Egyptian. Secondly, all of these, even the best of them, had been sadly and intentionally corrupted, in the interest of heresy, harmonizing, and so on. Thirdly, about the time of Basil, the two Gregorys and Chrysostom, the church, as part of a process of determining things which had been more or less floating, settled the text of the New Testament in its pure form. Fourthly, copies still multiplied, some of them representing the corrupted text, but the great body conforming to the fixed type established by the church. But at last Erasmus, using great care and critical judgment in his selection, chose four MSS. of the considerable number available, and from these constructed a text which has become the authorized text. These facts are not presented all together, they are scattered through the book, but they represent its main contentions. And it is not at all difficult to put your finger upon the one thing which vitiates the whole position. The authors not only secretly prefer authority to testimony, but they elevate this into a principle. They seem to think it strange that good churchmen will not follow this lead, and accept the authority of the church in regard to this as in regard to all matters else. They compare it to the acknowledged authority of the church in the matter of the canon. But the canon has to be decided by a faculty which the church possesses, that of detecting the marks of inspiration in a book. This matter of the text, on the contrary, is a matter of scholarship, and not of spiritual intuition. In fact, the application of some of the tests by

which the church decided the canon has been a considerable factor in misleading the church in its settlement of the text. Orthodoxy, *e. g.*, and literary smoothness would enter legitimately into the decision of the question whether a book should be admitted into the list of sacred books. But they are of no value in deciding the totally different question, what an author has written, a question which has to be answered by the testimony, and by internal evidence of a different sort. In fact, this admission of the active interference of the church in settling this question in favor of the traditional text, goes far towards overthrowing the whole argument of the book. This concurrence of the great mass of the later testimony might be a strong point, if this concurrence was without any external pressure. But here is the repeated claim that the church has exerted this pressure, which invalidates the concurrence.

The treatment of the ancient witnesses to the text is characteristic and singular. These witnesses are the MSS. BℵACDE, the fathers, and the Old Latin, the Syriac Peshito, and the Egyptian versions. Of these the MSS. are all set aside as comparatively worthless, two of the three versions are treated in the same way, and the testimony of the Fathers is sadly garbled. Out of the whole mass, the Peshito and the Fathers are treated as being of any value. The reasons for this discrimination are singular. C is only a palimpsest, which shows in what estimation it was held, and only a fragment at that. B and ℵ are on vellum and written in uncials, and the latest news about both material and character is that they rather discredit a manuscript than otherwise, showing it to be out of the great stream of testimony. Then, the very fact that they are preserved is against them, continual use being what destroyed the rest, while these refuse MSS. were allowed to remain on the shelf. Then they hail from Alexandria, and the rather shady Origen had to do largely with their production. Finally, they show heretical tendencies, and a "philosophical treatment of tender facts." As to the Old Latin version, its various forms are to be accounted for by the supposition that they are not variations of one version, but separate versions, and that their various readings are derived from the erroneous accounts of the gospel facts and teachings which prevailed before the publication of our present gospels. That is, we have in the various forms of the Old Latin, not different readings of those gospels, but other gospels mixed up with the standard or canonical gospels. The Egyptian versions pass under the condemnation dealt out to everything connected with Alexandria.

The testimony of the fathers is given more in detail, and we have an opportunity to criticise the treatment of details, as well as of generals, by this singular book. Lists are given which show that the proportion of quotations favoring the traditional text is to those confirming the neologian text as 2630 to 1753. But then it goes on to exhibit a number of the more important examples, in which the proportion is still more favorable to the traditional text. And it is in this list that we get our chance to scrutinize the methods employed. *E. g.*, βαπτίσαντες, instead of βαπτίζοντες, is given as the neologian reading of Matt. 28: 19. It is the reading of Tregelles and of Westcott and Hort in the margin. That is, it is not the neologian reading. In the appendix to St. Mark, Eusebius is given as the only father favoring the omission. A true statement would be that these authors trace all the patristic testimony to the omission to Eusebius, the number of fathers who fall in with Eusebius being five. Luke 22: 43, 44 is represented as omitted in the neologian text. As a matter of fact, it is omitted in only the margin of the Revised Version, bracketed by Lachmann, and double bracketed by WH. The same representation is met by the same state of the facts in Luke 23: 34. In John 1: 18 the reading Θεός for υἱός is given as the neologian reading, whereas LTR are on the other side. In John 3: 13, ὁ ὢν ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is said to be omitted in the neologian text, the fact being that it is omitted in only WH Rmg. In John 21: 25 the verse is said to be omitted in the neologian text, when only T omits it. In Matt 11: 27, the substitution of ἀποκαλύψῃ for βούληται ἀποκαλύψαι is classed as neologian, whereas it is the reading of only L mg. In Matt. 1: 25, there is said to be no patristic authority for the omission of πρωτότοκον, but Tischendorf makes two quotations from Ambrose for the omission. If this is the way in which the patristic testimony is treated, the proportion of witnesses to the traditional and the neologian text would have to be considerably modified.

Another attempt at analytical treatment is to be found in the discussion of the skeptical and otherwise suspicious character of the MS. B ℵ. Under this head we find cited the omission of τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ in Luke 24: 3, whereas it is omitted in only D, Itala. Another case is the change of Θεοῦ to κυρίου, Acts 20: 28, a reading found in ACDES, whereas B ℵ read Θεοῦ. In John 14: 14, the insertion of με is spoken of as a slur on prayer in the name of Christ. In Matt. 24: 36, the insertion of οὐδὲ ὁ υἱός is put into the same category. But when you reflect that the insertion is from Mark 13: 32, and that all the texts read εἰ μὴ

ὁ πατὴρ μόνος, the charge of skepticism is seen to have a sort of recoil. The omission of ὁ Θεὸς in Mark 10:46 is another specimen of the same kind of alleged skepticism. And so the substitution of ὅς for Θεὸς in 1 Tim. 3:16 is treated in the same way. By the way, the patristic evidence for the change is here quite strong, but then it does not come within the province of the book to mention this fact. The omission of passages about eternal punishment is also put in evidence. Specimens are the substitution of ἁμαρτίας for κρίσεως in Mark 3:29, and the omission of ὁ σκώληξ αὐτῶν οὐ τελευτᾷ, καὶ τὸ πῦρ οὐ σβέννυται, in Mark 9:44, 46. But the first of these passages does not even weaken the testimony to eternal punishment, it rationalizes it. And in the second the omitted passage is only reserved for vs. 48, where it is stronger for the previous omission. In Matt. 21:44, the skeptical omission of the verse is chargeable against D, not BℵL. In Mark 4:12, there is said to be an omission of the forgiveness of sins, but only τὰ ἁμαρτήματα is omitted, not ἀφεθῇ. In Mark 10:34, there is said to be an omission of the danger of riches, but as it is the theme of the passage, and as its omission in this part of the discussion only marks a transition from the general difficulty of entering the kingdom to the special difficulty that the rich encounter, we can afford to pass it over as on the whole not very dangerous. A special class is made of those passages which show a "philosophical obtuseness to tender passages." In the account of the institution of the sacrament, the omission of φάγετε, of τὸ before διαθήκης, and of καινῆς with the same, is instanced. Trivialities all. And then the omission of φάγετε is supported by overwhelming evidence, including all the versions. On the whole, one is justified in comparing this with the treatment of witnesses by a lawyer on the other side, not with the summing up by a judge.

It is gratifying to find that the internal evidence for the omission of the closing verses of Mark is not ignored, but explained. This is fortunate, as this internal evidence is really the strongest case of the internal evidence entirely discrediting a passage that I remember. But the book explains it by the supposition that Mark had Peter's help up to this place, and after this told the story for himself. There are two insuperable difficulties in the way of this, however. In the first place, the difference of every kind is so great that you have to say, in this case, that Peter was the real author of the body of the gospel, Mark being only his amanuensis. But in all such cases the author's name is given to the book, not that of the scribe. And, secondly, the appendix is evidently summarized from Luke and John. But just as

evidently, Matthew and Luke are dependent on Mark in the body of the gospel, and there is thus a gap in time between the gospel and the appendix, and the latter was wanting in the first copies of the gospel. That is to say, the copies which omit the appendix were made from the original, and those which insert it were made from this later form, which is just the claim of the critics, only they would account for the facts in another way.

On the whole, the showing made for the traditional text is not strong. It would be very much stronger if the editor would cull from his heterogeneous matter the really relevant material, and present that in a temperate way.

E. P. GOULD.

EPISCOPAL DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Philadelphia, Pa.

A DISSERTATION UPON THE GOSPEL COMMENTARIES OF S. EPHRAEM THE SYRIAN. By J. HAMLYN HILL, D.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. Pp. 169, 8vo. $2.

THE interest in the *Commentary* of Ephraem the Syrian upon the *Diatessaron* of Tatian continues to grow, and finds expression in various tracts whose misfortune is that they are in danger of being apologetic rather than scientific, and are the work of persons, like Dr. Hill and myself, and almost everyone else who has written upon the subject, who are absolutely ignorant of the Armenian, the only language in which S. Ephraem's work has come down to us. Both of these considerations furnish matter for regret; yet perhaps we ought not to be unduly sorry that the apologetic side of the question has been forced to the front, for the *Diatessaron* has become a leading factor in every question relating to the origin of the gospels and the character of the text. If reviewers had not been skeptical as to the authorship of the commentary in question and anti-apologists, like the author of *Supernatural Religion*, had not exhausted their powers of debate in a last vain effort to prove that Tatian never wrote a Harmony upon the Gospels, and Ephraem had never commented upon it, we should not have been driven into that close examination of the internal and external evidence which has finally shattered a body of adverse criticism which, for its own sake, ought never to have been brought forward; nor should we know what we now know with regard to the early commentaries upon the gospel in the Eastern church and their dependence

one upon another. As it is, we are almost able to trace the evolution of the conventional Syrian commentary from a primitive Targumistic form down to the finished mosaics of the later doctors of the church; and in this evolution Ephraem counts for a hundred missing links.

Last spring, in publishing a number of fragments of the Commentary of Ephraem in their original Syriac, I remarked that "no one who was the least versed in *Quellenkritik* would have any doubt as to the dependence of the later Syriac commentators upon the Ephraem Commentary, even if they had transcribed their extracts without the frequent introductory formula, 'Mar Ephraem says.' Nor would anyone who was acquainted with the writings of the great Syrian father fail to recognize that the commentary (even if it had come down to us anonymously) was so full of Ephraem's ideas, and of extracts from his hymns and discourses that it could have been identified as his independently of any superscription or tradition." The work before us furnishes a verification of the correctness of the latter part of this statement, by collecting the parallels which exist in the published works of Ephraem to the ideas and language of the much-disputed commentary. Dr. Hill has gathered sixty-one parallels, most of which are quite conclusive that the commentary is the work of Ephraem; or perhaps we ought rather to say that the major part of the explanations come from the hand of Ephraem; this will leave it open to the adverse critic to postulate the existence of later hands than Ephraem's in the work, and I wish him joy of his task, if, after examining and admitting Dr. Hill's parallels and my textual restorations, he wishes to carry the argument any further.

Returning to the difficulty previously alluded to, viz., that of the workman who is unacquainted with the tools that are necessary to the work, I regret personally that I was obliged to work from Mösinger's translation of the Armenian Ephraem and not from the Armenian itself; for a knowledge of the original text would in some cases have thrown light upon the text of my Syriac restorations. I must also regret that Dr. Hill's work suffers from similar defects. Just as in his translation of the Arabic Tatian, which he published under the misleading title of *The Earliest Life of our Lord* (which is much the same thing as saying that a *textus receptus* is equivalent to the original text), he was obliged to translate from Ciasca's Latin and call in the aid of Mr. Gray for the Arabic, so in the translation of the Armenian Ephraem fragments he is dependent upon Professor Robinson, and in the translation of the original works of Ephraem he depends upon

English and Latin renderings which already exist, apparently with no check upon the accuracy of the translations. And in consequence of this limited linguistic outlook, his pages are, like my own, sometimes the worse for want of knowledge. The fact is that Dr. Hill's parallels properly are the footnotes to a critical edition of the Ephraem Commentary; and this critical edition Professor Robinson might easily give us. Or is he waiting until some one discovers the original Syriac in full? Even in that case we shall not be independent of the contrast furnished by the translation.

Here is an example of the confusion introduced by lack of Syriac: on p. 64 Dr. Hill quotes Mösinger as follows:

> The Romans set up within their temple their standards, on which was the figure of an eagle, as it was also said, "Upon the wings of uncleanness and destruction." These closing words appear to be a variation of Dan. 9:27, and stand thus in the Latin: "Super alis immunditici et perditionis." S. Ephraem also has a variation of this verse at ii, 222 D, which stands thus in the Latin: "Et super alas abominationis desolatio," *i. e.*, and upon the wings of abomination desolation. Thus both in S. Ephraem and in our commentary there is a various reading, "wings," etc.

The argument would seem to be vitiated by the fact that Ephraem is merely quoting the ordinary text of Dan. 9: 27 in the Peshito, and apparently without any variation at all as follows:

And here is a case in which the argument for our Ephraemitic origin is reduced far below its proper strength.

On p. 68 Dr. Hill proceeds to translate Mösinger as follows:

> At Moes. p. 237, l. 26, we read: "In the month Arech (*i. e.*, Nisan) the flowers burst their folds and come forth, and leaving their folds naked and empty they become the crown of others. So also in the month Arech the High Priest tore his priesthood asunder, and left it naked and empty; and the priesthood passed over, and was conferred upon our Saviour."

Compare with this the words of S. Ephraem at B, 762, sec. 8:

> "In Nisan the flowers burst forth from their cups; they are plucked and leave the stem naked, and serve for crowning others. As Nisan, so his feast. In it indeed the High Priest rent his clothes; and the priesthood fled from him and left him stripped, and spread itself out upon our Saviour."

Dr. Hill does not notice that the two quotations are identical; one of them is an extract from a hymn of Ephraem's, and the other is an Armeno-Latino-Anglo translation of the very same verses. So we are not dealing with parallelism of ideas at all, but with the very words of

S. Ephraem. (See *Ephrem on the Gospel*, p. 88.) It is a pretty illustration of the havoc made by repeated translations, that the identity of these two passages was not recognized; but poetry easily gets mangled when it becomes prose.

Very often the translation of the Syriac in Dr. Hill's authorities needs revision; *e. g.*, on p. 68 we are told that "the same idea is expressed by S. Ephraem at A. 482. 'They plaited for him a crown of thorns, thus bearing witness to the curse of Adam. They gathered choice thorns and placed them on his head.'" One would readily suspect that this was not Ephraem; and a reference to the passage shows that it is a mere mistranslation on the part of Dr. Lamy. Such misinterpretations must always be watched for.

In handling the quotations from the Old Testament, Dr. Hill is often at a loss for want of Ephraem's own authorities. Thus in discussing (p. 48) the statement that the mystery of the virgin birth was known to Gideon, we are pointed rightly to Ephraem's reference to the subject in a comment on Ps. 72 : 6, "He shall come down like the rain into a fleece of wool." This, says Dr. Hill, is the prayer-book version and agrees with the Septuagint; but the Hebrew means "into the mown grass." It is something new to find the prayer-book version of the Psalms amongst the critical authorities for a text, and as to its agreement with the LXX one is tempted to ask why they should disagree. S. Ephraem should not be referred to the LXX, unless we wish to deprive the Peshito of all authority. So on p. 61 note the reference to Amos 7: 8. Septuagint version should at least be expanded by a reference to the Syriac, otherwise we shall be crediting S. Ephraem with a knowledge of Greek.

A worse mistake than all, which must be a mere slip, will be found on p. 52, note, where we are told that "Malachi means 'angel of God.'"

On p. 50 we are told from Mösinger that the ark rested upon a mountain in a district afterwards inhabited by the Carduchi or Cardui, Noah being said to have built the altar in monte Carduorum. And it is inferred that this identifies the commentary as Ephraem's, because similar statements are found in his works; and because, the opinion being common in Syria, the commentary probably had a Syriac origin. The expression is merely the language of the Peshito which replaces the Hebrew "Ararat" by "Kardu." This should have been stated. The remark that the district was afterwards inhabited by the Kurds, merely means that Dr. Hill believes the story of the deluge! We would

gladly believe in a time when there were no Kurds, but evidence is against such an opinion.

On p. 66 we are told that in an interesting note Dr. Lamy says this opinion [of the deconsecration of Judas' eucharist] was peculiar to S. Ephraem. Dr. Lamy goes on to quote from Bar Hebraeus the statement that Mar Ephraem and *Mar Jacob* held this view. So it can hardly have been peculiar in the sense that Dr. Hill implies. The Syrian church seems to have discussed the question not a little; of course Ephraem may have set them at it.

When the question of the character of Tatian's text comes up, Dr. Hill wisely admits that the *Diatessaron* may have undergone some changes between the time of Tatian and that of Ephraem. Still he clings too closely to the belief that Tatian harmonized our existing gospels without apocryphal additions. And on p. 32 the reason is given for disbelieving the story of the fire in the Jordan to have been in Tatian's text, because "it was not in the gospels he was harmonizing." How is this proved? Especially when it is admitted immediately after that the tradition exists in two old Latin MSS. It seems to us that it may very likely have been in Tatian. Certainly the reason given would necessitate the production of Tatian's copies.

On p. 7 we are told that Aphraates, the Persian sage, and his own bishop, James of Nisibis, made free use of the *Diatessaron* in their writings. The works commonly ascribed to James of Nisibis are the same as those which are now published under the name of Aphraates. Or is Dr. Hill referring to some works of James of Nisibis other than those published at Rome in the last century from the Armenian?

But now let us conclude our rapid reading of a painstaking and useful book; and let us hope that it will be read, amongst others, by Mr. Walter R. Cassels.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. By the REV. EZRA P. GOULD, S.T.D., Professor of New Testament Literature and Language, Divinity School of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Philadelphia. "The International Critical Commentary." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. Pp. lvii + 317. $2.50.

PROFESSOR GOULD'S *Commentary on St. Mark* professes to be distinctly critical. It belongs to the series of critical commentaries now

being issued under the editorship of Drs. Briggs, Driver and Plummer. It must be reviewed and estimated therefore in accordance with the standard which it sets for itself. In the preface the author declares his critical theme to be "the interrelation of the synoptics," by which is meant specifically the "two-document theory," according to which the primary sources of the synoptics are Mark's gospel and a collection of Christ's discourses written by Matthew. This theory necessarily attaches special value to Mark as an historical source for the events of Christ's life, and is supposed often to enable the critic to discriminate, approximately, the facts, from their embellishments in the gospel narratives. Hence, no doubt, the reason why Mark has been selected as the first gospel to be discussed in this series.

In the introduction Professor Gould briefly states the "two-document" theory; gives an analysis of Mark's book with a brief account of the writer and a few words on the date of his writing (which he concludes to have been "about 70 A. D."); then discusses "the person and principles of Jesus in Mark's gospel;" and adds a short chapter on "the gospels in the second century," and another upon "recent critical literature." Then follows a statement of the authorities for the determination of the text, and, finally, the commentary itself.

In reference first to the textual criticism, it should be stated that textual notes, with citations of editors and manuscripts, etc., are appended at the close of the exegetical comments on the several verses, and are very abundant. They appear, in fact, needlessly abundant. The majority of the various readings are of no exegetical importance, and, since the Greek text of the gospel is not printed in full, reference must constantly be made to the Testament in order to appreciate the notes. While the author's text nearly agrees with those of Tischendorf and Westcott and Hort, he exercises his own judgment. He does not state his principles of criticism; but, judging from specific instances, they appear unduly subjective. Thus, in 6:14, he prefers ἔλεγεν to ἔλεγον, because of the view he has adopted of the reasons governing Herod in his inquiry about John; he thinks ῥαντίσωνται, instead of βαπτίσωνται, in 7:4, "a manifest emendation," though it has the support of BN; in 14:68 he still inserts "καὶ ἀλέκτωρ ἐφώνησε," in spite of the weighty evidence against it, and the probability that it was inserted to explain "ἐκ δευτέρου" in vs. 72; in 15:1 he accepts "ἑτοιμάσαντες" instead of ποιήσαντες, on the express ground of "internal evidence," which means, as the commentary shows, that the author believes Matthew and Mark to give a different account of Christ's

trial before the Sanhedrim from that given by Luke; a view which, he thinks, ἑτοιμάσαντες supports. There is no discussion of the relative value of "groups" of authorities in Mark, and such considerations do not appear to have determined the conclusions. The account of the history of the text (pp. lii, liii) is rather obscurely given. We have not taken pains to examine the citations of textual authorities, but have chanced upon a few errors. The "Peshito" is called (p. lii) the "*oldest* Syriac version," and no mention is made of the Lewis or Curetonian recensions, the latter of which contains some of the closing verses of the gospel. The old Latin version should not be assigned "to the very beginning of the second century" (p. liv). In the note on 1:34, Codex ℵ is misquoted. So is B under 2:16 (*cf.* Gregory's *Proleg.*, p. 1261), and the evidence of B makes Professor Gould's text in that verse very improbable. Under 5:21 the strong attestation for WH's reading, which Gould rejects, is not given. Under 6:22 he does not notice that WH's reading αὐτοῦ replaces not αὐτῆς, but αὐτῆς τῆς, of Tex. Rec. Erroneous, too, is the note under 14:58, "WH. has the singular reading ἀναστήσω." WH. read οἰκοδομήσω, the other reading being simply noted as "Western." But of course the discussion of the last eleven verses of the gospel presents the chief textual question. Here the external evidence pro and con is very inadequately stated. Professor Gould, rightly we think, rejects the passage, but gives the reader little idea of the real weight of the argument, or of the evidence for the extreme antiquity of the addition. His own judgment is evidently determined wholly by internal considerations. The linguistic argument against the passage is vigorously marshaled, but the counter arguments are not presented. His final and main objection proceeds on the assumption that the addition, following, he thinks, Luke's narrative, makes the ascension occur on the day of the resurrection, and excludes all appearances of Christ in Galilee, whereas Mark, like Matthew, evidently had the latter in mind. But vs. 9 evidently implies John's account, and that evangelist believed in appearances of Christ both in Jerusalem and Galilee. Hence the author of the addition should not, any more than Luke in reality, be held to exclude the Galilean appearances, and this argument against the authenticity of the addition falls to the ground. Professor Gould holds also that Mark's work was intended to end with vs. 8, which is almost incredible even for so inelegant a writer as the evangelist. The whole discussion of the gospel's close can hardly be regarded as satisfactory.

The commentary itself is arranged upon an excellent plan. The gospel is divided into the brief sections into which it naturally falls. At the beginning of each of these an expository summary of its contents is placed. Then follow notes upon the particular verses. Condensation is evidently aimed at; so much so that the style frequently becomes obscure and at times the comments become little more than occasional remarks. An abundance of grammatical and lexical notes are given, generally at the bottom of the page. Many of them are rather elementary, but will make the commentary useful to young students. The authorities usually cited in these notes are Thayer's *Lexicon*, Winer's *Grammar*, and Burton's *Moods and Tenses*, references to which occur constantly. Occasionally, however, the author slips. Under 1:11 the aor. εὐδόκησα is translated "*I came to take pleasure*," and is said to denote "the historical process by which God came to take pleasure in Jesus during his earthly life." In support of this use of the aorist, reference is made to Winer and Burton. But the reference to Winer is wrong (it should be 40. 5. *b* 2), and Burton takes a different view of the passage. As the latter points out, Matt. 12:18 (to which Gould does not allude) makes it probable that the aorist here amounts to a vivid present, conceived of indeed as the issue of previous action, but forcibly suggesting the result. Again, under 14:41, the literal translation of ἦλθεν ἡ ὥρα gives a misleading idea of the force of the aorist, and, on a previous page, the statement that "the present imperative does not command the beginning of an action, but the continuance of an action already begun," if meant to be a general remark, is also likely to mislead. There are a few annoying errors in the references. Besides the one noted above, on p. 93 "Winer 144" should be "44;" on p. 94 the reference to Winer means *page* 272, though the number only is given; on p. 157 "Win. 43" should be 42, and "footnote * p. 156" should apparently be 158.

The exegetical part of the commentary aims simply to bring out the meaning of the evangelist. The author is familiar with the work of modern exegetes, but makes no parade of the history of opinion. As occasion offers, he briefly treats such subjects as the miracles of Jesus, the brethren of Jesus, the authority of Scripture, etc., but the discussions are very meager. He writes, however, with independent judgment and in some instances with much insight. We have read with pleasure his discussion of the healing of the leper (p. 32); his remarks on the miracles, directed against Holtzmann (p. 33); and, in particular, his too brief treatment of the transfiguration (p. 161) in

which Professor Gould makes some exceedingly suggestive and illuminating comments. Yet we think the commentary open to serious criticism from several points of view. (1) It betrays a general disposition to accept rationalistic interpretations. We read (pp. 3, 16) that the Old Testament contains no expectation of a personal Messiah, and (p. 15) that the synoptics *exclude* John's account of the early Judean ministry, though (p. 18) John's account of the first acquaintance of the disciples with Jesus is admitted to be necessary to explain the synoptic narrative. The discussion of demoniacal possessions (pp. 23, 27) is very hesitating, and in it the author seeks refuge in naturalistic explanations; and, while the actuality of the miracles is at times defended, dubious expressions elsewhere occur (pp. 86, 122). A distinction is also drawn between facts of Christ's life and the reports of them by the evangelists (pp. 37, 90, 92). The latter we must critically sift in order to reach the former. This places the exegete under the guidance of the philosopher. It sometimes leads also to explanations as incredible as any miracle. An instance of this occurs on p. 92 in the discussion of the Gadarene demoniac. The story in the gospel is said to be "a tax on our belief." "The *facts* in the case are the cure and the rush of the frightened swine." "Leave out the elements of the story contributed by the idea of possession and substitute the theory of lunacy, and the rational account of the fright and destruction of the swine is that it was occasioned by some paroxysm of the lunatic himself." This explanation is truly marvelous. What "paroxysm" could possibly have accomplished such a result? And why should there be belief in the fright of the swine at all, or why should we not reduce their number, say to half a dozen, if we may discriminate between the record and the truth? Again Christ's prediction of his death and resurrection is held to have been given in language much less distinct than is reported by the evangelists (pp. 159, 197, 198). The latter is thought to be inconsistent with the subsequent conduct of the disciples. But, as Professor Gould himself points out (p. 275) at the last the disciples' faith suffered an eclipse. We have only to put ourselves back into their situation to find it quite credible that the words of Jesus were forgotten amid the distress of his seeming defeat. (2) Equally extreme is the author's antiharmonistic prejudice. No doubt, harmonists have frequently strained the gospel narratives to show their agreement; but critics of the opposite school have been no less at fault in exaggerating the differences. This latter is what Professor Gould seems to us to do. To cite only a few instances

out of many: he positively affirms (p. 68) that Matthew puts in Passion Week the same denunciation of the Pharisees which Luke (11 : 37, etc.) assigns to an earlier occasion, and speaks of it as "a specimen of the disagreement of the evangelists in their attempts to give chronological sequence to their narratives." In the same connection he cites an unhappy suggestion of Dr. Gardiner, which few reasonable harmonists would follow, as an example of "the ingenuities and curiosities of harmonizing interpretation." Yet surely Christ may be supposed to have sometimes repeated himself, and he would be likely to do so, especially in the denunciation of specific and representative sins such as those of the Pharisees were; and, besides this, it is not improbable that Matthew intentionally enlarged his report in chap. 23 by material on the same subject spoken at other times. This, however, would give no occasion for Professor Gould's severe words. Again, when Matthew makes Jairus say that his daughter had just died, is it not hypercritical to charge the evangelist with "confounding this with the message brought later by members of his (Jairus') household"? Why should we not give the evangelist the credit of intentionally combining the two messages, since his narrative of the whole transaction shows his wish to be brief? It is most needless likewise to represent Matthew and Mark as inconsistent with Luke in their accounts of Christ's trial before the Sanhedrim (p. 283), and it is entire exaggeration to say (p. 87) that Matthew makes "the gathering of the multitudes about (Jesus) owing to the miracles accompanying the healing of Peter's mother-in-law" to have been "the *occasion*" of Christ's crossing the sea. Professor Gould on p. 84 admits that "the mark of time in Matthew is not definite enough to create positive disagreement." Yet on p. 102, *note*, he again assumes the contrary. In the same note is the remark that "Matthew connects the visit to Nazareth with the healing of Peter's mother-in-law, which Mark and Luke put at the beginning of the Galilean ministry, while Matthew, though connecting the two events as they do, puts them both at a late period." But surely the connection of the two events in Matthew is anything but obvious. One is narrated in 8: 14, and the other in 13 : 53–58. 11 : 1 is of itself enough to separate them widely in Matthew's account, and they are equally remote in Mark. Professor Gould's idea, however, seems to be that, assuming the identity of Luke's visit to Nazareth with that of Matthew and Mark, some connection between that event and the early work in Capernaum floated dimly before the minds of the synoptists, but each arranged them differently; and this insubstantial theory is

made to reflect upon the credit of the evangelists. These examples are sufficient to illustrate the author's unwillingness to seek a reasonable harmony. Many allusions indicate that he thinks the fourth gospel also contradictory of the synoptics (*cf.* pp. 123, 124, 257, 258, 273, 277, 288, 291, 297, 298). He usually gives the preference to the latter, and appears to regard the historical matter in the fourth gospel as quite untrustworthy.

It would be interesting to examine in detail many special interpretations, but we have space to mention only a few. The Baptist's doubt, it is said (p. 10), "could have arisen probably only from the failure of Jesus to carry out the kingly part of the Jewish Messianic expectation;" but is not Christ's failure at the time to inaugurate the *judgment* upon Israel, which John had specially predicted, a better explanation of the doubt? The temptation narrative is explained (p. 14) as a "pictorial and concrete story of what really took place within the soul of Jesus;" yet, if the narrative be true at all, it must have come from Jesus himself. Did he purposely give it a pictorial form? The feast which followed the call of Levi is held to have been in the house of Jesus himself (p. 41). This of course implies that Luke misunderstood the earlier narrative, which is in itself improbable and by no means made necessary by Mark's language. Christ's teaching about the Sabbath is said (p. 50) to imply that "*man* can adapt it (*i. e.*, the Sabbath law) and set it aside and modify it, whenever it interferes with his good." This is surely a large inference to draw from Christ's assertion of the human purposes of the Sabbath law and of his own authority over it. The Davidic origin of Ps. 110 is denied (p. 236) emphatically, because "the idea of a personal Messiah belongs to the period succeeding the close of the canon," and Christ's reference to it as Davidic and inspired is explained by saying that "inspiration, which accounts for whatever extraordinary knowledge belonged to Jesus in his earthly life, does not extend to such matters of critical research as authorship." Here Jesus is supposed to have hung his argument on a false historical statement; for if the Jews had known enough to reply that David had never made such a statement, they would truly have silenced their questioner. The eschatological discourse is interpreted (pp. 240, etc.) as referring wholly to the destruction of Jerusalem and the spread of Christianity among the Gentiles. In Mark, this interpretation may be plausibly defended and it is well exhibited by Professor Gould; but the reports of Matthew and Luke do not seem consistent with that view.

Two chapters of the introduction call for special notice; since, in

our judgment, they constitute the least satisfactory portions of the volume:

One is the brief account (pp. ix–xii) given of the critical theory of the origin of the synoptics upon which the commentary is said to proceed. This is the "two-document" theory, now so widely prevalent, and which Professor Gould represents as no longer theory but ascertained fact. We think it extremely unfortunate that this theory should not have been adequately discussed and abundantly verified, since it is represented as the critical basis upon which all gospel study should proceed and as the particular view which this commentary seeks to introduce. Surely more than four pages of introduction and occasional notes in the commentary concerning the use of identical expressions, etc., by the evangelists, are required to give readers even an intelligent idea of what the theory is. The uninstructed student will gain from the book no clear idea of the question, and the instructed student will see that Professor Gould dismisses in his brief introduction, with a simple, unverified assertion, matters about which there is much difference of opinion and plenty of room for argument. We are surprised, too, to observe that in the course of the commentary so little attention is paid to the bearings of the *order of narrative* upon the theory in question; while the author's disposition to exaggerate the differences between the evangelists provides plenty of material by which the theory of their mutual dependence might be rebutted. No one will be convinced of the theory by Professor Gould's book, and the presentation of it can hardly be called "critical." The few instances of verbal agreement in the synoptics which are noted here and there, are quite as explicable on the theory of a common source for all three.

The chapter on "The Gospels in the Second Century" appears to us equally unsatisfactory. Its conclusion is that in that period our gospels were the main authorities for the life of Christ, though they were not considered "Scripture" and extra-canonical material was to a small extent used as equally reliable. We are quite willing to admit that items of extra-canonical information were received as true without hesitation. But we believe that Professor Gould gives a wrong impression as to the authority which was attached even then to our gospels, and that his account is marred by serious inaccuracies. Is it not proper to interpret less explicit evidence by that which is more explicit? If so, the clear testimony to the canonical authority of our gospels which is given by the writers of the close of the second century (*e. g.*, Irenæus) should govern our interpretation of the earlier

testimony. The known relation of Irenæus with Polycarp and his wide acquaintance with the churches and history of his time, make it incredible that the four gospels were not, as he states, received from the close of the apostolic age as the only authoritative reports of Christ's life and teaching. And then in sketching the earlier evidence omission should not have been made of the fact that pseudo-Barnabas cites Matthew as Scripture, nor that, as Justin testifies, the gospels were regularly read in the public service of the churches. Professor Gould is, to say the least, misleading in the apparently large use of uncanonical gospels which he attributes to Justin (p. xxxvii) and afterwards he practically retracts it (p. xl). On the other hand he is inaccurate in stating that Justin quotes no uncanonical sayings of our Lord. He does give two (*Dial.* 35, 47). Especially surprising also is the statement (p. xxxviii) that Papias quotes Mark 10:38, 39. We wish that we could believe it; but the statement for which no proof is given, rests on a fragment of Georgius Hamartolos, a chronicler of the ninth century, published in 1862 by Nolte in the Tübingen *Theolog. Quartalschrift* (*cf.* Hilgenfeld in *Zeitsch. f. wissens. Theol.*, 1875), where Papias is said to have stated that St. John was slain by the Jews and the reference to and quotation from Mark which follow are doubtless from the pen of the chronicler and not from Papias. Moreover, how can it be said of the Muratori Fragment, which gives a list of books accepted by the section of the church which it represents, and confessedly enumerates only our four gospels, that "it becomes a witness to an acceptance of these *among the rest* as authoritative"? But we take particular exception to the statement (p. xl) that Marcion was the first to publish a New Testament canon. This view, though critics of the Ritschlian school support it, is without proof and is *a priori* improbable. The church fathers know nothing of it. The evidence both of the New Testament itself and of the earliest second century writers is against it. And the idea that a heretic should appeal to a written canon, if the idea of a written canon was not already established in the church, is almost preposterous.

We note in conclusion on p. 98 the misprint of לְשָׁוֹם for לְשַׁלֹּם; on p. 100 θόρυβον translated "crowd" instead of "tumult;" on p. 142, in 8:2, ἤδη omitted before ἡμέραι in the text; on p. 144 Magdala instead of Magadan as the true text of Matt. 15:39 reads. The statement (p. 283) that Pilate had been procurator for three years when John the Baptist began his work is perhaps another indication of the author's rejection of the historical element in the fourth gospel,

unless he means to date Christ's death as late as 32 or 33 A. D. Pilate is sometimes called the sixth procurator, but, properly speaking, he was the fifth who formally held that office in Judæa.

PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. GEORGE T. PURVES.

THE MESSIAH OF THE GOSPELS. By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1894. Pp. xv+337. $2.

THE MESSIAH OF THE APOSTLES. By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in the Union Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1895. Pp. xv+562. $3.

THE three volumes of Professor Briggs on the biblical doctrine of the Messiah are the most important contribution of modern times to this inexhaustible subject. His plan is comprehensive and attractive. The first volume, published in 1886, has taken its place so far up towards the head of what has been written on Messianic Prophecy that no one who studies the subject can afford to ignore it. The second and third volumes of the proposed series are devoted to the Messiah of the New Testament. In his preface to the first of these the author says "that, guided by the teachings of Christ and his apostles, he has caught glimpses of the Christ of the throne and of the second advent, which he did not learn from his theological teachers or from the writings of his predecessors or contemporaries." In his preface to the *Messiah of the Apostles* he claims to have "done his best to turn away from the Christ of the theologians and of the creeds of the church, and to see the Messiah as he appeared to each writer in each separate writing." He has found that the diversity is great. "It is not always possible to combine the diverse representations in a higher unity." He thinks that "a craze for logical systems of Christology" is to blame for the fact "that we have so many different, unsatisfactory Christologies in the literature of the church."

In setting forth the Messiah of the gospels, our author's plan first gives an outline of the Messianic ideas of pre-Christian Judaism, especially as traceable in the book of Enoch, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Psalter of Solomon. The Messianic conceptions of the

immediate forerunners of Jesus are found in the words of the angels, the prophetic utterances of Elizabeth, the Virgin Mary, Zacharias, Simeon, and the preaching of John the Baptist. Then follows a detailed examination of the Messianic ideal of each of the four gospels. "The Apocalypse of Jesus," in Matt. 24, and its parallels is regarded as of such exceptional importance that a separate chapter of more than thirty pages is given to its exposition. The volume on the *Messiah of the Apostles* follows the same general plan, and several apocryphal apocalypses, the preaching and epistles of Peter, the Pauline epistles, Hebrews, the Apocalypse and epistles of John, and finally the prologue of John's gospel are each made to exhibit their various Messianic ideals. The prologue of the fourth gospel is thought to be a later addition and of different authorship, for it "has features which distinguish it from the gospel, and its Christology is different" (p. 496). The things which chiefly arrest attention in the reading of these volumes, and call for special remark are of three kinds, critical, exegetical, and doctrinal. We give a few examples under each of these heads.

1. Touching the synoptic problem, Dr. Briggs holds that Mark's gospel is the earliest in composition and the simplest, but he offers no hypothesis of its origin. Matthew is dependent upon Mark for historical material, and upon the Logia for the discourses of Jesus. "This Logia was lost at an early date, but the most if not all of its contents are in the gospels of Matthew and Luke. Luke gives them more in the circumstances of their utterance. The gospel of Matthew arranged them in a topical order without regard to these circumstances." Luke's gospel is made up of historical material from Mark, a large portion of the Aramaic Logia of Matthew, and considerable matter probably from a third written source. It "seems to have tried the chronological method and to have succeeded only in part" (p. 73). For the quotations of Matt. 4 : 15; 8 : 16, 17; the writer used an Aramaic version of Isa. 9 : 1, 2 and 53 : 4. "The Wisdom of God" in Luke 11 : 49 is a lost writing belonging to the wisdom literature of the pseudepigrapha. The words of Gabriel to Zacharias and Mary, and those of Elizabeth, Mary, Zacharias, and Simeon (which the Logia did not include, and Mark "knows nothing of them") are songs which "doubtless represent reflection upon these events by Christian poets, who put in the mouths of the angels, the mothers and the fathers, the poems which they composed. But the inspired author of the gospel vouches for their propriety and for their essential conformity to truth

and fact" (p. 42). Not only does Dr. Briggs detect the poetic element in the utterances of the angels, and the fathers and the mothers, but he also finds poetic form in the apostolic commissions as written in Matt. 10 and in Luke 10, and he attempts "the reconstruction of the original sentences of the Wisdom of Jesus" (p. 182). The address to Peter in Matt. 16 : 17–19, the directions for dealing with an offending brother in Matt. 18 : 15–20, a large part of the Sermon on the Mount and many other discourses of Jesus, the prologue of the fourth gospel, and most of the Apocalypse are construed after the manner of the parallelism of Hebrew poetry. To such an extreme does our author carry his ideas of biblical poetry that one might, on his principles, construe the larger part of the New Testament into poetic form.

In his arrangement of the Pauline epistles Dr. Briggs says (p. 97) that the Thessalonian epistles "were soon followed" by those to the Corinthians, although the dates he assigns show an interval of at least four years. He thinks Galatians was probably written in the spring of 58, and Romans about the same time. As to the epistles of the imprisonment, Philippians is certainly Paul's, Ephesians probably, Colossians less probably. "The group of pastoral epistles cannot be explained within the limits of the life of Paul given in the Acts," but may have been written by that apostle at a later period, near the close of his life. The epistle to the Hebrews lacks sufficient evidence of Pauline authorship. "The author was a man of the Alexandrine school, who had been converted to Christianity, and who aims to reconcile Philo with Christianity," and he may have been the eloquent Apollos.

The critical theory of the Apocalypse set forth in the volume on the *Messiah of the Apostles* will probably command little following. It is, to our thought, the least satisfactory portion of the author's work, and exposes him to the charge of being carried away by a craze for divisive analysis as surely as he himself charges others with being misled by "a craze for logical systems." After stating the positions of Voelter, Weizsaecker, Vischer, Weyland, and Spitta, he frankly declares that he cannot accept the analysis of any one of these critics, and does not see his own way "through all the mazes of this intricate problem" (p. 289), but he feels that he has a new contribution to offer towards the desired solution. We opine that many critical minds that have not the slightest prejudice against a divisive analysis, and are most ready to welcome any light which reveals the composite elements of a great monument of literature, will be slow to accept the new theory of Dr.

Briggs. A hypothesis which supposes original documents of diverse authorship and date ought, above all things, to be able to show in those diverse sources obvious differences of tone, method, sentiment, language, and style, but Dr. Briggs and all his predecessors in this work have so far failed to produce clear and satisfactory evidence of such differences. Their varying theories create or suggest more difficulties than they solve.

Our author acknowledges the obvious unity of the Apocalypse, but this unity, he maintains, is the work of the final editor, and the result of four successive editions. The book now presents us with seven visions, four of which, viz., the epistles, the seals, the trumpets, and the bowls, "are marked off from the other three by distinct groups of sevens. How is it," we are asked, "that an author who made so much of this holy number in four visions did not use it in the other three?" (p. 290) This question seems to assume a principle of criticism which would deny an author reasonable liberty in composition. Is it even probable that an author competent to write any one of these magnificent visions would have carried the same stereotyped uniformity through seven in succession? Would he not rather have studied some variety in this as he has done in the imagery of his different groups of symbols? One might with the same reason ask why it is that, in the visions of the seals and the trumpets, the first four in each group are noticeably marked off from the other three, while no such distinct grouping appears in the visions of the bowls and the epistles? It would seem almost preposterous to insist that diversity of authorship is the only reasonable answer. As well might one allege that the visions of the great image and the four beasts and that of the ram and he-goat in Daniel prove corresponding diversity of authorship.

Another supposed evidence of independent documents is found in the fact that the visions of the epistles and the seals have each an introductory Christophany, the latter combining both Theophany and Christophany. Our author holds that the apocalypse of the seven churches (chaps. 1–3) "is evidently the last of the series" (p. 438), but he fails to put forth any valid proof that it is of a date so late that the author of the other portions of the book might not himself have prepared it expressly as an introduction to the series. He contradicts himself by admitting, on page 304, that it may have been written in the time of Nero, and yet declaring, on page 438, that "it cannot be earlier than the Flavian period." There is every reason to suppose that the "Epistles to the Churches" were written after the rest of the

book was, in its main contents, finished. Every epistle seems to imply this by some obvious allusion to what appears in subsequent portions of the Apocalypse: as, for example, the tree of life, the second death, a written name which no one knows, the ruling of all nations with a rod of iron, the morning star, the white garments, the book of life, the new Jerusalem and the reigning with Christ upon his throne. Such an introduction to his book shows by the very nature of its contents the propriety of its special Christophany, and is not in the least inconsistent with the additional Theophany which as appropriately follows in its place.

The episodes which come in between the sixth and seventh seals and the sixth and seventh trumpets are thought by the critics to be out of place, and Dr. Briggs asks, "What has become of the scene which originally followed the opening of the seventh seal?" We should answer that it follows now in its proper place where the author of the Apocalypse originally put it, and consists of the vision of the seven trumpets. The seventh seal issues in the revelation of the trumpets which serve after the manner of apocalyptic repetition to intensify the terrors of the great day of wrath depicted in the revelation of the sixth seal. The episodes, accordingly, coming in each case immediately before the seventh and last disclosure, are an additional evidence of the organic connection of the seals and trumpets in the apocalyptic scheme of the sacred writer. In this he imitates the method of the great epics and dramas, which aim thus to introduce beforehand whatever will serve to enhance the impressiveness of the final scene. The symbolism of the trumpets seems to have been suggested by the seven trumpets of the fall of Jericho. As their last blast sounded the fall of the first great city which stood in the way of the conquest of Canaan, so these symbolical seven sound the signal of the fall of the great city where the Lord was crucified.

No critical analysis can claim high regard which rests conspicuously upon needless conjectures and assumptions. There are other great compositions besides the Apocalypse which an ingenious critical analysis may plausibly rearrange. One might select those portions of the fifth and sixth books of the *Paradise Lost* which describe the wars and fall of the angels, and add in suitable order parts of the poem from the first four books and the tenth, and so construct an "apocalypse of Satan" without any real improvement on Milton's epic as a whole. We judge the same thing of the "Apocalypse of the Beasts," which Dr. Briggs constructs out of Rev. 10: 1–2, 8–11; 11: 1–13; 12: 18;

13; 14:8–13; 18; 19:11–21. For the consequent displacement of the vision of the woman and the dragon, and the connection of chapter 12 with 20; 21:1, 2, 16, 18–21; 22:3–5; 21:3–5 exhibits the arbitrary and violent method of the analysis. One result is that the critic is obliged to reject the best authenticated reading of 12:18 (*he stood*, that is, the dragon stood), and capriciously set aside the important teaching of the biblical writer in 13:2, 4, that the dragon gave to the beast "his power and his throne and great authority." The Apocalypse, without critical disruption, now clearly conveys the idea that when the dragon saw that he was cast to the earth he went his way to make war with the rest of the woman's seed, and he stood by the great sea, and when the monstrous beast came up out of it, he took possession of it, and used its power and authority as a mighty engine of persecution. We do not see that the new analysis and arrangement yield any better sense, or improve the composition.

2. The exegetical work of these volumes shows everywhere the hand of an accomplished master. This may be conceded even where the particular exposition is not satisfactory. We feel a convincing force in what is said against the Revised Version rendering of Luke 2:49, "In my Father's house." For this translation of the Greek is not exact, and it "is not suited to the context or the circumstances. For Jesus asks his parents why they sought him, and not why they did not seek him there. It was not a question of place, but a question of seeking him at all, when they ought to have had confidence in him that he was about his Father's work, wherever he might be." The exposition of the great Kenosis passage in Phil. 2:5–11 is as able and comprehensive as it is concise. The comment on Rom. 3:20–26 is no less noteworthy, and the translation, "propitiatory," in verse 25, is most ably defended. Less satisfactory is the explanation of "the man of sin" in 2 Thess. 2:1–12; and the treatment of the "Apocalypse of Jesus" (in Matt. 24 and its parallels) is as open to animadversion as is that of the Apocalypse of John. What can one say of an interpretation which insists that "immediately," in Matt. 24:29, "must be flexible enough to comprehend all the enormous uncertainty" of centuries of human history! To our understanding, also, the exegesis which virtually makes our Lord say, Verily, verily, I say to you, this generation shall not pass away until all these things are fulfilled, but the day and the hour may, for aught I know, be two thousand years hence, looks somewhat like a kind of solemn trifling. Perhaps the freedom and independence of Dr. Briggs as an exegete is nowhere better seen than in

his note on the word "seed" in Gal. 3:16, where he says that Paul "is incorrect in referring it to Christ alone as a person. But he certainly has in mind in the context, and probably here also the collective sense; for he and all believers are conceived of as so one with Christ that they die in him, live in him, and inherit the Abrahamic promise in him. If Paul had unfolded his argument further, he doubtless would have avoided the incidental error. He left his argument unguarded at this point" (p. 138). Many will question whether this is better than saying that Paul here simply makes use of a rabbinical mode of exegesis.

3. Among the doctrines peculiar to these volumes our space permits us only to make brief mention of the five following: (1) Baptismal regeneration is found in John 3:5, but while we are not to identify baptism by water with baptism by the spirit, we should "follow Jesus in his teaching that regeneration by baptism is necessary as well as regeneration by the divine Spirit." (2) The life of Jesus which he gave as a ransom for many (Matt. 20:28; Mark 10:45) was not a price paid to God, who claimed no such ransom; nor was it paid to the devil, whose authority was never recognized by Jesus. "It was paid to sin and evil as their ransom price" (*Messiah of the Gospels*, p. 112). (3) The grace and mercy of God in Christ are not confined in their activities "to the brief period of human life in this world, but continue in the middle state between the hour of death and the day of judgment" (p. 266). If any "have not the opportunity of the Messianic salvation in this life, they will probably have it in the middle state after death, and prior to the resurrection and ultimate judgment" (*Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 35). (4) Colossians 1:20 is thought to "imply a realm of evil spirits whom God reconciles to himself, and Christ is the medium of reconciliation for the heavenly beings as well as for men on earth" (*Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 216). (5) The millennium is the entire period of the kingdom of Christ in its domination of the world.

In making use of these volumes we have often felt the need of indexes of topics and of Scripture texts. We wonder that a writer of such ripe scholarship and experience as Dr. Briggs allowed his work to go forth with a defect so obvious, and one that might have been so easily supplied.

MILTON S. TERRY.

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE.

THE ATHANASIAN CREED AND ITS EARLY COMMENTARIES. By A. E. BURN, M.A. Cambridge: At the University Press. 1896. Pp. xcix + 68.

THIS monograph constitutes No. 1 of Vol. IV of *Texts and Studies: Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature.* Edited by J. Armitage Robinson, B.D. The series has already proved its right to exist by the enterprise that has enabled it to be the first to publish a number of important discoveries, and by the high scholarship that is apparent in all its issues. The series was happily inaugurated by the publication of the *Apology of Aristides*, edited by Professor J. Rendel Harris. It has already given to the world a number of newly discovered documents and improved texts of writings previously known. Its announcements of works in course of preparation, including a critical edition of the Curetonian Syriac gospels, is highly attractive to New Testament scholars and to church historians alike. The writing before us, in its rudimentary form, won in 1888 a prize offered by Bishop Lightfoot for an essay on this subject. Most of the author's spare time for the past seven years has been devoted to the elaboration of the essay, and the result is assuredly a monument of learned industry and of critical acumen. The Athanasian Creed (or *Quicunque*) has an interest for Anglicans that it possesses for the members of few other communions. The final report of the Ritual Commission of 1867 occasioned a prolonged and somewhat bitter controversy on the symbolical use of the Creed in the Church of England. This Creed has long been the *bête noire* of broad churchmen, because of its metaphysical character and its rigorous definitions of the doctrines of the Trinity and the Person of Christ, and because of its intolerance of any deviation from its formulæ. They have felt a natural interest in proving that the Creed is not only non-Athanasian (which is now commonly admitted), but that its composition dates from the most degenerate period of the mediæval time. High churchmen and conservatives of every type, while they have ceased to argue for Athanasian authorship, have been zealous in their efforts to vindicate the antiquity and authoritativeness of this bulwark of orthodoxy.

The conclusion reached by Mr. Burn is substantially in accord with that of Waterland (1724), who attributed the composition of the *Quicunque* to "Hilary, once Abbot of Lerins, and next Bishop of Arles, about the year 440." Waterland was of the opinion that it "was drawn up for the use of the Gallican clergy, and especially for the diocese or

province of Arles;" that "it seems to have been in the hands of Vincentius, monk of Lerins, before 434, by what he has borrowed from it; and to have been cited in part by Avitus of Vienna, about the year 500, and by Cæsarius of Arles, before the year 543;" that "about the year 570 it became famous enough to be commented upon like the Lord's Prayer and Apostles' Creed, and together with them;" that "all this while it had not yet acquired the name of the Athanasian Faith, but was simply styled the Catholic Faith;" but that "before 670 Athanasius' admired name came in to recommend and adorn it: being in itself also an excellent system of the Athanasian principles of the Trinity and Incarnation, in opposition chiefly to Arians, Macedonians, and Apollinarians;" and that "this gave it authority enough to be cited and appealed to as a standard in the disputes of the Middle Ages . . . . and credit enough to be received into the public service in the western churches."

This view was attacked by Ffoulkes (1873), Swainson (1875), Lumby (1887), and following these by Harnack (1887). The opposing theory is succinctly set forth in the following quotation from Lumby's *History of the Creeds:* "(1) Before A. D. 1809 there is no trustworthy notice of any confession called by the name of St. Athanasius. (2) Before that date two separate compositions existed which form the groundwork of the present *Quicunque.* (3) That for some time after that date all quotations are made only from the former of these compositions. (4) That the *Quicunque* was not known down to A. D. 813 to those who were most likely to have heard of it had it been in existence. (5) That it is found nearly as we use it in A. D. 870. (6) A comparison of the various MSS. shows that after the combination of the two parts the text was for some time in an unsettled or transition state. On every ground, therefore, both of internal and external evidence it seems to be a sound conclusion that somewhere between A. D. 813–850 the creed was brought nearly into the form in which we use it."

By a most laborious process, involving the collation of scores of commentaries on the Creed and works containing quotations from it, printed and MS., the author reaches the conclusion that the creed must have existed in substantially completed form and have had symbolical authority by about the beginning of the eighth century. Having thus reached what he regards as sure ground, he proceeds to work backwards through the seventh, sixth, and latter part of the fifth centuries. To follow him in his application of the principles of the "higher criticism" to the documents concerned would require more space than is

available, and to enumerate the documents studied would be useless. Critical texts of the creed and of the principal commentaries that form the material for the discussion are furnished.

It would be rash to assert that the author has established his case beyond the possibility of successful contradiction; but he has certainly set a hard task for those who would deny the existence of the *Quicunque* in substantially completed form before about the middle of the ninth century.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

THE AGE OF HILDEBRAND. By MARVIN R. VINCENT, D.D. New York: The Christian Literature Company. 1896.

THE purpose of this series, *Ten Epochs of Church History*, is in every way commendable. It aims to give an accurate and attractive account of the decisive periods of church history. There is every reason why the general public should have a knowledge of church history. Without such knowledge secular history cannot be adequately understood. Moreover, the study of church history is edifying and liberalizing in the best sense.

The book before us covers one of the most stirring and important periods in all history — 1049 to 1303. Hildebrand stands at the culmination of papal development. He and Innocent III stand at the zenith. But many forces are combining to change environments. Boniface VIII, far less able, but more dictatorial than either, utterly fails to understand his times. The result is that Romanism is shockingly humiliated in 1303.

Any satisfactory treatment of the age of Hildebrand can be nothing less than an outline more or less full of the entire church history of the period. Even when this is granted the embarrassment of riches is confusing, and the matter of historical perspective is fundamental.

The volume contains 437 pages. At page 124 Hildebrand has been evolved, done his personal work, and had his character and policy passed upon. The remaining 313 pages are devoted to the consequences. As we read along, the Crusades, scholasticism, mysticism, the various phases of doctrinal controversies, the Albigensian persecutions, the rise of the Dominicans and Franciscans, the Inquisition, the mediæval universities are all seen in their relations to the age of Hidebrand.

The mention of these subjects gives a partial idea of what the reader may expect to find in the book.

All in all, it seems to us that Dr. Vincent has realized the ideal of the series. His protestant point of view is evident from beginning to end. But most of his positions and implications would, we believe, stand a rigid, critical test. We entirely sympathize with his strictures on the strong tendency of our times to condone all sins, even the worst, by the overruling power of times and circumstances. He grants that the force of social and religious surroundings is very great. "A good deal of allowance," he says, "is to be made, no doubt, only let us be careful not to commit ourselves to the conclusion that a man cannot rise above the level of his time. The average man does not, as a rule, but we are not dealing with average men. Leo IX, Hildebrand, Urban, Innocent III, Boniface VIII were not average men." Moreover, "in earlier and cruder ages many men lived above the ethical level of their age, and even in Hildebrand's own age were such men as Bernard, Norbert, and Anselm, who lived on a much higher plane."

Dr. Vincent uses for his closing sentence a passage from Charles Kingsley's *The Roman and the Teuton.* Referring to the church it is as follows: "Her lie, as all lies do, punished itself. The salt had lost its savor. The Teutonic intellect appealed from its old masters to God and to God's universe of facts, and emancipated itself once for all. They who had been the light of Europe became its darkness. They who had been first became last, a warning to mankind to the end of time that on truth and virtue depends the only abiding strength."

An excellent classified bibliography adds to the value of the book.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. J. W. MONCRIEF.

LEADERS OF THOUGHT IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH. By WILLIAM MACDONALD SINCLAIR, D.D. London: Hodder & Stoughton. 1896. Pp. 378.

THE book consists of twelve biographical studies, as follows: Cranmer, the Restorer of Primitive Truth; Latimer, the Preacher of the Reformation; Laud, and the Mediæval Reaction; Hooker, the Wise Theologian; Butler, the Christian Philosopher; Waterland, the Expounder of the Lord's Supper; John Wesley, the Evangelist of the Masses; Simeon, the Teacher of Vital Religion; Newman, the Founder of Tractarianism; Pusey, the Guide of the Oxford Move-

ment; Arnold, the Advocate of Liberal Theology; Tait, the Wise Ruler.

The principle on which the twelve leaders are selected is that these men are "typical of the various aspects of the Church of England since the Reformation."

The author finds warrant for issuing his volume in the fact that the *Dictionary of National Biography* (from which the details of most of the lives are drawn) is "accessible only to a few," and that the biographies of good men are always in order. He believes that by bringing these twelve together "in brief in one volume they throw light upon each other;" and he hopes to show that the "Prayer Book and Formularies are enough for plain Christian men," while "movements" and "parties" are sure to result disastrously—thus aiding somewhat in bringing the Church of England, now "so unhappily divided," back to the "Holy Scripture, the early Fathers, and the English Reformation."

About thirty pages in large type, double spaced, are given to each character. Quotations from Green, Hallam, Gardiner, *Encyclopædia Britannica*, and the writings of the "Leaders" abound. No attempt is made at original research.

Cranmer was a great statesman and a great theologian, through whose wisdom, moderation, skill, and learning the Church of England was saved from breaking with the past—through whom the "chain of continuity" was preserved. To his genius we are principally indebted for the Book of Common Prayer and the 42 Articles, which productions accord with Scripture and the teachings of the primitive fathers. Those events in Cranmer's political and ecclesiastical career which are brought under review are favorably construed, while those which are least susceptible of defense are passed over in silence.

A few sentences are given to the popularity and power of Latimer as a preacher, but the sketch of him is chiefly biographical, ending with quotations (with which the author seems to agree) concerning the pope, the sacrifice of the mass, the real presence, and the Holy Scripture.

Laud was learned, devout, sincere and self-sacrificing, but hard, pedantic, inflexible and self-willed. He played a part which resulted in "wrecking monarchy and church," leading "honest, free, God-fearing Englishmen" to execute "king, primate, and minister." "Lovers of liberty, freedom of thought, and the simplicity of scriptural religion, as revived by Cranmer and the reformers, will have no sympathy whatever with the policy for which he paid his life. To those

who find their ideal in strict ecclesiastical discipline, the active discouragement of dissent, the doctrine of the offering of the sacrifice of Christ by a priest in holy communion, and an elaborate external ritual, Laud will appear little less than a martyr."

The treatment of Hooker begins with laudatory estimates by Clement VIII, James I, Hallam, and others, continues with biographical notices, and ends with excerpts from the *Ecclesiastical Polity* concerning the invisible church as distinguished from the outward Roman or national churches, the heretical character of the Church of Rome, the non-necessity of episcopal ordination, the entire validity of ordinations by other than bishops, the word presbyter to be preferred as a ministerial designation to the word priest (which nowhere appears in the New Testament), and the real presence of Christ found in the worthy receiver of the sacrament and not in the sacrament itself.

Apart from the biographical details, the essay on Butler is given up, for the most part, to a laudation of *The Analogy*, in which Reeve, Ueberweg, and others are freely quoted.

In Waterland is found the "standard exponent of the Church of England doctrine of the Lord's supper." Here we learn that the eucharist is a sacrifice of "alms," of "prayer," of "praise and thanksgiving," of "faith and hope and self-humiliation" — all in "commemoration of the grand sacrifice and resting finally upon it." We can "only commemorate what he did." "We do not offer Christ to God in the eucharist, but God offers Christ to us." We commemorate that great offering, "but do not reiterate it."

The facts in the career of Wesley are given apparently in a sympathetic vein, though from first to last there is no specific avowal of approval. In Georgia Wesley fell into trouble because he insisted on immersion in the baptism of healthy babes, required sponsors to be communicants, refused communion to those who had sent no previous notice, etc. Dr. Sinclair calls these insistences "pedantries." It must be remembered, however, that Wesley was following strictly and conscientiously the rules and rubrics of the Book of Common Prayer. In other instances where adherence to ordination vows is much less obvious, no idea of censure is even intimated. For breaking church order in intruding into parishes not his own, for the unseemly "convulsions" and "shoutings" which attended his fervent sermons, for erecting preaching houses apart from the parish churches, for organizing classes, appointing leaders, setting apart lay preachers, convening conferences, above all for ordaining Coke and others — the exclusive

prerogative of a bishop—no word of condemnation is allowed to fall. On the contrary, even such a man is, seemingly with pride and satisfaction, accounted still a worthy churchman, and place is given to Wesley's protest against secession, written a year before his death. "I never had any design of separating from the church. I have no such design now. I do not believe the Methodists in general design it, when I am no more seen. I do, and will do, all that is in my power to prevent such an event. Nevertheless, in spite of all that I can do, many of them will separate from it. In flat opposition to these, I declare once more that I live and die a member of the Church of England, and that none who regard my judgment and advice will ever separate from it."

Simeon is the saintly preacher, divine, president, writer, and churchman, whose fervor of spirit and earnest Christian activity are impressively delineated. Few Americans would agree with the commendation of the use of Simeon's *Horæ Homileticæ*. "Although it is best for every preacher to think out his own subject, for many in these days of incessant interruptions and countless sermons it is simply impossible; it would be an immense help to every young clergyman if he could have Simeon's two thousand five hundred outlines" (?).

By far the most interesting essays are those on Newman and Pusey. The one started, and the other guided the Oxford movement. With neither has Sinclair the slightest sympathy. In the other essays he narrates, acquiesces, and admires, but here he criticises, corrects, and condemns. On every page he gives us to understand that he is not an Anglo-Catholic. He calls to sharp account the men who would pervert the teachings of the Church of England and try to foist upon the English people the discarded errors and superstitions of popery. For apostolical succession, baptismal regeneration, priestly absolution, the real presence, ritualism, and the whole scheme of sacerdotalism and sacramentarianism, as taught by Newman and Pusey, he has only abhorrence. He is not inclined, however, to undermeasure the extent of this Romeward influence. "About three thousand persons of education and influence have followed Dr. Newman's example in joining the Church of Rome. . . . . The English Church Union . . . . contains twenty-nine bishops (chiefly colonial) and upwards of 35,000 men, 4200 of whom are in holy orders. They have published their president's appeal for union with Rome. The Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament has more than 15,000 members, of whom more than 1600 are priests. There are upwards of 1200 churches where

the mediæval vestments are used. In a considerable number of churches the ritual is not easily distinguished by the observer from that of Rome."

To Arnold the master of Rugby abundant praise is given, but to Arnold "the advocate of liberal theology"—the subtitle of the paper —less than a dozen lines are devoted.

Tait is the wise ruler, who, as Bishop of London and Archbishop of Canterbury, showed his wisdom by his firm, patient, temperate dealing with tractarianism, which "seemed nonsense, or the madness of incipient popery," ritualism, the Colenso controversy, the disestablishment of the Irish Church, and other troublesome questions with which his episcopate was vexed.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

JOHN KNOX. By A. TAYLOR INNES. Famous Scots Series. Edinburgh and London: Oliphant Anderson & Ferrier. Pp. 160.

IT has just been said that "it frequently happens nowadays that little books for the many are written by those who are well qualified to write big books for the few." The present author may be so classified. This book is the first to appear in the Famous Scots Series, which aims at "uniformity of treatment, distinctly national coloring, and unity of criticism." Mr. Innes has a famous character and he has given us a very concise and complete presentation.

He aims to let us see John Knox exactly as he was. He will have us understand the innermost nature of the man, what caused him to change from a Romanist to a Presbyterian, whether he was a man of absolute sincerity and integrity, what were his weak as well as his strong points, his actual work as statesman, diplomatist, and churchman, and the historical complications in which he was more or less involved.

For his data Mr. Innes has gone almost exclusively to Knox's own works. Taking his materials thus at first hand he has caught and kept the spirit of his subject throughout.

The perplexities with which Knox had to contend were very taxing and the fact that he overcame them so completely is a sufficient witness to his greatness.

As an example we may quote from page 116, showing the diffi-

culties he met as a churchman: "It was a great work—nothing less than organizing a rude nation into a self-governing church. And there were difficulties and dangers in plenty, some of them unforeseen. The nobles were rapacious, the people were divided, the ministers leaned to dogmatism, the lawyers leaned to Erastianism, the lowlands were menaced by Episcopacy, the highlands were emerging from heathenism, and between both of these there stretched a broad belt of unreformed Popery. There were a hundred difficulties like these, but they were all accepted as in the long day's work. For in Scotland the dayspring was now risen upon men!"

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

AGNOSTICISM AND RELIGION. By JACOB GOULD SCHURMAN, President of Cornell University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. $1.

THIS book is divided into three parts: Part I discusses Huxley and scientific agnosticism; Part II, philosophical agnosticism; Part III, spiritual religion, its evolution and essence. In the first, after a brief biological sketch of Mr. Huxley, the author gives us an analysis of his character and gifts, paying high tribute to his controversial power, his skill in attack and defense. "Huxley was not merely a seeker of truth, he was her knight and sworn champion, her defender and her advocate." "But he was too good a debater, too strong a hater, to put himself at the standpoint of his opponents, and lead them by kindly tact and timely suggestion of higher truth out of the bondage of error." His militant spirit was too strong for his pedagogical instinct, in a word. Huxley's recreation and exhilaration was a tilt with an ecclesiastic, whom he liked to impale between the horns of an "either—or." President Schurman's point is that this thesis and antithesis can be transcended through a higher synthesis of "both—and." "The many litigious suits in which Huxley was engaged as advocate of natural knowledge may all be embraced in three categories: the case of Science *versus* Revelation, the case of Evolution *versus* Creation, the case of the Ape *versus* Adam." Beginning with the second, the author's conclusion is that while God is the ultimate ground and source of all things, the Universal First Cause, science is in quest, not of this, but of the so-called secondary causes—the proximate agencies and circumstances—by which things have been modified in the natural order of events. The doctrine of instantaneous creation of all things

by divine *fiat* carries the problem out of the field of science altogether. "But that belief had no other basis than the biblical account of creation; and we have now learned that, whatever else the Bible may do for us, it was never intended to teach us science." None of its writers has any notion of that order of nature and system of secondary causes which it is the function of science to interpret. Let the evolutionist concede that God is ground and reason of all things; and the creationist, *becoming*, and the *versus* is canceled. Creation is the prerequisite of evolution as the bodily system is of digestion. Huxley never held that atheism was an inference from the theory of evolution.

As to the case of Pithecus *versus* Adam, Huxley considered the issue one of capital importance. He reached the conclusion that the structural differences which separate man from the gorilla and the chimpanzee are not so great as those which separate the gorilla from the lower apes. But "if animals of similar structure and function are ever descended from common ancestors, then there is no rational ground for doubting either that the human species might have originated from the simian, or that both are modified ramifications of a common ancestral stock." Grant this, what matters it that your ancestor was an ape, if you are a man? The vital matter is not whether the race started with a fallen archangel or an exalted ape, but what it arrived at. "You are not what you have come from, but what you have become."

Thirdly, Science *versus* Revelation. The author gives a clear and able statement of the issue, as conceived by Huxley, and then adds: "It is not criticism, it is not science, but it is dogmatism of the most arrant type, to assert that miracles are impossible." It is a question of evidence. However, "Grant that none of the miracles reported in the Old Testament occurred, grant that many of the historical events were very different from what the records would naturally lead us to suppose; still Israel's vision of a reign of righteousness on earth and in heaven is to this day verified in the soul of every good man who .... communes with their psalmists and prophets." So of the New Testament, even in much greater degree. I cannot resist quoting these eloquent words: "What the devout scholar and the devout scientist of modern times yearns for is not the theology of Christendom, but the religion of Christ. That religion I call the absolute religion. It is not true because it is in the Bible, it is in the Bible because it is eternally true. Its forms may change; its embodiments may perish; its records may pass away; for all these belong to the world of sense, and

may fall a prey to the contingencies of time; but the religion which Jesus lived and taught will endure as long as the human soul itself, which it is the glory of that religion to have bound indissolubly to its Divine Original. . . . . The evolution of our religion brings us back, at the dawn of the twentieth century, to Christ himself."

Part II traces, suggestively, the genesis of modern philosophical agnosticism from Spencer and Mansel back through Hamilton to Kant and Hume—a development which he compares with the analogous period in Greek thought. Thus, if the doctrine of the unknowableness of God appears and reappears at every critical epoch in the evolution of philosophy, it would seem to have some necessary connection with the progress of constructive thought itself. Now the themes of philosophy are reality and knowledge. Historically, man at times has laid undue stress upon the things of sense, treating perceptions alone as truth, and material objects as the sole reality. Philosophy has too often reduced knowledge to sensation and pictured God after the analogy of material things or mechanical processes. *Such* a knowledge cannot reveal God; and *such* a representation of God as an object among other objects easily discloses absurdities and contradictions. "Agnosticism, therefore, is the corollary of every sensational theory of knowledge and every mechanical conception of God." Dr. Schurman proceeds to the refutation of agnosticism, whether it affirms that knowledge is inadequate to the apprehension of God, or that, conversely, God transcends the reach of knowledge. This is the ablest work of the book, and it is doubtful whether our language contains a more conclusive and classic refutation of this transitional and temporary phase of thought, whose merit is in being a reaction from the excessive dogmatism of metaphysical theology, the *damnosa hereditas* bequeathed by Greece to Christian thought. The night of agnosticism is far spent, but, "as we strain our eyes to catch the first glimpses of the blessed moon, let us remember that, but for its humiliation and chastening in the valley of the shadow of agnosticism, the human mind would not, in our generation, have initiated the most important reform since the Reformation—the substitution of the spiritual religion of Christ for the speculative religion of Christendom."

The third part of the book is devoted to an interpretation of spiritual religion. The author looks first at the development of religion in the individual mind. There are three stages in the development of the soul; acquiescence and absorption in custom, tradition, inherited beliefs, and "sacrosanct formulæ;" the stage of doubt, a spiritual

puberty; finally, reasoned belief which, following credulity and doubt, brings the man peace again by a larger knowledge and a riper experience. But religion has also an objective side. It is a system of doctrine and worship embodied in the creeds and rituals of the churches. Turning to this, Dr. Schurman traces broadly the development of religion as an objective system and institution. Cult, not creed, was the first step in the evolution of religion. There could be no heretic in the primitive world. The second stage is that of creed or dogma, which yet is implied in cult. "The perfect dogmatist declares that we are saved by faith; and by faith he means acceptance of a number of propositions. . . . . The believer wins heaven; the doubter—let him be *anathema!* . . . . The doctrinaires hold that dogma is the essence of religion." The creeds of the churches all agree in furnishing a theory of the divine existence and government, a theory of the origin and destination of man, and a theory of the creation, course, and final purpose of the world—subjects upon which our knowledge is but partial, provisional, and only relatively true; and in the past the churches have all sinned through ignoring this consideration. "The Christian churches knew that the earth stands still, with heaven above and hell beneath. They knew that the world was created in six days, and so much of it each day. They knew exactly how the first man and the first woman came into existence. They knew how languages originated. They knew why men must toil and sweat, and why it is that boys kill snakes. . . . . In the books of the Old and New Testaments this religion of dogma possessed the truth, final, complete, and absolute, about all things of any importance in the life of man and God. These infallible oracles came from God himself, who inspired the authors. The church was as sure of the actual authors as we are of the writers of current literature. Moses wrote the Pentateuch; Solomon wrote Ecclesiastes; David wrote the Psalms; Job and Isaiah composed the works that bear their names." The arrogance of this dogmatism is hastening the close of the second stage of religion. Dogma has conjured up the avenger, doubt. All the old landmarks, Moses, Solomon, Job, are gone; and a restless sea of criticism threatens to engulf religion with the records it adored.

Shall we then despair? No, for the final stage of religion, the religion of the spirit, is at hand, which will yet include all that is good in the other two. This religion will recognize the worth of the church to spiritual life, but will not need a unique and separate sect, will make its home with any of the religious bodies which recognize it, will lead

to a modification if not an abandonment of authority in religion. There is only one ultimate authority in spiritual religion, and this is the free spirit of man which finds itself in life with God. Lastly, the religion of spirit will be not only theistic, but Christian. "I am moved more by my vision of the personality of Jesus than I am by my thought of his doctrines. . . . . As Jesus Christ was perfect man, so also, and for that very reason, was he the revelation and realization of the Divine Father, . . . . therefore Mediator and Saviour."

Eloquent, Christian, of philosophic breadth and insight, but a few minor points to be found fault with, the book could hardly be praised too highly, and should be read by students and preachers everywhere.

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

A NEW NATURAL THEOLOGY BASED UPON THE DOCTRINE OF EVOLUTION. By J. MORRIS. London: Rivington. 1896. Pp. 125.

THIS is a noteworthy treatise. Its author looks upon the doctrine of evolution as now fully established, and believes that it can be made the basis of a "new natural theology." The older forms of the argument from nature to the existence of God are supposed to be no longer tenable. Our better knowledge of nature, obtained through the doctrine of evolution, renders important changes in that argument necessary. Paley's reasoning is vulnerable at many points, and no modification of it by Janet, Momerie, or Flint is worthy of complete acceptance. As resting upon evidences of order and design in the phenomena of nature subject to our inspection, it is outworn and ready to be forgotten. For the present phenomena of nature have an ancestry. They are not products finished and fixed and explicable as results of immediate action by the Primal Energy, but they are parts of a process, an evolution, which has been going on through periods of time too vast for computation, which is still going on, and which may perhaps never come to an end.

The first part of this treatise is therefore a criticism and rejection of the theistic argument, in so far as it is based on evidences of order and indications of design in nature. For as soon as that argument is seen to be outworn and ineffective there must be need of a new and better one which it is the object of this discussion to furnish. But that new and better one must of course rest upon the science of today,

and the science of today rests upon the doctrine of evolution. Hence "the only true method of procedure is," in the opinion of our author, "to clear from the mind all ideas of design, and follow the teaching of evolution whithersoever it leads. Truth cannot be lost; and whatever elements of truth the argument of design may contain will reappear, and more readily gain assent, when reset in the ideas appropriate to our more advanced knowledge" (p. 22).

We do not propose to review the author's criticism of the argument from order and design in nature. It will be sufficient for our purpose to let him state in his own words the principal objection to that argument, premising only that it seems to us to bear with almost equal force against his own reasoning. Having referred to a few of the most striking examples of apparent design and prevision, such as Professor Flint and others have supposed to furnish evidence of the existence of God, Mr. Morris remarks: "We cannot, with all these examples before us, overlook the force of the objection that precisely the same evolution order which produces these apparent previsions produces also orders of phenomena which are prejudicial to the welfare of man. Every year has its tale of disasters from earthquakes, tempests, and floods; its plaints of misfortunes, dearths, and famines; and its death-roll from plagues, epidemics, and wars. And it is the existence of these which forbids us to see in apparent previsions, or in the general uses and relations of things, direct evidences of wisdom, benevolence and goodness. Nature, if prodigal of bounties, is also remorseless; the system of evolution is as cruel as it is kind, as passionless as it is benign. Nor do these opposites admit of any reconciliation" (p. 44).

It is only, as our author believes, by looking away from results as they now appear in life and nature to processes and their tendency, that such opposites can be harmonized in a divine purpose revealed to us by evolution. We may look backward to learn the history of nature and in the prophetic trend of that history anticipate a full revelation of God in the future. "Not," he says, "by tracing the adaptation of means to ends, nor by reasoning from the order and adjustment of things to an end, but by inferring the end from the nature of the processes that lead towards the end, can we hope to determine whether the order of evolution justifies belief in a God who is the Creator and Conservator, the Source and Maintainer of the universe, the Father and Preserver of the race of man" (p. 47). Again, near the close of his treatise Mr. Morris says, "Man coördinates the relations of the universe to secure certain ends; and, following out the analogy in this

direction, instead of looking for the evidences of an Intelligence in the coördination of the relations of the universe, we look for them in the end which the coördinated relations subserve. We come into view of this end, however, not as in the argument of design, by observing in particular pieces of mechanism the adaptation of means to ends, nor yet by reasoning from order to an end, but by discovering a purpose in the character of the processes which lead towards the end" (p. 294). We have never supposed that the men who believe in the soundness of the argument from order and design were indifferent to the working of coördinated powers or the tendency of natural processes towards a worthy end. They do, however, believe that the provisional and transitional results of evolution are suggestive of a Divine Hand, as well as the same things considered as stages of a development, as parts of the great movement of the universe towards the end for which it was made.

In looking at the larger and constructive part of this treatise, it is noticeable that the author dismisses the inquiry into origins as unprofitable, though he is constrained to speak of it once or twice near the end of his work. His attention is directed continuously to the laws and the different orders of evolution, with a distinct view to "ascertaining if a purpose can be inferred from the specific characters which they, [the laws] impart to the orders of evolution. And the orders of evolution are four, pertaining respectively to matter, to life, to mind and to spirit.

*Physical* evolution is the primary form. With it the process began, for it is impossible to conceive of it as eternal. We follow it back from the present phenomena of the universe, step by step, to the beginning of the process. In doing this we pass from masses to molecules, from molecules to atoms, and from atoms to a primeval, universal physical substance, existing at the highest temperature and in rapid motion through all its extent. The first product of evolution in this ocean of energy was a particular kind of atoms. This was followed, sooner or later, by another kind, and this by another, until at last, during the lapse of uncounted ages, the seventy kinds, more or less, which are known to science were formed. All these have persisted, without change of properties, to the present hour. No one of them has ever been seen, but they have nevertheless been weighed and their active properties ascertained.

It is unnecessary, if it were practicable, to describe the different stages in the progress of physical evolution. But it may be interesting

to look at a few sentences which characterize this order of evolution. "We surmise that the law of evolution is to be found in one of three spheres: (1) in the root-properties of the order, or (2) in the circumstances in which these root-properties are placed, or (3) in the connection between the root-properties and their circumstances" (p. 66). "At the base of all evolution lies the evolution of matter, and the law of the evolution of matter is the law of the distribution of energy. Whatever changes take place in the physical universe, they are changes in the form of an energy which remains constant in quantity" (p. 68). "The experience of man, from the first moment when he began to build up his knowledge of the universe, has been steadily confirmatory of the fact that the phenomena of the physical universe are dependent on conditions which are not influenced by the lapse of time" (p. 70). "The root-properties of matter are its gravitative, molecular, chemical, and electrical effects" (p. 76). "That some medium pervades all space is certain. There is conclusive evidence that the atoms of matter, whether we regard them as centers of force or as vortex rings, have definite relations to the portion of the medium which surrounds them; and light or radiant energy demands for its propagation a substance which possesses inertia and rigidity" (p. 81). Mr. Crookes postulates a primal stage of the universe when matter was in an "ultra-gaseous state, at a temperature inconceivably hotter —if such a term could be applied to such a state — than anything now existing in the visible universe. In this state, some process akin to cooling led to the formation of atoms endowed with energy. The substance most nearly allied to the original matter was first formed; then the next, and so on, the lapse of time between each birth of an element being the index to determine its different properties, depending upon the then state of original matter, and following an order of increasing atomic weight" (p. 83). "The forces of the universe are only known in relation to the changes of the universe; and force itself is merely a name for the rate at which energy does work" (p. 87). "There is nothing to warrant us in taking energy to be a product of evolution. Evolution began when change began; but every change is a change in the form or mode of an unchanging energy; and to conceive for a moment that energy is a product of evolution, we should have to inflict on our understanding the fantastic imagination that the first change in the mode of energy was the creation of energy . . . . Evolution tells us the story of change; but behind change lie the unchanging constants of the universe, matter and energy, — if, indeed,

these be two and not merely the two different conceptions we are constrained to take of what is really one and the same thing" (p. 92). "We take it as axiomatic that the primary organization cannot be looked upon as an occurrence out of a number of possible occurrences; but it is possible that the secondary and interdependent organizations may be so viewed . . . . The scale on which the operations of nature are carried on is so vast and so varied in degree that it may not unreasonably be assumed that every combination of occurrences possible at a given time has been realized; and that what has occurred has occurred because the conditions of occurrence were such that these and no other could occur" (p. 95).

Finally, "the process of physical evolution is that of a continuous formation of more and more complex relations of matter" . . . . "In all this we make a progression necessarily resulting from the conditions under which the evolution takes place; and we may not, because of any speculative fancy, refuse to this progression its legitimate significance that the order of evolution points forward to some ultimate stage of organization" (p. 98).

*Protoplasmic* evolution is next considered. And on this Morris speaks with great clearness, describing the physical elements and phenomena of protoplasm, and showing how it differs from any combination of chemical substances. "In protoplasm we have thus an order of activities altogether different to those we have met with in the physical order of evolution. And however ingeniously we may seek to link on the protoplasmic structure to the physical states of matter, we cannot fail to see in its properties the rise of a new order of phenomena . . . . We need not hesitate to say that if an hypothesis can be constructed which is able to account for the origin of protoplasm in accordance with the principle of continuity, such an hypothesis must be regarded as more or less probable. But a physical explanation of the structure of protoplasm would in no way account for the energies of life, or enable us to class the activities of life under the category of such physical processes as we have hitherto found to prevail" (p. 101).

He then proceeds to point out the differences between a crystal and a worm. Thus: "A crystal of any substance, when broken up into an amorphous mass, can, by a repetition of the process by which it was originated, be restored again, while in the case of a living body this is impossible . . . . The formation of living matter is universally conceded to be beyond the chemist's power. Protoplasm, living and potent of future modifications, is as unique as the chemical elements

themselves . . . . Even in the assimilative process there are elements which are distinctly peculiar to life. Its relations to the system of energy are characteristic, not so much of the assimilative process in itself, as of the work done by it. The activity of protoplasm in its assimilative aspect consists essentially of two parts, a living agency which is stable, and a non-living molecular stream continually undergoing transformation; and while the latter is subject to the system of energy, the former is as ultimate a cause of change as the physical forces themselves" (p. 104).

Morris also calls attention to the differences between vegetable and animal life. "Plants in general act upon inorganic substances and convert them into organic; and animals feed on vegetable tissues, or on the tissues of other animals; but in both plants and animals the function of assimilation is the same, and takes place under the same conditions . . . . The waste of an animal body is incessant, and food is constantly required, in a great measure already prepared, to supply the loss of tissue; while in general the plant builds on, and stores up the energy it receives" (p. 118). "The power of movement we find to preserve its original characteristics only in the plant life of the earth, and to have become in animal life modified at a very early stage into the special functions of nervous and muscular tissue." Again, "Assimilation, reproduction, and the power of movement, are the root-properties of life; and from the basis of these properties, by the assumption of adaptative features, life has progressed on the earth until every available sphere, presenting the conditions suitable for existence, has become filled with appropriate forms of life . . . . Wherever life could live it has lived; and in every locality a complex order of relations is observed to prevail among the various kinds of plant and animal life which inhabit it. The insect and the flower mutually support, the one the perfect life of the other" (p. 119).

We must not, however, attempt in any way to summarize the facts presented by our author in this part of his work. But the conclusion which he reaches is that the evolution of life is "a continuous adjustment of the root-properties of life to physical relations, under a law of selection in which is represented the physical order. And this, though suggestive of a purpose, carries us no further than the conception of a purpose of which the end is conditioned by the material order; and the material order points to a time when all life will have died out. The purpose of life cannot, therefore, be the primary purpose of the whole order of evolution," if that order reveals a Divine Father.

*Mental* evolution is treated in the third place, the writer having thus far studiously refrained from treating the connection between vital phenomena and the manifestations of mind. But now he affirms that "mind is not matter, nor are the manifestations of mind activities of force. Matter is made up of physical relations, . . . . mind is essentially a consciousness of relations. Neither is mind life, nor are the manifestations of mind vital activities . . . . In truth, the analogies between mind and life are fanciful rather than real; for to apply the term self-conservation to life is to extend the meaning of it beyond its due limits. Life forms in their protoplasmic aspect are conserved, not self-conserved, and the conservation is in every case nothing more than a mechanical relation established by means of natural selection between the native reacting power of the protoplasmic body and its environment . . . . The state of the case, however, is different with regard to the manifestations of mind and the changes of relation associated with mind . . . . All changes of relation attendant on mental manifestations are, in fact, attendant on the consciousness of relations, and not merely, as in the physical and protoplasmic orders, on mechanical processes" (p. 147). The discussion of this topic is full and satisfactory. There is a section on "The Philosophical Views of Mind," criticising especially the doctrine of Herbert Spencer, another on "The Nervous System as the Organ of Mind," another on "The Physical Side of the Mental Life," another on "The Inner Side of the Mental Life," another on "The Evolution of the Manifestations of Mind in Relation to the Inheritance of the Nervous System," another on "The Further Evolution of the Manifestations of Mind by Means of the Social Bond," and a chapter on "The Manifestations of Mind in Relation to the Protoplasmic Law." Under the last heading a number of very interesting thoughts are presented.

Thus: "When mind had once asserted itself as a primary influence in the order of evolution, under the complex environment resulting from the presence of competing organisms, direct advantage must have been given to the mental adaptability of the individual; and the spur of want urging an animal to mental activity must have played a considerable part in the evolution of intelligence to meet particular needs. And it is not leaving the solid ground of nature to say that, in view of the positions of the individual as a feeling and thinking unit, the struggle for existence has been the schoolmaster of mind to bring it to perfected self-consciousness" (p. 180). "In the higher stages,

consequently, the character of the order of evolution may be determined by the power of mind" (p. 181). Again: "The dispositions of the universe which make evident a want of beneficence relatively to life are in relation to mind further educive and directive of it. The struggle for existence is the schoolmaster of mind; and what appear harsh in this struggle, relatively to life, are, as it were, the birth throes of mind." "If the physical order be thus subservient to mind, may it not be that those conditions which, when discussing the argument of design, are found to be unfavorable to the well-being of life, and, in relation to life, to directly negative a benevolent plan, are not unfavorable to the order of mind, and are, in relation to the evolution of mind, suggestive of a final cause?" (p. 186) But "this view of purpose, however, as prevailing in mind, is insufficient in itself to infer a divine purpose . . . . To complete our argument, we must discern that the end, to which the purpose in mind is related, is not an end which is determined by the conditions of the material order; that is, we must prove that the laws of evolution operative in the order of consciousness of relations are educive of more than utilitarian elements, and directive to other than material correspondencies . . . . that the adjustments of mind transcend the sphere of the physical order."

In the *spiritual* order of evolution we have what we are seeking, that is, sentiments which transcend the sphere of the physical order, and which are governed by laws independent of the physical order. "Our love of knowledge for its own sake, our delight in beauty and awe at the sublime, our inward monitions of a moral law, and our feeling after God, are all more than utilitarian adjustments . . . . they are also all governed by one and the same law of sympathetic relationship. For this law of sympathy there is no place in the material order of things. By it we are carried outside ourselves into sympathetic union with all things and with God . . . . We therefore escape from all objections that arise out of the character of the material order" (p. 297).

"The sympathetic accord between nature and the intellectual and æsthetic attributes of man proves the divine immanence; and, taken alone, might incline the mind to pantheism. The sympathetic law, however, as manifested in morality, carries us further to the recognition of the truthfulness, righteousness, holiness, and goodness of God. Moral relations are eternal . . . . They are the reflection of the divine image in man, and by the very fact of their presence, however imperfect, in man, their presence in God is known" (p. 238).

Thus, according to Mr. Morris, "all that science has done has been to clarify the conception of God in nature. God has not been removed further from the universe; but the mode of approaching him in the universe has been made more precise. Modes of manifestation that had been thought to be primary have been discovered to be secondary; and, though increase of knowledge has shown the operation of God in nature to be seemingly less and less direct, God has been brought nearer to this universe as a whole. Fuller knowledge of the universe has brought truer interpretations of it; and if we now surrender the argument of design it is only to replace it by the higher idea of eternal purpose."

It may be added that Mr. Morris finds a place in natural theology for asserting the providence and the mercifulness of God and the fall of man. But we have no space for a representation of his course of thought on these topics. Perhaps, however, we may be allowed to propose and answer a single question before closing this review. It is this: If the processes of evolution do not reveal God until they are studied in the operations of the human spirit, why should a writer on natural theology trace them out with so much care in the earlier orders of being, in matter, in life, and in mind? Why not begin with the human spirit, and leave the barren wastes of physical, protoplasmic, and mental evolution to the votaries of science? This question is not answered in *A New Natural Theology based upon the Doctrine of Evolution*. Perhaps because it did not occur to the writer's mind. Possibly his rejection of the argument from order and design in nature led him to look with grave distrust upon any reasoning which is not based on the whole sweep of evolution through the ages. At all events his method is the only adequate one for a believer in evolution as the single solid basis of argument for the existence of God. For how can one who is in search of the true answer to the question of all questions be satisfied with evidence which is not drawn from all parts and ages of the known universe? If there are certain orders of evolution which do not in themselves imply prevision or purpose (which we doubt), it is surely important to ascertain whether they are or are not consistent with a wise and controlling purpose as to the whole: whether, when complemented and explained by other orders of evolution, they favor or antagonize belief in a divine purpose and Ruler.

Yet we think the amount of space given to the exposition of physical and vital evolution is greater than was necessary. A doctrine which can confidently be made the basis of so great an argument

ought to be well understood by the people who are addressed; but are not the essential facts and hypotheses of evolution generally understood? It is easy to err in answering this question, and the writer's judgment may be more correct than the reviewer's. Of one thing, however, all who read *A New Natural Theology* will be convinced, namely, that Mr. Morris has done a thorough and scholarly piece of work. They will also be satisfied that as conclusive an argument for the being of God can be based on the doctrine of evolution as the one commonly founded on the evidences of order and design in nature. Slow processes are not less divine than rapid ones. "One day with the Lord is as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day." And the fullest possible comprehension of the facts will furnish the firmest basis for reasoning.

ALVAH HOVEY.

NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

A HISTORY OF THE WARFARE OF SCIENCE WITH THEOLOGY IN CHRISTENDOM. By ANDREW DICKSON WHITE. 2 vols. New York: D. Appleton & Company. 1896. Pp. xxiv+415; xiii+475. $5.

PRESIDENT WHITE has rendered most distinguished service to the cause of truth in publishing the results of his prolonged investigations in this special field of history. Command of time and means, exceptionally favorable official positions, and long training in historical methods, have all combined in the production of a work of very great importance, probably much greater than will appear at first. It is not to be wondered at that the patient examination of an astonishing amount of practically new material through a period of twenty-five years should result in a work which it will take time to appreciate fully. Mr. White has told us that the book is an evolution from the original contest in which he found himself in connection with the founding of Cornell University. He early formulated the following thesis, and by lectures and magazine articles proceeded to defend it:

"In all modern history, interference with science in the supposed interest of religion, no matter how conscientious such interference may have been, has resulted in the direst evils both to religion and to science, and invariably; and, on the other hand, all untrammeled scientific investigation, no matter how dangerous to religion some of its stages may have seemed for the time to be, has invariably resulted in the highest good both of religion and of science."

The lectures and articles grew into a little book, *The Warfare of Science*, and the book led to further investigation. From time to time papers appeared in the *Popular Science Monthly* under the general caption "New Chapters in the Warfare of Science," giving us some of the results of these later researches, and somewhat preparing us for the final presentation of the whole subject in the work now before us.

The amount of labor involved has been simply appalling, and these volumes must ever remain a perfect mine of well-organized information that has been drawn from everywhere. The work is much more than a compendium of information, for a captivating style has succeeded in putting the endless details into an account so attractive that the reader is led along as by a strong romance.

We believe that Mr. White has been of the greatest service to the cause of religion, for he has told the truth, and the truth must free religion of the husks of pagan tradition and mediæval superstition. The world is passing from childhood to maturity, and the things which childhood accepted must be seriously questioned by maturity. It is well, therefore, to rid religion of its childish trappings and to allow it to keep step with the advance of knowledge. That there have been so many childish trappings put on in the name of theology seems now unfortunate, but it was certainly inevitable. To accept the truth, from whatever source that truth may come, is no less the duty of religion than of science.

It will be noted that Mr. White takes no issue with religion, for his treatment of the religion of Christ is as reverent as the most devout could desire, but he does take issue with the theology that has arrayed itself against discovered truth in a way to endanger both science and religion. He has succeeded well in preserving the judicial temper, when one remembers that his book is the outgrowth of a somewhat bitter contest. He is safe, however, in resting his case upon the facts without argument. One disputed subject after another is traced in historical sequence, from ethnic tradition, through mediæval crudities, to its modern status. It is well shown how both tradition and crudity arose from the condition of knowledge and the method of thought, though one is kept constantly wondering how there ever could have been such ignorance and such methods. It becomes evident that the scientific method, which seeks the facts and then constructs belief, was utterly repugnant to the mediæval theological method, which hesitated not to scout the facts which opposed its beliefs. It becomes an ever-increasing wonder how stoutly and even

bitterly men have denied things concerning which they profess no knowledge rather than to wait in reverent spirit for the truth to reveal itself.

One impression may be left by a too careless reading of the book which we are confident was very far from the intention of the author. It seems to array the church against science throughout the whole history of the contest, and the church is always appearing puerile and vindictive, and science always triumphant. With such an impression one may rise from the book with a feeling of resentment against the church, a feeling unfair to the church, and not fairly drawn from Mr. White's presentation. It is true that the church as an organization is defined by its theology, and that in the defense of its theology against the dangerous assaults of increasing knowledge prominent representatives of the church have displayed zeal without knowledge, but it must be remembered that it was other representatives of the church, both priestly and lay, who were thus attacked and who were the very apostles of science. The opposition that science has met at every step of its progress is the natural opposition of conservatism, both within and without the church. To us it would have seemed more scientific to have spoken of this warfare as between science and conservatism, with theology as a conspicuous expression of the latter. In Mr. White's book the churchmen who have been distinguished in the advancement of real knowledge are just as conspicuous as those who have opposed it, so that the author is free from the imputation of denying to the church her real glory in advancing the cause of intellectual freedom.

No adequate impression of the subject-matter can be given within the necessary limits of this review, for the work is a mass of details and treats of the most varied subjects. Some conception of the spirit and the scope of it may be obtained, however, from a selection of some of the chapter headings, as follows:

From Creation to Evolution; From "Signs and Wonders" to Law in the Heavens; From Genesis to Geology; The "Fall of Man" and Anthropology, and Ethnology, and History; From "The Prince of the Power of the Air" to Meteorology; From Magic to Chemistry and Physics; From Miracles to Medicine; From Fetich to Hygiene; From "Demoniacal Possession" to Insanity; From Diabolism to Hysteria; From Babel to Comparative Philology; From the Dead Sea Legends to Comparative Mythology; From Leviticus to Political Economy; From the Divine Oracles to the Higher Criticism.

The book should be read by every thoughtful person; by the theologian, for he needs the facts and the less positive spirit which the facts must bring concerning the unessentials of his system; by the scientist, for he will appreciate better that churchmen have always been found among the prophets and apostles of science; by the churchman, for he can see the luster of true religion ever growing brighter as knowledge has advanced.

JOHN MERLE COULTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

HISTORY OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE. By GEORGE PARK FISHER, D.D., Professor in the Yale Divinity School. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1896. Pp. xv + 583. $3.

DR. FISHER is exceptionally well prepared to write a history of doctrines. He possesses by nature the historic temperament; his mind is not affected by prejudice; and he is able to see both sides of a question and to accord due praise to the representatives of both. To this natural endowment he has added great acquisitions of learning. Moreover, he writes in a style at once simple, graceful, clear, and capable of expressing the nicest differences of meaning.

All these qualifications are evident in the book before us. It is singularly free from sectarian passion and bias. It makes no display of learning, while yet every page gives proof of wide research and careful thought. The language is full of those delicate shadings which are required by the subtle distinctions of philosophy and theology. The literary charm which made Dr. Fisher's *Grounds of Theistic and Christian Belief* acceptable to the unprofessional readers of a popular magazine pervades this work also.

The author has kept in mind the difference between Christian dogma and Christian doctrine. A history of dogma would consider only the official creeds of the various denominations, and would begin with the Council of Nice and end with the seventeenth century, when the great creeds were finished. It would not consider the movements of Christian thought during the past two centuries, a period in which Christianity has assumed a less dogmatic attitude, and several denominations have risen to power with but simple statements of belief, or with none at all, while several others have largely forgotten the dogmatic definitions for which they once contended. Dr. Fisher has happily

chosen the wider field of Christian thought on doctrinal subjects, including the formal creeds of Christendom, but also including much more. He devotes over a third of his book to theological thought since the era of creeds. His readers will appreciate specially his sketch of the present tendencies of theology. He rightly includes in his history the principal systems of heresy, since these have stimulated Christians to think soundly and have thus led to the discovery and the general acceptance of many truths, and have thus become a part of the history.

There are two forms in which the history of doctrines may be written. One is the chronological, in which the whole history is divided into periods, and the doctrines of each period are considered together. The other is the topical form, in which each doctrine is treated by itself and traced from its beginning to the end of its development. Dr. Fisher writes in the first form. But there is great need of a history of doctrines in the second, and I hope that he will soon supply this want in another volume. He has made it easy for us to survey the Christian thought of any particular period. Let him now make it easy for us to learn the history of any particular doctrine.

The judicious character of Dr. Fisher's thought is apparent in many passages in which he corrects popular impressions of history. He begins his book by rejecting the term "apostolic fathers" as inaccurate. He esteems highly the ability and piety of Wesel, Wessel, Wyclif, Hus, and Savonarola, who are known as the "reformers before the Reformation;" but he regards them, after all, as essentially Roman Catholic, and as differing fundamentally in doctrine from the later protestant leaders. Luther he represents as a conservative and cautious theologian. In a large section of the Anabaptists he sees excellent and able men, as far removed as possible from fanaticism and crime. He does not look upon the Unitarian movement in Massachusetts as a revolt from excessive Calvinism, for it was influential chiefly in the eastern part of the state, where Arminianism had been disseminated and had prepared the way for it, while it was little felt in the more Calvinistic west. It was a protest against the Puritanic neglect of fine literature, rather than against Calvinism, and began with admiration of such writers as Sir Charles Grandison and Miss Hannah More, and advanced to the admiration of Shakespeare and Goethe.

Dr. Fisher declines to say at what time the Anabaptists of England began to practice immersion, but waits for further discussion to cast light on the question. He keeps himself free from all such pre-

conceived theories as have forced some writers on the history of doctrines to misinterpret their materials, as the Roman Catholic seeks in the New Testament a germ of every dogma which he holds, and as the school of Baur bent the whole structure of Christian thought from its very beginning to the shape of the Hegelian philosophy.

But while Dr. Fisher is judicious and judicial, he is not cold. His pages glow with reverence for Christianity, and with sympathy with those who have sought to body forth its great truths in human language. Many parts of his work are biographical, and abound in the analysis of character and motive. His sketch of Channing is a good example of this feature. He appreciates highly many of those from whom, if he were stating his own views, he would differ; and he does not admire overmuch those who have gained the victory in the various doctrinal controversies of the past. Thus he gives us no mere catalogue of parties, of dogmas, or of states of opinion at particular epochs, but warm and living and well-balanced portraitures, and his work, though it is free from passion and from all excess of statement, does not lack the color and vitality which belong properly to all historical writing.

An excellent feature of the work is its brevity. One might suppose that an adequate history of Christian thought from its beginning could not be compressed into a single volume of moderate size; but Dr. Fisher has accomplished this difficult task. He has not sacrificed clearness in order to do this, nor has he given us partial views of the great systems of theology. His history is in a good degree round and complete. He has gained this success by seizing on the strong central features of the chief systems of Christian thought, while omitting many non-essential details; by quoting from others only their pivotal expressions, often only a few sentences, and often, again, only single phrases; and by restricting his footnotes to a few most necessary matters. Thus he has given us a full survey of the subject in a book which one can hold in his hand and read without the necessity of wading through useless verbiage.

I think that more might be done to ascertain the thought of the intelligent laity, as distinguished from that of the few great theologians. An example of this work is given in the closing chapter, where "certain theological tendencies of recent times" are considered. These are chiefly tendencies of the church as a whole, and not of theologians as a class. Could not a similar study be made of popular theology in the Middle Ages and the period immediately following the Reformation?

For the Middle Ages the Latin hymns would be an authority. The Anabaptist hymns used in Münster are remarkably orthodox and sober and remarkably free from the horrible teachings of Knipperdolling and John of Leyden. Would the Roman Catholic hymns of the Middle Ages show a similar freedom from many of the doctrinal errors adopted by the schoolmen? Moreover, would not a careful study of the Roman Catholic writers of our own times, in so far as they are not theologians, show a wide departure from some of the dogmas of the Council of Trent?

Dr. Fisher overlooks some writers who have contributed much to the formation of Christian thought. I may mention Andrew Fuller as an example, who once influenced powerfully the beliefs of both England and America, and who is still studied with attention by theologians. Swedenborg is noticed, but no account is taken of the undoubted effect produced on modern theological thought by certain parts of his speculations. The index is not complete and one consults it in vain for a number of names which are found in the text.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE contention of *Fichte und Erigena; Darstellung und Kritik, zweier verwandten Typen eines idealistischen Pantheismus*, von Dr. Theodor Wotschke (Halle a. S., Verlag von J. Krause; 1896, pp. 72; M. 1.50), is that man looks beyond empirical reality to a transcendent which is the principle of all finite existence and at the same time a fixed anchorage for the human heart in the storm and stress of life. This outlook and outreach is the metaphysical artery of the human organism and the source of religion and speculation, whose character in the individual is determined according as the intellect or the heart is the impelling factor and the preponderating coefficient of the exaltation into the eternal world. In spite of individual differences, the results of speculation show kindredness. Thus it is intelligible that at times we find a singular agreement between philosophers who are separated by a millennium, and who form their view of God and the world independent of each other. Fichte and Erigena show such similarity. The latter setting out from Greek Neoplatonism, the former from German idealism, arrive at the same monistic view of the world, which derives reality from one principle and considers the great manifoldness of existence, the intelligible world, and sensible objects, as expression and manifestation of an Absolute Existence. Both philos-

ophers illustrate the effort which rules modern speculation in general to overcome opposites and ascend to a higher unity. The author gives the solution of the world-riddle attempted by Fichte and Erigena,—first, an exposition and criticism of their systems respectively, then a critical valuation of the two related systems, pointing out the permanent and worthful in both systems. It is the merit of both thinkers that they sought to overcome the dualistic *Weltanschauung*, thereby shattering the old Greek philosophy persisting still in Christendom, and to replace it with a monistic one. But they escaped the deistic error only to be entangled in the pantheistic. The ideal is divine transcendence without externality and immanence without identity. The author suggestively shows how the false method (their starting point being "transcendent-theocratic instead of the cosmic-anthropocentric") of these philosophers had for its consequence, in part, false results.—GEORGE B. FOSTER.

*The Beginnings of the Wesleyan Movement in America and the Establishment therein of Methodism.* By John Atkinson, D.D. (New York: Hunt & Eaton, 1896, x + 458 pp.) The genesis of American Methodism is here disclosed for the first time. Dr. Atkinson has discovered most valuable material: he has sifted thoroughly the statements of Lee and Bangs and Stevens, his principal forerunners, and he has overlooked nothing of importance relating to his subject that has been published hitherto. The results of his researches are gratifying and surprising. The founders of Methodism in America (with one exception, perhaps), appearing in their right proportions, make a new and thrilling picture. The author's main thesis, to wit, that American Methodism was organized in 1773, he certainly establishes. Joseph Pilmoor is revealed in these pages as the conspicuous figure in the period of origins, and Francis Asbury is seen entering upon the indestructible labors of men whom he at first misunderstood and depreciated. Dr. Atkinson wastes space, I think, upon the question of priority; Strawbridge and Maryland Methodism were certainly independent of Embury and New York, and should have been treated separately. *What* Strawbridge did is of far more moment than *when* he did it. The author makes too little of him and his work. The book is enriched with accurate and vivid pictures of early Methodist preachers and people. These earnest men and women are shown rather than sketched; their deeds speaking for them or they speaking for themselves.—CHARLES J. LITTLE.

*Life and Times of Girolamo Savonarola.* By Professor Pasquale Villari, translated by Linda Villari, with portraits and illustrations. (Popular edition $2.50. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.) A large reading public will be glad to learn that this, the most satisfactory life of Savonarola, has been published in a neat and substantial volume, and put within the reach of many who could not afford to purchase the two-volume edition.— J. W. MONCRIEF.

*The Mind of the Master.* By John Watson, D.D. (Ian Maclaren). (New York: Dodd, Mead & Company, 1896. Pp. viii + 338. Price $1.50.) The book is what we would expect from the author of the *Bonnie Brier Bush* and *The Upper Room.* While seeking to exalt to its place of rightful supremacy the teaching of Jesus, it is a practical presentation of that teaching in a few aspects of it, rather than a complete study of Jesus' doctrine. In style it is full of charm and vigor, and in spirit it is fresh as the air of Drumtochty. One could wish that Dr. Watson had not made Paul responsible for post-apostolic ecclesiasticism and that in his treatment of the Cross he had not ignored Jesus' words at the institution of the Lord's Supper.— RUSH RHEES.

*On Sermon Preparation: Recollections and Suggestions.* (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896.) A valuable little volume composed largely of personal experiences in preaching by such leaders in the church of England as the Bishop of Ripon, Canon Tristram, Dean Farrar, Rev. W. H. M. H. Aitken and Rev. H. W. Webb-Peploe. It frankly acknowledges that the function of the preacher has often been overshadowed in the Anglican Communion, that it would be "exquisitely cruel torture" for a "really able and sensitive bishop to hear week by week all the sermons preached by the clergy in his name," and that many a young man is now ordained "who may never in his life have addressed ten persons in a group." These informal essays, packed with most suggestive experience, throbbing with vitality and sincerity, are an earnest attempt to infuse higher ideals and better methods into modern preaching. Free from professionalism and pedantry, the counsels they give come straight "from the burning core below" and have power to kindle and illuminate.

To those familiar with the voluminous homiletic literature produced in America in recent years, much of the advice here given must seem very obvious and elementary. But if the preacher is told on the one hand that the "best and most helpful commentary is Lange's," or that

he should "close the mouth at the end of a passage," he receives on the other hand most pregnant and pithy counsel from some of the most successful workers of our age, and he meets with such outlooks as this: "Pray intensely that you may be able to see history, literature, poetry, art, education, politics, industry, exploration, civilization, work and play as movements of the Lord Jesus Christ."—W. H. P. FAUNCE.

## NOTICE.

Besides THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, two journals published from The University of Chicago cover fields allied to that of this journal. These are *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, which, as its name imports, is especially concerned with Semitic Philology and Literature; and *The Biblical World*, a journal which has a more popular aim of extending knowledge of the Bible among all intelligent persons. It has been thought desirable to announce in connection with each issue of THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY titles of recent books, reviews of which appear in these journals but not in THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY. The following books have been reviewed in recent numbers:

W. H. KOSTERS, Die Wiederherstellung Israels in der Persischen Periode. *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang. and Lit.*, XII, 268–73.

KENT, C. F., Outline Study of Hebrew History from the Settlement of Canaan to the Fall of Jerusalem.—WARREN, H. C., Buddhism in Translation.—DAVIDS, T. W. RHYS, Buddhism: Its History and Literature.—HAMBURGER, J., Jesus von Nazaret: Geschichtliche, objective Darstellung seines Lebens, Wirkens, und Todes. 2te Aufl.—HALMEL, A., Ueber roemisches Recht im Galaterbrief. Eine Untersuchung zur Geschichte des Paulinismus. *The Biblical World*, September, pp. 250–52.

DILLMANN, A., Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie.—KENT, C. F., The Wise Men of Ancient Israel and their Proverbs.—FABER, W., Aus Jechiel Lichtenstein's hebräischem Kommentar zum Neuen Testament.—Greifswalder Studien. Theologische Abhandlungen Hermann Cremer zum 25 jährigen Professorenjubiläum dargebracht.—MEYER, L. R., The Shorter Bible, chronologically arranged, being the Holy Bible abridged and with its readings synchronized for popular reading. *The Biblical World*, October, pp. 324–32.

BRUCE, A. B., With Open Face, or Jesus Mirrored in Matthew, Mark and Luke.—GILBERT, G. H., The Student's Life of Jesus.—ABBOTT, L., The Life of Christ.—HOUGHTON, MRS. L. S., The Life of the Lord Jesus.—RENAN, E., History of the People of Israel, Vol. V: Period of Jewish Independence and Judea under Roman Rule. *The Biblical World*, November, pp. 405–13.

OTTLEY, R. L., The Doctrine of the Incarnation. 2 vols.—RESCH, A., Aussercanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. Viertes Heft. Paralleltexte zu Johannes, gesammelt und untersucht.—RICE, E. W., People's Commentary on the Acts, with Critical, Exegetical and Applicative Notes, and Illustrations from Life and History in the East.—ANTHONY, A. W., An Introduction to the Life of Jesus: An Investigation of the Historical Sources.—MÜLLER, D. H., Die Propheten in ihrer ursprünglichen Form. 2 vols.—MAHAFFY, J. P., The Empire of the Ptolemies.—REED, ELIZABETH H., Primitive Buddhism: Its Origin and Teachings.—LEROY-BEAULIEU, A., The Empire of the Tsars and the Russians.—BOSCAWEN, W. ST. C., The Bible and the Monuments. I. The Primitive Hebrew Records in the Light of Modern Archæological Research. *The Biblical World*, December, pp. 508–22.

# CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

BROWNING'S THEISM. By JOSIAH ROYCE; *The New World*, September 1896, pp. 401–422.

A POET'S originality may be tested by his individual inventions, or by his manner of conceiving ideas already more or less familiar. The manner in which Browning treated the most familiar of religious conceptions, the conception of God, has no insignificant place in determining his originality as a man and a poet.

The traditional Christian conception of God is the product of Hebrew ethical monotheism, speculative Greek theism, and mystical Indian monism—"these are the three streams of doctrine whose waters now mingle in the vast and troubled estuary of the faith of the Christian church."

What is Browning's attitude toward the problems that rise from this mingling of ideas? First, Browning conceives of God as Power, but never as the mere Unknowable. There is no place in the poet's thought for Materialism and other forms of pure Naturalism. He "continues in an undefined way the Aristotelian notion of God as the intelligent source of the world-order, and the relatively Oriental faith in the One Reality. For our poet, God as power is One and is Real." It is characteristic of him to pass by second causes, and an "interposing nature," and to go directly to the highest realm of Power. Nature is seen to be wise and beautiful and, by an immediate intuition, is referred to God as Power.

Second, by immediate intuition also, God is conceived as Love. In Browning's use of the term love it includes much more than God's tenderness or pity for us, or his desire to see us happy in his own arbitrarily appointed way; it includes also God's "delight in our very oddities, in the very narrowness of our ardent individuality. It means his sharing of our very weaknesses, his sympathy with even our low views of himself, so long as these mean our growing" toward the light.

The Christian doctrine of the Incarnation appeals to Browning with special force, but it has little connection, in his thought, with other articles of faith, for example, the Atonement. To him the truth

of the Incarnation lies "in its revelation of a universal and transcendently significant aspect of God's nature,—namely, the human aspect." To say that God is love is to say that God has been or will be incarnate. It is by this conception alone that we pass from the God who is mere Power to the God who is also Love.

The problem now is to reconcile Love with Power in the world as we know it.

Shelley's solution of the problem of Evil (in the Prometheus cycle) is shown to be trivial, because it lacks the conception which so powerfully possesses Browning. To the latter love includes strenuousness; it means "triumph amid suffering" in the sphere of human experience and still more in the divine. "Even the divine love itself must need for its fulfillment these struggles, paradoxes, estrangements, pursuits, mistakes, failures, dark hours, sins, hopes and horrors of the world of human passion in which the divine is incarnate. Perfect love includes and means the very experience of suffering, and of powers that oppose love's aims." Herein lies the solution of the problem of Evil.

The poet sees in the world as it is enough of "love's beginnings" to be sure that with more life more light will come, and we shall learn of God's love by seeing in dark Power "the source of that element of conflict, of paradox, of suffering and of ignorance, without which love could never possess the fullness of the divine life.

I have left space only for the comment that Professor Royce's article is characterized throughout by his well-known qualities,—learning, acuteness, and philosophical grasp.

SPRINGFIELD, MASS. PHILIP S. MOXOM.

THE RAISING OF THE DEAD IN THE SYNOPTIC GOSPELS. By EDWIN A. ABBOTT; *The New World*, September 1896, pp. 473–493.

IN the Talmud the symbolism of death is repeatedly applied to those who are "dead in sin." In the Targum blindness, lameness, and the like are interpreted to represent spiritual disease. It was said, "In the coming age the saints shall raise the dead as Elias did . . . . What 'dead'? Proselytes." The language of Jesus continues this Jewish usage: "Let the dead bury their dead;" "The dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God." Hence we naturally infer that when he said to the Twelve, "Raise the dead," he meant "Make proselytes." The process of translating the gospel from eastern metaphor and poetry into Greek prose might easily give rise to hypotheses of

miracle where no miracle was intended. That we find, in parallel passages, one gospel saying that Jesus "healed" while another says that he "taught," suggests that the "healing" is a misunderstanding of a word intended to mean "spiritual healing" or "teaching." (Compare Mark 6:34 with Matt. 14:14; Mark 10:1 with Matt. 19:2. In the Parable of the Sower in quoting Isa. 6:9, 10 Matt. has, "lest . . . . *I should heal them*," Mark, "lest *their sins should be forgiven*." Luke, who alone of the synoptists uses ἰᾶσθαι in his own person and always literally, omits this part of the quotation.) In the charge to the disciples (Matt. 10:7, 8), the closing words, "*Freely ye have received, freely give*," clearly indicate that it was not literal disease they were sent out to cure. All the sick were to be "healed," but it was the sick in heart and spirit. What vestige of evidence is there that in Corinth, Antioch, Cæsarea, etc., any apostle attempted to make a practice of healing the sick in the city?

Are we then to infer that all the acts of healing attributed to Jesus in the gospels are non-historical? That would be most unreasonable. The healing of the paralytic and of the lunatic child, the raising of Jairus' daughter, and other similar narratives contain no suspicious elements; they are vivid and generally coherent; are supported by the three synoptists; their phenomena are consistent with what we recognize as laws of nature; they correspond with acts of Paul and others described in the Pauline epistles and in other New Testament books. One safe general conclusion is that Jesus spoke and acted in the conviction that his main object was to heal the souls of men, and that bodily healing was far less frequent than the synoptic gospels would lead us to suppose. Whenever the synoptists describe the healing of great multitudes at a time the original tradition probably used the word in a spiritual sense.

The second century shows Apollonius alleging that John in Ephesus raised a dead man. But Clement of Alexandria tells us that John, having entrusted a young convert to an elder, and upon his return, questioning the elder about his charge, received the answer, "He is *dead*." "What death?" "He has died *to God*." The apostle reconverts the man, who becomes a "trophy of *resurrection*." When Irenæus says that men have been raised from the dead "frequently in the brotherhood on account of sore need" by "the prayers of the saints" it is by no means improbable that he was loosely and erroneously referring to those who in the preceding generation were rescued from spiritual death by the prayers of the Gallican saints.

Applying these principles to the raising of Jairus' daughter we find the following reasons for accepting it as authentic: It only professes to be the restoration of one who had just died; it contains no signs of symbolism; the graphic details of Mark are natural; and Matthew's and Mark's accounts when compared indicate the confusion of an earlier tradition.

In contrast with this account is that of the widow's son at Nain, given only by Luke (7:11–17). Contrary to his usual practice, Luke mentions a definite place. From the Talmudists and Josephus we conclude that this was a certain Nain in Samaria, so that the "widow" was a Samaritan. Furthermore, one meaning of Nain is "sleep," which suggests a symbolic reference to the sleep of death.

Again in 2 Esdras there is a vision of a woman mourning the death of her only son. The mother is Sion, the son the city or temple of Solomon. Hence after the destruction of Herod's temple, when "widowed" Sion (Lam. 1:1) was mourning for her "only son," it was natural that a tradition should spring up among Hebrew Christians that the Saviour had raised up the "widow's son" in raising up himself, the true Temple. Such a metaphor once accepted as a literal story, details would naturally be sought in corresponding acts of Elijah and Elisha. In 2 Kings 13:21 we find the words, "came and touched the bones . . . . and he lived and stood up;" in 1 Kings 17:22, 23 the child "called out" and the prophet "gave him to his mother." These details, slightly varied, are combined in the narrative of Luke.

No good reason appears why Mark and Matthew should omit this miracle if it were fact. But Luke places it just before a discourse of Christ's which contains the words, "the dead are raised," as if to prepare for them, and indicates by the rare use of "the Lord," which is regular in the gospel of the Hebrews, that he drew this account from an Aramaic source. We can thus, on the poem hypothesis, explain the origin of this narrative, its evolution, date, position in Luke's gospel, the motive of the author, and many of his expressions in detail. Hence we conclude that it is not history, but metaphor misunderstood.

This learned and ingenious article loses most of its weight if one accepts miracles and credits Luke with that careful research and respect for eyewitnesses which he claims in the preface of his gospel. The author's frank rejection of the miraculous is a constant make-weight in his scales. The degree of probability in the possible explanations which this rejection leads him to suggest will be variously estimated. There is slight evidence that Luke chose Nain in order to represent this sign as done in a Samaritan village whose name signified sleep. That the "widow" originally symbolized Sion,

whose "son" was the Temple, literally destroyed but figuratively restored in the risen Messiah, and that this poetry, originating after the year seventy, was transformed into literal prose before Luke wrote, taxes belief very heavily. It seems easier, on the premises of the paper, to suppose that a young man was resuscitated after some hours of apparent death or that one "dead in sins" was restored "alive again" to his widowed mother. The phrases upon which Dr. Abbott, like Strauss, Keim, and Holtzmann, base a dependence upon the revivifications of Elijah and Elisha are quite commonplace and naturally involved in the situation. The omission from Matthew and Mark is the most serious matter; but if the synoptic common tradition is due to sharply defined limitation, oral or written, it might omit even such a miracle as this, as well as the great parables peculiar to Luke or the mighty works done in Chorazin. Most satisfactory and valuable is the first half of this article.

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE. CHARLES F. BRADLEY.

DIE TAUFE BEI PAULUS. Von ERNST TEICHMANN; *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1896, Heft 4, pp. 357–372.

THE testimony of Paul on Christian baptism is important because he is the oldest source for the history of Christianity, and uninfluenced by such dogmatic considerations as underlie Matt. 28:19. Paul has few historical data; his interest is that of the theologian. Hence we must notice, first, the place of baptism in his teaching. The theology of Paul has throughout an *eschatological* orientation. So the significance of Christ lies chiefly in the fact that he has overcome death. Entrance into his approaching kingdom is not by works, but by faith in him. By this faith one comes into possession of the Spirit, and he who has the Spirit has eternal life.

In Gal. 3 : 26 Paul speaks of sonship to God as consisting of two elements, freedom from law and the reception of the Spirit. These two elements are closely related. The Spirit unites the believer with Christ. In Gal. 3 : 27 this union is expressed in the figure of *putting Christ on*. One who does this is *in Christ*. This conception is parallel to that of sonship. In vs. 26 the means of becoming a son is *faith in Christ;* in vs. 27, it is *baptism into Christ*. Of these two conceptions, baptism is secondary, and brings no new element into the thought. The apostle might have used faith in vs. 27 as in vs. 26. We have now to ask how far the other passages, which deal dogmatically with baptism, confirm this result. First, Rom. 6. Baptism into Christ is baptism into his death, that is, into fellowship with his death. But Christ rose from the dead; hence the hope that fellowship with his death will become fellowship with his resurrection. Baptism in this passage has an ethical

color, while in Galatians its mystical side is prominent. Yet the chief significance of baptism in Rom. 6 is that it brings into fellowship with Christ. The passage, 1 Cor. 12 : 13, is similar. The one *Spirit* takes the place here of the *water* in the other passages. The one body into which we were baptized is the church. Here the thought of fellowship with other believers is prominent, while in Romans it was fellowship with Christ. Briefly, then, the significance of baptism in Paul is this : it is the means by which one comes into (mystical) union with Christ. This union is realized through the Spirit who enters man at baptism. This Spirit is the material (*Stoff*) and power which on the one hand unites individual believers into one body, and on the other hand joins the individual and the church with Christ. What, now, in the thought of Paul, is the relation between faith and baptism? Baptism presupposes faith. It is impossible that there should be a baptism without faith. Baptism does not change character, but visibly represents a change that faith has wrought. The reason why Paul made this use of baptism was psychological. As the solemn act which separated between the old life and the new, it made an indelible impression on the memory, and the inner experiences which preceded it were called up by its mention. These experiences were not so well adapted to mark the decisive change in the believer as was the clearly defined act of baptism. Such a use of baptism by Paul presupposes a general use of the rite in the churches. This is against I. H. Kremer, who holds that only Gentile converts were baptized. Further, Kremer's view is exegetically untenable. For (1) it gives a narrowing force to ὅσοι in Gal. 3 : 26 and Rom. 6 : 3 ; and (2) it takes 1 Cor. 12 : 13 as referring to a *spiritual* baptism, in contrast to the real one.

Several circumstances help to explain the rapid adoption of baptism in the early church. There was the example of Jesus, who had submitted to the baptism of John. Then, since Gentiles had been admitted to Jewish fellowship by proselyte-baptism, it was natural that they should be so admitted to the Christian fellowship, especially as the earliest Christians were Jews, and Jews who had no thought of establishing a new religion. Further, the Gentiles were familiar with baptismal rites, since there were such in their *mysteries*. Paul's other references to baptism confirm the above result. Thus 1 Cor. 1 : 14 makes the impression that he did not attach great importance to the rite. In view of this passage, Matt. 28 : 19 must be regarded as of somewhat late origin. Paul could not have spoken as he did if the other apostles had received such a command from the Lord and had

conformed to it. A word of the Lord would have bound him, and then, further, as he claimed equal authority with the other apostles he could not have taken an isolated position in this matter. Hence we may infer from his treatment of baptism that the other apostles were not particular to perform the rite themselves.

Paul judged mildly of baptism for the dead (1 Cor. 15 : 29). It is probable that the dead for whom baptism was performed had accepted the gospel, but had not had opportunity for baptism. Two inferences may be drawn from this passage : (1) The rite of baptism in itself had relatively little significance for Paul. (2) The Corinthians laid great weight upon it. Here, then, in a special case we see the two moments which are decisive for the position of baptism in the theology of Paul. For him, baptism apart from faith was of secondary importance; but the church held it in high esteem. The combination of these two facts explains the peculiar manner in which Paul has incorporated baptism into the circle of his religious and theological thought.

This article by Teichmann is in the main convincing. It shows that Paul regarded the rite of baptism as a convenient symbol, of no real meaning apart from faith, and not as being in itself a necessary ordinance. The article has strong incidental evidence against the genuineness of Matt. 28 : 19. The author does not touch the point of *household* baptism, nor does he refer to the *mode* of baptism. We may infer from his general position that he thought of Paul as indifferent in regard to the details of the rite.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. GEORGE H. GILBERT.

ZUR RECHTFERTIGUNG DER KINDERTAUFE. Von P. LOBSTEIN; *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, 1896, Heft 3, pp. 278–298.

IN this article Professor Lobstein, of Strassburg, notices first the objections urged against infant baptism, (1) as foreign to evangelical faith, which is essentially personal; (2) the lack of Scripture support; and (3) that early church history shows no trace of infant baptism. Admitting the force of these objections, he finds that the alternative is either to postpone baptism till faith can become personal or to find new arguments for the baptism of infants. He decides for the latter, and sets himself to show how in our day, and in churches that have long been Christian, and are far from the relations of the mission churches of apostolic days, the baptism of infants can be defended on the broad ground of divine revelation and Christian nurture. It

does not rest upon some particular *dictum probans* of the Bible, but does spring from "the living spirit of the Christian revelation." Following this "organic" and not "atomistic" method of approaching the Scriptures, he finds infant baptism supported (1) as an "expression of the undeserved, anticipating love of God." His motto here is: "He first loved us." This is the heart of the gospel; not that we loved God but that he loved us. Jesus embodied this truth when he loved his own unto the end and gave his life for his enemies. He perfectly revealed, what the prophets also proclaimed, the free, gracious, unmerited, new-creating love of God. Deut. 7:7; 8:17; Jer. 31:3; Ezek. 16:6–8, etc., are quoted. The apostles magnify such love. Rom. 5:7 f.; John 15:16, etc., are referred to. And nowhere has "this message of grace, of peace and joy a more eloquent expression," a more "comprehensible and touching form," than in the baptism of babes and sucklings. The reformers felt this argument, and often presented infant baptism as a witness of the *gratia præveniens* of the Heavenly Father. Every man is as helpless as an infant when the sovereign grace of God first touches him. All is of grace.

(2) Lobstein presents infant baptism next as an "expression of the glorious liberty (or independence, '*Unabhängigkeit*') of the love of God." His motto text here is: "He is greater than our heart." God's love to us does not depend upon our love to him. It is a great error to measure his affection for us by the standard of our devotion to him. Our hearts are fitful, but his love is ever the same. At times we know the unutterable joy of the love of God; but again there comes the "sad pain of separation and isolation." Our faith, however, clings to God, though we feel him not; and we hope in his salvation, though its joy be for a time absent. "The foundation of our eternal salvation does not rest upon the uncertain ground of our feelings or thoughts or efforts . . . . but upon him who is without variableness or shadow of turning." "Our heart may condemn us, but God is greater than our heart." And nowhere does the truth of this text break forth with greater clearness than at the baptism of little children. Here love overflows all limits of age, ability, recognition. The child knows nothing of this love; neither does it know anything of the mother's love that guards its cradle. The recognition of the babe is no condition of either love. The reformers made this religious factor in infant baptism a motive power in some of the greatest doctrines of the gospel. They preached the gospel as the "word of life," the "promise of grace," as the unchangeable ground of Chris-

tian piety. Predestination for them was the assurance that the all-efficient grace of God was above all human changes. Justification by faith was nothing else than a "glorifying of the undeserved mercy of God." We had no more claim to it than the veriest babe. Here is the real ground of the zeal with which all the reformers fought for infant baptism.

(3) The last argument regards the baptism of children as an "expression of the unchangeable faithfulness of the love of God." The text cited is: "He cannot deny himself." All our sins and failures do not set aside Jesus our Advocate, and make void the grace and love of God. Hence the reformers urged all burdened souls to remember that they had been baptized as Christians, and God would not deny himself; his foundation stands sure. That is, to remember our baptism is to remember the word which God gave us, the grace which he promised, the salvation which he completed through Jesus Christ and communicates to us through his Holy Spirit. Baptism thus stands not for a magic power to wash away past sins, but for the ever-present, ever-uninterrupted grace of God.

Such a view of baptism, Lobstein says, rejects the Roman theory of baptismal regeneration, as well as the Lutheran idea of a germ of life or hope given in this ordinance. Such conceptions are unpsychological, more or less magical, and lead away from the protestant doctrines of the gospel. He adds that these thoughts of his on baptism are not to be regarded as "exhausting the theme." They deal with only "one of the ways" of treating the subject. They consider solely what has been called "the divine action" in this sacrament, which makes of it "an objective grace and a divine gift." The other side of baptism shows the reception of the child into the Christian society, its religious training, its gradual participation in all the blessings of the church of Christ. Here come the duties of parents, pastors, and others. On this phase of the subject he refers to the classical teachings of Zwingli as beyond all dispute true. He does not agree with Arnaud, that "in an epoch of deeper faith and greater enthusiasm we will give up infant baptism." He holds that faith and enthusiasm consist, not in rejecting such holy ordinances, but in fulfilling them, in restoring to the usages of the church their evangelical significance, and grasping them in their religious depth.

We heartily agree with this essay of Lobstein as far as it goes; though we think his alternative hardly does justice to either the biblical or the historical supports of infant baptism. The Scriptures teach that heredity may be good as well as bad, that

John the Baptist was filled with the Holy Ghost from his very birth, that God's promise is to both parents and their children, that regeneration is the way to salvation, hence if infants can be saved they can be regenerated, that the children of Christians are "holy" as others are not, and that circumcision carried with it all that evangelical churches claim for baptism. Calvin (*Institutes* IV, 16) and other reformers held that no argument urged against infant baptism does not apply against infant circumcision, which God commanded. We would hardly say with Calvin that the objections to pædobaptism from history are "shamefully contrary to truth," but we are convinced that much more can be urged from this source than Lobstein seems to think.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. H. M. SCOTT.

THE ARCHÆOLOGY OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM. By BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1896, pp. 601–644.

THE practice of the church is divided into an eastern and a western mode. Broadly speaking, the East baptizes by a trine immersion; the West by affusion. When we scrutinize the history of these differing practices, however, we quickly learn that, with whatever unessential variations in details, the usage of the East runs back into a high antiquity; while there are indications on the surface of the western usage that it is comparatively recent in origin, and survivals of an older custom persist side by side with it; so that there was a time when immersion was as universal in the West as in the East. There is a sense, then, in which we may say broadly that the present diversity in baptismal usage is a growth of time; and that, should we move back within the first millennium of the church's life, we should find the whole Christian world united in the ordinary use of trine immersion.

Was conformity to this mode of baptism held to be essential to the validity of baptism, or only necessary to the good order of the church? There never was a time when the church insisted upon immersion as the only valid mode of baptism. In support of this position may be cited the testimony of the *Didache* which allows affusion in case of scarcity of water; also, the well-known testimony of Cyprian concerning the validity of clinic baptism. It is also the assumption of the fathers in their discussion concerning the salvation of the apostles or of other ancient worthies who had died unbaptized. With whatever stringency trine immersion may have been held to be the only regular mode of baptism, other modes were not considered invalid. "We meet with no evidence from the writings of the fathers that baptism by affusion was held anything other than irregular and extraordinary; but we meet with no evidence that it was accounted void; it was even

held, on the contrary, imperative duty in case of necessity, whether on account of paucity of water, or on account of the weakness of the recipient."

But the evidence of the practice of affusion as something more than an unusual and extraordinary mode of baptism which fails us in the writings of the fathers seems to be provided in the monumental representations of the rite, although this apparent evidence runs athwart the consentient witness of the literary remains. The two lines of evidence, thus contradictory as it might seem at first sight, may be reconciled by adopting the theory of de Rossi that normal baptism was performed in the early church by a mode that united immersion and affusion in a single rite. The idea in any case would be an entire bath. The candidate standing in the water, this could be accomplished either by sinking the head beneath the water or by raising the water over the head. The monuments simply bear their witness to the prevalence of the latter mode of completing the ordinance. And when we once perceive this, we perceive also that the pictured monuments do not stand alone in this testimony. The extant fonts also suggest this form of the rite. And the literary notices themselves are filled with indications that the mode of baptism thus suggested was the common mode throughout the Christian world. This is implied, indeed, in the significance attached to the baptism of the head. "When we dip our heads in water as in a grave," says Chrysostom, "our old man is buried; and when we rise up again, the new man rises therewith." The ritual given in the "Catechesis" of Cyril of Jerusalem contains the same implication; we are told that the candidates, after having confessed their faith, "thrice *dipped themselves* in the water, and thrice lifted themselves from out thereof."

It may therefore be assumed that "normal patristic baptism was by a trine immersion upon a standing catechumen, and that this immersion was completed either by lowering the candidate's head beneath the water, or (possibly more commonly) by raising the water over his head and pouring it upon it." Additional support for this assumption is to be found in the fact that the fathers looked upon baptism primarily as a bath.

One further question is to be considered, namely, whether this mode of baptism represents truly the original mode of baptism as handed down to the church by the apostles. The earliest literary and monumental evidence does not go back any farther than the middle of the second century. At that time a form of immersion, though not

without allowance of a simple affusion in case of need, was practiced in the church. But Christian institutions in the middle of the second century, and much more at its end, were not the unaltered institutions of the apostolic age. In these circumstances we shall welcome any further line of investigation which promises to throw light on our problem. Such light it might seem would be found in the relation of Christian baptism to what is known as proselyte baptism or the rabbinical custom of initiating proselytes into the Jewish faith by a formal and complete immersion. But proselyte baptism was apparently a growth of the second century after Christ, and this line of inquiry is profitless. The archæological inquiry as to the mode of Christian baptism leaves us hanging, therefore, in the middle of the second century. Where, then, are we to go for knowledge of really primitive baptism? If the archæology of the rite supplies ground for no very safe inference, where can we obtain satisfactory guidance? Apparently only from the New Testament itself. We are seemingly shut up to the hints and implications of the sacred pages for trustworthy information here. But the conclusions to which these hints and implications would conduct us it is not the purpose of this article even to suggest.

This will be to many an unsatisfactory conclusion. It is not questioned by fair-minded scholars that very early in the history of the Christian church differences arose in the administration of the act of baptism. They were to be expected in connection with the growth of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. But no such differences are discoverable in the New Testament. Indeed so clear and definite is its teaching that historians of every name — Mosheim, Thiersch, Venema, Guericke, Bunsen, Schaff, Pressensé, Kurtz, Stanley, Döllinger — and New Testament interpreters in the various branches of the Christian church — Fritzsche, de Wette, Olshausen, Alford, Lange, Meyer, Tholuck, Lightfoot — have declared that the act of baptism in New Testament times was immersion and not affusion. It is to be wished, therefore, that Dr. Warfield had pursued his inquiries a little further and laid before us not merely the hints and implications but the clear testimony of the New Testament documents with reference to the primitive act of baptism. Perhaps he purposes to do this in another paper.

PORTLAND, MAINE. HENRY S. BURRAGE.

DAS TODESJAHR AGRIPPA'S II, DES LETZTEN JÜDISCHEN KÖNIGS. Von CARL ERBES; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Vol. 39, Heft 3, pp. 415–435.

ONE of the disputed points of chronology in the New Testament times is the date of the death of Agrippa II. In spite of the difficulties

which attend a solution of the problem, Schürer has ventured (*Jewish People in the Time of Christ*, Div. I, Vol. II, pp. 205, 206) to say: "According to the testimony of Justus of Tiberias, Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan, in A. D. 100; and there is no reason for doubting the correctness of this statement, as Tillemont and many modern writers have done." Notwithstanding this confident statement, Erbes has given in the above article an extended argument for assigning the death of Agrippa II to an earlier year, namely, the year 86 A. D. He introduces a piece of evidence "hitherto wholly overlooked" which comes from a much earlier time than the testimony of Photius (containing the supposed testimony of Justus of Tiberias referred to by Schürer), and which he thinks is sufficient to settle the question for the earlier date.

The "Weltchronik vom Jahre 334," which was published by Mommsen in 1850 (I. Band der *Abhandlungen der philol.-histor. Classe der königl. sächs. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften*) gives a series of figures out of which the following table of periods and dates is constructed: From the creation of the world until Cyrus was 4916 years; the Jews were under the Persians 230 years; the Jews were under the Macedonians 270 years; the Jews were under their own kings until Agrippa II, 345 years; from Agrippa until 194 A. D. (reckoned back from 334 A. D. by data given) is 109 years, leaving 86 A. D. as the date of his death. The numbers thus discovered receive confirmation also from other sources.

The testimony of the coins to the limits of Agrippa's reign is by no means clear; Mommsen is correct in saying that the year numbers on the coins of Agrippa II present one of the most perplexing numismatic problems. But from Mommsen's arrangement of the coins of this period Erbes finds evidence that the reign of Agrippa extended up to but not beyond the year 86 A. D., a conclusion at which de Saulcy had already arrived (*Numism. de la Terre Sainte*, p. 316).

It is argued also with much plausibility that the *Antiquities* of Josephus presuppose the death of Agrippa, and their date we know to be 93 or 94 A. D. For Josephus at an earlier time was on good terms with Agrippa, who read and praised for its trustworthiness portions of the *Wars of the Jews* while Josephus was preparing it; this work was completed under Vespasian. But when we come to the *Antiquities* Josephus has various statements concerning Agrippa which he could hardly have introduced if Agrippa had been alive at the time they

were written, *e. g.*, his charging the whole Jewish-Roman War to the permission given the Levites by Agrippa to wear linen garments like the priests (*Ant.* 20, 9, 6), and his very unpalatable although true comments upon the private character of Agrippa and his sisters (*Ant.* 20, 7, 2, 3).

The death of Agrippa of course took place before the publication of Josephus' *Life*. Erbes agrees with Schürer that the *Life* was a sort of appendix to the *Antiquities*, but argues against Schürer that the *Life* must have followed the *Antiquities* within a year, for Justus of Tiberias had already had his account of the *Jewish War* written for twenty years and he would not have lost time in publishing it after Josephus' *Antiquities* appeared with its misrepresentations. Then Josephus would have immediately followed up Justus' work with his *Life* in which he made himself out to be, not the chief organizer in Galilee of the forces of the rebellion as Justus truly represented him, but as the constant and faithful friend of the Romans. The *Life* presumably then belongs to 94 or 95 A. D.

The statement of the patriarch Photius in the second half of the ninth century, on the alleged authority of Justus, that Agrippa died in the third year of Trajan, *i. e.*, in 100 A. D., must therefore be a mistake. Several explanations could be given of how such an error might easily have been made. In any case its testimony is not sufficient to set aside the conclusions arrived at by the above presentation of data.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE HIMMELFAHRT DES JESAJA, EIN ÄLTESTES ZEUGNIS FÜR DAS RÖMISCHE MARTYRIUM DES PETRUS. Von CARL CLEMEN; *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, Vol. 39, Heft 3, pp. 388–415.

AN Ethiopic translation of the *Ascension of Isaiah*, an early Jewish-Christian book, was discovered in 1819. Since that time the book has been found also in Latin, and critics have usually discussed it from the standpoint of the Latin version, as Clemen does in the article before us. All recent critics hold that it contains two or more original documents by different authors, which some editor has joined together.

As the title of his paper shows, Clemen is concerned with but a single aspect of the book, the testimony to the martyrdom of the apos-

tle Peter at Rome which he thinks it gives. His supposition that it records this martyrdom is wholly new. But is it true? His argument may be understood by considering the following points:

1. Almost all critics think that the various original documents of which the *Ascension of Isaiah* is composed were written in the second century. If this opinion is correct, any reference to the martyrdom of Peter which the book might contain would be so late that we could not regard it as a good witness. Clemen admits that the second part comes to us from the second century, but he pushes the first part back to the period between A. D. 64 and 68. His discussion of the date is too long to be reproduced here; and it is sufficient to say that the considerations which he urges have been weighed and rejected by the great majority of those who have examined the book with care.

2. In the first part of the book, which Clemen dates thus early, there is a passage which depicts the evil angel Berial as descending from the firmament, "in the form of a man, a king of iniquity, a matricide." Clemen tells us that this must refer to Nero, and must have been written while he was yet alive. After his death there was a general expectation that he would come back from the tomb and reign as emperor and continue to manifest his well-known traits of generosity, caprice, and cruelty. The great majority of critics see in the passage an expression of this expectation. Clemen stands with a small minority when he insists that the passage must have been written during the lifetime of the tyrant. It is evident that its language might have either reference: if it were proven that this first part of the book is as early as A. D. 68, the reference would be to Nero yet living; but if the passage is from the second century, the reference would be to Nero soon to return from the dead. The question is simply concerning the date of the passage; and as the later date is the more probable there is little ground for the contention of Clemen at this point.

3. The passage continues as follows: "Et plantam quam plantaverunt duodecim apostoli dilecti persequetur; e duodecim in manum eius tradetur." The first member of this sentence is tolerably clear: "The plant which the twelve apostles planted he shall persecute." But what does the second member mean? Clemen translates it: "One of the twelve shall be given into his hands." But this is a forced rendering of the Latin, which others translate: "From the twelve it [the plant] shall be given into his hands."

4. The apostle given into the hands of Nero, Clemen proceeds, can only be Peter, for Paul "is out of the question." But he does not tell us why Paul is out of the question. It could only be on the ground that this part of the book seems to have been written by a Jewish Christian, and that a Jewish Christian would not speak of Paul as one of the twelve apostles. But this is by no means certain; hundreds of Jewish Christians rejoiced in the apostleship of Paul, and in Rome he was specially revered.

5. The martyrdom of Peter, Clemen continues, must have taken place at Rome, because the Neronian persecution did not extend to other parts of the empire. This is a conclusion, however, which many judicious historians call in question. The first member of the Latin sentence which I have quoted does not favor this limitation; the tyrant was to persecute the entire plant of Christianity which the whole company of the apostles had planted.

6. The passage does not tell us what became of the apostle, granting that it speaks of an apostle, after he fell into the hands of the tyrant. Clemen assumes as a matter of course that he suffered martyrdom.

It is on this evidence that we are to regard the *Ascension of Isaiah* " as an early witness to the Roman martyrdom of Peter, and are to congratulate ourselves that at length we have " formal proof " of it.

The argument, as the reader perceives, is encumbered at every point with improbable conjectures. It leaves the early date of all parts of the book in doubt. It leaves the asserted reference to the living Nero in doubt. It leaves the asserted reference to Peter in doubt. It leaves the martyrdom of the apostle, if we grant the reference to an apostle, in doubt. It leaves the place or places where the persecution occurred wholly in doubt.

I think it probable that Peter was crucified at Rome, but I am not able to find any evidence of this in the *Ascension of Isaiah*. Nor am I able to regard any part of the book as " the oldest literary monument of Christendom," as Clemen calls it. But, while I reject these opinions, which constitute the thesis of the writer, I appreciate his article highly for its very valuable summary of the work done by other critics of the book. I do not know where else to find so complete and so fair a review of their arguments and their conclusions.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

UNGEDRUCKTE EXCERPTE AUS EINER SCHRIFT DES PATRIARCHEN EULOGIUS VON ALEXANDRIEN ÜBER TRINITÄT UND INCARNATION. Von O. BARDENHEWER; *Theologische Quartalschrift*, Vol. 78, Heft 3, pp. 355–401.

EULOGIUS was patriarch of Alexandria from 580 to 607. He was a warm friend of Gregory the Great, and, like him, entered earnestly into the battle against the heretics of his time, confuting them with both voice and pen. Various fragments of his works have been published, chiefly by Cardinal Mai, but, as a whole, his writings are yet to be discovered. A treatise, or part of a treatise, by Eulogius was found two or three years ago by Krumbacher in the National Library at Paris, where he was searching for materials for his sketch of Michael Glykas, the Byzantine chronicler of the twelfth century. A few months later he found in the Bodleian Library of Oxford another copy of the same treatise, but much more extensive. The copy at Paris is full of all sorts of errors, besides being greatly abridged, while that at Oxford is remarkably correct.

The treatise, if it may be so called, has two closely related themes: first, the Trinity, and next the incarnation. It was evidently written as an exposition and defense of the doctrine of Chalcedon. The persons of the Trinity are represented as equally without a superior, without limits, and without change, as equal in wisdom and power, and as equally to be adored by the believer. This view is pushed so far as almost to suggest a doubt whether there are any differences of disposition, of tendency, by which the three persons can be distinguished from one another, or any reason, except arbitrary choice, for the differences of office and function by which we know them. Nevertheless, Eulogius attempts a distribution of their functions, apparently with reference to their tendencies, and perhaps at the cost of consistency. He sees a representation of the Father in the human understanding, of the Son in human speech, produced by the understanding, and of the Holy Spirit in the human soul. Or, again, the Father is the root, the Son the branch, and the Holy Spirit the fruit. Or, still again, the Father is the tongue, the Son the word uttered by it, and the Holy Spirit the mouth. Though these representations seem to us somewhat forced and clumsy, they interest us because they proved helpful to our forefathers in the faith.

The incarnation and death of the Second Person of the Trinity are illustrated by many fanciful conceits, some of which were afterwards

woven into mediæval sermons and hymns. Mary is the second Eve, undoing the mischief wrought by the first. The production of the person of Christ in her resembles the production of the pearl in the oyster by the lightning which flashes from heaven and strikes to the depths of the sea. As the pearl partakes of the substance of the oyster and of the brightness of the lightning, so Christ partakes of humanity and divinity. Because Adam was condemned to eat his bread in the sweat of his brow, Christ sweat in the garden. Because the earth was condemned to bring forth thorns and thistles, Christ wore a crown of thorns. Because it was the sixth hour of the day when man stretched forth the hand to the tree to pluck the forbidden fruit, it was the sixth hour of the sixth day when Christ stretched forth his hands on the tree to die. Because the feet of man wandered in evil ways about the tree of Paradise, the feet of Christ were nailed to the tree of Golgotha.

With these fancies are mingled some illustrations of a higher kind. Christ, for example, works as a human being, and as a divine being, and the two activities are present in every word and deed. "The knife, when it is heated to redness, both cuts the wood and burns it, so that it bears the marks both of cutting and of burning. Thus we are to think of the two activities of Christ as inseparably connected. There are also two inseparable activities of the sun; that of its light, and that of its heat; and these two differ in kind. The moon has light without heat. Melted lead has heat without light. But the sun unites both these forces in its activity, and it is thus an image of Christ, of whom God says: 'To them that fear me shall the sun of righteousness arise.'"

In reference to the sufferings of Christ, to his personal appearance, and to the perpetual virginity of Mary, Eulogius expresses the views which we know were prevalent as early as the sixth and seventh centuries. The divine nature of Christ did not suffer in his crucifixion. The body of Christ was majestic and beautiful in appearance. He caused that Mary should continue to be a virgin after his nativity, as before.

From these examples it is evident that the document contains little that is new. Yet we should be grateful for it since it brings before us once more the struggle of our forefathers to grasp and explain the great truths of the Trinity and the incarnation, which we accept as a part of our Christian inheritance from them, and which they discovered and transmitted to us by laborious and consecrated effort of thought and speech.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE CHRISTOCENTRIC THEOLOGY. By CHARLES F. DOLE; *The New World*, September 1896, pp. 422–437.

A CERTAIN group of Christian thinkers, such as Principal Fairbairn, of Oxford, Dr. Lyman Abbott, Dr. G. A. Gordon, Professor Harris, of Andover, and others, propose a new theology. They are men of warm, genuine religious feeling; men even of vehement enthusiasm. Their system is called "Christocentric," because it identifies Christianity with the doctrine of the person of Christ. The elder evangelical theology insisted on a circle of tenets, such as the infallibility of the Bible, the fall of man, eternal punishment, etc., which the new virtually discards. Its simple creed is that Christ is a unique being who incarnates the love of God. To worship, obey, and love him is to worship, obey, and love God. To be out of accord with him is to be in sin. To possess his spirit is to be saved. This is a practical as well as a simple gospel.

Moreover, it makes an appeal to sentiment. The name of Christ possesses a charm acquired through many centuries of indoctrination and association with all that is noble and lovable. This theology further offers a show of philosophical foundation. Dr. Gordon suggests that "the eternal Pattern of our race" may have been included in the nature of the infinite God. Man longs for a perfect king to follow; why should not this perfect king appear and show him the norm of his life?

In testing this theology one should note its lack of consistency and structure. Its idea of Christ and his relation to deity is mystifying. Here, its advocates say, is "the Eternal Filial," "the Christ in the deity," "in God's nature there is an Eternal Society." These expressions either stand for absolute mystery, in which case they might as well be a large algebraic *X*, or they contain some helpful truth regarding the nature of God. If so, what is their meaning? Or we may inquire into the idea of the person of Christ metaphysically. Was Christ on earth an infinite person? Then he was not what he seemed; which would be the heresy of Docetism. Evidently he did not possess the attributes of infinity and omnipresence. How is he then *now* an infinite person? Either we have two Gods exactly alike in all particulars or the true personality of Jesus is lost. But what of the life of the unique, "the Archetypal Man"? First, such an ideal being is not a real man. A real man grows; never attaining to the absolute. Jesus was a real man; he was capable of temptation. It is

not in human nature to grow into, but towards the ideal pattern of the race. The idea of a pattern incarnated is in itself out of line with all we know of the universe. No star or flower or crystal presents the absolute norm of its kind. Every man is man only as he is less than the ideal man. The truth is, that the identification of the ideal man with the historic Jesus is the obvious survival of an outgrown pseudo-Platonic theology. The Christocentric theologians do not themselves treat the historic Jesus as the ideal man.

They do not accept his authority as implicitly as they profess to do. They cannot point to a single teaching of his which they accept simply because he said it, and not because it is in their judgment true. They take good care to interpret the words of Jesus in the light of the universal reason. In using analogy to illustrate their view of the place of Jesus they show more than elsewhere the weakness of their position. If Jesus is in religion unique as other exceptional men are, each in his sphere, why are they not satisfied in classifying him among the prophets, as other exceptional men are classified in their special spheres? But the main question is one of facts. Was Jesus an unique person according to the records? Is it true that in his life alone the manifestation of God has been complete in such a manner as to make his conduct everlasting rule, and his word the word of God? The evidence in the records is not sufficient to establish this. His life is given in fragments. Was he sinless? All that can be said is, that no evidence of sin appears in his record. But the same may be said of many other good men. On the other hand, the records show that he was tempted; he was subject to waves of depression; he was impatient towards certain classes of evil doers; he did not sympathize with the rich and influential; he showed bitterness towards the Pharisees. These characteristics are below the ideal of manhood. The positive facts for which Jesus is accounted unique are also not satisfactory. His teachings, though clearly and forcibly put, are not new. His love and devotion, though the purest and greatest known in any individual, are found in all souls in a lesser degree. In fact, they show his humanity to be not less but more real. His claims for himself cannot be conceded any more than those of Savonarola or any other noble soul who was the creature of the age he lived in and shared its imperfect views. Either he was misunderstood or deceived as to himself. In either case his claims fall to the ground. His miracles must be treated on the same principles as other miracles performed before or since his day. In one place Jesus is certainly unique. This is his historical

position. With him the new type of loving life came to stay, though occurring sporadically before. He stands at the glorious point in history where the line of spiritual life, before somewhat flickering, becomes sure and continuous. To recognize this of him is to admit the sentimental, illustrative, and symbolic use of his name. To demand anything more in his behalf is to ask what cannot be justified at the bar of reason, while it serves as a disturbing element.

The article is a critique of the Christocentric theology from the standpoint of modern Unitarianism. The writer has certainly pointed out some serious flaws in the new system. But he asks too much of his opponents. To his charge that they are not able to state clearly the metaphysical side of their doctrine they may fairly retort: That may be due quite as much to the subjective conditions in their critic as to their own failure to grasp and present the matter. It is certain that his critique of the general doctrine of the Trinity to the effect that this doctrine does not furnish any helpful elements as to the personality of God is a misjudgment of the doctrine made by a very small fragment of those who have tried to think through the subject. The vast majority have recognized in it very great helpfulness.

McCormick Theological Seminary. A. C. Zenos.

The One Flock of Christ. By Charles A. Briggs; *Reformed Quarterly Review*, July 1896.

In the interpretation of the story of the Good Shepherd, found in the gospel of John, his personal relation to the individuals of the flock is usually considered, but Dr. Briggs considers his relation to the flock as a whole.

Jesus predicts the union of Jew and Gentile under one Shepherd. It is his mission to effect this union. He sends his ministers to preach the gospel to the whole creation, and tells them that he will not come again until, through their preaching, all his sheep have been led into the one flock. This one flock, as a complete and perfect organism, is the goal of his redemptive work. But before the time of the accomplishment of his gracious purpose, it is not the mind of Jesus that his sheep should remain apart, scattered or organized in a great number of different flocks. There is one Shepherd for each of the sheep, and only one Shepherd for the whole body of the sheep. The only normal relation is one flock, one Shepherd.

But all Christians are not now gathered into one flock. The Roman Catholic church recognizes no other flock of Christ than that within its own fold. Protestants, to be sure, regard all who love Christ as members of the invisible church, but, since no visible church is

coëxtensive with Christianity, some of Christ's sheep are excluded from it, and by such exclusion are debarred from all the advantages derived from the organization. This failure of Christianity to realize the ideal of Jesus is a sin which should not be condoned; it is, in short, high treason to the church and to Christ.

1. It was not the design of Christ that his one flock should be divided by racial differences. Jew and Gentile were made one in him. But now Christianity is divided on racial lines. There are the Greek and Latin churches. The Copts, the Armenians, and the Syrians for the most part are disunited. The German race is essentially protestant. But all should recognize the legitimacy of various racial types in the common Christianity.

2. Christ did not intend that his one flock should be divided by national distinctions. The successors of the reformers committed the sin of dividing it by national lines. And these lines of demarcation are kept up even in the United States, where the Reformed are divided into Presbyterian, Dutch Reformed, German Reformed and French Reformed. The same state of things substantially exists among the Lutherans.

3. It is not the mind of Christ that his flock should be broken up by differences of social condition. In early Christianity, rich and poor, bond and free, were on the same footing in the church. In this respect the Roman Catholics have been faithful to Christ; but it has remained for American protestants to organize special denominations for freedmen (?) and to establish congregations on the principles of social clubs. Christ himself will at last separate the goats from the sheep, but neither he nor his apostles ever separated the sheep from one another.

4. It was not the design of Christ that his flock should be divided by differences of doctrine. Pharisees and Sadducees in Jesus' day radically differed in doctrine, yet worshiped in the same temple. Paul contended with Barnabas and with Peter and James, yet did not break the unity of the church. Jewish and Gentile Christians remained in the one church, though the church at Corinth was torn by contending factions. But the compulsory subscription of creeds has divided Christendom into many denominations. While, however, these different denominations may rightfully contend for their theories in the forum of scholarship, he who by his theory divides the flock of Christ is guilty of *lèse-majesté*.

5. Differences in forms of worship should not divide the one flock. Each congregation should have absolute liberty as to forms of worship, and differences in ritual should not become walls of separation between different bodies of believers.

6. It is not the mind of Christ that his flock should be divided by differences in church government. Church government is not divinely ordered, and British Christianity has committed the great sin of dividing the flock of Christ by questions of polity. There is good in each of the various polities, but each has unfolded its own peculiar form at the expense of certain advantages contained in the others.

In order to unite into one flock the various folds, we must agree on the essentials. A definition of the essentials of the church may be regarded as the formal principle of church unity. But we shall never make this definition unless we are compelled by the irresistible force of a material principle. Love is that force.

Dr. Briggs thinks that if we were ready to give up everything not essential, all Christians might be brought into unity on the ground of the historical episcopate.

We have not space for extended criticism, but we notice:

1. That Dr. Briggs perhaps unwittingly exaggerates the divisions of the one flock. It is true that evangelical protestants are divided into many denominations, but these denominations are united in doctrine on ninety-five points in a hundred, and are able now to discuss without bitterness the points on which they disagree. They are also heartily coöperating in building up the kingdom of God. A large degree of unity is already secured.

2. The Greek and Latin churches are not divided on racial lines. The Greek church is the state church of Russia. Russia contains more than a hundred nationalities, that speak more than forty languages. Three-fourths of its population are Slavs. The line separating the Greek and Latin churches is both national and ecclesiastical rather than racial.

3. National churches exist on account of the union of church and state. They are separated politically, but in the main are united both in doctrine and spirit. Moreover, there are, in all parts of the world, hosts of independent churches, like those in apostolic times, which cannot be separated either by racial or national lines.

4. When Dr. Briggs says that Christ would not have the one flock divided by differences of doctrine, what does he mean by doctrine? If theories concerning doctrine, we heartily agree with him; but if the central, saving doctrines themselves, we must positively dissent. Christ certainly taught that it does make a difference as to what a man's doctrine is.

5. While Professor Briggs denies that there is a divinely ordered church government, he admits that the "general principles of church government were known and practiced by the apostles." Why not adhere to them and so secure unity in polity?

6. Why should not the work of becoming one visible organism begin somewhere? No wise man can reasonably expect all the divisions of the visible church to be wiped out at one time. The change toward unity must come gradually. First of all let those who differ least unite. For example, let the Presbyterians and the Dutch Reformed churches come together. One such object lesson would do more to hasten the desired end than a thousand learned essays.

7. But when the longed-for unity does come, we doubt if it will be through any adjustments of the various existing creeds and polities, through the "historical episcopate," or "quadrilateral," but it will come rather through a new baptism in the spirit of Christ. Then, without any extraneous appliances, non-essentials will disappear. Men, eager to know the divine will, will ask for the word of God. That word, not man-made creeds, nor propositions from any class of ecclesiastics, will be the basis of unity. Men will hear the Shepherd's voice and *follow* him. Then, and not till then, will Christ's prayer be fully answered that his children "may all be one."

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY.

## GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

### ENCYCLOPÆDIA AND METHODOLOGY.

Ernste Allotria. Abhandlungen aus Theologie und Kirche, von Dienern der evangelischen Kirche in Anhalt. Jubiläumsschrift. Dessau, P. Baumann, 1896; viii + 362 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

Realencyclopädie für protestantische Theologie u. Kirche. Begründet von J. Herzog. In 3. Aufl. hrsg. v. A. Hauck. I. Bd. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1896; ix + 801 pp., 8vo. M. 10; bd. 12.

The Prophets of the Christian Faith. A series of essays. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1896; 12mo; cloth. $1.25.

Contains:
- LYMAN ABBOTT: What is a Prophet?
- FRANCIS BROWN: Isaiah as a Preacher.
- GEORGE MATHESON: The Apostle Paul.
- MARCUS DODS: Clement of Alexandria.
- ARTHUR C. MCGIFFERT: St. Augustine as a Prophet.
- ADOLF HARNACK: Martin Luther, the Prophet of the Reformation.
- F. W. FARRAR: John Wesley.
- A. M. FAIRBAIRN: Jonathan Edwards.
- T. T. MUNGER: Horace Bushnell.
- A. V. G. ALLEN: Frederick Denison Maurice.
- F. W. FARRAR: Can we be Prophets?

### HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen. Hrsg. von Clem. Bæumker und G. v. Hertling.

II. Bd., 4. Heft. Die Philosophie des Alanus de Insulis, im Zusammenhange mit den Anschauungen des 12. Jahrhunderts dargestellt von M. Baumgartner. Münster, Aschendorff, 1896; xii + 145 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

COHN, JONAS. Geschichte des Unendlichkeitsproblems im abendländischen Denken bis Kant. Leipzig, W. Engelmann, 1896; ix + 261 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

HUNT, J. Religious Thought in England in the 19th Century. London, Gibbings, 1896; xxiii + 396 pp., 8vo. 10s. 6d.

JEVONS, F. B. An Introduction to the History of Religion. London, Methuen & Co., 1896; 452 pp., 8vo. 10s. 6d.

KALTHOFF, A. Schleiermachers Vermächtnis an unsere Zeit. Braunschweig, C. A. Swetschke & Sohn, 1896; vii + 236 pp., 8vo, with a photograph. M. 2.50.

KNAPPERT, L. Le Christianisme et le paganisme dans l'histoire ecclésiastique de Bède le vénérable, I. et II. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, July–Aug., 59–85; Sept.–Oct., 146–73.

MÉNARD, LOUIS. La symbolique des religions anciennes et modernes. Leur rapports avec la civilisation. I. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, Sept.–Oct., 174–202.

NEUMANN, A. Grundlagen und Grundzüge d. Weltanschauung v. R. A. Lipsius. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der neuesten Religionsphilosophie. Diss., Jena, 1896; vi + 80 pp., 8vo.

RENOUVIER, CH. Philosophie analytique de l'histoire. Tome I. Les idées; les religions; les systèmes. Paris, Leroux, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 12.

SANTAYANA, G. The Absence of Religion in Shakespeare. *New World*, Dec., 681–90.

SAUSSAYE, P. D. CHANTEPIE DE LA, Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte.

2. Aufl. in Vbdg. m. E. Buckley, H. O. Lange, F. Jeremias, J. J. P. Valeton, Jr.; M. Th. Houtsma, E. Lehmann; bearb. u. hrsg. = Sammlg. theol. Lehrbb. In 18 Lfgn. à M. 1. Freiburg, Mohr; 1. Lfg. (pp. 1–48).

SCHULZE, E. F. Das Uebel in der Welt nach der Lehre des Arnobius. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. patrist. Philosophie. Jena, 1896; 42 pp., 8vo.

VOWINCKEL, E. Religion u. Religionen bei Schleiermacher u. Hegel. Eine Verhältnisbestimmung. Erlangen, Merkel, 1896; 63 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

WEBER, A. S. The Development of the New Psychology. *Ref. Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 454–68.

NOTE.—The brief space allotted to this bibliography excludes completeness in any department; only the most important recent literature up to the end of November is given. W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

AGUILÉRA. De la nécessité des faits historiques pour la foi chrétienne. *Rev. Chrét.*, 1896, 241–51.

ANDREWS, O. F. The Relation of Christianity to the Conflict between Capital and Labour. London, 1896; 152 pp., 8vo. 2s. 6d.

BATCHELOR, GEO. The Infection of Pessimism. *New World*, Dec., 601–15.

BAUR, A. Die Weltanschauung des Christentums. 2. (Titel-) Aufl. Blaubeuren, Mangold; viii + 271 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

BRODBECK, ADF. Die Grundsätze der modernen Weltanschauung. Zürich, Verlags-Magazin, 1896; iv + 80 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

BRUNETIÈRE, F. Les bases de la croyance. *Rev. des deux Mondes*, Oct. 15.

CARR, E. S. Schleiermacher and the Christian Consciousness. *Bibliotheca Sacra*, Oct. 1896; 668–80.

CROTHERS, S. M. Tendencies of Thought in the Liberal Christian Churches of America. *New World*, Dec., 669–81.

DENNEY, JAMES. The Dissolution of Religion: Mark xii, 38–40; Matthew xxiii; Luke xx, 45–47. *Expositor*, Oct., 263–77.

FROMMEL, GASTON. The Principle of Moral Individuality in Catholic Christianity. *New World*, Dec., 634–54.

HAHNEMANN, M. Gottes Weltordnung ein Naturgesetz. Logische Kritik der Kultur in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart u. Zukunft. Berlin, Skopnik, 1896; 40 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

HAROLD, H. J. The Knowledge of Life, being a contribution to the study of religions. New York, G. P. Putnam & Sons, 1896; 8vo, cloth.

HUGHES, H. Religious Faith: an essay in the Philosophy of Religion. London, Paul, Trübner & Co.; 8vo. 10s. 6d.

JOHNSTON, H. A. Wanted: A Definition of Conscience. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VII., 622–29.

KIREEFF, A. Lord Halifax and the Reunion of Christendom. *Int. theol. Z.—Rev. int. de théol.*, Oct.–Dec., 697–714.

PAUL, L. Ein praktischer Standpunkt. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 3, 337–50.

PFLEIDERER, OTTO. Is Morality without Religion Possible and Desirable? *Philos. Rev.*, V., 449–72.

PICARD, L'ABBÉ. Chrétien ou Agnostique. Paris, Plon, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 7.50.

PULLAN, L. Lectures on Religion. London, Longmans, 342 pp., 8vo. 6s.

RENÉ (Le P.) DE NANTES. La Piété séraphique proposée aux âmes de bonne volonté. Paris, Poussielgue, 1896; 32mo. Fr. 1.50.

ROISEL, G. L'idée spiritualiste. Paris, Alcan, 1896; 12mo. Fr. 2.50.

SAMTLEBEN, G. Was die moderne Philosophie von der Religion verlangt? *Beweis des Glaubens*, Aug., 307–25.

SCHELL, HM. Die göttliche Wahrheit des Christentums. I. Buch: Gott und Geist. 2. Tl.: Beweisführung. Paderborn, F. Schöningh, 1896; xii + 726 pp., 8vo. M. 9.
To be completed in 4 vols.

SCHOLKMANN, A. Grundlinien einer Philosophie des Christenthums. Berlin, Mittler & Sohn, 1896. M. 7.

SIME, A. H. MONCUR. Elements of Religion; or, Thoughts on the Inner Life. London, Alexander & Shepheard, 1896; 8vo., cloth. 2s. 6d.

SVOBODA, A. Gestalten des Glaubens. Culturgeschichtliches und Filosofisches. I. Tl. Leipzig, C. G. Naumann, 1896; viii + 310 pp., 8vo. M. 6; bd. M. 8.

SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

BETTEX, F. Naturstudium und Christentum. 2. Auflage. Bielefeld, Velhagen & Klasing; 333 pp., 8vo; bd. M. 4.

BROWN, DAVID. What the Bible teaches about the Human Body. *Expos. Times*, Dec., 127–31.

BÜCHNER, LUDWIG. Gott und die Wissenschaft. Leipzig, Thomas. M. 1.50.

DAWSON, SIR J. W. The Testimony of Christian Students of Nature in Favor of Religion. *Hom. Rev.*, Dec., 503–5.

GALLOWAY, W. B. The Testimony of Science to the Deluge. London, Sampson Low, Marston & Co., 1896; 172 pp., 8vo.

MELLONE, S. H. Present Aspects of the Relation between Science and Religion. *New World*, Sept., 506–27.

PICTET, RAOUL. Étude critique du matérialisme et du spiritualisme, par la physique expérimentale. Paris, Alcan, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 10.

SIMON, D. W. Evolution and the Fall of Man. *Bibl. Sacra*, Jan., 1897, 1–20.

STRADA, J. Jésus et l'ère de la science. Paris, F. Alcan, 1896.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY.

GOODSPEED, G. S. Aids to Bible Readers: The Foreshadowings of the Christ, I. *Biblical World*, Nov., 376–89; II., *ibid.*, Dec., 483–91.

HEARN, L. A Living God. *Atlantic Monthly*, Dec., 833–41.

LABANCA, B. Il congresso delle religioni a Chicago nell' anno 1893. Roma, G. Balbi, 1896; 10 pp., 8vo.

MACNAUGHTON, JOHN. Tendency in Greek and Hebrew Religion. *Queen's Quarterly*, Oct. 1896, 145–48.

MILLS, L. H. Communication on the Unity of God and the Moral Idea in the Avesta. *Crit. Rev.*, Oct., 358–67.

RUNZE, GEO. Studien zur vergl. Religionswissenschaft, Heft 3. Das Zeichen des Menschensohnes und der Doppelsinn des Jonâ-Zeichens. Glossen u. Materialien zur Erklärung der Herrensprüche vom "Zeichen." Berlin, R. Gaertner's Verlag, 1896.

SHINN, REV. G. W. Some Modern Substitutes for Christianity. New York. Thomas Whittacker, 1896. $0.50.

SNELL, M. M. The Nature and Scope of the Science of Comparative Religion. *Biblical World*, Sept., 203–10.

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

BAYNES, H. The Mirror of Truth or Bauddha Confession of Faith. *Wiener Zeits. f. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, X., 242–51.

BESANT, A. The Path of Discipleship. Four lectures delivered at the 20th Anniversary of the Theosophical Society at Adyar, Madras, Dec. 29–30, 1895. London, 1896; 150 pp., 8vo; cloth. 2s.

BIXBY, JAMES T. Jainism and its Founder. *New World*, Sept., 541–56.

BUCKLEY, E. The Shinto Pantheon. *New World*, Dec., 719–44.

CALAND, W. Die altindischen Todten- u. Bestattungsgebräuche, mit Benutzung handschriftlicher Quellen dargestellt. Amsterdam; 14, 192 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50.

DAHLMANN, J. Nirvana. Eine Studie zur Vorgeschichte des Buddhismus. Berlin, F. L. Dames, 1896; xii + 197 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

GILMORE, DAVID. The Teaching of Buddha — is it the Teaching of Christ? *Standard*, Oct. 3.

HA-HSIAO. Magna doctrina Confucii. Textus sinicus autographice exscriptus ab H. Geiger. München, 1896; vi + 20 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

HARLEZ, C. DE. Fleurs de l'antique Orient. Extraits des œuvres inédites des quatre plus anciens philosophes de la Chine. *Journ. asiat.*, Sér. IX., Tome viii., Sept.–Oct., 181–233.

HUTH, G. Geschichte des Buddhismus in der Mongolei. Mit einer Einleitung: Politische Geschichte der Mongolen. Aus dem Tibetanischen des Jigsmed nam-mk'a herausgegeben, übersetzt und erläutert. II. Tl. Nachträge zum I. Tl. Übersetzung. Strassburg, 1896, K. J. Trübner; xxxii + 456 pp., 8vo. M. 30.
Part I. appeared in 1892. Price, M. 20.

I-TSING. A Record of the Buddhist Religion as practised in India and the Malay Archipelago (A. D. 671–95). Translated by J. TAKAKUSU, with a letter from F. MAX MÜLLER. London, Henry Frowde, 1896; 4to. 14s., *net.*

JACKSON, A. V. W. On Date of Zoroaster. *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, XVII., 1–23.

JOGENDRA, NATH BHATTACHARYA. Hindu Castes and Sects. London, 1896; 642 pp., 8vo. 16s.

KERN, H. Manual of Indian Buddhism. Strassburg, Trübner, 1896 = Grundriss d. indo-ar. Philol., III., 8. M. 7.

The Mahājanaka Jātaka, being the story of one of the anterior births of Gotama Buddha. Transl. (from Burmese) into English and with notes by Taw Sein Ko. Rangoon; 110 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

NYAYARATNA, M. M. CH. Brief Notes on the Modern Nyaya System of Philosophy and its Technical Terms. In Sanskrit and English. Calcutta, 1896; 23 pp. 1s. 6d.

REGNAUD, PAUL. Les premières formes de la religion et de la tradition dans l'Inde et la Grèce. Paris, Leroux, 1896; xi + 518 pp., 8vo.

SINNET, A. P. The Growth of the Soul: a sequel to "Esoteric Buddhism," 1896; 470 pp., 8vo., cloth. 5s.

TEMPLE, G. A Glossary of Indian Terms relating to Religion, Customs, Manners, etc. London, Luzac & Co., 1866.

# EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

## OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

### GENERAL.

Bible Illustrations. A series of plates, illustrating biblical versions and antiquities, being an appendix to the Oxford Bible for Teachers. Oxford, 1896; The Oxford University Press; 79 pp. and 124 plates; large 8vo, cloth.

HOGG, H. W. 'Amen.' Notes on its Significance and Use in Biblical and Postbiblical Times. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, IX., Oct., 1–23.
See also *Expos. Times*, Dec., 100–102.

### GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BAMBUS, W. Die Jüdischen Dörfer in Palästina. Ihre Entstehung und Entwickelung bis auf die Gegenwart. With 3 plates. Berlin, 1896; 36 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

BENSLEY, R. L. Our Journey to Sinai: A Visit to the Convent of St. Catarina. With chapter on the Sinai Palimpsest. London, The Rel. Truth Soc., 1896; illustrated, 186 pp., 8vo, cloth. 3s. 6d.

BIGG, C. Six Months in Jerusalem. London, 1896; with illustrations; xvi + 365 pp., 8vo; cloth. 7s. 6d.

GUINET, V. Syrie, Liban et Palestine, géographie administrative, statistique, descriptive et raisonnée. Paris, 1896; Vol. I., 200 pp., 8vo. Fr. 6.

LAGRANGE, M.-J. De Suez à Jerusalem par le Sinai. *Rev. bibl.* V., 618–43.

LAPPARENT, A. DE. L'origine et l'histoire de la mer morte d'après M. Blanckenhorn. *Ibid.* V., 570–74.

WELLS, J. Travel Pictures from Palestine. With illustrations. London, 1896; 200 pp., 8vo. 7s. 6d.

WRIGHT, WILLIAM. The Rivers of Damascus: Abana and Pharpar. *Expositor*, Oct., 290–97.

### INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

DICK, M. L'inspiration des livres saints. *Rev. bibl.*, V., 485–96.

LAGRANGE, R. P. L'inspiration et les exigences de la critique. *Ibid.*, V., 496–518.

### THEOLOGY.

CLEMEN, AUG. Einführung in die Heilsgeschichte des alten und neuen Testamentes. Leipzig, Dürr, 1896. M. 2.

HUIZINGA, A. H. Passages concerning seeing God. *Presb. Quar.*, X., 508–15.

PFEIL, TH. Das biblische Wunder keine Durchbrechnung von Naturgesetzen. *Bew. des Glaub.*, Oct., 369–89; Nov., 409–25.

VALETON, J. J. P. Christus und das Alte Testament. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896; viii + 60 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

## THE OLD TESTAMENT.[1]

### GENERAL.

BROOKE, S. A. The Old Testament in Modern Life. London, 1896; 352 pp., 8vo. 6s.

CHOTZNER, REV. J. Curious Biblical Proper Names. *Asiat. Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 392–4.

FRIEDLANDER, M. Text-Book of the Jewish Religion. Fourth Edition. 1896; 108 pp., 8vo, cloth. 1s. 6d.

KENNEDY, A. R. S. Jean Astruc. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 24–27; Nov., 61–65.

LANGEN. Die zwei Schwerter. *Rev. Int. de théol.*, Oct.–Dec., 1896, 635–53.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Zusätze und Berichtigungen zu s. Bibliograph. Handbuch über die Lit. f. hebr. Sprachkunde, Leipzig, 1859. Leipzig; 8vo. M. 2.

VOSS, LOUIS. The Old Testament and Social Reform. *Presb. Quarterly*, X., 442–57.

### LANGUAGE.

BALTZER, J. B. Hebräische Schulgrammatik für Gymnasien. Dritte Auflage. Stuttgart, vii + 143 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

[1] A bibliography of recent publications in the field of Semitic Philology and Literature, as well as on Rabbinical and Talmudical Subjects is found in each number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, published by The University of Chicago.

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRANDT, W. Israël in een Egyptischen Text van ca. 1200 v. Ch. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, Sept., 505–12. See *Expos. Times*, Nov., 76; *Am. Jour. Arch.*, xi, 388–90.

DAWSON, SIR, J. W. Merenptah and the Israelites. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 17–18.

DELATTRE, A. J. Le pays de Chanaan, province de l'ancien empire égyptien. Besançon, Impr. Jacquin; 93 pp., 8vo.

DIDIOT, JULES. Le pauvre dans l'ancien Testament; étude biblique. Lille et Paris, Impr. Taffin-Léfort, 1896; 94 pp., 32mo.

DRIVER, S. R. Melchizedek, *Expos. Times*, Oct., 43–44; Dec., 142–44.

GERMER-DUSAND. Épigraphie Palestinienne. *Rev. bibl.* V., 601–17.

HOMMEL, F. Melchizedek. *Expository Times*, Nov., 94–96.

——— Merenptah and the Israelites. *Ibid.*, Oct., 15–17.

MOOR, Fl. DE. Les Juifs captifs dans l'empire chaldéen depuis l'avènement de Nabuchodonosor jusqu' après la mort de Darius le Mède. *Le Muséon*, XV., 321–42.

SAYCE, A. H. Melchizedek. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 94.

——— The Israelites on the Stela of Meneptah. *Ibid.*, Nov., 89–90.

SCHALL, E. Die Staatsverfassung der Juden auf Grund des Alten Testamentes u. namentlich der 5 Bücher Moses m. fortlaufender Beziehung auf die Gegenwart. Erster Teil. Mosaisches Recht, Staatskirche und Eigentum in Israel. 2. Aufl. Leipzig; iv + 382 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

TRUMBULL, H. C. The Wells at Beersheba. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 89.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

BAXTER, WM. L. Professor Peake and Wellhausen. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 47.

GILBERT, J. Nature, the Supernatural, and the Religion of Israel. Cincinnati, 1896; 8vo, cloth. $2.50.

HARFORD-BATTERSBY, G. Professor Sayce on Pentateuchal criticism. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 91.

KASTEREN, J. P. Le Canon juif vers le commencement de notre ère, II. *Rev. bibl.*, V., 575–94.

PEAKE, A. S. Dr. Baxter and Wellhausen. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 93–4.

ZEYDNER, H. De houding des evangeliendienaars ten opzichte van het Oude Testament. *Theol. Studiën*, 241–72.

THEOLOGY.

BAUM, J. Der Universalismus der mosaischen Heilslehre in seiner allgemein ethischen, socialen und culturhistorischen Bedeutung. Eine populär wissenschaftl. Abhandlung f. die Lösung aller modernen socialen Fragen. II. Buch. Frankfurt a. M., Kauffmann, 1896; 80 S. gr. 8vo. M. 2.

DAVIDSON, A. B. The Old Testament Doctrine of Immortality. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 10–14,

KAMPHAUSEN, A. Das Verhältnis des Menschenopfers zur israelitischen Religion. Bonn; 80 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

MELZER, E. Die Unsterblichkeit auf Grundlage der Schöpfungslehre. Durch eine Beilage über einige moderne Unsterblichkeitslehren vermehrter Sonderabdruck aus dem 28. Bericht der wissenschaftl. Gesellschaft Philomathie zu Neisse. Neisse, Graveur, 1896; v + 116 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

PICK, BERNHARD. An Unscriptural Expiatory Sacrifice. *Hom. Rev.*, Nov., 409–10.

STUCKERT, KARL. Vom Schauen Gottes. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VI., 493–544.

THE LAW.

BALL, C. J. The Book of Genesis: critical edition of the Hebrew Text printed in colors, exhibiting the composite structure of the book, with notes.

Part 1 of The Sacred Books of the Old Testament, edited by Paul Haupt. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung; 120 pp., 4to. $2.00.

BLEEKER, L. H. K. A-van der Flier, C. Izn.: "Deuteronomium 33. Een exegetisch-historische Studie, 1895." *Theol. Studiën*, XIV., 359–82.

CONDER, C. R. The Date of the Exodus. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 90.

HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques; Vente de Joseph par ses frères, son élevation en Égypte jusqu'à sa réconciliation avec eux. *Revue Sémitique*, 289–323.

HAYMAN, H. The Great Pentateuchal Difficulty Met. *Bibl. Sacra*, Oct., 645–67.

LAIRD, H. P. The First Chapter of Genesis read in the light of Modern Science. *Ref. Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 481–90.

LÖHR, M. Das Deuteronomium. *Kirchl. Monatsschrift*, XVI., 1, 17–34; 2, 86–97.

MOE, O. Die Apostellehre u. der Dekalog im Unterrichte der alten Kirche. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1896; viii + 87 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

RUPPRECHT, E. Des Rätsels Lösung od. Beiträge zur richtigen Lösung des Pentateuchrätsels für den christlichen Glauben u. die Wissenschaft. 2. Abtlg.: Erweis der Echtheit u. Glaubwürdigkeit des Pentateuch f. die Wissenschaft. 1. Hälfte. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1896; xxiii + 408 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

SAYCE, A. H. Light on the Pentateuch from Egyptology. *Hom. Rev.*, Sept., 195–200.

——— Archæological Commentary on Genesis, ch. X. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 82–5.

SCHÖPFER, A. Bibel u. Wissenschaft. Grundsätze u. deren Anwendung auf die Probleme der bibl. Urgeschichte: Hexaëmeron, Sintflut, Völkertafel, Sprachverwirrung. Brixen; viii + 280 pp., 8vo. M. 3.60.

VUILLEUMIER, H. La première page de la Bible. Étude d'histoire religieuse. *Rev. de theol. et de phil.*, July, 364–78; Sept., 393–419.

WATSON, W. SCOTT. The final chapters of Deuteronomy. *Bibl. Sacra*, Oct., 681–90.

THE PROPHETS.

BARNES, W. E. The two servants of Jehovah, the conqueror and the sufferer, in Deutero-Isaiah. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 28–31.

BERTHOLET, A. Der Verfassungsgesetzentwurf des Hesekiel in seiner religionsgeschichtlichen Bedeutung. Habilitationsvorlesung. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr; iv + 28 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

CHAUFFARD, A. Les prophètes rapprochés des oracles sacrés. 2 vols. Paris, Listar, 1896.

CHEYNE, T. K. Nahum 2:7; Athaliah; Janoah: A correction. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 48.

GREGORY, D. S. The Prophets of the Restoration. *Hom. Rev.*, Oct., 348–53.

HALÉVY, J. Le Voeu de Jephté. *Rev. Sémitique*, 1896, 348–55.

KENNEDY, JAMES. Isaiah 64:5. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 44–6.

KOSTERS, W. H. Deutero- en Trito-Jezaja. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, Nov., 577–623.

MCCURDY, J. F. Light on Scriptural Texts from recent discoveries: (1) The Kingdom of the Ten Tribes. *Hom. Rev.*, Sept., 218–20; (2) 2 Kings 18:13. *Ibid.*, Nov., 411–13.

MÜLLER, D. H. Discours de Malachie sur le rite des sacrifices. *Rev. bibl.*, V., 535–40.

SMITH, GEO. ADAM. Professor Cheyne on my Criticism of Micah IV.–VII. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 48.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BEECHER, WILLIS J. The Sixtieth Psalm. *Hom. Rev.*, Nov., 444–47.

COOKE, J. HUNT. The Book of the Dead and a Passage in the Psalms. *Contemp. Rev.*, Aug., 277–85; reprinted in *Biblia*, Nov. 1896, 211–19.

GILSE, J. C. VAN. Psalm 84. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, Sept., 455–69.

HAITZMANN, A. Psalm 108. Ein Beitr. z. Exegese d. Fluchpsalmen. *Zeitschr. f. kath Theol.*, 1896, 4, 614–25.

HALÉVY, J. Notes pour l'interprétation des Psaumes. Suite: ps. 66–73. *Rev. Sémitique*, 1896, 323–43.

HOONACKER, A. VAN. Nouvelles études sur la restoration juive après l'exile de Babylon. Paris, E. Leroux, 1896. Fr. 8.

KAMPHAUSEN, A. The Book of Daniel: critical edition of the Hebrew and Aramaic Text, printed in colors, exhibiting the bilingual character of the book.

Part 18 of The Sacred Books of The Old Testament, edited by Paul Haupt. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung; 43 pp., 4to. $0.80.

KOSTERS, W. H. Het tijdvak van Israëls herstel. II. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, Sept., 489–504.

LEV, J. Die Metrische Beschaffenheit des Hiob.' *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 7–42.

MCCURDY, J. F. Light on Scriptural Texts from recent discoveries: (1) The Fate of the People of Northern Israel. *Hom. Rev.*, Oct., 311–14; (2) Transition from Hezekiel to Manasseh, 2 Chron. 33:11. *Ibid.*, Dec., 505–8.

PFEIFFER, R. Die religiös-sittliche Weltanschauung des Buches der Sprüche in ihrem innern Zusammenhang dargestellt. München, Beck, 1896.

TORREY, CH. C. The Composition and Historical Value of Ezra-Nehemia. Giessen, 1896; vi + 65 pp., 8vo. 2s. 6d.

THE APOCRYPHA.

ABRAHAMS, I. The Third Book of the Maccabees. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, IX., 39–59.

BÜCHLER, ADOLF. Das apokryphische Esrabuch. *Mon. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. d. Judentums*, Oct. and Nov., 1896.

FRANKENBERG, W. Die Datierung der Psalmen Salomos. Ein Beitrag zur jüdischen Geschichte. Giessen, 1896; ix + 97 pp., 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LÉVI, ISRAËL. Les dix-huit bénédictions et les psaumes de Salomon. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, XXXII., 161–78.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

BÜCHLER, ADOLF. Les sources de Flavius Josèphe dans ses *Antiquités*, XII., 5, i–xiii. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, XXXII., 179–200.

FRIEDMANN, M. Onkelos und Akylas. Wien, 1896; vi + 135 pp., 8vo. 3s.

WENDLAND, P. Philo und Clemens Alexandrinus. *Hermes*, Bd. 31, 435–56.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

HICKS, E. Traces of Greek philosophy and Roman law in the New Testament. London, S. P. C. K., 1896; 188 pp., 12mo. 3s.

KÖNNECKE, CL. Beiträge zur Erklärung des Neuen Testamentes. Programm. Stargard, i. P., 1896; 30 pp., 4to.

KRÜGER, G. Das Dogma vom Neuen Testament. Giessen, C. v. Münchow, 1896; 40 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

——— Die Entstehung des Neuen Testamentes. Freiburg, i. Br., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; 26 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

SÄUBERLICH, B. Jesus der Nazoräer und die Schriften des Neuen Testamentes. Nach dem Standpunkte der neuesten wissenschaftlichen Forschungen volksverständlich dargestellt. Nebst 2 einleitenden Abhandlungen über das Wesen aller Religionen und die Entstehung des Christentums. Dresden, A. Herrmann & Co., 1896; in 4 Lieferungen. 1. Lfg., 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.25.

STIFLER, J. M. A question of Interpretation. *Bibl. Sacra*, Oct., 691–707.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT.

BLASS, FRIEDR. Grammatik des Neutestamentlichen Griechisch. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; xii + 329 pp., 8vo. M. 5.40.

MARSHALL, J. T. The Semitic and the Greek Gospels. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 90–1.

NESTLE, E. Philologica sacra. Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und Apostelgeschichte. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896; 59 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

NESTLE, E. Zu Matth. 3:12; Luc. 3:17. *Mittheil. u. Nachr. des Deutsch. Pal. Vereins*, 1896, 54–5.

——— The Semitic and the Greek Gospels. I. Matt. 5:42 = Luke 6:30; II. Matt. 5:47 = Luke 6:34. *Expos. Times*, Oct., 42–5; III. Semitic Assonances, *Ibid.*, Dec., 138–9.

SELBIE, J. A. Nestle on the Original Gospels and Acts. *Ibid.*, Nov., 75.

TRABAUD, H. Un curieux manuscrit du Nouveau Testament. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, July, 378–86.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

ANTHONY, A. W. An Introduction to the Life of Jesus. An investigation of the historical sources. Boston, Silver, Burdett & Co., 1896; 206 pp., 8vo, cloth.

CROZIER, J. B. A Modern View of Jesus Christ. *Fortnightly Rev.*, Sept., 373–90.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Christ's Attitude toward his own Death. *Expositor*, Oct., 277–90.

GOLIZIA, B. Gesù Cristo. Introduzione agli studî biblici. Assissi, 1896; 136 pp., 8vo. il. 35c.

KLÖPPER, A. Zwei wichtige Aussagen Jesu. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 481–516. Matth. 11:25–30, Luc. 10, 21–24; and Matth. 22:41–46, Marc. 12:25–37, Luc. 20:41–44.

ROPES, JAMES HARDY. Die Sprüche Jesu, die in den kanonischen Evangelien nicht übermittelt sind; eine kritische Bearbeitung des von Dr. Alfred Resch gesammelten Materials. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896, viii + 176 pp., 8vo. M 5.50.

WALTER, A. Jesus Christus. Ein Lebensbild, nach den 4 Evangelien zusammengestellt. Mit 4 Karten in Farbendruck. Gera, Th. Hofmann, 149 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

BANKS, J. S. Back to St. Paul. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 55–59.

BARNS, THOMAS. The Apostolic Conference at Jerusalem: a study in Chronology and Criticism. *Expositor*, October, 298–308.

EWALD, P. Ueber die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelien. Aus *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, Leipzig, A. Deichert Nachf., 1897; iii + 25 S., gr. 8vo. M. 0.75.

KÜHN. Das Überwiegen der Gründe für die paulinische Abfassung des Hebraeerbriefes. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 719–36.

LISCO, H. Die Entstehung des Zweiten Korintherbriefes. Berlin, Schneider & Co., 1896; iii + 84 pp., 8vo. M. 1.80.

ROSE, R. P. L'épître de saint Jacques est-elle un écrit chrétien? *Rev. bibl.*, V., 519–34.

WANDEL. Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi, vor dem Richterstuhl der neuesten Kritik, *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 693–718.

ZÖCKLER, O. Einige Urteile wissenschaftlicher Forscher der Gegenwart über den Geschichtswert der Apostelgeschichte. *Bew. des Glaub.*, Nov., 433–50.

THEOLOGY.

ABBOTT, E. A. The Raising of the Dead in the Synoptic Gospels. *New World*, Sept., 473–92.

APPEL, H. Die Selbstbezeichnung Jesu: der Sohn des Menschen. Eine biblisch-theologische Untersuchung. Stavenhagen, Beholtz, 1896; vii + 139 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

FAYON, R. La notion du sacrifice dans l'épître aux Hébreux, comparée à la notion de saint Paul; Thèse. Montbéliard, Barbier, 1896; 88 pp., 8vo.

GÖBEL, S. Das "Christentum Christi" und das kirchliche Christentum. Vortrag. Gütersloh, E. Bertelsmann, 1896; 40 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

HENDERSON, C. R. The Development of Doctrine in the Epistles. Philadelphia, Baptist Publication Society. 50c.

HOFFMANN, R. A. Die Abendmahlsgedanken Jesu Christi. Ein biblisch-theologischer Versuch. Königsberg, Thomas & Oppermann, 1896; 151 pp., 8vo. M. 2.80.

HOLTZMANN, H. J. Neutestamentl. Theologie. Freiburg i. Br., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896, 8vo.
2 vols., in parts, each at M. 1.50.

KÄHLER, MART. Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche, biblische Christus, 2. Aufl. Leipzig, A. Deichert Nachf., 1896; xii + 206 pp., 8vo. M. 3.25.

LIETZMANN, HANS. Der Menschensohn. Ein Beitrag zur neutestamentl. Theologie. Freiburg i. Br., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; viii + 95 pp. 8vo. M. 2.

M*** Une nouvelle théologie biblique (Bovon) du Nouveau Testament. *Rev. Chrétienne*, Sept., 203–207.

RUPP, W. Paul's Doctrine of Election in Romans, chapters 9–11. *Ref. Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 411–440.

SCHAARSCHMIDT, M. Christi Lehrthätigkeit nach den Evangelienberichten für Schulzwecke dargestellt. Chemnitz, Programm der Realschule, 1896; 31 pp., 8vo.

TEICHMANN, E. Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung u. Gericht, u. ihre Beziehung zur jüdischen Apokalyptik. Freiburg i. Br., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; x + 125 pp., 8vo. M. 2.50.

ZIPPEL, B. Christus als zweiter Adam. Progr. des Kneiphöf. Stadtgymn. Königsberg, i. Pr., 1896; 35 pp. 4to.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

BEYSCHLAG, W. Ueber die Aussprüche Jesu an Petrus, Ev. Matth. 16:17–19.
Heft 124 der 'Flugschriften des Ev. Bundes,' herausg. vom Vorstand. Leipzig, Buchh. des Ev. Bds. 1896; 24 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

BONNET, L. Évangiles de Matthieu, Marc et Luc, expliquées au moyen d'introductions, d'analyses et de notes exégétiques. 2e édition. Lausanne, Georges Bridel et Cie., 1896.

DENNEY, J. Gospel Questions and Answers. London, Hodder, 1896; 150 pp., 12mo. 1s. 6d.

Great Text Commentary. John 7:17–39. *Expos. Times*, 1896; Oct., 35–38., Nov., 185–88; Dec., 119–22.

HILGENFELD, A. Die Apostelgeschichte nach ihren Quellenschriften untersucht.

VIII. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 517–558.

HILLARD, A. E. Gospel according to St. Matthew. London, Rivington, 1896; 154 pp., 12mo. 1s. 6d.

MÉCHINEAU, P. L. Une contradiction dans les évangiles, Matth. 10:9–10; Luke 9:3; Mark 6:8–9. *Études religieuses*, Oct., 303–15.

MORRIS, E. D. The Jerusalem Chamber. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VII., 595–610.

NIGLUTSCH, Jos. Brevis commentarius in evangelium S. Matthaei, ad usum clericorum in Seminario Tridentino concinnatus. Trient, J. Seiser, 1896; v + 219 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

PLUMMER, A. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1896; lxxxviii + 590 pp., 8vo, cloth. $3.00, *net.*

RICE, E. W. People's Commentary on The Acts. Philadelphia, Am. Sunday School Union, 1896; 371 pp., 8vo, cloth.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

BELSER, J. Die Selbstverteidigung des hl. Paulus im Galaterbriefe, 1:11–2, 21 (=Biblische Studien, Heft 3.), Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1896.

BRUSTON, G. Essai d'explication de Jacques 4:4–6. *Rev. de Théol. et des quest. rel.*, V., 433–36.

DRESCHER, RICHARD. Der Zweite Korintherbrief und die Vorgänge in Korinth seit Abfassung des ersten Korintherbriefes. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 43–112.

FAY. Blicke in das Gemüth des Apostels Paulus. *Zeitschr. f. den evang. Rel.-Unter.*, VIII., Oct., 10–26.

Kommentar, kritisch-exegetischer, üb. das neue Testament, begründet v. H. A. W. MEYER. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; gr. 8vo.

5. Abth. Der 1. Brief an die Korinther, von C. F. G. HEINRICI, 8. Aufl. M. 7.00; geb. 8.50.

16. Abth. Die Offenbarung Johannis, von W. BOUSSET, 5. Aufl. M. 8.00; geb. 9.50.

POGGEL, H. Der zweite u. dritte Brief des Apostels Johannes geprüft auf ihren kanonischen Charakter, übers. u. erklärt. Paderbon, F. Schöningh, 1896; iv + 169 pp., 8vo. M. 4.

PRATT, S. W. The Life and Epistles of St. Paul, harmonized and chronologically arranged in scripture language. New York, Randolph, 1896; v + 289 pp., 16mo, cloth. $1.00.

ROHLING, A. Erklärung der Apokalypse des hl. Johannes, des grossen Propheten von Patmos. Neue Aufl. Iglau, Jarosch, 1896; 244 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

SABATIER, A. L'apôtre Paul. Esquisse d'une histoire de sa pensée. 3e édition, revue et augmentée. Paris, Fischbacher; 1896; xxix + 429 pp., 8vo.

SELBIE, J. A. A Difficult Passage in St. James. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 761–7.

WITT, J. Der Tag Jesu Christi. Eine Erklärung der Offenbarung. Neumünster, Vereinsbuchh., 1896; 286 pp., 8vo. M. 2.10.

WOLF, E. J. St. Paul's Classification of Widows: 1 Tim., 5:3–16. *Hom. Rev.*, Oct., 344–47.

## EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

LITERATURE.

CLEMEN, C. Die Himmelfahrt des Jesaja. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 3, 388–415.

HÄBLER, A. Ein christlicher Astrolog des Altertums. *Zeitschr. f. wiss Theol.*, 39, 3, 433–36.

HARNACK, A. Die Pseudojustinische "Rede an die Griechen." *Sitzb. Berliner Akademie*, 1896; 20 pp., 8vo.

HAULER, ED. Eine lateinische Palimpsestübersetzung der Didascalia Apostolorum. Aus *Sitzungsber. der K. Akad. der Wiss. zu Wien*, 134 Bd. No. 11, 1896; Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm., 54 pp. 8vo.

HAUSSLEITER, J. Der kleinasiatische Presbyter Johannes vor der Kritik. *Theol. Litbl.*, No. 39.

HEINZELMANN, WM. Der Brief an Diognet, "die Perle des christlichen Altertums." Uebers. u. gewürdigt. Erfurt, H. Neumann, 32 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

LEITNER, FR. Die prophetische Inspiration. Biblisch-patristische Studie. (= Biblische Studien, Heft 4, 5.). Freiburg i. Br., Herder, 1896.

OLLIVIER, FR. M.-J. Ponce Pilate et les Pontii. *Rev. bibl.*, V., 594–600.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Heraus-

gegeben von Osc. v. Gebhardt und Adf. Harnack. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchh., 1896, 8vo.

XIV. 1. Hieronymus, liber de viris illustribus. Gennadius, liber de viris illustribus. Herausgegeben von E. C. RICHARDSON. lxxxii + 112 pp.— Der sogenannte Sophronius, herausgegeben von OSC. V. GEBHARDT. xxxiv + 62 pp. M. 9.

XV. 1. Monarchianische Prologe zu den 4 Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kanons von PET. CORSSEN. v + 138 pp. M. 4.50.

IV. 4. Die palästinischen Märtyrer des Eusebius von Cäsarea, ihre ausführlichere Fassung und deren Verhältnis zur kürzeren, von BRUNO VIOLET. viii + 178 pp. M. 6.

X. 4. Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. 4. Heft: Paralleltexte zu Johannes. Gesammelt u. untersucht von A. RESCH. iv + 224 pp. M. 7.

ZELLER, E. Der Märtyrertod des Petrus in der ascensio Jesaiae. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 4, 558–68.

## HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

### GENERAL.

BERTRAM, A. Die Bischöfe von Hildesheim. Ein Beitrag zur Kenntniss der Denkmäler u. Geschichte des Bisthums Hildesheim. Hildesheim, A. Sax, 1896; xii + 340 pp., folio. M. 25.

BRAUN, GUSTAV. Lourdes, seine Geschichte, Wallfahrten und Wunder. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 820–38; 881–916.

BUSCHBELL, G. Die *professiones fidei* der Päpste. *Röm. Quartalschr.*, 251–97.

Heresies of the Christian Church. London, 1896; 232 pp., 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LEA, H. C. A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church. Vol. III., Indulgences. 638 pp., 8vo. London and Philadelphia, 1896. 15s.

PEINE, S. St. Barbara, die Schutzheilige der Bergleute und der Artillerie, und ihre Darstellung in der Kunst. Progr. des Realgymn. Freiberg i. S., 1896; 38 pp., 4to.

WAKEMAN, H. O. Introduction to the History of the Church of England from earliest Time to present Day. London & New York, Macmillan & Co., 1896; 526 pp., 8vo. 7s. 6d.

### THE EARLY PERIOD.

ALLARD, PAUL. Les vicissitudes de la condition juridique de l'église au III^e^ siècle. *Rev. des quest. hist.*, Oct., 369–400.

ASMUS, J. R. Julian u. Dio Chrysostomus. Programm, Tauberbischofsheim, 1896; 41 pp. 4to.

### ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

DESROCHES, J. P. Le Labarum; étude critique et archéologique. Paris, Champion, 1896; xxvii + 520 pp., 8vo., fig. et carte.

LÜBKE, W. Ecclesiastical Art in Germany during the Middle Ages. Edinburgh, 1896.

MARCH, OTTO. Unsere Kirchen, u. gruppirter Bau bei Kirchen. Berlin, W. Ernst & Sohn. 1896; 24 pp.; 8vo; mit 10 Abbildgn. im Text u. auf 2 Taf. M. 1.60.

WARFIELD, B. B. The Archæology of the mode of Baptism. *Bibl. Sacra*, Oct., 601–644.

### GENERAL.

BARDENHEWER, O. Ungedruckte Excerpte aus einer Schrift des Patriarchen Eulogius von Alexandrien (580–607) über Trinität and Incarnation. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896; 353–401.

BRATKE, E. Handschriftliches zu Procopius von Gaza. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 2, 303–13.

CHAPMAN, J. Saint Ignace d'Antioche et l'église Romaine. *Rev. Bénéd.*, 1896; 9, 385–400.

DASHIAN, J. Die Lehre der Apostel. Altarmenischer Text aus dem 5. Jahrhundert mit Untersuchungen, Varianten, Variationen des syrischen Textes, etc. Wien, 1896; v + 442 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

DRÄSEKE, J. Zu Proklos' "Hymnus auf Gott." *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 39, 2, 293–303.

——— Adnotatiuncula Laodicena. *Ibid.* 39, 3, 436–43.

EGLI, E. Eine neue Recension zweier Apostelpassionen. *Ibid.*, 39, 2, 313–17.

FUNK. Konstantin der Grosse und das Christentum. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896; 429–62.

GÖTZ, K. G. Das Christentum Cyprians. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1896; x + 141 pp., 8vo. M. 3.60.

GRÜTZMACHER. Pachomius und das älteste Klosterleben. Ein Beitrag zur Mönchsgeschichte. Freiburg u. Leipzig, Mohr, 1896; 141 pp., 8vo. M. 2.80.

HOZAKOWSKI, V. De chronographia Clementis Alexandrini. Münster, 1896; 32 pp., 8vo.

MAYR. Zur Geschichte der älteren christlichen Kirche von Malta. *Histor. Jahrb.*, XVII., Heft 3.

MERKLE, S. Die ambrosianischen Tituli. Eine litterarhistorisch-archæologische Studie. *Röm. Quartalschr.*, 185–222. Also printed as a pamphlet. Freiburg, Herder; vii + 42 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

MORIN, GERMAIN. Les monuments de la prédication de Saint Jérôme. *Rev. d'hist. et de littérat. rel.*, I., 393–434.

SCHMID, R. Zur Bekehrungsgeschichte Augustins. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. und Kirche*, VII., 81–96.

SEEK, OTTO. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des Nicänischen Konzils. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 1–72.

SPREITZENHOFER, E. Die historischen Voraussetzungen der Regel des heiligen Benedikt von Nursia. Programm, Franz-Joseph Gymnas., Wien, 1896; 93 pp., 8vo.

TALMA, A. S. E. De oudste tractaten van Augustinus; I. *Theol. Studiën*, XIV., 305–58.

WARFIELD, B. B. Augustine and the Pelagian Controversy. viii. & ix. *Christ. Lit.*, XV., Oct., 454–66; Nov., 1–16.

### THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

AUVRAY, L. Les registres de Grégoire IX. Recueil des bulles, publiées ou analysées d'après les mss. originaux du Vatican. Fasc. 5. Paris, Fontemoing, 1896; col. 1009–1284. large 4to.

CRÉGUT, G. R. Les Croisades. Lille, 1896; 334 pp., 4to. fr. 8.50.

DUCHESNE, L. Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical 4e art.: La succession de Louis II. *Rev. d'hist. et de littérat. relig.*, I., 453–84.

ENGELMANN, E. Philipp von Schwaben und Innocenz III. während des deutschen Thronstreites, 1138–1298; Gymnas. Progr., Berlin, 1896; 25 pp., 4to.

FRITZSCHE, O. F. Über Bacharius und Peregrinus, ca. 1046. *Zeitschrift f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 211–15.

GIANNONI, C. Paulinus II., Patriarch von Aquileia; ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte Oesterreichs im Zeitalter Karls des Grossen. Wien, Mayer, 1896; 127 pp. M. 2.40.

HEGLER, A. Franziskus von Assisi und die Gründung des Franziskanerordens. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VI., 5, 395–461.

KLAP, P. A. Agobard van Lyon, VI. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1896; 5, 469–88.

MICHAUD, E. L'ancienne et la nouvelle église en Occident au IXe siècle. Fin. *Int. theol. Zeitschr.—Rev. int. de théol.* Oct.-Dec. 1896, 654–81.

NÜRNBERGER, PROF. DR. AUG. JOS. Die Namen Vynfreth-Bonifatius. Ein historisch-krit. Referat. Aus *28. Bericht der wissenschaftl. Gesellsch. Philomathie zu Neisse.* Breslau, Müller & Seiffert, 1896; vi + 96 S. gr. 8vo. M. 1.60.

OBST, A. Über die sogenannten Privilegien des Papstes Benedikt V. für Hamburg. *Zeitschr. d. Vereins f. Hamburg. Geschichte*, Vol. X., No. 1.

PAGES, A. et N. VALOIS. Les révélations de Constance de Rabastens et le schisme d'Occident (1384–86). *Annal. du Midi*, July 1896, 241–78.

PAWLICKI, B. Papst Honorius IV., Diss., Münster, 1896; vi + 118 pp., 8vo.

v. RICHENTHAL'S, ULR., Chronik des Concils zu Constanz 1414–18. Constanz, 1896; folio; 300 Seiten in Lichtdruck, worunter 160 Seiten grösstenteils kolorirte Photographien. M. 1100.

SÄGMÜLLER, J. B. Die Thätigkeit und Stellung der Cardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII., historisch-kanonisch untersucht und dargestellt. Freiburg, Herder, 1896; viii + 262 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

SCHELLHORN, R. Ueber das Verhältniss der Freiberger und der Tepler Bibelhandschrift zu einander und zum ersten vorlutherischen Bibeldrucke, I. Gymnas. Progr., Freiberg, 23 pp., 4to.

SCHRÖDER, EDUARD. Die Tänzer von Kölbigk. Ein Mirakel des XI. Jahrh. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 94–164.

SCHULZ, H. Peter v. Murrhone als Papst Cölestin V. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 3, 365–97.

TEIGE, J. Beitrag zum päpstlichen Kanzleiwesen des XIII. und XIV. Jahrhunderts. *Mittheilungen des Instituts für österr. Geschichtsforschung*, XVII., 3.

TSCHACKERT. Die angeblich Qillische Schrift "Determinatio pro quietatione conscientiae simplicium" ein Werk Gersons. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 234–44.

WILLING, C. Das Wormser Konkordat. Diss., Breslau, 1896; 37 pp., 8vo.

WILLING, C. Zur Geschichte des Investiturstreites: 1. Das Wormser Konkordat. 2. Die Berechtigungen der gregorianischen Forderungen. Programm, Liegnitz, 1896; 53 pp. 8vo.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

ALBRECHT, O. Studien zu Luther's Sendschreiben an die Christen zu Riga und in Liefland vom Jahre 1524. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 398–410.

BECKER, H. Des Zerbster Superintendenten Wolfgang Amling Ordinationen, 1578–1606. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 112–63.

BOSSERT, G. Sangerhausen in dem Brief Luther's vom 19. November 1521. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 245–48.

BRIEGER, THEODOR. Kritische Erörterungen zur neuen Luther-Ausgabe. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 165–210.

CHROUST, A. Aktenstücke zur brandenburgischen Geschichte unter Kurfürst Johann Sigismund.—2: Zur Geschichte der Einführung des reformirten Bekenntnisses in der Kurmark. *Forschungen zur brandenb. u. preuss. Geschichte*, IX., 1, 1896.

Corpus Reformatorum. Vol. 84. Braunschweig, Schwetschke & Sohn, 1896.

J. Calvini opera quæ supersunt omnia. Edd. G. BAUM, E. CUNITZ, E. REUSS. Vol. 56. vii, x pp., 700 col. 4to. M. 12.

DREWS, PAUL. Disputationen Dr. Martin Luther's in den Jahren 1535–1545 an der Universität Wittenberg gehalten. Zum ersten Male herausgegeben. Zweite Hälfte, Göttingen. Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; 999 pp. M. 23.

ENDERS. War Luther am 24. Februar 1539 in Grimma? *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 190–91.

ERHARD, O. Johannes Schwanhausen, der Reformator Bambergs. *Beiträge zur bayerischen Kircheng.*, III., 1, 1–23.

v. FUNK. Reuchlin's Aufenthalt im Kloster Denkendorf. *Hist. Jahrb.*, XVII., Heft 3.

GMELIN. Johann Valentin Andreä als Dekan in Calw. *Mancherlei Gaben und ein Geist*, 1897, 1, 3–12.

HAUSRATH, A. Luther's Bekehrung. *Neue Heidelberger Jahrbb.*, VI., 163–186.

KNAAKE. Bemerkungen zum Briefwechsel der Reformatoren. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 167–189.

KOLDE, TH. Über einen römischen Reunionsversuch vom Jahre 1521. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 258–269.

KÖSTLIN, JULIUS. Zur Frage über Luther's Grab. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 192–96.

KREMERS, H. Martin Luther, der deutsche Christ.=Heft 125 der Flugschriften des Ev. Bundes, herausgegeben vom Vorstand. Leipzig, Buchhandlung des ev. Bundes, 1896; 8 pp., 8vo. M. 0.15.

LOSERTH, J. Die steirische Religionspacification 1572–78. Nach den Originalen des steiermärkischen Landes-Archives herausgegeben und mit einer Einleitung versehen. *Veröffentl. der historischen Landes-Kommission für Steiermark*, 1 und 2, 1896.

MEYER, CHRISTIAN. Wiedertäufer in Schwaben. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 248–58.

NAGEL, E. Zwingli's Stellung zur Schrift. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; xi + 113 pp., 8vo. M. 1.80.

PAULUS, N. Luther's Lebensende und der Eislebener Apotheker Johann Landau. Mainz, F. Kirchheim, 1896; iv + 25 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

TSCHACKERT, P. Nachträge zur preussischen Reformationsgeschichte. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 410–12.

WALTHER, W. Reformierte Taktik im Sakraments streit der Reformationszeit. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 794–820; 917–36.

WILD, K. Johann Philipp v. Schönborn, genannt der deutsche Salomo, ein Friedensfürst zur Zeit des 30jährigen Krieges. Heidelberg; 86 pp., 8vo.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

BATTANDIER, A. Le cardinal Jean-Baptiste Pitra, évêque de Porto. Paris, Sauvaître, 1896; xxxvi + 965 pp., 8vo., av. portr.; 8vo.

BEKEN, V. van der. Le protestantisme dans les îles angle-normandes avant la révolution française (Thèse). Nancy, impr. Berger-Levrault; 63 pp., 8vo.

BRIMONT, DE. M. de Puységur et l'église de Bourges pendant le révolution. Bourges, impr. Tardy-Pigelet, 1896; 443 pp., 8vo.

BYINGTON, E. H. The Puritan in England and New England. With an introduction by A. McKenzie. Boston, Roberts Bros.; xl + 406 pp., 8vo. $2.

CHÉROT, P. H. Une grande chrétienne au XVII^e siècle: Anne de Caumont. *études religieuses*; Sept., 1896, 53–76; Oct., 200–204; Nov., 399–428.

Le P. Antoine Figueiredo et la profession de foi de Pie IV. *Int. théol. Z.—Rev. int. de théol.*, Oct.–Dec. 1896, 733–59.

KRIEG. Fürstabt Martin Gerbert von St. Blasien. Rektoratsrede. Freiburg i. B., 1896; 71 pp., 4to.

LEHMANN, J. Geschichte der deutschen Baptisten. I. Theil: Bildung, Ausbreitung und Verfolgung der Gemeinden bis zum Anbruch wirkl. Religionsfreiheit im Jahre 1848. Hamburg, J. G. Oncken Nachf.; 263 S., mit Abbildung. u. Tafeln, 8vo. M. 1.70, geb., 2.75.

PRIESACK, J. Zur Sachsenhäuser Appellation Ludwigs des Bayern. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 73–94.

Quellenschriften der elsässischen Kirchengeschichte. III. und IV. Band. Die Jahrbücher der Jesuiten zu Schlettstadt und Rufach 1615–1765. Strassburg, Leroux & Co.; vi + 894 pp., 8vo. M. 12.

REICHERT, B. M. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Dominikaner u. ihrer Reform. *Röm. Quartalschr.*, 1896, 3, 299–311.

REMENSNYDER, J. B. Early History of the Reformed and Lutheran Churches in New York City. *Lutheran Church Rev.*, Oct., 382–87.

ROBINET, LE DR. Le mouvement religieux à Paris pendant la Révolution, 1789–1801. Tome I. La Révolution dans l'église, Juillet 1789 à Septembre 1791. Paris, Quantin, 1896; 600 pp., 8vo. Fr. 7.50.

ROCHOLL, R. Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland. Leipzig, A. Deichert Nachf., 1897; xii + 593 S., gr. 8vo. M. 8.50, bd. 10.

RUVILLE, A. v. Die kaiserliche Politik auf dem Regensburger Reichstag von 1653–54. Berlin, Guttentag, 1896; 124 pp., 8vo. M. 2.50.

SELTMANN, C. Angelus Silesius u. seine Mystik. Breslau, G. P. Aderholz, 1896; 208 S., 8vo. M. 3.

ZIEGLER, E. Abt Otmar II. von St. Gallen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation in der Schweiz. Programm, Zürich; 75 S., 8vo.

### THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BEYSCHLAG, W. Aus meinem Leben. Erinnerungen und Erfahrungen der jüngeren Jahre. Halle, E. Strien, 1896; viii + 559 pp., 8vo. M. 7.50, bd. M. 9.

BREMOND, P. H. Manning et Newman. *Études réligieuses*, Oct., 250–72.

GOYAU, GEORGE. L'Allemagne religieuse. L'évolution du protestantisme contemporaine. II., Le faits. *Rev. des Deux Mondes*, Oct. 1, 1896.

GROSVENOR, EDWIN A. A Glimpse of the Eastern Orthodox Church. *New World*, Sept., 527–41.

HALL, EDWARD H. Renan after Thirty Years. *Ibid.*, Sept., 493–506.

JACOBS, H. E. C. W. Schaeffer, D.D., LL.D. *Luth. Church Rev.*, Oct., 369–81.

LAUCHERT, F. Bischof Joseph Hubert Reinkens als Theologe und Historiker. *Int. theol. Zeitschr.—Rev. int. de théol.*, Oct.–Dec., 760–85.

MCCARTHY, J. Pope Leo XIII. New York, F. Warne & Co., 1896; xi + 260 pp., 12mo. $1.25.

MCCOSH, J., The Life of. A Record chiefly Autobiographical. Edited by W. M. SLOANE. London, 1896; 296 pp., 8vo. 9s.

ROAMER, S. Cardinal Manning as represented in his own Letters and Notes. London, 1896; 288 pp., 8vo. 5s.

SEARLE, J. PRESTON. The Rev. Talbot Wilson Chambers, S.T.D., LL.D. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VII., 577–94.

TSCHACKERT, P. and others. Zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 414–37.

WEDGWOOD, JULIA. Fenton John Anthony Hort. *Expositor*, Oct., 309–20.

WEISS, B. Bilder aus der Bremischen Kirchengeschichte um die Mitte des 19. Jahrhunderts. Bremen, Nössler, 1896; 72 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

WILKENS, C. A. and others. Englisches zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte. *Zeitschrift zur Kircheng.*, XVII., 437–62.

——— Französisches zur neuesten Kirchengeschichte. *Ibid.*, XVII., 462–75.

## SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

### GENERAL.

BEYER, THDR. Die Bibel Gottes Wort. Ein schlichtes Laienzeugnis f. den göttl. Ursprung u. d. Irrtumslosigkeit der hl. Schrift. Eine Preisschrift des evangel. Pressvereins. 2. Aufl. Neustettin, F. A. Eckstein, 1896; 70 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

CARR, E. S. Schleiermacher and the Christian Consciousness. *Bibl. Sacra*, Oct., 668–80. See *Expos. Times*, Dec., 98–100.

DIDIOT, J. Cours de théologie catholique. Lille, 1896; xii + 608 pp., 8vo. Fr. 17.

Jahresbericht, Theologischer, hrsh. v. H. HOLTZMANN. 15 Bd., 3. Abthlg. Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke u. Sohn,

Systematische Theologie. Bearb. v. E. W. MAYER, TROELTSCH, SULZE u. DREYER; pp. 359–473. M. 4.

KAFTAN, J. Die Selbständigkeit des Christenthums. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VI., 5, 373–394.

MAGNUS, F. Die Bibel Gottes Wort. Barmen, Wupperthaler Traktat-Gesellschaft, 1896; 32 S. 8vo. M. 0.30.

PETIT, J. A. Le christianisme ésotérique. *Nouv. Rev.*, 15 Sept., 1896; 277–298.

PLITT, HERMANN. Das Leben ist das Licht. Evgl. Joh. 1:4. Theologische Bekenntnisse eines Schriftgläubigen. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1896; viii + 440 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

SACHSE, E. D. Fortschritte u. Abwege der gegenwärtigen Theologie. *Halte was du hast*, XX., 1896; 1–20.

### HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

CORWIN, C. E. The Development of the Atonement from the year 730 until the year 1710 of the Christian Era. *Ref. Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 497–518.

DIEKAMP, FR. Die Gotteslehre des heil. Gregor von Nyssa. 1 Tl. Münster, 1896; 56 pp., 8vo.

EMERY, LOUIS. A propos d'une dogmatique [par M. Jules Bovon] *Rev. de théol et de phil.*, Sept. 1896; 447–80.

FROMMEL, GASTON. Geschichte des individualistischen Princips von Calvin bis Vinet. *Zeitchr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VI, 4, 302–23.

MORIN, G. and U. BALTUS. Un opuscule inédit de S. Césaire d'Arles sur la grâce. *Rev. Bénéd.*, 1896, 10, 433–443

SCHEURER, G. Das Auferstehungsdogma in der vornicänischen Zeit. Eine dogmengeschichtliche Studie. Würzburg, Göbel, 1896; viii + 115 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

WEGENER, R. A. Ritschl's Idee des Reiches Gottes im Lichte der Geschichte. Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsb., 1897. M. 2.

### APOLOGETICS.

ELLINWOOD, FR. F. Present-Day Apologetics. *Hom. Rev.*, Nov. 1896, 401–409.

OETTLI, S. Falsche Propheten oder: das Merkmal des Göttlichen; Vortrag. Barmen, Wupperthaler Traktat-Gesellschaft, 1896.

SCHANZ, PH. Neue Tendenzen der philosophischen Apologetik. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896, 402–29.

ZÖCKLER, O. Ein Staatsmann (A. J. Balfour) als Apologet des Christentums. *Beweis des Glaubens*, Sept., 352–62.

### DOGMATICS.

ALTHAUS, P. Dogmatische Begründung der Neutestamentl. Aussagen über die Taufe. Greifswald, 1896; 42 pp., 8vo.

BEET, J. A. Nature and Christ: a revelation of the Unseen. New York, Eaton & Mains; iv + 184 pp., 12mo. $0.75.

CHAPUIS, P. Die Anbetung Christi. historisch-dogmatische Erwägungen. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VII., 28–80.

CONYBEARE, F. C. The Demonology of the New Testament, i., ii. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, VIII., 576–608; IX., 59–115.

DÖDERLEIN, JUL. Woher wissen wir, dass Gott ist? *Bew. des Glaub.*, Oct., 389–401

DOLE, C. F. The Christocentric Theology. *New World*, Sept., 422–37. See *Expos. Times*, Dec., 98–100.

GEMMEL, S. Das Sakrament des heiligen Abendmahls. Gütersloh, E. Bertelsmannn, 1896. M. 0.50.

GIFFORD, E. H. The Incarnation: a study of Philippians, 2:5–11. *Expositor*, Oct., 241–63.

HOLLIDAY, WILLIAM A. The Effect of the Fall of Man upon Nature. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VII., 611–21.

HOLTZHEUER, O. Das Abendmahl und die neuere Kritik. Berlin, Wiegandt & Grieben; vi + 74 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

KAFTAN, J. Das Verhältniss des evangelischen Glaubens zur Logoslehre. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VII., 1–27.

LOBSTEIN, P. Essai d'une introduction à la dogmatique protestante. *Rev. de théol. et de philosophie*, 1895, July, 297–356; Nov., 505–559; 1896, May, 193–249; July, 297–363.

MEIDELE. Zum Begriff des Wunders. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 737–54.

NITZSCH, F. A. B. Lehrbuch der evangelischen Dogmatik. (Sammlung theolog., Lehrbücher.) 2 Aufl., Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; xviii + 610 S. gr. 8vo. M. 14; geb. 16.50.

PORRET, J. A. L'espérance chrétienne, son contenu et ses fondements. *Rev. de théol. et des quest. rel.*, 5, 384–413.

RITTER, H. Ob Gott ist? Beiträge e. Suchenden auf die wichtigste Frage der Menschheit. 2. Aufl. Berlin, G. Reimer; iv + 241 S., 8vo. M. 2.40.

ROYCE, JOSIAH. Browning's Theism. *New World*, Sept., 401–21.

SAMTLEBEN, H. Die Bedeutung des Gebets. *Bew. des Glaub.*, Sept., 362–68.

SCHOLZ, H. Zur Lehre vom "armen Sünder." *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche.*, VI., 463–92.

SCHWARTZKOPF, P. Die Gottesoffenbarung in Jesu Christo nach Wesen, Inhalt u. Grenzen unter dem geschichtlichen, psychologischen u. dogmatischen Gesichtspunkte prinzipiell untersucht. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1896; viii + 199 pp. M. 4.50.

SIEFFERT, FR. Die neuesten theologischen Forschungen über Busse und Glaube. Aus: "*Halte, was Du hast.*" Berlin, Reuther & Reichard; 28 pp., 8vo. M 0.60.

SHIRREFFS, CH. The Spirit of Power. *Expos. Times*, Nov., 92–3.

SMITH, R. H. The Spirit of Power. *Expos. Times*, Nov., '92.

STRAUSS UND TORNEY, W. v. Christi Gottheit und Präexistenz. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 755–93.

WARFIELD, BENJAMIN B. The Resurrection of Christ a fundamental Doctrine. *Hom. Rev.*, Oct., 291–98.

ZIPPEL, B. Christus als zweiter Adam. Programm, Königsberg; 14 pp., 4to.

### ETHICS.

BERGH, J. VAN DEN. Christelijke Zedeleer. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, Nov., 563–76.

HOEKSTRA BZ., S. Geschiedenis van de zedenleer. Dl. II. Amsterdam, P. N. van Kampen & Zoon, 1896; 8 en 312 S., gr. 8vo. Fl. 3.25.

STEUDE, E. G. Eine Weltanschauung für die Unsittlichkeit? *Bew. des Glaub.*, Oct., 401–7.

STRONG, THOMAS B. Christian Ethics. The Bampton Lectures for 1895. New York, Longmans, Green & Co. $5.00.

Théologie Catholique. Mœchialogia. Morale matrimoniale, par un ancien chanoine. Paris, Per Lamm, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 6.

WIMMER, R. Liebe und Wahrheit. Betrachtungen über einige Fragen des sittlichen und religiösen Lebens. Freiburg, J. C. B. Mohr, 1896. M. 1.45.

## PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS.

### GENERAL.

LOVE, J. W. The Observance of the Lord's Day. *Ref. Quart. Rev.*, Oct., 490–6.

NORIKUS, F. Klarheit u. Entschiedenheit. Vermischte Aufsätze. Der Kath. Bewegung gewidmet. München, Abt, 1896; 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

PATZE. Bedenke, dass du evangelisch bist. Leipzig, Buchh. d. Evang. Bundes von C. Braun; 24 pp., 8vo. M. 0.30.

WHITE, H. M. The Church of the Living God. *Presb. Quar.*, X., 458–69.

### HOMILETICS AND CATECHETICS.

AUST, KARL. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte f. den evangelischen Religionsunterricht an Volks- u. Bürgerschulen, sowie verwandten Lehranstalten. Wien, A. Hölder, 1896; iv + 108 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

BUCHRUCKER, VON. Die moderne Katechetik. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 677–93.

ERNST, A. Leonhart Brunner und sein Katechismus. *Zeitschr. f. prakt. Theol.*, 1896, 4, 333–40.

HEYDT, PFR. J. D. V. DER. Der Religionsunterricht in Schule u. Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Reform desselben. Gotha, E. F. Thienemann, 1896; 83 S., gr. 8vo. M. 1.40.

KABISCH. Die Ergebnisse theologischer Forschung in der Volksschule. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VI., 4, 324–56.

MCLEOD, A. Ecclesiasticism in the Public Schools. *Queen's Quarterly*, Oct., 1896, 81–92.

MINTOR, H. C. The Authority of the Catechisms and Confessions. *Presb. Quarterly*, X., 470–8.

POLLOK, ALLAN. Homiletics viewed as Rhetoric. *Hom. Rev.*, Nov., 395–401.

PORRITT, EDWARD. The Education Controversy in England. *New World*, Sept., 458–72.

La question des écoles au Manitoba. Correspondance du Canada. *L'Université catholique*, XXIII., 80–106.

Sammlung von Lehrbüchern der praktischen Theologie in gedrängter Darstellung. Hrsg. von H. HERING. IV. Bd. Evangelische Katechetik von E. SACHSE. 24. u. 25. Lfg. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896; pp. 273–336, 8vo. Each part M. 1.

SCHIAN, M. Die Homiletik d. Andreas Hyperius. I. *Zeitschr. f. prakt. Theol.*, 1896, 4, 289–324.

——— Welches ist die Bedeutung des Andreas Hyperius für die Wissenschaft der Homiletik, und inwiefern haben seine homiletischen Lehren bleibenden Werth für d. evang. Predigt? I. Tl. Breslau, 1896; 40 pp., 8vo.

Symposium on the Sunday School; a Collection of 21 articles on the subject. *Lutheran Church Rev.*, Oct., 392–557.

VAN DYKE, HENRY. The Gospel for an Age of Doubt. The Yale Lectures on Preaching, 1896. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1896; xii + 457 pp., 12mo; cloth. $1.75.

WILKINSON, W. C. The Apostle Paul as Preacher. *Hom. Rev.*, Nov., 1896, 387–94; Dec., 484–93.

WURSTER, STADPFR. DR. PAUL. Christliche Glaubens- und Sittenlehre. Leitfaden f. den Religionsunterricht, hauptsächlich an höheren Klassen von Real-Anstalten und Real-Gymnasien. Heilbronn, E. Salzer, 1896; vii + 106 pp., 12mo. M. 0.70.

## CHURCH POLITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

B.-E. L. Congrès des jurisconsultes catholiques tenu à Lyon, les 11–12 août. *L'université catholique*, XXIII., 5–26.

BERBIG. Zur Komposition der Casimirianischen Kirchenordnung vom Jahre 1626. *Deutsche Zeitschrift f. Kirchenrecht*, VI., 2, 1896.

DUCHESNE, C. Autonomies ecclésiastiques. Églises separées. Paris, 1896; 360 pp., 18mo. Fr. 3.50.

GEYER, CH. Die Nördlinger evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zu der Geschichte des protestantischen Kirchenwesens. München, C. H. Beck, 1896; vii + 87 pp., large 8vo. M. 1.60.

HAUPT, HERMAN. Inquisition, Aberglauben, Ketzer und Sekten des Mittelalters, einschliesslich Wiedertäufer. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVI., 512–36; XVII., 270–87.

HODGES, GEO. The Problem of the Divided Church. *New World*, Sept., 438–58.

KATZER, E. Das evangelisch-lutherische Kirchenwesen der sächsischen Oberlausitz. Leipzig, G. Wigand, 1896; x + 528 pp., 8vo.

KREYENBÜHL, J. Die Nothwendigkeit und Gestalt einer kirchlichen Reform. Der Kirche der Reformation gewidmet. Freiburg i. Br., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; v + 256 pp., 8vo. M. 4.

LAUCHERT, FRDR. Die Kanones der wichtigsten altkirchlichen Concilien, nebst den apostolischen Kanones. Freiburg i. Br., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; xxi + 228 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

Heft 12 of: Sammlung ausgewählter kirchen- u. dogmengeschichtlicher Quellenschriften, als Grundlage für Seminarübungen, hrsg. unter Leitung von Prof. G. Krüger.

Lettre apostolique de notre saint père Léon XIII. sur les ordinations anglicanes. *L'université catholique*, Oct. 15, 161–77.

LOHMANN, J. B. Ueber den Priesterstand. Paderborn, Jungfermann, 1896; 256 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

RAGEY, P. Ou en est la campagne de l'union en corps de l'église anglicaine. *Ibid.*, XXIII., Nov. 15, 321–48.

SCHMIDT, G. Die kirchenrechtlichen Entscheidungen des Reichsgerichts und der bayerischen obersten Gerichtshöfe

aus dem Gebiete des gemeinen Kirchenrechts und des bayerischen Staatskirchenrechts. Mit Anhangband I. Entscheidungen aus dem Gebiete der in Bayern geltenden Partikularrechte. II. Entscheidungen über israelitische Religions-Angelegenheiten. 1. Abtlg. München, J. Schweitzer Verlag, 1896; pp. 1–240, 8vo. M. 3.

SEEBASS, O. Regula coenobialis S. Columbani abbatis. *Zeitschr. f. Kircheng.*, XVII., 215–34.

SMEND, J. Die evangelischen deutschen Messen bis zu Luthers deutscher Messe. Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; xii + 283 pp., large 8vo. M. 8.

STREIFF, D. Die Religionsfreiheit und die Massnahmen der Kantone und des Bundes gemass Art. 50, Abs. 2 der Schweizer. Bundesverfassung. Zürich, 1896; vii + 89 pp., 8vo.

VACANT, J. M. A. La controverse au sujet des ordinations anglicanes et la lettre pontificale apostolicae curae. *L'université catholique*, Oct. 15, 178–225.

VASSAL, A. Le célibat ecclesiastique au premier siècle de l'église. Paris, Oudin, 1896; viii+791 pp., 8vo.

LITURGICS, HYMNOLOGY.

ERKNER, JOS. Enchiridion liturgicum in usum clericorum et sacerdotum in sacris functionibus. Laibach, Kathol. Buchhandl., 1896; xii + 398 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

MUETHEL, J. Nochmals Satze über unsere lutherische Consecrations-liturgie im Abendmahls-Akte. Leipzig, A. Deichert, 1897; 8vo. M. 1.75.

SCHÄFER, P. THEODOR. Agende für die Feste und Feiern der Innern Mission. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896; xvi + 458 pp., small 4to. M. 7.50.

SWETE, H. B. Church services and service books before the Reformation, Facsimiles of MSS. London, S. P. C. K., 1896; 230 pp., 8vo. 4s.

SERMONIC LITERATURE.

GRAWITSCHKY, C. Licht vom Licht zum Heil des Einzelnen und der Gesammtmenschheit. Vortrag. Chemnitz, M. Winter; 43 pp., large 8vo. M. 1.

RYLE, J. C. Expository thoughts on the Gospel of St. John. Text and notes. Vol. 1. London, Hodder & St., 1896; 444 pp., 8vo. 4s.

SCHRECKENBACH. Halte, was Du hast! Eine Herzens- u. Gewissensgeschichte in Briefen. Leipzig, Buchh. des evangelischen Bundes, von C. Braun, 1896; 22 pp., large 8vo. M. 0.30.

STREHLE, F. Nach Jerusalem! Reise-Handbuch zum täglichen Gebrauch f. Zionspilger. Leipzig, G. Wigand, 1896; v + 835 pp., 8vo. M. 5; bd. 6.

MISSIONS.

BREED, D. R. Christian Endeavor and the General Assembly. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VII., 648–59.

FABER, E. Der Apostel Paulus in Europa. Die Einführung des Evangeliums in Europa. Vortrag. Schluss. *Zeitschrift f. Missionsk. u. Religionsw.*, XI., 208–14.

GRUNDEMANN. Missionsfeste u. Missionspredigtreisen. Erfahrungen auf dem Gebiete des pommerisch-märk. Missionslebens in Novellenform. Leipzig, Fr. Richter; 72 S., 12mo. M. 0.50.

HAMMER, THDR. Die kirchliche u. sittliche Bewahrung der Jugend. Ein Beitrag zur sozialen Frage. Konigsberg, W. Koch; 20 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

HERING, H. Chinesen u. Japaner; ihre Besonderheiten und die Nutzanwendungen für die Mission. Vortrag. *Zeitschr. f. Missionsk. u. Religionsw.*, XI., 199–207.

LAURY, P. A. Modern Missions. *Lutheran Church Rev.*, Oct., 564–70.

NOTMAN, W. R. The Early Bermuda Church. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VII., 630–47.

P., S. B. Saint Pierre Claver, Le nouveau patron des Missions chez les Nègres. *Études religieuses*, Nov., 515–23.

SCHUSTER, H. Giebt es characteristische Unterschiede zwischen Innerer Mission u. christlich-sozialer Reform, u. welche sind es? Vortrag. Halle, J. Krause, 1896; iv + 39 S. gr. 8. M. 0.50.

WATT, A. C. P. Twenty-five Years' Mission Life on Tanna, New Hebrides. Biographical Sketch, etc., by Leggatt, London, 1896; 386 pp., 8vo. 6s.

Vorträge der theologischen Konferenz zu Giessen; XI. Folge. Contains: Der deutsche Protestantismus u. die Heidenmission im 19ten Jahrhdt., von C. MIRBT. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1897; 56 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

Zeitfragen des christl. Volkslebens, hrsg. von F. Frhrn von Ungern-Sternberg u. Pfr. H. Dietz. 158 Heft: Die Evangelisation, von P. Märker. Stuttgart, Ch. Belser, 43 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIALISM.

FISCHER, A. Christlich-social als Zeitproblem. [Brennende Tagesfragen, II.]. Rostock, Volckmann, 1896; 23 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

Fragmente und Essays, historische, über die Entstehung der Genfer Convention und des Roten Kreuzes (nach alten und neuen authentischen Quellen). München, Seitz & Schauer, 1896; 80 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

HUGHES, H. P. Soziales Christentum. Eine Sammlg. der hierüber in St. James's Hall, London geh. Predigten. Deutsch von R. v. Zwingmann u. C. Krause. 2 Aufl. Leipzig, R. Werther, 1896; xv + 202 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

KAMBLI, C. W. Haben Christentum und Sozialdemokratie ein Interesse einander zu bekämpfen. Bern, A. Siebert, 1896.

MAINS, W. C. Die soziale Thätigkeit der Heilsarmee im "dunkelsten England." Diss., Halle, Wittenberg, 1896; 41 pp., 8vo.

v. NATHUSIUS, PROF. D. M. Was ist christlicher Sozialismus? Leitende Gesichtspunkte für evangelische Pfarrer und solche, die es werden wollen. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896; 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

SEEBERG, REINHOLD. Die Kirche und die soziale Frage. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 11, 839–81.

TRIAC, JEAN DE. Guerre et Christianisme. Paris, F. Didot; 12mo. Fr. 3.

WAGNER, C. L'obole de la veuve. *Rev. chrét.*, 1896, 291–98.

WEBER, Z. Der Brief an Philemon ein Vorbild für die christl. Behandlung sozialer Fragen. Vortrag. Leipzig, Wallmann, 1896; 23 pp., 8vo. M. 0.30.

WÖBCKEN, K. Das Neue Testament u. die Frauenfrage. Programm. Oldenburg, 1896; 35 pp., 8vo.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume I APRIL 1897 Number 2

# THE SPECULATIVE PHILOSOPHY OF THE CHINESE.

By W. A. P. MARTIN,
Peking, China.

THE term speculative philosophy is a little hazy, perhaps, however, not more so than the thing indicated. It represents an early stage of thought prior to the rise of physical science —may we not add prior to, and for the most part in neglect of, that logic whose office it is to analyze the process of reasoning and to fix the limits of knowledge?

Irregular and haphazard as it has shown itself in most countries, it is not inaptly described by the word speculation, as understood in business transactions. Why is it that the speculator in the stock market may, as by the cast of a die, achieve fortune or provoke ruin? Is it not because the unknown and the variable are elements that elude his grasp? Yet the element of uncertainty is precisely that which contributes most to the fascination of his ventures. Has it not been the same with most of those early thinkers who have undertaken to explain the mystery of existence?

When the pole of which they are in search is hedged about by frozen seas, what wonder if their happiest efforts have not been rewarded by complete success? Yet has the pursuit of truth in those regions and in all ages been justly regarded as the most ennobling occupation of the human mind. Nor has it

been barren of results, for may we not apply to speculative philosophy the words of Cowley in regard to alchemy?

> The search itself rewards the pains;
> So tho' the Chymist his great secret miss,
> For neither it in art nor nature is,
> Yet things well worth his toil he gains;
> And doth his charge and labour pay
> With good unsought, discoveries by the way.

Would it not be a surprise to find that Chinese explorers in these high latitudes have planted their standard nearer to the pole than those of most other nations?

To show what they have accomplished, I shall not deem it necessary to trace their philosophy, even in outline, from the dawn of speculation, but shall select a period when their speculative thought was most active and when the now dominant philosophy was formulated. Of the forty centuries included in the records of the Chinese Empire, there is one century, and no other, that can be selected as preëminently the age of philosophy. This was at the beginning of the Sung dynasty (1020 to 1120 A.D.), when gross darkness brooded over Europe and when the western world was convulsed by the Crusades. Earlier dynasties had been distinguished by various forms of intellectual activity,—one by the invention of political systems, one by historical writings, one for poetry and the drama, etc.,—but not until this epoch did the Chinese mind evince a disposition to question everything in heaven and earth. In the work of settling anew the foundations of faith and knowledge, five men took the lead, whose family names (two being brothers) fall curiously into an alliterative line of four syllables,—Cheo, Chang, Cheng, Chu.,—all so distinguished that they may be compared to a Pleiad cluster, a constellation (and are there not many such?) whose light has not yet reached our shores. The last named is by far the most celebrated. Not more original than the others, he combined the qualities of a laborious scholar and an acute thinker, and knew how to gather the scattered rays of his predecessors into a focus. Though shining in part by borrowed light, Chuhi looms up like a pharos, taking the third

place among the great teachers of the Chinese people. All five were Confucian scholars, but there can be no doubt that their mental activity was stimulated and its direction determined by the speculations of Buddhist and Taoist writers. Their writings derive immense importance from the fact that for five hundred years, since the publication by imperial authority of the great *Encyclopædia of Philosophy*, they have been accepted by the government as the standard of orthodoxy to which all who aspire to the honors of the civil-service examinations are expected to conform. Their views are therefore to be taken as the views of the educated men of the China of today.

In their mode of philosophizing they resemble Descartes more than Bacon. Their method is *a priori*, and, like the great Frenchman who had read Bacon and rejected his doctrine, they adopted theirs, not through ignorance of the experimental method, but from choice. Confucius himself had laid down the maxim that "knowledge comes from the study of *things*," a maxim which seems as much out of place in his pages as that fine aphorism which sets forth the value of experiment does in those of Plato: *ἐμπειρία ποιεῖ τὸν αἰῶνα ἡμῶν πορεύεσθαι κατὰ τέχνην, ἀπειρία δὲ κατὰ τύχην.*[1]

The Chinese assert that their sage wrote a treatise on the experimental study of nature, but that it was lost, and this fact they offer as an excuse for the backwardness of their country in that department of science. Descartes' preference for the deductive method sprang from his mathematical genius. On the part of the Chinese it was due to a desire to follow what they considered the order of nature. Both esteemed it most rational to do as Stanley did in exploring the Congo—to strike the stream at its head and follow it down to the sea—rather than with Bacon to enter the mouth and creep slowly upward against the current. Which is the more daring feat and which the more certain method needs not be pointed out. To compare the two methods and define the province of each, does not belong to our present theme. Suffice it to say that the champions of the one

[1] Experiment [or experience, for in Greek as in French the word means both] causes the world to go forward in a scientific way; the want of it, in a haphazard manner.—*Gorgias.*

not infrequently made use of the other. When the Baconian got hold of a great principle, he did not fail to deduce its consequences; nor, on the other hand, did a Cartesian neglect to appeal to experiment. With the former experiment preceded discovery; with the latter it was employed to confirm conclusions.

Practical as the Chinese mind confessedly is, it is not a little remarkable that in the study of nature Chinese philosophers have never made extensive use of the inductive method. That they have not been unacquainted with it is evident from the following questions and answers found in the writings of the brothers Cheng:

"One asked, whether to arrive at a knowledge of nature it is necessary to investigate each particular object; or may not some one thing be seized upon from which the knowledge of many things may be derived?"

"The Master replied: 'A comprehensive knowledge of nature is not so easily acquired. You must examine one thing today, and another thing tomorrow, and when you have accumulated a store of facts, your knowledge will burst its shell and come forth into fuller light, connecting all the particulars by general laws.'"

In view of this lucid response of one of their great oracles, who can deny that the Chinese had a clear conception of the inductive method five hundred years before Bacon? But, as Channing says, "Great men are not so much distinguished by difference of ideas, as by different degrees in the impression made by the same idea." Contrast with this a dictum of Chang, the second of the five: "To know nature, you must first know heaven. If you have pushed your science so far as to know heaven, then you are at the source of all things. Knowing their evolution you can tell what ought to be, and what ought not to be, without waiting for anyone to inform you." The former statement made no impression on the Chinese mind, while the latter is universally regarded as its guiding star. How different must have been the history of the world had Chinese thinkers, instead of seeking for a short cut to universal knowledge, been content to study one thing at a time, with a view to "connecting all the particulars by general laws."

In accordance with the principle so confidently enunciated, Chang and his followers (and his predecessors as well) have directed their main attack to the problems of cosmogony, believing that they might thereby arrive at the "source of all things." Tomes are filled with conjectures and reasonings which it would be unprofitable to follow out in detail. The results, however, if I may so call them, which they reached by a sort of happy guess work, are not unworthy of notice, forming as they do the philosophical creed of educated China.

Stimulated, as I have said, by the speculations of Buddhist and Taoist schools, they took care to follow neither; and betray the influence of these sectaries chiefly by the pains they are at to steer a middle course between the two. To the one school, mind is the only entity, and matter a deceptive figment of the imagination; to the other, matter is the sole essence, and mind one of its products. Each inculcated a species of monism. The thinkers of the Sung dynasty, combining these one-sided conceptions, boldly asserted a dualism in nature, and fix on *li* and *chi*, force and matter, as the seminal principles of the universe.[2]

It is a little startling, is it not, to find them at that early date hitting on a generalization which to us appears among the late results of modern science? Yet we shall see as we advance that this is not the only instance in which their unscientific speculations have anticipated the teachings of modern science.

Both terms in their dual formula require elucidation. Of the two principles, one is active, the other passive. I have rendered *li* by the word "force," as being active, but it is not mere force. The word signifies a principle of order, a law of nature. It is often synonymous with *Tao*, "reason," answering to the Greek *logos*. When Chuhi says that "heaven is *li*," he evidently means that the prime force in the universe is reason,—exactly the position maintained by the Taoists, though they use *Tao*, and not *li*, to express the idea. With both, this reason, if we may so call it, is rather a property of mind than mind itself. Each denies its

[2] They profess to derive their doctrines from the Yiking, the Chinese Genesis—and so do the Taoists. It is surprising with what skill each school succeeds in reading its tenets into that ancient text, parts of which are referred to B. C. 2800!

personality, not perceiving that a property implies a substance, and that in this case the substance must be mind.

*Chi*, the second term of the formula, being passive, is matter In popular use, however, it is limited to matter in a gaseous form and in these philosophical speculations it means primordial matter Hear what they say of it:

In a treatise called *Chengmeng*, "right discipline for youth,' Chang, with a thoroughness characteristic of the Chinese, begins with the origin of the universe. "The immensity of space, though called the great void," he says, "is not void. It is filled with a subtile substance. In fact, there is no such thing as a vacuum.' Now what is this omnipresent "subtile substance"? If we compare the descriptions of it given by these writers, we cannot resist the conclusion that it is ether; not the ether of the Greeks, the burning air, the empyrean, but the all-pervading ether of our modern science. It is the stuff out of which matter was produced This is now a familiar idea, not of science, but of scientific speculation. It is set forth with special fullness in a work on the unseen universe, by those eminent professors, P. G. Tate and Balfour Stewart, along with the correlative doctrine of the reversion of matter to its primitive state.

Our Chinese philosophers taught the same thing centuries ago. What says the author of *Right Discipline?* His words are: "Within the immensity of space matter is alternately concentrated and dissipated, much as ice is congealed or dissolved in water." Not merely do they antedate these English writers in making it the source of matter, they seem to have hit on the dynamical theory of the molecule, and particularly on vortex motion, as the process of transformation. Cheo, a contemporary of Chang, is known as the author of a diagram of cosmogony. He begins with a ring or circle of uniform whiteness, representing the primitive uniform ether. Then follows a circle partly dark, which shows the original substance differentiated into two forms, or rather forces, called *Yin* and *Yang*. Speaking of this diagram, "It shows," says Chu., the great expositor of the Chinese canonical books, "how the primitive void is transformed into matter." The two forces, *mo lai mo chü*, grind back and forth in opposite

directions, and the detritus resulting from their friction is what we call matter."

Perhaps the most striking point in this Chinese cosmogony is the account it gives of the creation of light. *Taiki tung rh sheng yang*, "The primal essence moved, and light was born." That the mode of motion was vibratory they also conjectured, but I do not assert that they ever carried their researches so far as to measure the length of a luminous wave, a performance which may now be witnessed any day in our physical laboratories. The occidental theory of the ether and its functions is confirmed by a magnificent array of scientific facts; the oriental theory, standing apart from experimental science, never emerged from the state of speculation; a speculation wonderfully acute and sublime, in which the scientific imagination shows itself to the best advantage, divining as if by instinct great truths which require for their confirmation the slower processes of patient investigation. Nor must we forget that in the West this theory existed in the state of a discarded speculation for at least two centuries before it received the seal of science.

The first European to get a glimpse of the circumambient ocean was René Descartes. His mistake in referring the motions of the planets to whirlpools of ether brought discredit on his whole system, notwithstanding the fact that he also held that minute vortices were necessary to explain the constitution of matter. But what a glorious resurrection awaited it! In the last year of the last century, touched literally by a sunbeam, it woke from its long slumber. Young found it necessary to the hypothesis of undulations, to which he was led by the interference of rays, and Fresnel resorted to it to explain the phenomena of polarization. If this revival enhances the respect with which we regard the "father of modern philosophy," should it not also reflect a little luster on those early thinkers of the far East who made the Cartesian ether the basis of their cosmogony?

Two or three doctrines that have played a great part in the intellectual movements of our age remain to be noticed as having been long ago propounded by the speculative philosophers of China. That they should have some conception of an evolutionary process in nature is not to be wondered at. What but

a most thoroughgoing doctrine of evolution is to be expected from men who begin with the evolution of matter? The original unity of matter, suggested by modern researches in molecular physics, we may remark, was assumed in all of their cosmological speculations. What the eminent physicist, J. W. Draper, says of the alchemists of Europe is true in a still higher degree of those of China who led the way, both in speculation and investigation. "They were the first to seize the grand idea of evolution in its widest extent as a progress from the imperfect to the more perfect in lifeless as well as living nature, in an increasing progression in which all things take part toward a higher and nobler state." This view is prominent in the writings of many of the philosophers of ancient China.

Here is a statement from the works of one of the Cheng brothers, which shows that they came very near to the doctrine of the conservation of energy. He says: "Body in motion is force. Its contact with another is followed by a reaction or effect. This effect in turn acts as a force producing another effect, and so on without end." "Here," he adds, "is a vast subject for the student of philosophy." The Chinese "students of philosophy" have not troubled themselves to verify this, any more than other shrewd guesses of their predecessors. The remark, however, which Chu. makes on this passage shows a comprehensive grasp of the idea. "Heaven and earth," he says, "with all they contain, are nothing but transformations of one primitive force."

In conclusion, the cosmogony of our Chinese philosophers is by no means so atheistic as it might appear. True, Chuhi, the authorized expounder of their system, says: "We must beware of thinking that there is a *man* up in the sky who controls the motion of the universe." But he does not deny that there is a power at work whose nature is inscrutable. Says Chang, the most daring of the five: "The great void is filled with a pure or perfect fluid. Since it is perfectly fluid, it offers no obstruction to movement" (*i. e.*, it neither impedes motion nor is its proper motion impeded). "There being no obstruction [*i. e.*, nothing to bring about a change of state], a divine force converts the pure

into the gross." To explain the creation of matter, he invokes, though reluctantly, the intervention of a *divine* power. Is it not what Horace calls *Nodus tali vindice dignus?*

That our Chinese thinkers meant God in a proper sense, I will not affirm, but they considerately leave room for him. Have we not seen that one of the dual principles postulated by them is invested with some of the "attributes of mind"? They dogmatize about self-acting laws, but there is reason to expect that another generation will come to understand that law implies mind, and will proclaim with Emerson that "conscious law is king of kings." To them our western school of agnosticism is, as yet, unknown. In that line, too, they are in advance of us by several centuries. But *their* agnosticism is of a milder type than ours. It is not aggressive, neither is it so bigoted as not to be open to conviction. It is, moreover, as the occidental is not, profoundly reverential. For this habit of mind it is indebted to Confucius, who, to wean his people from debasing forms of idolatry, employed for the Supreme Being the vague term Heaven, and discouraged them from prying into those transcendental mysteries hidden by the veil of blue. He believed, however, in a moral government, and so do all of his followers to this day. He ascribed to the object of his reverence more of personality than they are willing to admit. "The superior man," he said, "fears three things, and the first is Heaven." "With what words does Heaven speak to us?" he asks again. "The seasons run their rounds, and animal and vegetable life displays itself in a hundred forms. These are the language of Heaven." He approaches far nearer to the Christian idea of God than the negations of Buddha, or the metamorphoses of Taoism; and there is reason to hope that his disciples will come back to the mental attitude of their great master, which has been somewhat obscured by later speculations. To bring them back, and to carry them beyond it, they require, above all things, a truer logic and a juster psychology than they have ever possessed.

Happy will it be for China when those who control the opinions of the people learn in that vague Power of which they stand in awe to recognize the *Pater Mundi.*

# APOLOGETICS IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY.[1]

By A. M. FAIRBAIRN,
Oxford.

THE edition of Butler which Mr. Gladstone and the Clarendon Press has published suggests many interesting reflections. It is pleasant to see the University of Oxford doing honor by this book to two of its most illustrious sons, one the most eminent thinker it produced in the eighteenth century, the other the most eminent statesman it has formed in the nineteenth. It is no less interesting to see the enthusiasm of one distinguished Oxonian for another, who had done so much for the formation of his mind and the vindication of his faith. Still more interesting it is to think of a statesman in his retirement concerning himself with a book of this kind and quality. Mr. Gladstone, indeed, has never been a mere politician, but has ever remained a scholar and thinker, never so absorbed in the politics which were mere questions of the hour as to forget those ideas which are the permanent problems of thought and the true roots of character. In this he has been in some respects far from singular among English statesmen. It is not skill in the expediencies of the moment, but the possession of a lofty idealism, that distinguishes the statesman from the man of affairs. There is no principle which English history more illustrates than this, that problems, even in passing politics, are best understood when looked at in the light of large ideas and high aims. If we are unable to name Bacon a statesman, yet we cannot forget that he is the most eminent English philosopher of his day,—to say, as some have said, of all time, is to speak foolishly. Clarendon, once chancellor of the kingdom, has given us a history that will live as long as the English tongue. Bolingbroke, a narrow and reactionary Tory in an age of

[1] *The Works of Joseph Butler, D.C.L., Bishop of Durham.* Edited by the RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE. Two vols. At the Clarendon Press. 1896.

revolution, was yet a master of literary style, although only a shallow deist in thought, and no very profound thinker in political philosophy; but Burke, a political philosopher if ever there was one, must not be forgotten; while nearer our own day stand statesmen who were scholars, and minded the affairs of the state all the better that they did not neglect their own studies. We remember that one English prime minister of Queen Victoria translated Homer; another, the "little great man" who "knew that he was right,"—Earl Russell,—was almost as active in literature as in politics; a third, Lord Beaconsfield, was the author of some of the cleverest, most brilliant, audacious, and malicious novels of the time. The present leader of the House of Commons has distinguished himself as a writer on the philosophic questions that underlie all belief; and Mr. Gladstone, throughout his long career, has maintained this noble characteristic of the higher English statesmen. In his early years he was absorbed in those fundamental questions which touched the relations of church and state, and he dealt with them according to primary principles; not as mere matters of statecraft or occasional policy, but according to the idea and function of the church on the one hand, and those of the state on the other. In his maturer manhood classical studies absorbed him, and we had those delightful excursions into the world of Homer and the Homeric poems which were all the more instructive that they were in character so entirely distinct from the performances of the mere scholar. If he had not what the youngest scholar thought the only, because the newest, scientific method of inquiry into the date, the composition, the authorship, and the mythology of the Homeric poems, he yet showed an unrivaled mastery of the text and a familiarity with the world it described and illustrated which was all his own. And now in his later days he returns —though one may say from a maturer and higher point of view —to his earlier interests. It is less the political form and idea of religion, and more the metaphysical and ethical contents—*i. e.*, truth of it—that here interest him. There is a certain fitness in the man who began his life as an apologist for a given theory of the church in the state, ending his life as the editor of

the greatest of all the apologies of the Christian religion ever written in the English tongue.

The works of Butler fall, of course, into two classes,—the apologetic and the expository, or the Analogy and the Sermons. The popular judgment has dealt very differently with these from what their respective merits deserved. The Analogy has the much greater occasional, the Sermons the much more permanent, significance. In the Analogy he appears as the apologist, in the Sermons he appears as the ethical philosopher. The antecedents of the Analogy are English ; the antecedents of the Sermons are classical and specifically Stoic. In the Analogy Butler writes as the thinker who has assimilated his own age, who assumes the beliefs as to religion it accepted as axiomatic; and on this basis he erects a criticism of those opinions he considered false and a justification of those he considered true. In the Sermons he handles the great ethical problems of human nature and human life, the principles contained in nature and enforced by it, the instincts and the impulses that regulated conduct and determined choice. In the Analogy he speaks like the student of current literature, who has before him the intellectual illusions, agreements, differences, and disputations, of his own society. In the Sermons he speaks like one who is before all and above all the preacher of duty ; but his ideal of duty may be described as Stoicism baptized into Christ. As an ethical thinker there is only one man in his century with whom he can be compared—Kant. And the comparison need not at all be to his disadvantage. Butler is as characteristically English as Kant is German. Their problems are, in a sense, the same ; but the Englishman has not the elaborate and highly technical terminology of the German; and the German has not the intensely and directly practical speech and purpose of the Englishman. There is nothing, indeed, in Butler that corresponds to the schematism and systematization of the Critiques, whether of the Pure or the Practical Reason. If there had been, many of the questions Kant discussed would have been either superseded or differently stated and developed. But just as little is there anything in the German to correspond to that vindication of religion which is

better given in the Sermons than in the Analogy by the dispassionate statements and cogent enforcement of its cardinal ethical principles and duties. To Kant, indeed, religion was only a form of ethical philosophy — the apprehension of our duty as a divine command; but to Butler ethics are of the very essence of religion, and never fully realized without it or apart from it. The ethical system of Butler in its relation to religion seems to me, therefore, of a higher and more permanent significance than that of Kant; and we are exceedingly pleased to find that this edition does him the justice of sending out the Analogy and the Sermons together, edited and annotated with equal care. The Analogy, because of its apologetical and polemical force, has overshadowed the Sermons; but the Sermons have the excellence of being, both as regards form and matter, more permanently valid and valuable.

The difference of source, or, as it were, of historical antecedents, may explain a difference in principle between the Analogy and the Sermons, which I have stated elsewhere, but which Mr. Gladstone criticises as incorrect. The doctrine of probability, which lies at the basis of the Analogy, has seemed to me inconsistent with the doctrine of authority, which is the very essence of Butler's theory of conscience. And there is more than an intellectual inconsistency between these two parts; there is what we may call a genealogical difference, with all the distinctions two quite separate genealogies always imply. The metaphysical or psychological basis of the doctrine of probability is the philosophy of Locke. The philosophical basis of the theory of conscience is the Stoical doctrine of human nature. Locke's psychology explains what may be termed Butler's agnosticism, his great sense of human ignorance, of the incompetence of human faculty, the need of being guided by those probabilities which Locke had so carefully discussed and so truly deduced from his own principles and assumptions. But the authority of conscience expresses the Stoical belief in nature, the nature that is in man which man is bound to realize, which holds within it the law according to which he ought to live, that law which is, in a sense, the highest man is and the highest he

can reach. These two positions seem to me not only historically, but metaphysically different; and their conflict had a marked influence both on Butler's life and the life of a man who owed even more to him than Mr. Gladstone,—the late Cardinal Newman. Butler, and we say it with all deference and respect, never felt quite so sure of his beliefs as he wished to be, and we may describe the logical tendency that governed his life as a movement progressively towards outward authority in religion, *i. e.*, in search of supports other and stronger than mere probability. This was the secret of those accusations as to "squinting at Rome" which shadowed the later days of his life; they meant that, just like Newman afterwards, he was feeling for something kindlier and surer than probability supplied.

We are thus very doubtful, indeed, if the Analogy, which was so cogent to others, was ever entirely conclusive to Butler himself; but we think that his moral doctrine had a force and a finality which his Analogy was entirely without. We have spoken as to the difference in the historical antecedents of the Analogy and the Sermons. This leads us to say that as the antecedents of the Analogy were so thoroughly English, it can be read with thorough intelligence only by a man who knows the literature of the time. Butler read much, but he did not read many books, and he was signally sparing in his references to those he had read, but was thoroughly steeped in the thought of his time. To the man, therefore, who knows its literature his pages are alive with allusions. But it is more contemporary literature and thought that occupy him than what may be termed the classical works of the philosophers of history Just as Locke took his notion as to what was meant by "innate ideas" from Lord Herbert of Cherbury rather than Descartes, so Butler had more in view the crowd of almost nameless writers of his own day than the great masters in philosophy. But these writers he had studied thoroughly. There is hardly a suggestion of a constructive kind to be found either in the deistic or the apologetic literature of his own, or of the immediately preceding, period that is not taken up by him and worked into his scheme. But while it is this that makes, as it were, the warp and the woof of its thought, the weaving of the

two into the web of argument and illustration is due to his own strong personality. It is this that makes a book of historical notes to Butler at once so difficult and so necessary. He appropriates phrases, almost sentences, without acknowledging his authority or giving any clue to whence they were derived. His contemporaries knew his sources and did not need references, but we walk rather in darkness when the references are withheld. It is full of interest to see how he takes Matthew Tindal's *Revealed Religion* as a republication of *Natural Religion*, and turns his argument right round about, accepting his theory of distinction and relation in order to the vindication rather than the supersession of revealed by natural religion. It is also interesting to see how he takes John Foster—the Foster of Pope's couplet:

> "Let honest Foster, if he will, excel
> Ten metropolitans in preaching well"—

as to the difficulty of reconciling the universal destiny of the Christian religion with its local and particular diffusion, and incorporates it with his own complex and finely articulated structure. We are not inclined to lay so much stress on his obligations to Berkeley, for he did not—as Berkeley did—deal with his problem as metaphysical, but as ethical. In a word, Berkeley's problem was as to the source and process of knowledge; but Butler's problem had more relation to conduct as affected by faith. He found religion in man, but he also found that to its development and completion religion from above man was necessary. And though the analogy rested on the great conception as to the correspondence between the two worlds,—the transcendental and the empirical,—he rather assumed the correspondence than attempted any discussion as to how they were related in the process and laws of knowledge. But only by the history of the thought he inherited and used can either method or argument be properly appreciated.

We may describe the argument of the Analogy as occasional, and with the argument the method was inextricably bound up. Analogy is possible only provided there are two things which can be as exactly compared as could be his natural and

revealed religion. He did not invent the idea of either. He hardly needed to define the terms or to describe their respective meanings. He could assume them because they were the familiar commonplaces of the controversy in which he intervened. "Natural religion" had nothing of nature in it, and very little of religion. The phrase sprang out of Lord Herbert of Cherbury's attempt to discover what ideas were common to all religions, in order that a common substratum might be discovered and regarded as the very essence of all. This notion came to be formulated into a sort of philosophical doctrine, which might be termed the system of abstract beliefs proper to human nature, or the religious ideas native to man. It had on one side of it the value of the older theory of innate ideas, or the later intuitive principles of philosophy, *i. e.*, it intended to build on the catholic and necessary beliefs of mind; but it had also, on the other side of it, a more historical idea,—that of the primordial worship or faith which had belonged to primitive or aboriginal man. Now, both these meanings mix in Butler. He uses the phrase now in the one sense and now in the other; and the usage is not always consistent. If Mr. Gladstone had entered into the history of the idea and the phrase, he would have done something to make Butler more intelligible. Taken in its philosophical sense, the truth of natural religion was necessary to revealed; taken in its historical sense the corruption and the insufficiency of natural religion constituted the need for revealed. In the literature before Butler both these arguments have their place. Samuel Clarke in his correspondence with Leibnitz said: "As Christianity presupposes the truth of natural religion, whatever tends to discredit the latter must have a proportional effect in weakening the authority of the former." According to this, the supernatural had its basis in the natural; and the truth of the natural had to be maintained in order to the truth of the supernatural.

Here we have the intellectual basis for the "analogy." The two systems are so far parallel that each can be invalidated or vindicated through the other. But now between Clarke and Butler an important incident had occurred. Matthew Tindal had published his *Christianity as Old as Creation*, and had developed

the parallel to such an identity as made revealed religion a superfluous addition to natural. And so he argued that where the one went beyond the other, it was to be doubted or disbelieved. Now, over against Tindal and men of his kind the "analogy" was the most invincible of all *argumenta ad homines*. It showed that the so-called system of nature had as many and as grave defects as the so-called system of revelation. And Butler proceeded so to weld the two together as to make the two systems into one system, which was more credible as a whole than either constituent was credible apart.

I have spoken of the argument of the Analogy as occasional; it is this because the assumptions on which it proceeds and which give to it all its validity were strictly relevant to its own time and are not at all considered or accepted in ours. For one thing it is addressed to deists, and the deist is no more. The men who admit the idea of God do not now stand where the deists stood; they go further, they admit more—thanks in great part to the Analogy—or they deny more—thanks in great part to the Analogy again. Nor is the idea of natural religion today what it was then; it has ceased to be a philosophical system which could stand over against another and more elaborate system called revealed religion; it has become our notion of what primitive or savage people believe; it is a system which has ceased to be our own; it is the customs, the rites, and the institutions of those in an earlier stage of civilization. Between natural religion, as now conceived, and revealed, no argument from analogy would have any cogency, for the system is no longer accepted by the men the apologist addressed and assumed by him as an admitted basis of argument. And revealed religion has also undergone its change; it is no longer conceived as the very rounded and finished sort of thing that Butler imagined. His interpretation of certain of its doctrines are not ours, his reading of its history is not exactly the reading of scholars of today; and so with the basis gone from under it and all the rational relations between the two things changed, the argument has lost its cogency and speaks rather to those who have an academic purpose in view or to those whose interests are mainly historical.

This does not involve any censure upon the argument as used by Butler and addressed to his own day; it simply states a fact in present experience. The thought that needs to be satisfied now is at once more radical in philosophy and more critical in history. The agnostic or the physicist has replaced the deist. To men who do not know that God is, an argument that assumes his being speaks in vain. The men who think of religion as natural today do not conceive it as a system of duties, as a belief in a future state, or as a method of retribution and reward, but simply as so many phenomena in the life of peoples, to be studied by the archæologist or the historian.

The new analogy must be broader than the old, be as just to knowledge and speculation at the end of the nineteenth century as Butler's was to knowledge and speculation at the beginning of the eighteenth. The lesson he has to teach is that we be as honest as he was. His personal example is one of the great things he has bequeathed to us in his book. Mr. Gladstone well says, the method of the Analogy is of greater value than its argument; and we may add that Butler's attitude of mind, alike to method and argument, is of greater value than either. The signal veracity of the man as a thinker and a writer is above praise. "There are many men," he says, "who have a strong curiosity to know what is said, who have no curiosity to know what is true." He himself was a conspicuous example of a man who had the utmost curiosity to know what was said in order that he might discover and determine how far it was true. This is a very rare quality in an apologist, but it is characteristic of Butler, the moralist; and out of it all his best qualities as thinker and teacher come.

The influence of Butler on later thought is not quite so easy a question as it is sometimes assumed to be. He indeed marked the end of one great period of the deistic controversy. Its first half was largely concerned with the idea of natural religion. In Toland, Collins, and Tindal the discussion had relation to this natural religion as adequate to all the needs of men, and to the contradictions involved in the notion of revealed. Butler, in summing up the argument in his judicial and conclusive fashion,

brought the case to an issue and an end. From this time forward the controversy became, far more than it had previously been, a question as to the evidences of the Christian religion. These were of several kinds. They concerned the veracity, the authenticity, and therefore the credibility of the New Testament writings. In this field the greatest and most memorable work was achieved by Nathaniel Lardner; Jeremiah Jones, with his *History of the Canon*, moves in the same region; Paley's *Horæ Paulinæ* is the familiar and popular exponent of the same line. Miracles also played a great part. Their sufficiency was proved; their credibility and reality, their evidential value to the man on the street, if not in the study, discussed. David Hume may have had much to do with one special form that the discussion of miracles assumed. But it was older than he; it was in the air and continued down almost to our own day. Then there was the evidence of twelve honest men beginning with Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses* and running on to its culmination in Paley. These are interesting as indicating the change which may be said to date from Butler, though, of course, Sherlock's book was earlier than the Analogy.

We feel, therefore, that Butler's influence in the eighteenth century may, so far as religious or even literary, be easily exaggerated. To take Mr. Gladstone's instance, it is certain that there are far deeper and more ineffaceable traces of Coleridge in the literature of the nineteenth century than of Butler in that of the eighteenth. And such traces as we find are more of the moralist than of the apologist. One of the curious things pointed out by Thomas Reid and Dugald Stewart is that "Butler made a deeper and more lasting impression in Scotland than in any other part of the island." This is evident, not only from the correspondence with Lord Kames, but also from the anxiety of Hume to submit his *Treatise of Human Nature* to Butler and to win his approval for his *Essays;* and from what Dugald Stewart has well indicated,—that the fundamental idea of Adam Smith's *Theory of Moral Settlements* was suggested by Butler. Stewart also happily shows how frequently a single sentence of Butler shatters a whole ethical system. Thus Hobbes' account of

*pity* as "the imagination or fiction of *future* calamity to ourselves proceeding from the sense of another man's calamity" is proved futile by Butler's remark: "If it were just, it would follow that the most fearful temper would be the most compassionate." As Reid and Smith and Stewart had used Butler, so also, as Mr. Gladstone recognizes, did Chalmers, whose *Bridgewater Treatise* and *Natural Theology* and *Prelections on the Analogy* were but modifications of Butler's fundamental position. But it is remarkable that in all these cases it is the ethical doctrine in the Sermons and in the Analogy, more than the purely intellectual or philosophical principles of the latter, that are potent and influential.

So here again we reach the conclusion that the positive and ethical doctrine of Butler has a permanency which has been denied to an apologetic which was so largely agnostic.

The relation of Butler to contemporary and subsequent thought suggests a very interesting question as to the various conditions that make for cogency, whether in apologetics or in criticism. The defense of the Christian, or indeed of any, religion is not merely a work of literature; it is a much larger and more serious thing. The course of the deist controversy in England forms a remarkable contrast to the history of the parallel movement in France. The two were indeed closely related; the English was, in a sense, the source of the French deism. The bosom at which both were suckled was the philosophy of Locke, but of the children the English was the elder and formative, the French was the younger and more imitative, yet incalculably the more potent. Voltaire did not deduce his deism directly from Locke, he learned it from disciples less reverent and more audacious than the master. Nothing so astonished him during his English residence as the freedom with which religion was treated. He found just as Butler did that unbelief was fashionable; "Christianity was not so much as a subject of inquiry;" it had been "at length discovered to be fictitious." So Mr. Toland had proved that "Christianity was not mysterious." "The Sect of Free Thinkers" was the church of the wits, the synagogue of the socially select. Anthony Collins discoursed of

their wisdom, and it needed the audacity of a Bentley to satirize their freedom as "thinking and judging as you find," "which every inhabitant of bedlam practices every day, as much as any of our illustrious sect." To him, indeed, their wise men were "idiot evangelists;" but to Voltaire they represented letters, culture, the men of sense. Bolingbroke, Pope's "guide, philosopher, and friend," became Voltaire's master in deism; and he went home to France to preach what he had learned in England. But the course of the controversy was as different as possible in the two countries. In England the victory was with the apologists; in France with the assailants of faith. It was not that in the one case deism was intellectually outmatched, while in the other case it had all the superiority of mind. The English deist was in the matter of intellect quite the equal of the English apologist. Hume was more subtle than Butler. Gibbon was more learned and ponderous than Lardner or Paley. Tom Paine was a greater master of English and of argument than Beattie. Yet, in spite of the number and quality of their opponents, the apologists triumphed; when the century ended the Christian religion was far more strongly entrenched in the reason and heart of the English people than it had been when the century began. But in France there was another story. When the century opened it was still the great age of Louis XIV, where the church was as illustrious in intellect, in learning, and in eloquence as the state was in regal dignity, in military prowess, and in skillful statesmanship. When the century closed the Revolution had come, the terror had followed, kingdom and church had together perished. And to this catastrophe no cause had contributed more potently than the French movement which corresponded to the English deism.

Now why this remarkable difference? To examine all its roots and reasons would carry us much too far. But the main reason is one which is not without its moral for our own day. In England the political and social conditions were such that the religious was not a civil question, but rather one intellectual and ethical. The state had ceased to expect uniformity of worship and belief, and to enforce it by civil disabilities and

pains. The first step towards toleration had been taken, and parliament had practically recognized that the civil and the ecclesiastical society, the state and the church, were not identical and coextensive. And it so happened that the political situation, especially as concerned the kingship, was such as to reduce to silence the only party in the state who could have resisted the principle of liberty. The old high churchman who believed in the divine right of the king, and the duty of passive obedience, could not preach his doctrine in the face of the Hanoverian succession, or apply it to a sovereign who reigned by the will of the people and not of right divine. And so for the first time in English history since "the spacious days of great Elizabeth" religion had ceased to be a civil concern, and become the concern of the religious, a matter for the reason and the conscience, for the mind and the heart. And thus it was freely discussed, treated on its own merits, argued for, argued against, tried by logic, tested by evidence, dealt with as if it were of all subjects the one most germane to the intellect, the one thing absolutely common and accessible to all men. And the result stands written broad upon the face of the century: in a fair argument and on a free field religion easily and completely won.

But the situation in France was exactly the converse. In 1688 toleration began its reign with Dutch William in England; in 1685 Louis XIV revoked the Edict of Nantes, and began the reign of intolerance. Church and state were henceforth so bound together as to be in a sense one body breathing fateful breath. There was no greater enemy of civil freedom than the church; no more vigilant foe of religious liberty than the state. Each confirmed the other in the policy that was most disastrous to its good. And so it happened that the free-thinking spirit which had returned from England incarnated in Voltaire saw that it could not teach religion without offending the state; and so it had to strike at the state in order to get at the religion which had become the very soul of the tyrannical sway. And there was no lack of provocation to assault. In popular feeling, dislike of Voltaire, the mocker, has hidden from us how much there was to justify his mockery, and the really great ends it was often used

to serve. We forget that he was no mere spirit who denied, but one who strongly affirmed where affirmation was at once most necessary and most dangerous. He who loves freedom ought never to forget the services Voltaire rendered to the cause he loves. On behalf of Jean Calas, and in the name of justice and truth, he fought the whole collective bigotry of France, and prevailed. He confronted a church that in the age of Louis the Well-Beloved dared to persecute, even though so many of her priests and princes had ceased to believe; and by his arguments, his scorn, his bold mockery, he gained, almost single-handed, his splendid victory. And here was the real reason why in France religious apologetics never had a chance. The tongue of the church was tied, she had to defend the indefensible, and so was silent; while the assault was delivered against the whole broad face of two flagrant offenders whose alliance made them appear as one: a state that in its anxiety to repress a liberty which the church feared, forgot its own people; and a church that, in its desire to sanction and support a state which tried so hard to serve it, neglected its own duties and was faithless to the very end of its being. It was the civil independence of the question they discussed that made English apologetics so completely victorious; it was the league of church and state in France, so mischievous to the good of both, so provocative in both of evil, that contributed to their common and disastrous overthrow.

The moral is obvious. The successful apologetic of an age is to be found in its collective religion. The church which forsakes its high vocation as the prophet of God for the most splendid and profitable alliance obtains ascendency in one generation only to lose in the next all she has schemed to gain, in the revolution which is sure to come as the Nemesis of forgotten responsibilities. The church lives for the truth, and to be its persevering spokesman she needs to be free.

# STYLE AS AN ELEMENT IN DETERMINING THE AUTHORSHIP OF OLD TESTAMENT DOCUMENTS.

By SAMUEL IVES CURTISS,
Chicago.

MUCH of the popular misconception regarding the authorship of Old Testament documents arises from judging them according to modern and occidental standards. A little reflection must convince every student of the Old Testament that this method is radically wrong, that the literary standards of the Occident must be misleading when we are called upon to judge the writings of the Orient.

Not only so, but we must remember that antique conceptions and modes of representation are very different from our own.

There are two principles which are observed by occidental and modern writers; one is a studied effort at variety of expression in describing similar things, a careful avoidance of a repetition of terms; the other is the recasting of the materials, in historical, poetical, or other composition, so that the product is the mental possession of the writer.

These well-known principles of modern authorship are often applied in such a way as to discredit the results of criticism as to the authorship and composition of certain documents in the Old Testament.

It is clear, however, that if we wish to ascertain the truth as to the antique documents found in the Old Testament, we must discover how ancient Semitic writers were wont to express their thoughts. Did they aim at variety of expression in treating of the same thing, or did they use the same terms whenever they had occasion to speak of the same subject? Did they digest their sources in writing history or poetry, like modern writers, thus presenting an entirely new product in their own language, or did they aim, with rare fidelity, to preserve the

language of their documents? It is certain that both modes of composition are found. The prophets generally reproduced their favorite authors in their own language, though their style is strongly colored by them.[1] But it is just as certain, so far as we can judge, that other writers reproduce their authorities word for word. Indeed we have every reason for believing that, when a writer had two or three parallel accounts before him, he combined them as the harmonist combines the gospel narratives. The *Diatessaron* of Tatian[2] furnishes a good example of this method.

These two principles of composition, if established, are of the utmost importance in the criticism of the Old Testament; for if an author, or school of authors, uses the same language in describing the same things, then different codes regarding the same things, with a different terminology, are irrefutable witnesses to a diversity of authorship. Furthermore, duplicate or triplicate accounts of the same event not only indicate different sources, but furnish infallible proof that the author was really an editor who combined different narratives. This mode of composition is not to be summarily dismissed by making sport of it. Granted that it may seem a childish way of writing history, it really indicates great reverence and conscientiousness on the part of a writer in the use of his sources. If, for example, the Hebrew text of historical narratives in Chronicles can be separated by means of the scissors and joined together in a scrapbook so as to parallel certain similar narratives in Kings almost word for word, even to the dismemberment of verses, seemingly in a most arbitrary way, who shall complain?

However, it is not my purpose to prejudge the case. The

[1] Bishop Colenso maintained, from a comparison of parallel passages in Deuteronomy and Jeremiah, that Jeremiah was the author of Deuteronomy; Graf and Kayser, that Ezekiel was the author of the Law of Holiness (Lev. 18–26). It is needless to say that these views of the authorship of Jeremiah and Ezekiel are no longer held by critics. *Cf.* Ezekiel's use of the older prophets, particularly Jeremiah.—SMEND, *Der Prophet Ezechiel*, Leipzig, 1880, pp. xxiv, xxv.

[2] *Cf.* my article on "Wellhausen's Theory of the Pentateuch," in the *Expositor*, London, 1886, pp. 85 ff., and especially GEO. F. MOORE in the *Journal of Biblical Literature*, 1890, Part II, on "Tatian's *Diatessaron* and the Pentateuch."

object of this article is to prove two propositions from an inductive examination of numerous passages:

(1) *Ancient Hebrew writers do not usually aim at variety in describing the same things.*

(2) *Ancient Hebrew writers are accustomed to reproduce their sources with as little essential change as possible.*

Ilgen calls attention to the truth of the first proposition. He says: "Repetitions . . . . characterize the mode of narration of the ancient world, and are not merely a peculiarity of Genesis, or of other oriental writers; but also of the most ancient Greeks, as the Homeric songs must convince anyone. The ambassadors in Homer discharge their commissions with the same words with which they are instructed; as one hero arms himself, putting on one piece after another, so they all arm themselves; as one hero threatens, boasts, and reviles, so almost all threaten, boast, and revile; as one dashes down dead, so that the earth resounds, so many dash down; as one sacrifice is offered, so many sacrifices are offered. This simplicity and uniformity is the purest speech of nature which cannot displease anyone who makes any pretensions to taste. The old world could not persuade itself that a repeated fact and a repeated feeling, represented through repeated words, could be represented through changed words. They believed that changed words must change the representation of the thing which they would set forth."[3]

There are abundant illustrations of my first proposition. One which is familiar to every student of the minor prophets is found in the introduction to Amos, where we have, with one or two exceptions, the stereotyped formula repeated eight times: "Thus saith Yahwe, on account of three transgressions of . . . . and on account of four I will not turn it back, because . . . . therefore I will send fire . . . . and it shall consume the palaces of . . . ."[4] This formula is filled in with the names of the

[3] ILGEN: *Die Urkunden des Jerusalemischen Tempelarchivs, in ihrer Urgestalt.* Halle, 1798, pp. 365, 366. Cheyne says: "Ilgen's book is, in fact, rarer than ASTRUC'S *Conjectures.*"—*Founders of Old Testament Criticism*, p. 28.

[4] Amos 1:1—2:6.

people, the nature of their sin, the place where the fire is to be kindled, etc.

So, too, the author of Deuteronomy has left his sign manual whenever he speaks of the place where God is to be worshiped. The full form is given in Deuteronomy 12:5: "But unto the place which Yahwe your God shall choose from all your tribes to place his name there, to his dwelling ye shall seek and thither thou shalt come." The essential element in the passages where Jerusalem is indicated is in the expression, "the place which Yahwe [your God, or thy God] shall choose."[5] To this there is often added, "to cause his name to dwell there [or to put his name there]."[6] The substance of the phraseology is essentially identical[7] and is remarkably characteristic of the legal portion of Deuteronomy.[8]

Another example of the same phenomenon is to be found in the Book of Kings. We might almost say, in modern phrase, that a blank is provided for each Judæan, as well as for each Israelitish king, although the editor varies it slightly at times. The blank for the Judæan kings is essentially as follows: "In the . . . . year of . . . . king of Israel reigned . . . . over Judah [ . . . . years old was he when he began to reign][9] . . . . years he reigned in Jerusalem and his mother's name was . . . . daughter of . . . . And he did right in the eyes of Yahwe [or] and he did evil in the eyes of Yahwe . . . . And the rest of the acts of . . . . , and all that he did, are they not written in the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Judah? So . . . . slept with his fathers and he was buried with his fathers in the city of David; and . . . . his son reigned in his stead."[10]

The blank for the kings of Israel varies more on account of

[5] Deut. 12:5, 11, 14, 18, 21, 26; 14:23, 24, 25; 15:20; 16:2, 6, 7, 11, 15 16; 17:8, 10; 18:6; 23:16; 26:2.

[6] Deut. 12:5, 11, 21; 14:23, 24; 16:2, 6, 11; 26:2.

[7] There are thirteen slight variations.

[8] 12–26.

[9] Occurs often.

[10] *Cf.* 1 Kings 15:9–11, 23, 24; 22:41–51; 2 Kings 8:25–27; 12:1, 2, 19–21; 14:1–3, 18, 20; 15:1–3, 6, 7, 32–34, 36, 38; 16:1, 2, 19, 20; 18:1–3; 20:20, 21, The formula is slightly varied after the fall of the northern kingdom, *e. g.*, 21:1, 2, 17, 18, 19, 20, 25, 26; 22:1, 2; 23:28, etc.

the changes in the dynasties and the removal from Tirzah as capital to Samaria: "In the . . . . year of . . . . king of Judah . . . . reigned . . . . son of . . . . over Israel in Tirzah [Samaria] . . . . years. And he did evil in the eyes of Yahwe, and walked in the way of Jeroboam and in his sin with which he caused Israel to sin . . . . Now the rest of the acts of . . . . and what he did . . . . are they not written in the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Israel? And . . . . slept with his fathers and was buried in Tirzah [Samaria], and . . . . his son reigned in his stead."[11] The estimate of the character of the Israelitish kings varies somewhat, but the most common description is that given above. When the terms are not identical, they are at least synonymous, so that it is clear that they come from the pen of the same writer.

Wellhausen has called attention to the framework which we have in connection with the Book of Judges.[12] Here the same law prevails. While there is not an identical formula in every case, the expressions describing the condition of Israel before the raising up of the judge and during his administration are at least synonymous, as appears from the following example: "And the children of Israel did evil [again] in the eyes of Yahwe[13] . . . . and the anger of Yahwe was hot against Israel,[14] and he sold them into the hand of[15] . . . . and the children of Israel served . . . . years.[16] And the children of Israel cried unto Yahwe, and Yahwe raised up a deliverer for the children of Israel, and he delivered them[17] . . . . and the land had rest . . . . years."[18]

The epitaphs of the antediluvians may also be mentioned as cast in one mold; when we have read one, we have read all, with the exception of names and dates and ages. Remarks have been

[11] 1 Kings 15 : 33, 34; 16 : 5, 6, 23, 25, 27, 28; 2 Kings 13 : 1, 2, 8–12, etc.

[12] *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, Edinburgh, 1885, pp. 228, 229.

[13] This expression occurs seven times, Judges 2 : 11; 3 : 7, 12; 4 : 1; 6 : 1; 10 : 6; 13 : 1.

[14] Occurs thrice, Judges 2 : 14; 3 : 8; 10 : 7.

[15] Four times, Judges 2 : 14; 3 : 8; 4 : 2; 10 : 7.

[16] Twice, Judges 3 : 8, 14.

[17] Twice, Judges 3 : 9, 15.

[18] Four times, Judges 3 : 11, 30; 5 : 31; 8 : 28.

added for Enoch and Noah, but the scheme in every case is substantially the same.[19]

In the directions given for the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture, if we place command and execution side by side, in Hebrew or English, we shall find the same principle illustrated, namely, the use of the same language in describing the same things.[20]

On examining the laws of sacrifice contained in Leviticus[21] we find the writer uses the same phraseology in setting forth the same functions, or characteristics, of different kinds of sacrifice. The expressions are so clearly stereotyped that there is no mistaking the style to which they belong.

The priestly portion of the Book of Numbers furnishes many illustrations of the same proposition. Indeed, it is largely made up of a series of blanks which are filled up as occasion requires. First we have the enumeration of the different tribes. The blank, with a slight exception for the firstborn, is as follows: "Of the sons of . . . . their generations according to their clans, according to the family of their ancestors, their enumeration after the number of their names [by their polls],[22] every male from twenty years old and upward, all that were able to go forth to war; those that were numbered of them of the tribe of . . . . were . . . ."[23] This formula is repeated twelve times.

So we have an almost identical formula for the position of the tribes around the tabernacle: "On the . . . . shall be the standard of the camp of . . . . according to their hosts . . . . and the captain of the sons of . . . . shall be . . . . the son of . . . . and his host and those that were numbered of them were, etc."[24]

There is also substantially one blank for the families of the

[19] Gen. 5: 3–31. [20] *Cf.* Ex. 25: 10–40 with 37: 1–24; 26: 1–32 with 36: 8–38, etc.

[21] *Cf.* the laws for burnt offerings in Lev. 1: 3–9 with verses 10–13; for peace offerings, Lev. 3: 1–5, the offering from the herd, with vss. 6–17, the offering from the flock (1) vss. 6–11; from sheep, (2) vss. 12–17, from goats; for sin offerings (1) for the priest, Lev. 4: 1–12, (2) for the congregation, vss. 13–21, (3) for the prince, vss. 22–26, (4) for the individual, vss. 27–35.

[22] This expression is used twice, Num. 1: 20, 22.

[23] Num. 1: 22–43. [24] Num. 2: 2–31.

Levites: "Of . . . . was the clan of . . . . and the clan of . . . These are the clans of . . . . Those that were numbered of them according to the number of all the males from a month old and upward. Those that were numbered of them were . . . . The clans of . . . . shall encamp . . . . the tabernacle. And the prince of the father's house of, etc."[25]

The most remarkable instance of repetition is in the offerings of the twelve princes, where with very slight variations the same form is used in connection with each prince, the details to be filled in being his name, the day on which his offering was made, and the tribe to which he belonged. After a slight change for the first prince of the twelve,[26] the following blank occurs eleven times: "On the . . . . day offered . . . . son of . . . . prince of . . . . He offered as his offering one silver charger, of which the weight was a hundred and thirty shekels, one silver bowl of seventy shekels, after the shekel of the sanctuary, both of them full of fine flour mingled with oil for a meal offering; one spoon of gold of ten shekels, full of incense, one young bullock, one ram, one lamb of the first year for a burnt offering, one kid of the goats for a sin offering, and for a sacrifice of peace offering, two oxen, five rams, five he-goats, five lambs of the first year; this was the offering of . . . . son of . . . ."[27]

The modern critics sometimes adduce this passage as an example of the repetitious character of the priestly writings, but it should rather be adduced as a conspicuous illustration of the proposition stated. Other examples might be taken from the Book of Numbers, but these must suffice.

In all the examples which I have quoted—and many more could be adduced—it seems clear that Hebrew writers ordinarily use the same expressions when describing the same things.

I pass now to the other principle which is related to the method of authorship indicated.

(2) *Ancient Hebrews reproduce their sources with as little essential change as possible.*

There are many illustrations of this principle which will occur to any diligent reader of the Old Testament, even in the English

[25] Num. 3:21–35. [26] Num. 7:12. [27] Vss. 12–83.

version. It is not customary for Old Testament writers to give any indication that a passage is borrowed from another author.[28] We see this from the use which Isaiah[29] and his younger contemporary, Micah,[30] make of the same passage which they have doubtless quoted from an older prophet.

Another instance is in the employment, essentially, of the same material by the editor of Isaiah[31] and of the Book of Kings[32] in the story of Sennacherib's invasion of Judah, and in the account of Hezekiah.

Sometimes they quote extended sections, as in the case just cited, without change, except such as has been brought about by different recensions of the same text.[33] At other times they make slight changes. They also produce new compositions by piecing together various sources which we are still able to find. They conscientiously preserve the text they have before them, even when they introduce new matter, so that the first half of a clause or even phrase of a verse may appear at the beginning of a long insertion and the last half, or remainder, at the end. The Book of Chronicles, which is largely based on Samuel and Kings, furnishes the most instructive illustrations of all these characteristics.

The account of Saul's death is essentially the same in Chronicles[34] as in Samuel.[35] There are slight textual variations which may mostly be explained by their preservation in two different accounts. The chronicler's hand appears, however, in the reason which he assigns for Saul's death.[36]

In the Psalter we have an interesting illustration of the use which editors make of their sources, *e.g.*, in the second book, the fourteenth psalm is reproduced as the fifty-third. In the first book it is a Yahwe psalm, in the second an Elohim psalm. There is also a change in the sixth verse of Ps. 53. The Psalter also affords instances of the use of part of a psalm or of

[28] Examples of acknowledged quotations are: Num. 21:14; Josh. 10:12, 13; 2 Sam. 1:18; Jer. 26:18, *cf.* Micah 3:12.

[29] Isa. 2:2–4.

[30] Micah 4:1–3.

[31] Isa. 36—38:8, 21, 22, chap. 39.

[32] 2 Kings 18:13—20:12–19.

[33] Such textual changes are familiar to the critical student of the New Testament parallel passages in the Old Testament afford an admirable view of the same fact.

[34] 1 Chron. 10:1–12.

[35] 1 Sam. 31.

[36] Vss. 13–14.

piecing together different sources, *e.g.*, Ps. 70 of the second book is simply the reproduction of Ps. 40:14–18 of the first book, and Ps. 108 of the fourth book of Ps. 57:8–12 and of Ps. 60:7–14 of the second book.

Before turning to the chronicler, let us examine the sources of the account in 2 Kings 25:18–25, which details the second capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonians. The first part of this narrative to the twenty-first verse is parallel with Jer. 52:24–27; but the author of it has drawn the rest from Jer. 40:7–10 and 52:31–34, *e.g.*, 2 Kings 25:23, 24, with the exception of the words in brackets from Jer. 40:7–10: "And when all the captains of the forces [which were in the field] heard, they and their men, that the king of Babylon had appointed Gedaliah [son of Ahikam][37] governor [in the land, and had entrusted him with the men, women and children, and with the poor of the land[38] who were not carried away captive to Babylon] then they came unto Gedaliah to Mizpah, even Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, and Johanan [and Jonathan][39] the son[s] of Kareah, and Seraiah the son of Tanhumeth, [and the sons of Ephai] the Netophathite, and Jezaniah the son of a Maacathite, they and their men. And Gedaliah [the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan][40] sware to them and to their men, saying [Kings: and said to them], fear not to serve the Chaldeans, dwell in the land and serve the king of Babylon and it shall be well with you."[41] The author of the passage in Kings took vs. 25 from Jer. 41:1–3 almost word for word, with some omissions and some slight changes. The passage as found in Kings is after the omission of the additional matter which is bracketed: "And it came to pass in the seventh month came Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elishma

[37] Omitted by LXX.

[38] LXX omits "and children and with the poor of the land."

[39] LXX omits "and Jonathan."

[40] LXX omits this clause.

[41] The difference between the two texts may not be due to the effort of the editor of Kings to condense his sources. We may well believe that the text of Jeremiah which he had before him was at least as much briefer as that of the LXX; for the text of Jeremiah in the LXX is said to have 2700 words less than the Massoretic. An examination of the Septuagint version of 40:7–10 (47:7–10) shows almost as much condensation in the text of Jeremiah as in the parallel passage in Kings.

of the seed royal [and the princes of the king] and ten men with him [unto Gedaliah, the son of Ahikam, to Mizpah, and ate bread there together in Mizpah. And Ishmael arose, the son of Nethaniah, and the ten men which were with him] and they smote Gedaliah [the son of Ahikam, the son of Shaphan, with the sword] and he died[42] [whom the king of Babylon had made governor of the land]. And [all] the Jews [which were with Gedaliah in Mizpah] and the Chaldeans [which were found there with the men of war Ishmael smote], *which were with him in Mizpah.*" A comparison of the Hebrew text in Kings and Jeremiah will show that the words common to both are entirely the same, with one exception which probably did not exist in the original text, and that the order is the same, except that the sentence which is italicized is connected with the Chaldeans in Kings, instead of with the Jews, as in Jeremiah. Verse 26 of Kings is a condensation of Jer. 43:4–7. Hence 2 Kings 25:18–25 is pieced together from Jer. 52:24–27; 40:7–9; 41:1–3; 43:4–7; and 52:31–34.

We turn now to the Book of Chronicles as affording abundant illustration of the second proposition. Although the chronicler claims to have access to other authorities,[43] and writes in a priestly spirit, he certainly makes use of our books of Samuel and Kings, which he reproduces literally, as they lie before him, whenever he wishes to present the same events as those narrated in them. His method of composition is that already indicated. He reproduces his sources word for word, so far as they exist in Samuel and Kings, or in the Psalms, and often pieces different accounts together. For lack of space we must confine ourselves to his account of David and Solomon. Anyone who will take a Hebrew Bible, cut out the parallel passages and paste them on a piece of cardboard, side by side, will see that the chronicler has ordinarily reproduced the text of Samuel and Kings, although there are many evidences of corruption in the text that may well account for minor divergencies, which it is not necessary to note

[42] This is the translation of וַיָּמֹת as found in the text of Kings, which I regard as original. It will be noticed that the consonants in the text of Jeremiah 40:2 וַיָּמָת are the same. The adoption of the Hiphîl form instead of the Qal doubtless led some scribe to insert אֹתוֹ to complete the construction.

[43] *Cf. The Levitical Priests*, Edinburgh, 1877, pp. 168–174.

in this discussion. 1 Chron. 11:1–47, containing an account of David's coronation over all Israel and of his mighty men, is composed of 2 Sam. 5:1–3, 6–10 and of 23:8–39. Here two passages somewhat remote are joined together. Another example of patchwork by the chronicler is found in the psalm[44] which he assigns to David at the bringing up of the ark. He has made it by joining three late psalms together, which have no titles, taken from the fourth book. Verses 8–22 are the first sixteen verses of Ps. 105, or one-third of the whole; vss. 23–33 are the whole of Ps. 96; vs. 34 is the first verse of Ps. 106; and vss. 35, 36 are vss. 47, 48, or the last two verses, of the same psalm, which is the last in the book, and has a doxology. The chronicler gives the doxology a slight twist so as to adapt it to its new connection, and makes some other changes in the sequence of clauses taken from the psalmist. His method shows a very conscientious presentation of the words before him, although he does not hesitate to change clauses in a way which reminds us of the divisive theories which the modern critics are charged with importing into Genesis.

1 Chron., chap. 17, corresponds almost literally to 2 Sam. 7, 1 Chron. 18 to 2 Sam. 8; 1 Chron. 19 to 2 Sam. 10. 1 Chron., chap. 20, is composed of the following sources: vs. 1, first clause, copies 2 Sam. 11:1, and the rest of the verse, except the last clause, is based on the remainder even to phraseology. The chronicler omits the account of David's adultery with Bathsheba and his murder of Uriah, which immediately follows, and continues his narrative in vss. 2 and 3 by the use of the very words found in 2 Sam. 12:30, 31, which join on at the end of this story; while vss. 4–8 are from 2 Sam. 21:19–22. This is certainly significant, not only as to the matter which he omits,[45] but also as to the patchwork method of authorship, which thus contains 2 Sam. 11:1; 12:30, 31 and 21:19–22 in a chapter of eight verses. The chronicler omits all the troubles in David's family as the result of his wrongdoing, as found in the account of Amnon and

[44] 1 Chron. 16:8–36.

[45] 1 Sam. 11:2—12:25, *i. e.*, he joins 11:1 to 12:26, vss. 26–29 being condensed by the chronicler into a single line; hence we can see that this omission is intentional.

Tamar[46] and Absalom's rebellion,[47] and all the intervening matter until 2 Sam. 23:7. As we have seen, 2 Sam. 23:8–39 is contained in 1 Chron. 11:10–47.

A study of 1 Chron., chap. 21, which is a continuation of the narrative we have just been considering, is exceedingly interesting. It is a reproduction of 2 Sam., chap. 24, with some editorial omissions and additions. The chronicler, instead of imputing David's plan of numbering Israel to Yahwe, charges it directly to Satan. He omits vss. 5–8, and 11 of Samuel, and inserts vss. 16, 18 and 20. He also inserts matter from a Levitical standpoint. He manifests a tendency to enlarge the number of the people and turns the purchase money of Samuel, fifty shekels of silver,[48] into six hundred shekels of gold,[49] showing that he was an adherent of the gold standard.

1 Chron., chap. 22, to 2 Chron., chap. 2, is almost entirely without parallels in Kings; 2 Chron., chap. 3, is derived from 1 Kings 6 and 7, but is much abridged and changed; 2 Chron., chap. 4, is a composite production; vs. 1 is from the chronicler; vss. 2–5 are parallel with 1 Kings 7:23–26; vs. 6 is equivalent to 1 Kings 7:38, 39, abridged and somewhat modified; vs. 7 is based on 1 Kings 7:49; vss. 8 and 9 are editorial additions by the chronicler; vs. 10 is almost an exact reproduction of the last clause of 1 Kings 7:39; vss. 11–17 are essentially the same as 1 Kings 7:40–45; vs. 18 to 2 Chron. 5:1 is equivalent to 1 Kings 7:48–51; 2 Chron. 5:2–10, 13, last clause, 14 corresponds to 1 Kings 8:1–11; vss. 11–13, including the first two clauses, were inserted by the chronicler into vs. 11 of Kings, but he preserves almost the exact phraseology of Kings both before and after the insertion, as follows: "And it came to pass when the priests went out from the holy place [insertion of the chronicler] that the cloud filled the house of Yahwe, and the priests were not able to stand and minister on account of the cloud, for the glory of Yahwe filled the house of Yahwe." This passage certainly furnishes an important example of the mode of composition by the ancient Hebrews in retaining almost word for word the language of their

[46] 2 Sam. 13.
[47] 2 Sam. 14–18.
[48] 2 Sam. 24:24.
[49] 2 Chron. 21:25.

sources, which they piece together, even when they interpolate matter from some other author, or of their own.

2 Chron. 6:1–30 is found again in 1 Kings 8:12–50, first clause. In verse 39 the chronicler combines verse 49 in Kings with the first clause of verse 50; he omits verse 50, second and third clauses to verse 53 inclusive. In place of these he inserts Ps. 132:8, 9, and as the forty-second verse he combines the last clause of the tenth verse, after rejecting the first clause, with the first half of the first verse of the psalm, omitting the title and introducing the word "mercies" from Isa. 55:3, *i. e.*, he doubtless had this passage in mind when he wrote.

2 Chron. 7:1–11, which is a continuation of the account of the dedication of the temple, furnishes another example of the way in which the Hebrews used their sources, and how, when they interpolated matter, they preserved the material preceding and following. Verse 1, first clause, is the first clause of 1 Kings 8:54; but that which follows to verse 3, inclusive, is from a Levitical standpoint; verses 4 and 5 correspond to 1 Kings 8:62 and 63; verse 6 is an insertion of the chronicler. The expression, "on the eighth day," in the ninth verse of the chronicler is equivalent to the same expression in 1 Kings 8:66. The interpolation[50] in the passage from Kings is indicated by the brackets: "On the eighth day [interpolation by the chronicler][51] he sent away the people, and they blessed the king and went to their tents rejoicing and glad of heart on account of all the goodness which Yahwe had done to David his servant and to Israel his people." It is to be remembered that the chronicler is at pains to copy two Hebrew words from Kings before the interpolation. It is important to notice this as it may serve as an answer to the

[50] 2 Chron. 7:9–10, first clause.

[51] The passage according to the chronicler, bracketing the words not in Kings, is as follows: "[And they observed] on the eighth day [an assembly, for they observed the consecration of the altar seven days, and the feast seven days. And on the twenty-third day of the seventh month] he sent away the people to their tents, rejoicing and glad of heart on account of all the goodness which Yahwe had done to David [and to Solomon] and to Israel his people." As 2 Chron. 7:8 corresponds exactly to 1 Kings 8:66, there is no getting away from the conclusion that in his interpolation he retained the expression "on the eighth day" from Kings.

strictures made by the traditionalists on this mode of composition.

2 Chron. 7: 12–22 corresponds to 1 Kings 9: 2–9. The chronicler omits the second clause of verse 2; and expands verse 3, after omitting "and thy supplication that thou hast made before me," by inserting verses 13–15 between "I have heard thy prayer" and "I have hallowed this house, etc." I indicate the chronicler's insertions and omissions by brackets: "And Yahwe appeared unto Solomon [a second time as he appeared unto him at Gibeon]. And Yahwe said unto him, I have heard thy prayer [and thy supplication that thou hast made before me], [insertion by the chronicler of verses 13–15] I have hallowed this house [which thou hast built] to put my name there forever, and my eyes and my heart shall be there all the days." [52]

2 Chron., chap. 8, is parallel with 1 Kings 9: 10–24, with variations. 2 Chron., chap. 9, which contains the account of the Queen of Sheba and Solomon's magnificence, is almost the same as 1 Kings 10, excepting verse 28 which it modifies and verse 29 which it cuts out entirely. It is also significant that the chronicler finds no place for 1 Kings 11: 1–40, which contains the account of Solomon's apostasy, thus following his policy concerning David and that of the priestly writer in Genesis, who excludes all parallels to the Yahwistic writer, reflecting on the character of the patriarchs. When the sad story found in Kings concerning Solomon is ended, the chronicler incorporates 11: 41–43 in his narrative. Hence the sources of 2 Chron., chap. 9, are 1 Kings 10: 1–28 and 11: 41–43. The remainder of Chronicles would furnish further examples, but these must suffice.

We may now draw the following conclusions from this investigation:

[52] Parallel passages in 2 Chron. 7: 12–16 with interpolations: "And Yahwe appeared unto Solomon [in the night], and said to him, I have heard thy prayer [and I have chosen this place for myself for an house of sacrifice. If I shut up the heaven so that there shall be no rain, or if I command the locust to devour the land, and if I send pestilence among my people, and if my people, upon whom my name is called, humble themselves and pray and seek my face and return from their evil ways, then I will hear from heaven and will forgive their sins and heal their land. Now my eyes

1. Our standard for criticising the style of Hebrew writers must be derived from an inductive study of their writings.[53]

2. This being the case, we should not say on general principles that any method of composition is absurd. The examination of facts must show what method has been employed.

3. Our examination demonstrates two things: (1) that the Hebrews, in the most ancient specimens of Old Testament literature as well as the most modern, were accustomed to use the same terms in describing the same things; (2) that without fear of plagiarism they often incorporated their sources word for word, sometimes by quoting long passages entire, sometimes by piecing together different passages, and that when they had occasion to insert matter, either of their own or from some other source, they preserved the beginning and the end of the writing into which they brought the interpolation, even if it were only a verse of which two words appeared before the interpolation and the balance at the end.[54]

4. An examination of the chronicler shows that this was a favorite mode of composition with him. By taking two Hebrew or English Bibles, cutting out certain narratives in Chronicles, and finding the corresponding narratives in Samuel and Kings, and pasting them in parallel columns, we are able to show that the chronicler not only quotes accurately from Samuel and Kings, but that he pieces different accounts together. Whether he supplements these from his own materials or from those of other

shall be opened and my ears shall attend to the prayer of this place and now I have chosen and] I have hallowed this house that my name may be there forever, and my eyes and my heart shall be there all the days." This interpolation is made up of expressions taken from 1 Kings 8 : 26, 28, 33, 40.

[53] This is just as important as a study of oriental manners and customs, when comparing the Orient with the Occident. How little canons taken from occidental life would avail in judging the peculiarities of orientals appears from a passage in Graham's *Jordan and the Rhine*, London, 1854, p. 4: "Modes, customs, usages, all that you can set down to the score of the national, the social or the conventional, are precisely as different from yours as the East is from the West. They sit when you stand, they lie when you sit, they do to the head what you do to the feet; they use fire when you use water, you shave the beard, they shave the head, you move the hat, they touch the breast, etc."

[54] See pp. 322–4.

writers we cannot say, because the other writers no longer exist.

5. It would be possible, if Samuel and Kings were not accessible, for critics, with some degree of success, on account of their distinctive style, to cut out the passages taken from these books by the chronicler and piece them together.

6. In the light of these conclusions it would not be surprising that an editor, living about one hundred years before the chronicler and having different codes before him, with the accompanying historical matter, should group them together as the chronicler has grouped his sources, and as a harmony of the gospels combines different narratives.

7. This hypothesis becomes as certain as any can be when we find three different kinds of style and three main groups of laws running through the Pentateuch.

8. Not to discriminate between these documents leads to hopeless confusion in regard to the religious history of Israel.

9. God always uses such instruments as he finds, hence in transmitting his revelation he uses the literary methods of a given age, he chooses the foolish things to confound the wise; therefore it is not a legitimate criticism to say that this mode of authorship is not worthy to be used by God in making a divine revelation, since it has been used by the chronicler and other Old Testament writers.

10. We are not to fear any critical results which come from honest investigation. Let us say to the critic: "Turn on the light; the more you investigate the better." The questions of authorship and composition cannot affect "the heavenliness of the matter,"[55] nor is God's Word less of a treasure because contained in earthen vessels.[56]

[55] *Confession of Faith of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America*, chap. I, sec. v.

[56] 2 Cor. 4 : 7.

# THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE INQUIRY CONCERNING THE GENUINENESS OF THE PAULINE EPISTLES.

By BERNHARD WEISS,
Berlin.

SINCE the end of the second century thirteen Pauline epistles have been included in the canon of the New Testament. To be sure at that time no one had thought, nor was anyone competent, to examine these letters, which had for a very long time been read and used (even if not expressly cited) by ecclesiastical writers, with a view to determining whether they were what they professed to be, letters of the apostle Paul. There had never so much as a doubt arisen on this point. Only in our century has criticism raised the question whether all these thirteen epistles are to be attributed to Paul. First of all Eichhorn and De Wette denied the genuineness of the pastoral epistles; but doubts were also early entertained concerning the so-called epistle to the Ephesians and the second epistle to the Thessalonians. Yet the only question ever discussed was whether the epistles were to be attributed to Paul himself or to one of his disciples.

Baur was the first to reject all the shorter Pauline epistles, accepting as genuine only the four epistles, to the Romans, Corinthians, and Galatians; the others, he maintained, could not have arisen before the second century. But even in his school there soon sprang up a reaction against his position, Hilgenfeld again ascribing to the apostle the first epistle to the Thessalonians, the epistle to the Philippians, and the epistle to Philemon; and all recent criticism, more or less independent of Baur, agreed with him. But the reactionary movement thus begun reached farther and farther. Holtzmann set to work to prove at least a Pauline basis in the epistle to the Colossians; von Soden reduced the interpolations admitted by him in this letter to a minimum,

until at last he surrendered even this minimum and accepted the whole epistle as genuine. As for the second epistle to the Thessalonians, Paul Schmidt admitted that with the exception of the eschatological passage of the second chapter and a few smaller interpolations there is no ground for supposing it spurious. But when it came to be more and more believed that the meaning of that Pauline "apocalypse" had been found, all considerations against it were dismissed, and critics such as Klöpper and Jülicher (*Einleitung*, 1894) without further hesitation defended its genuineness. And though Klöpper at least still maintains the spuriousness of the epistle to the Ephesians, Jülicher declares the objections against it insufficient for its rejection. Recently also Harnack in his *Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur* (Vol. I, Leipzig, 1897) has treated all ten Pauline epistles which Marcion had in his canon as genuine. To the pastoral epistles only, as in Eichhorn's time, all recent criticism objects.

There is also, to be sure, a radical wing of recent criticism which even outstrips Baur, declaring as it does the four epistles unassailed by him, and thus the whole body of Pauline epistles, to be spurious. When Bruno Bauer first came forward in the middle of this century with this view it was universally rejected as hypercriticism hardly needing refutation; but recently several Dutch scholars have returned to the same theory. Among German scholars Steck in his *Galaterbrief* (Berlin, 1888) not only tried to prove the spuriousness of this epistle, but also rejected in connection with it the epistles to the Romans and Corinthians. Yet up to the present time he has been opposed, not less than his predecessor, Bruno Bauer, by all schools of criticism. When even a critic like Holtzmann declares this criticism to be the product of a mistaken exegesis and a historico-philosophical *petitio principii*, it is safe to say that there is as yet no occasion for entering into a detailed examination of it. The same holds also respecting the attempt, which has been more and more widely spreading of late, to prove more or less extensive interpolations in the text of the Pauline epistles transmitted to us (*cf.* C. Clemen, *Die Einheitlichkeit der paulinischen Briefe*, Göttingen, 1894). This rests, so far as it is not connected with

critical questions which we shall soon consider, upon exegetical difficulties that exist in the text or the context of the Pauline epistles. But it is clear that if one does not understand how this or that passage fits into the connection, it is far more difficult to conceive how an interpolator could come to interrupt a lucid text with interpolations alleged to be so incongruous. If one discovers, therefore, the line of thought which guided the interpolator, then that may also have been the line of thought of the apostle himself. It will always remain the task of exegesis to understand a document transmitted to us, as it lies before us, and that this is not impossible in the case of the Pauline letters, I believe that I have shown (*cf.* B. Weiss, *Die paulinischen Briefe im berichtigtem Text mit kurzer Erläuterung zum Handgebrauch bei der Schriftlectüre*, Leipzig, 1896).

This history of criticism and its present status affords abundant opportunity for a number of fruitful observations. I propose, therefore, to go through the series of the thirteen Pauline epistles according to their almost universally accepted order, and discuss in detail the critical problems which have arisen in the case of each one. In doing thus, I understand by "critical problems" not the grounds of doubt, often very subjective, with which, in the period of the criticism of the Schleiermacher-De Wette school, the genuineness of this or that epistle was disputed, since these, like the interpolation hypotheses named above, are mostly refuted by a careful exegesis. This it is, indeed, which the criticism of Baur and his school achieved for us, viz., that the critical problem is now always formulated in the question whether the epistles under discussion can be understood from the conditions existing in the time of Paul, or point to a later period. By this means only criticism gains a higher, more general interest, inasmuch as whatever its result may be it leads to a deeper historical understanding of these documents which are in any case so highly significant. We shall therefore first of all discuss the questions pertaining to the circumstances of their origin which appear to us not to have been as yet sufficiently cleared up. And in this matter even the extreme radical criticism may become of importance to us in so far as it

shows where even in respect to the Pauline epistles generally held to be genuine historical problems still remain which require a more thorough investigation.

### I. THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

When Baur in his *Paulus* (1845) declared the first epistle to the Thessalonians spurious, the prevailing conception of the epistle furnished a certain justification of this position. Until that time the first three chapters of the epistle had been thought to contain only outpourings of the apostle's heart and retrospects of the time of his ministry in Thessalonica and of his separation from the church; and their purpose remained unintelligible. The short admonitions and eschatological discussions of the fourth and fifth chapters formed, then, in reality the essential part of the epistle, although one could not conceive what was the purpose of those warnings, which aimed only at keeping the disciples from the grossest sins of heathenism, and of these discussions, which involved only the rudiments of the Christian hope for the future. But this conception of the epistle was even on exegetical grounds untenable. For the transition 4:1 with a λοιπὸν οὖν shows without doubt that, on the contrary, the first three chapters contain the main subject which the apostle had to discuss with the church, and that from 4:1 on he merely appends such admonitions and explanations as still remained for him to give to the church. But if this is so, the main purpose of chapters 1–3 cannot be found in the grateful retrospect of what God had hitherto done for the church, since all the letters of the apostle begin with that, or in the wishes for their further prosperity, which always follow closely on the thanksgiving (1:2–10; 3:11–13), but only in the sections of evidently apologetic character which stand between. The understanding of the epistle, and, consequently, the guaranty of its genuineness, turns accordingly on the question whether any occasion for these apologetic sections is perceptible.

Evidently this self-defense of the apostle is directed against slanders which had been circulated against him. The young Christians in Thessalonica had been told that they had been led

astray by cunning, ambitious, and self-seeking impostors; that only thus had they been alienated from their fellow-countrymen, from whom they were now suffering many a hardship and persecution. The burden of these hardships weighed heavily on the church and evidently gave the apostle great concern, since the young Christians had not yet proved themselves true under such a test. These slanderers declared that the apostles, for fear of being involved in these persecutions, had opportunely abandoned these whom they had betrayed and given them over to their fate; taking good care not themselves to return to the church. Only from this point of view does the whole section 2 : 1—3 : 10 appear in its true light and receive its right interpretation, as I have shown in the *kurzen Erläuterungen*. But the question arises, Whence did these slanders originate, from whom had they issued? This question has not yet been as satisfactorily and unanimously answered even by the defenders of the epistle as is necessary for its complete understanding.

There is indeed, both in the apology of the apostle and in the slanders which it presupposes, much that reminds us of the attacks which Paul endured in Corinth from his Jewish-Christian opponents. Since, however, it cannot be supposed that such opponents were to be found in this essentially Gentile church only recently established, Baur was right to a certain extent in finding here only imitations of the epistles to the Corinthians. But he neglected even to ask whether the analogous phenomena here could not perhaps be much better explained on wholly different grounds. Such a commentator as Hofmann and such a critic as von Soden (*Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1885, No. 2) assume, to be sure, that those slanders issued from the unbelieving Gentile countrymen of the Christians in Thessalonica. But it cannot be conceived how it should come about that the converts of Paul and his companion should be at all affected by the opinions of those who when the Jewish missionaries were present paid no heed to them. All becomes clear when once it is recognized that it was the unbelieving Jews in Thessalonica who during the presence of the missionaries had sought to bring an accusation against them (Acts 17 : 5–8), and now behind

their backs endeavored to undo their work. They were able to argue that they themselves surely knew their own countrymen better than these Gentiles newly converted to Christianity, and knowing them were in a position to affirm that they were deceivers and betrayers.

This suggestion is, moreover, obviously confirmed by the passage 2 : 15 ff. From the point of view of the current conception of the epistle Baur was right in declaring that the polemic against the Jews, which here suddenly breaks up all connection, was wholly unintelligible; and quite recently Schmiedel, who likewise thinks the slanders emanated rather from the Gentiles, has proposed to strike out these verses as a gloss. If, however, the attacks emanated from the unbelieving Jews, then it is clear why Paul ranks these slanders here with the efforts of the ungodly haters of the Gentiles who had tried on all occasions and in every way to obstruct his work of salvation among the heathen. Only from this point of view, moreover, is it possible to see why this severe polemic against the Jews closes with the statement that they had no need still further to fill up the measure of their sins by persecuting the messengers to the Gentiles, the [divine] wrath having already come upon them to the uttermost (vs. 16). So long as these words were referred to the destruction of Jerusalem, it followed, of course, that the epistle could not have been written by Paul, since he did not live long enough to witness this event. Even more recent defenders of the epistle make only random conjectures to account for these words. And yet there is but one clear and sure interpretation of them, and this recent critics also, like von Soden and Jülicher, have accepted. As Paul in Romans, chap. 1, sees the revelation of the divine wrath against the heathen world in its surrender to the folly of idolatry, to unnatural lust, and to a complete deadening of the moral sense, so he sees the wrath of God poured out upon unbelieving Israel in the judgment of hardening, of which he speaks in Rom. 11 : 7; 2 Cor. 3 : 14.

All that Paul says (chap. 1) in praise of the Christian standing of the Thessalonians and of the fame of their conversion to

Christianity is explained from the fact that he has in mind, by reference to the divine origin of Christianity and to the duty of guarding their good repute, to admonish them to endure with patience the persecutions that have befallen them. For manifestly their life as believers (for their perfecting in which he prays in 3 : 10) is deficient precisely in the fact that it still lacks that joyfulness which resists the trials of misfortune and which alone could establish their faith amid such trials. Further, the admonitions of chap. 4 show that the church was still lacking in the expression of its faith in practical life; that they still needed the warning against falling back into the old Gentile sins of unchastity and avarice (4 : 3–8). But it is just this that shows that we have here the picture of a church still young, much admired for the enthusiasm with which it had received the gospel, but now weighed down under the long continued persecutions and not yet sufficiently confirmed in moral life—a picture which no imitator of the apostle could invent and which is therefore in itself a guaranty of the genuineness of the epistle.

The eschatological discussions also (4 : 13—5 : 11) are easily understood if the pressure of persecution had raised to the highest pitch the desire for the return of the Lord, which alone could bring release. Exhortations, like 5 : 19 ff. carry us into the midst of church meetings roused to the highest pitch of feeling through such eschatological expectations. Prophets rise up who under a fanatical excitement declare the nearness of the second coming, while others oppose them with sober criticism, and, because prophecy had overstepped the bounds marked out for it, disparage it in general. Therefore the apostle is obliged to call attention to the fact that the day and hour of the parousia is and will remain unknown, and that we have only to take care that that time find us not unprepared (5 : 1–10). There were those also who under the influence of unwarranted expectation left their daily work professedly to spend their time in preparing for the parousia, which, as they thought, would end all things, thus becoming a burden on the charity of the church and even on that of their heathen countrymen. These are those

ἄτακτοι whom Paul (5 : 14) exhorts the church to admonish and to whom he directs his exhortation that, even when they do not themselves believe it necessary, they shall by all means work zealously, in order to be always gaining new means for more extensive labors of love, and not in the eyes of their unbelieving countrymen to bring disgrace upon Christianity through their idleness and beggary (4 : 10–12).

The discussion that follows (4 : 13–18), containing the most weighty eschatological material, brings us to the last point; and here also the epistle can be understood only in case it is genuine. Manifestly the church which at first, like Paul himself, had hoped while yet in its entirety to witness the parousia had through the first cases of death which occurred in its membership been thrown into the greatest distress. Since it cannot be supposed that a pseudonymous writer would make the apostle speak as if he hoped himself to be alive at the parousia (whereas he actually passed away before that event) the alarm implied in 4 : 13 is wholly inexplicable as the product of a period subsequent to that of the apostle, since the Christians of later times must certainly in some way have come to accept the fact that many would not survive to witness the parousia. When the resurrection had become a permanent part of the common hope of Christianity for the future, nothing could have been gained by an appeal to the awakening of those who sleep preceding the glorification of those who survive. These discussions can be understood only on the assumption that the apostle is explaining these things in detail to a new church, to which he, believing the parousia to be near at hand, had as yet had no occasion to speak of the fate of those who might perhaps die before the parousia, or to a congregation in which the antipathy of the Hellenic mind to this element of Christian doctrine (*cf.* Acts 17 : 32; 1 Cor. 15 : 12) had prevented their hearing or understanding his allusions to the parousia. It will then also appear what word of the Lord it is to which Paul appeals; and this is all the more important because those who have attempted to refer the epistle to a later time have taken advantage of the uncertainty which prevails regarding this term. Inasmuch as

the apostle by no means asserts that this word of the Lord contains all that he set forth (vs. 16 ff.), but only affirms on the authority of it that those who survive will not precede those who sleep, it is entirely sufficient to refer to Matt. 24:31, where Jesus promises at his parousia to gather his elect about himself from the four winds, hence all together. Second Thessalonians also makes allusion to this promise (2:1).

If thus the genuineness of the epistle appears fully confirmed, this yields from another point of view a highly important result for the criticism of the Pauline epistles in general. It was one of the fundamental errors of Baur's criticism that a doctrinal system based on the four epistles accepted by him was made the standard for determining what else should be recognized as Pauline. But those letters indeed show a form of teaching so related in content and expression only because the epistles to the Galatians and Corinthians are directed toward the same Jewish-Christian opposition, while the epistle to the Romans represents the results of that same struggle. Besides, all four were written in a period of three and one-half years, three of them within a period of less than a year. And yet the doctrine of salvation characteristic of the apostle even in them varies greatly in proportion and degree, while uniform development in other doctrinal topics is out of the question. But it is in itself contrary to all historical probability that Paul immediately upon his conversion worked out an original system of doctrine, or even that doctrine of salvation which later was developed in so profound a way. When, in Gal. 1:23, we read that the churches of Judea had heard say: "He that once persecuted us now preacheth the faith of which he once made havoc," it is evident that at this time there must have been no essential difference between his type of doctrine and that of the original apostles. It was probably rather the struggle with the Judaizer that forced him to develop his doctrine of salvation with such precision and sharpness, and to elaborate all its premises and consequences, and to express it in such bold propositions and striking terminology.

That such was in fact the case the first epistle to the Thessalonians proves most clearly. It is extremely interesting to see

how assiduously the most recent defenders of the epistles, Paul Schmidt and von Soden, reject the idea that it contains an undeveloped form of Pauline doctrine; and yet this is unquestionably the fact. It is, of course, true that even here those peculiarities of his doctrine which are connected with the peculiar character of his conversion come to light. Christ, of course, is to him the exalted Lord from whom comes all salvation just as from God himself; but there are no Christological statements furnishing more explicit information of the nature and origin of his person; there is no detailed exposition of the atoning significance of his death, which is touched upon only in a general statement, such as 5 : 10. Of course, even thus early Christianity is to him a divine dispensation of grace, but nowhere is the inability of the natural man to work out his own salvation, which such a doctrine called for, explained or traced back to the power of sin in the flesh; of justification by faith and not by works there is nowhere any mention; nor is the attitude of the Christian toward the law of the Old Testament and the relation of Jew and Gentile to salvation in Christ spoken of, although the way in which the unbelieving Jews tried to undermine Paul's work must certainly have furnished occasion enough for it. The doctrine of the Spirit who through the Word produces faith in the elect, and the new life in the believer, already has, it is true, an important place; but of the vital fellowship with Christ, secured by the Spirit, of the completion of salvation guaranteed by him, which gave to the apostle's developed system of thought such a peculiar stamp, there is as yet no trace. So much is certain: The critic who makes the theology of the four great doctrinal and controversial epistles the standard for all that is to be recognized as Pauline cannot accept the first epistle to the Thessalonians as genuine. In this Baur has been more consistent than the more recent criticism, which declares this epistle to be genuine, and then, nevertheless, rejects as spurious other epistles which in a much higher measure than it bear the stamp of developed Paulinism, because they are unwilling to admit that there was an advance beyond the point of view of the four great epistles.

## II. THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

It is very interesting to see how the epistles to the Thessalonians still show clear traces of the fact that Paul began in them his correspondence with his churches. Even the so-called address of the epistles shows a form much simpler, and in many respects peculiar, as compared with that of the later epistles which the address of the second approaches in one particular. In the first epistle the apostle enjoins the officers in whose charge the letter was sent to read it to the whole body of the brethren, consequently in full church assembly (5:27). In the second he hints at a misuse which had been made of letters professedly written by himself (2:2), and declares that, therefore, he intends henceforth to certify each one of his letters with a subscription in his own handwriting (3:17). In view of this fact, Weizsäcker, who still regards our letter as spurious, admits that it certainly becomes thereby an actual forgery. We can no longer speak in this case of pseudonymous writing, alleged in Christian antiquity to have been a wholly innocuous proceeding; here is a shrewd forgery which endeavors, by means of marks of genuineness borrowed from the later Pauline epistles (*cf.* 1 Cor. 16:21), to stamp a forged document as an epistle of Paul.

Recent criticism has been unprejudiced enough to acknowledge that, perhaps with the exception of the eschatological sections in chap. 2, there is no reason for denying the epistle to the apostle. Since Ewald the attempt has repeatedly been made to reverse the order of the two epistles. In fact, however, not only is this indefensible, but the second letter, by its relation to the first, discloses a situation so transparent that this itself vouches for the genuineness of the letter. It was written soon after the first, to which 2:15 clearly refers. The church has remained true, but the increased burden of persecution has also increased the enthusiastic expectation of the parousia to its highest pitch. The apostle is obliged to say to them that they appear to have forgotten entirely what signs must necessarily precede the appearance of the Lord. Those religious idlers whom the first

epistle more indirectly reprimands compel him, by their failure to return to their duty, to inflict on them some disciplinary punishment. No motive can be discovered which would explain the forging of such a document in the name of an apostle. The numerous similarities to the first epistle are explained by the fact that the second was written very soon after the first; but it must be conceded that, if grounds of suspicion in other respects are produced, these can be ascribed to imitation. And if umbrage is to be taken at every peculiar expression the epistle will afford opportunity for this also. Attention has been called to the expression ὀφείλομεν εὐχαριστεῖν, repeatedly occurring in the second epistle (1:3; 2:13), whereas the first epistle, like all others, says εὐχαριστοῦμεν (1:2; 2:13); to 3:15, ὁ κύριος τῆς εἰρήνης, and 2:13, ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ κυρίου, instead of which the first epistle writes ὁ θεὸς τῆς εἰρήνης (5:23) and ἠγαπημένοι ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ; to the anarthrous *terminus technicus* ἡμέρα κυρίου (1 Thess. 5:2), which appears in the second letter as ἡ ἡμέρα τοῦ κυρίου (2:2) or takes, as in the gospels, the form ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη; and these divergencies have often been regarded as indications of spuriousness. This is certainly unjustified. But it is of significance that recent critics have at length learned to take no notice of such peculiarities of a document. Thus, for example, both epistles have in common the expression ἔργον τῆς πίστεως (1 Thess. 1:3; 2 Thess. 2:11), and the characterization of the calling as a *continuing* divine work of grace (1 Thess. 2:12; 2 Thess. 1:11); and yet critics have taken no offense at the first epistle. It is very instructive to observe how even these earliest epistles show each their own peculiar forms of expression, in comparison with one another as well as with the later epistles. Although Paul certainly developed a dogmatic terminology of his own, yet it never became anything like a fetter to his versatile spirit. Every epistle has in this respect its own peculiarities, and it is very perilous to make these considerations decisive in settling the question of genuineness.

Criticism has always regarded the eschatological sections of chap. 2 as constituting the real problem of the second epistle to the Thessalonians. It must be recognized, indeed,

that the contradictions which are alleged to exist between it and the eschatology of the first epistle are easily explained. For that the day of the Lord comes as a thief in the night (1 Thess. 5:2) does not preclude his coming being accompanied with signs whose appearance is as impossible to foresee as that day itself; and that Paul himself still hopes to witness the parousia (1 Thess. 4:15) does not demand so immediate an occurrence of the day that the signs predicted in 2 Thess., chap. 2, could not precede it. That, moreover, the unbelieving will be led astray by the Antichrist (2 Thess. 2:10 f.) has nothing whatever to do with the fact that they will live until the dawn of the day of the Lord in peace and safety, and will have no presentiment of the approaching destruction (1 Thess. 5:3), but can at most intensify this feeling of security. What the apostle is aiming at is simply to call to the minds of the Thessalonians what he would have them remember his having previously said to them about the appearance of the Antichrist, which must precede the return of the Lord, and about that which, as they knew, still retarded that event. We have here, as in the Apocalypse of John and, in a certain sense, in the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus, an apocalyptic picture of the form in which godlessness must reach its highest point before the final judgment can be ushered in; for that this must happen first Jesus has already clearly declared in Matt. 23:32 ff. Such apocalyptic pictures must, however, necessarily relate themselves to existing circumstances. Their purpose is simply to interpret the signs of the times, searching for the point at which the hatred towards God, which is heaping up for itself wrath against the day of judgment, will manifest itself. If it be assumed that we have here the same situation as in the Johannean apocalypse, according to its usual interpretation, then the returning Nero is here the Antichrist, and the epistle could have been written only after his death, hence is in no sense a writing of Paul. To Kern, who first endeavored to establish the spuriousness of the epistle on substantial grounds, this was the really decisive argument, and the same was true of Baur and his followers. The more recent defenders of the epistle have contested this view;

but they have not been able to overcome it because they started from a wholly colorless conception of the Pauline picture. The apostle's picture of the Antichrist expected by him is said to contain only general features and such as are borrowed from Daniel and Jewish apocalyptic literature. There floated also before his mind, perhaps, a picture of a Roman emperor like Caligula. But this view takes too little account of the very concrete manner in which the apostle describes his eschatological expectation. He speaks of an *ἀποστασία*, out of which the man of sin rises up, to advance to the point of blasphemous self-apotheosis. The apostle knows of a "hindrance" which still delays this development and compels the *ἀνομία* to conceal its true nature in a mystery until the *κατέχων* is removed out of the way. Then will come the full revelation of the *ἄνομος*, who in Satanic power leads the unbelievers astray with lying wonders and every sort of unrighteous deception, but whose appearance causes the immediate return of the true Messiah who brings to an abrupt end the career of the Antichrist (2:3–10).

If there is no better interpretation of this picture than that adopted by the more recent defenders of the epistle, the evidence of its genuineness must be acknowledged to be weak. But there is another way. Starting with the interpretation of the *κατέχον*, it is pretty generally agreed that this term can be understood only of the imperial and judicial power of Rome; and this is manifestly confirmed by the fact that the neuter of the word "hindrance" (*κατέχον*) is used interchangeably with the masculine, *ὁ κατέχων*, which can refer only to the incarnation of that imperial power in the person of the Roman emperor (2:6, 7). But in that case the view that finds the Antichrist, whose appearance is retarded by "the restrainer" (*ὁ κατέχων*), in a Roman emperor or a character copied after the picture of such a one is excluded at the outset. If now, as is actually the case, the Johannean Apocalypse expects the Antichrist (not to be sure in the fabled return of Nero, but in an incarnation of the Roman imperial power), and if, as is clear, the reason assigned for this is that in the Neronian persecution of the Christians the Roman Empire had once already shown itself as the instrument

of the hostility to God and Christ, then it is clear that we have here an older apocalyptic combination which can have originated only in the time of Paul. And this is confirmed by the fact that in the Johannean Apocalypse the false prophet advances *along with* the beast, which represents the Antichrist himself, preparing the way for him by means of his lying wonders and his deception, and inducing mankind to apostatize to him. In Second Thessalonians, however, the Antichrist himself is the false prophet, who with lying wonders of Satan and fiendish deception leads mankind astray (2:9, 10)—from which it is again clear that he cannot be a Roman emperor.

What Paul's more exact thought about the appearance of this Antichrist was is clear from the relation in which that appearance (2:6) stands to the apostasy. It is quite out of the question to look for such a thing in the realm of heathenism, which neither knows nor worships God (1:8). On the other hand our epistles nowhere show any apprehension of an apostasy in the realm of Christianity, and certainly furnish no occasion for thinking of such a thing in the present passage. Thus Judaism only remains, which Paul in the first epistle (2:14–16) represented as the incarnation of all enmity to God and Christ; and which, if it continued on this way, must inevitably in the end apostatize wholly from God (*cf.* Heb. 3:12). The consummation of this apostasy, however, necessarily involved not only a persecution of the true Messiah (in his confessors) by the Jews, but the setting up over against him of the false Messiah. Therefore the false Messiah must be the Antichrist. This apocalyptic picture connects itself immediately with the prophecy of Jesus, which, as may be inferred from 1 Thess. 4:15; 2 Thess. 2:1, was already known to the apostle; only he thinks of the ψευδόχριστοι and ψευδοπροφῆται of whom Christ had spoken (Matt. 24:24; *cf.* John 5:43) as culminating in the person of the false Messiah, κατ' ἐξοχήν, who is identical with the false prophet. With this view and with this only can the description in 2:4, which plainly does not fit in with the apotheosis of the Roman emperor, be made to agree. Never did such an one, when causing himself to be numbered among the gods, set up the claim

of being higher than all the other gods, and thereby announce his intention to contend with all others, as it is asserted that the ἀντικείμενος καὶ ὑπεραιρόμενος ἐπὶ πάντα λεγόμενον θεὸν ἢ σέβασμα does. The very fact that what the passage speaks of is rather an assumption of equality with the one supreme God, on the part of one who endures no other gods beside him (not even the alleged Messiah revered by the Christians), shows doubtless that it is in the temple of God (at Jerusalem), where he takes his seat in order to prove thereby that he is of divine nature. Unbelieving Judaism had already found a blasphemous self-apotheosis in the claim of Jesus to the Messiahship (Mark 14:64; *cf.* John 5:18; 10:33), and so the false Messiah sets up the claim that he is the one in whom Jehovah himself comes to his people (Luke 1:17, 76), and who, according to Mal. 3:1, appears in his temple, the highest revelation of God, a consubstantial representative of God.

But the apostle also indicates very clearly why he expects the Antichrist in the false Messiah, when he sees (2:7) the mystery of the ἀνομία already in operation. It surely cannot be that by this the immorality of heathenism is meant,—this is well known to everyone,—but only the Jewish hostility to Christ (1 Thess. 2:15 ff.), which parades itself still under the name of zeal for God and his law, when it persecutes the messengers of the gospel, and is nevertheless in its innermost essence a repudiation of the divine will (revealed in the Messiah). It was, moreover, as we know from the Acts of the Apostles, the Roman judicial power which constantly protected the apostle from the attacks of Jewish fanaticism. But when it came to this, that the final apostasy of Judaism culminated in the epiphany of the false Messiah, and he with the power of Satan overthrew the imperial power of Rome in the person of its representatives, for the purpose of gaining for himself and his people the world power, then indeed a path would be made for Antichristianity to complete the annihilation of Christianity, then would the measure of sin be full, and then the returning of the Messiah must needs bring this career of lawlessness to an end. Thus the apocalyptic combination, so far from being inconceivable in the Pauline time, is

comprehensible only as proceeding from that time, when unbelieving Judaism was still the sole enemy with which the apostle contended in accomplishing his world mission.

The only thing to be urged with plausibility against this interpretation of 2 Thess., chap. 2, which is not only possible but exegetically necessary is that Paul, in Rom. 11:25 f., hopes for a complete restoration of Israel; therefore, it may be urged, he cannot have thought of the Antichrist as being the product of the final apostasy of Judaism. But as these apocalyptic pictures have always historical situations as their background, they must also change with them. Time and hour of Christ's parousia no one knows at all (Mark 13:32); but it is to be expected at any time, and each interpreter must therefore seek to determine from the signs of his own time the form in which the highest personification of the enmity to Christ will appear. Only the end of the days will show which of these personifications is actually the final one. Paul lived long enough to see that unbelieving Judaism was not able to prevent the victorious progress (2 Thess. 3:1) of the gospel throughout heathendom, that quite other forces, within Christianity, threatened its development; and it is one of the most significant signs of the time that in the epistle to the Romans he has returned to the hope of the complete restoration of Israel cherished by the primitive apostles. The same was true of the apostle John. Under the vivid impression of the horrors of a bloody persecution he saw in his apocalypse the personification of the hostility to Christ in a representative of the empire restored after the days of the interregnum. But soon it turned out that this power too was unable to cope with Christianity, mighty in its spirituality, and in his epistles John sees the Antichrist only in the false doctrine which, arising within the Christian church, denied the incarnation of the Son of God (1 John 2:18; 4:3).

### III. THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

The epistle to the Galatians was the Archimedes' fulcrum by means of which the critics of the Tübingen school believed they had overthrown the conception of the conditions of the

apostolic times, handed down from the time of the Acts of the Apostles. It was therefore an act of courage when Steck directed his attack against the genuineness of the epistle, and though the positive arguments which he believed he had found for the spuriousness of the epistle are so weak as to require no detailed discussion, yet he has shown irrefutably that the historical conditions of the epistle to the Galatians have not been determined with sufficient clearness to justify the assurance with which the Tübingen school boasts of its genuineness.

This holds true, to begin with, of the question concerning the founding of the Galatian church. In our day, as is well known, Hausrath has revived, and others have defended, the view first brought forward by Mynster, that the epistle was addressed to churches in Pisidia and Lycaonia, founded on the first missionary journey of the apostle, this region having been, after the death of the last Galatian king, included in the Roman province of Galatia. But the adoption of this view carries with it the assignment of the epistle to a chronological position different from that commonly accepted, and requires us to suppose that in all probability it was written shortly after the beginning of the second missionary tour of the apostle, in any event, quite a long time before the epistles to the Thessalonians. But although Steck maintains that the location of the Galatian churches cannot be determined with certainty, and inclines to the opinion of Hausrath, yet it must be regarded as very improbable that Paul should have addressed the people of Pisidia and Lycaonia as Galatians (Gal. 3:1) because they at that time belonged politically to Galatia. The only argument for this view having even *prima facie* value, namely, that he used this term to gather together under one general name the people of various districts, is an utterly worthless subterfuge; for Paul, who so very rarely addressed his readers by name, was under no necessity of doing so here if he had no fitting collective designation for them. Moreover, the churches founded in company with Barnabas, and before the so-called Jerusalem council, had, without question, a considerable Jewish-Christian element, while the churches to which our epistle was addressed are represented as

essentially Gentile Christian in character. Nevertheless it can be urged with a certain show of truth that although the existence of churches in Galatia proper is presupposed in Acts 18:23, yet of their founding we have no definite knowledge; for, according to Acts 16:6, Paul seems to have traveled through Galatia without stopping; so that the assertion that Gal. 4:13 refers to a stay there, during which these churches were founded, appears by no means to be established.

But this is simply a case in which the flagrant carelessness with which it is customary to treat the statements of the Acts of the Apostles as to the roads which the apostle traveled to Troas is avenged. There is indeed no question that the Acts intends to describe the apostle as going forward, not according to his own plan, but driven by the Spirit, and unable to tarry anywhere in Asia Minor until he reached the seacoast at Troas, where he received the divine intimation which directed him to Macedonia. It is expressly said of Asia and Bithynia that the Spirit prevented him from preaching there, although this was plainly his purpose. But we cannot think of such an intimation of the Spirit being wholly arbitrary; and since Paul later repeatedly emphasizes the fact that it is his principle—his, that is to say, taught him by the Spirit—not to build upon another man's foundation (2 Cor. 10:15 f.; Rom. 15:20), with which also agrees the fact that he regarded it as the peculiar task of his apostolic office to found churches (1 Cor. 3:10), we must infer that apostolic activity in these regions was forbidden him by the Spirit, because there were already churches founded there by the primitive apostles; and this is expressly affirmed by 1 Peter 1:1 with respect to Asia and Bithynia. To be sure this is not admitted by recent critics, nor even by those who acknowledge the first epistle of Peter to be genuine, because they have committed themselves to the opinion that the epistle was written to Gentile-Christian churches in the province of Asia; and yet this can be maintained only by extreme exegetical violence to the address of the epistle. In the entire ancient church it was never questioned that the elect strangers belonging to the dispersion of Asia Minor were Jewish Christians. If it is still insisted that we

have no knowledge of churches in Asia Minor founded by the mother church, this overlooks the fact that outside of the Acts of the Apostles, which, according to its plan, deals only with the Pauline mission, we have no information at all of the extension of Christianity. We know, however, that both the primitive apostles and the brothers of the Lord had actually made missionary journeys (naturally among the dispersion; *cf.* 1 Cor. 9:5); besides which it must be taken into account that the seed of Christianity might often have been scattered from Palestine among the dispersion in other ways than by the direct missionary activity of the apostles themselves.

To be sure 1 Peter 1:1 excludes a Pauline mission in Galatia as truly as one in Asia and Bithynia; but Gal. 4:13 says clearly enough that Paul did not go to Galatia to do there missionary work, but that his stay there when he made known the gospel to the Galatians was occasioned by physical weakness. The intimation given to the apostle by the Spirit can be understood only as meaning that he must not inaugurate his apostolic work where foundations had already been laid; but not in the sense that his mouth must be closed if for other reasons he stopped anywhere. The probability is that, his sickness having made it necessary for him to stay a while in Galatia, he took advantage of this enforced delay to make the gospel known there. Besides, Galatia was surely large enough to give him, even outside of the larger cities in which the Jewish dispersion resided, opportunity for an extended stay and the preaching of the gospel among the Gentile people. It is, to be sure, very remarkable that the Acts of the Apostles does *not* say of Galatia and Phrygia, in which 18:23 doubtless implies that there are Pauline churches, that he was hindered from preaching the gospel there (16:6); but only that he traveled through. But the reason of this is that the writer avoids mentioning the fruit of his labors here, which fell to him only incidentally, in order to represent Macedonia as the real divinely designated goal of his missionary journey.

We must, therefore, still hold that Paul founded the Galatian churches on his second missionary journey, and when he visited them for the second time (Acts 18:23) he found them already

troubled over the question of the law. If he hoped simply by emphatically repudiating all efforts which had for their object to bring them into subjection to the law to protect them against such errors, he must have learned all too soon that his efforts were in vain. After his departure the situation became still more threatening, and the churches were on the point of utter apostasy. Steck is also undoubtedly right in maintaining that these events, as they are represented in our epistle, are difficult to explain if it is genuine; at least they are not made clear by the prevailing conception of the epistle. It is commonly thought that this first trouble of the churches came in through Jewish-Christian agitators, who had come down from Jerusalem. But there is not the least indication of this in the epistle, and in fact it is difficult to explain why these Judaizers should have sought out precisely these purely Gentile-Christian churches in so distant a region, which offered them no vantage ground for their attack.

So far as I know Franke (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1883, I) is the only one who up to the present time has called attention to these difficulties and sought to explain the first perplexity of the churches, though to be sure by a very improbable hypothesis. After what we have established concerning the founding of the Galatian churches there is absolutely no need of any special hypothesis whatsoever to explain this. If there were old-established Jewish-Christian communities in Galatia it was entirely natural that these, who on their side held fast to the law, should seek to induce the young Gentile Christians in their neighborhood likewise to submit themselves to the law. They had nothing to say against the doctrine of salvation preached to the Gentiles and the blessings received through faith. They did not at all enter into a discussion of doctrinal differences, whether of faith and works or of universalism and particularism; their only concern was that the Gentiles should by circumcision and acceptance of the law become Jews, it being impossible from the point of view of Jewish Christians that the Gentile should share in the fullness of salvation promised to Israel except on these conditions. Paul had, however, taught that *all* the salvation

brought by Christ and to be expected from him is obtained through faith alone; and when he found them in a state of unrest in consequence of the requirements which the Jewish Christians urged, and defended apparently on so natural grounds, the apostle, without entering further into the question of divine authority, pronounced an anathema on all who should preach any other gospel, that is, on making salvation dependent on anything else whatsoever than faith.

If, now, one considers the apostle mainly as a dogmatician wholly occupied in maintaining against the primitive apostles certain theses of his, his course in this matter is very strange. When, however, we observe both from the speech at Athens and from the first epistle to the Thessalonians how simple was his preaching of salvation among the Gentiles, how far he was from comparing this with the law and the Jewish claims, then it is easy to conceive that he would certainly not have annoyed the Galatians with a discussion of questions which it was difficult to make perfectly clear to them, and that he simply pointed out to them the fact that the gospel which deviates from that brought to them by their apostle was *eo ipso* worthy to be anathematized. Certainly he did not accomplish his object, but almost the very opposite. And at this point, even Franke believes, there must be assumed an interference by Judaistic emissaries from Jerusalem, who caused the change in the churches. But the epistle contradicts this most decidedly, unless 5 : 10 be misinterpreted in the most absurd way. How can Paul ask who has bewitched them (3 : 1), if it was perfectly evident that it was those emissaries? On the contrary, it is entirely clear (4 : 17 f.) that the same people now court them as formerly did so during his presence among them. In fact there need not have been any direct interference on the part of such Jewish agitators; but because Paul had based his repudiation of the Jewish-Christian demand solely on his apostolic authority, it was obvious to ask whence he then had that authority. He could have received it, it would be said, only from the primitive apostles, who themselves held to the law and the promise given to Israel; and if he preached a gospel which refused to recognize these, then, it

was claimed, he changed the original message of salvation while they with their demands remained true to it. Thus, therefore, Paul was forced after all to discuss the question of the law and to prove the divine origin of his gospel. If he had received it, not from the primitive apostles, but through an immediate revelation (chap. 1); if the primitive apostles themselves acknowledged that he had been entrusted with this gospel to the Gentiles; and if he had vindicated it successfully even against Peter (chap. 2), then it was only necessary for him incidentally to refute the allegation that he had received his apostleship solely from the primitive apostles (1:1), for he had been called by God himself to the apostleship to the Gentiles (1:15). There is, moreover, not the slightest intimation that he is reminding them only of things which he had long ago told them, or that he is correcting misrepresentation. On the contrary he now for the first time relates to them these historical events, certainly not in order to defend his apostolic dignity, as is still supposed by many, but in order to prove the divine origin of his gospel, with the preaching of which he had been entrusted by God alone, and not by man.

The same is true of the whole subsequent doctrinal section. The apostle's purpose is not to defend his doctrine of justification, as is so often assumed, but to show how the claim that the promised salvation is secured only through subjection to the law completely destroys the foundation of his doctrine of salvation, which bases justification, adoption, and the inheritance of full salvation upon faith in redemption through Christ alone; the whole Christian dispensation of grace is denied if the salvation promised in it is dependent upon any human work whatever; and in confirmation of this he appeals to their own Christian experience (3:1–5). He does not fail also to show how the freedom from the law, which accordingly is to be steadfastly maintained, does not permit continuance in sin, but only secures in a new way the fulfillment of the will of God revealed in the law, through the working of the Spirit given to them. Surely if he preached these same doctrines from the beginning, Steck is quite right in saying that it is entirely inconceivable how his letter could at one stroke have effected what his preach-

ing had failed to accomplish. But the historical significance of the epistle to the Galatians consists precisely in the fact that here for the first time the apostle was under the necessity of exposing with all logical acumen the perilous and subversive character of the seemingly so well founded demand made by the Judaists, and of proving that the Old Testament itself bears witness not for but against this demand.

It is remarkable how radical criticism, which controverts the genuineness of the epistle to the Galatians, has only served to bring the Acts of the Apostles back again to a place of honor. Steck shows how the assumption of the Tübingen school, that the Acts, in the interest of its "tendency," misrepresents the historical events which Paul discusses (Gal., chaps. 1, 2) is thoroughly untenable. Granted that the Acts was insufficiently informed on many points concerning the early career of Paul, granted that, in accordance with the pragmatism that dominates it, it has represented some things in a one-sided and therefore incomplete way, yet in estimating its variations from the account given by Paul it must not be overlooked that Paul also presents these historical events only from a certain historical point of view, and touches only on those points which he can use to break the force of the charges which had been made against him. If it be regarded as entirely impossible that Paul should fail to mention to the Galatians the restrictions which, according to Acts, chap. 15, were imposed upon the Gentile Christians, it does not follow that the Acts of the Apostles has invented these things, but at most that it has erroneously combined the transactions of Paul with the primitive apostles, of which Gal., chap. 2, gives an account, with transactions within the primitive church, of which its sources treated; on which sources Acts, chap. 15, is clearly enough based.

Still another point is made clear by Steck which is of great significance for the criticism of the Pauline epistles. To be sure the view that the law (3:19) is degraded and belittled as an imperfect institution given by angels rests upon a wholly untenable exegesis. But so much is correct, that this statement about the law recurs nowhere else in the Pauline epistles. And if only

that is to be accepted as Pauline for which there are analogies in the other principal epistles of Paul, then the same considerations which are urged against other shorter epistles of Paul may also be urged against the epistle to the Galatians. And this argument may be applied in still another direction. The epistle to the Galatians has recently been explained as the latest of the Pauline epistles, because here the antithesis between Paulinism and Judaism is at its sharpest (*cf.* C. Clemen, *Die Chronologie der paulinischen Briefe*, Halle, 1893), whereas on the contrary nothing is more natural than that in the apostle's first daring effort to show the incompatibility of the Jewish claims with his doctrine of salvation he should express this antithesis as sharply as possible, even if later he found reason to modify it.

It is remarkable how little it has been observed that the chief differences between our epistle and the later ones pertain to quite a different matter. Steck has very correctly seen that here Judaism is in a certain sense put upon the same level with heathenism, though not, to be sure, in the way in which he, following the current misinterpretation of στοιχεῖα, maintains, but as a rudimentary religion such as we should look for at an early stage in the development of mankind. But what is surprising in this is not his judgment of Judaism, which he has all along regarded as the preparatory step in the economy of salvation, but his judgment of heathenism. If it be observed how in Rom., chap. 1, he sees in the present condition of the heathen world the judgment of divine wrath on the original apostasy of heathenism from primitive religion, how he in the first epistle to the Corinthians sees in heathenism an abandonment to the demoniacal powers (10:20; 12:2), it must be admitted that this estimate of heathenism is certainly wholly different from that expressed in the epistle to the Galatians. If one is unwilling to assume a development in the views of Paul, but feels compelled to ascribe to the apostle a fixed and permanent dogmatic system, then there must be admitted the spuriousness either of the epistle to the Galatians or of the principal letters which follow it. But indeed neither of these positions is held by recent criticism. And so the fact of the genuineness of the epistle, which the attacks of

radical criticism have only served to establish more firmly, leads, if we take occasion from these attacks to make a fresh investigation of the circumstances that gave rise to the epistle, simply to a revision of the general principles on which all recent criticism works.

### IV. THE EPISTLES TO THE CORINTHIANS.

The first epistle to the Corinthians, similar in this respect to the epistles to the Thessalonians, contains the guaranty of its genuineness in the fact that in it there is presented to us a picture of this the first church founded on Greek soil, which shows most vividly all the excellencies and all the weaknesses of the Hellenic character. Hence church meetings with their wealth of spiritual gifts, of which vanity and the passion for pre-eminence took advantage for their own ends, leading to strife over the superiority of the various gifts, in which even the Lord's Supper itself was profaned by the existence of cliques and gluttony. Hence also the fondness of the Corinthian Christians for going to law, and for associating with their unbelieving countrymen by which they were continually entangled again in the old Gentile sins of the luxurious commercial metropolis. Hence also the inclination in the face of the mockery of their fellow-men to sacrifice even the belief in the resurrection; above all, the excessive party spirit which engendered strife over the boasted merits of the various teachers. But Steck is right in maintaining that just in this matter the real state of affairs is far from having been sufficiently cleared up to enable us to arrive at a full historical understanding of the epistle. Even the opinion that we have to do here with various parties within the church is by no means dead, and cannot be refuted so long as one fails to recognize that the so-called "Petrinists" (1 Cor. 1 : 13) were really pupils of Peter who had been converted under his preaching. This presupposes, to be sure, that Peter had at some time come to Corinth in the course of his missionary journeys. I have always maintained that the account given by Dionysius of Corinth of a ministry of Peter in that city had, in spite of its rhetorical exaggerations, an historical reminiscence as its basis,

and Harnack has recently unequivocally acknowledged the very great probability of this view.

But the so-called Christ party is, as it always has been, the chief crux of the exegetes, and of late they are disposed, despairing of its solution, to get rid of it altogether by exegetical or critical expedients. The older theories about this party, to be sure, being without foundation and mutually contradictory, accomplished nothing. But Baur years ago pointed out the only right way when he combined the party cry of certain people who said of themselves: ἐγώ [εἰμι] Χριστοῦ (1:22), with 2 Cor. 10:17. It is also being recognized more and more nowadays that according to the analogy of the party cries of the other parties this can be put into the mouth of such only as were personal disciples of Christ or pretended to be. But while Baur regarded them as a party who stood for the primitive apostles in opposition to Paul, Holsten admitted that the ψευδαπόστολοι and ὑπερλίαν ἀπόστολοι whom Paul combated were, according to the context, not the original apostles, but the members of this Christ party, who on the ground of their relationship to Christ as against Paul made the claim that they were the only true apostles; and consequently they who made this their cry were not members of the Christian church, but the agitators who had come to the church from Jerusalem. Paul does not at all say (1:11 f.) that there were four parties in Corinth, but that disputes were there in which each one boasted of his special teacher; and that he meant to include with the three others the party cry of the Christ party as one that greatly aggravated and embittered the conflict of parties is made incontestably clear by the fact that at the close of the section directed against these parties he deals also with those τινές who boasted that when such people as they had appeared in Corinth Paul would not venture to come again to Corinth (4:18; *cf.* vs. 6). To be sure we gain our first definite knowledge of these people only from the second epistle, but it would have been very shortsighted of Paul to have begun his polemic against them before they had disclosed their ultimate aim and their resources for accomplishing it (yet *cf.* 9:1 f.).

But above all Steck is to a certain extent right in maintain-

ing that there still remains much to be done for the elucidation of the meaning of the second epistle and of its relation to the first before we shall have a firm basis for the proof of the genuineness of our epistle. And at this point the criticism which proceeds on the basis of the genuineness of the epistle has found itself becoming entangled in a maze from which there appears no way of escape except that of radical criticism. Bleek was satisfied to assume a lost letter between the two that we have, which Paul had sent by the hand of Titus and to which our second epistle refers. That was indeed in itself not an impossible view, since 1 Cor. 5 : 9 also undoubtedly refers to a letter now lost, sent before our first; but it was unfortunate that the controversy over this question should immediately be connected with the question whether 2 Cor. 2 : 5–10; 7 : 12 refer to the affair treated in First Corinthians or to an affront to the apostle, *i. e.*, in the person of his messenger, which was offered on the occasion of the visit of Titus to Corinth; on this question the various defenders of the hypothesis of an intermediate letter have not been able to agree. Furthermore there was a growing inclination to place the second visit of the apostle to Corinth, presupposed in the second epistle, between the first and second letters, rather than before our first epistle, as was generally held formerly, and is still maintained by many of the defenders of the intermediate letter, *e. g.*, Schmiedel. But Schmiedel himself, who in the introduction to his exposition of the epistle in Holtzmann's *Hand-Commentar zum Neuen Testament* has with great acuteness made a thorough examination of every hypothesis that has been proposed, recognized the difficulties which beset this theory of an intermediate letter, and was compelled, reviving an old view, to assume still another visit of Titus to Corinth with a letter from the apostle; so that there were two epistles between our first and second, both of which have been lost.

Finally, the complication of this hypothesis reached its highest point with Hausrath, who believed that he had found in the last four chapters of the second epistle to the Corinthians the intermediate letter so commonly assumed; in which

conjecture Schmiedel has recently followed him with great positiveness, while other defenders of the intermediate letter protest emphatically against this opinion. This was the signal for a general attempt to dissect our second epistle. Even earlier some had declared the section 6:14—7:1 to be spurious, while others thought they could discover in it the epistle written before our first. Now it was proposed to find also in chaps. 8 and 9 fragments of the two intermediate letters. Finally Halmet thought he could extract from our epistle still another epistle of four chapters, 2:14—6:10, which was written later than the first (chaps. 10—13); so that only a very small part of our epistle still remained. Again criticism has lost itself in a labyrinth of hypotheses, out of which there is no escape. For it is clear that simply by newly arranging these epistles or epistolary fragments and journeys or missions an equal number of new hypotheses can with a little acuteness be set up against those already advanced, with just as good or just as bad a foundation as they. We have here the same great fault of our modern criticism that is manifest in other fields also, *e.g.*, in the criticism of the Acts of the Apostles and of the Apocalypse, viz., that it transgresses the boundaries of the scientifically demonstrable, and confounds the products of fancy with scientifically established results. Had the facts been as any one of these hypotheses assumes, it would have been impossible to ascertain them with scientific exactness. An hypothesis is justifiable only when the documents in hand imperatively demand it. That this is not the case is shown by the fact that every hypothesis requires a new supplementary hypothesis to make it conceivable. Even Holtzmann has said that the close relationship of the second epistle to the first must always make it doubtful whether the interlacing and mutually contradictory hypotheses of unrecorded journeys and lost letters, which of necessity extend the interval between the two existing letters, can be substantiated. We are thus driven to inquire whether after all it is not better to reject all these hypotheses and return to the view that the second epistle to the Corinthians was written shortly after the first.

What originally suggested the idea of a journey of the apostle

to Corinth between the first and second letters to the Corinthians was the fact that in the second epistle the visit to Corinth which he was about to make is designated as the third, from which it follows that in addition to the stay of a year and one-half (Acts 18:11), during which he founded the church, he must also have made another visit before writing the second letter. This visit, it has been supposed, must have taken place *after* our first epistle, since the latter does not mention it at all. But this opinion is by no means necessary. If this visit preceded the letter ,mentioned in 1 Cor. 5:9, the things which he observed on that visit — perhaps only a brief one — were doubtless discussed in that letter, and called for no further treatment in our first epistle. But if now there really *was* such a visit before this lost letter, 1 Cor. 16:7 refers to it, and shows explicitly that it must have been only a flying visit (ἐν παρόδῳ). In any case, in order to explain the insinuations referred to in 2 Cor. 10:10, we must suppose that Paul on occasion of a visit to Corinth had had some sad experiences, that at that time he had dealt leniently with them, being reluctant to adopt strenuous measures (probably because he had recently learned by his experience in Galatia how little was effected by a harsh treatment of his churches), and that it was only in a letter written after this visit that he recommended stern measures against certain persons. If these events had happened in the time between our first and second epistles, we should have to suppose that it was the efforts of the Judaizers with which he was concerned, since it was they who at that time were making the apostle the most trouble. What he actually had to deal with, however, according to 2 Cor. 12:21; 13:2, was the sins of sensuality, as was also the case in the letter mentioned in 1 Cor. 5:9; and in this letter we know for certain that he pronounced the severest sentence of church discipline upon the fornicators within the church, as he had previously done upon the pious busybodies at Thessalonica. The visit therefore not only *may* have been, but *must* have been, *before* the lost letter, and with this the whole theory of a visit between our two letters falls to the ground.

The main argument for the hypothesis of a lost letter

between our two epistles has been the remarkable circumstance that, according to 1 Cor. 4:17, Paul sent Timothy to Corinth and that, although he is with him again when Second Corinthians is written (2 Cor. 1:1), not a word is said of any news brought by him; that, on the other hand (2 Cor. 2:12), Paul expects Titus with the report from Corinth concerning the result of his letter, and that he (7:5 ff.) in fact meets him in Macedonia with the news for which he was waiting. Inasmuch as all former attempts to explain these facts were evidently unsuccessful, it seemed as if it would be really necessary to adopt the hypothesis that Paul, on receipt of the news brought by Timothy, sent to Corinth by the hand of Titus another letter which is no longer extant. It is remarkable, however, that just at the time at which, according to 1 Cor., chap. 4, Timothy was despatched to Corinth the Acts of the Apostles (19:22) mentions only a journey to Macedonia. Still more remarkable is it that in 1 Cor. 16:10 Paul speaks of Timothy's coming as a possibility only (ἐὰν δὲ ἔλθῃ), although in 4:17 he had spoken of it quite positively. This can be explained only on the supposition that while the apostle was writing the first letter to the Corinthians the doubt arose in his mind whether it was desirable that Timothy should go to Corinth just at that time; accordingly he sent another messenger, perhaps Erastus (Acts 19:22), to overtake Timothy on his way through Macedonia in order to recall him; but that, not knowing whether Erastus would really find him, he expresses great anxiety as to the result in case Timothy should actually get to Corinth—an anxiety of which 4:14–17 shows no trace whatever. Between the departure of Timothy, therefore, which was occasioned by the news received from the household of Chloe concerning the existence of factions in Corinth, and his recall as implied in 16:10 something must have happened which created doubt in the mind of the apostle whether this mission of Timothy could still be successful or whether it was now at all expedient. This must have been the arrival of the delegation from Corinth (1 Cor. 16:17), with the letter from the church (7:1); in consequence of which that which he himself wrote in reference to the news which they brought and in reply to the letter of the

church (constituting the latter part of our First Corinthians), being carried by Titus directly to Corinth, would certainly arrive there in advance of Timothy's arrival. By this letter the commission given to Timothy had manifestly been rendered inopportune; and it would have been very unfortunate if Timothy had come to Corinth without knowing the contents of the letter or what Paul had learned in the meantime from the Corinthian delegation. The message to Timothy bidding him return which was thus made necessary in fact overtook him in Macedonia, and this explains perfectly why we find Timothy with the apostle, and why he was expecting Titus with news concerning the result of his letter, and renders unnecessary the hypothesis of an intermediate letter. It has also been justly said that if Timothy had actually reached Corinth he would certainly have been mentioned along with Titus in 12:18.

It has indeed been maintained that the references in Second Corinthians to a recently written letter do not fit our First Corinthians, and that for this reason we must assume an intermediate letter. But this by no means follows from the animadversions against him to the effect that he was always commending and praising himself, since the way in which he repeatedly appeals in the first epistle to his own example and speaks of his apostolic prerogatives, activities, and success might easily furnish his malicious opponents occasion for their attacks. Indeed, 2 Cor. 1:12 seems to refer directly to 1 Cor. 2:4 f. It must be admitted, however, that the apostle's great distress of mind over the result of his former epistle (2 Cor. 2:13; 7:5), and his expression concerning the state of mind in which he wrote it (2:14), is at first sight somewhat surprising if the reference is to our first epistle. But this is so only in case we concentrate our attention on the calm doctrinal discussions of the first epistle, to which of course these expressions do not refer. It is easy to overlook the cutting severity and the exceeding bitterness of tone which permeates all the polemical portion of the first epistle. Evidently the severity with which he dealt with the case of incest (1 Cor., chap. 5) would be most keenly felt in Corinth, as he himself was aware, and he refers to precisely this

matter in 2:5 f. in connection with what he says in 2:4 about the grief with which he wrote and the love he bore them. But it is surprising how startlingly in 1 Cor. 4:7–15 also the calm discussion is succeeded by an outburst of profound indignation over the empty pride and complacent self-satisfaction of the Corinthians, although severe expressions have already interrupted this discussion in passages like 3:1–4, 16–18; 4:3. And it is easy to conceive that he feared that in other passages also the church would miss the affectionate tone of their spiritual father, and that it was not easy for him to reproach them so severely as in this letter he was compelled repeatedly to do.

But these hypotheses of intermediate letters and intermediate journeys are not only unnecessary but untenable, since the second letter is connected in the closest possible way with the first. When Paul wrote the first letter he intended (16:5, 8) to make a journey through Asia to Macedonia; in the second letter he is carrying out this intention, going by way of Troas (2:8, 12 f.). According to 2 Cor. 1:15 f. the church at Corinth had been offended with him, misinterpreting his action in going directly to Macedonia and not, according to the promise he had made in a previous letter (see 2 Cor. 2:13) to Macedonia by way of Corinth, and then from Macedonia back to Corinth for a second visit. When and where he had made this promise we do not know; probably in the lost letter preceding our first. So much, however, is certain, that when he wrote 1 Cor. 16:5 he had already made this change in his plans, and in that passage informs them of the change. For the seemingly tautological repetition of διέρχομαι (1 Cor. 16:5) has no significance whatever unless he intended by it to emphasize the fact that he was not coming to them as his former promises had given them reason to expect, but was on the point of starting immediately for Macedonia. The only reason he gives for this is that he does not wish at this time to make them a merely passing visit as he had done before. The Corinthians themselves could not but see that after writing this letter it would be impossible for him to come to them without entering into a full discussion of many questions at issue between them. The deeper

reason he could not, of course, state in this letter; but now that the Corinthians had so outrageously misconstrued his change of plan, he is compelled to state it (2 Cor. 1:23; 2:1 ff.). Even in the first letter (1 Cor. 4:18) he had intimated that if he came before they had thoroughly reformed he should be obliged to resort to strenuous measures, and this, for his sake as well as for theirs, he was extremely reluctant to do. It was for this reason that he wrote instead of coming, hoping that the result of his letter would be that he would be able to come to them again with joy and not with sorrow.

If, then, the second letter is so closely connected with the first in subject-matter, intermediate journeys and letters are absolutely excluded. Moreover, the interruption of his discussion of his reasons for going directly to Macedonia instead of to Corinth (2:5–11) is utterly inexplicable unless his object was, in connection with vss. 3 and 4, to point out that he had in fact acted wisely in writing, since as a result of his letter the matter which had caused him most sorrow, and in which he had been compelled to cause them sorrow, was now happily disposed of. In this connection the matter referred to must be something discussed in the first letter. And the repeated expression ὁ τοιοῦτος (2:6 f.) refers as if by express intention to 1 Cor. 5:5, just as in 2 Cor. 7:12, where he is also speaking of the good result of their temporary sorrow which he had been obliged to cause them, he refers to the ἀδικήσας and the ἀδικηθείς. Here he must certainly be speaking not of an insult to himself or his messenger, but of the case of incest, and what he says is again closely connected not with any discussion of this matter in a lost letter, but with 1 Cor., chap. 5. In that passage he had said that he would have preferred to deliver such an one unto Satan. But inasmuch as he would not do this unless the church would fully concur with him in this sentence, and the church had shown itself far too lax and indifferent in this unhappy matter, he had contented himself with imperatively demanding the exclusion of the offender from the church. The majority of the church has inflicted this punishment (2 Cor. 2:6), and if now they are willing to pardon the penitent offender, he will not insist upon the minority's concurring

in the sentence, but expressly requests, for reasons that he sets forth, that the offender shall be restored to the church, this evidence of the obedience of the church, as such, being satisfactory to him (2:8 f.). If the explanation of the apparent interruption in 2:5–11 is correct, then it is clear how appropriately 2:12 ff. joins on to 2:4. The figurative expression, 2:14, has often been misunderstood. What it really means is simply that in the particular case mentioned in vss. 5–11 God has once more triumphed over him, inasmuch as by the news which Titus has brought concerning the success of his letter he has proved that all his anxiety had been wholly superfluous. Accordingly he brings the introductory thanksgiving of his letter (1:3—2:16) to a speedy conclusion and with 3:17 passes over to the great apologetic section of the first part of the letter (3:1—6:13). But there is no reason to regard even 6:14—7:1 as an irrelevant interpolation. The chief defects of the church, which were due to too intimate intercourse with their unbelieving countrymen, could not be corrected at one stroke, however good the effect of his letter. Accordingly he begins the hortatory portion with a renewed warning against all fellowship with heathenism; but in order to guard against their again misunderstanding him and supposing that he was overlooking the fact that they had made a good beginning in their reformation, he speaks in chap. 7 at length of the news which Titus had brought, and closes with an expression of the joy and good courage which he again has with reference to the church (7:16). He then passes to the matter of the collection for the saints, about which he has much to say to the church. This interpretation of the course of thought in chap. 7, and the continuity of the admonitions in chaps. 8 and 9, I have set forth at length in my *Erläuterungen*, already referred to. If anyone is surprised that the apostle adopts so different a tone in the third part of the letter (10:1—12:18), this is because it is overlooked that here the apostle is settling accounts with his Judaizing opponents and that he is dealing with the church only in so far as they have allowed these miserable agitators to impose themselves upon them. On the other hand, in the concluding exhortation (12:19—13:10), he turns his

attention again to those individuals who had not yet really repented, warning them not to compel him to use his divinely given authority if he should now come.

There is, accordingly, no more occasion to break up this letter into several pieces, written at different times, than to adopt the hypothesis of lost letters written between our First and Second Corinthians, which necessarily calls in question the genuineness of both letters, inasmuch as they involve the view that as these letters stand they cannot be explained as the product of a clearly defined situation.

### V. THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

The question concerning the constituent elements of the church at Rome to which Paul wrote may now be considered as finally settled by the history of modern criticism. Baur, feeling himself compelled in the interest of his conception of the letter to maintain the Jewish-Christian character of the church, endeavored to disprove the traditional view that it was composed essentially of Gentile Christians. His view was shared by many, even outside of his school, as for instance by Mangold, who attempted to elaborate this view in a special treatise (1866). In 1876 Holtzmann was able to assert with a certain semblance of truth that, as a result of modern investigation, the traditional view had been abandoned. But that very same year Weizsäcker protested in the *Jahrbuch für deutsche Theologie* against the modern view, and proved with the old arguments how indisputable the fact was that Paul conceived of his readers as Gentile Christians. From that time the tide began to move in the opposite direction; in vain did Mangold attempt once more in an entirely revised edition of his book (1884) to defend the thesis of Baur. Strangely enough there is an inclination, especially in the school of Hofmann, to take up that view again. But, as in the case of Baur, this is merely the result of a special tendency, although a tendency in quite another direction. How complete a victory the traditional view has gained, issuing from the prolonged conflict freshly established, is manifest from the embarrassment of Holtzmann in attempting to escape from the

difficulty by asserting that Paul himself would not have been able to answer satisfactorily the question concerning the proportions of the constituent elements of the church at Rome. That is not the question at all. For Paul must have known whether he conceived of the readers to whom he wrote as Jewish or as Gentile Christians.

Steck is wholly in error when, in order to show that the epistle to the Romans is also a patchwork made up from different treatises of the Pauline school, he asserts that at least the portion from 1:16—8:39 presupposes that the minds of the readers are still in bondage to Jewish Christianity. Even in 3:27–30 Paul argues from premises which would be unhesitatingly accepted only by Pauline Gentile Christians; in 4:16 he includes the readers with himself and his people in the *πάντων ἡμῶν* in order to imply that Abraham was the father both of Jewish and Gentile Christians. Since the type of doctrine which the readers have been divinely led to accept (6:16, 17) is shown by the connection to be that which is characterized in vs. 14 f. by the words *οὐχ ὑπὸ νόμον ἀλλὰ ὑπὸ χάριν εἶναι*, and since their past is also expressly characterized (vs. 19) by subjection to *ἀκαθαρσίᾳ καὶ ἀνομίᾳ*, it is evident that these readers are Pauline Gentile Christians. Beyschlag, to be sure, still claims on the ground of 7:1–6 that the church was composed of those who had been Jewish proselytes. But the anarthrous use of the word "law" and the whole connection show that the readers in 7:1 are not designated as persons acquainted with "*the* law" (though even Gentile Christians had become acquainted with it, according to Gal. 4:21, through the reading of the Old Testament in the meetings of the congregation), but as knowing *law*. It was, as also the epistle to the Galatians shows, just as important to prove that the Gentile Christians were free from law as such as that the Jewish Christians were so; since the Gentiles in becoming converted to the God of Israel would evidently be subject to his law *if* the obligation to render such obedience had not been removed for the Jews as well as for the Gentiles. The passage 7:5 f., however, does not by any means show that the readers have been subject with the apostle to the

law, but only means that both are, by their common deliverance from the law, free from its power to stir up in them the old sinful passions again and again.

But Steck is right in saying that no one has as yet sufficiently explained what purpose the doctrinal expositions of the epistle to the Romans have as addressed to Gentile Christians. Just because he considered them as polemical, directed against Judaizing tendencies, Baur was compelled to consider the readers as Jewish Christians. No matter how much the opposition which Paul has in view is reduced, whether one looks for it with Mangold among the Jewish Christians or with the majority of critics among the Roman Gentile Christians, who are supposed not to have reached as yet the height of Pauline knowledge, the idea that he is conducting a polemic against the views held by them, or is seeking to rectify their views, is in manifest contradiction to the full approval of their spiritual condition (1 : 12), which would become thereby an insincere *captatio benevolentiæ*, and with the definite implication in 15 : 14 f. that they share his knowledge and need only to be reminded of it. Every view which holds that the purpose of the letter is to reconcile opposing elements in the church, as is maintained by the later Tübingen school, men like Volkmar, Holsten, and Pfleiderer, is disproved by the fact that the Jewish Christians can have formed only a very small percentage of the church, and that at the only point where this opposition becomes conspicuous in the church (15 : 8 f.) the matter is a practical controversy over a very specific matter the treatment of which in chapter 14 excludes any far-reaching doctrinal difference. On the other side, in opposition to the very plausible view concerning the epistle defended recently by Weizsäcker, Grafe, and Jülicher, according to which the epistle aims to protect the church against invading Judaism, Steck has shown that, except in 3 : 8, there is in the whole epistle not a trace of an anti-Judaistic polemic, such as appears, for example, in the second epistle to the Corinthians. He might have added that Weizsäcker himself admits that we do not know that this reproach (Rom. 3 : 8) was ever brought against Paul by the Judaizers. It must be conceded, therefore,

that the polemical statements of the epistle cannot be explained by any immediate exigencies of the church at Rome. This is fully confirmed if we do not look at these statements from the point of view of a preconceived opinion concerning the purpose of the epistle, but ask ourselves the question whether they really can be regarded as attacks upon Judaistic errors in any form.

None of the theories concerning the purpose of the epistle to the Romans thus far proposed has succeeded in showing how the exposition of the punitive judgment of God upon the heathen world in chap. 1 stands related to the purpose which these theories attribute to the apostle. When, however, Paul in 2:1—3:20 sets forth that the Jews are also subject to this judgment of wrath in spite of their possessing the law and being circumcised, since the opportunity which they by their unfaithfulness furnished to God to exhibit his faithfulness in a yet clearer light cannot secure impunity for them; and, further, that the Old Testament teaching concerning universal sinfulness has reference to them also; it is clear that this portion of the letter cannot be directed against the Jewish-Christian position, since no Jewish Christian ever denied that the Jews, if they do not fulfill the law of which they boast and if their circumcision is not accompanied by that of the heart, are likewise subject to the judgment of God. And yet it is precisely in this part of the epistle that the apostle's dialectical method is most marked—a method which conveys the impression that he is establishing his position first of all in the controversy with the Jews. Without a trace of polemic the apostle proceeds then to show in 3:21—4:25 that it is only the gospel of justification by faith that can satisfy the religious needs of man, inasmuch as it excludes all self-righteousness and is equally available for both Jews and Gentiles; and, further, that this justification by faith had in both these respects a prototype in the history of Abraham. When he proves, however, in chap. 5 in a doctrinal and historical exposition that with this righteousness was given also life, *i. e.*, the completion of salvation, he has just arrived at the point on which he differed most sharply with the Judaizers; still there is no reference to their conception that the promises given to the

people of Israel could be shared only by those who have become incorporated with them by submitting to the law and circumcision.

The following section (6:1 ff.) might perhaps under stress be interpreted as an attempt on Paul's part to guard against the reproach that his doctrine of justification by faith would lead men to continue in sin. But in that case the paragraph is introduced in a very unskillful way by the harshest expression of the power of the law to increase sin (5:20, 21). The proof, however, in chap. 6, that in baptism a new life had already been established, which would necessarily lead to freedom from sin and to the service of righteousness, develops in a purely theoretical manner the consequences of the apostle's doctrine of grace. Even such a practical application as occurs in 6:12 ff. is not intended to correct Judaistic misconceptions, but is rather a moral exhortation addressed to the Gentile Christians. Finally, the exposition concerning the deliverance of the Christian from the law, in chap. 7, does not follow the mode of argument employed by the epistle to the Galatians, in which the apostle demonstrably deals with Judaistic opponents, but is based upon his own experience under the law from which he has learned that the law cannot overcome, but only stimulate, sin; thus it is proved that a new principle is absolutely necessary for the conquest of the power of sin in man. That the spirit given to us through our vital communion with Christ is this principle is clearly stated in chap. 8, but immediately the apostle turns to the exhortation that the Christians should surrender themselves to this spirit in all the affairs of life, and should find in it the pledge of the completion of salvation, the certainty of which he sees, finally, in the election and calling of those who have been justified.

It is an old opinion that Paul speaks of his mission to the Gentiles in chaps. 9–11, and justifies it over against Judaizing prejudices. The problem which occupies him here is, however, merely the question which, because of his affection for his nation—here again so vividly and repeatedly expressed, *e. g.*, 9:1–5 and 10:1—moves him deeply: What is the reason that notwithstanding the promises made in the first instance to Israel the majority of

the people of Israel have not obtained the salvation which was promised to them primarily? For no Jewish Christian ever considered it an injustice that God chose Isaac rather than Ishmael, and Jacob rather than Esau, or that he hardened Pharaoh; and still here also in the treatment of the subject Paul's peculiar dialectic method appears most vividly. If Paul emphasizes strongly the absolute freedom of God, which is displayed in ruling over the creatures of his power, he certainly has in mind first of all the expressions of unbelieving Jews; but over against this he at once states in 9:22 ff. the real condition of things, according to which God has endured the vessels which have become subject to his wrath with great patience, and has put off his final judgment in order to make room for the calling of the Gentiles, promised already in the Old Testament. He proceeds to show that the unbelieving Jews have themselves brought this fate upon themselves, by committing the unpardonable sin of unbelief which determines their fate (9:30—10:21). Did a Jewish Christian ever doubt this? If, consequently, the majority of Israel is hardened at present and only a remnant is saved, as even the prophets had foreseen (11:1–10), Paul has nevertheless come back to the belief that in the wonderful grace of God all Israel may finally be saved as a nation (11:25–36). And when he inserts here a practical application, it is not one intended to refute some Jewish-Christian error, but to warn the Gentile Christians not to boast, but rather to endeavor, by continuing in the grace of God through faith, to escape being themselves cast away. How little, however, these digressions of the epistle are intended to meet special needs of the church at Rome may be seen also from the hortatory part in which Paul develops the whole series of Christian duties in an entirely theoretical fashion, and only in chap. 14 takes up a special matter concerning which there had been some controversy in Rome.

It is, indeed, asserted that the epistle to the Romans could not be explained historically, and that it would be without any analogy whatsoever among the Pauline epistles, if it were not occasioned by existing defects and errors of the church at Rome. But on any theory this epistle holds a unique position

among the Pauline letters and the historical occasion may very well have been in the personal experiences of the apostle. We must remember that Paul stood at an important turning point of his life, since, having finished his work in the Orient, he was now looking for a new field of activity in the Occident. Just after the victorious completion of the controversy with his Judaistic opponents in Galatia and Corinth, it must have been a necessity for the apostle, having now learned to appreciate better what was defensible in the position of his opponents, to sum up the whole matter. And this he did, following his natural impulse as a writer, and formulating in a comprehensive treatise his doctrine of salvation, setting forth its points of agreement with the revelation of God in the Old Testament and with the claims which the children of Israel have, owing to their peculiar position in the history of the kingdom of God. The reason why he did this in the form of an epistle to the church at Rome was partly that this was about the only form in which he was accustomed to exercise his ability as a writer, and partly that just at this time he had occasion to announce to *this* church his intention to visit them.

He had long ago recognized the importance of the church in the world's capital (1 : 8), and it must have been a matter of importance to him to induce this church to receive and transmit a conception of his message of salvation adapted to end forever the controversy between Jewish and Gentile Christians, and which he was just then engaged in allaying by his journey to the mother church at Jerusalem for the purpose of delivering a collection from the churches. If he had in view with this matter an immediately practical purpose it could only be this, to enable the church at Rome, where Christianity and Judaism were both seeking to win for themselves the Gentile already yearning after monotheism, to answer all the claims and meet all the objections of Judaism. Let us remember, however, that he was just at that time seriously threatened by hostile Jews (15 : 31), and we shall at once see that the thought must have come to him that this epistle might be his legacy to the church and through it to all Christendom.

Baur's rejection of chapters 15 and 16 as not genuine was perfectly comprehensible from his point of view, since this section too directly contradicted his views concerning the anti-Judaism of Paul (*cf.* 15 : 8), the Jewish-Christian character of the church at Rome (*cf.* 15 : 14 ff.) and the unhistorical character of the Acts in those passages which tell of the first activity of Paul in Jerusalem (*cf.* 15 : 9). That Marcion, who also of necessity objected strongly to 15 : 8, did not have this section in his *Apostolos* does not concern us here, if we remember how he adapted the epistles to the necessities of his theory; and Baur's other reasons for rejecting the section were artificial and far fetched. Even writers as early as Lucht and Volkmar attempted, therefore, to extract from these two chapters the genuine conclusion which had been worked over later with an irenical tendency because it sounded too harsh; while genuine Tübingenists, like Hilgenfeld and Pfleiderer, and with them the majority of the other more recent critics, continued to defend their genuineness in spite of Baur. Since Mangold's refutation, which, with indefatigable industry, follows criticism into all its detailed objections, this position of Baur may also be regarded as superseded. Only the spuriousness of the doxology (16 : 25–27) has been maintained by many defenders of the remainder of the two chapters. The only reason that can be given for this view with any semblance of truth is that in some manuscripts the doxology is found at the end of chap. 14, in others is in both places, and in still others is missing entirely. But this fact is most probably the result of the omission of the concluding chapters in Marcion. If one does not consider this omission of any importance, the reason for the spuriousness of the closing doxology is removed also; if one, however, maintains this reason it is necessary in consistency to return to the position, now fortunately superseded, of doubting the genuineness of both of the concluding chapters. For the internal evidence against the genuineness of the closing doxology is at best weak. It is usually, with Holtzmann, attributed to the *auctor ad Ephesios.* Those who regard the apostle as the author of the epistle to the Ephesians can consequently make no objection to it here.

An entirely different question which has nothing to do with the genuineness of the Pauline epistles is whether the section 16: 1–20 was originally a part of the epistle to the Romans or whether it was an independent letter of recommendation for the deaconess Phoebe to the church at Ephesus. Even among the critics the controversy concerning this point is still going on. I believe that in almost every verse there are such overwhelming reasons in favor of the latter view that I cannot quite understand how anyone can adhere to the traditional view. The process by which this letter of recommendation got into the epistle to the Romans is, indeed, easily enough explained. If the deaconess went to Ephesus in order to embark thence for Rome and to deliver our epistle, it was but natural that the church at Ephesus should make a copy of this epistle and preserve with it the lines of recommendation which the church had received through the same hand that brought the precious epistle. It is easy to suppose that later on, since this ἐπιστολὴ συστατική had no address of its own, these lines were embodied in the epistle to the Romans, with which they had been connected from the beginning.

### VI. THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

With the epistle to the Colossians we pass to the so-called epistles of the captivity. Whether this was written from Rome or from Cæsarea does not affect the question of genuineness—I myself believe that the weight of evidence is for Cæsarea. But with the question concerning the errorists whom Paul opposes in the letter the case is different; the conception we form of these will determine our answer to the question whether the letter is genuine or not. And in reference to this matter the assumption that those whose error is refuted are partly or wholly the same as those against whom the epistle to the Galatians is directed has not yet received as thorough a refutation as the case demands. What the apostle is here dealing with is evidently not a denial of his doctrine of salvation, but rather the question whether for the attainment of the true consummation of Christian life and character, and so for the

full assurance of salvation, something more and greater be not necessary than the simple belief of that message of salvation and the Christian morality that comes with it, viz., a profound insight into the secrets of the divine being and a strict regulation of the whole life by ascetic rules.

This insight, it was supposed, could be attained partly through traditional theosophic doctrines (2:8), partly through visions and dreams (2:18); and asceticism was deemed necessary in order to enable one to enter into intercourse with the heavenly world, by which it would become more and more thoroughly known. Inasmuch as the asceticism in the Roman church, with which Romans (chap. 14) deals, and which included abstinence from flesh and wine as well as a strict observance of certain fast days, is to be traced to Essenic influence, it is probable that this theosophic-ascetic tendency of Jewish Christianity is also connected with Essenism.

It appears, to be sure, from 2:11 and 3:11 that this Jewish-Christian party attached great value to circumcision; this, however, was not because, like the Pharisaic party in the church, they held that by it one was incorporated into the Israelitish community, to which alone belonged the attainment of salvation, but because through it the whole physical life was believed to be in a higher degree consecrated to God. The Jewish festivals likewise (2:16) were not observed because the Mosaic law was regarded as of permanent validity, but because by such consecration to God of certain regularly recurring days the whole daily life was supposed to gain a higher consecration. Moreover, the rules which were, in the stricter sense, ascetic had, according to 2:20 ff., no relation whatever to the Old Testament, but were based upon commandments of men regarding all physical enjoyments; and for this reason Paul never appeals in his polemic to the Old Testament. Nevertheless the apostle perceived clearly that the danger from this party was quite as great as that from Pharisaic Jewish Christianity; for, aside from the conceit which such new wisdom and philosophy produced, it inevitably led to the idea that the fullness of the divine essence was poured out over the entire higher world of

spirits and thereupon to the attempt by worship of angels (2:18 and 23) to enter into mysterious relation with the Godhead; which the apostle foresaw would imperil both the unique majesty and dignity of Christ and the all-sufficiency of his redeeming work and mediatorship. These ascetic exercises, moreover, tended continually to the development of a new legalism which Paul could not but regard as a return to an obsolete stage of religious development (2:20).

Nevertheless the apostle was obliged to assume toward this tendency a very different attitude from that which he had taken toward the Pharisaic party in the church. Inasmuch as they did not oppose his doctrine of salvation, he could not reject their doctrine *in toto;* there was a legitimate element in it, inasmuch as it met an awakening consciousness of need of deeper knowledge. He himself knew that the gospel concealed in itself a profound divine wisdom (*cf.* 1 Cor., chap. 2) which was able fully to satisfy this desire; and the comparative restraint and greater leisure of his imprisonment gave him abundant opportunity to penetrate more and more into this divine wisdom. In his earlier letters the godlike glory of the exalted Christ had led to the recognition of his eternal existence and activity; all that was lacking now was that he should be apprehended as the foundation and the goal of all creation, all orders of the heavenly beings included (*cf.* 1:16), and that it should be seen that in him all the fullness of the Godhead, of which this theosophy had so much to say, dwelt bodily. His redemptive work also appeared now in an entirely new light. Hitherto Paul had regarded it only from the point of view of the human need of salvation; now, however, he perceived how by it the victory was gained over the principalities and powers hostile to God (2:15) and how the kingly dominion of Christ had displaced them, so that his redemptive work acquired also a cosmic significance. In proportion as the increasing tendency to speculation threatened to divide the church into parties or schools, Paul was compelled to emphasize the organic unity of the church under Christ as its head (1:18 and 24; 2:19) and the universal significance of the gospel by which it had been founded (1:6, 23). To be sure he was

obliged continually to insist that the content of the gospel was not some theosophic speculation but the mystery of salvation; yet at the same time that in the gospel were hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge (2:2 f.). Now, therefore, the difference between heathenism and Judaism is obliterated (3:10 f.) in an entirely different way from that employed in the earlier letters; by the redemptive death of Christ the law itself, conceived of as a code of statutes, is as such abrogated, and not simply the obligation of the individual to obey it. Now also the destiny of the world appears in a new light; the great gulf which sin made in the divinely created world of spirits is done away, and by joining them to Christ as their only head, men *and* angels must again be united (1:20). Thus in a certain sense the antithesis between heaven and earth is even in this life done away with.

But lofty as were these chronological, soteriological, and eschatological speculations, yet the apostle was constantly forced to emphasize the fact that every true advance in knowledge must also bear fruit in the fulfillment of the divine will and in the achievement of complete moral renewal (1:9 f.; 2:9 ff.). He was, however, compelled also to prove how this renewal is shown not in the carrying out of arbitrary human enactments, but in the reorganization of domestic and social life with the duties pertaining to it. In a more thoroughgoing way than in the earlier letters he sought to regulate the Christian moral life through detailed prescriptions, and the significance of the Old Testament was revealed to him in a new light, being regarded no longer as a code, but as a typical foreshadowing of the divine will as it was fulfilled in Christ (2:11, 17). It is the province of biblical theology to set forth in detail this development of Paulinism in all directions as it appears in the letters of the imprisonment (*cf.* my *Lehrbuch der biblischen Theologie des Neuen Testaments*, 6. Aufl., Berlin, 1895). It is sufficient for criticism to prove that there was adequate occasion for this development in the new kind of opposition which confronted the apostle in Colossæ.

To be sure if we deny to the Paul of the great doctrinal and

controversial epistles any capacity of development in his ideas we can hardly regard the epistle to the Colossians as his work; and if we hold that he was limited to a narrow vocabulary and a stereotyped style, forced upon him by the former controversial period, we can no longer recognize the apostle in the writer of these letters. But what a pitiful conception of the great apostle underlies criticism of this sort. It is, on the contrary, only natural that his rigid and dogmatic style of expression with its theses and antitheses should disappear upon the cessation of the conflict with Pharisaic Judaism; and that when there was no longer any opposition to his doctrine of salvation the argumentative exposition of it should likewise cease. Moreover, as a wise teacher Paul would take up the technical terms of the theosophists, such as *πλήρωμα* and *μυστήριον*, as well as their speculations concerning the angelic orders, their demand for a higher gnosis, and for the perfection of the Christian life; only he would stamp them with a meaning of his own. He was obliged to employ in the unfolding of the entire fullness and depth of the truth of salvation a mode of presentation different from that required in the original exposition and substantiation of it. The long-drawn-out sentences, overloaded with ideas, their parts only loosely connected by relatives and participial constructions, simply show that the same apostle is writing who in the earlier letters shows himself unacquainted with literary Greek and on principle indifferent to rhetorical effect. Where, however, he assumes again a definite polemical attitude he expresses himself in antitheses which are as pointed as in the earlier letters, though now they often suggest more than is actually said.

In view of all this it is easy to understand how criticism should inevitably have been in perplexity concerning the genuineness of this letter. Ewald, indeed, for a time went no further than to ascribe it to Timothy, who drew it up after a preliminary discussion of its contents with the apostle. But the Tübingen school was forced to construe the expressions of the letter in the sense of second-century gnosticism in order thus to be able to prove by an evident *circulus in demonstrando* that it was influenced by this gnosticism and opposed it; or to discover in the

mention of the Petrine Mark (4:10) and the Pauline Luke (4:14) a trace of the reconciling tendency of the second century which was supposed to appear also in the emphasis which the epistle lays on the unity of the church. Hilgenfeld, however, dated the letter much earlier and regarded it as a polemic against the beginnings of gnosticism in the person of Cerinthus. In this he returned to the view of Mayerhoff, who first (1838) controverted the genuineness of the letter from this point of view. But it is most interesting to observe that the alleged dependence of the letter to the Colossians upon that to the Ephesians, on which he based his attack, was just the point at which the reactionary movement set in. When Holtzmann in 1872 carefully investigated both letters with reference to this point, he believed that he found interwoven in Colossians the indications both of originality and dependence upon Ephesians, both of genuineness and of spuriousness. Upon this he built the hypothesis that the genuine letter of Paul to the Colossians was imitated by the *auctor ad Ephesios* and then once more—with what purpose it is difficult to conceive—was interpolated to suit his own views. In opposition to him von Soden in 1885 successfully proved that the indications of dependence and spuriousness found by Holtzmann in the letter to the Colossians were wholly unsubstantiated, and he regarded only a very few verses as later interpolations. In his *Hand-Commentar*, 1891, he admitted the genuineness even of these. Since then Jülicher and Harnack have emphatically declared themselves in favor of the genuineness of the epistle as handed down by tradition. Accordingly this letter also, having been tested by the fire of criticism, has maintained its genuineness.

It is certain that since the personal greetings in chap. 4 are not matters of invention they constitute an argument against the hypothesis of pseudonymous authorship difficult to overcome. The same is true of the canonical letter to Philemon, so inseparably joined to the Colossian letter by the reference in Col. 4:9. It is today quite generally accepted that Baur's maintenance of the spuriousness of this letter was one of his worst blunders. That he should have called it the embryo of a Christian novel

sounds like a jest, not a scientific argument. Weizsäcker is nearer right in regarding it as the presentation of truth by example. But in that case we should expect a discussion of the question of slavery. Unfortunately, however, the letter gives no definite instructions on the subject whether Philemon is to receive the returning slave as a brother merely, or free him, or give him to the apostle as his personal servant; that is purposely left undetermined in the letter. That Hilgenfeld, in spite of Baur, accepts the letter as genuine is an admirable evidence of his appreciation of the character of this document with its delicate tact and spirit of amiable comradeship testifying in every word to its genuineness. But this conclusion of his is not consistent. It would be a refinement of deception, entirely foreign to pseudonymous literature of that period, that an author who purposed writing to the Colossians in the name of Paul should ferret out this private letter in order to accredit himself as the genuine Paul by the allusion to it in 4:9.

### VII. THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

When Schleiermacher and DeWette directed their criticism against the letter to the Ephesians, their chief argument was that the general content of the letter stood in evident contradiction with the special address. This argument has been abandoned since modern textual criticism has conclusively shown that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ in the address are a later addition. Indeed, doubt of this fact, though entertained by even so distinguished a commentator as Meyer, must be definitely given up; as well as the view, represented by Bleek, that the address, so clearly incomplete, was left so by Paul himself in order to issue several copies of it, filling in local references in each case. Why the apostle designates his readers as "saints who also believe in Jesus Christ," that is, New Testament saints in contradistinction to those of the Old Testament, cannot be understood at all if the proper purpose of the letter receives so little consideration as is ordinarily the case. Likewise, the identification of the letter in any way with that mentioned in Col. 4:16 must be definitely given up. It is excluded by the fact that Paul in 4:15 could not send

greetings to the Laodiceans in the letter to the Colossians, if, at the same time, he sent to Laodicea by the same messenger one addressed to them, or even intended also for them. We must, however, abandon all attempt to justify the special address on the ground that the letter, at least in the first instance, was intended for Ephesus; because in that case we do not at all meet the real difficulties which criticism has from the first rightly pointed out. Since the readers are addressed constantly as Gentile Christians, but according to 3:2 ff.; 4:21 could not possibly have been converted by Paul, it follows that this circular letter was addressed to Gentile-Christian churches not founded by the apostle, to whom it was to be carried and read publicly. Tychicus, the bearer of the letter (6:21), must have received verbal instructions to that effect. That the churches addressed were in Asia Minor is made highly probable simply by the fact that Tychicus carried the circular letter at the same time that he went to Asia Minor with the Colossian letter. The simplest explanation of the later insertion of the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is that the letter intended for the churches of Asia Minor in general was at a later time assumed to have been addressed primarily to the metropolis, Ephesus.

The second difficulty which the letter presents is its extremely close relationship with the letter to the Colossians. And this difficulty is not so easily disposed of as is generally thought. If, to be sure, we recall the parallel passages in the two letters to the Thessalonians and the parallels in the letters to the Romans and the Galatians, the latter two written years apart, we cannot wonder that two letters written practically at the same time show so great similarity both in form and matter. This becomes, however, perfectly explicable only when we suppose that the news received from Colossæ had introduced Paul into an entirely new circle of ideas, and that as a natural result, though writing a circular letter to a group of churches, he was still dominated by the thoughts developed in the letter to the Colossians. How difficult it is to prove here a strict literary dependence of one letter upon the other appears from the fact that, although the letter to the Ephesians is generally admitted

to be dependent on Colossians, yet Mayerhoff held exactly the opposite opinion, and a keen critic like Holtzmann maintains that the evidence points to mutual dependence. The decisive argument against this view will always be that it would have been impossible for a writer who, when writing independently, could imitate, often so strikingly, the doctrine and style of Paul as the writer of Ephesians must have done, should, in order to make his writings seem like Paul's, follow a Pauline letter in other passages so slavishly, and that even in sections which have nothing whatever to do with the main purpose of his letter. But it is still more incomprehensible that by the fiction of 6:21 f. he should give the first indication of his motive for connecting his composition so closely with a letter which, after all, furnished him for his main purpose a very unsatisfactory point of attachment, especially as such attachment and the fiction would be more likely to give offense than to lend the appearance of genuineness to his composition.

The standing problem for those who maintain the genuineness of both letters is to present proof that as regards the parallel passages the same thoughts and expressions are used with far too great freedom to permit us to speak of literary dependence. In respect to that, however, much remains to be done, since the exegesis of both letters is far from having attained to the exactness and certainty which has been reached in the case of many other letters of Paul. Above all it must be clearly understood that the Pauline spirit was far too rich and free not to be able to express the same thoughts in different ways or to give a different application to the same expressions, even in two letters written the one immediately after the other. So the letter to the Ephesians in spite of its relationship to the Colossian letter exhibits, in accordance with its more general purpose, a peculiar style, or, more exactly, a peculiar coloring of the whole mode of presentation. It contains expressions like the frequently recurring τὰ ἐπουράνια and μεθοδεία which is found at least twice (4:14; 6:11); so also διάβολος, meaning "devil" (4:27; 6:11), which is wholly foreign both to the Colossian letter and the other letters. Such facts are not without importance to one

to whom the close relationship of two contemporaneous letters presents in itself no difficulty. It is certainly a sign of greater freedom from prejudice on the part of criticism that Jülicher and Harnack are again inclined to accept the genuineness of the letter which in spite of its peculiarities preserves in so many ways the undeniable Pauline type. But there will still be need, in that case, of making a somewhat more thorough exegetical investigation of many points. I will not speak of the fact that the interpretation of 2:20 in its relation to 1 Cor. 3:9 f. is still unsettled, since it can be said that the varying application of such a figure is not of itself remarkable, even though in this case the underlying thought is of too fundamental a character to be irrelevant to the question of the Pauline origin. Yet upon first glance it is somewhat remarkable that the apostles and prophets are called ἅγιοι (3:5), if we do not observe that this explains why they, being sent forth of God to his service, can be set over against the sons of men. And it is certain that 4:11 according to its usual interpretation carries us down beyond the date of the pastoral letters, since here already the government of the church and its instruction appear to be united in the same church officer, the first impulses toward which appear in the pastoral letters. This interpretation, however, cannot be correct, because the whole context clearly shows that only gifts of speech are meant. Accordingly the intention of the addition καὶ διδάσκαλοι must be to designate the ποιμένες as those shepherds who lead the individual churches to the right pasture (*cf.* John 10:9 f.), that is, provide them with the instruction and admonition which they constantly require.

The Tübingen school, to be sure, advanced nothing that strengthened the argument against the genuineness of the letter. For its contention that here we recognize already the spirit of the second century loses its force, since we find in the letter elements both gnostic and Montanistic, even the same passage (4:7–11) being interpreted by some as gnostic, by others as Montanistic. But it is an altogether baseless claim that here a unification is sought after by means of an external synthesis of faith and love, by weakening the Pauline doctrine of justifica-

tion by faith, and making concessions to the Judaistic doctrine of justification by works. Whatever distinguishes the doctrine of this letter from that of the earlier letters is found also in Colossians, and is inseparably connected with the transformation of Paulinism, which in that letter is set forth and explained. When recent criticism, at least in the case of the majority of its representatives, carries the composition of the letter back into the first century, assuming, however, that a disciple of the apostle might have been its author, it surrenders therewith all definite standards by which one can decide whether this transformation could not have taken place in the time of Paul and in his own person. But that which offers some ground for both the older and the later opinion is the fact that its exact aim on the presupposition of the genuineness of the letter has not yet been made clear. There is in the letter no trace of heretics, about whom so much has been said, for 4:14 is satisfactorily interpreted in view of the recent experiences of Paul in the Phrygian churches, and 5:16 does not refer to a libertine gnosis, but to moral seduction. Since now the hortatory portion of the letter begins with most impressive and explicit emphasis upon the unity of the church, both earlier critics like De Wette and recent ones like von Soden have found in this thought the main object of the letter. But this is to enter again the channel of Tübingen criticism which explains the letter from the presupposition that efforts after union of the parties in the church were made in the second century. To be sure it is not difficult to prove that nowhere in our letter is it possible to find a trace of the concessions which are required by this hypothesis, since a demand for the moral preservation of Christian character is found in all the Pauline letters and is no concession to the Judaistic doctrine of righteousness by works. Still, neither has criticism of the other school as yet explained what was the occasion of this exhortation to church unity.

Nor, to be sure, has it been recognized that in the entire first part of the letter this exhortation has been prepared for with conscious purpose. If even the address indicates that the Gentile-Christian readers were saints, as were the members of the

Old Testament covenant nation, the conclusion of the words of thanksgiving in the introduction likewise emphasizes how the Gentile Christians, though in a different way, had attained to the same certainty of the promised salvation as had the Jewish Christians (1 : 13 f.; *cf.* vs. 12). The entire second chapter turns upon the thought that the Gentile Christians had been actually received into the community of the saints in Israel, after the law was abolished as a method of salvation and life; and the third chapter also begins with the statement that the apostle was entrusted with the gospel, by means of which the Gentiles became actually partakers in the promise to Israel (3 : 6), a thing which, according to Galatians, chap. 2, even the primitive apostles also recognized. Whereupon it may be reasonably asked what could be the occasion of these declarations and the exhortations of the second part based upon them if the churches of Asia Minor to which the letter was directed were, as on the usual presupposition that Paul is responsible directly and indirectly for the Christianization of the whole of Asia Minor they must have been, altogether made up of Gentile Christians. In the discussion of the Galatian letter we have already seen that this presupposition is untenable. Our judgment, moreover, is evidently established on a broader basis by the Apocalypse. The church at Smyrna which is persecuted only by the synagogue of Satan, which blasphemes the name of Christ, and the church of Philadelphia which had successfully prosecuted its work among the Jews and will continue in it (Rev. 3 : 8 f.) can only have been purely Jewish-Christian churches. It is clear, therefore, that there were in Asia Minor not only Gentile-Christian churches — many of them, indeed, *e. g.*, those in Phrygia, shown by our letter not to have been founded by Paul — but also from earliest times numerous Jewish-Christian churches which probably owed their origin to the primitive apostles; and this being so, the old conflict between the two might here, as was the case in Galatia, break out again and again, though the opposition would not necessarily take the form of Pharisaic legalism, as it had done in Galatia, but might assume that of theosophic asceticism such as the apostle had so recently met

in Phrygia. And in view of this we can understand how the apostle should feel constrained earnestly to admonish the Gentile-Christian churches of proconsular Asia that by their reception into the community of the saints and by their participation in the promises once made to Israel, itself now free from the obligation of the law, the old antithesis between Jew and Gentile was once for all abolished.

From this point of view, all the admonitions of this letter, growing out of the one chief admonition to maintain the unity of the church, are seen in a new light. For they all turn on the fact that Christianity necessarily carries with it the complete putting off of the old man and the putting on of the new, the description of which issues in the exhortation to walk in love after the example of Christ (4 : 1 f.; 5 : 2), and on the warning against all alliance with the old heathen iniquity, even in the form of apparently innocent association with their unbelieving countrymen (5 : 3–20), the perils of which Paul had formerly learned by severe experiences at Corinth. But after his latest experiences he was compelled to add that asceticism was as unnecessary for this regulation of the whole life in a Christian spirit as was legalism (5 : 21—6 : 9). From this there follows yet another consequence. The remarkable literary resemblances between the Ephesian letter and the first epistle of Peter have indeed seemed to almost all recent critics explicable only on the hypothesis that the former, being dependent on the latter, was, though attributed to Paul, spurious. On my view of the epistle of Peter, according to which it is older than Galatians, and was known to Paul when he wrote his letter to the Romans, it is not impossible that the epistle to the Ephesians was written with some reference to it. And even if a spokesman of this school of criticism like Holtzmann calls it "sheer nonsense," it nevertheless remains true that it accords entirely with the aim of this letter that Paul should, with deliberate purpose and openly, employ the language of an older apostolic letter already in circulation in Asia Minor and held in high esteem. He wished to show the Jewish Christians, who would learn of a letter of the great apostle of the Gentiles which was in circulation in that

region just as Paul and the Gentile Christians would hear of the letter of Peter, that the Gentiles were educated in the same Christian truth and manner of life as they themselves. Only on this view can the obstacle on which the genuineness of the letter seems likely after all to be shattered be really removed.

### VIII. THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

Concerning the epistle to the Philippians it may apparently be said at the outset that criticism has only served to establish anew its genuineness. Denial of its genuineness begins with Baur, who rejected it along with the other epistles of the imprisonment. But in order to find echoes of gnosticism in it he was obliged to explain 2 : 6 from the history of the Valentinian Sophia, and in order to assign it to its place in the conciliation movements of the second century he had to identify the Clement mentioned in 4 : 3 with the disciple of Peter who appears in the Clementine legend, and whom he regards as one of the οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας (4 : 22).

Baur's pupils even interpreted 4 : 2 as referring not literally to two women, but to two parties which, in the guise of an appeal to his σύνζυγος, *i. e.*, in their opinion, Peter, Paul admonishes to be of the same mind (4 : 2, 3). With remarkable unanimity all the leaders of the more recent criticism have decisively rejected this opinion of Baur and his followers, and even Hilgenfeld has recognized that the epistle is genuine. In fact there are few cases in which the impossibility of so much as conceiving of a letter as the work of a pseudonymous tendency-writer is so evident as here. And yet in the *Jahrbücher für protest. Theologie* for 1875–6 Holsten undertook to recover the position which had apparently been lost. But at what cost! According to his view the epistle is no longer to be regarded as a product of the second century, but as having arisen between 70 and 80 A. D., being written, in order, by a continuation of the conciliatory policy which the apostle inaugurated in his epistle to the Romans, to restore the inner unity of the Philippian church. The personal references of the letter are all supposed to rest upon genuine tradition; and only a slight un-Pauline tinge is to

be discovered in doctrine, in language, and in the appreciation of the gift which ostensibly furnishes the occasion for the letter. But even such a critic as Paul Schmidt repudiated this position (in 1880) as "New Testament hypercriticism." And really, that at a time when everybody in Philippi knew that the apostle was dead, and had never written a letter to the church, a disciple of the apostle should fabricate a letter from him to the church, in which the apostle expresses the confident expectation of seeing them again (1:25; 2:24), is a theory which would not have the faintest appearance of probability, even if the view that the letter is genuine labored under the most serious difficulties.

Nevertheless I cannot admit that the question has been solved by the more recent criticism. Measured by the standard which this criticism is accustomed to employ, the epistle to the Philippians must be rejected as spurious. By admitting that it is impossible to understand this letter on the assumption of its pseudonymous character, criticism has allowed itself to be led into making a concession which is absolutely contradictory to its other assumptions. Holsten is undoubtedly right in maintaining that according to the standard of the great doctrinal and controversial epistles the doctrinal views of Philippians contain much that is surprising. With what triumphant assurance criticism would, if it served its purpose, reject as spurious a letter alleged to be from Paul in which he declares himself "touching the righteousness which is in the law blameless" (3:6), on the ground that the real Paul everywhere proceeds on the view that there is no such thing as righteousness under the law. It really required no very artificial exegesis to extract from 3:9 the meaning that justification is involved in vital union with Christ—a view by which, however, Paul's doctrine of salvation is exactly reversed. A verse like 4:8 actually reminds one more of the moralizing tone of the pastoral epistles than of the ethics rooted in the facts of salvation which are characteristic of the older letters. One is indeed quite justified in asking with Holsten why the title of apostle is lacking in the address, and where the ἐπίσκοποι καὶ διάκονοι, of whom not a trace is to be found else-

where in the Pauline letters, suddenly come from. And it is by no means easy to explain how the same Paul that in 1 : 23 is only in doubt whether he shall choose to die immediately in order to be with Christ, or to abide in the flesh for the sake of the church, in 3 : 11 is apparently not even yet sure of his resurrection from the dead. And there is no doubt that the admonition of the two women *coram publico* (4 : 2) is altogether unparalleled in the Pauline letters. Of course all these difficulties can be obviated, but not so long as one retains the finicalness which characterizes all our modern criticism.

But it remains true that the whole type of doctrine of our letter resembles that of the letters of the imprisonment much more closely than it does that of the great doctrinal and controversial letters, although when account is taken of the relatively small amount of doctrinal material in Philippians the difference is not so marked. There is not lacking a certain strong emphasis on the gnosis (1 : 9; 3 : 8, 10). It cannot be denied that the Christology goes beyond that of the older letters, or that emphasis upon the connection between the doctrine of salvation and practical life takes the place of the strong insistence on doctrine which characterizes the older letters. In passages like 2 : 10 and 3 : 20 there is a clear enough reference to the cosmic significance of the saving work of Christ. The emphatic admonition to unity in which the exhortation 2 : 2 f. really culminates reminds us strongly of a characteristic feature of the letters of the imprisonment; and what 3 : 12–16 says about the true Christian perfection reminds us again of what the Colossian letter intimates about the false ways by which the theosophists of Colossæ professed to lead men to perfection. Holsten's lists of words, by which he undertakes to distinguish what is Pauline, un-Pauline, and anti-Pauline, need not be taken seriously; but if, after the prevailing fashion of modern criticism, one stumble over every new expression and note the absence of every catchword of the old Pauline letters, it is as easy to prove the spuriousness of Philippians as of Ephesians. The history of the criticism of the letter to the Philippians issues of necessity in a dilemma; either it must be recognized that the whole previous

method of criticism has been in certain respects very faulty and must undergo a thorough reform, or we must go back and question again the genuineness of Philippians. We have not yet reached our goal, not even with respect to the letter to the Philippians.

The chief reason for this state of affairs is that criticism as a whole has accomplished but little for the interpretation of the epistle to the Philippians, and that the historical situation which the letter presupposes is very far from being cleared up. Or, is it possible that some agreement has actually been reached, at least respecting the condition of the church which the letter presupposes? It will be useful to recall the course which the investigation of this matter has taken. In the case of the epistle to the Philippians it was the older criticism that held that the church was troubled by reason of the Judaistic errorists that were supposed to be referred to in chap. 3. A dark picture was painted of the parties into which the church was divided, and Rheinwald, in 1827, represented it as threatened with extinction by the division between Jewish and Gentile Christians. Then came a reaction, which, however, did not lead to the discovery of the seat of the error until Schinz in 1833 proved that the church was a purely Gentile-Christian body, in which there were no such parties, and that the praise which the apostle gave the church was wholly irreconcilable with the supposition of their existence. But even he put in the place of conflict over doctrine which was said to have divided the church only on the one side a boastful celebrating of their own superiority, called forth by personal disagreements, and on the other a jealous belittling of the merits of others. Almost all modern interpreters have followed him. But does this view accord any better with the praise repeatedly bestowed on *all* of the members of the church *individually* (*cf.* 1 : 3, 7, 8; 4 : 1)? And what basis is there for this view?

It is simply the intolerable fashion the interpreters have of assuming, the moment the apostle utters a word against a prevalent sin which is inherent in us all, that his readers must be guilty of it in a very exceptional degree. Accordingly evidence for this must be extorted from 2 : 2 ff. But would Paul really

have felt called upon to reprove before the whole church the quarrelsomeness of two women, which was probably due in the two cases to similar causes, if the church was itself guilty of exactly the same fault? Certainly not. Accordingly both on the side of the defenders and on that of the deniers of the genuineness of the letter there is more or less tendency to return to the old view. And so again we have the theory of two parties with a "divided Christian consciousness," or Judaizing heretical teachers. But I cannot discover that the new arguments in defense of this view are any better, or that the old arguments against it have been refuted. Of course the church which the apostle designates as his joy and his crown is composed of human beings. But I cannot allow myself to distort the picture which the apostle gives of it by introducing any kind of factious disorder. The epistle is not a letter of reproof. When he closes the expression of his joyfulness in imprisonment, of which no possible exigency can rob him, with the statement that it is in their power, by standing fast in one spirit, striving for the faith of the gospel, as well as by a harmony based on self-denying humility, not only to promote their own spiritual welfare, but also to increase and share his joy (1:27—2:18), this very form of expressing his admonition shows conclusively that he is not endeavoring to heal a serious rupture of the church.

But even in respect to the situation in Rome to which reference is made in 1:14–18, there is anything but clearness and agreement of opinion among scholars. The common opinion is that here also there is a reference to Judaizing heretics, and it was especially natural for those to adopt this opinion who regarded the Roman church as essentially or in large part a Jewish-Christian body. But in that case the way in which Paul minimizes the doctrinal differences between these people and himself, and rejoices if only Christ is made known, whatever the method, involves so glaring a contradiction with Gal. 1:8 f. that it would be impossible to ascribe the letter to Paul. Of what avail is the paltry subterfuge that Paul was softened by age, or that the church in question was not one of his own founding? On this point Paul could never change, could never regard

that other gospel as of equal value with his own. The latest opponent of the epistle (Holsten) and its latest defender (Paul Schmidt) both frankly admit this, though, to be sure, critics like Holtzmann and Jülicher still find no difficulty whatever in the old opinion. Nevertheless exegetically the latter is simply impossible, since the antithesis between the Judaizing and the Pauline preaching cannot be expressed by εἴτε προφάσει εἴτε ἀληθείᾳ. And where has Paul ever accused his Judaizing opponents simply of preaching Christ from envy of him (διὰ φθόνον, vs. 15)? He could never have done so. These opponents must have been personal rivals of the apostle, and in that case there is no ground for holding that they were Jewish Christians. As long ago as 1859 I advanced the opinion in my commentary that they were old teachers of the church who, finding themselves forced into the background by the unexpectedly prolonged stay of the apostle in Rome, where, despite his imprisonment, he became the central figure of the church, sought by redoubled zeal to outstrip him, and by criticism of himself and of his work to destroy his popularity. I admit that I cannot *prove* this to be the case, and I am entirely ready to accept any suggestion that is more in accord with the words; but I cannot go back to the old impossible views.

The hypotheses which have gathered around the passage 3:1 furnish a sad illustration of how matters stand in the exegesis of Philippians. Most interpreters have found here an allusion to earlier letters to the Philippians, as even the hypothesis-spinning criticism of the old rationalists found here the beginning of a new letter. But the most recent criticism of the Hausraths, Völkers, and Clemens, revels in ever new inventions of letters of which our letter is an unskillful patchwork. And what is the reason of all this? Simply that they will not see that the whole previous part of the letter has been treating of that Christian joy of which Paul is, *ex professo*, now about to speak again. Even the prelate Bengel long ago recognized that the epistle to the Philippians might properly be described as *epistola de gaudio*. Such a letter may not seem to modern criticism worthy of the apostle. But it gives no evidence of having any other purpose.

The flourishing Macedonian churches were just those that were most affected by the hostility of their unbelieving countrymen. To this was added the news of the imprisonment of their apostle, which had lasted now for years, and of the complete cessation of his missionary work. These things lay like a heavy burden upon his beloved church; and for this reason he could not better repay the gift they had sent him than to kindle in them, despite all the burden of the present, that profound joy in believing which filled him, though in chains and bonds. In chap. 1 he had said that they should promote and share this his joy; and all that he says in chap. 2 concerning the sending of Timothy and the return of Epaphroditus has to do with the fact that he desires to do what he can to promote their joy. Is it to be wondered at that in 3:1 he accompanies his χαίρετε ἐν κυρίῳ with an apology for always writing the same thing?

But that throughout the third chapter also he is speaking of the ground, means, and goal of true Christian joy is not so readily conceded. Here it has been customary to find a warning against Jewish-Christian heretics, either in Rome or in Philippi; the same Paul who in 1:18 was so mild in his attitude toward them speaking here in a tone that outdoes all the polemic against them that we have seen in Galatians and Corinthians. But this interpretation would require him to use βλέπετε ἀπό and not βλέπετε with the accusative, as 1 Cor. 1:26; 10:18 show. The verb, three times repeated for rhetorical emphasis, shows, moreover, that there are three separate categories of men to whom he directs their attention, in order, by means of the contrast which these present, to develop the ground on which the true Christian joy rests (3:3–11), the means by which it is to be continually promoted (3:12–16), and what its final goal is (3:17–21). That the unbelieving Jews constitute the third of the categories ought never to have been overlooked. Where has Paul designated the Jewish Christians as the περιτομή simply? Least of all could he do so here, where by the substitution of the word κατατομή (*cf.* Gal. 5:12) he intimates that because of their unbelief, by which they have lost all the privileges of the περιτομή, it has become a useless mutilation. Recent critics also,

like Hökstra, Holsten, Lipsius, and Paul Schmidt, opponents and defenders of the genuineness of the letter alike, recognize this. The privileges of which unbelieving Judaism boasts, in which it puts its trust, and the joy with which the apostle at his conversion gave up these things for the sake of Christ who is his only joy, is the theme of the following paragraphs.

But furthermore the κακοὶ ἐργάται are far from being the ἐργάται δόλιοι of 2 Cor. 11 : 13. They are those teachers in Rome whom Paul describes in 1 : 15–17, who take pleasure in envy and strife and in making trouble for him, as they think, in his bonds. And what can the οὐχ ὅτι of 3 : 12 signify except that he refers to the charge of these people that he imagined himself to be already perfect? For certainly nothing that he has previously said in the passage itself furnishes the slightest opportunity for the misunderstanding which he wishes here to avoid. On the contrary it is they who by their assumption of superiority to him and their rivalry with him make such a claim. True Christian joy can be attained only when the Christian is continually pressing forward toward the goal in order ever more perfectly to apprehend Christ, when he knows no other perfection than to be always striving after greater perfection. The ultimate purpose of his whole letter is that the church should by continually pressing forward toward this goal learn to overcome the spirit of despondency which oppresses it, and its anxiety for the future in the midst of all the threatenings of the present.

But exegesis has done its worst in the passage 3 : 17–21. The people there described have actually been held to be Jewish-Christian heretics. To be sure the opinion commonly held by interpreters down to the present day, that they were nominal Christians living immoral lives, is not much better. Can such a thing be possible in the beloved and highly praised Philippian church, for every member of which the apostle can make his supplication with joy (1 : 3)? If in Christendom today there are such nominal Christians — God forbid that it should be so! — who, though they have been baptized, have never learned what it means to be a Christian, it by no means follows that then,

when to be known as a Christian brought only disgrace and persecution, there were among the Christians enemies of the cross of Christ, who, with shameful indulgence, practiced idolatry. On the contrary, it can only be heathen whom in vs. 2 he designates as κύνες (*cf.* Rev. 22:15) in order thus to characterize their impure, indecent way of life—persons respecting whom he had once cherished the hope that they could be won for the gospel, but whom now he is compelled with deep sorrow to describe as given over to perdition. In contrast with them he shows how the man who finds his joy in Christ alone and has his citizenship with him to whom he belongs, in heaven, looks for him as his deliverer from the perdition to which these others have fallen, and having reached the goal actually attains that which the heathen vainly seek in their wrong way—as well as the glorification of the bodily life which they think to accomplish by their deification of the κοιλία, and the honor which they seek in their shame.

Since 1859 I have maintained this interpretation. But exegesis still goes on contentedly in its old impossible path. No wonder that the criticism of Philippians, despite all the defense of it even by recent critics, is unable to reach final conclusions. A book must first be understood before a final judgment concerning its author can be pronounced. I believe that I have shown that the epistle to the Philippians is still very far from being understood.

### IX. THE PASTORAL EPISTLES.

The pastoral epistles have been to apologetics a perennial source of difficulty. Criticism in all its various schools has maintained that their spuriousness was definitively settled. But if, as we have learned since Baur's time, the task of criticism is to be recognized as the unfolding of the historical understanding of a document and of its origin, then in this instance its task is still very far from having been accomplished. One of the most significant points which apologetics has constantly urged against the view that here is a case of purely fictitious documents passing for Paul's was the abundance of purely personal and historical ref-

erences appearing, especially in the letter to Titus and in Second Timothy, for the fabrication of which no intelligible reason can be seen. Moreover we cannot quite stop with these two letters. It is true that in respect to the two men who in 1 Tim. 1:20 are delivered over to Satan, Jülicher as a compromise allows that perhaps the writer has in mind as a model an event of an earlier period. It is, however, noteworthy that both names recur in 2 Tim. 3:17; 4:14. And, to say the least, the advice which is given to the disciple of the apostle respecting his health in 1 Tim. 5:23, in a connection so obscure that a pseudonymous author would surely have no occasion to bring it in just there, appears so very strange as to be exceedingly difficult of comprehension as a mere fabrication. Criticism has always granted with regard to the other letters that they may be based on genuine Pauline elements. Second Timothy, especially, was regarded by Credner in his Introduction, dated 1836, as originating by combination and interpolation from two genuine letters of Paul, and Lemme in 1882 accepted the whole letter as genuine with the exception of a single somewhat extensive interpolation. Knoke and Hesse have recently (1887, 1889) attempted neatly to extract the Pauline elements from all three letters. Even such thoroughly positive theologians as Grau and Plitt proposed to defend the genuineness of the pastoral letters in this sense only, and also Kübel believed that the letters had received an odor of ecclesiasticism by a final redaction.

How the two most recent critics of the pastoral letters stand on this question is well worthy of consideration. Jülicher, quite in the manner of Credner, seeks to show how the author of Second Timothy had before him fragments of two different letters to Timothy which he put together unskillfully because he incorrectly regarded them as fragments of one and the same letter. In his reverence for Paul he could not but give them to the church; but as a couple of fragments were of little service to it, he filled them out by putting into the mouth of Paul what the Christian community of his day needed. In the same way he edited a fragment of a letter to Titus. Later with no such Pauline documentary basis he wrote First Timothy entire *currente calamo*,

freely gathering together his fundamental ideas which did not yet seem to him to be clearly and convincingly set forth in the two other letters. The critics themselves would have been primarily responsible for what seems to be an interpolation with a purpose by a skillful forger, since they would have sought to determine that which was genuine even down to single words and syllables, and to prove with the acuteness of a modern critic his method of using his material. Harnack says frankly that the pastoral letters are based on Pauline letters, or, more exactly, on fragments of such letters; sections of Second Timothy of considerable extent and importance, and a scant third of the letter to Titus, can be claimed as genuine, even if perhaps few verses apart from the historical references are reproduced without change; in First Timothy, on the other hand, while Pauline material is found, no single verse bears a clear indication of Pauline origin.

On this basis, indeed, the spuriousness of the pastoral epistles in the earlier sense is given up; their case, however, is but little strengthened, since even upon Harnack's form of the hypothesis it may be urged, as Jülicher rightly says of his own, that every attempt to separate the Pauline groundwork from the later redaction is utterly hopeless and leads only to an idle play of individual acuteness. In that case, however, it is obvious to remark that no clear idea of those fragments can properly be obtained, and so it becomes utterly impossible to decide the question how far it was still in accord with the spirit of the times to make such use of them or, more exactly, thus to work them over, and whether in that case the charge of conscious forgery can be met. Harnack occasionally intimates that in that time epistolary material would have been protected against interpolation; but if so it must be held that those Pauline fragments were not written in real epistolary form. In confirmation of this Jülicher also, although finding in the salutations the clearest traces of Pauline diction, regards it as incomprehensible that the apostle should designate himself in writing to intimate friends as he does in these salutations. It seems, however, very questionable whether, on this

supposition that the author used those epistolary fragments, this is a case of that kind of pseudonymous authorship which we describe as altogether innocent. That the author did not wish valuable material such as words of admonition and didactic exposition to be lost one can easily understand, but most of these historical or personal notes, greetings, and commissions, which were said to account for the existence of such epistolary fragments, cannot be said to belong to material of this class. If, nevertheless, the author of his own preference introduced these glosses or notes, although not in the least connected with the purpose of his composition, he could not have had the intention to accredit them as Pauline, and no one would hold that this method is in harmony with the character of naïve literary composition. My feeling is that this is the course which would be pursued by a later writer who, as Jülicher says, was inventing a situation in accordance with which he ascribes to the apostle the sending of instructions to renowned leaders of the churches. To this must be added that with every expansion of the genuine material underlying these epistles the question recurs anew whether the style and diction of the letters can really be so utterly un-Pauline as criticism affirms. But we have abundantly proven above that precisely at this point the method of the critical school is in urgent need of revision, so that it is impossible to solve this problem by details; furthermore if we abandon the attempt to separate the genuine Pauline basis from the later additions the problem is absolutely insoluble.

We are thus forced, notwithstanding the new turn which the investigation into the genuineness of these epistles seems to have taken in recent criticism, again to propound the question whether these letters in the recension in which we possess them absolutely preclude the view that they are in reality what they claim to be. Apologetics has always affirmed this to be the case. Still it has deprived its efforts of all success, because a large number of its spokesmen have persisted in relating the letters to the life of the apostle as known to us. We must, however, concede, and that for the reason often mentioned, that this is utterly impossi-

ble. All artificial combinations do not suffice to lend to this assumption even a shadow of plausibility. If these letters are to be considered as genuine, they must have been composed at a later period of the apostle's life which is unknown to us. It is true that only recently Jülicher has again argued very strenuously that in view of the fullness of our traditions the whole notion of a later period unknown to us is improbable, being in fact simply a precarious postulate of those who, at whatever cost, wish to maintain something that is absolutely untenable. It is to be said on the other side, however, that Harnack, though maintaining that these letters in their present form are utterly un-Pauline, holds on quite independent grounds, without such ulterior motives, that Paul was set free from the recorded Roman imprisonment and accordingly lived at least five years longer. To these years (A. D. 59–64) Harnack assigns the composition of the genuine letters underlying our present recension, or, as he really should say according to his own exposition, the fragments of letters. Since even Harnack does not seem to me to prove that the apostle's death took place during the so-called Neronian persecution of the Christians, these five years ought, I think, to be extended to nine, and since no one can deny that such a term of years gives ample space for the composition of the letters, this at once breaks the force of all objections to their authenticity.

Jülicher thinks that even if this be granted the situation, at least of First Timothy and Titus, is incomprehensible; but this cannot be conceded. He overlooks altogether that the apostle who originally intended to return shortly was, as is clearly intimated in 1 Tim. 3 : 15, delayed, and that this delay sufficiently accounts for the renewed emphasis and expansion of the commissions given to Timothy. The intended recall of Titus (Titus 3 : 12) does not preclude the hypothesis of a delay, since the apostle had been taught by ample experience how little he could with certainty count on the execution of plans that looked so far ahead as spending the winter at Nicopolis, and since we cannot say, with any degree of definiteness, how long it might have been before he could have sent Artemas or Tychicus to relieve

Titus. The passage in Titus 3: 13 clearly shows that it was the journey of Zenas and Apollos that induced him to accompany their letters of introduction with this letter. Strong statements such as that he describes to Titus in detail the Cretan heretical teachers, with whom Titus certainly must have been better acquainted than he was, prove nothing; for a reasonably unprejudiced exegesis will show that Paul simply justifies his instructions by reference to the character of these heretics. Jülicher's arguments concerning the manner in which the Pauline pretender talks about himself and his intimate friends carry no greater weight. Whether here and there an occasion appears for the apostle to refer to his own apostolic calling or his past history can be decided only by detailed exegesis. Paul certainly does not become a scoundrel (*"ein Schandmensch"*) simply because according to 1 Tim. 1: 15 he feels himself, on account of his persecutions of the church, "a chief of sinners." He may even then have served God with a clear conscience (2 Tim. 1: 3), though he was still in error. That Timothy, though he was many years older than when he became an assistant of the apostle, was still in need of encouragement in order to be able to represent the authority of the apostle over against the undoubtedly aged presbyters (1 Tim. 4: 12) no one can reasonably doubt. Jülicher explains the admonition to Timothy (2 Tim. 2: 22) as meaning that Timothy should be careful to conduct himself properly. But this view is rendered untenable by the whole context, which shows the admonition to be directed against the youthful eagerness to convert those in error by passionate appeals and arguments, a zeal which, as is well known, does not cease with a certain year of one's life.

It is not my purpose to add another to the many discussions of these subjects. I have intended only to show by the example of the latest Introduction to the New Testament how criticism stands in relation to them. It only repeats the old arguments in more emphatic words; and either does not trouble itself about the counter-arguments which are urged against it or scornfully sets them aside. It is for this reason that so little progress is really made on so many points, even on those where

agreement would be altogether within the range of possibility. If the pastoral epistles are actually to be regarded as pseudonymous productions, it will still be necessary to admit that the author had a measurably clear conception of the rôle which he meant to assume. It can least of all serve the purpose of criticism to combine with the distinguishing characteristic of pseudonymity that of absence of thought. Yet it is never weary of conjecturing that its pseudonymous author contrived impossible and absurd situations, that he conceived of the relation of Paul to his friends in an entirely contradictory fashion, that he mixed up the present and the future, and made similar blunders which we have still to consider. And yet the whole plan of proposing to address the church of his time in the name of the apostle itself testifies to a certain boldness of conception which must have been accompanied by at least the simplest literary qualifications. Of course that does not in itself prove genuineness. If the situation is conceivable, if the apostle may have spoken as the letters speak, then naturally the author may have carried his plan through successfully just as the real apostle may have written them. Only the critics ought not to spoil our pleasure in our New Testament writings by this petty, pedantic criticism of them which only testifies to a want of inclination to think their way somewhat more deeply into them. The decision of the question of genuineness must be sought in an entirely different direction.

The first question concerns the doctrinal errors which are combated in our letters. I grant that in connecting them with "the beginnings of gnosticism" very little has been accomplished. But neither has criticism as yet been able to explain these errors. A long quest was made for a definite gnostic system that fitted the situation; as none could be found it has been claimed that, though the author wished to combat the whole movement, he did so only by allusion, since he had also to keep up the rôle of Paul. Whereupon the critics proceed to extract from the most harmless passages, for which actual parallels can be shown everywhere in the epistles of Paul, a polemic against particular gnostic heretical teachers. But such polemic can be

found in such passages only *if* it has first been proved that the pastoral letters have these heretics in mind. But that is just what cannot be done. Harnack calls the characterization of the heretical teachers "confused." But that is just where I hold him to be in error. On the contrary, the presumption with which one should first of all approach the letters is that the author knows what he proposes to combat, and that even if he takes the rôle of Paul and must therefore deal only in generalities, he must be fully confident of striking the evil at its heart. In fact, however, his characterization of the then existing errors of doctrine is always the same, even to his favorite expressions; the position which he takes toward them is always the same; one should be drawn into no discussion with them, one should simply turn them off, one should set over against this unsound doctrine the only sound system, which holds fast to the old gospel, the truth of which the author therefore repeatedly affirms. I do not know that at any place or time in the history of the ancient church gnosticism was combated in this fashion.

If, indeed, the author of 1 Tim. 4: 1–4, for reasons which are clear enough in this connection, speaks of an error of doctrine which he fears is coming in the future, but no trace of which is to be seen in what he says elsewhere of the false doctrines of the present (*i. e.*, the period in which he is assumed to have written), and if nevertheless one finds in it a characteristic sign of this present, then of course everything is in confusion. If the author finds the sanctimoniousness under the cloak of which the unhealthy zeal for teaching is concealed (2 Tim. 3: 1–7) so dangerous on this account, because the immorality to be expected in the last days will eagerly seize upon a doctrine which keeps the religious interest active without requiring true inner renewal, there is still in this position no untenable mixture of present and future to be found. If the author of 2 Tim. 2: 16–18 points to the fact that to argue with these persons incites them to more and more impious assertions, and illustrates this fact by a single example, and if a characterization of the false doctrines combated in the letters is then found in that example it is impossible to gain a correct picture of it. If the

author of Titus 1 : 15 f. is giving a characterization of the unbelieving Jews, to whose myths and commandments of men some are turning back (vs. 14), and if in that teaching the false doctrines of the post-apostolic time are regarded as characterized, then it is not surprising if the picture turns out confused. It seems at present to be granted that the ψευδώνυμος γνῶσις (1 Tim. 6 : 20) is not a catchword adopted by our author from Hegesippus, but one which Eusebius repeated after him. But when Jülicher and Harnack cannot yet tear themselves away from the idea that the ἀντιθέσεις refer to the famous work of Marcion they forget that this interpretation is rendered exegetically impossible by the fact that this expression is joined with βεβήλους *under one article.* After all has been said it is impossible to claim that criticism has succeeded in really explaining the polemic of our letters from the point of view of contemporaneous history.

The same is true respecting the internal condition of the churches which is presupposed in our letters, or which it is their purpose to bring about. Despite the splendid service which Harnack has done in clearing up the history of the development of the government of the church, I have looked in vain for any new light from him on this question. The very first redaction of the pastoral epistles, which is still quite distinct from additions of a much later date, is regarded as revealing the presence of an ecclesiastical rank with special rights and duties. It is absolutely impossible for me to discover anything of the sort in our letters. When the church assures support to the presbyters who also give themselves diligently to teaching (1 Tim. 5 : 17 f.) exactly as in 1 Cor., chap. 9, and, for the same reasons that are given in that passage, I can find in that only the endeavor, pervading all three letters, by the closest possible union of the teaching and ruling functions in the church, to promote the maintenance of sound doctrine made so necessary by the evident neglect of the charismatic gift and the spread of false doctrine. I can find nothing of the other "rights" which are assigned to them. Jülicher, again, speaks of the division of the church into clergy and laity, accomplished in fact, even if not in name, which he founds upon a reference to the passage discussed

above. It makes strongly against this view that everywhere only moral integrity and uprightness in family life is demanded of the officers in the church, and that nowhere is a higher dignity or special grace for their office spoken of. According to Harnack the letters assign to the disciples of the apostle a position for which no analogy can be found in the first century. But the chief duty which is continually laid upon them is simply that of instruction and admonition. They are to have charge of the organization of the church and to guard against mistakes in the selection of officers of the congregation. The qualifications necessary for such officers are to be determined only by the church itself. All other regulations for the church services (1 Tim., chap. 2) or the enrollment of the widows of the church (1 Tim., chap. 5) belong to the church as such.

The one thing that goes beyond that is the discipline of the presbyters, which, according to 1 Tim. 5:19 f., is assigned to Timothy in the more mature conditions of the Ephesian church. Well, to whom ought it to have been assigned, as long as no monarchical episcopate yet existed? And of this not the least trace appears in our letters. Even here no special method of procedure is prescribed, but on the well-known Old Testament rule it is affirmed that no process may be instituted against the presbyters without two or three witnesses to establish the accusation, since such a process, even if it should end with their acquittal, would steadily undermine their position in the church. But the λοιποί of vs. 20 are, as the context would lead us to expect, not the laity in contrast with the clergy, but the other presbyters. The so-called ordination of Timothy, in connection with which there is repeated reference to the prophetic words that designated him to be the helper of the apostles, cannot be intended to introduce an ecclesiastical institution, especially as in the case of Titus there is no reference to anything of the kind. The χάρισμα of which mention is made in connection with it (1 Tim. 4:14) is, according to 2 Tim. 1:6, the *charisma* of teaching, not a special grace that goes with the office. Moreover, unless the Book of Acts is to be regarded as entirely valueless, the laying on of hands is an ancient apostolic custom.

It is certain that there are to be seen in the Ephesian church — but only there — evidences of advanced development in church life, tendencies to confessional formulæ, fragments of an ancient church psalmody, traces of fixed liturgical formulæ. What do we know about the period when these began to take shape in the church?

This leads us to discuss the age in which, according to the view of criticism, our letters must have been written. Jülicher places them *ca.* 125; Harnack, *ca.* 90–110; the difference is not very significant, as Harnack also accepts still later interpolations which take us down beyond the age of Marcion. But Harnack has established the fact that Polycarp already knew and used these like other Pauline letters. The question whether the Ignatian letters, which are essentially contemporaneous with Polycarp, knew them is unessential, though I believe that it must be answered in the affirmative. The Barnabas letter, which in Harnack's view is essentially later, does not enter into the question, although I think that its knowledge of our letters can be proved. Of the so-called first letter of Clement, Harnack himself does not venture to maintain with Ewald that in the "undeniable genealogical relationship" the priority belongs to it. How one can maintain, after all has been said, that the attestation of the pastoral epistles is less satisfactory than that of the other letters of Paul, I cannot understand. That Marcion did not have them in his canon is very far from proving that he did not know them. In the first place, they were letters to individuals, and could not lay claim to universal acceptance in the church. The case is somewhat different with the letter to Philemon, in so far as it was inseparably joined to the Colossian letter, and yet Marcion has separated it from that letter and placed it at the end of his list. When we observe in what an artificial way even as late as the third century justification was constantly found for having taken into the canon of the church at large letters directed to individual churches, we understand how the Muratorian canon is compelled expressly to declare that these letters, though directed only to individuals, had been promoted to the position of normative doctrinal writings of the church and holy books. When

now Marcion made the first attempt to limit the number of writings which were to be regarded as normative in the church, it was only natural, since he was restrained by no ecclesiastical tradition, that he should exclude these private letters, which were inconvenient for him since their polemic had been at an early period brought to bear upon him and other gnostics. But this implies no doubt of their coming from the apostle from whom they purported to come and whose other letters he also corrected to suit his purpose. The decision respecting their genuineness therefore must be based on internal evidence.

Moreover I believe that I have shown how far short criticism has come of being able, on the basis of the false doctrines combated in them, and of the condition of the church which they presuppose, to determine with certainty a time in which they must have originated.

I have not proposed to offer anything new in the foregoing discussion. I have only set forth the views which are expressed in my *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, just appearing in a third edition (Berlin, 1897), and which have long approved themselves to me as correct. I have not hesitated where it seems to me that I have in that work written clearly and strongly to repeat now and then the very words. However I trust that in this survey many things have been put in a clearer light, and that stimulus has been given to a renewed consideration of my view by its more thorough defense in many important points. What I have said is based on a constantly renewed, thorough, and detailed exegesis of the Pauline epistles, in which it is my judgment that the criticism of the present day is altogether too deficient. They who wish to acquaint themselves with this exegetical work as a whole may now find it gathered together in my *Paulinische Briefe*. It may be that this renewed consideration of it will remove many prejudices and cause many critical results claimed as final to appear exceedingly doubtful.

# IS CHRISTIANITY FITTED TO BECOME THE WORLD-RELIGION?

By JOHN HENRY BARROWS,
Chicago.

MANY of the most important questions which men are considering at the close of the nineteenth century are either included in this inquiry or suggested by it. Studies in comparative theology and the pressing and very practical problems of Christian missions are closely related to it. Thoughtful men, trained in the ancient religions and philosophies of the Orient are answering our inquiry affirmatively to this extent, that they are urging and promoting ethical reforms which follow the spirit and methods of Christian philanthropy. The awakened and expanded intellect of India and Japan looks upon Christendom with grateful appreciation, and regards Christianity, as represented by Christ and his teaching, with a growingly favorable mind.

Many are coming to see that the higher principles and ideals of the ethnic and of the so-called universal religions touch those of the Christian Scriptures at certain vital points; and good results might follow from an authoritative statement of these principles by representatives of each historic religion, and, following this, by the comparison of these statements the elements common to all could be discovered. This residuum, however, would constitute an insufficient basis for that new, universal religion which a few idealists imagine is to spring from this common content. Scholars have tried in vain to construct an artificial language, which men shall adopt and use, out of the best elements of the greatest forms of human speech, and it is not probable that a universal religion can be educed out of the elements common to the mightiest systems of faith. Religions whose origins are known have not been manufactured. They have been born like children. They have sprung like trees from seeds or roots in the past, and their development has not been

mechanical, but vital and organic. Dissection neither discovers nor develops life. Reducing Christianity and the non-Christian faiths to their common principles we bring the highest to the level of the lowest, cut each faith off from its history, and eliminate from each at least some of the characteristic elements which give it energy and enduring attraction. The ethical and philosophical remnant, plus the dim recognition of a supernatural order, cannot be considered the world-religion for which mankind is supposed to be waiting. Men acquainted with the history of religions do not anticipate the rise of a new faith which, gathering the best elements of the others into a grand synthesis, is destined to supplant all present systems of belief and worship.

What appears, then, in the present field of history, which is worthy of serious attention, as possibly the ultimate and universal faith? At most there are but five religions which now divide the allegiance of the chief part of the world's inhabitants, and the leading principles, the main historic developments, the most important moral and spiritual results and the present working forces of these systems are well known or may be easily and accurately ascertained. As a matter of fact, the faiths which dispute with Christianity the conquest of the globe are but two, the Mohammedan and the Buddhist. Confucianism may be regarded rather as an obstacle to the progress of the others than as a disputant of their pretensions. And it is only recently that Hinduism, one of the most exclusive and national of religions, has made the least claim to universalism. The efforts of a few Hindu scholars to secure a general recognition of the worth supposed to belong, for example, to the Vedanta philosophy do not properly place Hinduism in the ranks of the missionary faiths seeking by zealous propagandism to gain universal acceptance. It has been the mission of the greater religions, of those which are vertebrate with organizing principles, to absorb the primitive and the unsystematized faiths of the world. In India, as the hill tribes and the people of the jungle have become slightly civilized, they have gradually melted their rude and cruel superstitions into the types of the more intellectual religion. They have changed their modes of living and their ideas, and passed

into Hinduism "by a natural upward transition which has led them to adopt the ritual of the classes immediately above them." Mohammedanism is sweeping away the barbarous cults of central and western Africa; Buddhism in its wide conquests has wrought similar work, and Christianity not only dethroned the gods of Olympus, but has annihilated the primitive faiths of many of the savage islands of the Pacific. With the dividing walls of nations broken down and their doors of exclusion broken in, the great religions confront each other today. Principal Grant has written of one higher faith meeting another: "Victory cannot be expected to incline to either side until there has been an intelligent study by each of the sources of the other's strength, an appreciation of the spiritual and social needs which it has met, and an absorption, by the one that has the most inherent excellence and power of assimilation, of all in the other that caused it to be accepted and retained for centuries by millions of human beings." Of the four great religions which meet Christianity today, he adds that "they have proved themselves so enduring and so suited to men on a great scale that, if Christianity should succeed in absorbing and taking the place of one of them, it would be a more crowning demonstration of its superiority than was its triumph over the religions of Greece and Rome."

Can it be shown that Christianity includes what is best in the non-Christian systems, and possesses elements which make it supreme and final, as well as an authoritativeness which makes it distinctive? Are there reasons for believing that, when developed in accordance with its original ideas and modified in non-essentials so as to meet the mental and other peculiarities of different nations, it will yet dominate with its beneficent rule the entire race?

These inquiries will involve comparisons of the Christian and other systems, and these comparisons may now be conducted without misleading ignorance, with freedom from acrimony, in the spirit of perfect fairness and with genuine and generous appreciation of the elements of truth and goodness discoverable in each of the leading historic faiths. It is only two years since

Professor Max Müller described, in the *Deutsche Rundschau* of Berlin, each religion as going its own way, so convinced of its own and only beatifical power that it hardly looks at others, and can only with difficulty suppress a smile of self-content when it is asked to put itself within the same line and order with the other religions. This description may express the general feeling of the past, and a prevailing feeling with multitudes at present; but surely we have witnessed the beginnings of a truer understanding among those who variously represent the spiritual forces of the earth. There are multitudes of Christians, profoundly loyal to Jesus Christ as the world's only Saviour, who have expressed a glad appreciation not only of the truth contained in the Sacred Books of the East, but also of the devoted lives of many who have not known the historic Christ, or who have been blessed by him indirectly rather than directly, that is, through lunar rather than solar radiance. The fact that the ethical codes of all the great faiths resemble each other in many things is well known to students, and, as Dr. Washburn of Constantinople has said: "So far from being discouraging to Christians, it is one of the principal grounds of our faith in God's purpose to redeem the whole world." Another student of religion of wide influence and experience, President Martin, formerly of Peking, has written: "In the most frigid zones of heathenism there are warm currents that rise toward the Sun, and in the warmer spiritual atmosphere of Christendom are there not cold currents that set away from Him? It is a mistake to imagine that the Holy Ghost confines his operations within the forms of Christianity. In heathen countries his presence is like electric fluid in the atmosphere, while in Christendom it is like that fluid circulating through a network of wires, and responding to the human touch in producing light, heat, and power." Four years ago in the Palace of Delight, outside the fortress of Acre, according to the narrative told by Dr. Henry H. Jessup of Syria, there died a famous Persian sage, named Beha Allah, the Glory of God, the head of that vast reform party of Persian Moslems who accept the New Testament as the Word of God, who regard Christ as the deliverer of men, all peoples as one,

and all men as brethren. This Moslem saint said to an English scholar: "All nations should become one in faith, and all men brothers; the bonds of affection and unity between the sons of men should be strengthened; diversity of religions should cease and differences of race be annulled. These fruitless strifes, these ruinous wars shall pass away, and the Most Great Peace shall come. Do not you in Europe need this also? Let not a man glory in this, that he loves his country; let him rather glory in this, that he loves his kind." Such Christian sentiments as were spoken by this Babi saint indicate that loving souls are finding each other out, and are reaching forth their friendly hands, now that heaven appears to be calling to a new truce of God. In spite of wars and preparations for war, there is an increasing spirit of fraternity among the more enlightened peoples. The unity of mankind is a foremost thought in the modern world. The tendencies toward unification in commerce, laws, morals, scientific conceptions, are stronger than ever before. The two inquiries: Has a universal religion appeared among the historic faiths? and Will Christianity be ultimately accepted as the world-religion? are therefore questions not unsuited to the temper of our time in this stage of human development. The reply to the second inquiry will be an answer also to the first.

Christianity in the present discussion is not identified with any part of Christendom, like the Greek church, the Roman Catholic church, or with protestantism in any one of its types. The religion which will be considered is the common, catholic, historic Christianity, the faith delivered in the first century to the Christian church, not as a perfect jewel, admitting of no change or growth, but rather as a celestial seed, capable of indefinite expansion. This Christianity, so far as its fundamental truths and facts are concerned, is expressed in the chief articles of the Apostles' Creed. While there have been Christian developments outside of these limits, and noble characters shaped by Christian truth who have not accepted in its fullness the historic faith, our present inquiries will not deal with exceptions, but with the rule. Christianity is a majestic growth from the seed planted in

Palestine by Christ and his apostles. The truths and forces which have made Christendom are centered in him whom the church reveres as the Messiah of Israel, the Son of God, the Divine Redeemer, incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth for the redemption of men. Of course, Christianity cannot properly be regarded as merely the theological teachings and historical propositions of the so-called Apostles' Creed. It must also be thought of as the spirit pervading these. As Christ created Christianity we must know him in order to understand what he created; his conception of God as Father, gracious and merciful and providing propitiation; his conception of himself as the Mediator and Redeemer; of men as children of God whose primary obligations are the filial spirit toward him and the fraternal spirit toward each other; of worship as spiritual and independent of priests and sacred places; of the kingdom of heaven as a society founded to universalize Christian ideals. By his holy and perfect character he brings before men in the most impressive way the doctrine of God's righteousness and forbids the cherishing of evil in the heart. By his own life he teaches the supremacy of love, and through the cross illustrates the spirit of self-sacrifice. Through his revelation of God's Fatherhood, and himself as the Son of God, he sets forth the divine worth and dignity of man, of man not as one of the sexes, but as including both. He gives such honor to womanhood and to childhood that oppression and cruelty in every form are unchristian. His instruction is meant to regenerate the household and remold society. He proclaims the vital importance of fidelity, inward purity, and mutual kindness. He both teaches and illustrates the law of forgiveness. By his death he makes redemption an actual thing, an accomplished fact for all who will receive it, and by his resurrection he brings the life immortal into new and abiding radiance. Whatever, in any degree, is contrary to the reigning spirit and the foundation principles of Jesus Christ is alien to true Christianity and a hindrance to that kingdom of God which it was his plan to make a world-embracing commonwealth.

A religion which is to be ultimate and universal cannot hold

to an imperfect conception of God. Christian theism appears to be an adequate basis for a universal faith. The God who is the Father of all men is a boon to the whole world. The God who is one mind, of absolute perfection, can bring intellectual peace and spiritual purity to nations still distracted and degraded by polytheism. The God who is personal and holy and is able to create holy personalities needs to be known by those who are still shrouded in the mists of pantheism. The God who is merciful as well as mighty, whose central nature is love, and whose compassion has been revealed and personalized in the redeeming Christ, can impart unspeakable good to all who consciously or unconsciously are sunk in guilt, error, and degradation. The God who became incarnate that men might at last know his nature in its divinest manifestation and thereby gain spiritual release, restoration, and harmony, is indeed the fulfillment of the prayers and hopes and vague longings of many peoples and many generations of men. When the Christian messenger goes today to Arabia or to China, to the islands of Japan or to the schools of India, he believes, with the best of reasons, that he has a higher, purer, completer, and more potent disclosure of the Supreme and Infinite Spirit than has been recorded in any sacred book of the Orient. The eastern world has not yet fully learned the monotheism of science or the monotheism of religion. Students of India and Japan have seen what a poisonous and corrupting element is the pantheism which branches out into polytheism and idolatry. Christianity, with its doctrine of a changeless, omnipotent God, transcendent as well as immanent, emancipates the bewildered intellect, and thus gives to science a lasting foundation. Christianity, with its teaching that God is love, a love which has had a matchless expression in the historic Christ, and which continually and everywhere pours its affection through the tides of the Spirit, is able to satisfy the restless and sin-burdened heart. The one doctrine which the philosophic Hindu of today exploits and defends is his doctrine of God. Destroying the distinction between the human and the divine, degrading man "into a fleeting manifestation of the great impersonal spirit of nature," pantheism has exercised an immense

fascination over the eastern spirit. But to the Christian theist this God of Hindu speculation seems robbed of ethical character. To him the Hindu pantheism with all its attractions is a golden fog blotting out the brightest stars of truth and of hope, because the divine personality has been obliterated. To him personality in God and man is essential to moral worth, and he has learned from the Christian Scriptures, with their teaching of a Godhead existing as Father, Son, and Spirit, that personality in the divine nature is not limitation or loss, but fullness, richness, as well as mystery of being. Christianity gives a conception of the Godhead "which has all the constituents and conditions of a real intellectual, moral, and social existence," thus saving us, as Dr. Fairbairn has said, "from the deism which shuts up God within the limitations or impotences of his own infinitude, and from the pantheism which loses him within the multitudinous and fleeting phenomena of an ever-changing universe."

Christianity goes to the nations, proclaiming that the one God has revealed himself as the loving Father and Redeemer of the world. The sage of China had no such message. Confucius did not claim to know much of the power that rules in the heavens. Prince Siddartha, driven into practical atheism, never uttered any messages of divine love, and so the "Gospel of Buddha" which modern scholars are compiling and printing is a misnomer. Friendly students of the prophet of Islâm affirm that Mohammed's God is savage, aggressive, and almost cruel. Though the Koran speaks much of the Merciful One, the divine mercy is dimmed by other attributes and is not made real or credible. Islâm is a crescent, a pale lunar sickle of gracious truth in the sky of religion. We may discern the luminous shadow faintly rounded out, but the light is narrow and not intense. Allah is a God afar off. He does not satisfy the yearnings of the soul. And as Kuenen has said, "The people therefore makes a new religion at the graves of its saints; it seeks compensation for the dryness of the official doctrine and worship." Only through Christ have men ever gotten worthy and complete conceptions of God's merciful nature. In a world of

sorrow, contradiction, and moral weakness, the foremost need of mankind is to know that God, in whom all things move and have their being, is love. And Christianity supplies that need as no other religion has done or attempted to do, by setting forth God as revealed in Christ, reconciling the world unto himself. The ethical man of the present and future cannot accept any vindication of the present order of things, any release from the weary weight of an unintelligible and sorrow-laden world, which like Hindu pantheism is unethical and enervating to spiritual energy. Christ becomes for men not only a revelation of God, but a vindication of the divine government through his disclosure of a merciful Fatherhood, a disclosure which not only brightens the world that now is, but reaches into the life immortal, illumining the darkness of the grave with a light which the founders of other religions never held in their hands.

It accords with reason to expect the universal prevalence of Christianity, not only from the perfection of Christian theism, but also from the distinctive character and claims and the all-sided manhood of Jesus of Nazareth. He is indeed unique. "It is only of One," as Professor Harnack has said, "that we know that he united the deepest humility and a purity of will with the claim that he was more than all the prophets that were before him: the Son of God. Of him alone we know that those who ate and drank with him, glorified him not only as their Teacher, Prophet, and King but also as the Prince of Life, as the Redeemer and Judge of the world, as the living power of their existence." After eighteen centuries of human progress, believers in Christ today abate not in the least from this primitive reverence. They almost shrink from naming him in the august company of the founders of other religions. He is the very substance of their belief, the beginning, middle, and end of Christian faith. There is no form nor degree of love which he does not call forth. They perceive in him the goal of prophecy and the turning-point of history. He sustains different relations to the Christian spirit from those sustained by the founders of other religions to their disciples. We cannot say of Mohammedanism that it is Mohammed, though he is certainly a part of

it, the temporary strength, the real weakness, the ultimate disintegration of it. We cannot say of Buddhism that it is Gautama Buddha, for not only does that protean system recognize many Buddhas, but even in the beginning it was Nirvana and the Law, rather than the gentle saint himself, that his loving disciples preached. Hinduism is scarcely associated with any great historic name. It knows no history, and is wanting in that power and adaptation which belong to Christianity, from the fact that its message centers in the person, character, teaching, and deeds of the greatest life ever lived. Confucianism cannot be identified with Confucius, for the Chinese sage was a scribe and historian of the ancients, a transmitter and not a creator. While he represents China and is venerated by millions, while temples are dedicated and sandal-wood papers are burned to him in every Chinese city, he is the symbol, rather than the ever-living embodiment, of the faith which he taught. But in Jesus, his followers find the truth personalized; knowing him, they know God, man, atonement, resurrection, immortality. Thus Christianity, as Professor Schultz has said, "is bound to the personality of Jesus."

It is generally recognized that Christianity alone represents in its founder and central personage the representative or universal man, who is able to meet the moral needs, the national temper, the intellectual and spiritual demands of the greatest variety of peoples. He rules the occidental nations, but he is no more occidental than oriental. The East may claim him as well as the West. Keshub Chunder Sen rejoiced that Jesus was an Asiatic, that his disciples were Asiatics, that all the agencies primarily employed for the propagation of the gospel are Asiatic, and that "in Christ we see not only the exaltedness of humanity, but also the grandeur of which Asiatic nature is susceptible." With beautiful and loving sentences Mozoomdar has pictured the "Oriental Christ" the bathing, fasting, praying, teaching, healing, feasting Prophet of Nazareth. When Jesus is received into the heart he is as much at home among the most cultivated Europeans as among the most barbarous Africans, in the universities by the Ganges as in those by the Isis and the Cam, in the cities by the Indus and the Nile as in those by the

Thames and the Rhine, the Hudson and the Clyde. We cannot think of a western Mohammed, we can hardly think of a western Buddha; but there is nothing local or provincial discoverable about Jesus Christ.

So complex a being as man requires a leader and prophet who shall answer to all his intellectual and moral needs. The Teuton requires a hero in whom is every quality of splendid manliness. The Asiatic demands a seer whose mind perceives and formulates universal principles. Men who are Greek in their intellectual aptitudes cannot be fully satisfied with a teacher who is not analytic and even Socratic in his methods. There are poets in the world in whom imagination is the central light of the soul, who commune with nature because they see in the outer world a reflex both of humanity and divinity. Most that is good in human life is found not in the school, but in the family and society, and the world needs a prophet who is familiar, friendly, sympathetic, blessing little children, sharing the wedding feast and standing with tear-wet eyes at the open grave. Jesus and he alone is adequate to all these demands.

No one doubts that in the teaching of Jesus we possess a body of ethical and spiritual wisdom of the loftiest spirit, of marvelous completeness, and of unequaled adaptation to the most various minds. Professor Romanes and others have noticed the absence from it of any doctrines which the later developments of human knowledge, whether in natural science, ethics, political economy, or elsewhere, have had to discount. The words of Jesus manifestly springing from a calm and certain mind come to us with the familiarity of the breakfast table and yet with the authority of Mount Sinai. The free utterances of the Nazarene Teacher do not recall the frenzy and ardor of other prophets who appear to have been lifted by a divine breath greater than themselves. They do not remind us of the experiences of Mohammed, whose struggles and agonies were accompanied by delusions of the senses, nor of Buddha, who after years of vain search and many painful disappointments finally gained his vision of partial truth. Both by the method of his speech, and the contents of his revelation, Jesus so meets the needs of mankind that he appears as

the one perfect teacher, whose message grows not antiquated. Buddha should not be mentioned as a possible rival, for the Indian sage was blind to that truth which glowed ever in the heart of Jesus and was the determinative principle of his teaching, the Fatherhood of God. The doctrine of Jesus compromises with no darling sin of human nature, as did that of the prophet of Islâm. Unlike Confucianism it leaves men satisfied with no fragmentary virtues, and unlike Buddhism it confesses no agnosticism with regard to the Power that rules in life and nature.

The moral qualities of Jesus are such that we need to offer no apologies for him, like those with which Mohammedan scholars seek to defend the Arabian prophet, and we have no limitations to concede like the Israelite in his panegyric of Moses. Christ's freedom from the consciousness of sin was absolute, and he stands on a moral height as much above his people today as above his disciples in the beginning. He is that moral hero in whom men can implicitly trust and to whom they can offer an unreserved devotion. Unlike every other great prophet he is proclaimed and believed in as a personal presence among his followers today. This Teacher, the crystal goblet of whose soul was not only stainless, but was also filled with the wine of absolute goodness, reveals to us a heart ever open towards God and man, with an apparent consciousness of perfect oneness with both. He rose above the formalism of the Pharisee and the skeptical looseness of the Sadducee. Rescuing the Mosaic statutes from their accumulated errors he declared love to be the whole law. Ascending above national prejudice he proclaimed himself to his people's most hated enemies. Lovingly faithful to all who came nearest to his own life, he yet lived and died with a compassionate consciousness of the whole world's needs. To his perfect moral glory he added the majesty of suffering, and bore the manifold indignities of malice, cruelty, ingratitude, not with stoic hardness but with more than womanly sensitiveness, and yet with a calm which was a benediction of peace to his followers. Sustained by the might of love, with a quietness unbroken by a murmur, he passed calmly up the slopes of Calvary, and with forgiveness

for his murderers closed his life of transcendent and spotless virtue with the immortal infamy of the cross. His sufferings, like his doctrine and his nature, make him the brother of all men. There is nothing exclusively Jewish about him excepting his dress and his speech. As in him we behold the equilibrium of ethics and piety, the harmony of God and man, the sweet marriage of all contrasting virtues, we are not surprised at his growing moral conquests over men. Already his empire overleaps all kingdoms.

Only through forms of sacred literature have religions been able to exercise a wide, continuous power among the more or less enlightened nations. Of all religions Christianity has been most eager to make known to men its sacred writings. It gives its Bible in a multitude of languages. The Moslem offers his Koran in one. The representatives of other faiths are not active in furnishing Christendom with translations of their own sacred books. But Christianity offers men in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments a Bible of unequaled adaptation to the most various mental and spiritual needs. It may indeed be called the universal book, although it is more accurately described as "a collection of books, with a backbone of history and biography of the highest kind, stretching over a period of more than three thousand years." But these various books in the library of the Christian Scriptures are held into some measure of oneness by the prophetic character of the older volumes and the historic consummations of the later. Or the unity of the Scriptures is discoverable in the great idea and purpose of the kingdom of God, which runs through their pages. Or it may be truly said that Christ, the culmination of the gradual progress of redemptive disclosure, is the unifying principle of this multiplex volume.

Christianity presents as its text-book literature of well-defined proportions and contents, distinguishable clearly from the glosses, comments, parasitic growths which have expanded the Brahmanic and Buddhistic scriptures into immense and varying proportions. This book has secured admission into almost every part of the globe, and its beneficent power gives no signs of

obsolescence. Originating in a land which was itself an epitome of the whole world, the Bible reproduces the geographical features of the entire globe, and thus possesses a fitness to meet some of the wants of all mankind. It reproduces, moreover, the spiritual life of the race in its multitudinous phases. Its authors include men of almost every station, genius, and temper. Thus the biblical literature presents a marvelous variety in the products of men who lived through many centuries, and expressed their thought in dramatic poetry, like Job; in history which reads like epic poetry; in tragedies which Shakespeare and the Greeks have not surpassed; in pastorals like Ruth; in love songs like those attributed to Solomon, and in sententious precepts like the Proverbs. We have besides grandest oratory, like the writings of Isaiah; fascinating biographies, like the gospels; grave doctrinal and practical letters, like those of Paul; profoundest principles of statesmanship, such as run through the Old Testament prophecies; missionary annals, like the Acts of the Apostles, and visions of earthly and heavenly victory over evil, like that of the Apocalypse.

Non-Christian literature abounds in biblical elements, showing that men everywhere have been groping after the highest. But they have seen it only in fragments. The human heart needs for its purest life not partial, but full-orbed spiritual truth. In the Christian Scriptures we not only find the noblest precepts which have been uttered by the sages and saints of the non-Christian world, but confront a sacred literature which, as it reflects the mind of Christ, is purified and transcendently glorious and life-giving. Instead of fragmentary and uncertain mutterings of the spirit, mixed with voices of baser tone, we have the full, articulate utterance of the highest inspiration. In the ten words which were the basis of the Mosaic legislation we behold a divine hand smiting down idolatry, with its accompanying degradations, and building up the institutions of the family. The sacredness of life and of possessions, of truth and purity, is authoritatively announced, in connection with the obligation of worship to a righteous and redeeming God. The Sermon on the Mount was the fulfillment of this old law, and

offers men a perfect standard, a moral legislation, which, as it comes from the lips and is associated with the life of Jesus, covers mercifully and completely the ethical realm.

Under the biblical training there was no retrogression, as in the Hindu sacred literature, to lower conceptions, but rather a steady advance to an ethical monotheism, crowned by the revelation of Christ. The Bible is a progressive disclosure of truth. But in it there is no down-sinking to inferior standards. The thoughts of men are rectified, moralized, and increasingly spiritualized. Wherever the Christian Scriptures have entered into the thoughts of the nations, men, though clinging to other bibles, have been awakened out of moral lethargy and have felt themselves both challenged and condemned, even though they hold in their possession many scattered gems of ethical truth.

Christianity's doctrine of God, its Central Personage, and its sacred writings seem to fit it to become the world-religion; and its historical effects also show its adaptation to universal human need. The record of all religions has been a history of good and evil strangely blended. The beneficent results of the non-Christian religions are fully acknowledged by many who are striving to supplant them with what they believe to be a higher faith. With all their evils they have been better than no religion. A Christian missionary in China says: "India may be as bad as you please under the reign of Brahmanism; China, Thibet and Corea as degraded as you choose under that of Buddhism and Confucianism; Arabia and Turkey as cruel and lustful as you can imagine under Mohammedanism; Africa as savage as you care to suppose with its dumb, dark fetichisms; all would be worse without these. Superstition, lust, cruelty, selfishness, savagery, wrong, hate, rage, can get on without religion of any kind." But the moral usefulness of a faith does not prove its adequacy. It is said that Buddhism has made Asia mild. It has done more than that, but it can hardly be shown that Buddhism has made Asia moral. India has been an immense theater for the activity and contention of all the religions which are really great. It may be truly called the museum and encyclopædia, the reservoir, morass or Dead Sea of these

faiths. The foremost minds of India see but little hope of national regeneration in the native religions out of which the spirit has fled, and it would not be difficult to establish a claim frequently made that Christianity has done more for the elevation of Hindu society in the last half century than the other faiths have wrought in all their long dominion. Much might be written in praise of Confucianism, but it has not been progressive, it has not been in a high sense religious, and it has sacrificed man to the social order. Perhaps nothing more is needed to show that Mohammedanism is only a temporary halting-place in human progress and "something short of the final religion" than the engrafting of polygamy into its fundamental ideas and permanent system. Religions are not to be judged solely by their worst results or accompaniments, nor must they be estimated merely by their brighter and more beneficent effects. It is necessary, in order to understand a religion, to discover its fundamental ideas and its working forces. A distinction must be made between its legitimate fruits and the incidents or accidents of its historic development. Other causes coöperate with religion and their force must be regarded. The tests which should be applied to religions include the fundamental and ethical ideas of each faith, its incomplete and ignoble teachings, if there be such, the spiritual dynamics of each through which its ideals become realized, the best effects which each faith can show and also its average results, its workings through long ages on great masses of people, its vital relations to enlightenment, liberty, and progress.

The supreme position which the Christian religion has achieved is indicated by the panegyric which describes civilization as "the secular name for Christianity," a eulogy which scholarly men would never think of applying to any other faith. The fruits of Christian life and teaching—in the elevation of womankind, in the promotion of charity, in the advancement of knowledge and freedom, in lifting great masses of men into self-helpfulness and self-respect, in the building up of noble and many-sided character, in creating the spirit of humanity, in destroying feudalism, serfdom, barbarism, slavery, in lessening

the horrors of war, in diffusing the spirit of brotherhood and in making less inhumane the relations which peoples sustain to one another—although not worthy of its Founder nor commensurate with its opportunities, have still been so wondrous and world-wide that to some minds they furnish the most persuasive apologetic. Marred and blackened though Christian civilization is, the law of life, the law of hope, and the law of progress run their golden threads through its entire organism. Christian peoples are not moving in fatal cycles round and round, coming back to the same place and making no true advancement. An increasing purpose and hopefulness run through Christendom. In spite of a backward turning now and then, the stream of life rolls on its fertilizing flood with such energy that obstacles do not prevail against it.

In the stress and interchange of modern civilization the best religion must more and more come to the front. It appears to be the mission of Christendom to draw nations out of their seclusion, to generate unrest and eager inquiry throughout all the world. The non-Christian faiths are not permitted to remain at ease, as they behold Christianity seeking to become universal, as it must do by the very law of its being. The Christian faith has already been accepted by so many races of men and has prevailed over so many other religions in individual conquests that it is not safe to argue with Herbert Spencer that every religion is the best which its followers could hold and practice in that stage of their development, and it seems like playing with history for another to write, "No nation can part with its religion without destroying its mental continuity and cutting itself off in a fatal way from the sources of its strength." Acknowledging the providential character of other faiths, we cannot be certain that they are the best which their peoples can at present possess. The peoples among whom Christianity now prevails had other religions, which they left with moral advantage. Mohammedanism, superseding an idolatrous religion, accomplished high, not the highest, results for Arabia.

It is evident that Christianity alone, at the present time, appears like a universal religion. Although at one period the

Roman paganism and at a later Mohammedanism occupied more of the earth's habitable surface than Christendom; and although it is easy to overestimate the argument for the truth and fitness of any belief from its wide acceptance, still the great religions have been acting upon each other and upon the world through such a vast stretch of time that it is not without significance that the nations that have accepted the Christian faith hold in their hands the military power, the learning, the arts, the commerce and the practical sovereignty of the globe. The greatest empires of the ancient world are insignificant in comparison with Christendom. The nominal disciples of Christ are more than four hundred millions, while under Christian governments, dwelling beneath the reign of law and the influence of Christian institutions are more than six hundred millions of the earth's inhabitants. A large work of preparation has already been accomplished, and more significant than the vast numbers and the wide influence of the peoples nominally Christian are the changes which are discernible and even impending. Mankind appears to be getting ready through international interchange of commodities and ideas, through friendlier feelings toward Christians on the part of non-Christian rulers and statesmen, through a new knowledge which discriminates between true and false Christianity, through a better understanding of the loving and beneficent spirit of the true, for a universal faith. "Different moral standards," as Dean Fremantle has said, "cannot ultimately be," and, "if the human race is one and is to be drawn into unity, it is impossible that there can be ultimately different religions."

The survey of commanding truths and facts connected with Christianity which has thus far been made is surely confirmatory, with minds that discover rationality in the orderings of human life, of the fundamental claim which the Christian church has always made. The claim is this, that Christianity alone is a religion of supernatural historic facts, a system of faith built not upon a philosophy, nor merely upon the ethical and spiritual teachings of some saintly founder, but resting on what is surer and more authoritative. The gospel of Christianity is its history. That

history is the very life of the Christian faith. It centers in a supernatural person, who in himself sums up the truths and forces of his religion, who by his life, character, self-sacrificing death and victorious resurrection, placed the divine seal, the signature of heavenly authority upon the perfect doctrine which he taught and embodied.

The strange mixture of truth and error in the non-Christian religions indicates clearly enough that men need such a revelation as has come through Jesus Christ. Dim guesses and half-truths have not contented the mind. It has often been felt that the fatal deficiency of Plato's doctrine of immortality is that he does not know. The sacred literatures show that men have required a more certain and authoritative guidance. They need to learn more fully the gracious character of God in order to gain relief from the awful pressure of sorrow. Preëminently they need to discover the one who is able to deliver from the guilt and slavery of sin. The Christianity of Christ reveals the divine character in its most merciful aspects; it illumines all the truths of God which are dimly revealed in the light of nature; it provides a remedy for the malady of sin which the testing of centuries and the experience of multitudes of men have shown to be adequate. It lifts a future world, with all its vast restraining and vivifying powers, before the vision of the believing soul; it links the practice of the most perfect ethics with devotion to the person and world-wide kingdom of Jesus Christ. Upon such a system of faith, and upon no other, it seems worthy that the stamp of supernatural authority should distinctly and perpetually rest.

Through the comparative study of religions Christianity appears to be so adapted to universal acceptance that its ultimate prevalence seems more than probable. The systems which withstand it, however, are of no feeble texture. Their disintegration will not be accomplished in a day or a decade. But the time is apparently coming when Christianity will be recognized. Seen in its true spirit, apprehended as the fulfillment of all the best thoughts and aspirations of what Schelling has well called the "wild-growing religions," grasped in its central person and

power, it will yet appear to the worshipers of Krishna and the disciples of Buddha, Confucius, and Mohammed in its distinctive character and its peerless supremacy. They will be ready to say with the Christian apostle, "When that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away." Unfortunately Christianity has not usually been seen in its true, certainly not in its highest, character. The corruptions and divisions of Christendom, the faithless and cruel oppressions by so-called Christian nations, and sometimes the very imperfect methods of Christian propagandism, have stood in the way of its more rapid progress. The purification and reunion of Christendom must very likely precede that rapid conversion of men to the Christian faith which the church is eagerly expecting. Since the progress of the Christian religion has always been accompanied by a renewed activity of the non-Christian systems, the question of the wisest methods of Christian missionary effort is one of supreme importance. The messenger of Christ confronting the disciples of other religions must not stand to them as the representative of a spirit "which indiscriminately denounces all they believe and ascribes to them the worst of motives." In the better day which has dawned, the representatives of the Christian faith will be more constructive and less destructive in their teaching. They will be more contented with the primitive gospel of Christ and less eager to engraft upon the oriental world the various systems of western theology. Full of hope and love and brotherhood they will "emphasize those essentials of truth by which the world is to be saved, rather than those non-essentials by which it is liable to be lost."

# DOCUMENTS.

## PROTEVANGELIUM IACOBI.

[FROM AN ARMENIAN MANUSCRIPT IN THE LIBRARY OF THE MECHITARISTS IN VENICE.]

ARMENIAN TITLE:—CONCERNING THE HOLY VIRGIN MARIAM, WHO WAS IN THE HOUSE OF HER FATHER. THE WHICH WAS RELATED BY ST. JAMES, THE BROTHER OF THE LORD.

*Tisch. ed.* I, 4. But the husband Joachim,[1] when he went forth from his home, took his flocks and his shepherds, and departed into the wilderness, and there pitched his tent. And he fell to praying for thirty days and thirty nights, crying and weeping (living) on bread and water only; (and) he sat down and besought God with sorrowful soul and spake thus: Remember me, Lord, according to thy mercifulness and righteous-
I, 3. ness; and work unto me a sign of thy loving kindness, as thou did'st unto our forefather Abraham. For in the season of his old age thou gavest to him seed of blessing, a son of promise, Isaak his mother's only son, and heir of consolation to his nation. Even so with tears he besought God with sorrowful soul, asking for pity from the Lord. And he said: I will not go down hence, I will not eat nor will I drink until the Lord look upon me and have pity on his servant. And when he had finished his forty days' fast, the angel of the Lord came
IV, 2. and stood before Joachim and said to him: Joachim, the Lord hath heard thy supplication and hath fulfilled thy desire. Behold, thy wife shall conceive and shall bear to thee seed of thy blessing, and her name shall be great, and all nations shall bless her. Arise, take the offering which thou did'st promise to make, and thou shalt take it into the temple of holiness and shalt fulfill thy vow there. For, behold, I will go before thee on this night and will intimate to the high priest to accept sacrifices from thy hands. And having said this the archangel left him; but Joachim arose quickly full of joy, and went with his many flocks and offerings.

And in the same vision the angel of the Lord appeared to the high priest Eliazar and said to him: Behold, Joachim cometh unto thee with offerings. Thou shalt accept his sacrifices with holiness and lawfully as is right. For the Lord hath listened to his supplication and hath fulfilled his desire. And the high priest awoke from his sleep, and rose up and thanked the Lord and said: Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who despiseth not his servants who ask of him.
IV, 2. And then the angel of the Lord appeared a second time to Anna

[1] The beginning of the piece is missing in the Arm. MS. In the margin are noted the corresponding chapters and sections of Tischendorf's text.

and said to her: Lo, thy husband cometh; arise, go forth to meet him, and receive him with joy. But Anna arose and dressed herself in her wedding garb, and ran to meet him. And when she saw her husband, she bowed low to him with joy, and fell on his neck. But Joachim said to her: All hail to thee, Anna, and good tidings; for the Lord God hath had compassion on me and hath blessed me, and hath promised to give us seed of blessing. And Anna said to Joachim: Thy good tidings return unto thee, for me also hath the Lord enjoined to give (them) as thou sayest. *Tisch. ed.* IV, 4.

Anna was rejoiced and said: Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who hath not despised our supplications, and (hath) not (withheld) his compassion from us. And straightway Joachim bade summon his friends and neighbors; and he entertained them with great cheer: they ate and drank and were merry. And having thanked God, they departed each to his own home; and raising their voices they glorified God.

CHAPTER II.—*About the birth of the holy virgin Mariam, which was in the house of her father.*

And on the morrow Joachim arose and called the shepherds and said to them: Bring ye ten lambs. White shall be[2] this offering for the great temple of my God, and twelve calves. This shall be for the priests, the scribes and the ministrants, who are servitors of the church. And goats[3] a hundred. This shall be for all the congregation of Israel. And when Joachim had taken his offerings and brought them into the temple of the Lord, and had saluted the priests and all the congregation, he brought forward and set down before them his sacrifices. And they beheld him and were glad, and called him blessed; for that the Lord was pleased to receive offerings of holiness from his hands. The multitude of men that were there wondered and said: Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who hath fulfilled the desire of thine heart. Go in peace into thy house; and the Lord shall be with you forever, and shall give thee good seed and a holy offspring from the fruit of thy loins. And Joachim saluted the priests who were there, and he rose up and entered the temple; and he fell to praying and gave thanks to the Lord and said: O Lord God of Israel, of our fathers; as thou hast heard thy servant, and hast magnified thy mercy, so now I pray thee, O Lord. If thou shalt give to me seed, male or female, I will give it to thee, Lord, in thy temple here to be thy minister all the days of its life. And Joachim thus spake, and he arose and departed in joy unto his home. IV, 3.

When three months had passed, the child leapt in its mother's womb; and Anna was right glad and rejoiced, and said: The Lord liveth. Whether the seed of blessing be for me male or female, I will give it unto the temple of holiness all the time of its life. And Anna went with child for 180 days, which is six months. Then Joachim went up with his offerings away unto the temple of holiness, and pre- IV, 1.

[2] The Arm. = πρόβατα δέκα λευκά ἔσται τοῦτο. I suspect that the verb is singular in the Armenian because it is made directly or indirectly from a Greek text where a plural neuter has a singular verb.

[3] The meaning of the Arm. word which I render "goats" is not certain.

*Tisch. ed.* sented before the priest the blood sacrifices which he had promised to make in all fulfillment at the end of the year. And when they had dragged the (victims of the) holocaust to the altar and slain them, in the shedding of their blood they saw that there was no blemish in them, and they were right glad and praised God. But Joachim after presenting his offerings took a single lamb and having presented it slew it there upon the altar. And they all saw on a sudden as it were white milk gushing out of its veins instead of blood. And the priests and all the congregation saw this and marveled and were agape; because never before had such a sign been manifested as there was in the case of this slaying. The high priest Eliazar said to Joachim: Tell us in whose name thou hast presented this offering, who hast brought lambs to be slain later on upon the altar. Joachim said: The first sacrifice I had vowed to make to my
P. 6. Lord in fulfillment of my first vow. But this last lamb is in the name of my seed. Having taken counsel I was to sacrifice it in behalf of that (my seed). The high priest said: Thou dost see this sign, which the Lord hath shewn thee in the name of thy seed. The high priest said: The milk which gushed out just now from its veins is in the name of thy seed. For that which is born in the womb of its mother is female incorruptible and holy virgin. But the virgin conceiving without man giveth birth to a male child, who becometh a great ruler and king of Israel. And when all who stood there heard this, they marveled greatly. But Joachim departed in silence unto his home, and told to Anna his wife about the wonders which had taken place. And they gave thanks to God and were glad, and said to the Lord: Thy will be done.

V, 2. But when the pregnancy of Anna was advanced 210 days, which is seven months, forthwith in the seventh hour Anna bore her holy child, on the completion of the twenty-first (day of) the month, which is September eighth. The first day she asked the midwife: What have I borne? And she answered: Thou hast borne a female child, but very beautiful, fair to behold, and comely, pure without any stain. Anna said: Blessed be the Lord God of Israel, who hath hearkened unto the prayers of his servants, and hath magnified his compassion and his dealings with us; and we have been made to rejoice. Now is my heart established in the Lord, and my hope raised on high in God my Saviour.

P. 7; V, 2. When the child was three days old, the midwife ordered it to be washed, and to be placed in the upper chamber with honor. And they brought it before her, and she gave it the breast and suckled it and gave it to drink of her milk; and out of tenderness called her name Mary.[4] And day by day she grew and increased; and she would toss her in merriness in her arms. Thus then, her parents brought her up with fostering care.

When Mary was forty days old, her parents took her with great honor and many offerings; and brought her to the temple of the
VI, 1. Lord according to the rule of their tradition. And the child Mary increased and grew day by day. But when she was six months old, her mother let her make her first essay at walking; and when she had taken three steps, she turned round and going back threw her-

[4] In the original "Mariam."

self in her mother's lap; but her mother lifted her up upon her arms and caressing her, said: "Mary, mother of holy virgins, thou goodly root of trees, branch and blossom. From thee glances forth the morning star of light like to the moon, than stars more brilliant, brighter than the splendor of the sun, light of day, effulgence of the dawn ethereal." These and other words spake Anna and embraced the holy child and said: The Lord liveth, that thy feet shall not tread the ground until thou art brought into the temple of holiness. And Joachim said: Yea, well hast thou spoken. And the child abode in the house of her father till she was three years old. Amen. *Tisch. ed.*

CHAPTER III.—*Concerning the holy virgin Mary's upbringing, which was in the Temple of Holiness for twelve years.*

Joachim said unto Anna: The days of the child with us are completed. Do thou bid summon all the daughters of the Hebrews, the virgins devoted to God; and let them take each a lamp in their hands, and bear the child with honor and holiness into the temple of God as is even right. And they bore and set her down on the third step of the tabernacle, and the Lord God gave her grace and wisdom. And an angel of God came down from heaven and waited on her at table, and she was fed by the angels of life. And every day she listened to the sound of the tongue and the songs of angels there in the tabernacle. And Mary was three years old, when her parents gave her unto the temple; and she abode there twelve years, and in one year died her parents. And Mary felt much sorrow for her father and mother, and put on mourning for thirty days. But Mary stayed in the temple and was brought up there and grew after the manner of women, like the other daughters of the Hebrews, who were with her until she was fifteen years old. In that same year the high priest Eliazar died,[5] and the children of Israel mourned for him and lamented thirty days. Then after that year there was a gathering of the priests and of the elders and of the others, to take counsel and appoint a high priest of the temple and cast lots. And the lot fell upon Zachariah, son of Barachiah. And the priests all elected him, and appointed him minister of the holy altar. Now Anna and Elizabeth were kinswomen of one another, and they were both barren, and they had no offspring. And after that Anna conceived, and that thirteen years had passed by since the birth of Mariam, until Zachariah became high priest of the temple. And it was in the priesthood of Zachariah, and his wife likewise was barren like Anna. After that the priests took counsel and all the congregation, and said among themselves: It hath been untoward, and we understood not the deed we wrought. Wherefore did we appoint him high priest in the temple? for he hath sins and his wife is barren and hath not the seed of blessing. Then one of them, named Levi, said to the priests: If ye think him worthy (? unworthy), by your command I will tell him this. The priests answered: Only intimate unto him what we say in secret, that he may know this action, and tell thou it to no one. The priest answered: Yea, I will tell him this, and none else. And it came to pass one day at the VII, 2. VII, 3. VIII, 1.

[5] The details which follow about Zachariah are absent from the Greek protevangel and seem to belong to some apocryph about Zachariah, so far as they are not taken from Luke's gospel.

*Tisch. ed.* ending of the time of prayer, the priest came in secret by and revealed to him that which had been said. And when Zachariah heard this, he was much afflicted, and considered in himself saying: What shall I do, or what answer shall I make? For in myself I am not conscious of having done any wrong. And if they hate me for nothing, when I am sinless, how shall the Lord himself search out that alone? But if I dismiss my wife without her being in any way guilty as a reason, that is a heavy sin unto me. If they think that I have any guilt, how shall I be acquitted? But if I silently retire from the service of the holy altar and from the high priesthood, that is very hard for me. What then is to become of me? For I am very perplexed and my heart is grieved.

While he was thus considering all that and was deep in thought, the hour of the service of prayer arrived, that he should cast incense before the Lord. And he stood there in the temple near to the holy altar of God, and shed his tears before the tabernacle, and prayed thus: Lord God of our fathers, God of Israel, look in thy pity on thy servant, who stand ashamed before thy majesty, and supplicate thy benevolent and kindly will. Scorn not thy servant; but, if thou think me worthy to minister to thy holy altar, shew unto me thy loving kindness, O thou who alone art merciful and all-powerful; and to thee be glory for ever. Amen.

And this did the high priest Zachariah say, and stood on the right hand of the holy altar, and prostrated himself humbly before the Lord; when lo! an angel of God appeared unto him in the tabernacle and said to him: Fear not, Zachariah, for thy prayer is heard, and thy desires are come before God. Behold, thy wife Elizabeth shall conceive and bear a son, and his name shall be called John. Saith Zachariah: How shall I know that thing, for I am old and my wife is advanced in her days? How shall that be unto me? Saith the angel: For as much as thou heardest me not and didst not believe my words, lo! thou shalt be dumb, and shalt not be able to speak until the day in which it shall be unto thee. And forthwith Zachariah swooned in the temple, and he fell down silently before the altar and lamenting beat his breast, and wept bitterly. But the priests and the rest of the multitude who were there were lost in wonder at his tarrying in the temple. And the priests entered and found him in a swoon, and he could not speak. But with his hand only he made a sign. But after the feast was passed by of the tabernacles of holiness on the fifteenth of the month of Tisri, which is October the second, there was the end of all the chief of the feasts. And on the twenty-second of Tisri, which is October the ninth, Elizabeth conceived. And in the month Thamul, on the sixteenth, which is June the fifth, was the birth of John the Baptist. Glory unto Christ. Amen.

CHAPTER IV.—*Concerning the holy virgin Mariam, the giving of her to Joseph unto wife according to the rule of their tradition, for him to keep the virgin's purity with due care; and about the devoting of her by faith to the Lord.*

VIII, 2. When the days of the holy virgin Mariam in the temple were completed, and she was fifteen years old, the priests held a council among themselves and said: What shall we do with Mariam, for her parents

are dead; and they intrusted her to us in purity in the temple here? *Tisch. ed.*
and she is quite grown up in stature after the manner of women.
We must not keep her in our midst, lest she unexpectedly ruin the
temple of God.
The priests said among themselves: What then shall we do with
her? And one of them said, a priest whose name was Behezi: And
there are many daughters of the Hebrews here in the temple along
with her. Let us proceed to ask the high priest Zachariah, and
whatsoever he wishes, let us do it. They answered with one accord:
Good. Then the priest Behezi came forward and said to Zacha-
riah: Thou art high priest fully ordained unto service of the holy
altar; and there are here women of the Hebrews, who have devoted
themselves to God. Enter into the holy of holies and pray for them.
And whatsoever the Lord revealeth, according to his pleasure, that
let us do. And forthwith the high priest Zachariah rose up, and
took the twelve stones, and entered into the holy of holies, and prayed
for them. And as he cast the incense before the Lord, lo! an
angel of God came and stood by the altar of the tabernacle and said
to Zachariah: Depart outside the door of the temple, and bid
summon the eleven daughters of the Hebrews; and Mary bring
thou hither with them, who is of the tribe of Judah and of the stock
of David. And bid summon all the unwedded men in the city
hither, and let them bring each one a tablet; and thou shalt lay
(them) in the tabernacle of testimony and shalt write their names on
the tablets, and shalt pray. And whomever of them the Lord signi-
fies, his wife shall she become. And the high priest Zachariah went
forth out of the temple and bade it be proclaimed to all the city to
this effect: Whosoever are unmarried, let them quickly come hither.
And when all heard it, they gathered all together there, and had
with them tablets each one in his hand. And the old man Joseph IX, 1.
having heard this, at once threw away his adze, and took a tablet in
his hand and hastened off and came. And the high priest took the
tablets in his hands and entering the temple prayed concerning them.
For it was the rule of the tribes of Israel, that from the tribe of
Judah (and) from the stock of David they should give them con-
tinually their daughters for them to keep in the temple in purity and
righteousness during twelve years, to await and abide the coming of
God's command; that the Word be made flesh of a stainless and
untouched holy virgin, and appearing in the flesh like one of man-
kind walk up and down the earth. This had been sealed in writing
and preserved by the tribe of Israel, because of the tradition of their
fathers there in the temple. But if there came not unto them any
sign or intimation from the Holy Spirit, they took and gave them in
marriage. Likewise also these, who were daughters twelve of the
tribe of Judah and stock of David, and the virgin Mariam with them,
who is chief above all virgins.
These were gathered there and stood all together in union, and the
lot was cast over the bachelors (to decide) to which of them should
fall a wife.
Now when the high priest Zachariah had taken from the temple the
several tablets, he gave to the bachelors, and they saw written the
writing of the names of the virgins on the tablet, to whom (each)
should fall as wife. And when the high priest gave the tablets, no

*Tisch. ed.* sign came to pass unto them, but only the writing of the names which was written. But the last tablet (he gave) to Joseph, on which was written the name of the holy virgin Mariam. And lo! a a dove issued out of the tablet and rested on the head of Joseph. Said the high priest unto Joseph: Thou art the portion that falls to the virgin Mariam. Take her, let her be kept to thee unto wife; for she has been allotted in purity to thee unto wedlock of wifehood, as also the other virgins to their several bachelors.

IX, 2. But the old man Joseph when he heard this resisted and said: I pray you, priests and people, who are of one accord in the holiness of this temple, put ye not force upon me before you all. How shall I do all this which ye say, for I have many kinsfolk. A son I have and a loved one, and I am greatly put to shame by them. Force me not. The priests and all the people answered: Hear us and submit to the will of God, and be not so contrary and opposed; for it is not the law for anyone to do as thou doest. Said Joseph: I am very old, and am come nigh to death. And wherefore is all this matter unto me, which ye bid my old age perform, the which is not right. The high priest answered: Hear us, no shame or grief whatever shall come upon thee from anyone, but from all blessing and riches and glory. Said Joseph: Ye speak fairly, but that she cometh to me as a daughter and not as a wife, and that all see and hear this, is for the sons of Israel to make mock of me. Said the high priest: We know thee for a just and good soul and a lover of God. And she is pure and neglected of her parents, and they committed her unto us under oath into this temple. And we by the command of the priests and of all the congregation bear witness that by law the virgin Mariam hath fallen to thy lot. Take her by our pleasure and blessing and lead her away and keep her in purity and with respect. As is the law and tradition of our holy forefathers, until the time cometh for thee to receive the crown of blessing along with the other virgins and with the bachelors. Joseph said: Have mercy on my old age and white hair, and force me not to perform what I have no inclination for, to keep her in security and readiness as is right. For she is a virgin and is come unto her husband after the manner of women. Or else how is it right for me to take her to wife? For 'tis a sin. The high priest answered: If thou hadst not been prompt and willing of speech, who constrained thee? Wherefore didst thou come hither with the bachelors, and draw lots according to the law of holiness, and receive in the temple of the Lord the sign of blessing, which was vouchsafed to thee by God unto even partnership?

Joseph answered: I understood not earlier, and pondering it I could not understand this saying, which was to be or (how) such a matter was to befall me. For unto me now is the season of death and not to my old age and white hair . . . . [6] life without blemish. Said the high priest; Fear the Lord and resist not his commands.

IX, 2. Remember what God did unto Kora and Dathan and Abiram;[7] how the earth was cloven asunder and swallowed them up, because of the opposition which they made. And now do thou fear the

[6] There is a lacuna here in the text.

[7] Spelt Korḥ, dadan, and Abiron.

same from God, lest suddenly and unawares some evil befall thee. *Tisch. ed.*
When Joseph heard this, he bowed his head and did obeisance to IX, 3.
the priests and to all the congregation. And he took Mariam out of the temple and went forth and led her into his house unto the city of Nazareth. And Joseph said to Mariam: Thou girl, hear me what I shall say unto thee now. Give ear and mark it well. Behold I leave thee here in my house, even as thou dost see, and for all the necessities of thy body I will here make provision. And do thou sit here in the place of honor, as I told thee, and be careful and prepared in thyself. Go not anywhere vainly, and let no one enter in unto thee to come in and go forth until I return and come to thee, as the Lord shall desire. The God of our fathers, the God of Israel be with thee forever.

And when he had thus spoken, Joseph arose and went his way to his work of carpentering. And it came to pass after a few days, they held a council among themselves and said: Come let us make X, 1.
a vail of the temple, that on the day of the great festival it appear when the congregation is gathered together, and (that) the service of the holy tabernacle be thus adorned. Said the priests: Ye say well. Then the high priest bade summonse the wives and virgins who were dedicated to God in the temple from the tribe of Judah and family of David. And when the twelve virgins were come, the high priest Zachariah remembered the holy virgin Mary that she was of the family and they went and called her. And when Mary came the high priest said: Cast lots to see who shall weave the gold-blue, the byssus and the purple, the red and the hyacinth. And when they had cast lots, as the lot of Mariam came out the purple and the red. And she took it silently and went to her home, and she began first to weave the red. And at the same time she took XI, 1.
her pitcher and went to the fountain to bring water.

CHAPTER V.—*About the voice of good tidings of the Angel, who foretold the pregnancy of the holy virgin Mariam.*

In that hour there came to her a voice from the angel saying unto XI, 1.
her: Be thou glad, O virgin Mary. And on a sudden Mary was startled and much afraid, and looked this way and that and saw no one. And pondering whence the voice came to her and taking up her pitcher she abruptly fled and shutting the door sealed it securely. And she herself went silently and sat in the corner of the house. But in her mind she was amazed and wondered and said: What is this greeting which was given to me? Who is there that knew me or knew before who I am, or whom have I anywhere seen to address and speak such words unto me? And as she thought over all this she was afraid and trembled. And she rose up and prayed and said: Lord God of our fathers, God of Israel, look in thy mercy upon me and incline thine ear unto my prayers and to the supplications of my heart; and hear thy humble maidservant, who trusting in thee and fleeing to thee cry out. Lead me not into temptation of the enemy, nor into the toils of the traducer, but save me from the snare and deceit of the hunter. For in thee is my trust, and mayest thou, my Lord and God, keep my maidenhood inviolate. And when Mary had thus spoken she wept and gave

*Tisch. ed.* thanks to the Lord. And she abode there three hours and took in her hand and wove the red.

XI, 2. And behold an angel of the Lord came and entered in unto her through the closed doors, appearing to her without body as if with bodily appearance, and said: Be thou glad, Mary, virgin intact, handmaiden of the Lord. And Mary suddenly beheld the angel and was afraid of the same and being full of terror could not flee away. And the angel said unto her: Fear not, Mary, thou blessed among women. I am the angel Gabriel who was sent from God to say unto thee this: Behold thou shalt conceive and bear a Son to the Father on high. And he shall be a great king over all the earth. And Mary said: What speakest thou and what sayest, tell me. Said the angel: Whatsoever I have told thee, thou hast heard from me. Receive the summons of my oracle, which I foretell unto thee, and do thou be glad.

Mary said: A new and strange thing is this which I hear from thee, and I am agape with awe. Shall I conceive and bear like any other woman? How is this unto me, who know not a man?

The angel answered: O holy virgin Mariam, think not so, but understand this matter. What thou sayest may not be so. For not from flesh, nor from blood, nor from the will of man, but from the power of grace of the Holy Spirit is that which shall dwell in thee and be with thee, even as he shall himself will. Mary said: Hard and strange seemeth to me the word which thou speakest, and I cannot bear nor endure to be under the words thou hast spoken. And I marvel at thy saying it; for the thought is unseasonable, and such a miraculous event unlikely, as thou tellest me of. And as I listen to thee my soul is scared and trembles, and my mind reels, and is perplexed, and I know not what answer to make unto such a message. The angel said: Why is thy soul afraid and scared? The holy virgin said: How then shall I hearken unto thee, or believe in thy words; since such a thing as this was never heard of by man, nor is that which thou sayest to be comprehended . . . .

The angel said: The words I have uttered I speak truly to thee and with full assurance and not vainly; nor have I told thee aught out of my own imagining, but only that which I heard from the Lord. And I was sent by God to give thee this tidings and to announce them to thee. Yet thou dost reckon my words to be false. Fear thou the Lord and hear me.

The holy virgin Mary said: 'Tis not that I account thy words vain, but I am filled with wonder. For heaven and earth cannot contain or envelop the deity, nor could all the heavenly orders of the incorporeal hosts made of spirit and of fire look upon and behold his glory. How then shall I be able to bear and support the infinite fire and afford him a dwelling in my body? or how can I support and carry him in my bosom and with my hand handle him? This thou sayest is impossible and the thought beyond reach and the reality marvelous; and 'tis beyond all human ken to inquire into and understand him. Surely 'tis with deceptive words thou wouldst convince my mind? Is it not so?

The angel said: O blessed holy virgin, hearken unto what I shall tell thee. Moses in the mountain, how did he become an eyewitness of God? And how did the bush flame with fire and not burn

him? How did Abraham's tent admit him in fleshly form and yet the fire not touch them? And how, when he wrestled with Jacob, did he converse with him? And so with many other patriarchs and prophets—how did he manifest himself to them so that according to their piety they saw him? So do thou not fear; only have faith and be silent about all I shall tell thee now. *Tisch. ed.*

Mary said: How shall this be unto me which thou sayest? or how shall I know his advent, and on what day it is or in what hour? Tell me this.

The angel said: Speak not thus of that which thou knowest not; nor be unbelieving as touching what thou dost not understand. But incline thine ear, and trust me in that which I shall say unto thee.

Mary said: 'Tis not from distrust I speak, nor from weak assurance. But I would fain ask and understand the truth—how this shall be unto me, and in what hour it shall be, in order that I may be truly prepared.

The angel said: His advent is at all times prepared, and in entering and dwelling in thy womb he doth hallow and cleanse all the tenement of thy body, and it shall become his temple.

Mary said: How shall this be unto me, for I know not a man?

The angel said: The Holy Spirit shall come upon thee, and the power of the highest shall overshadow thee, and the Word God is made flesh from (*or* in) thee; and thou shalt bear a Son to the Father on high; yet spotless and inviolate shall abide thy virginity.

Mary said: And how can a woman in her virginity bear a child without a man?

The angel said: What thou sayest is not so. Nor is thy offspring born after the fleshly affection of actual desire, nor is thy pregnancy result of wedlock and actual connection. But holy and inviolate abideth thy virginity. Neither in entering doth the Word outrage thy womb, nor in going forth therefrom in the flesh shall he rend thy virginity.

Mary said: I fear thee, because of the very pleasingness of the words which thou addressest to me, and thou dost very much astonish me in so speaking to me. Surely thou wouldst not deceive me with words of guile, as my first mother Eve was deceived, who was persuaded by the pleasing and flattering words spoken unto her and in consequence inherited death.

The angel said: O Mary, holy virgin, how many times have I spoken to thee and told thee what is true and assured; and yet thou dost not give ear to my behest and to the oracle of my mouth! And yet I stand before thee, and once more with God's help I address thee. Let not thy heart tremble at the sight of me, nor let thy thoughts waver from the Lord thy God. And remove not thy heart away from my words which I have uttered, but hearken now and learn of me. It is not out of any guile or deceit, nor from chicanery and craft that I came to speak with thee, but to prepare thee beforehand to be his temple and dwelling place.

Mary said: Now at the sound of thy words and thy full converse do I marvel, and my mind is occupied to know what answer to give unto thy saying. And if I cannot satisfy my mind, then to whom shall I relate my matters, or who will believe me, that the things I tell of are [true]?

*Tisch. ed.* The angel said: O holy inviolate virgin, do not occupy thy mind with such vain fancies.

Mary said: I distrust not thy words, nor is that which thou sayest incredible. Indeed, I rather rejoice and exult in thy message. Yet my soul is affrighted and trembles [at the thought that] in my body I carry God as it were a man, to give him birth, and that after it my virginity abides inviolate. O how marvelous and wonderful is that which thou sayest!

The angel said: How many times have I told thee in many words, and have made thee accurately my witness; yet hast thou been distrustful of me.

Mary said: I pray thee, servant of the Most High, take not amiss my repeated questions. For thou dost know men's nature, that they are distrustful in all matters. Therefore I desire to ask, that I may know for certain. So do thou not be offended because of what I have said.

The angel said: Thou sayest well, but believe me who have been sent from God to speak with thee and give thee good tidings.

Mary said: Yea, I believe thy words and listen to the oracle thou hast announced to me, that it is really so. But hear of me what I say to thee. Until this day I have kept myself in purity and righteousness before the priests and all the congregation, being allotted unto Joseph to wife. And now am I resolved [to remain] in trust in his house and to preserve myself cautiously, until we shall receive the crown of blessing along with the other virgins and celibates. But if he shall come and see me grown heavy in pregnancy, what answer shall I give or what say unto him? And if he asks me whence comes my pregnancy, what answer shall I make?

The angel said: O blessed holy virgin, keep it in silence from thy betrothed, and in thy mind hold fast what I have said, that this result is not of men, and that this thing which I tell thee of comes from none save the Lord, who worketh this for thee. He can save thee from all trial and temptation.

Mary said: If this really be which thou sayest, and if the Lord himself hath been pleased to humble himself unto his handmaid and servant, let it be unto me according to thy word.

And the angel departed from her. And at the same time as he spake the word, and as the holy virgin bowed down, the word God entered into her ear of hearing within; and the thought of the nature of her flesh was cleansed by efflatus along with all her senses in the twelve members, and was purified like gold in the fire. And she became a temple holy and spotless and a dwelling place of his Godhead. And at the same time began the pregnancy of the holy virgin. For when the angel foretold the event to Mariam, it was in the month of Nisan the fifteenth, which was April the sixth, on the fourth day of the week at the third hour of the day. And that same day the angel of the Lord went direct into the regions of Persia and gave tidings to the magian princes that they should go and worship the new-born child. And they were led by the star for nine months and then came and arrived in time for the birth from the holy virgin. For at that time the kingdom of Persia was powerful, and they were victorious above the other kings who were in the East. And those who were princes of the magi were three brothers; the first was Melchon,

who was ruler of the Persians; the second, Baltasar, who had authority over India; and the third, Gaspar, who held the land of Arabia. They, by the command of God, joined together and came for the birth of the holy virgin, and arriving in haste were in time for the birth of Jesus. *Tisch. ed.*

But when the holy virgin heard the tidings from the angel she rose and fell on her face and said: O Lord of my spirit and my flesh; thou hast power to do according as may be the will of thy creative love; and even as thou art pleased and hast planned all according to thy good will. Now incline to the prayer of thy servant, and hear me, and save my soul. For thou art God my Saviour, and thy name is called Lord over me forever. And until this day have I kept myself in purity and righteousness and spotlessness unto thee, O Lord my God, to guard my virginity safe and sound without the impurity of any fleshly desire; and now thy desire is fulfilled.

And having said this the virgin Mary rose and thanked the Lord; and after that the holy virgin passed an hour in pondering, and wept and said: What is this new and marvelous thing which has happened unto me, that which has never come to pass in the birth of men until now? And I am become a mark and a reproach to all men and women. And now am I confounded and know not what to do, nor what answer to make to anyone for myself. To whom shall I go, or to whom tell of it? Wherefore did my mother give me birth, and why did my parents ask for me of God unto their sorrow of soul—me that am a reproach to myself and to my parents? Wherefore did they consecrate me to the temple of holiness to keep my virginity? Why was I not erewhile banished by death from the face of the earth? and if I have remained alive, why did my parents not wed me secretly like other daughters of the Hebrews? Ah, who has heard, who seen the matter? who has related it, who will believe that a woman without a man bears a child, a woman who knows not any man? to whom shall I relate this matter and tell it clearly, that in secret . . . . [8]shall give answer, whether to married women or to virgins? whom shall I be able to persuade? If I tell them of this matter, in just manner they will make mock of me? If I speak on oath, then I sin; and for me to say what is false is impossible. And for me to be condemned in my innocence is very harsh. And if they demand testimony of me, there is no one who can justify me. And then if I a second time repeat my story and adhere to it, they will in contempt slay me. And all those who hear my story, far and near, will say that I by false excuses cajole the senseless and silly. So now I know not what to do, nor who will advise me about this matter how to answer all men, and how to tell this to my own husband, for I have been assigned to him by name in marriage. And to the priests and the congregation—how shall I dare to speak before them? And in the market place how shall I excuse myself to men? If I shall tell married women of my virginity, and that without help of man I am pregnant, they will ridicule my report and disbelieve me. How shall I excuse myself for this matter which has happened? But this only do I know about myself that my virginity is pure and my pregnancy certain. For the angel

[8] A brief lacuna in the Arm. text.

*Tisch. ed.* of the Lord hath not spoken falsely to me, but truly; and hath not vainly beguiled me, but speaking justly and truly by the Holy Spirit hath told me. So then what shall I now do, since I am become a reproach and loathing among the children of Israel? O marvelous report, O wondrous reality, O fearful thing and awful! I am wholly without knowledge of man, and in my pregnancy, which is invisible, they will not believe; if I assure anyone that in spite of my virginity I am pregnant, they will say to me: Lo, can we believe that thou speakest truly and justly? Tell us how a virgin woman can bear a child without a man's rupturing her virginity. And with these very words they will meet me and put me to scorn. But I know that many will speak unjustly of me and frivolously condemn me in my innocence, but the Lord will save me from the blasphemy and reproaches of men.

XII, 1. And having said this Mary forthwith was silent and she rose and opened the door of her chamber to see if anyone was there and was listening to the words spoken. When she saw no one there, she turned and entered her chamber anew, and taking up the same scarlet and purple, she continued to weave the temple vail which she had previously received from the priests to make. When she had finished the work, she took and gave it to the high priest Zachariah. And as he took it from the hand of the holy virgin, he said to her: My little child, Mary, blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the womb of thy virginity. And the Lord shall magnify thy holy name over all the earth. And thou shalt become chief of women, and among all even mother of virgins. And from thee shall be the salvation of all the earth.

And when the high priest Zachariah had said this, Mary bowed low to the priests and all the congregation, and passed in joy to her house. And when the angel gave th e tidings to the virgin Mary was in the pregnancy of Elizabeth on the twelfth of Tisri, on October the ninth. And from then till the fifteenth of Nisan, which is April the sixth, there are 180 days, which is six months. And then it was that the Christ began to be made man incarnate of the holy virgin.

XII, 2. Now one day the holy virgin Mary took it in her head and said: I will rise and go unto my kinsmen, unto Elizabeth, and will tell her all this which has happened unto me, and I will do whatever she shall say to me. So she went out secretly at daybreak and betook herself to the mountain side of Judea to the city of Judah, and entered the house of Zacharias and greeted Elizabeth. And when Elizabeth heard the voice of Mary, the child leapt with joy in her womb; and Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Spirit, and lifted up her voice and cried out and said: Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb. And wherefore is this for me, that the mother of my Lord should come unto me? For lo, when I heard in my ears the voice of thy greeting, the child leapt in my womb.

And Mary, when she heard this from her, raised her eyes full of tears to heaven and said: Lord, who am I, that all nations bless me; that among all women and daughters of the Hebrews I am become manifest and notable in name and conspicuous among all the tribes of he children of Israel?

XII, 3. And Mary had forgotten the advice which she had earlier heard from the angel. And she remained many days with Elizabeth, and

told her all the tale in order in secret, what she had seen and what heard from the angel. And Elizabeth marveled much and said to her: My child, this is a very wondrous work of God, of which thou tellest. So hearken unto what I shall say to thee. Be not afraid because of this message nor be distrustful, for all the mystery both of act and word is above all intelligence of men. For behold thou dost see me who am grown old and am now come nigh unto death. I have in my old age conceived and bear a child, that before the Lord no word may be impossible. But do thou go quietly unto thy house and tell no one what thou hast seen and heard. Recount it to none of the children of Israel, lest they should in vain conversation divulge it and make mock of us; and thy husband, who is betrothed, lest his heart be wounded by thee and he leave thee; until the will of the Lord be brought to pass and he reveal the action which he plans to perform. *Tisch. ed.*

Mariam said: Whatever command thou givest me I will do.

Elizabeth said: Listen to and mark whatever advice I give thee. Go in peace to thy house and come not hither and thither to any place; but sit silently in thy house and keep thyself secret from men, that no one may know. And whatsoever command thy husband hath imposed on thee, do the same, and the Lord according to thy trial will provide an escape. Fear not, and be glad.

And when Elizabeth had spoken, Mary saluted her and went rejoicing to her house. And there she stayed many days and day by day the child grew in her womb. And being afraid of men she continually hid herself that none might know.

## CHAPTER VI.—*About the vexation of Joseph and his finding fault with the holy virgin in her innocence and his condemning her.*

And when those days were ended, Joseph came to his house from his work of carpentry, and Mary arose and went out to meet him, and saluted him. Joseph said to her: Art thou well, art thou glad, how hath it been with thee? Mary said: I am well. XIII, 1.

And when they had set before themselves a table, they eat and were cheerful, and Joseph lay down upon his bed and desired to rest. And he turned his glance on Mary; and her face changed color and a blush mantled on her cheek and she hid herself from shame, and she could not. And Joseph looked at her in sorrow and rose and sat down and said to her: Thou maiden tell me: Methinks thou hast not the bloom of youth, for I behold a change of a kind in thee. Mary said: And what wouldst thou say about me, who dost ask and enquire all this? Joseph said; I am astonished at thy speaking and thy making of excuses. Why dost thou with changed color on thy face sit idle and sad? Surely no one hath spoken with thee? 'Tis hard for me. Embarrassment and languor have taken hold of thee or else some temptation hath beset thee or some snare on the part of men. Mary said: 'Tis not as thou dost say. Joseph said; Then why dost thou not boldly answer? Said Mary: What dost thou wish me to say to thee?

Joseph said: I believe not thy words, until I shall see. Shew me thy person plainly and boldly before me, if the thing thou sayest is true. And Mary hesitated in her mind and knew not what to do.

*Tisch. ed.* Then Joseph suddenly sat on his chair, and, scanning her with his eyes this way and that, saw that she was big with child, and raising his voice to a cry he said: O what wicked deed is this thou hast done? And Joseph fell from his chair on his face on the ground, and with his hands he clutched his forehead and beard, and plucked out his white hair and covered his face in the ashes and said: Woe is me, and bitter the disgrace of my old age. What is this that is done, what disaster this that I behold in my house? How shall I look men in the face, or how answer the priests and all the congregation of Israel? And how shall I repel the accusation of guilt? How satisfy the mind of anyone [save] by deceit? What shall I do to her, or what shall I devise about her, whom I received as a virgin holy and spotless from the temple, yet have not been able to preserve according to the tradition of my fathers? If they ask me violently and say: Where is her virgin holiness, bring her spotless and set her before us, — what answer shall I give to all the priests and the congregation? Who was the enemy that has caught me? Who was the robber who took away captive her virginity from me? Who has committed this great wrong in my household; making me a reproach and laughing stock among the children of Israel? Surely the guilt rests not upon me, who through the craft of the serpent have been ejected from my happiness!

And having said this Joseph burst into tears aud smote himself; and then he again called Mary before him and said to her: Tell me, thou pitiable person, what wicked deed is this which thou hast done? Why hast thou forgotten the Lord thy God who fashioned thee in the womb of thy mother; thou whom thy parents with tears and lamentations sought from God and devoted in holiness and lawfulness to the temple? . . . .

## NOTE BY THE TRANSLATOR.

It is not necessary to translate this apocryph any further. In the immediate sequel Mary hears an angel say to her: Fear not, for lo, I am with thee to save thee from all thy tribulation.

The gospel of James, of the old Armenian form of which the first few chapters are here translated, is probably a writing of great antiquity. It was known to Gregory of Nyssa and Epiphanius in the last half of the fourth century, to Origen in the middle of the third century, most probably to Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr in the second century.

The contents of it are summarized in the headings of the chapters of the Armenian text. These are as follows:

1. The life of the holy virgin Mary in the house of her father. Recited by St. James, brother of the Lord.[9]

[9] This is more properly the title of the whole book than the heading of the first chapter. For the earlier sections of that chapter along with the special heading are really lost in the Armenian version.

2. About the holy virgin Mary's birth, in her father's house.

3. About the holy virgin Mary's upbringing in the temple of holiness for twelve years.

4. About the holy virgin Mary's being given to Joseph in wedlock according to their legal tradition, that he should keep the virgin with holy care, and about her being intrusted unto the Lord in faith.

5. About the voice of the herald of annunciation which proclaimed to the holy virgin Mary her pregnancy.

6. About the vexation of Joseph and his finding fault with the holy virgin and his condemning her.

7. About Mary's defense of her holy virginity and of Joseph's chastity, and how they both passed the ordeal.

8. About the birth of our Lord Jesus Christ in the cave.

9. About the first mother Eve and Joseph, and how they came in haste and beheld the birth all famous of the holy virgin Mary.

10. About the shepherds who saw the birth of our Lord.

11. About the coming of the magi with gifts to worship the newborn child Jesus.

12. About his being taken into the temple in the city of Jerusalem to be circumcised.

13. About the wickedness of Herod and his slaying the children in Bethlehem.

14. About the repetition of wickedness on Herod's part and how he slew Zacharias because of John, his son.

15. About the angel's revealing to Joseph that he should flee into Egypt.

16. About their departure as fugitives to Qebron that is Qaraq.

17. About his destruction of the idols and demons and pagan priests of Egypt.

18. About their return, by command of the angel, into their land.

19. Their going to Arabia. He destroyed the idols and raised the dead.

20. He came into the land of Canaan and worked wonders in secret and raised the dead.

21. How they reached the land of Israel and caused Jesus to be taught writing.

22. When they came to the city of Arimathea he worked miracles and raised the dead.

23. How they came to the city of Tapari and caused him to be taught dyeing, and of the wonders that there took place.

24. About their coming into the land of Galilee, and what he did with the children of the Israelites and other wonderful acts.

25. How he went up to the village of Emmaus and healed the sick.

26. About the many cures which Jesus wrought in the city and the village, and in other places where Jesus wrought cures.

27. How he fulfilled the traditional writings of the prophets and of the law which he fulfilled.

28. About the judgment which he passed between two soldiers.

Thus the Armenian includes not only the Greek protevangel, which ends with the murder of Zacharias by Herod, but parts as well of the Arabic Gospel of the Infancy, and perhaps of other similar apocryphs. The reader will notice that in the first six chapters which we translate there is considerable expansion of the Greek text. Written on such a scale the Armenian text is of tedious length; and to those who have been brought up to regard the four canonical gospels as works of supreme value in comparison with which all later documents of the church are insignificant, the protevangel in all its forms must seem superfluous. Yet we cannot afford to neglect anything which has once on a time deeply appealed to the human spirit, least of all a work such as this which has had so profound an influence on Christian art and belief. The dogma of the immaculate conception of the mother of Christ which was made a part of the Latin Catholic faith in 1856 really rests on this protevangel, which is the first document of the church to imply that Mary the virgin was herself miraculously conceived. Very just, therefore, are the remarks of Tischendorf in criticising Thilo who first edited the Latin recension of the protevangel called the gospel of Pseudo-Matthew. For he writes thus: "nimirum fabularum amplificatio, quam Thilo iure questus est, non probanda gustu nostro, sed minime contemnenda est propterea quod pertinet ad cognoscendum ingenium temporum eorum quibus debetur atque placuit."

The Armenian version here rendered seems to be made from an older Syriac text which was in the hands of Ephrem Syrus, the great fourth-century doctor of Edessa. That this is so is clear from a comparison with it of Ephrem's sermon on the birth of Christ, of which I translate by way of example the following from an old Armenian version, in which alone, so far as I know, it is preserved:[10]

"The command went forth from the Great King and thereupon the

[10] See *St. Ephremi opera Armenice*, Venice, 1836, Vol. IV, p. 19.

Son of the King entered by the portals of her ears. When the virgin said to the angel, 'Lo, here am I, the handmaid of the Lord, be it unto me according to thy word,' he gave the word and she received the Child into her bosom. 'Tis not, as some say, that before the angel came it went down into the virgin; though, if it had been so, it were no wonder. But it was needful first that the tidings should be given to the virgin and that she in good will and holy freedom should accept him. There was nothing specially glorious to God in the angel's coming first; what was to be praised was that his advent was made in humility. Just as Moses announced to the people that the Most High shall descend, and when the elders and Moses were purified, then the Most High came down on Mount Sinai, even so Gabriel brought the tidings; and she was purified by the Holy Spirit and became a temple for God to dwell in. The effulgent splendor flashed out into Mary, yet was not divided from the essence of the Father."

In the commentary on the *Diatessaron* there are further traces that Ephrem used a form of the protevangel very similar to the Armenian. The question arises whether the incident of the conception through the ear originally had a place in the protevangel. The Greek entirely omits it, but the gnostic character of the addition would account for its doing so. The same story recurs in several Greek documents; for example, among the doubtful works of Athanasius in the *Quæstiones Aliæ* (printed in Migne, *Patrol. Graeca*, Tome 28, Col. 789) we have the following passage: "Hear another mystery. As a house shut in on all sides, but which has towards the east a window of pure and thin glass, admits the sun's rays to penetrate and light up the whole of its inside; and just as the sun in passing through and his rays in going out again do not break the glass, which remains unhurt by their impact as they pass in and out—so must you understand as touching the virgin Mary. For she was quite chaste, like a house shut up all round; yet the Son and Word of God descended like a divine ray from the Sun of Justice, the Father, and entered in through the little glass window of her ears, and lighted up her most holy abode. And after that he went out again as he knows how to do, without her virginity having been in the least impaired. But as before the birth, so during the birth and after the birth he preserved the chastity of the virgin."

The same idea recurs in another spurious homily of Athanasius in the same volume of Migne, col. 969 D, where we read that "God entered through the virgin's ears as he liked." This homily is, perhaps, the work of Chrysostom. The same thought is nowhere more

clearly expressed than in a homily of Theodotus, bishop of Ancyra, *c.* A. D. 430 (Migne, *Patrol. Gr.*, Tome 77, Col. 1392). Here we read that "Mary the prophetess conceived through her hearing the living God. For the hearing is the natural channel for words to pass through" (*φυσική δίοδος τῶν λόγων ἡ ἀκοή*). Where we may render by "hearing" or by "ear" as we like. The idea, already entertained by Tertullian and Origen, is in close relation with the docetic belief of many of the earliest Christians that the body of Christ was phantasmal or akin to ether in its composition, a mahatma in fact.

FRED. C. CONYBEARE.

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
Oxford.

# CRITICAL NOTES.

## ON THE FORENSIC MEANING OF δικαιοσύνη.

BIBLICAL theology has scarcely come to its own in determining the distinctively Pauline conception of δικαιοσύνη, and especially of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ in Rom. 3:21, 22. It is a commonplace of Protestant exegesis, not to say of biblical philology, that δίκαιος and its cognates have more or less often in Paul a forensic sense, but it is by no means a matter of agreement precisely what that forensic sense is.

The considerations to be presented in the following note may be conveniently grouped under four propositions:

1. Δικαιοσύνη, "righteousness," in all its meanings, whether ethical or forensic, *has back of it the idea of law.* This is unquestionably true of its biblical, and especially of its Pauline, use. With Paul, indeed, it could scarcely be otherwise — Paul the Israelite, nay, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, and a Pharisee, trained in Judaistic theology. To him religion had once been wholly a system of morality, legally defined. When he became a Christian, his watchword was no longer law, but grace. Yet the moral government of the world had not been abolished by grace, and on some terms or other the law of God was still to be reckoned with. His own profound religious experience made such an adjustment necessary. But even otherwise it would have become a necessity in the conduct of his apostolic mission — forced upon him by the conflict with Judaism. His argument with the Judaizers must inevitably move in the plane of their thought, and what the Pharisaic point of view was on the subject of righteousness becomes unmistakably manifest in the synoptic gospels. Weber's account of the early rabbinic theology describes with more detail, and with abundant citation, essentially the same view; see *Die Lehren des Talmud,*[1] the chapters entitled: "Gesetzlichkeit das Wesen der Religion," and "Die Gerechtigkeit vor Gott und das Verdienst."

The argument in the first five chapters of Romans takes for granted

[1] Recently (1897) edited again under the title: *Jüdische Theologie, auf Grund des Talmud u. verwandter Schriften gemeinfasslich dargestellt.* Leipzig, xl + 427 pp., 8vo, M. 8.

the elementary ideas that enter into the concept of obligatory law. It assumes that law takes cognizance of the moral action of free, intelligent persons, that it involves obligations and correlative rights, and that it provides for compensatory consequences, whether of reward or punishment. The argument aims not to prove that sin exists, or that men are sinners, but that as sinners they are personally responsible, accountable to the law, and subject to its condemnation. It is distinctly forensic from beginning to end, in terms and in method.

Nor are we left in doubt as to what "law," or, specifically, "the law," meant to the apostle Paul. It was the will of God revealed to men as a rule of moral life. In written form it was the Old Testament Scriptures, but broadly viewed it included the entire historical revelation which had taken place under the old covenant.

It is of the first importance to bear in mind, as we proceed in our definition, that δίκαιος and its cognates do not in themselves contain the idea of moral excellence, only that of an objective relation to the law. Legality, not virtue, is the essential factor. Δικαιοσύνη, "righteousness," is *conformity to the law;* this is the primary idea; what the content of the law is, what virtue is, is secondary. With the English words "righteous" and "righteousness" the opposite is now the case. Virtue or goodness—their ethical quality—is the essential mark, at least in their prevailing and popular use. The objective relation to law which they imply has become altogether secondary in thought. It is easy to lose sight of this important difference between the Hellenistic δικαιοσύνη and the word "righteousness" by which we ordinarily translate it. The signal vice of Judaistic ethics was that it viewed morality and religion for the most part as an outward matter; it emphasized, not the spirit, but the form, not virtue, but legal conformity.

Both Judaism and the divine law itself were, however, at one in this: They insisted upon obedience as the only method of securing conformity to the divine will—of becoming "just with God." By obedience one could be "justified," and the reward was life. The penalty of disobedience was death.

2. Δικαιοσύνη (in Rom. 3:21, 22) *has back of it the idea of violated law.* The first five chapters of Romans, so far as the exposition of justification is concerned, have wholly to do with the case of sinners —with those who are not only destitute of ethical righteousness, but have become positively ἄδικοι and ὑπόδικοι. The conclusion reached in 3:19, 20, to which the argument from the start has been leading,

is that all must perforce acknowledge themselves to be ὑπόδικοι θεῷ, guilty in their relation to God—guilty in the full sense of the word, that is to say, personally responsible for their sin and subject to the law's condemnation. As already remarked, the Pauline indictment aims chiefly to establish the fact of their accountability to the law, rather than of their unholiness, the moral evil of their condition. The ὀργὴ θεοῦ of 1 : 18 marks out the line of the argument at the outset; note also ἄξιοι θανάτου in 1 : 28, and the use of κρίνω and its cognates ten times in the opening section of the second chapter; and the case is summed up by showing that the law provides no way of relief from this universal guilt and condemnation: "by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified in his sight" (3 : 20). Looking forward to the final judgment, when all human lives shall pass under review, Paul declares that on the basis of the law there can be no clearance from guilt. For the disobedient there is no δικαίωσις.

The law once violated provides no way of relief, no δικαίωσις. With one exception. There is, technically considered, one way, namely, by the sinner's submission to the imposed penalty. Thus, and thus only, so far as the terms of the law are concerned, can he become non-ὑπόδικος, or "justified." After a man has suffered the required penalty he is no longer in the eye of the law guilty. All law recognizes this principle, and with Paul it is axiomatic: "He who hath died is justified from sin" (Rom. 6 : 7). Obviously this mode of justification could not inure to the advantage of the sinner. It would maintain the law, but would be fatal to him.

3. But now the gospel announces another δικαίωσις, a free gift. Its nature is briefly described in Rom. 3 : 21–26, a remarkably clear and compact definition of what the apostle peculiarly terms δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ. In this passage it becomes evident that *with Paul* δικαιοσύνη *derives its forensic sense from the verb* δικαιόω *and its cognate noun* δικαίωσις. This is a third datum furnished by the analysis of the Pauline argument, contributing to the solution of the problem indicated in the title of the present article. In every case where the apostle uses δικαιοσύνη in its forensic sense there is implied a previous δικαίωσις. We must not attempt to deduce this sense directly from the adjective δίκαιος, but through the line of the verbals derived from it. It is still less allowable to reverse the true order and seek for the meaning of the verb from the noun.

That δικαιόω in New Testament Greek is always forensic we assume. With those who take the opposite view, urged anew by Professor Gould

in the January number of this JOURNAL (pp. 149–158) we make no argument. What we insist upon is, that, the forensic sense of the verb once ascertained, it determines the forensic sense of the noun. The verdict of modern philology that δικαιόω is forensic will not easily be reversed — meaning "to declare righteous," or "to accept as righteous." This definition, however, leaves the question still open what is signified by "righteous." According to our view this ambiguity is unnecessary; we render δικαιόω in Rom. 3:20, 24, 26 and similar connections by its nearest untechnical English equivalent — to "pardon." To "justify" in these passages means simply and only to "pardon." It denotes acquittal, the opposite of condemnation, and it needs scarcely be added that acquittal, *in the case of those who have violated the law*, is simply pardon. That "justify" is the precise antithesis of "condemn" is evident from such passages as Rom. 2:12, 13, "as many as have sinned under law shall be judged by law; .... but the doers of a law shall be justified;" 8:33, 34, "It is God that justifieth; who is he that shall condemn?" Condemnation is the act of declaring guilty and consigning to punishment; if justification be its true opposite, it is the act of releasing from legal accountability, and remitting the sentence of punishment — and no more. A remarkably lucid as well as accurate statement of the biblical sense of δικαιόω will be found in Beyschlag, *New Testament Theology*, Bk. III, in the chapter treating of "justification in the epistle of James." In the English translation it is pp. 362, 363 of the section entitled "The Concept of Justification in General." The line is there clearly drawn between *justificatio justi* and *justificatio injusti*, the Pauline δικαίωσις being the latter. Unfortunately, in the later chapters, which expound the Pauline conception in detail, Beyschlag assigns to the faith of the *injusti* an ethical value, making it the germinal factor of a new imparted moral life, and thus converts the *justificatio injusti* of Paul back into a *justificatio justi*.

We make no objection to the familiar definition of δικαιόω, "accept as righteous," except that the word "righteous" still needs to be defined. Otherwise the reader is left quite uncertain in what respect the justified person is judged righteous, or else takes it for granted that it is by virtue of some moral excellence either acquired by or attributed to him. Now it is liable to be overlooked that "accept as righteous" is an expression found neither in the writings of Paul nor in the New Testament elsewhere. If employed as an equivalent of δικαιόω, *justify*, it should be with the distinct understanding that "righteous" is used in a non-moral sense, having no ethical content

whatever. It is, as already explained, simply equivalent to non-ὑπόδικος, free from legal accountability. Justification not only does not impart moral excellence, but presupposes none, imputes none. God is he who "justifieth *the ungodly*" (Rom. 4 : 5), and he does so not by attributing to him any moral quality entitling him to justification, but simply as a matter of grace, "by not imputing unto him his trespasses" (*cf.* 2 Cor. 5 : 19).

The three terms into which the Pauline doctrine of justification came to be crystallized are δικαιόω, δικαίωσις (with which δικαίωμα in Rom. 5 : 16 is nearly interchangeable), and δικαιοσύνη (also used interchangeably with δικαίωσις), and this is their logical order. That the verb is the exact opposite of the forensic "condemn" has been shown above. The nouns are used in the same limited sense. See Rom. 5 : 16, 18, where they are opposed to κατάκριμα, and 2 Cor. 3 : 9, where "the ministry of condemnation" is contrasted with "the ministry of righteousness" (δικαιοσύνης). "Justify" and "justification" seem, accordingly, in the Pauline vocabulary, to denote the sovereign act of *pardon*, grounded (precisely by what moral principle the apostle nowhere fully explains) on the propitiatory death of Christ. That which in the synoptic gospels is called the "remission of sins" (ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν) is technically designated in the theological controversy with Judaism "justification" from sins; *cf.* Acts 13 : 38, 39, where the two thoughts stand in parallelism: "through this man is proclaimed unto you remission of sins; and by him everyone that believeth is justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." Forgiveness, or remission, however, is properly a personal act, and does not necessarily look beyond the restoration of a ruptured personal relation, as when one forgives a friend's neglect, or a father forgives a child's ingratitude. Justification, like pardon, belongs in its proper sense to the domain of established law, and is the act of a judge or a moral sovereign. "Restoration to favor" may for popular purposes be added as a phrase explanatory of the result of justification, but does not strictly belong within the Pauline concept; his term denoting this is καταλλαγή, *reconciliation*, which has to do with the personal relation as such, and does not belong to the legal sphere. The distinction between the two should not be obliterated. In the apostle's argument they are closely related, and he passes freely from one to the other, but nowhere identifies or confuses καταλλαγή with δικαιοσύνη. Yet the former is a distinct and

prominent conception in his theology, and one which has not received its fair share of attention.

*Adoption* (*υἱοθεσία*), on the other hand, differing in this regard from *reconciliation*, is a legal conception, probably derived from well-known Roman usage. Justification includes neither reconciliation nor adoption, but is logically requisite to both. Justification does not even imply adoption, but furnishes the necessary legal basis. It is the entire legal *sine qua non* of all the privileges and blessings which accrue to the believer through Christ's redemption. The apostle Paul could have borrowed the language of John: "But as many as received him [*i. e.*, believed], to them gave he *the right* to become the children of God." Justification bestows that "right."

4. Δικαιοσύνη, therefore, *in its strictly forensic meaning, and denoting the result of a* δικαίωσις, is *legal acceptableness, the status before the law of a pardoned sinner*. For lack of any precisely equivalent English word, "righteousness" will doubtless remain its usual rendering, though always open to the objection that to the lay reader it is ethical, not forensic, in its suggestion. By taking it in the sense just defined, and disengaging the idea from all other elements which combine to make up the whole soteriological fact, Paul's exposition of justification in Galatians and Romans becomes luminously clear and consistent.

To the common objection that justification thus limited is purely formal and negative, and becomes to the sinner an empty gift, the obvious reply is that justification is nowhere represented by the apostle as being the whole of the soteriological process, or even as its principal phase. How differently he describes the way of salvation in the first and second chapters of Ephesians. The doctrine of justification is a theoretical adjustment of the gospel to the principles of moral law — an adjustment demanded by the Jewish mind at that time, and by the legalistic mind at all times. A writer in the *Expositor* recently referred to the Jewish "passion for pardon." Now Israel's seeking after righteousness, to which Paul refers, amounted precisely to this; it was a passion for pardon. The goal of their effort was not a holy soul, a regenerate nature, but to stand uncondemned at the great assize, and thus enter into the kingdom. Thus, to be "just with God" was, to the Judaist, if not the whole of salvation, about all of salvation that he was earnestly concerned with. Those who obtained "righteousness" did not *de facto* become, but gained the right to become, sons of the kingdom. It cannot be too often repeated, when the signification of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ

in Rom. 3: 21, 22 is in question, that this term sprang out of the great controversy with Judaism, and stands for a distinct conception which the conditions of contemporaneous theology made it necessary for the apostle Paul to define and defend.

That justification is synonymous with pardon has been often enough maintained in Protestant circles, but the argument needs the clearest possible restatement. The object of the present note is particularly to insist that the corresponding definition of the noun δικαιοσύνη should be consistently adhered to throughout the Pauline exposition. The chief hindrance to so doing is the phrase "imputed righteousness," chiefly derived from the fourth of Romans. This must for a moment be considered. In that chapter λογίζομαι, *to be reckoned*, or *set to one's account*, occurs eleven times. The Revisers have discarded altogether in this connection the word "impute" and in each instance render "reckon." But the difficulty felt by all readers does not depend on the rendering. Paul does at first sight in this chapter seem to regard faith as constituting righteousness in some ethical sense, and to represent the believer either as inherently righteous by virtue of his faith, or else as invested with the ethical righteousness, the moral excellence of Christ. Calvin accordingly defines justification as consisting in "the remission of sins and the imputation of the righteousness of Christ," although in his argument later on with Osiander he contends that God *justifies by pardoning*, and that the remission of sins is the whole definition.

The difficulty disappears when we observe that the fourth chapter adds no new constituent elements to the idea of δικαιοσύνη θεοῦ, which was already defined in the third chapter, but uses at length the case of Abraham to show how the same principles of faith held under the old covenant. "Faith was reckoned for righteousness" to Abraham — Old Testament phraseology — is used as the precise equivalent of Abraham "was justified by faith." The apostle plainly limits it thus, as Calvin himself strenuously insists, urging that Paul means the psalmist's words, "Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven," to be a complete definition, not a partial one, of the "righteousness" imputed to Abraham. He adds (*Institutes*, III, 11): "Certainly Paul does not adduce the testimony of the psalmist as teaching that the pardon of sins is *a part* of righteousness, or *concurs* to the justification of a man, but he includes the whole of righteousness in a free remission, pronouncing, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered. Blessed is the man to whom the Lord will not reckon sin."

Calvin is not the only interpreter who has failed to apply the apostle's limitation with absolute consistency throughout the entire argument in Romans, disengaging the strictly forensic sense of the Pauline term from all ideas of inherent or of attributed moral excellence. Even Weiss, whose exposition of the argument (in his *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, Part III, sec. ii, chap. 6) is in a marked degree faithful to Scripture, allows himself in one instance to say: "God reckons something for righteousness which is not righteousness in itself, and on the ground of which he did not need to justify." Writing as we do in the interest of biblical theology purely, and aiming to interpret the Pauline thought rather than to construct a comprehensively scriptural doctrine of justification, we have no concern with either the phrase or the doctrine of "imputed righteousness" beyond its meaning in the fourth of Romans. That Christ's ethical righteousness becomes ours appears not to be taught there, nor indeed anywhere in the Pauline writings. So far as the content of δικαιοσύνη is concerned, in the fourth chapter, as well as in verses 21, 22 of the third, there is little doubt that Calvin expresses the case exactly in the words already quoted: "Paul includes the whole of *righteousness* in a free remission."

WM. ARNOLD STEVENS.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

## A STRICTURE ON SCHAFF'S ACCOUNT OF SERVETUS.

SERVETUS stands on the border line which separates the intolerance of the Middle Ages from the spirit of religious freedom in modern times. Accordingly the interest centering in Servetus has less to do with his opinions, scientific and theological, though these in many instances anticipated the progress of after centuries, than with his connection with the theory of persecution, which caused his death. "I am more deeply scandalized," says Gibbon, "at the single execution of Servetus than at the hecatombs which have blazed at the *auto-da-fés* of Spain and Portugal."

The present paper grew out of the writer's feeling that Schaff's account of Calvin in Vol. VII of his *History of the Christian Church* is manifestly unfair to Servetus. Even if prior to the reading of that book the facts of Servetus' life should have been unknown to one, Schaff's account itself would beget a sense of injustice done to Servetus. This is due to the author's inability to conceal his grudge against Servetus

for having been the innocent victim of Calvin's intolerance. The reader clearly perceives that Schaff's facts do not agree with his feeling; and he becomes indignant, not because Calvin put Servetus to death, but because Schaff would like to justify Calvin, if he dared do so. Schaff attempts at least to tone down the malignity of Calvin's crime by false touches in portraying the life of Servetus. Neither the judgment of the gifted historian nor the plain facts in the case permitted an account that would be openly hostile to Servetus. It is rather in the coloring, in little side thrusts, in insinuations, that this suppressed revengeful feeling gets the better of him. This is shown in the following examples:

On page 687 Schaff says: "Calvin and Servetus — what a contrast! The reformer and deformer; the champion of orthodoxy and the arch-heretic, the master architect of construction, and the master architect of ruin." In the light of the banishment from Geneva of Bolsec and Castellio, and of the stake of Servetus, read this sentence: "They [Calvin and Servetus] were of the same age, equally precocious, equally bold and independent, and relied on purely intellectual and spiritual forces." On page 688, Schaff says: "Servetus, as if inspired by a demoniac force, urged himself upon the attention of Calvin." "He bombarded him with letters from Vienne; and at last heedlessly rushed into his power at Geneva, and into the flames which have immortalized his name." The sequel will show that this language about as truly characterizes Servetus' course as it does that of the fly which becomes at last entangled in the web of its patient watcher.

On page 690 occurs this sentence: "Calvin's prominence for intolerance was his misfortune. It was an error of the judgment, but not of the heart." Again, on page 691 Schaff continues: "In one respect he was in advance of his times, by recommending to the Council of Geneva, though in vain, a mitigation of punishment and the substitution of the sword for the stake." Yet years before this event Luther asserted the principle of freedom in a sentence like this: "Heresy is a spiritual thing which no iron can hew down, no fire burn, no water drown."

On page 715 this language is used: "Servetus was too vain and obstinate to take advice." Schaff apparently failed to see the grim humor in a reference on page 783 to Farel's coming to Geneva: "He had come at the request of Calvin, to perform the last pastoral duties to the prisoner, which could not so well be done by any of the pastors at Geneva."

Only when feeling is somewhat intense is one so fluent in adjectives as in the following sentence, found on page 787: "He was vain, proud,

defiant, quarrelsome, revengeful, irreverent in the use of language, deceitful, and mendacious."

It is, of course, not contended in this article that Servetus' life is without puzzles, or that he was free from the faults which have marked in general the Spanish character. He seems to have made false statements to clear himself from the suspicion of heresy. On the other hand, there is no desire to belittle the splendid talents of Calvin and the fruitful influence of his mind in the cause of liberty upon Switzerland, France, Scotland, England and America. Truth, however, demands that we shall not magnify one of these men at the expense of the other, and I submit that we should be at as great pains to regard impartially the character of Servetus as to appreciate justly the merits of Calvin.

What sort of a man was Servetus? He was born in Spain, probably in 1509, the same year in which Calvin saw the light. His father was a notary of good standing in Aragon. Servetus got his early training at the University of Saragossa, and afterwards studied law at the University of Toulouse. Here, at the age of nineteen, he saw the Bible for the first time, as Luther, at the same age, had done at Erfurt. "The Bible now became his guide, and next to the Bible he esteemed the ante-Nicene Fathers."

In the suite of Quantana, he was present in February, 1530, at the coronation of Charles V, at Bologna. "These mine eyes," he tells us, "beheld the pope . . . . worshiped by crowds, which knelt before him in the street. As Luther's visit to Rome in 1510 afterwards confirmed him in his opposition to the Roman Catholic church, so this sight begot in Servetus a strong anti-papal bent. At the age of twenty-three he published in Germany a book in Latin on the *Errors of the Trinity*, which Gordon characterizes as "crude, but original and earnest." He put his name boldly on the title-page. Melancthon at this time writes: "I am reading Servetus much." In this book, according to Schaff, Servetus proceeds from the historical Jesus of Nazareth and proves, first, that this man is Jesus the Christ; secondly, that he is the Son of God; and, thirdly, that he is God. He begins with the humanity in opposition to those who begin with the Logos, and who, in his opinion, lose the true Christ. In this respect he anticipates the Socinian and modern humanitarian Christology, but not in a rationalistic sense; for he asserts a special indwelling of God in Christ (somewhat resembling Schleiermacher), and a deification of Christ after his exaltation (like the Socinians). He rejects the identity of the Logos with the Son of God, believing that the Christ was not God before his natural birth.

Father, Son, and Spirit he thought were not three persons, but three dispositions of God.

In 1534 Servetus met Calvin in Paris. A disputation on religion was arranged between them, but Servetus failed to appear at the appointed time. Calvin himself tells us that he had offered to set Servetus right on some questions. Servetus now brought out a splendid edition of Ptolemy's *Geography*, in which occurs the statement that Palestine is inhospitable and barren, which Calvin construed as throwing slight upon Moses' description of it as a "goodly land." He studied medicine in the University of Paris, where he subsequently lectured on geography, astrology, and astronomy. In 1531 he put forth a learned medical treatise on "Syrups," and made the discovery of the circulation of the blood nearly a hundred years before Harvey. In his thirtieth year he was rebaptized, urging Calvin to do likewise; for, as he states, "the promise is given to believers only, and infants have no faith." From 1540 to 1553 Servetus practiced medicine at Vienne, near Lyons, in France, where he made money. In this place he was known as Villeneuve, after the place of his birth, such changes in one's name being not uncommon at that time. He also conformed here to the worship of the Catholic church. About this time he annotated the Latin Bible of Pagnini, in which he insists on the literal and historical sense of Scripture, and rejects the mystical interpretation, thus anticipating the accepted methods of today. After his death, Rome put his comments on the *Index* (1559).

During his quiet residence at Vienne he was writing, in order to amplify his earlier views, his great work on the *Restoration of Christianity*, and sent a copy of the unfinished manuscript to Calvin, at Geneva. In the correspondence which was carried on between them interruptedly from 1540 to 1548 Calvin referred Servetus for information on certain points to his own *Institutes*, which Servetus returned with copious critical objections, especially to the doctrine of infant baptism. "There is hardly a page," said Calvin, "that is not defiled by his vomit." On February 13, 1546, Calvin said in a letter to his friend Farel, "Servetus lately wrote to me, and coupled with his letter a long volume of delirious fancies. He offers to come hither, if it is agreeable to me. But I am unwilling to pledge my word for his safety; for if he does come, provided my authority be of any avail, I shall never suffer him to go away alive." Notice that this threat was made seven years before its execution. Servetus begged Calvin to return his manuscript to him; and when several requests went unheeded, he

even asked the minister Pepin at Geneva to get it for him, but in this also he failed. Six years afterwards the *Restoration of Christianity*, without the name of the author, was printed secretly at Vienne at the expense of Servetus. It was finished on the 3d of January, 1553. The copies were done up in bales to be sent secretly to Frankfort and other places. But Calvin got hold of one or two copies from Vienne. William Trie, a proselyte of Calvin, residing in Geneva, wrote on February 23, 1553, to his Catholic cousin Arneys at Lyons: "I can observe, blessed be God, that vices are better corrected here than among all your officials. . . . . To your confusion, I can give you one example, since I am forced to mention it, which is, that with you they support a heretic who deserves to be burnt wherever he is found. . . . . This man is a Portuguese Spaniard, called Michael Servetus, for his proper name, but he calls himself Villeneuve . . . . practicing physic. He has made some stay at Lyons, just now he is at Vienne . . . . where (his) book has been printed by a certain person named Bathazard Arnaulet; and that you may not think I talk hearsay, I send you the first sheet as a specimen." Arneys lost no time in putting Trie's letter in the hand of Ory, the trained judge of heresy at Lyons, under the bloodthirsty Cardinal Tournon. Servetus was at once brought before the tribunal, but his heresy could not be proved. Arneys was then directed by Ory to ask his cousin in Geneva to send the entire copy of the work, of which they had only the first page. Trie replied on March 26: "I cannot send the book itself, but I can furnish you with a better means of proving the guilt of this man, consisting of two dozen written leaves, in which are portions of his heresy. If his printed work be shown to him, he can deny that he is the author, but not so with the handwriting. I must, however, plainly confess to you that I have had great trouble in obtaining from Mr. Calvin what I now send to you," etc. These enclosures were Servetus' private letters to Calvin. Upon this betrayal of confidence, Erasmus at the time expressed himself thus: "You are not ignorant how abhorrent, I do not say from virtue, but entirely from all humanity, it is to betray the secrets of friendship."

When this additional evidence arrived from Geneva, on April 4th, Servetus was arrested and thrown into prison. According to the statements of the inquisitors, Servetus on his trial denied that he was the author of the book on the *Restoration of Christianity*, and professed devotion to the mother church. Then upon being unexpectedly shown his letters to Calvin, "My lords," said he, his eyes stream-

ing with tears, "I will confess the truth. Twenty-five years ago, when I was in Germany, a book by one Servetus, a Spaniard, was printed at Hagenau; I know not whence he came; but at that time I was in correspondence with Calvin, and he addressed me as Servetus, for there was a similarity in our appearance, and I assumed his character." For ten years, he added, he had ceased to write. On the third day of his imprisonment, at four o'clock in the morning, he put on a nightgown over his clothes, and, pretending a call of nature, he secured the key from the jailor and thus escaped across the Rhone. The trial, however, continued, and he was condemned on the 17th of June to be burnt by a slow fire. After four months' concealment, Servetus resolved to make his way to Naples to take up again the practice of medicine; and fearing to go by Piedmont, he took the route through Switzerland. He entered Geneva alone, on foot, and turned into the Rose Inn, a small house near the lake, used by strangers. He engaged a boat to carry him across the lake on his way to Zürich. But before setting out he attended Calvin's church on Sunday, August 13th, where, it was said, Calvin recognized him. That afternoon as Servetus was on the point of taking the boat, he was arrested, though legally no one could be arrested on Sunday in Geneva, except on a capital charge. The money, nearly five hundred dollars, and jewelry, found on his person, were handed over to Tissot, and after the trial were given to the hospital. The Registers of the Company of Pastors under the date of August 13th have this record: "M. Servetus having been recognized by some brethren, it was found good to cause him to be imprisoned, as he might no longer infest the world with his blasphemies and heresies; for he is known to be wholly incorrigible and desperate." Calvin in his letter to Sulzer states more definitely: "One of the syndics at my instigation (*me auctore*) ordered him to be led to prison." It was a law in Geneva that the accuser should become a prisoner with the accused, and, if the charge proved false, the prosecutor suffered the penalty instead of the one accused. The person employed for this purpose was Nicholas de la Fontaine, Calvin's secretary; "*Nicolaus meus*" is Calvin's reference to him. The advocate, or counsel, of Fontaine was Colladon, an able lawyer, who had advised Calvin in framing a new constitution for Geneva. No counsel was allowed Servetus. The trial took place in the Little Council, in which Calvin's influence was supreme, and not in the Council of Two Hundred, in which a strong party was dissatisfied with the severity of his rule in the city. Thirty-eight articles, alleging blas-

phemy, heresy as to the Trinity, and especially as to infant baptism, were drawn up by Calvin against Servetus. One of these declared that he had defamed Calvin, to which charge Servetus replied that he had had abusive language from Calvin. Fontaine brought forward as evidence certain letters, Ptolemy's *Geography*, and a copy of *The Restoration of Christianity*, together with the manuscript which Servetus had sent to Calvin six years previously, and which he had since been unable to get back. Servetus with simplicity and candor admitted that he was the author of these books, adding that he had not intended to blaspheme, and that he could show publicly that his views were according to the Scriptures. The Council thought it prudent not to accept this bold challenge. Indeed such were the skill, knowledge, and firmness of the prisoner that he proved more than a match for his opponent, Fontaine. Accordingly, on the third day of the trial, Calvin took the case in person, sending his brother as surety to prison in his stead. His satisfaction with the conduct of the trial from this point is attested by a remark in his letter to Farel three days later: "I hope that the sentence will be at least a capital one." The limits of this paper do not permit one to go into details of the discussion as to the Trinity, the meaning of *persona*, ὑπόστασις, etc. At times the words of both contestants were sharp and bitter. As to the statement in his *Geography* of the barrenness of Palestine, Servetus insisted that there was "nothing wrong there." As to the charge of immorality, he pleaded his physical infirmity, resulting from rupture, which shielded him against licentiousness. He declared that he had always tried to lead a Christian life. Together with the charge that he had vilified Calvin, the most dangerous count against him was his rejection of infant baptism. "Infant baptism," he asserted, "was nowhere commanded; it was an invention of the devil." He steadfastly refused to recant unless he was shown from the Bible that he was wrong. Luther before the Diet at Worms was no whit more stubbornly insistent on the Bible as the sole authority in matters of faith than was Servetus before the Council at Geneva. Paper and ink were now for the first time furnished him, with which he addressed this petition to the Council:

*To the very honorable Lords, My Lords, the Syndics and Council of Geneva:* Michael Servetus, accused, lays it down as a certain fact, that this is a new invention. The apostles, disciples, and the ancient church had no notion of making a criminal process for any doctrine of the Scripture . . . . Wherefore, my Lords, the said suppliant prays that he may be dismissed from

the criminal accusation. Secondly, my Lords, he begs you will consider that he has committed no offense, neither in your territories nor anywhere else, that he has neither been seditious nor turbulent; for the questions relating to him are difficult and ought to be put into the hands of learned men. Thirdly, my Lords, because he is a stranger, and does not know the customs of this country, nor in what manner he is to proceed in judgment, he humbly begs of you to grant him an advocate, who may speak for him. In doing so, you shall do well, and our Lord shall prosper your republic. Given in your city of Geneva, August 22, 1553. Michael Servetus, of Villeneuve, in his own cause.

The Council sent to Vienne for the documents by which Servetus had there been condemned to the stake. In three days the jailer from whom he had escaped came in person, bringing a copy of the sentence, to demand the prisoner, adding that the papers asked for could not be given, but that the authorities at Vienne thanked the Genevese for the intelligence as to the whereabouts of the prisoner. Servetus was asked whether he wished to go or stay, and, falling on his knees, he begged not to be sent back to Vienne, where only a cruel death awaited him. He sent a paper by the jailer declaring that his escape had been without the connivance of the jailer, and he generously refused to give the names of his creditors in France, that he might not enrich his enemies nor endanger his friends. How vividly this united zeal of papist and Protestant — friends only in their hate — against a lone man who in daring to think for himself was fighting the battles of the future, recalls the fact that two other immemorial enemies — Athens and Sparta — were never so intimately united in effort as when hunting down the outlawed Themistocles, who by his foresight had made Athens, and by his energy saved Greece from Persian despotism.

The trial went on while the four Protestant cantons, prompted by Calvin, were giving their sanction to the proceedings at Geneva.

Meanwhile Servetus from a foul cell petitions again on September 15th: "Calvin is resolved that I should rot in prison to please him. I am eaten up with lice. My hose are worn to pieces, and I have no change nor another doublet, and only one shirt and that in tatters." He ends another petition on October 10th with the words: "It is now three weeks since I desired to have a hearing, but could not obtain it. I beseech you, for the love of Jesus Christ, not to deny me what you would not deny a Turk, when I beg you to do me justice. I suffer terribly from the cold . . . . It is very cruel that I am neither allowed to speak, nor to have my pressing wants supplied. For the love of

God, my Lords, either in pity or in duty, give some orders in my behalf."

When the Council met on October 26th to decide the matter, Perrin, the presiding syndic, made a last effort in favor of Servetus. He at first pleaded for his acquittal. Failing in this, he urged that the case be transferred, according to the wish of Servetus, to the Council of Two Hundred, in which Calvin was less dominant. Seeing, however, that the majority were bent on fixing the death penalty, he with a few others left the senate house. The decision was unanimous. The wish of Calvin to change the sentence from death by fire to death by the sword did not prevail; and seemingly this was the only point throughout the whole affair in which he was unsuccessful.

The sentence was not made known to Servetus in the prison until the next morning, the same day on which he was to die ere the clock of St. Peter's sounded the hour of twelve. Though he was horror-struck at the suddenness of it, his fortitude and Christian spirit were such as have not failed, in a single instance known to me, to draw forth words of admiration from his most prejudiced critics. "He showed," says Schaff, "the courage and consistency of a martyr in these last awful hours." Servetus sent for Calvin, whom he received tranquilly. Calvin has described the scene: "When one of the members of the Council asked him what he wished with me, he answered that he desired to beg my forgiveness. I readily answered, and it was strictly the truth, that I had never sought to resent any personal affront. . . . . Turning, however, from what concerned myself, I prayed him to implore the forgiveness of God, whom he had so awfully blasphemed." Servetus was silent. "When I found," Calvin continues, "that I could effect nothing by my arguments and persuasions . . . . I withdrew from the presence of a man who had sinned as a heretic and was condemned of himself. Titus 3: 10, 11." Could anything more clearly reveal the blindness and hardness of theological rancor?

Servetus, smiting his breast, continued in prayer, acknowledged Christ as his Redeemer, and besought God to forgive his accusers. When the prisoner was brought about eleven o'clock to the stake at Champel, Farel, whom Calvin had asked to act as minister to the doomed man, said to the multitude: "You see what power Satan has at command, when he gets possession of a man." Servetus, with his book, both in manuscript and in print, tied around his body, was chained to the stake, which was surrounded, as a Genevese states, by fresh oak still in leaf. "On his head was a wreath woven of straw and

leaves, sprinkled with brimstone." In the last moment he was heard to pray, in smoke and agony, with a loud voice: "Jesus Christ, thou Son of the Eternal God, have mercy upon me."

As the bell was sounding twelve, the tragedy ended.

Thus perished, at the age of forty-four, one who had stood for the freedom of the will, for the Bible as the sole guide in spiritual matters, and for the only method of interpretation now used; who declared faith to be a prerequisite to baptism and the Lord's Supper; who had a passionate devotion to the person of Christ; who opposed the papacy and all persecution for religious opinions; who discovered the circulation of the blood and advanced the sciences of geography and medicine.

It cannot be maintained, with Michelet, that this execution was "a crime of the times rather than of Calvin himself." While it is true that Catholics in general and Protestants sometimes were in that age given to intolerance, noble voices were not wanting to plead for religious toleration. Listen to Luther, who died seven years before the fires consumed Servetus: "Belief is a free thing which cannot be enforced;" and again, "If heretics were to be punished by death, the hangman would be the most orthodox theologian." Philip of Hesse would not use force against differences of faith in his own subjects. Joris, an Anabaptist at Basel, protested thus at the time: "It is an incredible blindness that the servants of Christ . . . . should condemn the erring to death. If Servetus be a heretic, he ought to be admonished in a friendly manner, and then banished from the state." But Calvin was not without inner light; for in his own early work on Seneca he had contended for liberty of thought.

There was, moreover, at that time, no law in Geneva for inflicting the death penalty for differences in belief. Banishment alone was legal. An extinct law seems to have been revived specially for the case of Servetus.

Although in a barbarous age David was led on by passion to compass in battle the death of Uriah the Hittite, yet he finds even now on every hand Nathans to say "Thou art the man;" whereas Calvin, like a sleuthhound, relentlessly tracked Servetus to the end, knowing that his death would but feed fat the ancient grudge he bore him, and yet finds in our times one to contend that his deed "must be excused, though it cannot be justified, by the spirit of his age."

May we all lay more to heart what Augustine long ago pointed out: "Nothing conquers but truth; the victory of truth is love."

RICHMOND COLLEGE,
Richmond, Va.

S. C. MITCHELL.

## THE NEED OF A NEW THEOLOGY.

We need a new theology, but not a new religion. Religion is the life of God in the soul of man. This divine life is in its manifestation ever new, in its essential principle ever old. Theology is the science of this life, that is, it is the intellectual statement, in an orderly manner, of the laws of that life as they are understood by man. Such intellectual statements of life change from time to time with increased knowledge and with an altered point of view. The stars are the same, but we have a new astronomy; flowers the same, but we have a new botany; religion is the same, but we need a new theology.

We need not merely modifications and emendations of historic creeds, such as a change in the Articles of the Westminster Confession respecting elect infants, or an addition to that Confession respecting the truth of God's love. No such amendments as have been proposed in the Presbyterian church in America, no such interpretative declarations as that proposed by the United Presbyterian church in Scotland, can meet the intellectual needs of our times. We need a new theology constructed on a new foundation, a new interpretation of the religious life as seen from a modern point of view. All the current movements toward a new theology are really contributions, conscious or unconscious, toward this final accomplishment.

The modern point of view of life is expressed by the word evolution, as defined by Professor Le Conte. The modern thinker believes that all life is a "continuous, progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces." This belief underlies all teaching in our colleges and higher seminaries. Not only the student of the natural sciences accepts this definition of life as an axiom, but the literary and philosophical student no less accepts it. The study of history, of literature, of sociology, of philosophy in its various forms is the study of a continuous, progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces.

Are religious phenomena also evolutionary in their character? Is the science of religion to accept this point of view? Is the religious life a continuous, progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces? Christ gives to this question an explicit and definite answer in the affirmative. "The kingdom of God," he says, "is as if a man should cast seed into the ground, and should sleep and rise, night and day, and the seed should spring and grow up, he knoweth not how. For the earth bringeth forth fruit of herself, first the blade, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear." In this

parable all the elements of Le Conte's definition are involved: a series of progressive changes,—first the blade, then the ear,—according to certain laws,—the seed springing forth and growing up,—by resident forces,—the earth bringing forth of herself.

But our traditional theology has a very different point of view; interprets religious life in a very different manner; regards as synonymous the words divine and supernatural; regards the religious life as non-natural because divine; treats it as due not to resident forces, but to successive interventions,—is, in a word, cataclysmic, not evolutionary. According to traditional theology, before it had been modified by modern thought, creation was a sudden intervention in nature by a divine *fiat*, six thousand years ago. Revelation was another intervention for the purpose of communicating truth to a specially favored nation. Incarnation was another intervention, completed in one historical episode and lasting about a third of a century. Atonement was another intervention, according to a considerable school limited in its effects to an elect few; punishment was another intervention for the purpose of satisfying divine justice, if not divine vengeance. Substantially every important term in traditional theology represented to the human mind not a progressive and spontaneous change in life, but a mysterious if not arbitrary intervention in life from without. Thus we have had two sciences of life growing up together: the science of nature, founded on the theory that all life is a series of progressive changes, and the science of religion, founded on the theory that the spiritual life is due to a series of successive interventions from without. What the church needs is that its religious teachers should frankly acknowledge that the church has been mistaken in its interpretation, and should reconstruct its theology along evolutionary lines, so making it conform to that larger and better view of life to which modern scholarship has attained. It will not be expected that in so brief a note as this the writer will attempt to furnish a reconstructed theology, but it is possible to give some hints of the direction in which that reconstruction is actually proceeding.

We are coming to see that there is no distinction between the supernatural and the natural; that the natural is all supernatural, and that the supernatural is all most natural. We are coming to see what Bushnell pointed out in his *Nature and the Supernatural*, that the only real distinction is between the spiritual and the material. Miracles are therefore no longer regarded by intelligent scholars as violations of the laws of nature. Special providences are regarded as special illustrations of a providence which is universal. Answer to prayer, as

part of the whole experience of communion with God, is in accordance with the great mysterious laws which regulate intercourse between spirit and spirit. In a word, the immanence of God is coming to be recognized as the fundamental fact in the new theology,—God in everything; all power belonging unto him; all phenomena, save only those of human sinfulness, manifestations of him; all life emanating from him. He is thus seen to be, as John described him, the eternal Word, that is, a God always self-revealed. There is, perhaps, in modern literature no nobler representation of this truth than the revolutionary yet conservative treatise of Dr. Samuel Harris on *The Self-Revelation of God.*

Creation we are coming to regard not as a bit of carpenter work, not the construction of an edifice by an architect, or of an engine by an engineer; not a work wrought *ab extra;* it is perceived and interpreted as vital. The declarations of modern science, that all the creative phenomena of past ages have their analogue in phenomena now going on, will, in the future, be frankly and gladly accepted. We shall see that the process by which the soul forms the body furnishes a far better analogue of creation than the process by which a carpenter makes a box. Nature will be recognized as a material manifestation and forthputting of the invisible and eternal Spirit. Every spring will be perceived to be as truly a creative day as the days of which the ancient Hebrew poet sang. Creation will be recognized as a continuous process, eternal as God is eternal, and because God is eternal. Before this acknowledged conception of creation all the profitless debates about the first chapter of Genesis will disappear, and the chapter itself will be accepted as a splendid poetical interpretation of the truth that creation is itself the product of the Word of God, and that God is always speaking in every new manifestation of nature.

The origin of sin in an evolutionary theology will no longer be traced to an historical fall of Adam six thousand years ago. The combined teaching of theology, sociology, anthropology, and philology, that man has ascended from a lower animal race and carries in him the relics of his ancestry, will be frankly accepted. Temptation will be interpreted as the struggle between the animal and the spiritual, the σάρξ and the πνεῦμα. Every victory of the animal over the spiritual will be recognized as a fall. The responsibility for human sin will no longer be rolled back upon unhappy Adam; each man will recognize that he carries in himself an animal nature whose emergence and victory over the spiritual sense constitutes fall and sin. In short, the Jewish conception of the origin of sin, parenthetically accepted in an

*argumentum ad hominem* by Paul in the fifth chapter of Romans, will be abandoned, and the modern conception of sin, anticipated by Paul in the dramatic portrayal of human experience in the seventh chapter of Romans, will take its place. Temptation will be seen to be essential to the development of a moral free agent out of a preëxisting animal condition, and sin and fall will be seen to be necessarily possible incidents in that development.

Revelation will no longer be regarded as furnishing an infallible book. It will be perceived to be gradual, progressive, taking place in human consciousness, and sharing in the imperfections of human consciousness. The Bible will be seen to be an anthology of Hebrew literature, composed of the uttered experiences of devout souls, giving expression to the life of God in themselves, for the purpose of inspiring a like life in others. It will be seen that centuries of spiritual growth intervened between Moses' conception of Jehovah and Christ's revelation of the Father. There will no longer be an attempt to prove that Moses saw everything that Christ saw, and the teachings of the latter will no longer be narrowed and impoverished in order to make them conform to the inferior conceptions of the former. It will be seen that the Hebrew prophets grew in grace and in the knowledge of God, and the inconsistencies and incongruities in the Bible will be easily understood when we understand that the Bible itself is the history of the growing consciousness of God in the heart of a great nation. The higher criticism will bring us continuously closer to the life of the individual writer. It will show us with increasing clearness that the Bible is the most human of books, and it will thus bring us nearer to God, who dwells not in a printed page but in human hearts, and whose glory it is to reveal himself to imperfect humanity through the very imperfections of the men in whom he dwells and by whom he speaks.

The mediæval conception of Christ, as a God-man, a composite being now divine, now human, whom we can neither take as a perfect manifestation of God because of his humanity, nor as a perfect model for us to follow because of his divinity, is gradually disappearing from the church. In the place of it is coming the more rational and more scriptural conception of Christ as the supreme manifestation of God in man. All prior history prepares for the incarnation of Christ, and the incarnation in Christ prepares for all subsequent history; for the object of all history is the creation of a race of beings with whom the Spirit of God will dwell, in whom God will be immanent as he is immanent in nature; who will be partakers of the divine, heirs of God, spiritual

dwelling places of the Almighty. The real consummation of the incarnation will not be seen until the human race is perfectly conformed to the image of God's Son, so that he is the firstborn among many brethren, and God himself is all in all. So viewed, the incarnation is itself a gradual, progressive change,—it begins with the earliest glimmering consciousness of God in the human soul, it is traced with increasing distinctness in the fragmentary and exceptional experiences of God recorded by the saints and prophets of the olden time; it comes to its historical consummation in the individual life in Jesus of Nazareth, who is perfect God and perfect man, because that man only is or can be perfect in whom God perfectly dwells. But he is himself what he has declared himself to be, a door, through whom humanity enters God. His incarnation is carried on in the church which is the body of Christ, and is consummated when the whole redeemed race is built up, a spiritual house, an holy priesthood, a living temple for the indwelling of the Everlasting Father.

Thus incarnation, atonement, forgiveness, and regeneration are simply expressions of different aspects of the same life of God in the soul of man. Incarnation is the dwelling of God in humanity, seen in its historic perfection in Jesus the Christ. Atonement is the coming of God and man together in this incarnation through this Jesus Christ; the spiritual union of the two, perfected only when the one insuperable obstacle, a recalcitrant will, showing itself in a sinful nature, is removed. Forgiveness of sins is not merely, nor mainly, the remission of penalty; it is the cleansing of the soul, it is purification, a reconciliation to, a unity with, God, which is not merely judicial but vital; so that the life of the one may flow into and supply the other. Regeneration is that new and spiritual life which is born of God, which comes from his brooding of the Divine Spirit, and which can no more be without him than natural life could be without the sun.

This outline is not offered as adequate and satisfactory, nor these definitions as above serious criticism. The object of this note, it must once more be repeated, is not to offer a reconstruction of theology, but to intimate to students and religious teachers, especially the latter, the direction in which and the lines along which it seems to me our studying and our teaching must go, if we are so to interpret religion — the life of God in the soul of man — as to make it seem rational to an age which accepts as its axiom in science and philosophy that all life is "a continuous, progressive change, according to certain laws, and by means of resident forces."

LYMAN ABBOTT.

BROOKLYN, N. Y.

# RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

RELIGIONSGESCHICHTLICHE STUDIEN ZUR FRAGE DER BEEINFLUSSUNG DES URCHRISTENTUMS DURCH DAS ANTIKE MYSTERIENWESEN. Von GEORG WOBBERMIN, DR. PHIL., Lic. Theol. Berlin : E. Ebering, 1896. Pp. vi + 191. M. 5.

THE question as to the influence of classical culture on early Christianity has recently been studied with renewed interest by both English and German scholars. In particular, Usener and his pupils at Bonn, and the school of Harnack in Berlin have given much attention to the matter, the one working forward from the classical period, the other backward from the early Christian church. The present volume is one more witness to the stimulating influence of Harnack's seminar. The writer is deterred from his plan of discussing the subject systematically by the appearance of Anrich's excellent presentation of the subject: *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum.* (Von Lic. Gustav Anrich, Privatdocent in Strassburg, Göttingen, 1894.) Accordingly he presupposes that the reader is acquainted with the book by Anrich, of which he gives the briefest outline, and only takes up those points where he would amend the treatment in the earlier book.

Part I discusses the essential nature of the Greek mysteries. In this section the chthonic cults in general, the mysteries in the narrower sense of the word, and the Orphic poems are treated as three phases of one great religious movement. In each the author traces five characteristics which distinguish this movement from the rest of Greek religion: (1) its soteriological character, (2) its henotheistic character (3) its dualistic character, (4) its ethical character, and (5) its eschatological character. He reaches the conclusion that this great movement is the popular religion of the common people in Greece, the one *Volksreligion* in the world of which we have adequate literary account (p. 9).

The treatment is characterized throughout by great lack of discrimination and frequent carelessness of statement. The word *mystery* is extended from the solemn drama at Eleusis, shielded from profana-

tion by deep religious awe, to any religious practice in which Pausanias or Clement of Alexandria finds something for which the priests do not give an adequate explanation. Moreover all foreign practices introduced into Greece are "in reality Greek cults of which only the outer garment is foreign" (p. 7). So the conception of chthonic cults is extended to include all ancestor worship and hero worship, and much of the worship of the Olympic divinities. The mysteries at Eleusis are the extension of a simple chthonic cult (pp. 29 ff.) because some heroes are worshiped there, because Demeter is worshiped as chthonic in some parts of the Peloponnesos, and because Iakchos is really a god whose chthonic character is evident in Thrace. The reader will not expect much "light on the essential nature of the mysteries" (p. 7) after such a beginning.

It will not be denied that the idea of salvation from danger is frequently found in the worship of the chthonic gods, nor that the mysteries proper have an eschatological meaning, nor that the Orphic writings are marked by a tendency to syncretism. The effort to trace these characteristics, together with henotheism and dualism, through chthonic worship, the mysteries, and the Orphic writings is a most striking example of the *Schematismus* which our author condemns. The discussion of what the writer calls henotheism shows a particular absence of any understanding of the nature of the Greek divinities. Because a hero has a functional name rather than a personal name, we certainly have no right to infer that no weight is laid on the name; because Æschylus calls Artemis a daughter of Demeter, we cannot say that he identifies Artemis and Kore, nor does the existence of a common epithet give any assurance of the same conclusion. The fact that the Eleusinian gods were named from their functions (p. 35) has little or nothing to do with the Orphic syncretism to which it is compared. The question whether the earlier forms of purification and later the mysteries had any real ethical significance is an exceedingly interesting and important one, but the position of Rohde and Anrich is hardly weakened by the objections raised by Dr. Wobbermin.

The second part of the book consists of a series of short essays tracing the influence of Orphism or the mysteries on the early history of Christianity. The first, a note on the word ἅγιος, hardly deserves attention. The second discusses gnosticism as Christian Orphism. The proof that Plato's use of the word δημιουργός was due to Orphic influence rather weakens the position that the gnostic use of it is also due to Orphic influence, and yet the latter position seems to be intrin-

sically probable. The proof that the gnostic use of the serpent in worship came from the later mysteries is much weakened by the author's schematism, but the position can hardly be questioned. The third essay seeks to trace in the gospel of the Egyptians the influence of Orphism in Egypt. The androgynous symbolism, the prohibition of marriage, the vegetarianism, the discussion of the origin of the soul, and finally the hylozoistic pantheism of this gospel are presented as Orphic elements in it.

The next two essays on the terms *θεὸς σωτήρ* and *θεὸς μονογενής* are more interesting. The writer holds that the early conception of *σωτηρία* soon came to have more of an eschatological meaning. Christ is generally called *σωτήρ* only in the pastoral epistles, which are assigned to Greek soil, and in those early writers who were in touch with Greek rather than Judaic thought; and the term becomes common only in the gnostic writers. This fact is explained by the Greek use of the word *σωτήρ* in connection with the chthonic cults and the later mysteries. The discussion of *θεὸς μονογενής* leaves much to be desired in point of clearness, but it offers conclusive proof that the gnostic use of the term is due to Orphic influence, and it explains the very common use of the term in the first centuries by the prevalent use of it in connection with popular Greek religion. This is held to weaken Hort's argument for this reading in the prologue to John's gospel, and the writer is inclined to explain this reading there by its prevalence in the popular religion. He adduces a striking instance of the incorporation of Christian doctrine into an Orphic hymn to show how Christian writers sought to mediate between Christianity and popular belief.

The concluding essay takes up again the interesting question as to the origin of the early Christian terms for baptism, *σφραγίζεσθαι* and *φωτίζειν*. The topic is discussed at much greater length than by Anrich, and the question receives some new light, but the author only claims that the usage of the mysteries exerted some little influence on the introduction of these terms. As an argument the presentation suffers, because the author sometimes argues from the use of these terms by Christian writers back to their use in the mysteries in order to trace the influence of the mysteries on these same Christian writers. Still he makes it appear probable that at least in some of the mysteries these terms were used, so that the terms as well as the practices denoted by them influenced the usage of the early church.

ARTHUR FAIRBANKS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

VATER, SOHN UND FÜRSPRECHER IN DER BABYLONISCHEN GOTTESVORSTELLUNG. Ein Problem für die vergleichende Religionswissenschaft. Von HEINRICH ZIMMERN. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1896. Pp. 15, 8vo. M. 2.

IN a small pamphlet of fifteen pages, Professor Zimmern discusses the interesting question of "mediatorship" as illustrated by the religious literature of the Babylonians. It is by no means the first time that attention has been directed to the subject. The writer of this review in a monograph on the Dibbarra Epic published in 1891[1] referred to the association of two deities in the relationship of father and son, the latter acting as mediator between the former and the subjects of both —mankind. The text which forms the starting point of Zimmern's investigation is the same as the one I took as the basis of my remarks. The two gods brought into association are Marduk and Ea; and it is in the incantation texts more specifically that Marduk appears in the rôle of mediator between Ea, the god of humanity *par excellence*, and suffering mankind. The petitioner, whether tortured by disease or otherwise subjected to discomfort by the hold which some evil spirit (or spirits) or a cruel witch has obtained over him, appeals to Marduk for relief. Marduk, yielding in authority to his father Ea, proceeds to the dwelling place of Ea which is "the deep" and asks for instructions. Ea deprecates the possession of superior knowledge. He says to his son :

"What can I tell thee that thou dost not already know?"

Despite this assumed modesty, however, the father directs his son what remedies to apply in order to secure the relief of the sufferer, in whose behalf Marduk acts as mediator.

So far everything is clear, but when it comes to interpret the meaning and reason for this position of mediator which Marduk assumes, we are unable to agree with Dr. Zimmern. According to him, Ea as the father-god is "unapproachable." The conceptions bound up with him are such as to remove the thought of a direct appeal to him.

It seems to me, however, that Dr. Zimmern omits to take into consideration an important factor in accounting for the present form of the incantation texts. There can be no doubt that the religious literature of Babylonia, especially those portions of it like the incantation rituals which served a practical purpose, underwent recastings at

[1] *A Fragment of the Babylonian Dibbarra Epic* (Philadelphia, 1891), p. 38.

various periods. These recastings were in large measure superinduced by changes in the political conditions occurring in the Euphrates valley. The most striking of these changes and the most effective in its results was the supreme position secured for the city of Babylon through the conquests of Hammurabi (*c.* 2300 B. C.). With this supremacy of the city, the patron deity of Babylon, who is none other than Marduk, is naturally elevated to be the head of the Babylonian pantheon. This momentous event superinduced many changes in the traditions, the legends, and in the religious beliefs that long before Hammurabi had already been combined into some definite system, or perhaps it would be more correct to say into systems, produced in the various ancient centers of Babylonian life and thought. Marduk—a comparatively recent deity—had to be brought *en rapport* with the traditions of the past. A place had to be found for him that would accord with the dignity he assumed in the united empire formed of the ancient states of Babylonia. The theologians of Babylon did not hesitate to set aside an older god to promote the glory of their favorite Marduk. Among the ancient centers of Babylonia, Nippur and Eridu occupy a prominent position. The chief god of Nippur was En-lil who became known as Bêl, "the lord;" the chief god of Eridu was Ea, the creator, protector, and teacher of mankind. Both had to yield some modicum of their authority to Marduk. According to one version of the creation of mankind, it was Bel of Nippur who succeeded in overcoming primeval chaos—symbolized by a monster Tiamat—in order to prepare the way for the creation of mankind. This story was recast by the Babylonian schools of theology so as to give to Marduk the honor originally belonging to Bel of Nippur. The older god voluntarily resigns in favor of the younger one. In the present form of the Tiamat story, Bel transfers his titles including the name Bel or "lord" to Marduk. The transference of the name meant the transfer of all power and prerogatives. Ea, the god of Eridu, makes a similar transfer. Other gods follow the example of Bel and Ea, and thus armed with the combined strength of the pantheon, Marduk proceeds to the conflict and is of course triumphant.

In the same way, we must interpret the association of Marduk and Ea in the incantation texts. The prominence of Ea in incantation rites is a survival in religion of the important position once occupied politically by the city of Eridu—situated on the Persian gulf. The patron god of the largest and therefore most sacred sheet of water known to the inhabitants of the Euphrates valley becomes, by virtue

of the dimmed tradition according to which the culture of the land takes its rise in the extreme south, the one who watches over the welfare of mankind in general. Other factors that need not be enumerated here enter into play to make the incantation ritual perfected in Eridu or under the influence of the Ea cult, a standard adopted by the priests of Babylon. But the old ritual was reshaped. Ea is not set aside altogether, Marduk is "shoved in," as it were, and accorded the distinction of being the protector of humanity which is of right due to Ea. It is Marduk and no longer Ea who hears the cry of the one held in the clutch of the evil spirit. Marduk on the other hand pays a tribute of respect to Ea but the latter is at pains to acknowledge that Marduk's wisdom and power is equal to his own. The point of the dialogue between Marduk and Ea is to emphasize the *equality* of the two. The assumed relationship of father and son between Marduk and Ea which is not limited to the incantation texts represents the natural compromise brought about by the theologians of the united Babylonian Empire whose task lay in reconciling the religious legacy of the past with the existing conditions. Ea being older in authority is the father who—it is important to note —*willingly* acknowledges the supremacy of Marduk. The latter by virtue of being younger to attain to prominence, is regarded as the son.

There is nothing about Ea which makes him more "unapproachable" than Marduk or any other god, as Dr. Zimmern would have us believe. He is not approached directly in some of the incantation texts, simply because these old texts have been reshaped in order to give a proper place to the great god of Babylon.

Not all the incantation texts have been so reshaped. There are some in which Ea is *directly* appealed to and where Marduk is not mentioned at all. A further proof that Ea is the older "god of incantations" and was once regarded within a wide district as the superior in this respect to all others is the text—well known to scholars—in which a group of spirits constantly molesting mankind are described as "hostile to Ea." They are "hostile" to the god because it is he who is able to check their course. It is he to whom as the protector of mankind the appeal is made. For further illustrations of this historical view as to the relation existing between Marduk and Ea, I may be permitted to refer to chapters viii and xv of my forthcoming volume on *The Religion of the Babylonians and Assyrians* in which the subject is fully treated.

We are therefore not justified in concluding from the Marduk-Ea episode, as Dr. Zimmern would have us do, that the Babylonian doctrine of mediatorship has any direct connection with the Christian teaching. But Dr. Zimmern goes further than this. He suggests that the fire-god Gibil or Nusku, appearing in the incantation texts as the one who "intercedes" with Ea through Marduk on behalf of those suffering from bewitchment may have been the "germ" that developed into the doctrine of the "Holy Ghost." While careful to emphasize the tentativeness of his theory, Dr. Zimmern propounds the very interesting thesis — and if correct, very important one — that Marduk, Ea, and Gibil-Nusku form a triad that reappear in more developed form in the Christian Trinity of Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Apart from the objections already urged against Zimmern's interpretation of the relationship between Marduk and Ea, in his view of the rôle played by the fire-god in the incantation texts he omits an important link — the relationship of Gibil to the god Bel of the old Babylonian triad Anu, Bel and Ea.

In my monograph on the Dibbarra Epic already referred to (pp. 26–27) I called attention to a section in the "Shurpu" series* of incantations in which Bel and Nusku appear in combination with Marduk and Ea. The fire-god is the messenger of Bel. He bears, therefore, a similar relation to Bel as Marduk does to Ea. Marduk is Ea's messenger, sent as occasion arises to do his service. Bel and Nusku seem to belong to the heavenly hosts, while Marduk and Ea are more concerned with earthly affairs, but this distinction is not consistently maintained in the religious literature. Now, in the text in question, the two groups are combined in an interesting manner. Bel sends his messenger Gibil-Nusku with a message to "the deep" — *i. e.*, to Ea. The latter hears the appeal made to him, but instead of replying directly sends his son Marduk as the messenger to convey his answer. According to the view above proposed, we must see in this combination of the four gods a further trace of the reëditing which the old incantation ritual underwent at the hands of Babylonian theologians. Fire, as Zimmern properly points out, was an important element in Babylonian magic, and, for that matter, in all magic. The combination of the fire-god with Bel points to some ritual — perhaps one devised by the priests of Nippur — in which these two deities played the chief part. It would be natural for the priests of Nippur to make Gibil-Nusku the messenger of the mighty Bel.

* See now ZIMMERN, *Die Beschwörungstafeln Šurpu*, Tafel V und VI.

Next to fire, or rather by the side of fire, water constitutes an important element in magic. Water purifies, as fire removes impurities. Both are regarded as sacred by all ancient nations, both lend themselves to mystic speculations. In the "Ea" incantation rituals, water must have played an important part. Frequently does Ea direct his son to carry "waters of purification" to those stricken with disease by the evil spirits. Hence what could be more natural than, in the eclectic process to which all religious rituals are prone, to combine "water" and "fire" incantations into a single group. Marduk having been introduced into the "Ea" incantations, it was only another step to add to the Marduk-Ea group, Bel and Nusku.

The text (IV Rawlinson, plate 15) which Dr. Zimmern adduces in proof of his view of Gibil-Nusku as the "interceder," represents but another variation of the combination of the Marduk-Ea incantations with "fire" incantations. The omission of Bel in the text translated by Zimmern and in others adduced by him, only shows that Gibil-Nusku could be introduced independently of Bel, and was originally independent of Bel, just as Ea is at times dissociated from Marduk and was originally entirely independent of Marduk. More than this, the fire-god is just as often addressed directly and independent of Marduk and Ea, both in the "Maqlū" and in the "Shurpu" series, That Gibil-Nusku is made in a measure subservient to Marduk and Ea, acting as interceder or as one who could only be addressed with the sanction of Marduk and Ea ("Maqlū" series, Tablet V, l. 124, quoted by Zimmern) is again due to the priests of Babylon in their desire to deduce all authority from their favorite Marduk.

With such a large number of variations in the incantation rituals, Ea, Marduk-Ea, Marduk-Ea and Gibil-Nusku, Bel and Gibil-Nusku, Marduk-Ea classing with Bel-Gibil-Nusku, the conclusions drawn by Dr. Zimmern are certainly not warranted. He, as noticed by Amiaud, himself points out (p. 9) that the notion of "intercession" is not limited to its association with Gibil-Nusku. Already in Gudea's days the great gods appear, accompanied by smaller ones, who act as "interceders" on behalf of mankind. In some cases this relationship of greater to smaller gods is expressed by making the smaller ones sons of the greater, in others by classing the minor gods as servants or messengers. So for later days besides the groups Marduk-Ea and Bel-Nusku, we have Nergal and Išum, Marduk and Nebo, and more the like.

The reason for the existence of these relationships is by no means

the same in all cases. In some instances, the lesser god represents the patron deity of a district conquered by a more powerful state; in others mythological factors enter into play, while again there is a third class of instances in which the combination reflects the views of certain schools of theological thought.

It is not necessary, however, to turn to the Babylonian pantheon to find traces of the doctrine of "mediatorship" and "intercession." The position of the priest in the Babylonian religion is primarily that of mediator. It is he who brings the petitions of the individuals before the gods. In later days, even the kings cannot approach the gods directly. The priest is the only one who can "inquire" of the deity what is to be done in regard to the case under consideration, what the outcome of a disease or of a military undertaking will be. The power acquired by the Babylonian priesthood is due chiefly, if not solely, to this function of mediatorship which was constantly exercised by them.

In accounting, then, for the existence of "mediatorship" in the relationship among the gods, our starting point must be the views current among the Babylonians as to the relationship *between* the gods and mankind. It is this relationship which comes to be applied to the gods, when in the course of time attempts were made to combine the large number of gods—whatever their origin—into some system. Father and son, master and servant, as applied to the gods reflect social institutions; and similarly "mediatorship" is a doctrine which is introduced into the Babylonian theology and applied to the gods by virtue of the manner in which people viewed their own relations to the powers upon which they felt themselves dependent. Briefly put, mediatorship exists on earth and among men before it is projected heavenwards.

So far as Marduk, Ea, and Gibil-Nusku are concerned, I trust to have shown that there is nothing peculiar in the position which they occupy in the Babylonian pantheon, and nothing exceptional in the view taken of their relationship to one another. There are other gods viewed as father and son, and the addition of the fire-god to Marduk and Ea is not of a nature such as to constitute a trinity or triad to which any special religious significance is to be attached. The combination of Marduk and Ea is due to political conditions rather than to religious speculation, while the addition of Gibil-Nusku is a natural consequence of the importance attached to fire as a means of release from the clutch of the evil spirits or of the sorcerers.

The introduction of the idea of "intercession" in the relationship between the three gods, besides not being exceptional (as Zimmern himself recognizes), is due to the prominence given to the function of the earthly priest as "interceder." In the combination Marduk, Ea, and Gibil-Nusku there is not a "trinity" corresponding in any way to "Father, Son, and Holy Ghost," but only a *duality*—a superior god and one who, in the capacity of son or messenger, occupies or once occupied a lower rank. Gibil-Nusku, when added to Marduk and Ea, does not introduce a new idea or a third factor, but only a modification of an idea already existing. Gibil-Nusku, like Marduk, is a "mediator," and the mediation in his case, as in the case of Marduk, is due to the recasting and combination of old rituals to make them conform to the dignity accorded to the head of the Babylonian pantheon.

The combination of gods into a triad or trinity is of course well known in the Babylonian religion. For the older period, we have Anu, Bel, and Ea; for a later period, Sin, Šamas, and Ramman. A reference to the former triad may perhaps be seen in the protest of the decalogue (Ex. 20:4), but there are triads of gods among other nations — notably Egypt and India — and there certainly does not appear to be any warrant for regarding Marduk, Ea, and Gibil-Nusku as a triad in this sense. The importance of the issue raised by Professor Zimmern justifies this rather extended notice of his little pamphlet. While scholars will be grateful to the learned Leipzig professor for his suggestive essay, it remains to be seen whether many will be found who will agree with the rather startling deductions made by him from the existing and rather scanty material.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA. MORRIS JASTROW, JR.

A CYCLE OF CATHAY. By W. A. P. MARTIN, D.D., LL.D. Chicago: F. H. Revell Co. 1896. Pp. 464. $2.

A "cycle of Cathay" contains sixty years, and the cycle last finished Dr. Martin outlines for us on the basis of a forty years' activity in China. Moreover the activity was nearly unique, being comparable only with that of Sir Robert Hart, of Chinese customs fame, for Dr. Martin was entrusted by the Chinese government for thirty years with the presidency of the Tungwen College, established for the education of its diplomatic corps. In this function Dr. Martin came into frequent and intimate contact with the *Tsungli Yamen*, China's Foreign Office,

and the most influential body in that mighty empire. No man living should, therefore, be so competent as Dr. Martin to adjudicate, among other things, upon the moral aspect of the relations between China and the great Powers. The reader is surprised to learn that, though all the Powers are Christian, by no means all the right lies on their side. Indeed one can readily understand how the Chinese came to consider all the right on their side, and how the damaging effect upon Christian prestige and Christian missions has been proportionately great. When missions are scored for slow progress, let Christian injustice be included with Confucian stubbornness and pride among the causes, just as must be done *mutatis mutandis* in Japan and India and Turkey.

Dr. Martin's work was unique again in giving us information about that *homo incognitus*, the mandarin, whom other foreigners have been rarely able to meet, and then only in the most formal way. *Per contra* Dr. Martin daily met mandarins of all ranks "from policemen to princes," and his information is correspondingly full and correct.

Again Dr. Martin will delight those who see in science the indispensable ally of Christian missions. Besides writing his *Evidences of Christianity* (Chinese both in language and spirit, and famous throughout the far Orient) he translated text-books on international law, physics, and chemistry, the latter two with set purpose to upturn the basis of "all kinds of errors in philosophy, religion, and politics." "The power that shakes these pillars (dual forces, etc.) will bring down the whole edifice of superstition. It is not a blind Samson that can do it, but science with her eyes open."

Dr. Martin again is the sole authority on the Jewish colony in Honan, which he found moribund on his visit to it in 1866. Other topics upon which Dr. Martin adds to our previous scanty store are human sacrifice in its various Chinese forms, the lewdness of the people (notwithstanding the purity of the Chinese classics, and the comparative freedom of Chinese mythology from erotic myths), the moral degeneracy of Chinese Buddhist monks, the menace opium offers to Chinese continuity, the power, occasionally even to infliction of the death penalty, exercised by village elders owing to the strength of family life, the total lack of literary culture in Chinese women, even the noble born, and finally the characterization of the bland, decorous, imperturbable, and ceremonious Chinese.

A single correction is needed anent great bells. While the Moscow bell is the largest in the world it is neither intact nor suspended. The largest ringing bell hangs at Chionin, the great Buddhist temple

in Kyoto, Japan, and weighs seventy-four tons, while the great bell, also belonging to Buddhism, near Peking, weighs but fifty-three and one-half tons.

It is plain from all the above that *A Cycle of Cathay* takes rank with the few first-class authorities on the Chinese.

EDMUND BUCKLEY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE HEBRÄISCHEN VERBA DENOMINATIVA INSBESONDERE IM THEOLOGISCHEN SPRACHGEBRAUCH DES ALTEN TESTAMENTES. Von W. J. GERBER. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1896. Pp. iv+250. M. 7.50.

DENOMINATIVE verbs or verbal stems etymologically connected with given nouns and only through the latter indirectly with the root itself are noted in the current text-books of Hebrew grammar. The question of the priority of verb or noun is irrelevant. Whether the imperfect יִצּוֹד or the infinitive צוּד, צֵידָה be the earlier, צוּד (of which the reflexive is found in the present texts: Josh. 9 : 12) derives its meaning from the noun: to furnish with צֵידָה provision (compare the phrase *ibid.* 11 corresponding to the verb in the next verse). To prove the denominative character of a verb we must show that its meaning cannot be derived from the root except through the medium of a noun. The original signification of the root must then be positively known and not constructed along the lines of questionable combinations of a purely subjective character if the argument is to be convincing. Baudissin (*Semitische Religionsgeschichte* II, 19 ff.) claims that the verbal forms of the root קדשׁ are derived in their entirety from קֹדֶשׁ or קָדוֹשׁ; the primary meaning which he assigns to the root cannot of course be proven from actual usage. Professor Gerber complains that the subject of Hebrew denominative verbs has received but little attention at the hands of recent lexicographers. His book is to show that denominative verbs are more frequent in Hebrew, especially in the theological language, than is commonly supposed. With Professor Kautzsch (to whom the author is indebted for the subject) he makes all those verbs of the theological language denominative of which the material primary meaning in the simple stem no longer exists or the simple stem of which has dropped out altogether from the language. Denominatives are furthermore all s. c. intransitive (direct causative, as König calls them) hiph'îl forms, then numerous

pi'el, niph'al and hithpa'el which, in case the original verb still exists, can only be brought in connection with it in a forced manner. The author finds it necessary to resort to etymologies which will probably not be accepted by every reader. Thus the argument remains largely subjective. Of grammatical observations made by the author we may mention the following: It cannot be said that certain nominal formations place their denominatives preferably in one particular stem. There are not many derivatives from nouns of place or time, but they occur regularly in the causative. For the same category of concepts the same stem will be used. The oldest denominatives were formed in the simple stem. The material used for the purpose of proving the points mentioned above is arranged in the form of a lexicon which goes minutely into the ramified usage of a verb in the present literature and embodies the results of a painstaking and independent exegetical study of the biblical texts. The book is a useful supplement to any Hebrew lexicon.

MAX L. MARGOLIS.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

THE BOOK OF THE TWELVE PROPHETS COMMONLY CALLED THE MINOR PROPHETS. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH, D.D., LL.D., Professor of Hebrew and Old Testament Exegesis, Free Church College, Glasgow. Vol. I. Amos, Hosea, and Micah, with an introduction and a sketch of prophecy in early Israel. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Co. Pp. xvii + 440. $2.

NOTHING could have been more satisfactory than the selection of George Adam Smith to furnish the volumes on the Minor Prophets in the series of the *Expositor's Bible*. These books, which have been "haunted for centuries by a peddling and an ambiguous title," deserve the attention, not only of an accurate scholar, but also of a sympathetic spirit. Both of these are combined in Professor Smith. The causes for the almost universal neglect of the minor prophets by the church are, in his words, "the more than usual corrupt state of the text; the consequent disorder and in parts unintelligibleness of all the versions; the ignorance of the various historical circumstances out of which the books arose; the absence of successful efforts to determine the periods and strophes, the dramatic dialogues (with the names of the speakers), the lyric effusions and the passages of argument, of all of which the

books are composed." The plan of the volume includes a historical sketch of prophecy down to the time of Amos; then each prophet is taken up in chronological order, and, in connection with each, a critical introduction to the book, an account of the prophet himself, and a translation of the various prophecies with an application to the present. In each case there follows a summary of the main doctrines taught by the prophet.

One of the best chapters of the book is that on "The Influence of Assyria upon Prophecy." This gives the reader the real situation in Israel before Assyria had accomplished the worst, and explains why, when the prophets were assured of Israel's overthrow, the leaders of the people were so indifferent about Assyria's coming. A study of Assyria's movements from 870 B. C. when Assurnasirpal took tribute from Tyre and Sidon to 721, when Samaria fell, shows, according to Professor Smith, that, after all, Assyria's advance was "fitful and irregular," and her sieges of the western cities "prolonged and doubtful." In many cases it requires the campaigns of several years to accomplish their purpose. It was always possible politically that Assyria would not come back, and at times when she was engaged in putting down revolts in other parts of her empire a combination of forces in Syria might have been successful. The only explanation of the vagueness of Amos' descriptions of Assyria is the political uncertainty of the future; and if the prophet himself is uncertain, how easy to understand the uncertainty felt by the leaders. There was always the chance of the recall of the Assyrian army because of the uprising of distant provinces. There were all the difficulties of carrying on war in the mountainous regions of Palestine. The case, in other words, was not a hopeless case; there was a chance, down to the very end, of success. Besides all this, Israel's new conception of God had aroused the nation. Their God was supreme. How could he surrender his nation to a heathen people? The leaders of Israel and the people were optimists. In opposition, however, stood the prophets. And the better we appreciate the side of the leaders, the better able we shall be to understand the independence of the prophets who, from the beginning, predicted the fall of Israel by Assyria. This conviction, as is clearly pointed out, rested upon their belief in the righteousness of Jehovah.

We cannot accept Professor Smith's statement that Assyria's advance on Israel is nowhere treated as a problem. Isaiah, at a certain stage in his career, had no use for Assyria in the plan of his work; and Habakkuk,

later, was almost hopelessly paralyzed by the problem presented by the Babylonians. The proposition that the spiritual service which Assyria rendered could not have been performed without the conviction of righteousness on the part of the prophets is of course true. Israel's compact with Assyria required a complete reconstruction of her theology. A new conception of God and of his power resulted. The prophets, indeed, were raised up to bring about this new adjustment in the situation. Assyria's work of breaking up the kingdoms of the earth and uniting them in one great empire was the basis for new conceptions of the sovereign providence. The breaking up of tribes was the breaking up of the tribal theory of religion, that is, a god for every tribe. The doctrine of monotheism therefore had an opportunity for development which never before existed. Israel's imagination and sympathy were wonderfully widened in this period of Assyria's conquest. It is in this connection also, as the writer continues to show, that Israel first learned the doctrine of equality of all men; a lesson gained from the falling of nation after nation before the Assyrian power. Professor Smith's suggestion that the influence also extended to Israel's conception of God in nature is less definite and concrete, and his illustration in which he finds a deeper meaning in the old national name Jehovah of Hosts does not commend itself.

The division of the Book of Amos into three sections, namely, chaps. 1 and 2, The Heathen's Crimes and Israel's; chaps. 3–6, Israel's Crime and Doom; chaps. 7–9, Divisions with Interludes, seems to have no real basis in the facts. The book is rather composed of a series of independent poems, not closely connected, each poem representing an oracle, the various oracles repeating over and over again the same thoughts. The more minute division of chaps. 3–6 into six groups, closing with 3:15; 4:3; 4:12; 5:17; 5:27; 6:14, we think could be improved by substituting 3:1–8; 3:9—4:3; 4:4—12 (13), etc. Surely 3:9—4:3 is a piece by itself made up of six strophes, each of four pentameters. In this piece, much is gained by transferring 3:15 to follow 3:11. The strophes in 4:1–3, directed against women and describing the siege of the capital, is the climax of what goes before and should be closely connected with the preceding.[1] Just such a climax is given us by Isaiah in the important section beginning with chap. 2:6 and closing with the diatribe against women in 3:16—4:1.

The exact time of Amos' writing is represented as during the later

[1] So Wellhausen.

years of Jeroboam's reign, after the pestilence and the eclipse (about 763), and before the advance of Tiglathpileser in 743. His argument (p. 69) for the genuineness of the title is not conclusive.

The description of the surroundings of Amos (pp. 79–81), and the various ways in which he might have secured the large knowledge which his book exhibits, is an excellent example of the author's skill in picturing the background of an utterance.

In his interpretation of Amos 3:1–8, he follows closely the ordinary view which makes the passage an explanation of the prophet's mission, upon the ground that he is compelled to speak although against his will.[2] The thought is rather: Israel, who has forsaken Jehovah, shall be punished, for there must be agreement between a nation and its God (vss. 1–3). The prophet sees ahead the dissolution of the covenant relationship; the *two* are Israel and God, not God and the prophet (so Grotius, Gebhard, Marck, Harenberg, Justi, Schröder, Henderson, Pusey). The roar of the enemy may even now be heard; Israel, though unconscious of the fact, is already within the toils; only the prophet sees and hears (vss. 4, 5); the calamity comes from Jehovah; but Jehovah always warns; why, then, do not the people tremble (vss. 6, 7)? The enemy having manifested his presence, everyone should fear (and repent); Jehovah having spoken (in the clearest possible tones), everyone should be able to prophesy, that is, recognize the coming calamity (vs. 8). The prophet sees it, why does not everyone see it?

The treatment is ostensibly a popular one; and yet the book abounds in critical observations. The most important of them are found in footnotes, *e. g.*, p. 57 on יהוה צבאות, in which he understands that "hosts" is always used of human beings; p. 77, on the sycamore; p. 126, on destruction of Gath, as against Wellhausen; p. 139, on עוך (2:13); p. 146, on בדמשק ערש (3:12); pp. 205, 206, on the titles for God in Amos; p. 261, on גאון; p. 315, on the emendation of Hos. 14:8. It is worthy of note that in this particular the author gives very much less attention to Hosea and Micah than to Amos.

In his treatment of the text, Professor Smith is very liberal, throwing out as of later date in Amos not 1:9, 10 (Tyre), nor, probably, 1:

[2] So Calvin (1557), Mercer (1675), Dathe (1773), Vater (1810), Rosenmüller (1812), Hitzig (1838), Ewald (1840), Henderson (1845), Baur (1847), Pusey (1860), Keil (1866), Hoffmann (1883), Gunning (1885), Reuss (1892), Wellhausen (1892), Mitchell (1893). This list is merely representative.

11, 12 (Edom), but surely 2:4, 5 (Judah), agreeing here with Duhm and Wellhausen, as against Robertson Smith and Kuenen. He would omit also 4:13; 5:8, 9; 9:5, 6. More important still, he rejects 9:8–15. Still other less important omissions are advocated.

In Hosea he treats as glosses 4:15 (?); 6:11—7:11 (?); 7:4; 8:2; 12:6. Of the twelve references to Judah in Hosea he rejects 4:15; 8:14; 5:5; 6:10, 11. He maintains against Cornill the genuineness of 10:11, and against Wellhausen that of 12:3.

Professor Smith's exposition is particularly happy in the following passages: the situation of Hosea (pp. 253, 254; his characterization of Hosea's description of the phases of Israel's might (p. 254). The chapters on Hosea's knowledge of God, Repentance, Sin against love are summaries of the theology of the book, and, as such, unsurpassed.

As much cannot be said of the treatment accorded Micah. With 140 pp. for Amos, nearly 150 for Hosea, and only 80 for Micah, as much could not be expected. One sees that the author felt himself greatly cramped. The passages predicting restoration in Amos were rejected as not authentic; in Hosea they were accepted as being entirely consistent with the trend of the author's thought; in Micah they are accepted (with Wildeboer, Ryssel, de Goeje), as against Cheyne. Chaps. 1–3 are assigned to a date between 725 and 718 B.C. Chap. 4:1–5, the prophecy of the mountain of the Lord's house (also in Isa. 2:2–5), is correctly regarded as pre-exilic, indeed, as belonging to the eighth or beginning of the seventh century. This is the position taken for 4:6—5:14. Chap. 7:7–20 is thought to contain several pieces of various dates. On the ground of the restoration of the people only to Bashan and Gilead, the provinces overrun by Tiglath-pileser III in 734, the larger part is taken as early; vs. 11, from the exile, vss. 18–20 standing separately.

It could be devoutly wished that every pastor who is capable of appreciating a piece of work like this series of sermonic discourses would study them as a model of expository preaching. The applications to the preacher's situation are most apt and of overwhelming force. It is not every audience perhaps that could be held to sermons of such strength and character; but, after all, the simplicity and sincerity which are everywhere so marked would go far to make them as attractive as they are profitable. We join with the author in his defense against those who regard the application of ancient prophecy to the problems of our day as the prostitution of prophecy. The

prophets were practical men and "spoke for a practical purpose." This book will open up to many what has always been for them an unknown land. WILLIAM R. HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

HANDBUCH DER ALTTESTAMENTLICHEN THEOLOGIE. Von AUGUST DILLMANN. Aus dem Nachlass des Verfassers herausgegeben von RUDOLPH KITTEL. Leipzig: Verlag von S. Hirzel, 1895. Pp. viii + 565. M. 11.

THE preface states that the editor has carefully selected from material left by the author such parts and proportions as he believed to represent the most mature thought of the author. Also the work has been so edited as not to leave the reader in uncertainty in respect to what has come from the author and what from the editor.

The body of the work after a general introduction to the study of Old Testament theology consists of three parts: I. Preliminary discussion of the nature of the Old Testament religion; II. Historical representation of the development of the religion; III. Doctrinal exposition, followed by twenty pages of index. In general the volume bulks not far from two-thirds as much as the fourth edition of Schultz's *Old Testament Theology*, which has been translated into English.

The conception of Old Testament theology, presented in this volume, is that of an essential constituent of biblical theology, closely bound to the theology of the New Testament, inasmuch as it presents the development of the redemptive religion in the stages preparatory to the New Testament revelation; while the ultimate aim and uses of this discipline are subsidiary to the proof of the inner truth of Christianity, of the necessity of the Old Testament revelation and its conformity to God's purpose of redemption.

The preliminary discussion of the nature and character of the religion of the Old Testament denies at once that the fundamental thought of this religion was either monotheism or sublimity, for neither of these accounts for the ethical character of the religion of Israel, and this character essentially differentiates it from all heathen religions. The real basis is found in the holiness of God, from which follow the conceptions of monotheism, the creation of the world, and freedom from any moral evil. It also necessitates a deeply ethical view of the physical world and of history, so that the relation between God and man is thoroughly ethical and therefore it is progressive,

with the divine holiness as the impelling force in the progress. Full ground for this general position is found in the facts that in the Old and New Testaments alike the view of human history is entirely religious, that the goal sought is the attainment of holiness by man, and that in these respects both stages of the religion are unlike all other religions. At the same time, because the Old Testament religion was the earlier stage in the development of this progress, it had not become entirely detached from the heathenism out of which it emerged, and accordingly it has several points of likeness to heathenism, such as the externality of worship, material sacrifices, dwellings for the deity, toleration of polygamy and blood revenge. In its inner principle there was no common ground. This was due to the revelation of God, it was in consequence of the divine activity making God known to men.

The second part is intended to delineate the historical course of the Old Testament religion, including only those details which the author held to be established by critical research. In the present stage of Old Testament discussion, it is interesting to note those things concerning the origin of the religion of Israel and its early history, which Dr. Dillmann considered to be established by criticism. Among these are the following: Abraham was a great nomad prince leading a Hebrew migration. When he cut loose from his family and family relations, under the providence of God a fit occasion was made for the beginning of revelation. The faith of Abraham rested in one God who was free from any limitation of nature, who was worshiped without any image, and whose relations with Abraham were simply and thoroughly ethical. During the stay of the race in Egypt their religious education was arrested and idolatrous practices gained ground. The oppression unified Israel and quickened their sense of religious need. The God of their fathers became their refuge. Moses was a great man, largely endowed by nature and well trained in his time, but not all his opportunities, his natural capacities, and developed powers can account for him and his work. The fact of a revelation from God and the reception of divine influence alone are adequate for this.

The author holds that there is no reason to doubt the historicity of the covenant, Ex., chaps. 19, 20, in its general features, or that the obligations of this covenant received definite form. The narrative of the conquest of Canaan shows that there was a sudden irruption across the Jordan of a people filled with religious enthusiasm (as later the Arab Moslems against the much more cultured Greeks and Persians), and

the ban which was executed indicates that Israel felt the difference between its religion and that of the Canaanites to have an ethico-religious basis. Although much can be said for the position that no priesthood dated from Moses, that no prominence was given to ritual, nor was any priesthood exercised by the tribe of Levi before the judges, yet various phenomena, notably the lack of any definite region of land belonging to this tribe, make it probable that this tribe was entrusted with the care and management of the sanctuary, and that some slight beginning of the development of the Aaronic priesthood was made in the time of Moses.

The standard attained under Moses was more lofty than the nation could maintain after their settlement in Canaan in contact with the culture and heathenism already there; hence religious and national disintegration followed.

The volume contains no more fruitful ideas than those centering in the conception of God, and its relation to the life and ideals of Israel. The name יהוה is explained from the Qal of the verb, and is said to mean God as existing, not in the merely metaphysical sense, but as living and being the same to the Israel in Egypt as to their fathers, hence as unchangeable and faithful to his promises, and as being free in action, in short, a person. The great riches of this idea of יהוה are unfolded under the three heads of immateriality or spirituality, uniqueness, and holiness. No writer in attempting to give the Old Testament conception of holiness has been more true than Dillmann to the Old Testament writings while expounding their meaning. The view which he gives, though not unfamiliar, deserves to be stated. "Everything which God discloses of an ethical nature, wrath, vengeance, burning anger of retributive justice, his law-giving word, his grace, love, compassion, everything is the evidence of one and the same essential power in him, namely, the vindication of his ethical purity and perfection in the struggle against that which opposes him and his holiness and attacks it, and (this power) has for its aim the upbuilding of the kingdom of the pure and the good," p. 257. This definition and statement of the nature and content of the divine holiness prepares the way for a doctrine of man. Yet more plainly is it fundamental to the doctrine of the way of salvation, the kingdom of God, or the Messianic ideal. The development of the Messianic ideal is sketched from its beginning; it includes an outline of Old Testament ethics in connection with the Ten Words, also of the covenanted blessings of God's people, especially the atoning reconciliation, of

prophecy and the prophetic mission, of the nature of the kingdom of God, and finally of the doctrine of the Messiah.

The following features in this volume are of especial value: (*a*) The discussion of the nature and relations of the religion of the Old Covenant. So profound a conception of the real nature of the religious life which was at the basis of the Old Testament literature, and so firm a grasp of the real relations of this religion to other religions, is commonly not to be found in current discussions of the general subject. For many readers these sections would be as a strong wind driving away the volumes of mist with which the subject is often befogged.

(*b*) The critical vindication of the historical elements in pre-Mosaic and Mosaic religious life, and of those elements in the Mosaic religion which are at the basis of the historical development of the religion. The representation here given of the beginnings and development of the religious history of Israel has due regard to the magnitude of the problem, which is not the case with a theory which defers almost the entire development of ethical monotheism until the eighth century.

(*c*) The Old Testament idea of God. Although Dr. Dillmann declines to attempt the genetic presentation of the religious beliefs in general of the Old Testament religion, he nevertheless gives an admirable genetic analysis of this conception. The keen perception manifested in the introductory portion is again shown in the masterly demonstration that Moses had at least the germinal elements of the idea of יהוה as a living person, an incomparable and holy God. Unfortunately in the majority of discussions, critical and otherwise, too much strength is expended in calling attention to scattered phenomena and in discussing the external relations of these phenomena, especially in relation to a theory which is supported or opposed. There is altogether too little acumen displayed in seeking the great facts which lie beneath the phenomena, and in learning their significance. This volume is a call to a more patient study of the essential nature, the deeper things, of the Old Testament and its religion.

While the greater part of the material of this work is to be found in the commentaries of the author, those students who are familiar with those commentaries will prize most highly a systematic presentation of what they have found in scattered pages. The editor has not erred on the side of fullness; a more complete discussion of several subjects would have been more than welcome. A separate discussion of the wisdom literature is desirable. It may be said that this literature lies

outside the great current of redemptive thought which is characteristic of the religion of the Old and New Covenants. It is true that this literature betrays little consciousness of the great hope of Israel, yet it is doubtful whether it could have originated in any race where the conception of God as known in the Old Covenant had not molded the thought of the writers. It is a loss to any Old Testament theology in which this literature has no special discussion. The sacrificial system, whatever the history of its development, has a symbolism which is of theological value. It deserves more than the one section which touches on the subject. One could wish also that a more full discussion of "prophecy on its formal side" had been given. It is not easy to see *how* the opinion of Lotz,[1] referred to with apparent approval, p. 474, escapes the charge of being "mechanically magical." It may be that the editor will find occasion to issue another edition and that the material at his disposal will afford the more complete discussions to be desired.

The style of the treatise is delightful. It provokes the question why so few German writers present thought in this clear, perspicuous, and almost luminous manner. In conclusion it is to be noted that the work as a whole is so valuable that it deserves immediate translation, and English-reading students will be the losers if they do not have it to study.

FRANCIS B. DENIO.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Bangor, Maine.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG DES DEUTERONOMISCHEN GESETZES kritisch und biblisch-theologisch untersucht von CARL STEUERNAGEL. Halle: J. Krause, 1896. Pp. x + 190. M. 4.

IT is at present universally recognized that the book presented to Josiah's secretary by the priest Hilkiah which, according to 2 Kings 22:3 ff., induced this king to destroy all temples and shrines outside of his capital, to abolish the worship of all gods except Jahwe in the royal sanctuary at Jerusalem, to desecrate altars, holy stones, and holy trees, to remove country priests to the metropolis or to slay them, and to celebrate the passover in a manner until then unknown in Israel, has been preserved to us in Deuteronomy. Practical unanimity has also been reached in reference to the pseudepigraphical character of Josiah's law book and the age when it was composed. Critical investigation has shown that, in spite of its distinct claim to be a work of

[1] WILHELM LOTZ, *Geschichte und Offenbarung im Alten Testament*, pp. 76–87.

Moses, it cannot have been written by him, nor by any man living before the seventh century B. C. The recognition of this fact has materially furthered our knowledge of the book. There is a gravitation of responsible opinion to certain conclusions upon questions still under debate. Thus it is becoming increasingly certain that the framework contains at least two parallel introductions (1–4 and 5–11), two corresponding epilogues (27, 31, and 28–30), and a historic conclusion drawn from different sources embodying also the song and the blessing; that even the legal portion (12–26) shows secondary strata; that numerous additions were made in the exile; that the Josianic code was written in the time of Josiah rather than in Manasseh's reign; and that the Deuteronomic school was familiar with the Jahwist, the Elohist and the earlier prophets but not with any part of the Priests' code. Yet there are numerous problems still unsolved in connection with this remarkable work.

Dr. Steuernagel has devoted himself with industry and critical acumen to the elucidation of some of these problems. In an earlier work entitled *Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums*, and published in 1894, he attempted an analysis of the parenetic discourse (5–11), taking for his clue the peculiar alternation of 2 p. Sg. and 2 p. Pl. in this address to the people. The same thought has occurred independently also to Dr. W. Staerk, *Das Deuteronomium*, 1894. The sections assigned by Dr. Steuernagel to the source *sg.* formed themselves into a farewell address; those attributed to the source *pl.* made a fairly connected introduction to the law book.

The present study is divided into two parts. Of these the first contains a critical analysis of chapters 12–26. The author finds in the main two sources. Upon closer inspection these prove to be continuations of *sg.* and *pl.* Thus 5–26 appears as a compilation of two documents, one of which, *pl.* (A), uses the plural pronoun, the other, *sg.* (B), the singular, in addressing Israel. The unity of *sg.* (B) is more marked than that of *pl.* (A) which seems to be made up of different older material, such as collections of court decisions (*die Aeltestenquelle*), war laws and oracles against religious "abominations." Both documents reveal an interest in the centralization of the cult. Dr. Steuernagel therefore concludes that an older law touching this subject was first enlarged by *pl.* (A) and then by *sg.* (B), the former adding chiefly laws, sayings, and oracles edited by himself, the latter writing a good deal of new matter as well, and that the combination of both by an editor who provided it with many glosses constituted

Josiah's law book. After the adoption of this work some additions were made, chief of them the Decalogue, which, with Meisner, our author regards as post-Deuteronomic, and the phrase, "the priests, the Levites," which in his opinion occurs for the first time in Ezek. 43:19. By assuming that all the verbal parallels with the Covenant code are interpolations and that all analogous statements depend upon use of the same sources, he is able to take the position that Deuteronomy received already in Manasseh's reign the form it had when proclaimed as law in the eighteenth year of Josiah. But the earliest of its sources cannot, in his judgment, have been written before Hezekiah's reformation which he considers as historical.

The second part is "biblical-theological." Its purpose is to show that the manner in which the author conceives of the origin, growth, and composition of the work is in harmony with the trend of religious development depicted in the prophetic writings. In order to test the accuracy of his analysis and his dates, he examines the ethical and religious ideas of each section. The thought of centralizing the cult seems to him possible already in the reign of Hezekiah because of the natural tendency to celebrate the great feasts at some famous sanctuary, at Bethel, Dan, Gilgal, Beersheba or Jerusalem, and because the motive that led men like Amos, Hosea, Isaiah and Micah to attack the cult was not hostility to the cult in itself so much as anxiety lest it lead to Baal worship. Hence the union of an ethical conception of Jahwe and a concern for the cult, visible even in sg., is not the result of a compromise, but a logical development of earlier prophetic thought. While the influence of Amos and Hosea is marked, there is an advance from their conception that the relation of Jahwe and Israel may be dissolved toward the later position. On the other hand, the monotheism is not yet so fully developed as in Jeremiah. The religious interest in the *Aeltestenquelle* is to realize the ideal of a people free from moral guilt. This may be traced back to Isaiah (6:5, 13). With all their differences *pl.* and *sg.* had in common an earnest desire to reform the life of the nation, both in morals and in cult, in order to avert a coming disaster. This led the editor to unite them. His purpose was not to furnish a party platform, a programme for a revolution, a new constitution, but simply to give his people a book of exhortation that would by its intrinsic value commend itself and exercise a spiritually constraining influence. Dr. Steuernagel holds that the priesthood was not at any time before the exile even by custom limited to the tribe of Levi and that this was an innovation on the part of Ezekiel. Ezek. 44:

10–14, where the Levites are degraded because of their service in the hill temples and the priesthood limited to the Zadokites, he regards as an interpolation. Consequently the interpolated "Levite-priests" of Deuteronomy are post-Ezekielic.

The author of this book has applied the fruitful principle of modern science: *divide et impera!* Even though the division should prove unwarranted or inexact, it has helped him to a mastery of the Deuteronomic material and enabled him to offer some valuable suggestions. His method is sound, though the results may be questioned. There is much to be learned from his careful observation of the moral and religious thought contained in each document, and his eager quest for the origin of ideas and customs. The literary analysis would have been more convincing if the process had been simpler, and the resort to interpolation less frequent. *Sg.* and *pl.* may indeed have been living men, but a more searching analysis will be needed to raise their existence beyond a doubt. Despite its many excellences, the second part does not strike one as confirmatory of the documentary analysis and the dates assigned. In view of the historic account, it is difficult to believe that the law read three times in one day was so extensive as Dr. Steuernagel thinks, and that its leading ideas could have been expressed in different documents through two generations already. The superior attraction of some city temples is one thing, a command to worship only in one place is quite another thing. It is a stubborn fact that the early prophets rejected *in toto* the Jahwe cult in Bethel, Gilgal, and Jerusalem alike (Isa. 18:7 is post-exilic), while they had little to say about idolatry. When Josiah slew soothsayers, necromancers and bamoth priests, he did not so badly misunderstand the law he had pledged himself to keep, nor was its author adverse to using the strong arm of civil authority for the suppression of obnoxious religious practices. Under all circumstances, the Mosaic guise is a *pia fraus*. There is no intrinsic reason for relegating to a later stage the passages which show dependence on the Covenant code. Nor is there any justification, in my judgment, for the excision of Ezek. 44: 10–14, with the consequent recasting of the entire history of the Israelitish priesthood. What constituted Josiah's law book still remains a problem. The view that it is more likely to be found in Deut., chaps. 12–26 than anywhere else and that it was written in the reign of Josiah has not been essentially shaken.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY.

DIE STELLUNG DER ISRAELITEN UND DER JUDEN ZU DEN FREMDEN. Von LIC. ALFRED BERTHOLET in Basel. Freiburg i. B. und Leipzig: Akademische Verlagsbuchhandlung von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1896. Pp. x + 368. M. 7.

THIS is an able, scholarly, though somewhat prolix treatise that has grown out of a licentiate's dissertation. It shows at once, however, that we have in the young writer a biblical scholar of unusual promise from whom we shall expect to hear again. The author seeks to portray the relation of Israel, and then of the Jews, to non-Israelites or the strangers dwelling among them from the beginning of Israel's national life to the first century after Christ. The fruitfulness of such a theme is seen at once when one considers not only the frequent mention of "the stranger" in the law, but also the missionary destiny of Israel so clearly portrayed in the prophets. Israel contained within itself two principles working in opposite directions: the priestly principle of exclusiveness and the prophetic of inclusiveness, or the principles of particularism and universalism. The former finally triumphed and became crystallized in Judaism, while Christianity became the heir of the latter. The historic unfolding of these two principles in all the vicissitudes of Israelitish and Jewish history, within the period mentioned, is then the theme of our author, as he has rightly apprehended it. This has made his work not simply one of law and archæology, but also of Old Testament and Jewish theology.

At the outset in our work it is clearly manifested that foreigners were always present in Israel, and the distinction is shown between the nokhri (נָכְרִי), the transient foreigner, and the ger (גֵּר), "the stranger," or the permanent foreign resident. The former in early Israel was honored, the latter tolerated. The strong family or clan spirit so often existing was unfavorable to the latter. Royalty, however, favored the gerim, "the strangers," for reasons of trade and military service. In early Israel no objection was made to the stranger on account of his religion; he was allowed to worship his own god and to join with the Israelites in their worship of Jehovah. Ordinarily, however, his own religious cultus was laid aside. The exception was in cities where foreign traders and artisans, located frequently under royal patronage, had their own native worship. Thus are explained the altars to foreign deities erected by Solomon. They were not so much for the inmates of his harem as for gerim dwelling in Jerusalem. It was in this spirit of toleration that the Israelites freely intermarried with the Canaanites and gradually absorbed them, for only through

such absorption can the growth of Israel between the time of Deborah and Solomon be explained. The tribe of Judah, especially, contained a large Canaanite element. After the preaching of the prophets, beginning with that of Elijah, the ger was placed in another relation. Religious and not simply economic considerations began to determine his place in Israel. He was obligated to fulfill certain religious duties in the worship of Jehovah but not all of those required of Israel. This is his position under the Deuteronomic law. It is quite different from that of the nokhri who is passing over into the class of the heathen from whom the Israelite is to be completely separated. This distinction is still further sharpened in the priestly legislation. A good example of the development of the idea of the ger is seen in the laws respecting that which is torn or dies of itself. In Ex. 22:30 there is no mention of the ger; in Deut. 14:21 the ger with the nokhri is allowed a habit less clean than that of an Israelite; in Lev. 17:15 the lesser cleanliness of the ger is not allowed. Thus in the priestly legislation the gerim were drawn more closely into the obligations of the Israelites. Our author thinks that not all gerim under this legislation were circumcised but that this ideal was before the legislator. In the period between the writing of the priestly legislation and the books of Chronicles ger, in meaning, loses the restriction of one resident in Israel and becomes the proselyte. The establishment of this historic development of the ger which brings us to the Grecian period occupies about one-half of this treatise. The remainder carries one into the Maccabean and Roman periods and shows the working of the particularism and universalism of Judaism in the struggles for national life and in the growth of the Jewish sects.

YALE UNIVERSITY. EDWARD LEWIS CURTIS.

THE TARGUM OF ONKELOS, TO GENESIS. A critical inquiry into the value of the text exhibited by Yemen MSS. compared with that of the European recension together with some specimen chapters of the oriental text. By HENRY BARNSTEIN, PH.D. London: David Nutt, 1896. Pp. x+100.

THE text of the Targūmīm is, as is well known, sadly neglected. The vocalization especially, as given in the ordinary editions, presents the aspect of boundless confusion. Lagarde (re)printed the prophets from the Reuchlin codex and the Hagiographa mainly from the first Bomberg edition, both only consonantally: "codicem istum vocalibus

instructum ita ut inveni edidissem, si . . . . vocales in codice eadem semper ratione essent positæ." Berliner gave us a reprint of the Sabbioneta Onqelos which shows how unreliable in point of vocalization even the best texts are. For grammatical purposes the Targum was scarcely available. One knows how much uncertainty attaches to grammatical observations made from unpointed texts which are not even consonantally established. What would become of our knowledge of Hebrew grammar if we were only left to the keṭīb? Of late Targum MSS. with superlinear vocalization have been brought to Europe from Yemen and acquired by the British Museum. Merx printed from them selected portions in his *Chrestomathy*. The excellence of the vocalization of the Yemen texts is proven by internal evidence and by comparison with Syriac. Dalman was able to use for his excellent *Grammatik des jüdisch-palästinischen Aramäisch* a MS. of Onqelos with superlinear vocalization belonging to Professor Socin of Leipzig. Mr. Barnstein has examined four of the Yemen MSS. accessible in England for the Onqelos version of Genesis. The philologist will be interested in those parts of the thesis which deal with the superlinear vocalization in general, the differences of vocalization, the variations in orthography, and especially the grammatical variants. גְּדֵרֵי (p. 65), I may be permitted to remark, is not a Hebraism. *Cf.* חֲטָאֵי (Merx, *Chrest.*, 153) and Syriac ܣܓܠܐ. The plural of "segolates" in Hebrew is, to use a term from the Arabic grammar, a plural of a plural formed from the type فُعَّال (Salter Brooks, *Vestiges of the Broken Plural in Hebrew*). Hence פְּתָאִים, *i. e.*, פִּתְאִים, from pitā'un for pitāwun; hence צְבָאוֹת and hence the retention of the (long) vowel in the examples quoted. The Bible student who uses Onqelos for textual and exegetical purposes will be concerned with the exegetical variants. (On p. 71 read אֲנָשִׁים for אֲנָשֵׁי.) There are appended at the end of the very laudable effort of the young doctor four specimen chapters (17, 26, 31, 41) from Genesis according to the Yemen texts consulted by the author, which make us but eager to see the remainder in print. When we have the whole before us, we shall be in a position to judge whether indeed, as the author maintains, the Yemen MSS. represent the Palestinian recension of the Onqelos version. The question is certainly an interesting one and of the utmost importance for the reconstruction of the original text of Onqelos.

MAX L. MARGOLIS.

HEBREW UNION COLLEGE,
Cincinnati, Ohio.

DAS JOHANNEISCHE EVANGELIUM UND SEINE ABFASSUNGSZEIT. Andeutungen zu einer veränderten Datierung des vierten Evangeliums. Von O. WUTTIG. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Nachf. (Geo. Böhme), 1897. Pp. iv+134, 8vo. M. 2.

THE author of this booklet attempts to show that the fourth gospel was written before all the synoptics, about the year 62, the last chapter being added by John himself a few years later, soon after the death of Peter. For this thesis the author sums up his argument (p. 126) thus: "We have undertaken in what precedes to deduce the date of the composition of the fourth gospel from the gospel itself, from the object and plan of its composition, from the type of its teaching, from the selection and arrangement of the matter contained in it, in events, actions, and discourses, from the whole contemporary situation, and the knowledge assumed in the readers, from the contents and ascertainable purpose of the appendix, chap. 21, from the contents and purpose of the epistles in like manner ascribed to the author of the gospel, from the testimony of the gospel to itself, from the preface of Luke, from numerous details, and especially from the literary attestation and the church tradition."

In our judgment, Wuttig entirely fails to make his opinion seem a probable solution of the problem. Of course he assumes the authenticity of the gospel, and much that he says is valuable in favor of that view, which we also share. But he overstates the range of proving power in not a little of the evidence he adduces. Several of the points he makes in favor of the early origin of the gospel are sufficiently explained by the early origin of the tradition therein contained, if its source is the apostle John. Underlying a good deal of Wuttig's argument is a confusion of thought between the historical situation of the narrative and that of the author in writing. We also find a like confusion between the situation of the readers of the gospel and that of the actors in it. Besides this, many points are discussed on speculative grounds which have very little probative force. For example (p. 24): 'If the fourth gospel is historical and Jesus really made these Christological utterances, why may they not have been written down before 70 A. D., since like views are found in Paul's epistles?'

To those familiar with the subject, it will be sufficient to state some of Wuttig's main arguments. He finds, in John 20:31 (p. 8) and the many Old Testament connections of the gospel, reason for believing it was written for Jews. This loses sight of the great extent to which, in the apostolic age, all Christian instruction was mediated by the use of

the Old Testament, and would prove that most of Paul's epistles were addressed to Jews (*cf.* Acts 15:21; Rom. 16:26; Gal. 4:21). He discovers that the main point in John, chap. 21, is the recent death of Peter, not the destiny of the beloved disciple (pp. 82–88). He interprets Luke 1:1–4 so as to find therein a reference to the fourth gospel, as previously written and known to Luke (pp. 59–69).

Wuttig reproaches Grimm's New Testament lexicon (familiar to all in Professor Thayer's admirable edition) with making the fourth evangelist attribute to Jesus and his disciples an expression (οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι) which in that meaning could belong only to a later time. But Wuttig himself does the same thing again and again, by assuming an exclusive adaptation of the gospel to its readers rather than to the actual setting of the narrative. Thus he affirms (p. 10) that John 10:16; 12:32; 18:37 look to a future yet distant. But this can be evidence for an early writing of the gospel only if the phraseology is adapted to the point of view of the writer, or readers, or both, rather than to that of Jesus, to whom the words are ascribed. He calls attention (p. 19) to the fact that the discourses of the fourth gospel show no recognition of Gentile antagonisms in Asia Minor, which Paul refers to very clearly. But what historical basis would be left for a gospel *thus* fitted to its age? He even ventures to affirm (pp. 27–30) that the background of the gospel implies that all the institutions of Judaism were still standing when it was written. He has an interesting study of "The Jews" (pp. 38–52) in which he brings out finely the probability that the author was a Galilean, but here as elsewhere he overdoes the inference as to the kind of readers for whom the gospel was intended.

Wuttig's peculiar style of argumentation is exhibited in his treatment of the Logos doctrine of the fourth gospel (pp. 19–23).

He contends that its independence of Philo shows the early date of the gospel. For had it been written near the end of the century, John must either have borrowed more from Philo, or antagonized him more clearly. And then he proceeds to suspect Paul of opposing Philo, especially in First and Second Corinthians! He holds that the Christian development of the Logos idea in the second century points to an early origin for it in the first. Does not the fact that we do not find it mentioned before Ignatius, nor worked up before Justin, rather favor the view that it was not put into Christian circulation by the fourth gospel till near the end of the first century?

But the decisive point for Wuttig's thesis is the relation of the fourth gospel to the other three. Here he must stand or fall. He

does not appreciate the cardinal importance of this question, and his treatment of it (pp. 52–59) is very inadequate. He appears to think that if the author of the fourth gospel knew the synoptics, then we must concede that John, chap. 11, was worked up from Luke 16 : 19 ff., and John 12 : 1–8 from Luke 7 : 36–50! He takes no account of most of the points of contact between the synoptics and John, such as are mentioned by Weizsäcker (*Untersuchungen*, pp. 270–289) and Beyschlag (*Joh. Frage*, pp. 54–124), and he misstates the relation of John 3 : 22–24 to the synoptics. Indeed he starts from false premises. He regards the synoptics as in the main independent of each other (p. 123, note) and also, apparently, founded on a wide and general knowledge of the materials for a record of Christ's work. It is now generally recognized that the synoptic tradition is limited in scope by the underlying documents, and by the dependence of Matthew and Luke on Mark and the Logia. The Johannean tradition, however, if the gospel is John's, was not limited, and this would explain the fact, which Wuttig notes, that the materials of the fourth gospel undoubtedly make the impression of a selection out of abundant stores, not of a mere gleaning after the three synoptics (p. 14). Under these circumstances it is much easier to account for the omissions of the synoptics if they preceded, than for those of John, if he wrote first. John's selection may be regarded as intended to supplement the synoptic record. For instance, Wuttig (p. 17) claims that it is very difficult to account for the insertion of the feeding of the five thousand by John if the three synoptics were known to him. But is it not clear that the miracle is narrated (with its pendant, the walking on the water) to introduce the discourse on the Bread of Life, which is untouched by the synoptics?

Wuttig cannot understand (p. 14) how the seven miracles in the fourth gospel could have been neglected by the synoptics unless they had already been used by John in a written gospel. We reply that they do give two out of the seven, and add nothing essential to the account in the fourth gospel (except Peter's walking on the water, in Matthew alone), so that the only reason why they omitted the other five is likely to be that these were not contained in traditions accessible to the authors, who were probably none of them eyewitnesses. These five miracles apparently belong to parts of Christ's life not included in the synoptic tradition. Finally, it may be asserted with little fear of refutation that all the correspondences between the fourth gospel and the rest are much less difficult to explain on the supposition that the fourth is the latest than that it is the first. Wuttig does not grapple

seriously with this problem, nor touch on many of the points of contact between the synoptics and the fourth gospel.

The book is acute and painstaking, and contains much that is valuable. But the author does not survey the whole field covered by his problem, nor does he show good judgment in weighing evidence or in estimating its range of effect. The chief value of the treatise lies in the fact that it furnishes some new points of evidence in favor of the genuineness of the fourth gospel. C. J. H. ROPES.

BANGOR THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Bangor, Maine.

DER NEUENTDECKTE CODEX SYRUS SINAITICUS UNTERSUCHT; mit einem vollständigen Verzeichniss der Varianten des Cod. Sinaiticus und Cod. Curetonianus. Von DR. CARL HOLZHEY. München: Verlag der J. J. Lentner'schen Buchhandlung, 1896. Pp. vi + 59 + 89, 8vo. M. 5.

COLLATIO CODICIS LEWISIANI RESCRIPTI EVANGELIORUM SACRORUM SYRIACORUM CUM CODICE CURETONIANO. (Mus. Brit., Add. 14,451.) Cui adiectæ sunt lectiones e Peshitto desumptæ. Auctore ALBERTO BONUS, A.M. Oxonii: e prelo Clarendoniano, 1896. Pp. xi + 97, 9 × 11½ in. 8s. 6d.

IT will be convenient to notice these two books together, as their subject-matter is common. Each of them is occupied with a critical comparison of the text of the recently found Lewis Gospels of Mt. Sinai with the Cureton Gospels of the British Museum. Mr. Bonus' work in this direction is later in date than Dr. Holzhey's, though I cannot find any allusion in his book to the latter; and it supplements it in two important ways: (1) Mr. Bonus uses the more complete text of the Sinai Syriac Gospels which we owe to Mrs. Lewis' further investigations by which an astonishing addition (as well as very many corrections) had been made to the work of the first transcribers (see *Some pages of the Four Gospels retranscribed from the Sinaitic Palimpsest* by A. S. Lewis; London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1896); (2) Mr. Bonus has added to his comparative tables of the parallel readings of the two famous old Syriac texts the corresponding readings of the Peshito. So that for the purposes of textual criticism Mr. Bonus' work puts that of Dr. Holzhey out of court. The former collation is now only useful to check the latter. Moreover, Dr. Holzhey was so sparing of his Syriac

type as to render it often impossible for a scholar to use his collation unless he had at hand the two texts from which the work was done. In this respect Mr. Bonus' work is much more convenient.

When we observe also that in some cases Mr. Bonus has occasionally corrected the slips in the printing of the Cureton text by an actual reference to the MS. in the British Museum, it will easily be seen that we have before us an important piece of careful critical work. Both of the writers in question refer to the supplementary fragments of the Cureton text which exist at Berlin.

It must not, however, be supposed that Bonus' publication entirely supplants that of Holzhey. In the prefatory matter of the former there is little that requires attention: its elegant Latinity disguises real critical poverty. Problems are stated with no hints for their solution, and the only thing one can gather is that it will be a long time before conclusions are arrived at, although as a matter of fact not a few of the questions involved are either solved already or well on the way to solution. But we suspect that Mr. Bonus rather inclines to that impossible Oxford school which is occupied with the task of maintaining the priority and extreme antiquity of the Peshito.

Holzhey's prolegomena occupy nearly sixty pages, and are a genuine contribution to the question; he sums up his conclusions under a number of heads, of which the most important are as follows: that the Lewis Gospel is a translation of a Greek text; that the Lewis and Cureton texts are recensions of the same primitive translation to which the Lewis text is nearer than the Cureton; the Peshito text is a reformed text formed from the same translation; the Lewis text is more free than the Cureton text from Western readings, while both texts show traces of what Dr. Hort calls Alexandrian readings. The text of the *Diatessaron* is held to be dependent from a text of the Lewis type. These are the chief critical conclusions as regards the text. They are most of them easily verified, except the last which is by no means a closed question.

It would be possible to find a few scattered errors in the two collations, but not many. In one passage of the Lewis text to which Mr. Bonus has properly attached a *sic*, Luke 17:13, a reference to the original MS. shows that the printed text is in error, and the supposed variant can be removed.

It should also be noticed that Mr. Bonus' quotations from the Peshito are not to be regarded as more than illustrations of the passages quoted from the two old Syriac texts; they are not intended to

be taken as a collation of the Peshito text with the MSS. in question. Some persons will wish that the work had been further extended in this direction; but we incline to think that Mr. Bonus has given us just what we wanted. To have attempted more would have made his work cumbrous and hard to use. As it is, the conspectus of readings is luminous and convenient. J. RENDEL HARRIS.

CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

L'APÔTRE PAUL: ESQUISSE D'UNE HISTOIRE DE SA PENSÉE. Par A. SABATIER, Doyen de la Faculté de Théologie protestante de Paris. Troisième édition, revue et augmentée. Paris: Fischbacher, 1896. Pp. xxix + 424, 8vo. Fr. 6.

THIS important contribution to the study of Paulinism, which is intended to show the connection of the apostle's thought with his life, contains in its third edition considerable new matter, the most valuable of which is an appendix of fifty pages on Paul's doctrine of the origin of sin. The writer accepts all the epistles generally ascribed to Paul except the pastoral epistles. These, he thinks, were composed by some disciples of the apostle on the basis of brief letters of his. Paulinism appears in them to be impoverished rather than enriched. They have in part the doctrine of Paul without the soul.

According to M. Sabatier it should be the end of all history, and is the aim of all biblical criticism and exegesis, to find the original physiognomy of the sacred writers in the traditional type, the man in the prophet or the apostle. Of all the apostles, however, this "historical resurrection" is possible only in the case of Paul, because we have of him alone incontestable writings. He did not aim to construct a system of theology, but he was a missionary and preacher whose thought was influenced by his environment. He should not, then, be studied either from the point of view of those who regard him as a sort of speculative genius creating an *a priori* system, or of those who "stifle the personal travail of his mind under a crude and mechanical theory of inspiration." Perhaps, however, the course of development cannot, as the author supposes, be as accurately traced for want of data. The victory in the conference at Jerusalem may not have been the occasion of the apostle's belief in the inadequacy of the Mosaic law. May not the idea of grace through Christ as opposed to the law have lain in his mind at his conversion as one of the factors of that event? His "ardent conflicts" may have determined the form rather than the substance of the doctrine in Romans.

The author finds the origin of Paul's ideas of God, of revelation, of righteousness, and of holiness in the Old Testament, while his doctrine as to angels and demons, the two great world-periods — the present age and the age to come — predestination, and anthropology have their source in the Jewish theology. Perhaps full justice is not here done to the Hellenistic influence. But the fact is not overlooked that what was most fruitful and powerful in his thought was due to "the revelation of Jesus Christ." The psychological antecedents of the conversion of Saul do not receive due consideration.

The second book treats of missions, the third of the great conflicts, the fourth of the later Paulinism, and the fifth of the organism of doctrine. The theology is treated under three heads: (1) the Christian principle in the psychological sphere (anthropology); (2) in the social and historic sphere (religious philosophy of history); (3) in the metaphysical sphere (theology). The flesh (σάρξ) is regarded as the seat of sin in the apostle's thought, and the notion of the material organism remains always fundamental. Christ, though "in the likeness of sinful flesh," was sinless because he was "the life-giving Spirit." If this does not take account of character it is because Paul did not think of Jesus as developed through conflict with sin and temptation. As to Christology, preëxistence is accepted, but it is not thought with Pfleiderer to be conveyed in the idea of the second man from heaven. Jesus became "the second man" only by his resurrection. This interpretation is not, however, well sustained.

In the appendix on the "Origin of Sin," the two factors, the flesh and the law, are made fundamental. All men sin, like Adam, on account of their fleshly nature. "Because all sinned" (ἐφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον) means that all sinned individually. The writer's directness, courage, and sincerity must meet with the approval of all his readers, and one great merit of the book lies in the consistent and fearless application of the scientific method which is maintained throughout.

ORELLO CONE.

BOSTON, MASS.

---

THE AGE OF THE GREAT WESTERN SCHISM. By CLINTON LOCKE. "Ten Epochs of Church History." New York: The Christian Literature Co., 1896. Pp. x + 314.

THE epoch of the Great Western Schism will always interest the historical student. It was fitting that it should be selected as one of the Ten Epochs of Church History.

Dr. Locke had the general facts of the situation well in hand, and has succeeded in giving us a very readable and popular story.

He begins properly with the contest of Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, and carries the narrative through to the end of the Council of Basle. He closes with short chapters on The German Mystics, The Inquisition in the Fourteenth Century, and Literature and Arts in the Fourteenth Century.

Dr. Locke's style is easy and direct, but bordering all the time on colloquialism,—too much so, we think, for the formal and elegant treatment that a great historical subject should have.

Moreover, he would not himself expect that there would be complete agreement with him in many of his positions—as, for example, his estimates of Wiclif and Huss, their relations to each other, their doctrines and their general influence.

But all in all the general reader will welcome this book, and most students who want a clear and concise statement of the great issues involved in this tumultuous age will find much to interest them.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. J. W. MONCRIEF.

IGNATIUS VON LOYOLA UND DIE GEGENREFORMATION. Von EBERHARD GOTHEIN. Halle: Max Niemeyer, 1895. Pp. xii+795. M. 15.

WHEN the four-hundredth birthday of Luther was drawing near, from 1880 to 1883, the press of Germany poured forth an enormous flood of books and pamphlets connected with the Reformation and its great leader. Most of these were of slight value, and have long since been forgotten. A few, however, were of a higher grade, and have survived. Among these latter was a small book by Eberhard Gothein on Loyola, the early Jesuits, and the counter-reformation. It was welcomed at once as a work of wide research, of judicial fairness, and of much literary charm. The favorable reception which it met encouraged the author to study his theme exhaustively, and to write it out in a more expanded form. The small volume is now recognized everywhere in Germany as the best brief presentation of the subject, and the larger volume as the best extended presentation.

Indeed, it may be said that no thoroughly good book on Loyola and the early Jesuits existed before Gothein published the results of his investigations. The Catholic writers have always indulged in indiscriminate praise, and the Protestant in indiscriminate blame. The

former could not find any fault in a saint of their own communion; and the latter attributed all the sins of the Jesuits of the eighteenth century to the founder of the order and his immediate disciples, scarcely excepting even Xavier from the general condemnation. Gothein has avoided these extremes.

In preparing for his larger work, Gothein read all the published sources, in itself an enormous task. But, not content with this, he consulted the manuscripts preserved in the archives at Munich, Cologne, Paris, Venice, Florence, and Naples, and thus secured a rich store of new materials.

But he has not permitted the abundance of these spoils to embarrass him. He has mastered them, arranged them, and presented them to the reader in a form at once exact and fascinating. He writes with much literary tact, and in what may be called the newer German style, which favors short sentences of simple construction.

He has given us for the first time a Loyola whom we can understand, and who, hence, is simply a man subject to all the passions of our common humanity, and triumphing over them by the aid of divine grace. The story of the conversion of Loyola from the ordinary licentious and vain character of a military officer of that day to that of a devout Christian reads like a chapter from *Grace Abounding*. His was a Puritan or Methodist conversion, attended with overwhelming emotions, though it took place in the bosom of the Catholic church. The result was a new life not unlike that of Bunyan or Edwards or Wesley, though at first it took on mediæval forms and reveled in extreme self-mortifications and in visions and ecstasies. Through long years the aristocrat brought up in the ignorance usual to his class struggled to secure an education. Through years he struggled to master his own religious emotions and to learn the lesson taught by the apostle Paul, that "the spirits of the prophets are subject to the prophets." Through years he struggled patiently to form the "Spiritual Exercises," the drill-book of his society, by means of which he subdues all its members to obedience and reduces them to a uniform pattern. Through years he struggled to gather about him a small band of remarkable men who should devote themselves to mission work in foreign lands, the sphere to which he purposed that the new organization should limit its activities. When at length circumstances led it to make its home in Europe he struggled for years to give it a constitution adapted to its new field, to confine its ministrations within certain definite lines, and to secure for it perfect freedom of action within the Catholic church. At length

he presented to the world an army composed of selected men, and thoroughly organized, equipped, and disciplined for its campaign.

The story of Gothein ends with the triumph of the Jesuits in every Catholic country of Europe and in many other lands. Had he followed the history further his pages would have assumed more somber colors. For the first fifty years, to which, in a general way, he limits himself, the Society of Jesus contributed to the Catholic church a purifying force of the greatest value. Indeed, it may be said that for a century it was on the whole a blessing to the Catholic world. Then succeeded swift decadence, when the Jesuits became a menace to society; and then their suppression by the Catholic nations of Europe and their flight to South America and to protestant countries, where alone they could find complete toleration. Into these later years of wickedness and disaster Gothein does not enter, and hence he creates in the mind of the incautious reader a certain unbalanced admiration for an organization which has done more than any other both to reform and to disgrace the Roman Catholic church.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE KIRCHENPOLITIK FRIEDRICH WILHELMS, DES GROSSEN KURFÜRSTEN. Von DR. HUGO LANDWEHR. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co., 1894. Pp. xii + 385. M. 4.

IT would be difficult to find a period of history which has been more elaborately treated in publications of the sources, in connected narratives, and in special investigations, than the history of Prussia in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The mass of printed matter is so great that there hardly seems room left for further original contributions. And yet such are still presented us from time to time by Prussia's patient and ingenious scholars. The present work is indeed limited in scope, aiming at nothing beyond following truthfully the great elector's policy toward the two Protestant denominations of his states, but within its chosen sphere it is thoroughly original, and altogether may be fairly denominated a right worthy child of the severe historical ancestry of Ranke and Droysen.

If the book founds its conclusions, as has been said, upon a mass of new material, discovered chiefly in the state archives and in the archives of the Royal Consistory at Berlin, it does not therefore astonish us with many new results, but confirms rather by the weightiest witnesses the views of Frederick William's church policy which

have been advanced by Droysen, Erdmannsdörfer, and the other predecessors. On the whole, it is but a single novel thesis which is put forward by the author, and that thesis he may be said to have substantiated. Frederick William, we now know, did not attempt to unite the Protestant churches, as is commonly supposed in Prussia, but only aspired to win them both over to accept his great state principle of tolerance. And as a sort of corollary the author establishes the conclusion that if the elector met with difficulties in this course it is not alone the fault of the Lutherans, but also, and in far greater degree than has commonly been supposed, of the Calvinist denomination.

In spite of the remoteness of much of the matter discussed in this book, it is remarkably easy reading. One may say of it that it is fairly free from volubility, and that it is pervaded by a keen sense of order; praise which can only rarely be accorded German historical books. It should also be noted as worthy of consideration that the author, although dealing with highly specialized matter, never loses from sight the larger political points of view, and so succeeds in giving a very just estimate of Frederick William's share in the Peace of Westphalia and of the importance of his assumption of the evangelical leadership in Germany.

FERDINAND SCHWILL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

MORAL EVOLUTION. By GEORGE HARRIS, Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., The Riverside Press, Cambridge, 1896. Pp. ix + 446. $2.

IN this book Dr. Harris has made a new and valuable addition to the doctrine of evolution, and has at the same time done much to show that this doctrine is consistent with ethics and theology. Since evolution is as far reaching in time as gravitation is in space, it becomes important to conceive of it in such fashion as not to exclude, but to include, those moral and spiritual elements which constitute the real significance of the universe. But the waste and pain of the animal creation, the beasts red in tooth and claw with ravin, the struggle for life, the hecatombs of victims, have seemed difficult to reconcile with benevolence or morals. It is a great gain to learn that even the ante-human life of the world has in it the germs of ethics and of goodness.

Professor Drummond, in his *Ascent of Man*, gave the first step of

the demonstration. He showed that there is a certain altruism in the brute creation. Reproduction is a giving out as well as a taking in, and care for offspring is not self-regarding, but self-sacrificing. All along the line of upward development there was not only struggle for life, but also struggle for the life of others. In every lion's den and tiger's lair there were the beginnings of sympathy and helpfulness, adumbrations of the moral life that was to come. Evolution of animal life, though not itself moral, was, at least in this one respect, preparing the way for morality in man. So Professor Drummond disclosed a thread of connection between the earlier and the later history of the planet, and pointed out that "through the ages one increasing purpose runs."

But Professor Drummond's justification of the evolutionary process left much to be desired. It showed at most an occasional and partial mitigation of what seemed on the whole to be warfare and cruelty, devastation and slaughter. It is the great merit of Dr. Harris that he has discovered another genuine preparation for morality in the world's prehistoric life. It has occurred to him that altruism is not the whole of morality; that self-preservation, self-assertion, self-perfection are just as important to ethics as self-surrender, self-abnegation, self-sacrifice. Self-love is just as much a duty as love to our neighbor, —in fact, we are commanded only to love our neighbor as ourself. This is not only a divine law, but a rational law; for unless we take care of self we shall have nothing to give to others; and we cannot rightly give to others anything that involves moral loss or harm to ourselves. For the very sake of others, then, I am bound to make the most of myself. Self-defense, self-maintenance, self-perfection are not only duties,—they are the very law of being, and no morality can exist without them.

In the light of this principle, much that before seemed not only unmoral but contrary to morality, in the evolution of life, now falls into line as a natural preliminary to man's self-realization. The very struggle for life has an incipient moral significance, or at least it has in it a germ of good which will in time develop into self-perfecting moral effort. Life is a good, and it is right for the animal to preserve it. Since self-preservation is a prerequisite to self-realization, it is not antagonistic to altruism, nor done away by it. Self has its own claims, and these must be satisfied. And much of the evil look of evolution disappears, or is mitigated, when this principle is recognized. Of a hundred blossoms one survives: but the ninety-and-nine fertilize the

soil and enable the survivor to ripen. The young lions roar and seek their prey from God: God provides the prey, even as he provides animal food for man.

But does Dr. Harris explain the failure to realize themselves on the part of the ninety-nine blossoms that did not survive, or on the part of the sheep that the lion slew? Our author does not claim to have constructed a complete theodicy. He has justified the survivor, but it is more difficult for him to justify the fate of those who do not survive. He shows indeed that strife, waste, and pain are merely incidents, but are not the law, of progress. There might be a progress without them, —at least we can conceive of a progress in which each should take only what the other freely gave. He points out that self-preservation, becoming self-realization, tends to eliminate strife and suffering, and to correct its own defects. But why the defects? Much as we praise the positive merits of Dr. Harris' treatment, and gladly as we acknowledge the new point of contact which he has shown between evolution and ethics, we must regard his solution of the problem as incomplete, both because of an overestimate of what is meant by evolution, and an underestimate of what is meant by ethics.

Evolution is only a method, and nature is but a means, while the agent is God. The idealistic view of the world which regards matter as the constant manifestation of mind and will leaves the universe subject to plan and plastic in God's hands. Just as the stone foundation of the house may be the designed preparation for the brick superstructure, while yet with the superstructure there enter in new methods and laws, so animal life may be the basis of human life, yet fail to explain it. With Lotze we would hold to continual divine reinforcements of the evolutionary process, rather than to a fixed *quantum* of energy; yet, with Lotze, we believe that these increments of power, once appearing, become inseparable parts of the great whole. And what is true of God is in a limited measure true of man. Man's will can enter into nature and can change and add; though these effects, once appearing, are never again lost. Hence we can believe in miracle, not as an interference from without, but as the working of the immanent God from within. To him who believes in a God of whose mind and will nature is but an expression, there is no inconsistency between evolution and miracle, for miracle is only a unique and forward step in evolution, when the fullness of time has come, a forward step which cannot be explained as an outcome of the past, but which is accomplished by a new impulse of the God whose regular action made that past what it is.

There is another conception of evolution. It intends to be Christian. It speaks of evolution as God's method. But it falls in with the current view of nature as a second absolute, a closed circle, sufficient to itself. It seems to us that Dr. Harris concedes too much to this tendency of thought. Though he does not intend it, his book shows that mechanical views still have hold upon him. There is a general disposition to eliminate the miraculous, and to substitute the operation of natural law. For example, he grants man's rise from savagery, the evolution of the monogamic family from polygamy, the development of the moral sentiments from the instincts of animals, the blossoming of polytheism into monotheism. Though Christ's virgin birth is consonant with his transcendent origin and work, Dr. Harris does not regard it as essential to Christianity. And, although his expressions are somewhat vague with regard to Christ's resurrection, we gather that he attaches greater importance to Christ's life after death and to some sort of spiritual appearance to the disciples than he does to a literal physical coming forth from the tomb.

We regard all these concessions not only as unrequired by a proper view of evolution, but as inconsistent with the historical trustworthiness of Scripture. Moreover, they seem to us to endanger the very ethics for which Dr. Harris is seeking to lay a foundation. For the basis of ethics is the self. The terms which occur so frequently — self-regarding, self-perfecting, self-realizing — are without meaning unless they imply freedom. Freedom does not run in a rut. It involves the possibility of new beginnings. It is capable of unique and exceptional, as well as of regular and automatic, action. Our author grants this in the case of sin. He grants that there is such a thing as degeneration. This reverses the evolutionary process. The loss and destruction that are contrary to virtue are the results, not of the original law of man's being, but of a self-perversion which consists in abnormal exaggeration of the principle of self-love. But virtue is equally the product of freedom, and if man is made in the image of God, God as well as man must be free. The naturalistic view of evolution which treats all miracle with suspicion, if not with denial, is in danger of cutting away the very foundation of ethics by practically ignoring the freedom of both God and man.

Andover has hitherto been a synonym for the doctrine of free will. But it has also been a synonym for the doctrine of disinterested benevolence as the essence of virtue, and of love as the fundamental attribute of God. It is significant of a widening horizon when Dr. Harris

proposes to make self-love, as well as altruism, essential to virtue, and declares that "self-love is not derived from love to others, but love to others gets its pattern and therefore its measure from love to self." Here is an admission of great consequence to a correct theology. It seems to grant the contention of the older and more rigid systems that in God the self-affirming, self-maintaining, self-asserting attribute, which we call holiness, must be logically prior to the self-imparting, self-communicating, self-sacrificing attribute, which we call love. Dr. Harris, it is true, defines holiness as "wholeness," in a way which seems to us to ignore the definite biblical descriptions of it as purity contrasted with sin; and he tries to include self-love in love, so as to make self-assertion a form of self-impartation, both of which we consider unjustifiable, although necessary to the vindication of the Andover theology. The fact still remains, that we have in this book, in spite of its too great concessions to a naturalistic view of evolution, an approximation to the old-fashioned scriptural view that God's interests are supreme, that he finds his ultimate end in himself, and that holiness and not love is the fundamental attribute of his nature.

If Dr. Harris would grant this formally and fully, rather than impliedly and inferentially, light would be thrown upon matters which his book has left obscure. The necessity of an atonement would be apparent, and it would be plain that, in the redemption of man, God, and not simply man, must be reconciled. If the waywardness of a son may cause grief to an earthly father's heart, and the demand of righteousness that he be expelled from the household may come into grievous conflict with the pleadings of fatherly affection, why should we deny that man's sin brings God's pity into such conflict with God's holiness that only the Lamb slain from before the foundation of the world can reconcile them? And if God's antagonism to sin is justly displayed in judgment, and in the infliction of suffering since man appeared, why should we hesitate to believe that the prehistoric pain and waste and death were congruous incidents and preparations of the great moral drama that was to be enacted upon earth? The problem of physical evil can never be disconnected from the problem of moral evil, and neither of these problems can find its solution apart from a thoroughgoing acknowledgment of the holiness of God and the sin of man. We can hold to moral evolution only as we emphasize the word moral quite as much as we emphasize the word evolution. Much as we admire Dr. Harris' book, it seems to us to lay greater emphasis upon the physical aspect of evolution than upon its moral aspect.

Though the virgin birth is not regarded as essential to Christianity, we can highly commend the new proof which Dr. Harris has given that evolution is perfectly consistent with the supreme and unique position of Jesus Christ as spiritual head of the race. Evolution has in all probability brought forth all the myriads of human beings from a single human ancestor—a fact *a priori* difficult to predict, and, considering the immense number of chance variations which had at favorable times to be taken advantage of, almost incredible. But if it is consistent with evolution that the physical and natural life of the race should be derived from a single source, then it is equally consistent with evolution that the moral and spiritual life of the race should be derived from a single source; and Scripture is stating only scientific fact when it sets the second Adam over against the first Adam, as the head of redeemed humanity, the only name given under heaven among men whereby we can be saved. We have put the thought of our author in other words than his, but we fully agree with the substance of it, and we esteem it as still another valuable contribution to the reconciliation of evolution and ethics.

AUGUSTUS H. STRONG.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DIE URCHRISTLICHEN TRADITIONEN ÜBER URSPRUNG UND SINN DES ABENDMAHLS. ZUR GESCHICHTE DES URCHRISTENTUMS. Von FRIEDRICH SPITTA. Erster Band. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1893.

Professor Spitta's essay on the Eucharist has excited much attention in theological circles in Germany, and is both strikingly original and full of valuable suggestions. Some remarks on it will be found in Grafe's lecture on recent theories as to the Eucharist in the *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, zweites Heft, 1895, pp. 101–139.

Spitta confesses at the outset that he has been led to abandon his earlier views on the subject, expressed in his treatise "On the Reform of Evangelical Worship." The true key to the understanding of the real meaning of the last supper is to be found, he thinks, in the words of institution, which, as Keim rightly remarks, form one of the most certain parts of the tradition of the life of Christ. Spitta indeed holds that St. Paul's version of the words is not so trustworthy as that contained in the synoptics. He is of opinion that the original tradition might have received accretions during a period of twenty years, such as elapsed before St. Paul wrote. Here I cannot agree with him,

for surely the same reasoning would apply to the record of the words in the synoptics themselves, and indeed with double force, since the synoptic tradition was in all probability not reduced to writing till much later. But more of this presently. The author next proceeds to examine the evidence for the day on which the last supper took place. Here his position that St. John's gospel fixes the night of the last supper as the evening of the 13th of Nisan, and that this, and not the following evening, was really the evening on which it took place, seems to me unassailable. As scholars have always hesitated on the point, his arguments may with profit be recapitulated here. The opening words of St. John 13:1 are: "Now *before* the feast of the passover," and in what follows there is no hint that the occasion was that of the paschal supper. "Supper being ended" is an entirely general expression; nor would the washing of the disciples' feet have been at all in place during the solemn ritual of the paschal feast. The same holds true of the episode of Judas Iscariot. No proof is adduced when it is asserted, as it commonly is, that the dipping of the sop was a feature of the passover ritual, and it would have been a very serious breach of ritual law for Judas to have left before the end of the meal, to say nothing of the reason alleged for his departure, viz., to buy things necessary for the feast. Moreover, the words of 13:1 (ἀγαπήσας . . . . ἠγάπησεν), followed as they are by so many counsels of love (ἀγάπη), suggest that the meal was an *Agape*. Again, although 19:36 ("A bone of him shall not be broken") shows that the connection between Christ and the paschal lamb was a familiar thought with the apostle, not a word is said in chaps. 13–17 to suggest any connection with the passover on the occasion of the last supper. Very conclusive too is the often-quoted passage "that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover." To "eat the passover" could refer to one thing only, viz., the paschal supper, which evidently had not then taken place. It is also probable that Pilate released Barabbas before the supper with the special purpose of enabling him to join in the great national feast. The expression "the preparation of the passover" would be redundant had not Good Friday been not only a Friday, but the Friday before the passover; a circumstance which also throws light on the fact that "that Sabbath-day was an high day." And is it not highly incredible that our Lord should have celebrated the paschal supper on the day before the legal day, as some suppose?

So far Spitta's position is unassailable. But when he proceeds to find a difficulty in reconciling the section St. John 6:51–59 with this

view, and therefore proposes to treat it as an interpolation, Grafe[1] seems to me to be right in considering such a course wholly unnecessary. Spitta finds a difficulty in the words: "Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood." It is part of his theory that such a notion as that of drinking blood would have been abhorrent to a Jew. So it would if it had had reference to the blood of a victim. But where, as Spitta himself argues, the reference is simply to the fruits of the earth as being, symbolically speaking, Messiah's flesh and blood, the difficulty vanishes. In St. John, chapter 6, we read that the Jews, who refused this hard saying, did so because they denied the claim which it involved. "How can *this* man give us his flesh to eat?" He is not such a supernatural being as we look for in a Messiah! It was an exactly similar feeling which excited the remark, "Who is *this* Son of Man?" It was not that they denied that the Son of Man would possess supernatural powers. The Book of Enoch sufficiently proves the contrary. But they simply did not believe that Christ was the Messiah. They were not content to look for his supernatural powers solely in the spiritual region. They did not look to the "spirit and life" of his words, but to his human limitations. The disciples on the contrary confessed, "Thou hast the words of eternal life." They learned the lesson of the loaves. They saw that Christ possessed the powers of earthly life. The very bread they ate was, as it were, his flesh, and the wine they drank his blood. And as he possessed the powers of earthly life, so too they believed he could give them the powers of heavenly and eternal life. Spitta, to my mind rightly, believes this to be the primary meaning of the words of institution. Why then not also of the sixth chapter of St. John? Perhaps further reflection may lead him to alter his opinion on this point.

But how came the synoptic gospels to differ from St. John on this point? Spitta assumes that they do differ, and again attempts an explanation by a supposed interpolation, viz., the section St. Mark 14:12–16. Here I venture to disagree with him on both points. It will be enough to take this section and show how it is not necessarily inconsistent with St. John. In vs. 12 (R. V.) we read: "And on the first day of unleavened bread, when they sacrificed the passover, his disciples say unto him, Where wilt thou that we go and make ready that thou mayest eat the passover?" Clearly the 14th of Nisan is here referred to, but it must be recollected that the 14th of Nisan began at sunset on Thursday. It is not at all unlikely that it was

[1] *Loc. cit.*, p. 121, n. 1.

in the late afternoon when the Lord had, as usual, retired with his disciples to the Mount of Olives, that this question was addressed to him. The paschal supper must be celebrated the following evening. It was time to secure a room and make preparations. How natural that the Master and his disciples should occupy the room that same evening for the purpose of an ordinary supper! The words of vs. 17: "And when it was evening, he cometh with the twelve," are more literally, "when it was *late* evening," which is confirmatory of this supposition. For if it was about sunset when the disciples set off to prepare, the Lord would leave them time for their preparations, and not come till the late evening.

In support of this contention I would further urge a passage in Hippolytus.[2] Referring to St. Luke 22:16, "I will no more eat the passover" (*οὐκέτι ἐγὼ φάγομαι τὸ πάσχα*), Hippolytus adds: "*εἰκότως τὸ μὲν δεῖπνον ἐδείπνησε πρὸ τοῦ πάσχα, τὸ δὲ πάσχα οὐκ ἔφαγεν· οὐδὲ γὰρ καιρὸς ἦν τῆς βρώσεως αὐτοῦ.*" The Quartodecimans had argued: "Christ ate the passover on the fourteenth day." Hippolytus replies: "Christ did not eat the passover at all," and bases his assertion not, as might have been expected, on St. John's gospel, but on St. Luke's. Now I suppose most of us have been in the habit of taking the words "I will not any more eat thereof" to mean "I will never after this occasion," but Hippolytus shows us that this sense is inadmissible, and, indeed, in the R. V. *οὐκέτι* is omitted, and we have simply "*οὐ μὴ φάγω;*" in which case the whole passage will run: "With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will certainly not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God." I do not see how in the face of this passage it can any longer be maintained that St. Luke regarded the last supper as a paschal supper.

But it will be said: "Have not scholars always traced strong points of resemblance between the last supper and the paschal supper?" Let us, with our author's help, briefly examine these points. The first cup mentioned by St. Luke is said to correspond to the first of the four cups at the paschal feast, and St. Paul mentions the cup "after supper," which would correspond to the fourth cup. But these two cups were usual at ordinary suppers. Then the singing of a hymn is said to correspond to the Hallel (Pss. 115–118). But the paschal supper did not conclude with the Hallel, but with the last cup. On the other hand, it was the custom to close ordinary suppers with a song of praise. If it be said that the institution took place at the third cup,

[2] *Fragmenta*, pp. 868–9.

and the fourth was omitted, most of us would agree with Meyer that it is highly improbable that the fourth cup would be omitted. It will be asked: "Did not the expression in 1 Cor. 10:16, 'the cup of blessing which we bless,' refer to the third paschal cup?" Spitta replies that at ordinary suppers there was a cup "after supper," over which a thanksgiving for the food received was pronounced, and this may very well have also been known as "the cup of blessing." Certainly the words "*μετὰ τὸ δειπνῆσαι*" confirm one in the impression that the third paschal cup, which did not come after supper, cannot be signified.

We may note here in passing that Spitta agrees with Westcott and Hort in omitting St. Luke 22:20 (the second cup), though he would retain vs. 19. Yet he thinks that the concluding words of vs. 19, "Do this in remembrance of me," were not actually spoken by Christ, but were a later accretion which had been added by the time St. Paul wrote. They are not found in the tradition of St. Matthew and St. Mark. St. Luke and St. Paul, he holds, who were neither of them eye witnesses, had mistaken the words in question for a real dictum of the Lord. This seems to me impossible and unlikely. St. Paul wrote many years before St. Mark's gospel could have been written, and though he had had little personal intercourse with the apostles it is hardly conceivable that he would so definitely say that he had received these words from the Lord, that is, as being the Lord's own words, had he not found a very strong tradition to that effect, both in Jerusalem and Antioch. There would have been many who, like Barnabas, could at once have corrected him, had he been wrong. It seems to me also that Spitta has wrongly interpreted the phrase. He wishes to connect the word *ἀνάμνησις* with Exodus 12:14, but the word there used is *μνημόσυνον*. It is very important for the true understanding of the institution of the eucharist that the meaning of this clause "Do this in remembrance of me" should be clearly understood. I therefore make no apology for quoting in full the following passage from Scudamore's *Notitia Eucharistica*, pp. 552–553:

"There is great reason to think that the verb *ποιεῖτε*, which is here rendered by 'do,' ought to be understood in the sense of 'offer:' '*Offer* this in remembrance of me,' or, rather, as we shall see, 'Offer this for my memorial.' *ποιεῖν* is frequently used by the LXX in this sense, both of the priest and the people: *e. g.*, 'Thou shalt *offer* every day a bullock for a sin offering;'[3] 'The priest of his sons, that

[3] Ex. 29:36.

is anointed in his stead, shall *offer* it'[4] (a meat offering of fine flour); 'There he *offered* burnt offerings;'[5] 'I will *offer* bullocks with goats.'[6] In one place[7] our version gives the word 'sacrifice' where the Septuagint has ποιεῖν: 'Thou must give us also sacrifices and burnt offerings, that we may *sacrifice* unto the Lord our God.' This mode of speaking originated in the idiom of the Hebrew, the verb עשׂה, to *do* or *make*, being constantly used to signify to *offer* or to *sacrifice*. We find a trace of the same usage in the New Testament. Thus in the order given by St. Paul to Timothy,[8] that 'supplications, prayers, etc., *be made* for all men,' the version should rather be, '*offered* for all men,' as it is in the Syriac. I find but one clear instance of this usage in any Gentile Father; and that is in Justin Martyr,[9] who being himself a native of Samaria, and at the time disputing with a Jew, would very naturally fall into it: 'The offering of the flour commanded to be offered (προσφέρεσθαι) for persons cleansed from leprosy was a type of the bread of the eucharist, which our Lord Jesus Christ gave command to offer (ποιεῖν) for a memorial of the suffering which he underwent for those whose souls are cleansed from all iniquity.'"

Spitta wishes to deny that Christ even intended to institute anything. "The so-called words of institution" (as recorded by St. Mark), he writes, "give one the impression of having been spoken as the inspiration of the moment, and nothing is said as to any repetition of the ceremony." But when St. Mark wrote the eucharist was a fixed institution, and no one doubted that Christ had instituted it. There was no occasion to record everything that Christ said, and it was probably not usual at the *Agape* to do more than repeat the words recorded by St. Matthew and St. Mark. In fact, the clause "Do this in remembrance of me" is, as Scudamore notes,[10] "omitted in the Roman and Greek liturgies, including that of Jerusalem, in the Milanese, the Armenian, the Nestorian, and St. Mark, nor do I observe it in any of the thirty-eight Syrian liturgies published by Renaudot. It occurs in all the Egyptian (both Coptic and Greek) in the same words as our own. The Moz-Arabic has 'Do this, as oft as ye shall eat it, in remembrance of me.'"

This suggests a very simple explanation of the omission of the words in St. Matthew and St. Mark. They simply repeated the liturgical formula, whereas St. Paul and St. Luke made careful enquiries as

[4] Lev. 6:22. [6] Ps. 66:15. [8] 1 Tim. 2:1.
[5] 1 Kings 8:64. [7] Ex. 10:25. [10] *Loc. cit.*
[9] *Dial. c. Tryph.*, c. 41; tome. ii, p. 132.

to the actual words of institution, the original command on which the whole observance rested. Spitta makes a very good point when he notes that in all four accounts of the eucharist the "εὐλογεῖν" or "blessing" precedes the "breaking of the bread," whereas in the paschal supper the words "Blessed be he who brings bread upon the earth" follow the breaking of the bread. And he further points out that the εὐλογεῖν also comes first in the miracles of the loaves, and the breaking of the bread at Emmaus. The close correspondence between our Lord's action on these occasions seems to me to give the key to the true primary meaning of the eucharist. "He took the loaves and gave thanks and brake," or, "Looking up to heaven, he blessed and brake." Now this act of taking the bread and solemnly blessing God for the gift of it was a sacrificial act. Christ offered it for a memorial before God, as a memorial of God's love. It was a sacrifice of thanksgiving. Moreover, as we learn from St. John, chap. 6, he taught his disciples to regard these earthly gifts of bread and wine, specially given through him, as his flesh and blood, though but a foretaste of the bread and wine of the kingdom of God, those heavenly gifts, whereby they should be nourished unto life eternal, which God would give them through him hereafter. This, indeed, is the special interpretation of the words "This is my body," "This is my blood" for which we have to thank Professor Spitta, though he does not connect them, as I have done, with St. John 6. But I would urge that the words "Do this in remembrance of me," understood in the sense "Offer this for a memorial (before God) of me," connect perfectly well with the above interpretation of the words of institution. As Scudamore shows ἀνάμνησις is the word used in the LXX in such passages as Lev. 24:7, Num. 10:10 ("for a memorial before your God"). I do not, however, think that the expression "a memorial of me" should be understood *primarily* of a memorial of Christ's sacrifice, but rather of a memorial of his miraculous gifts of bread and wine, the earnest of the heavenly gift of eternal life.

The author next examines the eucharistic prayers in the "Didache," or "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles," and the "Apostolical Constitutions." In the Didache the blessing of the cup precedes that of the bread, exactly as in 1 Cor. 10:16, and on this Spitta remarks, "The oldest form of the eucharist appears to have been not a repetition of the actual procedure of Jesus at the last supper, but such a feast as an ordinary Jewish supper, at which the blessing of the cup and the bread was made an occasion to recall the words of Jesus." In

process of time a separation was made between the *Agape* and the eucharist. This had occurred when the Apostolical Constitutions were written. There we find the eucharistic prayers of the Didache reappear in a new recension (vii, 25, 26). There is a reference to the sufferings and death of Christ which is absent in the Didache; and whereas in the Didache it appears from the words "*μετὰ τὸ ἐμπλησθῆναι*" that the supper was still a meal, in the Apostolical Constitutions the idea of a meal has disappeared, and "*μετὰ τὴν μετάληψιν*" is substituted. Another very striking difference is that in the Didache the words "Hosanna to the *God* of David," and the invitation "If anyone is holy, let him come" are closely associated with the parousia, and simply echo the words of Ps. 118:19, 20: "The righteous shall enter in," etc., whereas in the Apostolical Constitutions we have "Hosanna to the *Son* of David," and the words are made to have a reference to the coming of Christ in the eucharist, an idea which still survives in many liturgies of the church to this day.

It will, however, be necessary to justify more at length the special meaning which Spitta attaches to the words of institution. The whole question is treated in his second section, pp. 266–337. It has generally been supposed that the words "This is my blood of the covenant" are an echo of Exodus 24:8, "Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you." But Spitta justly observes that Christ spoke of a liquid which was to be drunk, not sprinkled, and that his words had reference to wine, not blood. Moreover, the covenant which Christ referred to was not the Mosaic, but the Davidic-Messianic—the "New Covenant." Now in what is said about the "New Covenant" in the Old Testament eating and drinking, and the figure of a great feast play a great part. Thus, to take one example, in Isaiah 55 "Ho, everyone that thirsteth," and the invitation to a feast of good things which follows is associated with the covenant, "and I will make an everlasting covenant with you, even the sure mercies of David." The *locus classicus* on the point Spitta considers to be Isa. 25:6–8. One traces a continuous expression of the idea in the apocalyptic and rabbinic literature, and references to this great Messianic feast at the coming of the kingdom are frequent in the gospels—*e. g.*, St. Luke 14:15. "Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God," and above all our Lord's own words at the last supper, "I will no more drink of the fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God." Moreover, it was said that the wine to be used at this feast should grow on a wonderful

vine. This idea finds its expression in Ap. Baruch 29:5 f. "Et in vite una erunt mille palmites, et unus palmes faciet mille botros, et botrus unus faciet mille acinos, et unus acinus faciet corum vini, et qui esurierunt jucundabuntur." Schürer holds that this apocalypse was not written till after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, but I suppose it reflects the ideas current in that age, and Papias quotes these particular words as a saying of Christ. In this same apocalypse (29:8) it is said that the miracle of the manna should be repeated when Messiah came, and this is an idea which frequently recurs in Jewish theology. Spitta further compares Prov. 9:5 in which wisdom says "Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled," and Ecclesiasticus 24:17, 19: "As the vine I put forth grace. . . . . Come unto me . . . . and be ye filled with my produce." The manna again is spoken of in Wisdom 16:20, 1 as "the sweetness of the divine wisdom."

In the light of such a cycle of ideas, it must be confessed that the words of institution, "This is my body," "This is my blood," receive a natural interpretation. Bread and wine had been miraculously multiplied by Christ; through him they had been given in special abundance, as the manna of old through Moses. They were gifts which God gave men through him, or, metaphorically, his body and his blood. And they were an earnest of higher gifts, when the disciples should "eat and drink at Christ's table in his kingdom."

As we have seen, this interpretation receives some support from the earliest liturgy of the church, contained in the Didache, which says nothing of a remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, but speaks of spiritual food. "Thou didst give us spiritual food and drink and life eternal" (10:3). In the early liturgies generally the bread and wine are called "God's gifts," and the oldest and most central part of the service ("It is very meet, right, etc.") contains a special thanksgiving for God's gifts in creation, concluding with the Ter Sanctus. It seems probable that the earliest form of service simply connected these earthly gifts with the higher heavenly gifts promised through Messiah, and specially the gift of eternal life. According to Harnack (*History of Dogma*, English translation, p. 66, note), "The earliest theory of the supper was that which viewed it as a communication of eternal life, and an anticipation of the future existence." A careful examination of the references to the eucharist in the earliest Fathers such as Ignatius, Irenæus, and Clement of Alexandria, and again of the inscriptions in the catacombs, will confirm this statement.

The reader will find an excellent catena of passages in Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen*, pp. 181 ff. And this is exactly the conception of the sacrament postulated by Spitta's theory, according to which the eucharistic bread and wine were a covenanted pledge of the food of immortality — the bread and wine of heaven. That is one great point in favor of our author's view. In the note just quoted, Harnack speaks of this essay as a profound and remarkable investigation, but he hesitates to accept Spitta's idea that the Pauline account of the supper was not the oldest. The words of 1 Cor. 11:23 ("For I have received of the Lord," etc.) are too strong for him; as, indeed, they are for me. Yet the other suggestions of the essay remain most valuable, and will, I trust, be carefully considered by the theological world. If I am not mistaken, they promise to prove an "*eirenicon*" on that most vexed of all questions, the nature of the so-called "real presence." The only "real presence" on Spitta's view is the presence of the Creator in his gifts. This presence must of course be admitted by all. Is it too much to hope that a way may thus be opened to close this chapter of theological controversy?

Another remark of Harnack's on the subject of the eucharist is (p. 210, note): "The real sacrificial act in the supper consists, according to Justin, only in the εὐχαριστίαν ποιεῖν, whereby the κοινὸς ἄρτος becomes the ἄρτος τῆς εὐχαριστίας."

If this be Justin's conception of the sacrifice, it is also the conception for which I have pleaded in the modification of Spitta's theory which I have proposed. The bread and wine are to be offered with thanksgiving for a memorial before God — a memorial of all his mercies, but above all his mercies in Christ.

At the same time it was no doubt under divine guidance that the church amplified this first simple intention of the sacrament by a further reference to Christ's death and resurrection, and a thanksgiving for them, as the means whereby the promised gift of eternal life is to be realized. This step appears to have been taken by St. Paul, though it would be too much to say that the church owes the change to him alone.

At first the Christian *Agape* was a joyous remembrance of the promised gift of eternal life (see Acts 2:46, "ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει"). But when this joyful character of the feast produced excess and disorder in the church, as it did at Corinth, a more somber character was given to the rite by specially associating it with the remembrance of the redeeming death of Christ (hence St. Paul's words: "As often as ye eat this

bread and drink this cup," etc.). What was more natural than that this should lead to a different conception of the words of institution, especially amongst the Gentiles, to whom the strictly Jewish ideas of Messiah the giver of the manna and of the wine of paradise were strange? And this changed conception of the words is evidenced by the additions which they received in the later texts. It may fairly be urged, as it is by Spitta, that St. Mark's text represents the oldest form of the words. If we look at St. Mark 14: 24, we find, "This is my blood of the covenant which is poured out for many." On Spitta's view that would be interpreted of the promise that the wine of heaven should be poured out for the eternal felicity of many souls at the great banquet in the kingdom of God. But in St. Matthew we have, "This is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many *unto remission of sins*." The very fact of the absence of the italicized words in St. Mark's, the earlier, text is significant of the changed point of view from which the words of institution were regarded. Doubtless the change was due, not only to St. Paul's influence, but to the natural association between the blood of Christ and the blood of the paschal lamb. It can be rendered very probable that our Lord suffered on the cross at the same time that the paschal lamb was being offered in the temple. It was precisely this association of Christ with the paschal lamb which opened the apostles' eyes to the significance of Christ's death; and henceforth the words of institution would have an added meaning for them. They would be well aware that the words, "This is my blood," at the institution referred simply to the fruit of the vine, but how suggestive of the blood "poured out" on the altar of the cross. Hence the words assumed a secondary meaning, which remained when the primary meaning was forgotten.

It will be seen that the chief objection to Spitta's theory is that he thinks St. Paul was not in touch with the original idea of the eucharist, but regarded it as an institution of Christ, whereas it was merely an inspiration of the moment. I hope I have sufficiently shown my strong dissent from such a view. I believe St. Paul had full opportunity for knowing and recording exactly what Christ said at the last supper, but in accordance with his general principle of preaching "Christ crucified," he brought the sacrament into close and lasting connection with the thought of the redeeming death of Christ.

No doubt many will cling to the old idea that the eucharist is the Christian passover. Historically speaking, the eucharist is probably no more the Christian passover than Sunday is the Christian Sabbath.

But just as, practically, Sunday is the Christian Sabbath, so the eucharist is practically the Christian passover. For the spirit of the ancient Jewish rite has passed over to the Christian rite. But this is not only true of the passover. All the sacrifices of the law find their true antitype in the great Christian sacrifice.

Personally I have found Spitta's study very helpful. It seems to make the last great act of the life of Christ more natural and lifelike. Understood in this new light, the eucharist becomes the last example of the primary and secondary meaning of the prophetic Scriptures. Doubtless the rite was intended by the Holy Spirit to receive a fuller and deeper meaning in the light of the cross and the resurrection. The church came to think of the body broken, and the blood poured out on the cross, although these ideas were not directly associated with the words of institution. It was inevitable, too, that the Messianic ideas originally connected with the words should, as the church spread through the Gentile world, be more and more forgotten. A somewhat parallel case may be found in the way in which the reference to Christ's Davidic descent, which occurred in the earliest confessions of faith, disappeared about the close of the first century. We are too apt to forget that the contemporaries of Christ lived and moved in the peculiar atmosphere of a set of ideas totally foreign to ourselves. The study of Jewish apocalyptic and rabbinic literature is doing much to place Christ and early Christianity in a truer light than that in which we have been accustomed to view them; nor need we fear the result of a closer scrutiny of the foundations of our Christian faith. On the contrary, let us welcome the fuller light: it can only serve to throw out into bolder relief the unique personality of him who was both God and man.

STURMINSTER, NEWTON, S. O.,
Dorset, England. J. H. WILKINSON.

LIFE AFTER DEATH AND THE FUTURE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD. By BISHOP LARS NIELSEN DAHLE, Knight of St. Olaf. Translated from the Norse by the REV. JOHN BEVERIDGE, M.A., B.D. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark. Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1896. Pp. xii + 455; cloth. $3.50.

THE fundamental postulate and the method of this book are explicitly set forth in the author's preface to the English translation: "The rule laid down, and followed to the best of our ability, has been to accept no guide except Holy Writ; and we venture to hope that we

have succeeded in our endeavors to be faithful to our rule. In all doubtful points we have tried to draw a clear distinction between what is actually revealed to us in Scripture, what is only hinted at, and what is simply the result of more or less ingenious human speculation." The rule has been adhered to with impressive fidelity; neither reason nor sympathy is allowed to influence in the slightest degree our author's exegesis of biblical texts or the conclusions deduced from them. Affirming that salvation comes only through Christ, and that the only known way of connection with him is by the Word and the sacraments, he discusses the fate of unbaptized infants, and concludes that "we may entertain a hope of salvation and bliss for our unbaptized children immediately after death, yet not more than a hope. But the question is still unanswered. Under any circumstances we have this consolation, that if the hope should be unfounded such children will at least have the opportunity of the uncalled at some time to receive God's gracious call" (p. 227).

Obviously Bishop Dahle's view is needlessly limited. Of modern scientific thought he seems to be totally ignorant. Death is regarded as an unnatural event, yet "the best educational institution," a break in the life process due to the sin of Adam, and the argument that there are evidences of death prior to the appearance of man is met by the curious plea that that past period cannot be proved to fall within the six days of creation, and "it is only with the creation dating from that epoch that we have here to do—it is the dominion of death in *this* creation we have to explain" (p. 40). The moral and philosophical arguments for immortality are superficially stated and curtly dismissed since revelation is the sole and sufficient authority.

In dealing with the Bible, moreover, the author makes no account of critical methods and conclusions. We are told that "between the Old Testament and the New there lies a period of between three and four hundred years" (p. 113), and the hope is expressed that after the "restoration of the Jews" the sons of regenerate Israel will help solve some of the riddles of the Old Testament "which is now misunderstood and torn to pieces by an unbelieving criticism that is foreign to its spirit" (p. 311). Nevertheless, it is acknowledged that we must look to the New Testament rather than the Old for light regarding the future, since the earlier revelation was "imperfect" (p. 126), yet the advance of the New Testament from the Old is made merely by the method of addition.

Herein lies the radical fallacy of our author's method. The prog-

ress of revelation is not by addition alone, but by addition which works transformation of earlier ideas. Where thought is vital, as Hebrew thought preëminently was, it grows not mechanically but chemically. Hence a new conception is not only beyond, but different from, an old idea, perhaps even contradictory to it. The New Testament Hades, which Dahle regards as denoting solely the abode of the wicked in the intermediate state, is not more definite than Sheol, but the two ideas are contrary to each other. In a word, the biblical texts bearing upon eschatology cannot be harmonized on a horizontal plane; their unity is to be found only in the ordered continuity of developing life. In the New Testament we discern slight differences of teaching due to individual peculiarities, but of these our author is entirely oblivious. This critical defect vitiates the treatment.

Bishop Dahle's eschatological programme has become familiar to us in the writings of a certain school of Bible readers in England and America. After death the soul passes into an intermediate state. The souls of the wicked go to suffer in Hades, while the souls of the righteous, from whom sin has been forever abolished by the event of death, pass into the bliss of heaven. On earth the forces of lawlessness are held in check by the conservative respect for law and order, and also by "him that letteth," whom our author regards as an angelic personality; but soon this restraint is removed and the anarchistic energy is embodied in a single personality, Antichrist. Before the manifestation of Antichrist, however, the restoration of the Jews occurs, not necessarily to their ancient land, but certainly to God's favor by reason of their acceptance of Jesus as the Christ. The appearance of Jesus in the clouds is signal for the binding of the Devil, the resurrection of "the dead in Christ," the transformation of the righteous living, the rapture of these two classes of saints, and the beginning of the millennium. After the thousand years are over, Satan is loosed and makes war upon the saints, which is terminated by the coming of Jesus upon the earth, the resurrection of all the dead, the day of judgment, with its decrees of unending woe and bliss, the renovation of the heavens and the earth, and the entering of the elect upon their everlasting home, the new heaven and the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. In the course of the argument many subsidiary questions are discussed, such as the "interim corporeality," the relation of souls to one another and to the world during the intermediate state, the nature of the resurrection body, and the fate of those dying without a knowledge of Christ.

Upon the last mentioned topic Dahle holds substantially the view known in this country as the Andover hypothesis. The dilemma is clearly presented: If heathen uncalled before death are saved solely by obedience to the light actually granted them on earth, then another salvation than through Christ must be acknowledged; if, however, men are saved only by acceptance of Christ, as the New Testament expressly declares, then those who have never heard his name must be called by him in the intermediate state. Dahle accepts the latter alternative, resting his decision upon the famous passages in Peter. But he is careful to state that if once the proclamation of the gospel reaches the ears of a man on the earth his opportunity of future probation is cut off. Considering the better chance one would have of accepting salvation when convinced by actual experience of future life and punishment, and especially when preached to by angels or even by Christ himself, we cannot help wondering whether, on Bishop Dahle's view, it is not a mistaken mercy to deprive men of this better opportunity.

The style of the book is remarkably lucid, and the arrangement is orderly. Everywhere it gives evidence that the author is preacher rather than scholar. Yet in spite of close literalism and narrow exegesis, a reader conceives genuine respect and admiration for his author's unmistakable sincerity and absolutely unfaltering allegiance to biblical authority. A critical scholar will find little in the volume to repay study, but for what it aims and purports to be, the book is decidedly valuable.

W. W. FENN.

CHICAGO.

THE GOSPEL FOR AN AGE OF DOUBT: Yale Lectures on Preaching, for 1896. By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896. Pp. xii+457; cloth. $1.75.

THIS book is the most serious piece of writing yet done by Dr. Van Dyke. Beginning as a series of sermons in his own pulpit; then extended into the Yale lectures for 1896; then amplified into a volume for the general public, it has at once the religious fervor of the prophet, the didactic quality of the lecturer, and the literary charm of the man of letters. The gospel which the author has for the age of doubt is essentially the teachings of the Westminster Confession, held unequivocally and tenaciously; yet held so generously, winsomely, and

tenderly, that for the average reader this presentation "steals away their sharpness ere he is aware."

The first chapter is a remarkable analysis of the temper of the present age as mirrored in its literature. The questioning, critical spirit of the nineteenth century is set forth with a wealth of quotation rarely equaled. Through all modern literature, English, French, and German, the author roams, gathering up the sad or passionate expressions of doubt, gloom, and pessimism, until his diagnosis of the modern world leaves us like Virgil's women of Troy—*pontum adspectabant flentes*. Indeed, it is a little bewildering to meet so many witnesses at once, and we hardly know what conclusions to draw when we are carried through twenty authors in twenty pages, referred at once to *Madame Bovary* and *Beyschlag's New Testament Theology*, and introduced in half a chapter to Mrs. Humphrey Ward, St. Augustine, Benjamin Kidd, Von Hartmann and *The Methodist Review*.

Then the author asks how we shall meet this temper of the age, and skillfully shows that science cannot furnish its own remedy, and neither philosophy nor *a priori* theology can furnish the answer. A positive gospel is needed; a gospel which is a fact and force in human history and embodied in a personal life. "This presentation of a person to persons, this is preëminently the gospel for the age of doubt." This chapter is full of noble loyalty to the historic Christ; but Christ is the unveiling of the Father. "The first Christians saw what the church has always seen in Jesus Christ—a real incarnation of God." With no uncertain sound the writer sets forth the deity of Christ. For such a gospel the world is now prepared, for modern thought has proven the shallowness of agnosticism. But theology must not lose sight of Christ's humanity, as it too often has done. The works of Shedd and Liddon obscure the real humanity behind metaphysical formulas. But in Christ was a real self-emptying, and the doctrine of the Kenosis is in no way at variance with the Scripture; only a really human Christ can be a real Saviour. In the teaching of Christ the idea of the kingdom is central, though the emphasis in modern theology is seen in Hitchcock's *Complete Analysis of the Holy Bible*, whose index contains one solitary reference to the kingdom of God. Dr. Van Dyke seems to make Christ the King. Is this in harmony with Christ's own teaching? He also represents the kingdom, not as a divine society and fellowship, but rather as a school in which Christ is the authoritative teacher. Surely, the authority of Christ as a teacher is not identical with his doctrine of the kingdom of God on earth.

Then in three chapters the author plunges into the three problems of Liberty, Sovereignty, and Service. "The modern fatalism is Calvinism with the bottom knocked out." Determinism is not proven, and we are free to accept Christ's clear teaching of the genuine freedom of the soul. An age which "has hypnotized itself by its own denials" surely needs the clear assertion of Jesus as to human liberty. Yet the sovereignty of God also is fundamental in Christ's teachings. His sovereignty embraces human freedom, as the ocean surrounds the island. Miracles are "rare works, unique, transcendent," but not against nature. Evil is self-destroying; as for Satan (*pace Westminster!*) "the day is coming when he must perish," and God be all in all.

The chapter on Service is a lofty and moving call to the service of man. Not equality but fraternity are we to preach, and the only election is an election to bless the world. With fine enthusiasm this thought is unfolded until we reach the closing statement, a compact and guarded theology in a sentence: "We must enter into life by giving ourselves to the living Christ who unveils the Father in the human life, and calls us with divine authority to submit our liberty to God's sovereignty in blessed and immortal service to our fellow-man for Christ's sake."

The only dubious feature in the book is the ponderous appendix occupying nearly one-third of the volume, consisting of extracts more or less weighty, from authors known and unknown, profound and shallow; extracts that are admirable in a commonplace book, but which, if relevant, are so discordant as to add more to the "doubt" than to the "gospel." Our very admiration for the clear thought and limpid style of the author makes us a little impatient when, after a page of prophetic fervor, we come upon the inevitable: "See Appendix, note 66," and our prophet condescends to become the curator of a museum. But two-thirds of the volume is by Dr. Van Dyke himself, and will help thousands of readers in solving the questions of today.

NEW YORK, N. Y. W. H. P. FAUNCE.

THE GOSPEL MESSAGE. By R. N. CUST, LL.D. London: Luzac & Co., 1896. Pp. xx + 494; cloth. 7s. 6d.

IN this book is distilled the clear thinking of "a humble student of the philosophy of missions and observer of the great work in the field and the committee room of many churches and denominations in the mission fields of the world for half a century."

Twenty-five years' experience as a magistrate in British India

among the native peoples, twice as many years as student of the languages, especially of Africa and Asia, with critical and comparative study of ancient and modern religions, with an intense and almost consuming enthusiasm for Christian missions to non-Christian races and people, have fitted Dr. Cust to write as few men can or will on the greatest of practical Christian themes.

This volume of nearly 500 pages condenses the matter of his forty or more volumes and pamphlets. The result is probably the most informing, critical, suggestive, and valuable single volume on missions now extant. Almost every phase of the subject is discussed, for Dr. Cust has been a long and patient sitter and hearer in committee-rooms and missionary anniversaries and knows both the inside and outside of his subjects. It would be less easy to find what important theme or phase of the subjects he has not treated than to enumerate the many lines of inquiry which he has illuminated. He groups his studies under the heads of motive and duty; servants of the Lord; incidents and dangers; results. He preaches the duty of self-sacrifice and shows the glorious opportunity to the young men. He believes heartily in the work of women, but he does not believe that the missionary ought to marry until he has at least been tried on the field, found capable, and, above all, has mastered the language. He insists that the details concerning wives and children ought to have no place in missionary reports, and persistently, with appeal, sarcasm, and solid argument, returns to this subject. He calls for the best men and women to do Christ's glorious work abroad. Throughout he insists that the Christian message should be the simple gospel only, and that the messenger of Christ should leave politics severely alone and not try to dictate to European governments or to meddle with native polity. Furthermore, the missionary ought not to intermeddle with the social customs, tradition, literature, and even religion of the people in an hostile, overbearing, and polemic way, but rather in love and sacrifice deliver the gospel message of reconciliation to God through Jesus Christ. No one more than he recognizes the great obstacles to Christianity both among ourselves and in that common human nature which is modified by old beliefs, customs, superstitions and national inheritances. He pleads that the man who today first hears the gospel ought to have the same equal opportunity of taking advantage of it as did the Greek or Roman citizens to whom Paul or Peter preached. Unfortunately, the average pagan of today does not have the advantage of those to whom Paul preached. He is expected to embrace as much dogmatic theol-

ogy as if he were in Europe or America with centuries of Christianity behind him, and he is too often compelled to take a large quantity or flavor of Anglican, Yankee, German, or occidental notions and customs as part of his Christianity. Dr. Cust discusses with clearness and force the relations of missionaries and missionary societies to the ideas and institutions of the various nations. He lifts the voice of warning for the twentieth century in view of the waste and failure of the past, which we all know has been great.

With most of the conclusions of the author we heartily agree. The method of carrying on missionary work is in need of radical reformation. This book, excellent for the beginner or the veteran in the field or the pastor at home, ought to be read and pondered by all who believe intensely in the Master's command to evangelize the nations and who hold that economy and practical wisdom in carrying on missionary work are as important as in everyday business.

ITHACA, N. Y. WM. ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

LITURGIES, EASTERN AND WESTERN. Being the texts original or translated of the principal liturgies of the church. Edited, with introductions and appendices, by F. E. BRIGHTMAN, M.A. On the basis of the former work by C. E. HAMMOND, M.A. Vol. I: Eastern Liturgies. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1896. Pp. civ+603; cloth. £1 1s.

THIS handsome volume is an important and valuable addition to the apparatus for liturgical study. Nearly twenty years ago Mr. C. E. Hammond put forth his *Liturgies, Eastern and Western*, which promptly commended itself as the most available handbook of the texts of the chief historic liturgies. The present work is in some sense an extension of Mr. Hammond's book. A new edition of the latter was called for, and Mr. Hammond entrusted the preparation of it to Mr. Brightman, Pusey librarian at Oxford. The result is a truly monumental piece of scholarship, remarkably elaborate in contents, and set forth in great typographical beauty by the Clarendon Press. The plan of the original work has been so much amplified that in place of one small volume of about 400 pages we are now to have two large ones, of which the present book is the first,—much more than a fourfold increase. This first volume deals only with the Eastern liturgies, and contains little besides the texts and the critical introduction thereto, all general summaries and discussions being reserved for the

future. This being its scope, we shall content ourselves with a rapid description of the main contents of the volume, noting one or two of its points of special excellence.

One of the best features of Mr. Brightman's plan is his elaborate exhibition of the sources available for the texts presented. He does not claim that his own use of these sources has been exhaustive,—doubtless their almost infinite extent precludes that for any single investigator,—but he evidently has been exceedingly painstaking in his study of what was immediately accessible to him, and highly judicious in his use of the work of others. Here Mr. Brightman's book is a notable advance on all its predecessors, both in scope and in the handling of details.

The introduction to the present volume occupies about 100 pages, in which we have a sufficiently exhaustive exhibit of the sources (1) of *the Syrian Rite*, including the so-called Clementine Liturgy, and the Greek and Syriac liturgies of St. James, which run out into many fragmentary variants, (2) of *the Egyptian Rite*, including the Greek Liturgy of St. Mark, the Coptic and Abyssinian liturgies, with their partial variants, (3) of *the Persian Rite*, with some partial variants, (4) of *the Byzantine Rite*, including the Orthodox liturgies in their multiform ramifications in several languages, and the Armenian liturgies, with their historic variations.

In discussing the details of manuscripts and other sources the editor displays a splendid mastery of his materials, an acute and balanced historical judgment, and an enviable power of compact and lucid statement. It is safe to say that the matter covered by this introduction has never before been so succinctly massed or so conveniently classified for reference. Special space is taken for the vexed problem of the Clementine Liturgy, which (following Funk's monograph) is affirmed to be Antiochene, "worked over and expanded by the compiler of the Apostolic Constitutions, who is also the pseudo-Ignatius, and filled in with prayers, which, whatever sources they may include, are very largely the work of the same compiler" (p. xliii). The evidence adduced is finely marshaled, and the various conclusions are apparently sound.

The main portion of the volume—450 pages—is occupied by the actual texts of the great liturgies in full, arranged with elaborate care as to the distinction between rubric and formula, as to the subordination of supplementary to essential passages, as to the parallelism of synchronous exercises, and as to the indication of biblical

quotations. Where the texts are in Greek, they are given in the original: in all other cases they are translated into English. Mr. Brightman has taken pains, "wherever possible, to represent the whole liturgy as it is celebrated on some given day,"—a plan which involves the introduction of the proper lections and hymns for that day. Whether this touch of vividness amounts to much may perhaps be queried, unless it is accompanied, as we wish had been practicable, by a tabulation of the other lections and hymns which might also occur at the same points on other days. It is not always remembered that liturgical usages form great cycles, the variable parts being combined in rotation with the invariable, and the impression of the whole, as it would be made on one constantly engaging in the rite, depending on the sum total of the parts, invariable and variable. To the technical student of liturgies in the narrow sense the examination of the fixed structure, the regular sequence of parts, the language and ritual of the more critical and central exercises, and the mystic significance attached to the core of the sacramental observance, is so absorbing that it is not as common as it ought to be to see a proportionate interest in the vast body of other liturgical materials (not only variable, but collateral, comparatively unemphasized, perhaps not fully formulated, usages) which really belong to the subject of liturgical history and praxis, well deserving scrutiny and record in connection with the technical "liturgies" themselves. Our author's labor to perfect his presentation in certain variable particulars is therefore a pleasing sign of thoroughness. We hope that in time the same principle of research will give greater attention, not only to the scope and order of lectionaries, of stipulated antiphons, canticles, hymns, etc., but even to such neglected matters as the ritual of secondary services of every description, including, when possible, usages that are merely tolerated as well as those that are enjoined.

After the texts—the details of which we do not pause to examine —come almost a score of valuable appendices, occupying nearly 100 pages more, in which are given in full several specially important descriptions and rescripts of usages from various sources, largely of the first ten centuries,—all designed to throw light on the historical development of the forms now held to be standard. Here again, both in the selection of matter and in his often minute annotations, the editor shows conspicuous wisdom and care. The beginning in this direction had been made by Mr. Hammond, but Mr. Brightman has gone much further.

The volume is rounded out (1) by a very full index of biblical quotations, arranged in the order of their occurrence in the liturgies themselves, from which the inquirer as to the amount and character of the scriptural matter used may derive what he needs with perhaps reasonable convenience; and (2) by two glossaries of technical terms, the one English, the other Greek, which are finely wrought out, especially in their massing of the terms for the same thing in different languages, and in their compact references to the historical growth of certain usages.

The appearance of the second volume of this noble work will be awaited with great interest.

WALDO S. PRATT.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE SEVEN LAST WORDS OF OUR MOST HOLY REDEEMER, WITH MEDITATIONS ON SOME SCENES IN HIS PASSION. By the Rev. ALFRED G. MORTIMER, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia. New York, London, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1896. Pp. x+198; cloth. $1.

THE order of subjects indicated in the title is the reverse of that in the book, in which we have first the meditations on the passion and then some brief addresses on the seven last words of Christ. These meditations were delivered in St. Mark's, Philadelphia, during Lent of 1895, and the addresses were delivered on Good Friday of that year at the three hours' service.

The style of both the meditations and the addresses is clear, simple, direct, and forceful. In this respect they are worthy of hearty commendation. In many passages redemption through the sufferings and death of Christ is justly and ably presented. Would that we could here close our criticism! But our author holds that, in addition to what Christ has done to save men, those who are redeemed by him must do penance. In his view penance is suffering for sin. He says: "The sorrows of life" are "the necessary penance for sin." Narcotics should not be used to deaden pain, since that thwarts our penance; and any suffering for sin which we thus avoid in this world we shall be compelled to endure in the next. This is unquestionably "another gospel."

The addresses on the last words of Jesus, bating some slight blemishes, are excellent; but from the words, "I thirst," the author draws, by what occult principle of hermeneutics we have been unable to discover, the subject, "temperance."

The meditations especially are sadly marred by allegorical interpretation. Thus the crown of thorns, because it was pressed upon the *head* of Christ, denotes the expiation made for evil thoughts. Thorns by which the ground is cursed, on account of Adam's transgression, mean penance for sin. God revealed himself to Moses in a thornbush (*sic!*), which indicates that God reveals himself anew to men in their penance. Eve was taken from the side of Adam, so the bride, the church, is taken from the wounded side of Jesus. The nails driven through his hands and feet "were typified in the Book of Numbers, where we are told that the princes and nobles of the people with their *staves* digged the well. Strange instrument with which to dig a well, a staff, type of the nails by which were dug in the hands and feet of our Redeemer the wells from which the living water of life should flow!" The nails also were typified by those who supported the hands of Moses while Israel fought with Amalek. When the blood ran from the hands and feet of Jesus, from *four* wounds, as he hung on his cross, the words found in the second chapter of Genesis were "fulfilled," "A river went out of Eden to water the garden, and from thence it was parted and became into *four* heads." The Italics are ours. Havilah, the land "where there is gold;" gold is here "the emblem of love." The wagging of the heads of those who passed by the cross indicates "the revolt of human reason — the head — against Christ."

These are a few of the many specimens of allegorical exposition scattered over the pages of this book. As one reads he is compelled to turn back to the title-page to assure himself that he is not perusing a book written by some monk of the Dark Ages. These meditations are musty with fanciful, discarded, mediæval interpretations. We lay down these discourses with the positive conviction that the most cogent proof of the divine origin of the gospel is that it survives the interpretations given to it by some of its advocates.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

*Ancient India, its Language and Religions.* By H. Oldenberg. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1896, pp. 110; 50c.) With this comprehensive title are presented translations of three (in the original two) articles by Professor Oldenberg in the *Deutsche Rundschau*: "The Study of Sanskrit," "The Religion of the Veda," and "Buddhism." In the first, a brief sketch of the century's work, the study of the Vedic literature is more particularly considered. The

second bears the same title as the author's well-known volume, *Die Religion des Veda*, and from the same point of view indicates the character of the Vedic conceptions. The essay on Buddhism directs attention to the close relationship of its fundamental principles (the evil of life, the circle of births, the means of release) to those of the Orphic and Pythagorean movements and Plato. In the explanation of these similarities the author remarks that "we may and must be satisfied with the similarity of historical causes." In the same way he would account for resemblances in literature and institutions between Buddhism and Christianity.—A. W. STRATTON.

*Studia Sinaitica*, No. V: *Apocrypha Sinaitica*. Edited and translated into English by Margaret Dunlop Gibson, M.R.A.S. (London: C. J. Clay & Sons, 1896.) While the original texts in Syriac and Arabic which are here published for the first time will be interesting to scholars, especially to students of the New Testament and of ante-Nicene ecclesiastical history, the translations will be found as entrancing as a good story to all those who love the literature of romance and folklore. For, as the editor remarks in her introduction to the Preaching of Peter: "Such tales probably took a similar place within the cloistered fane to the modern religious novel in Puritan families." The Clementine literature receives a valuable contribution in the two Arabic recensions of the *Recognitions* in the *Martyrdom of Clement* and in the *Preaching of Peter* (which is entirely different from that Kerügma of which Dobschütz writes in the ninth volume of Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*). The stories of the martyrdom of James and of the preaching and martyrdom of Simon, the son of Cleopas, present some new points for consideration in determining such questions as their relation to the Lord and to each other. The superscription to the Preaching of Simon will show this: "This is the preaching of the blessed and holy Simon, son of Cleopas, who was called Jude, which is, being interpreted, Nathaniel, who was called the Zealot, and was bishop in Jerusalem after James the brother of the Lord Jesusthe Christ."—R. D. WILSON.

*L'Écriture et le caractère*. Par J. Crépieux-Jamin. (Paris: Felix Alcan, 4$^{me}$ éd., 1896, pp. x + 463, fr. 7.50.) This interesting and elaborate attempt to interpret character from handwriting assumes that a relation exists between character and writing similar to that between character and gesture, writing being considered as composed of numerous gestures in miniature. "Graphology rests upon the most securely

established psycho-physiological conclusions; it has its laws, its experimental method, its classification, its technique; it can no longer be justly denied the rank of a science."

Various styles of chirography are reproduced in facsimile, and from an analysis of these, certain signs or characters of writing are determined, and the author attempts to establish a definite relation between these signs and (1) the superiority or inferiority, (2) the intelligence, (3) the moral character, (4) the will, (5) the æsthetic sense, (6) the age, (7) the sex, and (8) the pathological tendencies of the individual. The volume closes with a chapter of instructions to amateurs on the analysis of handwriting.

The collection of autograph letters and signatures is very rich, and of unusual interest to the lover of such matters.—W. I. THOMAS.

*Die Apostelgeschichte St. Lucä in Bibelstunden für die Gemeinde ausgelegt.* Von W. F. Besser. Dritte Auflage. (Halle a. S.: R. Mühlmann, 1896, 3 vols., M. 10.) This is part of an exposition of the entire New Testament in plain language for ordinary readers. Twelve volumes have already appeared. The work has been most cordially welcomed in Germany, and parts of it have achieved a great circulation and have passed through many editions. Though intended for popular reading, and not encumbered with the discussion of critical questions, it is the fruit of scholarly study. Besser writes from the standpoint of a strict Lutheran believer, with much insight, much weighty thought, and much gracious emotion.—FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

*A Man's Value to Society: Studies in Self-Culture and Character.* By Newell Dwight Hillis. (Fleming H. Revell Company, pp. 321, $1.25.) This is a series of essays or lectures or sermons in which very familiar truths are put in pungent, epigrammatic forms. It discusses "Memory," "Character," "Visions," "The Imagination," and kindred themes, with remarkable profusion of allusion and anecdote. At times it mounts to a height of vision and oracular utterance which reminds us of Emerson, but anon the miscellaneous incidents and exhortations bring us to the level of Samuel Smiles' *Self-Help.* Yet the tense and nervous apothegms in which the work abounds must drive home many a needed truth to the minds of young men.—W. H. P. FAUNCE.

*The Divine Life in Man and Other Sermons.* By Frederick A. Noble, D.D. (Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1896, pp. 311, cloth, $1.25.) In this volume of fifteen sermons we have

the discussion of practical topics which "come home to men's business and bosoms." While these discourses are strictly evangelical, they are replete with the best and freshest thinking of our day. The author has read widely and thoroughly and has a comprehensive and strong grasp of historical, literary, and scientific facts. His style also is clear and fairly forceful.

Most of these sermons, however, lack directness of address. The preacher does not grapple with his audience. He says "we," "our," "us," but in only two brief passages, in all these 300 pages, does he say "you." Were it not for the fact that the subjects of these discourses are pertinently unfolded from texts of Scripture, the reader might think that he was perusing simply a series of interesting essays. And the long sentences encountered here and there, some of which contain more than 200 words, would confirm the impression. Then there are words which are out of place in discourses addressed to popular audiences, such as "immanent," "transcendent," "differentiates," "oppugnant," "atrophied." The great Preacher of the ages, Jesus Christ, never used such words when he proclaimed the truth to men. But these are only slight blemishes in sermons which, taken as a whole, are worthy of hearty commendation.—GALUSHA ANDERSON.

*Obdachlos: Bilder aus dem sozialen und sittlichen Elend der Arbeitslosen.* Von Constantin Liebich. Mit einem Vorwort von Professor Adolph Wagner. (Berlin: Wigandt & Grieben, 1894, pp. 256, M. 3.) The introduction by Professor Wagner gives a guarantee of faithful treatment and genuine first-hand observation. The author has gained his materials by direct intercourse with the wretched human beings whom he describes. He follows them from the demoralized home, become a purgatory through poverty, vice, and discord, along the highways, in the relief stations, lock-ups, lodging houses, warming halls, asylums, restaurants, criminal gangs, markets, penitentiaries, labor bureaus, intelligence offices and workmen's colonies. The pictures of a German tramp's life are instructive for us in America, because the same industrial forces are at work to produce this pathetic and discouraging type of humanity, on which Salvation Army, rescue missions, institutional churches, settlements, charity organizations, and all benevolent citizens are spending so much money and sympathy, without other result thus far than serious increase of the plague, with the exceptional rescue of individual vagrants.—C. R. HENDERSON.

*Bilder aus dem Menschenleben in Lichte des göttlichen Wortes.* Von G. Stäbler. (Stuttgart: Rud. Roth, pp. 487, M. 3.20.) The author gathered a large number of illustrations, anecdotes, proverbs, and maxims for his own use in teaching a Bible class in Sunday school. He made notes for the conversational lectures before his classes. These he shaped into this book, which contains brief comments on events and teachings in the gospels, together with a generous supply of stories and other pictorial forms of instruction.—C. R. HENDERSON.

*Juvenile Offenders.* By W. Douglas Morrison. (New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1896, pp. 317, $1.50.) The chaplain of Wandsworth prison, London, to great devotion in his pastoral duties has joined a profound study of the literature of modern penology. The work here mentioned bids fair to become a classic in its particular field. It discusses the conditions which lead children and youth into crime: physical environment, domestic influences, economic opportunities, and industrial training. The various methods of dealing with young offenders are described and criticised; admonition, conditional release, fining, corporal punishment, imprisonment, corrective institutions. A very important conclusion is that the remedies lie in bettering social conditions rather than in reformatories and prisons, and that the church should crown its work for individuals by lending its powerful influence to the removal of those general causes which produce misery. —C. R. HENDERSON.

## NOTICE.

The recent numbers of *The American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, and of *The Biblical World*, contain the following reviews of books which will not be reviewed in THE JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY:

HEINR. ZIMMERN, Beitrage zur Kenntnis der babylonischen Religion.—LEON. W. KING, Babylonian Magic and Sorcery. *Am. Jour. Sem. Lang. and Lit.*, XIII, 154–162.

BLASS, FR., Acta Apostolorum sive Lucae ad Theophilum liber alter secundum formam quae videtur Romanam. *The Biblical World*, January.

WRIGHT, A Synopsis of the Gospels in Greek after the Westcott and Hort Text. —FLOURNOY, The Search-light of St. Hippolytus. *The Biblical World*, February.

DAWSON, Eden Lost and Won.—WRIGHT, Illustrated Bible Treasury and Combined Concordance.—TOLSTOI, The Gospel in Brief.—VOLLERT, Tabellen zur neutestamentlichen Zeitgeschichte.—FAUNCE, Inspiration Considered as a Trend.—SELL, Bible Study by Books.—HENDERSON, Development of Doctrine in the Epistles. *The Biblical World*, March.

# CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

THE MIDRASHIC ELEMENT IN CHRONICLES. By W. E. BARNES; *The Expositor*, December 1896, pp. 426–439.

THE manifest didactic *Tendenz* of the chronicler gives a Midrashic character to his narratives. Does this extend to the inclusion of Haggadah? There are five conspicuous stories in Second Chronicles, having no parallel in Kings, which have been considered Haggadic: (1) Abijah's victory over Jeroboam (13:3–20). The enormous armies, the quotation from the priest code, the tone of Abijah's speech, tell against the narrative. Yet the victory is by no means improbable, and the story is circumstantial and self-consistent. (2) Asa's victory (14:9–15). This narrative is not difficult to accept if the Cushites be regarded as from Arabia, and the million invaders understood as merely an innumerable host. Kings is generally silent on matters concerning Judah alone. (3) The invasion of Moab, Ammon, and Edom (chap. 20). The vagueness of the military details, and the particularity of the religious and liturgical, give to this narrative a Haggadic appearance. Yet an unsuccessful migration of these tribes into Judah is not improbable. Jehoshaphat's prayer and the coloring of the narrative may belong to the chronicler, but there is probably a basis of fact. (4) Uzziah's leprosy (26:16–20). The law of the altar seems to be of later origin. Kings has no reference to any cause of the leprosy, though the expression וינגע (plagued) may indicate that it was regarded as a judgment. Eliminating the marks of late style and phraseology, there seems to remain a pre-exilic narrative presenting, in general, the same account. (5) The repentance of Manasseh (33:12, 13). This narrative is not necessarily inconsistent with the unqualified condemnation of Manasseh in Kings. If the repentance came late in life and the reformation was only partially and temporarily successful, they might easily be omitted by the almost contemporary writer. But the chronicler was bound to notice anything good of a Davidic king. The phraseology is not necessarily late.

The discussion of this problem must take into account the narrative of Jehoiada's revolution (chap. 23). The prominence of the Levites and

the law, the anachronism of the porters, the sanctity of the temple, the supereminence of the priest, and the marks of post-exilic style, all render the story suspicious. But as there is in this case a parallel in Kings, a detailed criticism is possible, and the narrative is seen to be essentially historical. The difficulties are due to some minor errors and additions of the chronicler. The same is probably true of the other narratives. They are based on historical sources, though doubtless they are modified, even in important details, in accordance with the *Tendenz* of the writer.

The five narratives selected afford a very fair test of the problem under discussion. The conclusion seems to present the view to which scholarship is tending. The writer well shows that the criticism of Chronicles cannot proceed by a simple comparison with Kings and the wholesale application of the *argumentum e silentio.* While his conclusion concerning the Manasseh narrative may be correct, he has not considered the objection of Graf and Wellhausen that the story is introduced as an explanation of Manasseh's long and prosperous reign.

ROCKFORD, ILL. THEO. G. SOARES.

DER TAG DES LETZTEN ABENDMAHLS UND DES TODES JESU. Von PROFESSOR DR. BELSER; *Theolog. Quartalschrift,* Viertes Quartalheft, Tübingen, 1896.

BOTH John and the synoptists agree that the last supper was celebrated on a Thursday evening, and that the crucifixion was on a Friday. The only point in doubt is the day of the month. The author of the present article holds that it was the thirteenth, and so that Jesus observed the passover one day before the legal time. The fourth gospel, which is to be regarded as chronologically exact, furnishes the following data: (1) 18:28. The Jews entered not into the judgment hall that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover. Comparison with the synoptists, specially Luke, shows that we must think of the passover proper, and not of the Chagigah. This is confirmed by Jewish writings. Moreover, the defilement caused by entering a heathen house would have lasted *seven* days, and not simply till sundown, as some say. (2) 13:1. It was *before* the passover that Jesus gave the signal proof of his love in washing the disciples' feet, with which the supper and the passover were associated. This passage leads us to the evening of the thirteenth. (3) 19:14. "Preparation of the passover" is not the name of a day of the week, but is the day of preparation for the passover. The Jews called the sixth day παρασκευὴ τοῦ σαββάτου because it was the day on which they made ready for the

Sabbath. By analogy παρασκευὴ τοῦ πάσχα must mean preparation for the passover. The context in John also requires this. (4) 19:36. This proves that the evangelist thought of the crucifixion as contemporaneous with the slaughter of the passover lambs. (5) 19:31, 42. The Sabbath that followed the day of the crucifixion was *great*, and that is explained by the fact that it was the first feast day.

This testimony of John is confirmed by many early writers, as Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, Apollinaris, Eusebius, the Gospel of Peter, the Acts of Pilate, and the Toldoth Jeschu.

Now the language of the synoptists is not in conflict with John. For they bear witness that the trial of Jesus was not on a feast day, but on a work day. Note the going out with swords and staves, Simon's coming from the field, the request of the people that a prisoner be released, care for the burial of Jesus, the trial, the sending of the prisoner to Pilate, and the tumult in the streets. It is impossible to suppose that these things took place on the first feast day. This was holy, and no work might be done thereon.

Moreover, the synoptists tell us that the leaders purposed to avoid the arrest of Jesus during the feast, and there is nothing to indicate that this plan was abandoned. Further, trial by the Sanhedrin was not allowed on Sabbaths and feast days. To the objection that if Jesus' trial was the day before the feast his crucifixion must have been on the feast day, it is to be said that the *Pharisees* indeed held that a sentence of death could not be executed on the day of its passage, but the *Sadducees*, who were in office when Jesus was crucified, disregarded this rule.

The statement of Matt. 26:17, that Jesus kept the passover on the first day of unleavened bread, and the fuller statement of Mark 14:12, must be regarded as using the word πρῶτος in a peculiar sense. Mark may have had קדם before him, which was used in the sense of *preceding*.

This article by Dr. Belser is an interesting argument for the 13th of Nisan as the date of the last supper and for the harmony of the synoptists with John. Some points which seem to us not made out are (1) that the defilement of entering the judgment hall would last seven days; (2) that John 13:1, which puts the washing of the disciples' feet *before* the passover, puts it just twenty-four hours before it; (3) that John, in 19:36, thinks of Jesus as the antitype of the paschal lamb; (4) that the various activities which the synoptists put on the day of the crucifixion might not, in extraordinary circumstances, have taken place on a feast day; and (5) that men who wrote Greek readily could have said τῇ πρώτῃ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν ἀζύμων when they meant the day *before* the feast.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. GEORGE H. GILBERT.

La Crise du Protestantisme Français. Par P. E. Portalié; *Études Religieuses, Philosophiques, Historiques, et Littéraires*, Juin, Août, et Septembre, 1896.

French Protestantism has reached a crisis in its history. It has suffered for years from a division in its ranks into liberals and orthodox. This division is killing Protestantism. Attempts at reconciliation have reached a crisis at the Synod of Sedan, June 1896.

The purpose of these articles is: (1) to show the present state of French Protestantism; (2) to estimate its proposed achievements in our country; (3) to seek the causes of the gradual extinction of its churches; (4) to conduct the entire discussion in a purely historical spirit.

If Protestants have been guilty of vituperation and flagrant misrepresentation of Catholics, we shall exhibit no such spirit.

French Protestantism can be divided into three principal groups: the Lutheran church, with 77,000 souls; the independent churches, with 11,000 souls; the Reformed church, with 540,000 adherents.

There are other independent churches of foreign importation with small followings, as the Methodists and Baptists, but the French spirit is hostile to these exotic ravings (*rêveries exotiques*). It is an incontestable fact that the coexistence of these different churches, having each its work and its societies, is one of the scourges of Protestantism.

The Calvinistic church in France far outnumbers all the rest. Now, is there unity in this church? Is unity possible? Calvinism has always offered the illogical contrast of a synodal organization strongly authoritative and a principle essentially revolutionary. In the course of time and in various phases this contradiction worked itself out in deeds.

Immediately after the battle of Waterloo France was invaded by large numbers of rigorous Calvinists, who pushed to the extreme the doctrines of predestination and the uselessness of works. This brutal dogmatism embraced by the young pastors stirred up the most vigorous opposition to the ancient school and prepared the way for destructive German criticism and Renan's *Vie de Jésus*. Renan at once had a very large following. The result was a denial of the supernatural element in Christianity and the widest liberty in the interpretation of Scripture. The audacity of these negations aroused orthodoxy, which immediately prepared for the meeting of a national synod. The synod met at Paris June 6, 1872. After stormy debates they voted as follows: "The supreme authority of the Holy Scriptures in the matter of faith and salvation by faith in Jesus Christ — the only Son of God — who died for our sins and arose again for our justification."

It voted further that candidates for ordination must subscribe to this declaration.

It remains to the liberals to submit or separate. Strangely enough they do neither, and Protestantism is left in that uncertain condition which is neither unity nor schism—a condition of organized anarchy ruling every sphere of activity in the church. This anarchy exists not only between the two factions but within each of the factions. There are no common rules admitted by all. Attempts are made to draft a discipline, but who will obey it? What legal sanction has it? The pastors enjoy an exaggerated independence. What is still worse—think of the spiritual anarchy!

Here, then, we come to the true crisis in French Protestantism; it is unable to escape a terrible dilemma, either schism or apostasy. If schism is perpetuated it is death. Peace can be concluded only upon the ruins of the faith.

In the midst of this perplexity a third party, the moderate right, arises. It opposes the theory "everything or nothing," advocates a theology of the conscience, and makes Christianity a *life* of the heart. Ostensibly it is with the orthodox, but its closest affinities are with the liberals.

Thus matters go on from bad to worse until the Synod of Sedan convenes June 2, 1896.

The synod is confronted by many grave problems, such as mixed marriages, religious indifference, deficit in the budget. This last seriously affects theological students, pastors, and the education of pastors' children. All these things are consequences of the division.

But the gravest of all the problems is: What can be done to restore unity? The parties are well organized, the debates are spirited, and the conference ends with an apparent reconciliation. But we do not fear to affirm that this assembly was fatal to Protestantism, because it marks a decisive step of orthodoxy towards liberalism. Its contradictory and equivocal votes conceal, with the danger of more complete failures in the near future, a real betrayal of Christ, of the faith, and of souls.

M. Portalié assured us that his discussion should be conducted in the purely historical spirit. We had a right, then, to expect samples of all the facts, a judicial calm, a sympathetic attitude towards the entire situation, even though the criticism might be adverse. It is difficult to see how he has met the requirement in any one of these particulars. He rather appears from beginning to end as an advocate, indeed as a consistent Jesuit. His readers must consequently, while learning from him, keep both eyes wide open.

The French Protestants left the mother church, and in pursuing their own unpiloted way have been wrecked upon the rocks of anarchism and infidelity. What shall they do now? He does not tell us in words, but the inference can hardly be mistaken. Correct the initial mistake, come back to the mother church, and all will be well.

It is extremely improbable that French Protestants will ever consent to such doctrines as are found in the Pope's last encyclical, *e. g.*, "The dispensation of the divine mysteries was not granted by God indiscriminately to all Christians, but to the apostles and their successors."

Moreover it may be that his view of Protestantism is too limited. Possibly the very *rêveries exotiques* which he dismisses so summarily may be an element in the further development of French Protestantism.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. J. W. MONCRIEF.

EARLY BRITISH CHRISTIANITY. By F. HAVERFIELD; *The English Historical Review*, July 1896.

OF the first bearers of Christianity to Britain, of the time of its introduction, and of the section of Christendom from which it was brought we are entirely ignorant. The claim that one of the apostles —no less than six have been named—first preached the gospel in the island is supported by no sort of evidence. The story of King Lucius is without historic basis. The celebrated passage in Tertullian would seem to fix the date at the beginning of the third century, but its "rhetorical coloring" "forbids precise conclusions." With the opening of the fourth century we reach sure historical ground. In 304 the persecution of Diocletian was felt in Britain, to which later ages ascribe the martyrdom of St. Alban. At the Council of Arles, held in 314, three British bishops were present from York, London, and Lincoln. There is ample literary proof that "an organized church existed at the outset of the fourth century." By the end of the century Pelagius was actively engaged in sowing his heresies. "By 400 Christianity had made vast progress in Britain."

Archæology throws light on early British Christianity in at least three respects: (1) The Christian monogram, Chi-Rho, has been found on mosaics, building stones, pavements, cups, rings, lamps, etc. To the fourth century certainly some and perhaps most of these objects must be referred. (2) Inscriptions on stone are less numerous, and can only plausibly be ascribed to the fourth century. Two tombstones belonging to this age have recently been dug up on which were found the phrase, *plus minus*, a Christian phrase "used of a man's length of life." (3) To monograms and inscriptions must be added the discov-

ery in 1892 at Silchester of "a small building which by its ground plan declared itself to be a fourth-century Christian church."

From these literary and archæological remains it is fair to conclude that in the fourth century there was in Britain a "fully organized church," that it had at least three bishops, that "the seats of the bishoprics were in three of the largest towns," that Christians were in every part of the island — in the villages as well as the great centers of population. In the Roman army Christianity seems to have had few adherents — clear signs of its presence are wanting.

The latest researches controvert the view advocated by Mr. Hugh Williams and others, that "the church of fourth-century Britain was the church of the resident Roman population, not of the people of Britain." On the contrary it was an essentially British church, or rather a Romano-British church, whose existence and character would not be seriously affected by the presence or withdrawal of the Roman army and population.

Professor Haverfield's article is "an attempt to summarize what is now certain or probable respecting British Christianity during the first four centuries of our era." That part of the summary which presents the literary proofs and gives an estimate of their weight and value quite accords with the judgments expressed in recent works on English church history whose opening chapters treat of the introduction of the Christian religion into the island. The chief interest of the article lies, not in its literary proofs, but in the archæological evidences adduced concerning fourth-century Christianity.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. ERI B. HULBERT.

DIONYSISCHE BEDENKEN. Von Dr. JOHANNES DRÄSEKE; *Theologische Studien und Kritiken*, 1897, pp. 381–409.

THE date of the writings of Dionysius has been greatly discussed during the last decade, and much learning has been brought to bear on the subject. One of the latest writers is Jos. Stiglmayr who claims to have found four definite time-limits after which the composition of these writings must be placed, viz.: (1) the Council of Chalcedon (451); (2) the works of Proklus (412–485); (3) the introduction of the *credo* into the liturgy of the mass (476); and (4) the issue of the Henoticon under Emperor Zeno (482). He therefore designates as the date of their composition the period of the religious controversy at Constantinople, 533.

Cogent reasons for rejecting this view are given by Harnack, Langen, Hipler, and others. They all agree that these writings must have been composed in the latter part of the fourth century, but that

they underwent at a later time many alterations. In this view they are supported by Victor Ryssel, the well-known Syriac scholar and palæographer, who states that early, perhaps in the fifth century, Dionysius' writings were translated into Syriac, as is shown by the manuscript in the British Museum and also by the citations of Isaac of Nineveh, who lived in the fifth century, and certainly did not know the Greek language.

Against Stiglmayr's assertion that the term ὑπόστασις in the meaning of person as opposed to nature—οὐσία—so frequently used by Dionysius—points to a time (440–482) long after the Synod of Alexandria, 362, when both words were still employed with the same meaning, reference is made to Apollinarius of Laodicea (especially to his Dialogues on the Holy Trinity) and to Gregory of Nyssa who as accurately distinguish between these two words as does Dionysius.

The dependence of Gregory on Dionysius is proof conclusive against the position of Stiglmayr: 1. In a discourse on the Feast of the Birth of our Lord, Gregory, alluding to the two cherubims on the ends of the mercy seat in the holy of holies, makes reference to another who has discoursed on this same theme. Dionysius is indisputably in Gregory's mind, and not Athanasius, as Stiglmayr supposes. 2. In the conclusion of Gregory's second great theological discourse Περὶ θεολογίας this dependence is also perceived. In a passage in which he speaks of the great inferiority to God of the celestial and supercelestial (ὑπερουράνιον) beings, notwithstanding their superiority to human kind, Elias of Crete not only refers to Dionysius but expressly calls our attention to the dependence of Gregory on Dionysius. 3. Gregory pictures in bold outlines only the world of angels who continually surround God; and who from this divine fountain of light become illuminated, as it were, thus themselves becoming fountains of light for others inferior to themselves; they are ministers of the divine will and by their natural and supernatural powers and the lightness of their substance are able to hasten over all places ready to serve. Thus they lead all to the One, the created to the Creator. This description shows the dependence of Gregory on the greater and larger work of Dionysius, as Elias of Crete intimates.

Finally may be mentioned an Alexandrian writer, Syonesius, who, when yet a heathen, wrote about 403 his Δίων, in which he alluded to certain mystical and theosophical expressions frequently and with preference used by Dionysius and common in the monastic circles in which he was a leader.

These arguments show that the composition of the writings of Dionysius must be assigned to the latter part of the fourth century.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. ADOLF SCHMIDT.

CHRISTI GOTTHEIT UND PRÄEXISTENZ. Von W. von STRAUSS UND TORNEY; *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift*, VII. Jahrgang, pp. 755–793.

THAT the only-begotten Son of God was before his incarnation in and with God, and that in the incarnation and after it he became no other in essence, but that he revealed his divinity during the period of his humiliation, are positions which have been held and taught in Christendom from the earliest days. These positions constitute a connected teaching; they are of vital importance, being intimately associated with the views of Christians as to the person and work of Christ, and as to his permanent relation to the church. It is generally believed that this teaching is scriptural. Before proceeding to examine its scriptural foundation, however, it is proper to cast a glance at the views now taught on the subject by Ritschl and his numerous school. Ritschl says of the preëxistence: "Christ exists for God eternally as one who for us is revealed in the limitations of time; but only for God: because for us Christ as preëxistent is concealed;" and of the divinity of Christ: "This attribute cannot be considered complete unless the same activities through which Jesus reveals himself as man are considered in the same relation as peculiar predicates of God, and means of his revelation through Christ." This language is obscure, and, when cleared of its obscurity, unsatisfactory, because it evaporates the real and objective preëxistence of Christ, and thereby makes of no effect his essential divinity. The Scriptures throughout are clear in indicating the reality and objective character both of the preëxistence and of the divinity of our Saviour. In the synoptic gospels Jesus designates himself as the Son of Man, but names no other man by that term; thus making it clear that he recognizes himself as a member of the race of Adam, but, at the same time, puts a difference between himself and all other members of the race. He also calls himself the Son of God. He claims God as his father in a unique sense. The combination of these two self-designations and their appropriation by any other, in this sense, would be nothing short of madness. This relation is especially emphasized in Matt. 11:25, 27; Luke 10:21, 22. God only can know God perfectly. If the Son knows God the Son is God. In the trial of Jesus before Caiaphas he declared himself the

future judge of his judges as the Son of Man, which is meaningless unless the judge is divine. The same "I" is the Son of Man and the Son of God. The converse of this is found in the recognition from heaven of the unique sonship of Jesus (Matt. 3:17; Luke 9:35). So also in the words of the annunciation (Luke 1:32–35), and in the final commission to the disciples (Matt. 28:19, 20). Here Jesus assigns himself a place between the Father and the Holy Spirit, certifying a certain unity of essence in the three. All this is confirmed and corroborated by the miraculous works recorded of Jesus in the synoptic gospels. The Pauline teaching on this subject is not less pronounced. To Jesus Christ is attributed here also a certain character before his incarnation which logically involves his preëxistence (1 Cor. 10:1; Col. 1:15–17; Phil. 2:5–12). The epistle to the Hebrews confirms this view (1:1 ff.). The emphasis here is on the fact that Christ is the heir; the beginning of this heirship is not spoken of, but the end of it is naturally the entrance of the heir upon the inheritance; in any case, heirship is recognition of rights which already exist. Christ possesses his rights in the incarnate state, because he possessed them in the pre-incarnate state. Further, God has created the world by him, and he is the effulgence of his glory and the very image of his substance. Only God can be said to uphold all things by the word of his power. If these apostolic expressions regarding the deity of Christ should be considered obscure, there are others clearer. Compare 1 Thess. 1:11, 12; Rom. 9:5; Titus 2:13; 2 Peter 1:1. But the ripest and clearest view of the apostolic teaching on the subject is to be found in the gospel of John. In 3:13 his being in heaven while on earth is an indication of divine nature. In 5:19, 20, 22, 23, 26, 30, the prerogatives described are received from the Father; but yet they express equality with the Father. In 6:28; 8:23, 42, 58, there are expressions teaching not only heavenly preëxistence, but timeless eternal essence; and as the Father and Son are of the same essence, he can say (10:30) "I and the Father are one," and (vs. 38) "the Father in me and I in the Father." Compare also 14:10, 11. "I and the Father are one" can only mean essential unity, as the only unity that can exist between two persons is that of essence. This idea of essential unity with God was so inwrought in Jesus' consciousness that he could and did say: "Who hath seen me hath seen the Father" (13:45; 14:9). Accordingly, in his intercessory prayer (17:15–24) he gives utterance to his consciousness of unity with the Father, and does not refuse or reject the ascription of divinity by Thomas. To

these utterances of Jesus, reported by John, must be added the words of John himself as to the Logos (1 : 1–5, 14). The Logos, whatsoever else may or may not be found in that term, is the eternal Son before and after the incarnation. This Logos was both distinct from, and one with, God.

It is true that the Old Testament does not know the only-begotten Son. Its rigid monotheism would not risk the possibility of misunderstanding by even suggesting separate personalities in the Godhead, but this monotheism is not revealed as an empty numerical unit. The Old Testament, though not teaching the Trinity, leaves the way open for it; and, finally, the divinity of Christ is a fact which must enter into the experience of the Christian in order to secure perfect freedom and fullness to his Christian activity (Matt. 28 : 18, 20).

It is impossible to reproduce the full force of an article like this in a condensation. The argument of the writer depends very largely on the impression made by his special exegesis. And no adequate idea can be given of the exegetical refinements of a serious and scientific thinker on such a subject except by reproducing them in detail. We can only say therefore that with few exceptions the deductions of the writer from the text of the New Testament seem to us valid. The exceptions would hardly alter the general conclusion he reaches.

McCormick Theological Seminary. A. C. Zenos.

Das Verhältniss des evangelischen Glaubens zur Logoslehre. Vortrag, gehalten in Eisenach am 5. October, 1896. Von Professor Dr. I. Kaftan, Berlin, 1897, 27 pp., 8vo, M. 1; *Separatabdruck* from *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, VII, 1–27.

This topic has been selected for discussion at the suggestion of Professor Harnack, because we regard it as a good thing to take heed of the inheritance of truth which has been preserved for us even when we cannot accept certain phases of a doctrine.

1) What permanent truth of Christianity is it for the expression and formulation of which the older theologians made use of the Logos idea? The position occupied by this doctrine in the writings of the early apologists, and in the historical development down to the times of Athanasius, shows that it was the intention to express thereby the absolute character of the Christian religion and the fact that the significance of the Christian religion depended on the incarnation of the divine Logos in the person of Jesus. The application of the Logos idea is new, but the fundamental idea is as old as Christianity itself, only with this difference, that in the primitive congregation this con-

sciousness was manifested in another form, namely, in the belief of the speedy return of the Lord unto judgment. But in both forms the fundamental idea remains the same, namely, that the spiritual content of Christianity, as a whole, is to be regarded as superior to the world, and that the embodiment of these contents, Jesus Christ, is to be associated (*zusammenstellen*) with that God who controls the world.

These motives the Christian church can never discard. Nor is it possible that there should be a separation of the two fundamental conceptions in this doctrine, *i.e.*, the absolute character of Christianity cannot be maintained without the absolute character of the person of Jesus.

2) And why must we, nevertheless, reject the traditional Logos doctrine? At all events, it is impossible to return to the older formulas by which the fundamental ideas of this dogma were expressed, namely, the expectation of the speedy return of the Lord. For, in the first place, it is a settled fact that the Lord has not returned; and, secondly, the Logos idea is in so far a higher expression of this idea, as it bases the absolute significance of Christ not on a divine function which he performed, but on his person. But how is it with the Logos doctrine? It cannot be expected by anyone that we should revive the old philosophical dogma of the Logos, for this is based on an unnatural idea of transcendency, and includes in itself the danger of pantheism. Neither of these elements, however, has in the Logos doctrine of the church been taken over from the Logos idea. And yet we cannot accept even this, nor can we rest contented with the thought that we are here dealing with a mystery which we should respect as such without bringing it in any connection with actual piety. For this in itself militates against evangelical faith. We know only mysteries in the sphere of conceptional thought of a kind which are open to faith and profitable for personal piety. But it causes us to hesitate when it is remembered that the Logos doctrine, even in the shape in which it has been accommodated to the needs of Christianity, misleads and corrupts Christian faith. But it leads to a false conception of the biblical picture of Jesus. And then, too, it is based on another conception of the idea of what the highest good is than the idea of Christianity on this subject, namely, the Catholic idea of the highest good, the characteristic feature of which is the subordination of the ethical to the logical thought. The Logos doctrine seeks the purpose, the object and aim of the Spirit, and indeed of God himself, in knowledge. Genuine Christianity, however, seeks this in the domain of moral activity. In direct and immediate connection with this we find

another thing, that in this doctrine the divine life and the participation in it is represented as something physical of a higher order. But this conception of what the highest good is was thoroughly rectified by the Reformation. This movement again grasped the unity of religion and morality as found in the gospel, and has carried out this thought in every department except that of doctrine. This is the reason why we have not at all, yet, become sufficiently conscious of the fact that the doctrinal questions of Christianity must also be apprehended from a religious point of view, and that we overlook the fact that the ultimate questions of knowledge are of a different nature from that which we ordinarily call science.

3) And how shall we in evangelical dogmatics do justice to the unchangeable motives of the Logos doctrine? Here we can give only hints and suggestions. The Logos idea was at one time the uniform conception of the philosophy of being (*Weltanschauung*) in the non-Christian world. The apologetic writers of primitive Christianity in uniting this idea with Christianity could also in a philosophical manner place Christ at the center of their idea of things. The same thing must be done now again. Now, unfortunately, we do not possess such a uniform conception of things with which we could unite this idea. We can accordingly only proceed from that which has shown itself for us in our Christian faith to be the real sphere of divine activity. This is the ethico-historical sphere. In the place of cosmological speculation a new way of looking at affairs steps in, and that, too, one that confines men to the historical, and the controlling idea is found in that of personality. Accordingly, we do not say that the divine Logos became man in Jesus Christ; but we say that the personal God has assumed historical form in the man Jesus. This, it is true, is no explanation of his being, but rather a fixing of the fact upon which our faith rests. And there remains also untouched the unique character of Jesus, which is not lost in our conceptions.

With this expression full justice is done to the motives of the Logos idea. For in this way Christ is absolutely placed at the center of history, and in it everything is made to refer to him. But is it possible, as has been done in the case of history, to subordinate also nature to the religion, the spiritual contents of which have been transmitted to us through Christ? However, in the first place, this limitation of speculation to the domain of history is not destructive in its character, but is, rather, a bulwark against all kinds of pantheistic speculations; and, in the second place, the specific subordination of nature

to the spirit has been accepted everywhere. And it is preëminently the natural sciences of our day that have proved themselves to be the real ground of history and are the immense territory in which to discover the means of the life of the personal spirit. But if we attempt to formulate the relation of nature to spiritual life, we can have recourse to no other way than that of nature in history; *i. e.*, to accept a grand scheme of development, the end of which is humanity, the absolute center of which, again, is Christ.

Finally, the question, Is the modern theory of development a precursor of a new and uniform philosophy of existence? Will this idea prove to be the unity in which evangelical faith and evangelical order of life will become purified into a higher state or order of things in our thought and tendencies of civilization, and all this based on God?

And one confession we must make which attains to unity and continuity of Christian faith through all the changes of the thought of centuries. Whether we engage in metaphysics or metahistorics, that faith remains, that we in our religion lay hold of God himself, and the foundation of this faith remains the same, namely, that it is established on Jesus Christ our Lord!

This is probably the most noteworthy dogmatical article that has appeared in Germany for many months. Its significance is rather representative than individual. It was originally delivered as an address at the convention of liberal theologians held in October at Eisenach, and can practically be regarded as the position of advanced theological thought on this fundamental problem.

COLUMBUS, O. GEO. H. SCHODDE.

THE RECONSTRUCTION OF THEOLOGY. By DAVID N. BEACH, D.D.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1897, pp. 108–141.

1. *The caveat of Scripture.*—Had the relation of Romans to the canon of the New Testament, and that of Job to the canon of the Old Testament, been rightly apprehended, a deal of trouble would have been saved the world.

The philosophical section of Romans, chaps. 1–11, contains the assumption, that "the invisible things of God since the creation of the world are clearly seen, being perceived through the things that are made." In other words, God is self-manifesting. The order of the world shows him forth. But the Jew and Gentile alike failed to apprehend God as he is. God's effort through the Jewish cult to recover the world had for its specific aim the development of an attitude of

faith. The worship of the Divine Spirit is manifested both in the psychology of individual experience and in the cosmical movements. Jesus, as the concrete evidence of faith in its clearest light, is the soul's deliverance. This is God's world. He is manifesting himself through it, and men are without excuse for not recognizing him. But some races have had a decided advantage over others in the divine pedagogy. However, there is no injustice in this. Paul concludes, more practically than logically, that all have been shut up unto disobedience in order that God may have mercy upon all. The conclusion is reached by insight, figure, and imagination. The problem of seeming injustice which puzzles the mind of the apostle is solved by the prophetic faculty of his heart. This faculty must be exercised in determining any doctrine of God or of man.

The Book of Job sustains to the Old Testament a significant relation. It reaches a conclusion somewhat analogous to that observed in Romans. When examined from the broad standpoint of motive the Book of Job is an attempt to make clear that man has not said the right thing concerning God. The pith of the whole document is summed up in a sentence: "And it was so, that after the Lord had spoken these words unto Job, the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, My wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right." In fact, the right thing concerning God cannot be spoken without profoundest insight and a conscientious regard for all the facts. As much as to say, that the modest, teachable, expectant, undogmatic attitude should characterize the student of religion.

These two documents with their refusal to remain in the simple outlines of truth, and their leaping forward into the untried ranges of thought by expectant faith, ought long ago to have sounded an alarm which should have prevented the narrowness of theology in the past.

2. *The warning from science.*—God's self-revelation in nature is primary. No additional revelation can contravene it. The concrete is the most intrinsic kind of revelation. For this reason theology must consult science. The history of astronomy, geology, and the doctrine of evolution is a warning, parallel to the *caveat* of Scripture, against trusting in dogmatic assertions. Science joins with Romans and Job in pleading for patience, perseverance, and expectancy in the search for a better and better knowledge of God.

3. *The practical necessity.*—It is capable of substantial proof that the traits of our time, its mental attitude, the unsatisfactory condition

of certain primary questions in theology, demand a radical, though tentative, reconstruction of theological science.

4. *Fundamental requirements.* — Great progress has been made within the present century in the direction of a broader, simpler, profounder, theology. While the Germans have contributed much to this end, their efforts have lacked the practical directive which has been given in the more constructive works of English-speaking writers. The progressive movement has been Christocentric, in which fact lies its promise and glory. The time has come to accelerate the work. In this anticipation there are certain great foundations which cannot be shaken. (1) The yearning of the heart after God. (2) Christ. Theories of his person will change. Indeed to emancipate Jesus from the hypotheses within which we have tried to place him is the need of modern theology. (3) Experience. This is the counterpart of the religious impulse. (4) Scripture. It is a slow deposit of the ages found in tradition, on monuments and cylinders, and in the sacred books of eastern peoples. Every Scripture inbreathed of God is inspired. Every Scripture is not equally valuable. The literature of the Jews most nearly approaches the oracular. All Scripture, however, must be used in furnishing a scientific basis for theology.

The first requirement of a reconstructed theology is a scientific basis. In place of the present threefold basis, — fact, authority, and faith, — theology should have but one basis, fact. Whatever legitimately belongs to the other two is really only fact. Faith is an eye of the mind and soul, but the content of things perceived thereby must always be open to revision in conformity to the results of ampler and acuter vision. We must apply the inductive method. This requires a larger definition of Scripture. The inbreathing of God in man is not partial, but universal. Man's capacity to receive has determined the degree in which God has spoken to him. Scripture is endeavoring to impart a kindling of the soul. It is not a bulletin or an objective content of knowledge. We must apprehend Scripture in its true function. God is to all men a Speaking Presence, leading them to duty, aspiration, and a greater hunger to know and live the truth.

5. *The line of direction.* — A new day shall dawn for religion, when theology shall recognize the true function and scope of Scripture, and shall submit itself, without reservation, to the inductive process. In doing so there will be a setting aside of our *a priori* rubric of theological instruction, and an inductive, experimental study of the religious faculty. A theology thus grounded will pass out upon the broad

tablelands of theological knowledge, namely, the indwelling of God's Spirit, the processes of the upbuilding of spiritual life, a right Christed ethics, God's manifestations of himself everywhere.

6. *Discoveries and effects.*—The reconstructed theology will be most studious and teachable. What man is, and how shall he be saved, will engage its consecrated and concentrated powers. The whole subject of the reciprocal interaction of the seen and unseen worlds will be patiently studied. Research and discovery will be made in the sphere of motive.

This will have a real and a much-to-be-desired effect in theology. Many graven images, which have been wrought out with the holiest intent in the sphere of dogmatics, will be ground to powder. There will be also a sifting of men. Many who are now foremost in dogmatic assertion will drop out of the theological ranks. The places thus made vacant will be filled by men full of earnest endeavor, who are willing to devote their lives to the study and progress of a theology founded upon fact. This theology will change the world.

Dr. Beach, at the expense of much space and labor, has endeavored to expound Romans and Job as notes of warning against narrowness in theology. His conclusions are more ingenious and helpful to his main thesis than true to fact. Paul may have, indeed did discover much of the truth of God by the means of patient "insight," but Romans was not written to illustrate the fact; nor can it be so easily maintained that the "moral" of Job is in its protest against man's dogmatic assertions concerning God.

The main portion of this article is in full sympathy with the present demand for a simple dogmatic. There is not much new material here, but a great deal of creditable feeling. In his avowed effort to emphasize the "factual" in theology, the writer does excellent service to theological science. The chief merit of the article, in our opinion, is not so much in its argument as in its illustration of some strong present tendencies. The writer's view of the scope and function of Scripture, although shocking to the bibliolater, in fact detracts nothing from the value of the Bible. The distinction made between Christ and theories of his person is pregnant with helpful suggestion.

PONTIAC, ILL. ELIPHALET A. READ.

THE BAPTISM OF POLYGAMISTS IN NON-CHRISTIAN LANDS. By S. H. KELLOGG; *Presb. and Reformed Review*, April 1896, pp. 285–302.

THE synod of India in November 1894 discussed this question: Whether, in the case of a Mohammedan or Hindu with more than one wife applying for baptism, he should in all cases, as a condition of baptism, be required to put away all his wives but one. By a vote of 36 to 10 the synod requested the general assembly to leave the ulti-

mate decision of all such cases in India to the synod of India; adding that "it is the almost unanimous opinion of the members of the synod that under some circumstances converts who have more than one wife, together with their entire families, should be baptized." Of thirty-six missionary ladies present all but three agreed with the majority of the synod. The Panjab Missionary Conference, the Madura Mission, and many able and devoted missionaries and uncompromising Christian statesmen of India are cited as supporting this conclusion. It is the object of this paper to set forth the considerations upon which it is defended.

The question at issue is not whether it is ever lawful for a professing Christian to contract a polygamous marriage, but whether in the case of an applicant for baptism in a non-Christian country who, previous to conversion and in good conscience, has contracted polygamous relations, the law of Christ requires him to put away all his wives but one; and whether his refusal to do so would be inconsistent with a credible profession of faith and therefore necessarily a bar to his baptism.

When the *validity* of the polygamous marriage is considered the obligation to put away all his wives but one is not so luminously clear that no sincere Christian can doubt it. It is maintained by the Christian jurists of British India that a polygamous marriage is not nullified by conversion. The husband is bound not only to continue to maintain his wives, but to admit to conjugal rights all who wish to live with him. It does not appear that a Hindu who refuses to defy the law by denying the validity of his marriages may not be a Christian and as such entitled to baptism.

The New Testament principle of the temporary toleration of an admitted evil in the final interests of the highest righteousness is urged, as clearly applicable to polygamy as to slavery. Duty in this case is extremely uncertain. Which of his wives shall the polygamist keep? The ruling of the general assembly, choosing the first, is not a self-evident answer. For the first marriage was probably contracted in infancy or childhood. If it alone is valid to the convert, the church may seem to give moral support to an atrocious system. Further, since the second marriage among the Hindus has commonly been contracted because of the childlessness of the first, the ruling of the assembly would involve in most instances the cruel injustice of putting away a mother and thereby bringing her under the suspicion of unchastity. Even when suitable provision for the support of the discarded wife is made, there is still a serious breach of contract in the refusal of the cohabitation to which she is legally entitled. And how

can a father bring up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord the children whom he has turned out of his house? In answer to the claim that a converted polygamist may be recognized as a Christian but not admitted to the church where his presence would occasion offense, it is held that if he is a Christian he cannot justly be denied baptism and church membership. Thus the lesser wrong must for a time be tolerated to avoid greater wrong.

A scriptural argument for the baptism of polygamous Christians is found in 1 Tim. 3 : 2, which is interpreted: A bishop must not be a man who is living with more than one wife. From the emphasis put upon this qualification for the bishopric is inferred the possible presence in the churches under Timothy's charge of men who were not in the sense intended husbands each of one wife.

Objections to the position of the paper are considered, as that the testimony of the church against polygamy will be neutralized, and that there is danger, if this practice be permitted, of the growth in India of communities of polygamous Christians. Appeal is made finally to the one scriptural condition of church membership, as set forth in the Presbyterian standards, viz., a credible profession of faith and loyalty to Jesus Christ. To this simple and plain condition not one iota must be added from any consideration of supposed prudence and care for the purity of the church.

The surprising approach to unanimity[1] among Christian residents in India, missionaries and laymen, in the positions of this paper is very significant in contrast with the equally unanimous contrary opinion at home. The argument from the legal validity of polygamous marriages in India is strongly put. Churches accustomed to legislate against the use of intoxicating liquors or indulgence in certain amusements by the imposition of pledges as a condition of membership will hardly admit the force of the appeal to the single scriptural condition upon which the argument in the main rests. The scriptural argument from 1 Tim. 3 : 2 based upon a disputed interpretation of a single text is a precarious one.

CHICAGO, ILL. A. K. PARKER.

THE RELIGIOUS LIFE: ITS NATURE AND CLAIMS. By JAMES H. FAIRCHILD, D.D.; *Bibliotheca Sacra*, January 1897, pp. 21–37.

THE religious man is one who calls the religious elements of his nature into activity. We are born with a religious nature; we are

[1] See the *Missionary Review of the World* for February 1897, p. 109, where five missionaries of Japan and ten of China give cogent reasons against receiving polygamists into the churches. G. A.

responsible for its proper exercise; and its proper exercise brings us into conformity with duty. He who makes it his habitual aim to do his duty is accepted by God, even if he knows nothing of God, and when he dies will be received into heaven. It is not affirmed that any ever turn to duty without some conscious reference to God; but the possibility of doing so is maintained. When one turns to duty, he finds himself so weak and so greatly in need of aid to keep his high purpose that he instinctively calls on God in prayer. But the essence of conversion is the turning to duty, and if the man subsequently turns to God, this does not constitute a new moral attitude. He who is truly striving to perform his duty is truly religious. Thus the religious life is strictly natural. The drift of the human soul is not toward sin. If a man is unworthy, he is so not because Adam fell, but because he is untrue to his own higher self. The claims of the religious life grow out of its nature; he who does not lead it fails in duty, is recreant to himself, and becomes subject to his own contempt.

This article states an interesting half-truth and pushes it to an extreme which neither the Bible nor Christian experience justifies.

It presents a low view of sin in its statement that it is not natural to sin. It suggests a definition of sin which will not bear inspection. For a man to sin, it tells us, is "to count himself a brute and to live by mere animal instinct and impulse." But sin exists in full control in men who no longer feel the power of animal instincts and impulses. The aged, who have lost all appetite and passion and ambition, are often completely alienated from God, self-centered, self-willed, and contented with their condition. Those who explain the existence of sin in the human heart by referring it to mere animal passions as yet unsubdued should account for its continued reign after these passions have decayed and disappeared. They should account, still further, for the fact that a much larger percentage of young persons, in whom these passions are strong, begin the religious life than of the aged, in whom they are no longer found.

Presenting a shallow view of sin, the article is consistent in presenting also an inadequate view of regeneration. Or rather, it entirely omits regeneration as an act of the Holy Spirit. The change from the unreligious life to the religious is chiefly the act of man himself. Repentance is repentance toward duty, and not toward God, except as God happens to stand in the same direction with duty. But little place, if any, is found for Christ as a savior from sin. The obligation to turn from sin to duty is an obligation which man owes to himself, and is associated but slightly with the fact that God is his Creator, Benefactor, and Redeemer.

This gospel, which exalts the natural and sees but little of the supernatural, can never win men in general to a life of duty. Men are converted when they are brought into contact with God in Christ, when they recognize the awful character of sin as a revolt against infinite love and holiness, and when they seek power to conquer it from the Being whom it has offended. They have already a sufficient confidence in the natural, and it is of the supernatural that they need to think.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY.

## GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

### ENCYCLOPÆDIA AND METHODOLOGY.

BUCHRUCKER, V. Sammeln und Zerstreuen. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 1–17.

Flugschriften des Evangelischen Bundes. Hrsg. vom Vorstand des Ev. Bundes. 126.–133. Heft. Leipzig, Buchh. d. Ev. Bundes, 1896. Each M. 1.

Orient, Der christliche. Monatsschrift. Hrsg. von JOHS. LEPSIUS. 1. Jahrg., 1897; 12 Hefte, 8vo; Heft 1. Westend-Berlin, Akad. Buchh., W. Faber & Co., 1897; 48 pp. & 1 illustr. Ann. sub. M. 6.

*Theologiae Novitates.* Bibliographie und Rundschau auf dem Gebiete der ev. Theologie u. verwandter Wissensgebiete. Mit Beiblatt: Für Pfarrhaus u. Familie. 2. Jahrg., 1897; 12 Nos., 8vo; No. 1. Leipzig, B. Richter, 1897; 24 + 16 pp. M. 1.60.

Theologisches Jahrbuch auf das Jahr 1897. Hrsg. von P. J. SCHNEIDER. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897. M. 2.40.
Inhalt: Stand der christl.-soc. Bewegung. Kirchliche Gesetzgebung. Personalstatus. Heidenmission. Judenmission. Kirchliche Statistik. Evangelisation. Innere Mission.

### HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

AUDOLENT, A. Bulletin archéologique de la religion romaine (année 1895). *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, XXXIV., 3.

BLANC, E. Histoire de la philosophie, et particulièrement de la philosophie contemporaine. Paris, libr. Vic & Amat.; 656 pp., 8vo. Fr. 3.50.

BRANDT, GUST. Grundlinien der Philosophie von Thomas Hobbes, insbesondere seine Lehre vom Erkennen. Kiel, 1896; 82 pp., 8vo.

BRUNO, GIORDANO. Vom Unendlichen, dem All u. den Welten, verdeutscht u. erläutert von L. KUHLENBECK. Leipzig, A. Warnecke; 210 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

EUCKEN, RUD. Die Lebensanschauungen der grossen Denker. Eine Entwickelungsgeschichte des Lebensproblems der Menschheit von Plato bis zur Gegenwart. Leipzig, Veit & Co.; 492 pp., 8vo. M. 10.

FRASER, A. C. Philosophy of Theism: being the Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Edinburgh, 1895–6. 2d series. New York, C. Scribner's, 304 pp., 8vo. $2.00.

GARDAIR, J. Philosophie de saint-Thomas. La nature humaine. Paris, Lethielleux; 420 pp., 16mo.

HARLEZ, C. DE. La plus ancienne psychologie connue. *Muséon et rev. des relig.*, Jan., 7–21.

HECKER, MAX F. Schopenhauer und die indische Philosophie. Köln, Hübscher & Teufel, 1897; 255 pp., 8vo. M. 3.60.

KAYSERLING, ARTH. Die Idee der Kausalität in den Lehren der Occasionalisten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Cartesianismus. Heidelberg, Weiss' Sortimentsbuchh.; 72 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

Leçons de philosophie néo-scolastique. Rennes, impr. Oberthür; 590 pp., 8vo.

MÉNÉGOZ, E. Un événement théologique (à propos de: Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion, par A. SABATIER.) *Rev. chrét.*, Feb., 81–9.

NIETZSCHE, FRIEDRICH, The Life and Works of. *Book Reviews*, Feb., 284–7.

OTTEN, DR. Der Grundgedanke der cartesianischen Philosophie, aus den Quellen dargestellt. Zum 300-jährigen Geburtsjubiläum Descartes'. Freiburg, Herder, 1897; vii + 143 pp. M. 3.20.

PFLEIDERER, EDMUND. Sokrates und Plato. Tübingen, H. Laupp'sche Buchh., 1897; xv + 921 pp. M. 18.

NOTE.—Only the most important recent literature up to the beginning of March is here given.

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

RAPPOPORT, CH. Zur Charakteristik der Methode und Hauptrichtungen der Philosophie der Geschichte. Inaug.-Diss. Bern, 1896; 106 pp., 8vo.

REICH, E. Die Entwickelung der Religiosität u. das Werk der Religion. 1. Bd.: Die Entwickelung der Religiosität u. das Recht der Religion. Zürich u. Säckingen, Wortmann, 1896; xi + 353 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

REICHE, A. Die künstlerischen Elemente in der Welt- u. Lebens-Anschauung des Gregor von Nyssa. Ein Beitrag zur Philosophie der Patristik. Jena, O. Rassmann, 1897; 60 pp. M. 1.

RITSCHL, O. Nietzsches Welt- und Lebensanschauung in ihrer Entstehung und Entwicklung, dargestellt und beurtheilt. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; vi + 58 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

SABATIER, AUGUSTE. Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion d'après la psychologie et l'histoire. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; xvi + 416 pp. Fr. 7.50.

——— Quelques réflexions sur la philosophie de la religion. *Rev. chrét.*, Nov., 330–41.

WARREN, H. L. Dante Rossetti as a Religious Artist. *New World*, March, 94–117.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ANZOLETTI, L. La croyance au surnaturel et son influence sur le progrès social. Essai historique et religieux. Traduit de l'italien par Mme Louis Vismara, sur la 2e édition, revue et augmentée. Paris et Lyon, libr. Delhomme et Briguet, 1897; xxvii+421 pp.

ARDUIN, A. Revue scientifique: paléontologie philosophique. *L'Université cathol.*, Feb. 15, 267–82.

ARMAND-DELILLE, J. La source de la vie. Méditations matinales (mars–septembre 1871). 2e édition. Paris, Fischbacher, 1896; 12mo. Fr. 3.50.

ARMSTRONG, RICH. A. God and the Soul. London, Philip Green, 1897.

BRUNETIÈRE, F. La renaissance de l'idéalisme. Paris, Firmin-Didot & Cie.; 88 pp., 16mo.

CRAUFURD, A. H. Christian Instincts and Modern Doubt. London, James Clarke & Co., 1897; 8vo. 6s.

FREYBE. Bilder aus der Goetheschen Fausttragödie. *Bew. des Glaub.*, 1897, 3–15; 64–84.

GREY, F. W. Protestants and the Principle of Authority in Religion. *Cathol. Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 141–51.

HOLD, CH. Vernünftiges Denken und katholisches Glauben. Kempten, J. Kosel, 1897, M. 1.80.

JACKSON, A. W. Philosophy and Immortality. *New World*, March, 38–56.

JANET, PAUL. Principes de métaphysique et de psychologie. Leçons professées à la Faculté des lettres de Paris, 1888–1894. 2 vols. Paris, Delagrave; 8vo. Fr. 15.

KAFTAN, JUL. Das Christentum und Nietzsches Herrenmoral. Vortrag. Berlin, G. Nauck, 1897; 24 pp. M. 0.50.

KEITH, GEO. S. A Plea for a Simple Faith. London, Kegan Paul, 1897.

KENDAL, JAMES. Aspects of Pessimism. *Cathol. Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 74–97.

LINDSAY, J. Recent Advances in Theistic Philosophy and Religion. 8vo. 12s. 6d. *net.*

LOWELL, FRANCIS C. God and the Ideal of Man. *New World*, March, 84–94.

MARSHALL, H. R. The Religious Instinct. *Mind*, Jan.

MARTY, A. Was ist Philosophie? Inauguralrede. Prag, J. C. Calve, 1897; 35 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

MAUSS, M. La religion et les origines du droit pénal. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, XXXIV., 3.

New Theistic Speculations, à propos of C. UPTON'S "Lectures on the Bases of Religious Belief." *London Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 270–85.

NIEMIROWER, S. S. Der Zusammenhang von Willensfreiheit, Gewissen, Belohnung und Strafe. Inaug.-Diss. Bern, 1896; iv + 99 pp., 8vo.

PFLEIDERER, OTTO. Religionsphilosophie auf geschichtl. Grundlage. 3. Aufl. Berlin, G. Reimer; 761 pp. M. 12.50.

RÉCÉJAC, E. Essai sur les fondements de la connaissance mystique. Paris. Félix Alcan, 1897; 306 pp., 8vo. Fr. 5.

STEIN, LUDWIG. Die Sozialphilosophie im Zeitalter der Renaissance. *Archiv f. Philosophie*, X., 2.

——— Origine psychique et caractère sociologique de la religion. *Rev. internat. de sociol.*, Jan., 40–64.

STÖCKL, ALB. Der moderne Liberalismus u. dessen atheistischer Charakter. Philosophische Studien, 36 pp. M. 0.50.

Bd. XVII., Heft 7 of "Frankfurter zeitgemässe Broschüren." Neue Folge. Frankfurt a. M., P. Kreuer.

TÄNZER, A. Die Religionsphilosophie Josef Albo's nach seinem Werke "Ikkarim" systematisch dargestellt u. erläutert. Teil I. Inaug.-Diss. Pressburg, 1896; viii + 80 pp., 8vo.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

ABBOTT, EDWIN A. The Spirit on the Waters. The evolution of the divine from the human. New York and London, Macmillan Co., 1897; 8vo. 12s. 6d.

BOURDEAU, L. Le problème de la mort, ses solutions imaginaires et la science positive. 2e édit., revue et augmentée. Paris, Alcan; 362 pp., 8vo. Fr. 5.

BRUNETIÈRE, F. La moralité de la doctrine évolutive. Paris, Firmin-Didot & Cie.

CANZ, W. Giebt es einen lebendigen Gott? Antwort mit Zeugnissen. 1. Bd. Mannheim, 1897; 303 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

DENNERT, E. Die Religion der Naturforscher. Wider eine Lüge des materialist. Sozialismus. 3. Aufl. Breslau, 1897; 8vo. M. 0.20.

Evil and Evolution: an attempt to turn the light of science on the ancient mystery of evil, by the author of "The Social Horizon." New York, The Macmillan Co.; 184 pp., 12mo. $1.50.

FRANKE, J. H. (H. Wortmann). Ueber den Kulturwerth der Religion vom Standpunkte der Kunst. Zürich u. Säckingen, Wortmann, 1896; 64 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

HAACK, E. Christentum und Kultur Schwerin, F. Bahn, 1897. M. 0.50.

HENSLOW, GEO. Christ no Product of Evolution. London, G. Stoneman, 1897.

HOWARD, W. W. The Evolution of the Universe. London, James Nisbet & Co., 1897. 12s. 6d.

HUNT, W. HOLMAN. Religion and Art. *Contemp. Rev.*, Jan., 41–52.

LORENZ, OTTOMAR. Die materialistische Geschichtsauffassung, zum ersten Male systematisch dargestellt und kritisch beleuchtet. Leipzig, Buchh. d. Ev. Bundes, von C. Braun. M. 1.50.

PARTRIDGE, W. O. The Relation of Art to Religion. *Arena*, Dec.

PETERS, RUD. Der Glaube an die Menschheit. Naturwissenschaftlich, psychologisch u. geschichtlich begründet. Stuttgart, J. H. W. Dietz; 280 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

SVOBODA, A. Gestalten des Glaubens. Culturgeschichtliches und Filosofisches. 2. Teil. Leipzig, C. G. Neumann, 1897; iv + 385 pp., 8vo. M. 7.

SMITH, GOLDWIN. Guesses at the Riddle of Existence, and other essays on kindred subjects. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 8vo. 5s.

WRIGHT, G. FR. The Harmony of Science and Revelation. *Hom. Rev.*, March, 206–10.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY.

BERENGER-FERAND, S. J. B. Superstitions et survivances étudiées au point de vue de leur origine et de leur transformations. Paris, libr. Leroux; 555 pp. Fr. 5.

BLOCH, LEO. Der Kult u. die Mysterien von Eleusis. Hamburg, 1897; 8vo. M. 1.

No. 257 of Sammlung gemeinverst. wissenschaftl. Vortrage, hrsg. v. Rud. Virchow u. Wilh. Wattenbach. Neue Folge. 41 pp.

CHARBONNEL, VICTOR. Les mystiques dans la littérature présente. Paris, impr. Marpon, 1897; 207 pp., 16mo. Fr. 3.50.

1e série: Les précurseurs; à la recherche du mysticisme, à travers les chapelles mystiques; croyants ou crédules; mysticisme épars; le jeune idéalisme.

——— Congrès universel des religions en 1900. Histoire d'une idée. Paris, Armand Colin & Cie., 1897; 301 pp., 8vo.

COURBET, P. Nouvelles études sur le christianisme. Necessité scientifique de l'existence de Dieu. Paris, Bloud & Barral; 72 pp., 16mo.

DÜHRING, E. Der Ersatz der Religion durch Vollkommeneres u. die Ausscheidung alles Judäerthums durch den modernen Völkergeist. 2. Aufl. Berlin, Kufahl, 1896; viii + 278 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50; bd., M. 5.50.

HARTLAND, E. S. The Legend of Perseus: a Study of Tradition, Custom and Belief. Vol. 3: Andromeda, Medusa. 1896; 264 pp., 8vo; cloth. 7s. 6d.

MÜLLER, F. MAX. Contributions to the Science of Mythology. New York and London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. 2 vols., 8vo. 32s.

O'NEILL, JOHN. The Night of the Gods. An inquiry into cosmic and cosmogonic mythology and symbolism. Vol. II. Profusely illustrated. London, David Nutt, 1897; 8vo.
Vols. I.–II., £2 12s. 6d.

PHILPOT, J. H. The Sacred Tree; or, the tree in religion and myth. New York and London, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 8vo. 8s. 6d., *net.*

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

BEAMES, JOHN. A Plain Account of Buddhism. II. *Imper. Asiat. Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 144–58.

BROOKS, J. W. Reformed Hinduism. *Hom. Rev.*, Jan., 25–8.

CARUS, PAUL. Philosophy of Buddhism. *Monist*, Jan.

CROOKE, W. Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India. 1897; 2 vols., 8vo. 21s., *net.*

GOTAMO BUDDHO'S Reden aus der mittleren Sammlung Majjhimanikayo des Pali-Kanons. Zum ersten Mal übers. v. KARL EUG. NEUMANN. Bd. I., Lfg. 5; Leipzig, W. Friedrich; pp. 449–568, 8vo. M. 6.

JACKSON, A. V. W. The Moral and Religious Teaching of the Ancient Zoroastrian Religion. *Int. Jour. of Ethics*, Oct.

PASCAL, TH. A. B. C. de la théosophie. Paris, libr. de l'Art indépendant, 1897; 52 pp., 18mo. Fr. 0.50.

PEISSON, Z. Le Confucianisme. *Rev. des relig.*, Sept.–Oct., 439–54.

Pitrmedhasutras (The) of Baudhāyana, Hiranyakesin, Gautama. Edited with critical notes and index of words, by DR. W. CALAND. Reprint. Leipzig, 1897; 8vo. M. 6.

SIMPSON, W. The Buddhist Praying-Wheel: a collection of material bearing upon the symbolism of the wheel and circular movements in custom and religious ritual. New York, The Macmillan Co.; viii + 303 pp., 8vo. $4.

SWAMI VIVEKÂNANDA'S Addresses. No. 1. The Necessity of Religion. 1896; 12 pp., 8vo. 6d.

UTTER, DAVID. Mormonism of Today. *New World*, March, 13–32.

WASSILIEFF, W. Le Bouddhisme dans son plein développement d'après les Vinayas. Trad. du Russe par SYLVAIN LÉVI. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, XXXIV., 3.

## EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

### OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

CROSLEGH, CHARLES. The Bible in the Light of To-day. London, Soc. Prom. Christ. Knowl., 1896; pp. xxvi + 497.

KULDELL, A. G. Der Unterschied zwischen dem alten und neuen Bunde. *Theologische Zeitblatter*, XVI., Jan.

OORT, H. R. G. Moulton's Literary Study of the Bible. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 350–7.

PARDINILLA, M. De la literatura bíblica. Madrid, G. del Amo, 1896; 4to. 5 pes.

PATON, D. K. The Higher Criticism the Greatest Apostasy of the Age. London, Passmore, 1896; 8vo. 1s. 6d.

PÈGUES, R. P. A propos de l'inspiration des livres saints. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 75–83.

The Bible as Literature, by R. G. MOULTON, A. B. BRUCE, H. VAN DYKE, J. M. WHITON, J. F. GENUNG, W. E. GRIFFIS, L. W. BATTEN, A. P. COOK, and others. Introduction by LYMAN ABBOTT, D.D.; 2d ed. New York, T. Y. Crowell & Co., 1897; 12mo, cloth. $1.50.

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

FISCHER, H., u. H. GUTHE. Wandkarte von Palästina zur bibl. Geschichte. Leipzig, H. Wagner & E. Debes, 1896. M. 6.

FROTHINGHAM, A. L., JR. Archæological News. *Am. Jour. of Archæol.*, XI., 3.

GUTHE, H. Eine neue Wandkarte von Palästina. *Mitth. u. Nachr. des Deutsch-Pal. Vereins.*, 1896, 65–71.

ROCKWELL, J. H. The Meaning of Scriptural Numbers. *Cathol. Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 178–96.

TEMME, F. Reise nach Palästina. Reiseeindrücke aus der Schweiz, Italien, Aegypten, der asiatischen und europäischen Türkei. Bonn, 1897; vi + 199 pp., 12mo. M. 1.50.

## THE OLD TESTAMENT.[1]

### GENERAL.

BAUMGARTNER, ANT.-J. L'humour dans l'ancien testament. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, Nov., 497–536.

BROWN, F. Old Testament Problems. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 63–75.

CANTLAY, A. S. Our Sacred Books. Part I. The Old Testament. 1896; 8vo, cloth. 2s. 6d.

GLASBERG, A., and others. Die Beschneidung, in ihrer geschichtl., ethnogr., religiös. und medic. Bedeutung zum 1. Male umfassend dargestellt. Berlin, C. Boas Nachf., 1896. M. 6.

Hebrew Monarchy, a Commentary, with a Harmony of the Parallel Texts and Extracts from the Prophetical Books. Ed. by ANDREW WOOD; Introd. by R. Payne Smith. London, Eyre & S., 1896; 780 pp., 16mo. 21s.

JONES, A. T. The Empires of the Bible from the Confusion of Tongues to the Babylonian Captivity. Battle Creek, Mich., 1897; xvi + 410 pp.; cloth.

LAMBERT, M. Notes exégétiques: Le mot תהלה. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, XXXIII. (65), 140–42.

MONTEFIORE, C. G. The Bible for Home Reading. New York and London, Macmillan & Co., 1896; xviii + 621 pp., 8vo.

SANDERS, FR. K. The Literature of the Hebrews. *Progress*, II., 3, Nov., 137–51.

### GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRADLEY, J. R. Baruch the Son of Neria. *Seminary Mag.*, Jan., 166–70.

CHEYNE, T. K. Professor Hommel on Arphaxad. *Expositor*, Feb., 145–8.

*Cf.* HOMMEL, *Expos. Times*, March, 283.

GRÄTZ, H. Geschichte der Juden. Billige Lieferungsausgabe in 60 Lfgn. à M. 0.20. Leipzig, O. Leiner, 1896.

HALÉVY, J. Israël dans une inscription égyptienne. *Rev. sém.*, 1896, 285–7.

KASTEREN, J.-P. VAN. Notes de géographie biblique. Dalmanutha, Magadan, Mageth — Doch. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 93–104.

KIRK, TH. Saul, First King of Israel. Edinburgh, A. Elliot, 1896; 8vo. 3s. 6d.

LAGRANGE, M. J. Le Sinai. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 107–30.

MEYER, EDUARD. Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine historische Untersuchung. Halle, Max Niemeyer, 1896; viii + 244 pp. and a map. M. 6.

MOLANDRE, A. Le nom d'Israel, d'après une inscription hiéroglyphique. *Rev. des relig.*, Sept.–Oct., 415–21.

PERCY, ALGERNON HEBER. Moab, Ammon and Gilead. With illustrations and a map. London, Simpkin, 1896; 110 pp., 8vo. 6s.

POLLARD, JOSEPH. The Land of the Monuments: Egypt. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1896; xx + 456 pp., with illustrations, 8vo.

SCHALIN, ZACH. Der Aufenthalt der Israeliten in Aegypten nach Gen. 15:13–16 u. Exod. 12:40, 41. Helsingfors, 1896; 88 pp., 8vo.

SCHÜRER, EMIL. Der Kalender u. die Aera von Gaza. *Sitzb. Berl. Akad.*, 1896, XL., XLI.

SMITH, GEO. A. Buhl's New Geography of Palestine and Certain Geographical Problems. *Expositor*, Dec., 401–13.

SPIEGELBERG, W. Der Siegeshymnus des Merneptah. *Zeitschr. f. agypt. Spr. u. Altertumskde.*, XXXIV., 1, 1896, 1–25.

WRIGHT, T. F. King David's Stone Stairway. *American Antiquarian*, Nov.-Dec., 1896, 324.

WRIGHT, WILLIAM. Hermon. *Expositor*, Nov., 351–9.

———. The Homeland of Jesus. *Ibid.*, Dec., 461–69.

### LANGUAGE.

ADLER, M. The Elements of Hebrew Grammar. With exercises. London, David Nutt, 1897; 8vo. 1s.

BEECHER, W. J. Hebrew Word Studies: *Sekel, Maschil. Hom. Rev.*, March, 261–2.

GRAY, G. B. Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. London, Black, 1896; 354 pp., 8vo, cloth. 7s. 6d.

[1] A bibliography of receht publications in the field of Semitic Philology and Literature, as well as on Rabbinical and Talmudical Subjects is found in each number of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, published by The University of Chicago.

LAMBERT, M. De la vocalisation des *Ségolés*. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, XXXIII. (65), 18–23.

——— Une hypothèse sur la longueur des lignes dans les anciens Manuscrits de la Bible. *Ibid.*, Oct.-Dec., 305–6.

LÉVI, I. Manuel de lecture hébraïque. Paris, Durlacher; 22 pp., 8vo. Fr. 0.60.

PERLES, F. Zur althebräischen Strophik. [Aus: *Wiener Zeitschr. f. Kunde des Morgenl.*] 1896; 14 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

SCHILLING, D. Methodus practica discendi ac docendi linguam hebraïcam; accedit anthologia cum vocabulario. Paris, Mersch, 1897; xii + 182 pp., 8vo.

STRACK, H. L. Hebräische Grammatik mit Uebungsbuch. 6th edition. Berlin, 1897; xvi, 152, 116 pp., 8vo; cloth. 4s.

WIYNKOOP, J. D. A Hebrew Syntax, translated from the Dutch by C. van den Biesen. London, Luzac & Co., 1896.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

BAENTSCH, B. Geschichtsconstruction od. Wissenschaft? iv + 50 pp., 8vo.
Ein Wort zur Verständig. üb. d. Wellhausensche Geschichtsauffassg., in besond. Beziehg. auf d. vorprophet. Stufe der Religion Israels u. die religionsgeschichtl. Stellg. Davids.
Halle, J. Krause, 1896; M. 1.

BARNES, W. E. The Religious Standpoint of the Chronicler. *Am. Jour. of Sem. Lang. and Lit.*, XIII., 14–20.

BEECHER, W. J. The Alleged Triple Canon of the Old Testament. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 118–29.

BEYER, TH. Das Alte Testament im Lichte des Zeugnisses Christi; Vortrag. Berlin, Wiegandt & Grieben, 1897; 48 pp., 8vo.

BURTON, JOHN. Criticism and Deuteronomy. *Queen's Quarterly*, 1897, IV., 3, 203–9.

DALE, R. W. The Place of Abraham in Religious History. *Expositor*, Nov., 338–50.

DRIVER, S. R. Sargon of Akkad and his Critics. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 240.

DUHM, BERNHARD. Die Entstehung des Alten Testamentes. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 8vo. M. 0.60.

FINK, D. Glaube u. Kritik. Ein offenes Wort zur Verständig. an alle Bibelverehrer u. zugl. e. solches der Entgegng. auf die Schrift: "Jesus u. d. A. T." v. J. Meinhold. Leipzig, Haacke, 1897; iii + v + 121 pp., 8vo. M. 2.50.

GANDER, M. Die Sündflut in ihrer Bedeutung für die Erdgeschichte. Versuch e. Ausgleiches zw. Bibel u. Geologie. Münster, Aschendorff; 109 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

GAUCHER, E. M. Essai sur les six jours de la création; leur symbolisme; le paradis terrestre, d'après les SS. Pères et la science, précedés d'une thèse sur l'écriture sainte en général. Paris, Impr. Fontaine, à l'œuvre des orphelins-apprentis, 40 rue la Fontaine, 1897; xxix + 135 pp., 8vo. Fr. 2.

KITTEL, RUD. Die Anfänge der hebraischen Geschichtsschreibung im Alten Testament. Rektoratsrede. Leipzig, 1896; 26 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

KLOSTERMANN, A. Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs. I. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 48–77.

KOBERLE, J. De Elohistæ Pentateuchici prioris, qui vocatur, ethica. Erlangen, 1896; 98 pp., 8vo.

KÖNIG, E. The Linguistic History of the Old Testament, and Maurice Verne's Dating of the Documents. *Expositor*, Jan., 59–68.

MCCURDY, J. F. Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries. Arabia in the Old Testament. *Hom. Rev.*, Feb., 124–6.

MACDILL, D. The Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch defended against the views and arguments of Voltaire, Paine, Colenso, Reuss, Graf, Kuenen, and Wellhausen. Dayton, O.; 275 pp. $2.00.

MÜLLER, A. Das Alte Testament im Lichte der neuesten assyrisch-babylonischen Entdeckungen. Frankfurt, 1896; 30 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

OSGOOD, HOWARD. Was Astruc a bad man? *Expos. Times*, Dec., 141.

RIEBER, J. Über Flutsagen und deren Beziehung zu den semitischen Flutberichten. *Katholik*, 1897, 65–87.

RUPPRECHT, ED. Des Rätsels Lösung, oder Beiträge zur richtigen Lösung des Pentateuchrätsels f. den christl. Glauben u. die Wissenschaft. 2. Abtlg.: Erweis der Echtheit des Pentateuch f. die Wissenschaft. 2. Hälfte (Schluss). Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; iv + 458 pp., 8vo. M. 5; bd., M. 6.

SAYCE, A. H. The Biblical Critics on the War-path. *Contemp. Rev.*, Nov., 728–36.

SCHMIDT, N. Was בר נשׁא a Messianic Title? *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 36–54.

SCHÖPFER, A. Bibel und Wissenschaft. Grundsätze und deren Anwendung auf die Probleme der bibl. Urgeschichte: Hexaëmeron, Sintflut, Volkertafel, Sprachverwirrung. Brixen, 1897; viii + 280 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

SCHUMANN, G. Die Wellhausen'sche Pentateuchtheorie, in ihrem Grundwesen dargestellt und auf ihre Haltbarkeit geprüft. Karlsruhe, J. J. Reiff. M. 1.20.

VOLZ, P. Die vorexilische Jahweprophetie und der Messias. In ihrem Verhältniss dargestellt. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; viii + 93 pp., 8vo. M. 2.80.

ZOCKLER, O. Deutsche Streiter wider die alttestamentliche Radikalkritik. I. *Bew. des Glaub.*, Dec., 485–95; II., *ibid.*, Jan., 1897, 28–39.

THEOLOGY.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, P. The Prophecies of Jesus Christ relating to his Death, Resurrection, and Second Coming. Translated by Neil Buchanan. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1897; 340 pp., 8vo. 5s.

THE LAW.

DAWSON, J. W. The Historical Relation of the Book of Genesis to the Exodus from Egypt. *Hom. Rev.*, Jan., 9–20.

HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques: Histoire du retour de Jacob depuis son départ de Galaad jusqu'à la mort d'Isaac. *Rev. sém.*, 1896, 193–225.

——— Recherches bibliques. La descende des Israélites en Egypte jusqu'à la mort de Joseph. Gen., chs. 46–50. *ibid.*, 1857, 1–24.

HAUPT, PAUL. The beginning of the Judaic Account of Creation. *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, XVII., *Proc.*, 158.

KENNEDY, A. R. S. The Fasting of Moses. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 154.

MARGOLIOUTH, G. Moses at the Battle of Rephidim. Exodus 17:8–13. *Expositor*, Feb., 119–28.

PETERS, J. P. Notes on the Old Testament. I. The Site of the Tower of Babel: Gen. 11: 1–9. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 106–9.

WRIGHT, C. H. H. The Book of Genesis in Hebrew. New ed. London, Williams & Norgate, 1896; 8vo. 3s. 6d.

THE PROPHETS.

BETTERIDGE, W. R. The Predictive Element in Old Testament Prophecy. *Bibl. Sacra*, Jan., 50–66.

Cambridge Bible: Isaiah, chs. 1–39. By J. SKINNER. 4s.

CHEYNE, T. K. Notes on Nahum 2: 8. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 198.

——— Notes on Obscure Passages in the Prophets. *Expositor*, Jan., 41–51.
On G. A. Smith's Interpretation of Amos 5: 26; 9: 7–15; Hos. 6: 7–11; Nah. 2: 7; Isa. 9: 19 (Heb. 18); Isa. 10: 4.

COBB, W. H. The Ode in Isaiah XIV. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 18–36.

DAVIDSON, A. B. The Books of Nahum, Habakkuk, and Zephaniah. With introduction and notes. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1896; 144 pp., 8vo. 3s.

LOFTMAN, K. Ofversattning och kommentar till profeten Hoseas bok. Linköping, 1896; viii + 239 pp., 8vo.

MACMILLAN, HUGH. By Hook or by Crook. 1 Sam. 2: 13. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 214–5.

MOORE, DUNLOP. Have we in 1 Sam. 2: 22 a valid witness to the existence of the Mosaic Tabernacle in the days of Eli? *Expos. Times*, Dec., 139–41.

PATON, L. B. Notes on Hosea's Marriage. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 9–18.

PETRIE, FLINDERS. The Period of the Judges. *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1896, 243–9.

SAYCE, A. H. Archæological Commentary on Genesis, ch. x. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 180–2; March, 256–9.

SKINNER, M. M. הַעֲלִיָּה 1 Sam. 9: 24. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 82–87.

SMITH, H. P. The Sources E and J in the Books of Samuel. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 1–9.

STREANE, A. W. The double text of Jeremiah, Massoretic and Alexandrian, compared together with an appendix on the Old Latin evidence. London, G. Bell & Sons, 1896; 384 pp., 8vo. 6s.

THOMAS, JOHN. "Double for all her sins:" a critical exposition. Isa. 40: 1; Job 11: 6. *Expositor*, Nov., 370–80.

TORREY, C. C. Notes on Amos 2: 7; 6: 10; 8: 3; 9: 8–10. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 151–5.

TOY, C. H. Text-critical Notes on Ezekiel. *Ibid.*, XV., 54–9.

TOUZARD, M. De la conservation du texte hébreu; étude sur Isaïe xxxvi–xxxix. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 31–48.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BARNES, W. E. The Midrashic Element in Chronicles. *Expositor*, Dec., 426–39.

BUDDE, K. Das Buch Hiob. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1896; liv + 256 pp. M. 6.
Handkommentar z. A. T., hrsg.v. W. NOWACK. — II., 1.

Also see *Expos. Times*, Dec., 111–12.

——— Psalm 101. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 202–4.

CHEYNE, T. K. Notes on Psalm 22:25. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 198.

——— Textual Criticism of the Psalms. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 236–7.

Book of Job. With designs by HERBERT G. FELL. With an Introduction by J. Jacobs. London, Dent. 4to. 12s. 6d.

HALÉVY, J. Notes pour l'interprétation des psaumes; suite; ps. 58–65; 74–76. *Rev. sém.*, 1896, 225–44; 1897, 24–35.

JASTROW, MORRIS. On Ruth 2:8. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 59–63.

Book of Ruth. Pictured and designed by W. B. MACDOUGALL. With an Introduction by E. Rhys. Dent. 4to. 12s. 6d.

MAYSTRE, L. La morale de l'ecclésiaste. Genève, 1896; 64 pp., 8vo.

MOOR, FL. DE. Le livre d'Esther; un épisode du règne de Xerxès Ier (suite). *La science cathol.*, Oct. 15.

MOORE, G. F. Daniel 8:9–14. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 193–8.

PETERS, J. P. Notes on the Old Testament. 2. The Three Children in the Fiery Furnace, Dan. 3; Jer. 29:22. 3. The Nebuchadrezzars of Daniel. *Ibid.*, XV., 109–17.

PFEIFFER, R. Die religiös-sittliche Weltanschauung des Buches der Sprüche in ihrem inneren Zusammenhange dargestellt. München, C. H. Beck, 1896; viii + 264 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

Psalms. Exposition by REV. G. RAWLINSON. Homiletics by REV. E. R. CONDER, D.D.; Homilies by various authors. 3 vols. London, Trübner & Co., 1896; 8vo. 10s. 6d.

RODEMEYER, A. Beispiele u. Aphorismen zu den Psalmen. Leipzig, Riehm, 1896; xxiv + 407 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

WRIGHT, J. F. Nehemiah's Night Ride. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 129–35.

ZENNER, J. K. Die Chorgesange im Buche der Psalmen. Ihre Existenz und ihre Form; in 2 Teilen. Freiburg i. B. and St. Louis, Herder'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897; xiv + 164 pp. M. 10-
1. Prolegomena, Uebersetzungen und Erläuterungen mit einem Titelbilde: Die Sängerriegen des ersten Tempels nach Kosmas Indicopleustes (Cod. Vat. graec. 699); vii + 92 pp. — 2. Texte; v + 71 pp.

THE APOCRYPHA.

BÜCHLER, ADOLF. Das apokryphische Esrabuch. Schluss. *Mon. f. Gesch. u. Wiss. des Judenthums*, Dec.

COWLEY, A. E., and AD. NEUBAUER. The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus (chaps. 39:15—49, 11), together with the early versions and an English translation. Followed by the quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1897; with two facsimiles; 4to. 10s. 6d.

GASTER, DR. Two Unknown Hebrew Versions of the Tobit Legend. I. *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, XVIII., 208–22; 259–71; XIX., 27–38.

KEEL, L. Sirach. Das Buch von der Weisheit, verfasst von Jesus, dem Sohne Sirach's, erklart f. das christliche Volk. Kempten, Kofel, 1896; iv + 373 pp., 8vo. M. 4.

LÉVI, ISR. I. Encore un mot sur les dix-huit bénédictions. II. L'origine davidique de Hillel. III. Une falsification dans la lettre de Maimonide aux juifs du Yémen. *Rev. des ét juiv.*, XXXIII. (65), 142–7.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

BÜCHLER, ADOLF. The Sources of Josephus for the History of Syria. *Jew. Quar. Rev.*, 1897, 34–49.

HORT, F. J. A. A Criticism of Dr. Hatch's "Essays in Biblical Greek." *Expositor*, Feb., 81–96; March, 178–84.

IOSEPHI, F. Antiquitatum iudaicarum epitoma, edidit B. NIESE. Berlin, Weidmann, 1896; x + 369 pp., 4to. M. 15.

NIESE, B. Flavii Josephi epitomæ adhuc ineditæ pars nona. Marburg; 48 pp., 4to.

PHILONIS Alexandrini opera quæ supersunt. Recognoverunt L. Cohn et P. Wendland. Ed. minor. Vol. I., Recognovit COHN. Berlin, G. Reimer, 1896; x + 280 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### GENERAL.

GUTJAHR, F. S. Einleitung zu den hl. Schriften des Neuen Testamentes. Leitfaden zunächst für Studierende der Theologie. Graz, Styria, 1896; x + 315 pp., 8vo. M. 5.40.

PEYTON, W. W. Vicarious Heredity: a Reading of the Child Massacre in Bethlehem. *Expositor*, Dec., 440–61.

### GRAMMAR AND TEXT.

BALJON, J. M. S. Grieksch-theologisch Woordenboek, hoofdzakelijk van de oudchristelijke letterkunde. Dl. I. A–I. Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon, 1896; viii + 936, 63 + 2 pp., 8vo. Bd., fr. 10.75.

BECKWITH, I. T. The Articular Infinitive with *els*. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV. 155–68.

MOULTON, JAMES HOPE. A First Reader in New Testament Greek. London, Kelly, 1896; viii + 40 pp., 12mo. 6d.

NESTLE, E. Etymologische Legenden. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 40, 148–9. Additions to "Philologica Sacra."

——— The Last Word of the Bible. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 190–1.

Novi Testamenti Græci supplementum editionibus de-Gebhardt-Tischendorfianis accommodavit EBERHARDUS NESTLE.

Insunt: Codicis Cantabrigiensis collatio; evangeliorum deperditorum fragmenta; dicta salvatoris agrapha; alia.

Leipzig, Tauchnitz, 1896; 8vo. M. 0.75.

Testamentum, Novum, græce. Recensuit C. DE TISCHENDORF. Ed. XIV. ad ed. VIII. majorem compluribus locis emendatam conformata. Leipzig, B. Tauchnitz, 1896; xxx + 437 pp., 8vo. M. 2.70.

VOTAW, CLYDE W. The Use of the Infinitive in Biblical Greek. Inaug.-Diss. Chicago, 1896; 59 pp., 8vo.

WEISS, B. Die paulinischen Briefe im berichtigtem Text. Mit kurzer Erlauterg., zum Handgebrauch bei der Schriftlektüre. (Aus: W., "Das Neue Test.") Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1896; v + 682 pp., 8vo. M. 12.50.

### LIFE OF CHRIST.

BRUINS, SR., J. A. De Christus naar de Evangeliën. Amsterdam, van Holkema & Warendorf, 1896; viii + 148 pp., 8vo. Fr. 1.50.

BURTON, HENRY. The Son of Man. *Expositor*, Nov., 388–400.

CHADWICK, G. A. The Mind of the Master. *Ibid.*, Jan., 1–16.

CONNOR, DAVID. The Historical Jesus and the Christs of Faith. *Contemp. Rev.*, Sept., 365–76.

GEIKIE, CUNNINGHAM. The Date of Christ's Birth. *Hom. Rev.*, Dec., 493–7.

GERHARD, C. S. The Ever-living Christ. *Ref. Church Rev.*, Jan., 74–84.

GOLIZIA, B. Gesù Cristo. Assisi, Stab. Metastasio, 1896; 8vo. L. 1.25.

HANSEN, J. J. Betrachtungen über das Leben Christi vom hl. Bonaventura, ins Deutsche übertragen. Paderborn, Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1896; 264 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

HOWATT, J. R. Jesus the Poet: Brief Readings on the Metaphors and Similes uttered by Our Lord in the Gospels. London, E. Stock, 1896; 292 pp., 8vo. 6s.

MASON, A. J. The Conditions of Our Lord's Life on Earth. Five lectures. London, Longmans, 1896; 218 pp., 8vo. 5s.

MEDLEY, E. A Conception of Christ suggested to a Heathen Inquirer by Paul's Earliest Extant Writing: a study of 1 Thessalonians. *Expositor*, Nov., 359–70.

PENTECOST, GEORGE F. The Birth and Boyhood of Jesus. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1896; viii + 399 pp., 8vo. 6s.

PETERS, J. P. Christ's Treatment of the Old Testament. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 87–106.

REVILLE, ALBERT. Jésus de Nazareth: études critiques sur les antécédents de l'histoire évangelique et la vie de Jésus. 2 vols. Paris, Librairie Fischbacher, 1897; x + 500 + 522 pp., 8vo.

ROBSON, JOHN, *et al.* The Homelessness of Christ. St. Matthew 8: 19–20. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 221–6.

SAVIN, TH. P. The Transfiguring of the Cross; or, The Trial and Triumph of the Son of Man; a series of sermons. Troy, N. Y., Brewster & Packard, 1896; viii + 240 pp., 12mo.

SCHMIDT, H. Zur Lehre von der Person Christi. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 972–1005.

STAPFER, EDM. Première activité de Jésus. *Rev. chrét.*, Nov., 342–50.

Supremacy and Sufficiency of Jesus Christ as set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews. By IGNOTUS. London, W. Blackwood, 1896; 232 pp., 8vo. 3s. 6d.

TISSOT, J. JAMES. La vie de Notre-Seigneur Jésus-Christ. 365 compositions d'après les quatre évangiles, avec des notes et des dessins explicatifs. T. 1er, Tours, Mamé, 1896; 272 pp., 4to.

APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

CHASTAND, G. Un agitateur social. Jean Baptiste. *Rev. chrét.*, Feb., 90–102.

COBB, S. H. The Fellowship of Goods in the Apostolic Church. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VIII., 17–34.

NESTLE, EBERH. St. Paul's Handicraft. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 153–4.

SEEBOCK. S. Paulus, der Heidenapostel. Nach neuen Quellen u. archäolog. Forschungen dargestellt. Paderborn, Schöningh, 1896; vii + 240 pp. M. 4.50.

SCHNELLER, L. In alle Welt! Auf den Spuren des Apostels Paulus von Antiochia bis Rom. 1–3 Aufl. Leipzig, Wallmann, 1896; 544 pp. with illustrations and 3 maps; 8vo. M. 5.40.

STOSCH, GEO. St. Paulus, der Apostel. 2. Aufl. Berlin-Westend, Verlag der Akad. Buchh., W. Faber & Co., 1897; vi + 210 pp., 8vo. Bd., M. 3.75.

——— Paulus als Typus f. die evangelische Mission. Vortrag. (Aus: *Allg. Missions-Zeitschr.*) Berlin, Warneck, 1896; 28 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

BADHAM, F. P. The Integrity of Luke i: 5–ii. *Expos. Times*, Dec., 116–9.

BECKER, W. Anmerkungen zu ausgewählten Stellen des Neuen Testaments. Friedenau–Berlin, Buchh. d. Gossner'schen Mission, 1896; 48 pp. M. 0.60.

BELSER. Der Tag des letzten Abendmahls u. des Todes Jesu. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896, 529–70.

BLASS, Fr. Savonarola und unsere Evangelisten. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschrift*, VII., 964–71.

BUISSON, T. C. DU. The Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark, and its Relation to the other Synoptists. The Ellerton Essay, 1896. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896.

BURGON, WILLIAM. The Causes of the Corruption of the Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels. Arranged, completed, and edited by EDWARD MILLER. New York, Macmillan Co., 1896; 304 pp., 8vo., cloth. $2.50.

CLEMEN, CARL. Die Reihenfolge der paulinischen Hauptbriefe. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 219–70.

CORSSEN, P. Monarchianische Prologe zu den vier Evangelien. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Kanons. Hinrichs'sche Buchh., Leipzig, 1896; iv + 88 pp. M. 4.50.

ERMONI, V. Le noyau primitif des évangiles synoptiques. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 83–93.

HINKS, E. Y. The Meaning of the Phrase τὰ στοιχεῖα τοῦ κόσμου in Gal. 4:3 and Col. 2:8. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 183–93.

HOFMANN, R. Galiläa auf dem Oelberg, wohin Jesus seine Jünger nach der Auferstehung beschied. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1896; 53 pp., 8vo. M. 1.
Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der vermeintl. Widersprüche in d. evg. Berichten v. d. Erscheinungen des Auferstandenen.

NOSGEN, F. Die Genugsamkeit und Vielseitigkeit des neutestamentlichen Kanons. Vortrag. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1896; 40 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

RAMSAY, W. M. New Light on the Book of Acts in "Recent Research in Bible Lands," etc., edited by HILPRECHT. Philadelphia, J. D. Wattles & Co., 1896.

WEISS, B. Das Neue Testament. Textkritische Untersuchungen und Textherstellung. II. Thl.: Die Paulinischen Briefe einschliesslich des Hebräerbriefes. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1896; iii, v + 161 & v + 682 pp., 8vo. M. 18.

SCHAEFER, C. G. R. De quatuor quæ in novo testamento de cœna domini extant relationum natura ac indole. Königsberg, 1896; 40 pp., 8vo.

SPLITTGERBER, A. Die Stellung Christi zum Alten Testamente: ein Spiegelbild für die moderne Kritik. *Kirchl. Monatsschr.*, XVII., Heft 3.

WILKINSON, J. H. Note on the Meaning of the Word αἰώνιος. *Expositor*, Jan., 78–80.

WUTTIG, O. Das Johanneische Evangelium u. seine Abfassungszeit. Andeutungen zu e. veränderten Datierg. des 4. Evg. Leipzig, Deichert, 1896; iv + 134 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

THEOLOGY.

BEET, J. A. Christian Perfection. 1. The Word "Perfect" in the New Testament. *Expositor*, Jan., 30–41; 2. Other New Testament Teaching, *ibid.*, Feb., 134–45; 3. The Teaching of Wesley, *ibid.*, March, 211–22.

BURR, E. F. Aleph the Chaldean; or the Messiah as seen from Alexandria. 1896; 414 pp., 8vo; cloth. 3s. 6d.

BORNEMANN, J. Die Taufe Christi durch Johannes in der dogmatischen Beurteilung der christlichen Theologen der vier ersten Jahrhunderte. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchh., Leipzig, 1896; iv + 88 pp. M. 2.40.

CASPARI. Der *Descensus Christi ad inferos*. *Halte, was du hast*, XX., 2, 1896, 53–66.

GENZMER, E. M. Entwickelung des biblischen Begriffes σάρξ. *Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, XX., 4, 1896.

SCHULZE, M. Die Religion Jesu u. der Glaube an Christus. Halle, Krause, 1896; v + 77 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

TEICHMANN, E. Die Paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht u. ihre Beziehung zur judischen Apokalyptik. Freiburg, I. C. B. Mohr, 1896; vii + 125 pp., 8vo. M. 2.50.

VOIGT, A. G. The Historical Mission of the Holy Spirit. *Luth. Church Rev.*, Jan., 15–33.

VOLLERT, W. Die Bedeutung der Himmelfahrt Christi für die Kirche und für den einzelnen Glaubigen. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VII., 937–65.

WESTPHAHL, A. De la valeur réligieuse de la notion biblique du péché. *Rev. de théol. et des quest. rel.*, 1897, 22–44.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

BARBIER, E. Les récits de l'évangile. Paris, Oudin, 1896; 284 pp., 16mo.

BRUCE, A. B. On Matt. 8:20. See *Expos. Times*, Dec., 97–8.

CARTER, G. The Gospel according to St. Luke. London, Rolfe, 1896; 186 pp., 8vo. 1s. 6d.

DRUMMOND, ROBERT J. The Destroyer of Soul and Body. Matt. 10:28. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 191–2.

EBERHARDT, M. Ev. Joh. c. 21. Ein exegetischer Versuch als Beitrag zur Johanneischen Frage. Leipzig, Dürr, 1896; 83 pp., 8vo. M. 1.80.

Great Text Commentary. The Great Texts of St. John's Gospel. John 8:12; 8:31, 32; 9:4. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 163–6; Feb., 216–8; March, 260–2.

GREGORY, D. S. Mark, the Gospel for the Roman. *Hom. Rev.*, Dec., 536–41.

——— Luke, the Gospel for the Greek. *Ibid.*, Jan., 67–72.

——— John, the Gospel for the Christian. *Ibid.*, Feb., 165–71.

HENDERSON, ARCH. James 4:4–6. *Expos. Times*, Dec., 141.

LOISY, A. Les évangiles synoptiques. (3e article.) *Rev. des relig.*, Sept.–Oct., 385–414.

MARTIN, G. CURRIE. Know no Despair. Luke 6:35. *Expos. Times*, Dec., 141.

NESTLE, EBERH. Genesis 25:22 and Luke 1:41. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 237.

——— Rest and Comfort. Luke 16, 25. *Ibid.*, 239–40.

REDPATH, HENRY A. St. Luke in the International Critical Commentary. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 218–20.

RISNER, H. G. Exegesis of John 6:53–6. *Seminary Magazine*, Jan., 187–92.

ROPES, J. H. Acts 15:21. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 75–82.

SMITH, J. G. MOORE. Notes on the Gospel of St. Luke. London, H. Frowde, 1896.

SMITH, W. T. Matthew 5:14. *Expos. Times*, Dec., 138.

WHITEFOORD, B. Aside from the Multitude; a study in St. Mark 7:33. *Expositor*, Nov., 380–7.

WHITNEY, S. W. How should the Last Clause of Luke 7:45 read? *Hom. Rev.*, Dec., 535–6.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

D., M. Misused Scripture Texts: 1 Cor. 12:3; 13:13. *Expos. Times*, Dec., 142; Jan., 191.

GOEBEL, SIEGFRIED. Neutestam. Schriften, griechisch mit kurzer Erklärung. 1. Folge: die ältern Briefe des Paulus. 2. Aufl. Gotha, Perthes, 1896. M. 7.

HILGENFELD, A. Die Hirtenbriefe des Paulus neu untersucht. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 40, 1–86.

Kommentar, kritisch-exegetischer, üb. das Neue Testament, begründet v. H. A.W. MEYER. 12. Abth. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; 8vo. M. 6.
Die Briefe Petri u. Judas. Von der 5. Aufl. neubearb. v. E. KÜHL. 6. Aufl., 463 pp.

MATHESON, G. St. John's View of the Sabbath Rest. Rev. 1:10. *Expositor*, Jan., 51–9.

——— Liberty of the Tree of Life. Rev. 2:7. *Ibid.*, Feb., 96–105.

MATTHEW, JAMES. Hebrews 12:2. *Expos. Times*, Feb., 238.

NIEMANN, RUDOLF. Gedankengang und Gliederung von Römer 1:18—3:20. Gymnas. Programm, Waren, 1896; 25 pp., 4to.

SCHLEIERMACHER, D. E. D. Über den 1. Brief Pauli an Timotheus. Ein kritisches Sendschreiben an J. C. Gass. iv + 126 pp. M. 1.

Vol. VI. of Reuter's theologische Klassikerbibliothek. Braunschweig, 1897. G. Reuter, 8vo.

SPITTA, FR. Der Brief des Jacobus, untersucht. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896. M. 7.

## EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

### LITERATURE AND HISTORY.

The Ante-Nicene Fathers. New Volumes, New York, Christian Literature Co., 1896; 540 pp., 8vo. $4.00.

Contains: ARMITAGE ROBINSON: The Gospel of Peter.
ANDREW RUTHERFORD: The Apocalypse of Peter; the *visio Pauli;* the Apocalypses of the Virgin and Sedrach.
WM. A. CRAIGIE: The Testament of Abraham; the Acts of Xanthippe and Polyxena; the Narrative of Zosimus.
HOPE W. HOGG: The Diatessaron of Tatian.
D. M. KAY: The Apology of Aristides.
JOHN KEITH: The Epistles of Clement.
JOHN PATRICK and ALLAN MENZIES: Origen's Commentary on Matthew and John.

BATTIFOL, M. Homélie inédite d'Origène sur Daniel et l'Antéchrist. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 5–27.

DIETERICH, A. Die Grabschrift des Aberkios erklärt. Leipzig, Teubner, 1896; vii + 55 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

EPHRAEM SYRUS. Dissertation on the Gospel Commentary; with a Scriptural Index to his Works by REV. J. H. HILL. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1896; 177 pp., 8vo., cloth. $2.00.

GWATKIN, H. M. Irenæus on the Fourth Gospel. *Contemporary Review*, Feb., 220–6.

HARNACK, A. Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius. 2. Thl. Die Chronologie. 1. Bd.

Die Chronologie der Litteratur bis Irenäus, nebst einleit. Untersuchungen.

Leipzig, Hinrich's Verlag, 1897; xvi + 732 pp., 8vo. M. 25; bd., M. 28.

JACKSON, HENRY. Notes on Clement of Alexandria. *Jour. of Phil.*, XXIV., 263–71.

KLEFFNER, ANT. IGN. Porphyrius, der Neuplatoniker und Christenfeind. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der literar. Bekämpfung des Christenthums in alter Zeit. Paderborn, Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1896; iv + 98 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

KUTTER, H. Clemens Alexandrinus u das Neue Testament. Eine Untersuchung. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1897. M. 3.60.

PISTIS, SOPHIA. A Gnostic Gospel (with Extracts from the Books of the Saviour Appended). Originally translated from Greek into Coptic, and now for the first time Englished from Schwartze's Latin Version of the only known Coptic MS., and checked by Amelineau's French Version. With an Introduction by G. R. S. MEAD. London, Theosophical Publishing Society, 1896; 438 pp., 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Herausgegeben von Osc. v. Gebhardt u. Adf. Harnack. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchh., 1896–7; 8vo.

X, 5. Ausserkanonische Paralleltexte zu den Evangelien. Gesammelt und untersucht v. ALFR. RESCH. 5. Heft: Das Kindheitsevangelium nach Lucas und Matthaeus. Unter Herbeiziehg. der ausserkanon. Paralleltexte quellenkritisch untersucht. iv + 336 pp. M. 6.50.

XVI, 1 (= neue Folge I, 1) Die *sacra parallela* des Johannes Damascenus v. PRIV.-DOC. LIC. DR. KARL HOLL; xiv + 392 pp. M. 12.

### ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

ANDREWS, W. Antiquities and Curiosities of the Church. London, W. Andrews, 1896; 8vo. 7s. 6d.

DANIELL, A. E. London City Churches. With numerous illustr. by Leonhard Martin, and a Map showing the Position of the Churches. London, A. Constable, 1896; vi + 394 pp., 8vo. 6s.

DETZEL, H. Christliche Ikonographie. Ein Handbuch z. Verständnis der christl. Kunst. 2. (Schluss) Bd.: Die bildlichen Darstellungen der Heiligen. Mit 318 Abbildungen. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1896; xviii + 708 pp., 8vo. M. 9; bd., M. 11.50.

DISSELHOFF, JUL. Alles ist Euer, Ihr aber seid Christi. Vorträge und Abhandlungen über das Verhaltnis der Kunst, besonders der Poesie, zur Offenbarung. Nach dem Heimgange des Autors gesammelt und hrsg. von D. Disselhoff. Kaiserswerth, Buchh. der Diakonissen-Anstalt, 1897; ix + 355 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50.

FUHRER, Jos. Eine wichtige Grabstatte der Katakombe v. S. Giovanni bei Syrakus. München, J. Lindauer, 1896; 11 pp., mit 1 Taf.; 8vo. M. 0.60.

HENNECKE, E. Altchristliche Malerei und altkirchliche Literatur. Eine Untersuchung über den bibl. Cyklus der Gemälde in den röm. Katakomben. Leipzig, Veit & Co., 1896; xi + 299 pp., with 35 illustrations; 8vo. M. 10.

RAMSAY, W. M. The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia. Vol. I., Part 2. 1897; 8vo. 2s. *net.*

RICHTER, CHR. Die altchristlichen Sinnbilder in ihrer Bedeutung. Stuttgart, Christliches Verlagshaus, 1896; 144 pp., 8vo. Bd., M. 1.

VIÉNOT, JOHN. L'art protestant au XVI^e^ siècle; le retable de Montbéliard. *Rev. chrét.*, Dec. 1.

## HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

### GENERAL.

Beiträge zur sachsischen Kirchengeschichte, hrsg. v. DD. FRZ. DIBELIUS u. THDR. BRIEGER. Heft 11. Leipzig, J. A. Barth, 1897; iii + 196 pp., 8vo. M. 3.75.

Blätter für die württembergische Kirchengeschichte. Neue Folge. Hrsg. v. FR. KEIDEL. Jahrgg. 1897. Heft 1. Stuttgart, W. Holland. M. 3.

CHURCH, R. W. Occasional Papers, selected from the *Guardian*, the *Times*, and the *Saturday Review*, 1846–1890. 2 vols.; London and New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897, 8vo. $3.00.

COWAN, HENRY. The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom: being the Baird lectures for 1895. London, A. & C. Black, 1897; 312 pp., 8vo; cloth. 3s. 6d.

HEMMER, H. M. Chronique d'histoire de l'église gallicane. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, I., 534–45.

MEYER, PH., and GOETZ, L. K. Kirchengeschichtliches zur griechischen Kirche. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 583–94.

PEIRCE, W. F., and LOUISE F. The Armenian Church. *New World*, March, 56–69.

RAMSEYER, C. A. Histoire des baptistes depuis les temps apostoliques jusqu'à nos jours. Avec une préface de M. R. Saillens. Neuchâtel, Grassart, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 6.

SOHM, R. Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss. 10. Aufl. Leipzig, Ungleich, 1896; vi + 218 pp., 8vo. M. 3; bd., M. 4.

Studien, kirchengeschichtliche. Hrsg. v. KNÖPFLER, SCHRÖRS, SDRALEK. 3. Bd., 1.–3. Hft. Münster, Schoningh, 1896; 8vo.
Subskr.-Pr. M. 6.60; Einzelpr. M. 8.80.
Contains—1 and 2: Der Ostgotenkönig Theoderich der Grosse u. die katholische Kirche; von G. PFEILSCHIFTER (viii + 271 pp.).
3: Ulrich v. Cluny. Ein biogr. Beitrag zur Geschichte der Cluniacenser im 11. Jahrhdt.; von E. HAUVILLER (viii + 86 pp.).

TACHELLA, E. Les anciens Pauliciens et les modernes Bulgares catholiques de la Philippopolitaine. *Muséon et rev. des relig.*, Jan., 68–91.

WEINGARTEN, H Zeittafeln u. Überblicke zur Kirchengeschichte. 5. Aufl., von DR. ARNOLD. Leipzig, H. Hartung & Sohn, 1896. M. 8; bd., M. 5.80.

ZENOS, ANDREW C. Compendium of Church History, with an introd. by JOHN DE WITT. Philadelphia, Presb. Board of Publ., 1896; x + 340 pp., 12mo; cloth. $1.00.

ZÖCKLER, O. Askese und Mönchtum. 2. neu bearb. u. stark vermehrte Aufl. der "Kritischen Geschichte der Askese." 1. Bd. Frankfurt a. M., Heyder & Zimmer, 1897; viii + 322 pp. M. 5.

### THE EARLY PERIOD.

ARNOLD, FR., PREUSCHEN, ERW., etc. Zur alten Kirchengeschichte. Nachrichten und Anzeigen. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 594–632.

ST. AUGUSTINE, Confessions of. Newly translated, with an introd. by C. BIGG. With a frontispiece. London, Methuen & Co., 1897; 18mo. 1s. 6d.

S. AURELII AUGUSTINI HIPPONENSIS EPISCOPI Liber *de Catechizandis Rudibus*. Edited by REV. W. Y. FAUSSET. London, Methuen & Co., 1897.

CHAPMAN, J. The Holy See and Pelagianism. *Dublin Review*, Jan., 88–111.

CLAUSEN, W. De Dionis Chrysostomi Bithynicis, quae vocatur, orationibus quaestiones. Kiel, 1896; 74 pp., 8vo.

DRÄSEKE, JOH. Dionysische Bedenken. *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 381–409.

GRANDGEORGE, L. Saint Augustin et le néo-platonisme. Paris, Leroux, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 4.

=Tome VIII. de la Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études, sciences religieuses.

GRANDMAISON, L. DE. La question dionysienne. *Études*, Jan., 34–48.

HOHN, KARL. De Dionis Chrysostomi orationibus, quae inscribuntur Diogenes (vi., viii., ix., x.). Inaug.-Diss., Göttingen, 1896; 73 pp., 8vo.

HUTTON, W. H. The Church of the Sixth Century. Six chapters in ecclesiastical history. New York, Longmans Green & Co., 1897; 8vo. 6s'.

IHM, M. Zu Augustin's Confessiones. De inscriptionibus quibusdam christianis. *Rhein. Mus. f. Philol.*, Bd. LI., Heft 4.

KLAP, P. A. Tertullianus en het Montanismus. *Theol. Studiën*, 1897, 1–26.

KNELLER, C. A. Der hl. Ignatius von Antiochien und "protestantische Wissenschaft." *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1896, Heft 10.

MERKLE. Der Streit über Priscillian. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896, 630–49.

MORIN, G. Deux petits discours d'un évêque Pétronius, du V^e^ siècle. *Rev. bénéd.*, 1897, 1, 3–8.

RAMSAY, W. M. On Dr. Schürer's Reply. *Expositor*, Jan., 69–72.

See SCHÜRER: Reply to Professor Ramsay, *ibid.*, Dec., 469–72, an answer to Ramsay's article, "Cornelius and the Italic Cohort," *ibid.*, Sept.

RÉCÉJAC, E. De mendacio qui senserit Augustinus. Paris, E. Leroux, 1897; 166 pp., 8vo.

ROTTMANNER. Ein letztes Wort über die *clavis Melitonis*. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896, 614–29.

SCHMID, REINHOLD. Marius Victorinus Rhetor und seine Beziehungen zu Augustin. Kiel, 1896; 82 pp., 8vo.

SUNDERMEIER, A. Quaestiones chronographicae ad Eusebii et Hieronymi *chronica* spectantes. Kiel; 44 pp., 8vo.

TALMA, A. S. E. De oudste Tractaten van Augustinus; II. *Theol. Studiën*, XIV., 407–47.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

BLOCH, H. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Bischofs Leo v. Vercelli u. seiner Zeit. *Neues Archiv f. alt. deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXII., 1, 1896, 11–136.

BOURGEOIS, E. L'assemblée de Quierzy-sur Oise (877). Paris, Cerf; 19 pp., 8vo.

BRETHOLZ, B. Ein päpstliches Schreiben gegen Kaiser Otto IV. *Neues Archiv f. alt. deutsche Geschichtskunde*, XXII., 1, 1896, 293–8.

St. Catharine of Siena. *Church Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 344–64.

CONDER, C. R. Saladin and King Richard; the eastern question in the twelfth century. *Blackwood's Magazine*, March, 297.

——— The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem. London, Palest. Expl. Fund, 1897; 452 pp., 8vo. 7s. 6d.

CONYBEARE, F. C. Ananias of Shirak (7th century A. D.) upon Christmas. Translated from the Armenian. *Expositor*, Nov., 321–37.

DECHÊNE, W. Der hl. Lambertus. Sein Leben u. seine Zeit. Paderborn, F. Schoningh, 1896; iv + 204 pp., 8vo. M. 2.40.

DETTEN, GEO. v. Über die Stift- u. Klosterschulen Sachsens im Mittelalter. 20 pp. Frankfurt a. M., P. Kreuer.

= Bd. 17, Heft 10 of "Frankfurter zeitgemässe Broschüren," neue Folge. M. 0.50.

DIEFENBACH, JOH. Die Kreuzzüge, 1096–1291. Ihre Ursache, ihr Verlauf, ihre Folgen. Ein Gedenkblatt zur 800-jährigen Erinnerungsfeier des ersten Kreuzzuges. 32 pp. M. 0.50.

= Heft 8, *ibid.*

DUCHESNE, L. Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical. Cinquième art.: La maison de Théophylacte. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, I., 489–514.

ESKUCHE, GUSTAV. Heidenthum und Christenthum im Chattenlande. Siegen, Real-Gymnas.-Progr., 1896; 42 pp.

FICKER, G.; HEIDENREICH; WENCK. Zur mittelalterlichen Kirchengeschichte. Nachrichten und Anzeigen. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 633–6.

GOETZ, L. K. Geschichte der Slavenapostel Konstantinus (Kyrillus) u. Methodius. Quellenmässig untersucht u. dargestellt. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1896; viii + 272 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

GUILLERMIN, H.-F. Saint-Thomas et le prédéterminisme; réponse aux études. *Rev. thomiste*, No. 5, Nov.

HÄNE, JOH. Der Klosterbruch in Rorschach und der St. Galler Krieg 1489–1490. St. Gallen, 1896; ix + 272 pp.

IFLAND. Geschichte des Bisthums Camin unter Conrad III., 1233–1241. Programm. Stettin, 1896; 24 pp., 4to.

KEHR, P. Ueber d. Plan einer krit. Ausgabe d. Papsturkunden bis Innocenz III. *Nachr. v. d. Kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Gottingen*, 2, 72–86.

MAYERHOFER. Beiträge zur Lebensgeschichte des Hieron. Bock, gen. Tragus (1498–1554). *Histor. Jahrb. der Gorres-Gesellsch.*, XVII., 4.

MORIN, G. Lettre inédite de l'évêque Evodius aux moines d'Adrumète sur la question de la grâce. *Rev. bénéd.*, Nov.

MULLNER, J. Die Taufe des römischen Königs Heinrich IV. *Histor. Jahrb. d. Gorres-Gesellsch.*, XVII., 4.

PFÜLF, O. Die Neuausgabe der Werke Dionysius des Kartausers. *Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1896, Heft 10.

PREDELLI. Bolla granda di Papa Alessandro III. inedita. *Nuov. Arch. Venet.*, XII., 1, 1896, 151–70.

PRUDENZANO, F. Francesco d'Assisi e il suo secolo. 12ª ediz. riveduta. Napoli, tip. del Diogene, 1896; 448 pp., 8vo. L. 8.50.

RIGG, J. M. St. Anselm of Canterbury; a chapter in the history of religion. London, Methuen & Co., 1896; 294 pp., 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ROSENFELD, FELIX GEORG. Ueber die Komposition des *Liber pontificalis* bis zu Papst Konstantin (715). Inaug.-Diss. Marburg, 1896; 60 pp., 8vo.

SÄGMÜLLER. Die Idee Gregors VII., vom Primat in der päpstl. Kanzlei. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1896; 577–613.

SCHÄFER, DIETRICH. Die Hinrichtung der Sachsen durch Karl den Grossen. *Historische Zeitschrift*, 78, 18–39.

SCHULZ, HANS. Peter von Murrhone als Papst Cölestin V. Schluss. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 477–507.

STERNFELD, R. Ludwigs des Heiligen Kreuzzug nach Tunis 1270 u. die Politik Karls I. v. Sizilien. M. 9.
Heft 4 of "Historische Studien," hrsg. v. E. Ebering. Berlin, Ebering, 1896; xxxii + 394 pp., 8vo.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.[a]

BECKER, H. Die ersten Ordinationen d. evangel. Kirche Anhalts 1538–78. *Mitt. d. Ver. f. Anhalt. Gesch.*, VII., 7, 1897, 556–92.

BEYSCHLAG, W. Philipp Melanchthon u. sein Antheil an der deutschen Reformation. Festschrift zum 400-jähr. Geburtstag des Reformators. Freiburg i. B., P. Waetzel, 1897; iii + 82 pp. and one portrait, 8vo. M. 1.

BLASS, FR. Melanchthon als Humanist und Pädagoge. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 165–94.

DOUMERGUE. G. Nérac au temps de Calvin. *Rev. chrét.*, Jan., 1897, 10–20.

EGELHAAF, GOTTL. Archivalische Beiträge zur Geschichte des schmalkaldischen Krieges. Schulprogramm. Stuttgart, 1896; 56 pp., 4to.

ERHARD, O. Joh. Schwanhausen, d. Reformator Bambergs. Schluss. *Beitrage z. bayer. Kirchengesch.*, III., 2, 55–74.

FINSLER, GEO. Zwingli-Bibliographie. Verzeichnis d. gedruckten Schriften von u. über Ulrich Zwingli. Hrsg. durch die Stiftung Schnyder v. Wartensee. Zurich, Orell Füssli, 1897; x + 187 pp. M. 4.

FRANK, EBERT. Das deutsche Volksschulwesen vor und nach der Reformation. Ein Beitrag zur deutschen Schulgeschichte, 32 pp. M. 0.50.
Bd. 17, Heft 5 of "Frankfurter zeitgemässe Broschüren." Neue Folge. Frankfurt a. M., P. Kreuer, 1896.

GOLTZ, ED. FRHR. VON DER. Bibliographische Studien zur Geschichte der ältesten Ausgaben von Dr. Martin Luthers kleinem Katechismus. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 508–21.

HAUSSLEITER, JOH. Aus der Schule Melanchthons. Theolog. Disputationen u. Promotionen zu Wittenberg in den Jahren 1546–1560. Festschrift der kgl. Univ. Greifswald zu Melanchthons 400-jährigem Geburtstag. Greifswald, Jul. Abel, 1897; viii + 163 pp., 8vo.

[a] Space forbids to mention more than a few of the many publications commemorative of the 400th anniversary of the birth of Melancthon.

KAYSER, K. Die reformatorischen Kirchenvisitationen in den welfischen Landen 1542–1544. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; xi + 687 pp., 8vo. M. 12.

KOLBERG. Die Einführung der Reformation im Ordenslande Preussen. *Katholik*, 1897, 1–20.

KOLDE, THEODOR. Drei Briefe aus d. Reformationszeit. *Beiträge z. bayer. Kirchengesch.* III., 2, 1896, 74–85.

LEFRANC, A. Les idées religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre. I. *Bull. de la soc. de l'hist. du protest. franç.*, 1897, 7–30.

LEZIUS, FR. Zur Charakteristik Melanchthons. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 101–26.

LOOSE. Der Meissner Domklerus zur Zeit der Reformation. *Mitteil. des Ver. f. Gesch. der Stadt Meissen*, IV., 2.

LOSERTH. Bilder aus der Reformationszeit in Mähren.

1. Dr. Martin Göschel, Probst des Frauenstiftes Konitz. 2. Oswald Glayt.

*Zeitschr. des Vereins f. d. Gesch. Mahrens und Schlesiens*, I., Heft 1.

——— Die Anfänge der Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich. *Beilage zur Allgem. Zeitg.* München, Feb. 5, 1897.

MOORE, DUNLOP. Luther and Religious Persecution. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VIII., 99–102.

RAHLWES, F. Die Reformation als Kulturkampf. Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1896. M. 1.20.

RAPIN, EUGÈNE. La réforme du seizième siècle et l'évolution musicale. *Revue de théol. et de philos.*, Jan., 40–56.

REICH, M. Erasmus von Rotterdam. Untersuch. z. seinem Briefwechsel u. Leben in den Jahren 1509–1518. *Westdeutsche Zeitschr. f. Gesch. u. Kunst. Ergänzungsheft*, IX., 1896, 121–279.

RITTER, MORIZ. Meine Ansicht der deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation. *Histor. Zeitschr.*, 78, 67–78.

SCHÄFER, E. Luther als Kirchenhistoriker. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Wissenschaft. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897; viii + 515 pp. M. 9.

SCHÖNHOLZER, G. Die religiöse Reformbewegung in der reformirten Schweiz. Denkschrift. Zürich, A. Frick, 1897; 84 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

THUDICHUM, F. Die Einführung der Reformation und die Religionsfrieden von 1552, 1555 und 1648. Tübingen, J. J. Heckenhauer, 1896; 8vo. M. 1.20.

VOGT, O. Melanchthon's Stellung als Reformator. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 40, 87–130.

WARFIELD, E. D. Philip Melanchthon. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VIII., 1–16.

WEIDEMANN, K. Landgraf Heinrich I. von Hessen und das Erzstift Mainz. Inaug.-Diss. Marburg, 1896; 72 pp.

WILKENS, C. A. Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus im 16. Jahrh. 2. (Titel-) Ausg. (mit neuem Vorwort). Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1896; xxvii + 259 pp., 8vo. M. 4; bd., M. 4.80.

WUNDERLI, G. Huldrych Zwingli u. die Reformation in Zürich nach den Tagsatzungs-Protokollen u. zürcherischen obrigkeitlichen Erlassen. I. Zürich, Selbstverlag, 1897; iv + 255 pp. M. 4.

### THE MODERN PERIOD.

BUCKLEY, JAMES M. A History of Methodism in the United States. In 2 vols. Vol. I. New York, The Christian Literature Co., 1897; 472 pp. 2 vols. $5.

CHÉROT, P. H. Une grande chrétienne au XVII^e^ siècle. Anne de Caumont, comtesse de Saint-Paul, duchesse de Fronsac, 1574–1642, fondatrice des Filles Saint-Thomas à Paris, 1626. Paris, Dumoulin et Cie., 1897; 159 pp., 8vo. Extrait des *Etudes*, augmenté de pièces justificatives.

COLOMER, B. Nouvelle étude sur le calendrier grégorien, ses origines, son histoire et les éléments qui le composent. Perpignan, Latrobe, 1897.

DAVIS, O. S. John Robinson (1575–1625), Pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers. *Hartford Sem. Rec.*, Feb., 143–60.

EATON, T. T. Did Baptists in England immerse prior to 1641? *Bibl. Sac.*, Jan., 162–7.

HANSEN, S., og P. OLSEN. De danske Baptisters Historie. København, 1896; viii + 200 pp.

HANSJAKOB, H. Die Salpeterer, eine politisch-religiöse Secte aus dem südöstlichen Schwarzwald. 2. Aufl. Mit urkundlichen Beilagen. Freiburg, Herder, 1896; iv + 99 pp., 8vo. M. 1.40.

HUBERT, F., und C. A. WILKENS. Italienisches zur neueren Kirchengeschichte. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchen.*, XVII., 554–66.

JECKLIN, FR. Bündniss zwischen den Freiherren von Brandis einerseits und dem Gotteshausbund andererseits. *Anzeiger f. schweizerische Geschichte.*

KAINDL. Zwei Urkunden zur Geschichte des 30-jährigen Krieges. *Histor. Jahrb. der Görres-Gesellsch.*, XVII., 4.

MICHAUD, E. La fin de Clément XI. et le commencement du pontificat d'Innocent XIII. (1721) d'après des documents diplom. inédits. I. *Int. theol. Zeitschr.* —*Rev. int. de théol.*, Jan.–Mar., 42–61.

PHILLIPS, W. A. The Influence of Machiavelli on the Reformation in England. *Nineteenth Century*, Dec.

The Puritan Settlements in New England. *London Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 328–55.

SACHSE, J. F. The Genesis of the German Lutheran Church in the Land of Penn. *Luth. Church Rev.*, Jan., 60–77.

SKEATS, H.S. History of the Free Churches of England, from the Reformation to 1851. With a continuation to 1891, by C. S. MIALL. London, Alexander & Shepheard, 1897; 800 pp., 8vo. 6s.

STECK, RUD. Die Piscatorbibel u. ihre Einführung in Bern im Jahre 1684. Eine Studie zur Vorgeschichte der schweizer. Bibelübersetzung. Rektoratsrede. Mit 1 Bildniss Piscator's u. einem Anhang von Aktenstücken aus d. bern. Staatsarchiv. Bern, Wyss, 1897; 64 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

STIEDA, WILH. Eine Hugenotten-Kolonie in Mecklenburg. *Jahrb. d. Vereins f. Mecklenb. Geschichte u. Alterthumskunde*, LXI.

VILMAR, W. Dietrich von Pleningen. Ein Uebersetzer aus dem Heidelberger Humanistenkreis. Inaug.-Diss. Marburg, 1896; 70 pp., 8vo.

WILKENS, C. A. Franzosisches zur neueren Kirchengeschichte. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVII., 522–54.

——— Spanisches zur neueren Kirchengeschichte. *Ibid.*, XVII., 566–83.

ZIEGLER, E. Abt Otmar II. von St. Gallen. Ein Beitrag zur Kirchengeschichte der Gegenreformation der Schweiz. St. Gallen, 1896; 75 pp., 8vo.

### THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BELLESHEIM, A. Joseph Hippolyte Cardinal Guibert, Erzbischof von Paris. *Katholik*, Dec.

BERNARD, J. H. Archbishop Benson in Ireland: a record of his Irish sermons and addresses. With illustrations. London and New York, The Macmillan Co., 1896; 8vo. 3s. 6d.

BLAIKIE, W. G. Thomas Chalmers: Famous Scots Series. London, Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1897. 1s. 6d.

BLANCKMEISTER, FRZ. Emil Frommel. Sein Leben u. seine Schriften. Dresden, F. Sturm., 1897; 16 pp. M. 0.20.

BURN, J. H. Frederick Field. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 160–3; March, 274–8.

BRÉMOND, H. M. Gladstone théologien. *Études*, Jan., 94–101.

ECK, S. Über David Friedrich Strauss. *Christl. Welt.*, Nos. 1–4, 1897.

MÜLLER, K. Recht u. Aussicht reformirter Bestrebungen in Deutschland. *Ref. Kirchenz.*, 1897; pp. 2–3; 10–12; 18–20.

QUIÉVREUX, C. Le paganisme au XIX^e^ siècle. 2 vols. Paris, Retaux. Fr. 6.
I. Le christianisme antique; II. Le paganisme moderne; le dogme néo-paien.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Some Recent English Theologians: Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Jowett, Hatch. *Contemp. Rev.*, March.

FARRAR, F. W. Two Archbishops, Magee and Benson. *Ibid.*, Nov., 622–35.

KNORTZ, K. Die wahre Inspirations-Gemeinde in Iowa. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des christl. Pietismus u. Communismus. Leipzig, O. Wigand, 1896; 88 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

TISSOT. Schleiermacher an Dr. Lücke. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, Nov., 536–50.

VINET, A. Gedanken u. Betrachtungen aus seinen Schriften. Mit e. Vorwort v. A. RÜEGG. Heilbronn, Salzer, 1896 xvi + 211 pp., 8vo. M. 2.20; bd., M. 3

## SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

### GENERAL.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. The Theology of an Evolutionist. *Outlook*, 1897: 46–8; 175–9; 243–7; 344–50; 393–7; 496–500; 550–56; 601–4; 745–50; 786–9; 840–44.

BEACH, D. N. The Reconstruction of Theology. *Bibl. Sac.*, Jan., 108–40.

BIDDLE, JACOB A. The New Theology. *Ibid.*, Jan., 96–107.

C. H. Un ancien symbole chrétien découvert en Mongolie. *Le Muséon et rev. des relig.*, Jan., 53–60.

CALKINS, MARY W. The Religious Consciousness of Children. *New World*, Dec., 705–19.

EVERETT, C. C. Kant's Influence in Theology. *New World*, March, 69–84.

GERHART, E. V. The Principle of Christian Doctrine. *Ref. Ch. Rev.*, Jan., 27–40.

INGE, W. R. The Threefold Cord. *Expositor*, Feb., 128–34.

KINARD, M. M. The Ethics of Evolution. *Luth. Church Rev.*, Jan., 34–51.

LINDSAY, JAMES. The Significance of the Old Testament for Modern Theology. London, William Blackwood & Sons, 1897. 1s.

MEZGER, PAUL. Christlicher Gottesglaube u. christlicher Offenbarungsglaube. Antrittsvorlesung. Basel, R. Reich, 1897; 36 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

MITCHELL, WILLIAM. The Spirit of Modern Theology. Terre Haute, Ind., Moore & Langen, 1897; 38 pp., $0.25.

Theology of Walter Pater. *British Weekly*, Dec. 31. See also *Christ. Lit.*, Feb., 406–12.

REUTER'S theologische Klassikerbibliothek. 7. Bd. Braunschweig, G. Reuter, 1897. M. 1; bd., M. 1.30.

7. *Soli Deo Gloria*. Vergleichende Würdigung evangelisch-luther. u. romisch-kathol. Lehre nach Augsburg. u. Tridentin. Bekenntnis mit besond. Hinsicht auf Möhler's Symbolik von Dr. ERNST SARTORIUS. viii + 264 pp.

RITSCHL, ALBR. Gesammelte Aufsätze. Neue Folge. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; vii+219 pp., 8vo. M. 5.40.

SELBY, T. G. The Theology of Modern Fiction. Fernley lecture, 1896; 8vo. 2s.

SILVESTER, GUY. Studies in Theology. Manchester, J. Heywood, 1897. 1s. 6d.

WINTER, F. J. Die neue Wendung in der Theologie und die Aufgabe der Kirche. Leipzig, Richter, 1897. M. 0.50.

## HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

AALL, A. Der Logos. Geschichte seiner Entwickelung in der griechischen Philosophie u. der christl. Litteratur. 1. Geschichte der Logosidee in der griechischen Philosophie. Leipzig, Reisland, 1896; xix+251 pp. M. 5.

BAINOEL, P. J.–V. L'Église. Histoire du dogme. L'Évolution des idées. *Études*, 1897, 5–16; 175–96.

BORNEMANN, J. Die Taufe Christi durch Johannes in der dogmatischen Beurteilung der christlichen Theologen der vier ersten Jahrhunderte. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1896; iii + 88 pp., 8vo. M 2.40.

DELAROCHELLE, JEAN. L'Idée de l'église dans saint Cyprien. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, I., 519–34.

EATON, A. W. The Heart of the Creeds, Historical Religion in the Light of Modern Thought. New York, Thom. Whittaker, 1897; 200 pp., 8vo. $1.00.

ENGLERT, W. Ph. Von der Gnade Christi. Text des hl. Thomas von Aquin. *Summa Theol.*, II, 1, *qu.*, 109–114, mit deutschem Commentar. Bd. I. Bonn, P. Hanstein, 1896; 323 pp.

JUNG, CHARLES. Le Problème de l'individu dans le système de Schleiermacher. Paris, Fischbacher, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 2.

KOCH, A. Die Entwicklung des Moralsystems des hl. Alfons von Liguori auf Grund seiner Briefe dargestellt. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1897; 70–126.

KOCH, R. VON. The Ritschlian Reform Movement in Germany and Sweden. *Christ. Lit.*, Feb., 361–74.

KREVENBÜHL, J. Das freie Christenthum u. die Bewegung f. ethische Kultur. Vortrag. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; iii + 34 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

LOW, GEO. J. The Development of Doctrine in the Pre-Christian Church. *Christ. Lit.*, Jan., 1897; 241–8.

LÜDEMANN, H. Reformation u. Täufertum in ihrem Verhaltnis zum christlichen Princip. Bern, W. Kaiser, 1896; 95 pp., 8vo. M. 1.80.

MAUSBACH. Historisches u. Apologetisches zur scholastischen Reuelehre. *Katholik*, 1897, 148–64.

SCHICK, FRIEDRICH. Der Entwickelungsgedanke in der evangelischen Theologie bis Schleiermacher. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VII., 140–70.

SCHLATTER, A. Der Dienst des Christen in der älteren Dogmatik. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; viii+81 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

= Heft 1 of Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, hrsg. v. A. Schlatter u. H. Cremer.

SCOTT, HUGH MACDONALD. Origin and Development of the Nicene Theology, with some reference to the Ritschlian view of Theology and History of Doctrine.
Lectures del. on the L. P. Stone foundation at Princeton Theological Seminary, Jan. 1896. Chicago, The Chicago Theological Seminary Press, 1896; ix + 390 pp., 8vo; cloth. $1.50.

SWING, A. T. Harnack's "History of Dogma." *Bibl. Sac.*, Jan., 153–61.

WHITE, GREENOUGH. Discussion of Historical Christology. *Sewanee Review*, Jan., 33–47.

APOLOGETICS.

BACHELET, X–M. LE. Questions d'apologétique. *Études*, Feb. 5, 381–90.

BERNDT, G. Grenzen u. Art d. Apologetik i. d. Predigt. *Mancherlei Gaben u. ein Geist*, 1897, 112–20.

HASERT, C. Antworten der Vernunft auf die Fragen: Wozu Religion, Gebet u. Kirche? Graz, U. Moser, 1897; iv + 94 pp., 8vo. M. 0.90.

HOENSBROECH, P. VON. Religion oder Aberglaube? Ein Beitrag zur Charakteristik des Ultramontanismus. Berlin, H. Walther, 1897; vii + 135 pp. M. 2.

OBRICHT, K. Zur 25-jährigen Dogmatisirung der vatikanischen Papstlehren. Fragen ohne Antwort über die romische Zukunftstheologie u. die alte katholische Christenlehre. Halle, Strien, 1897; iii + 356 pp. M. 4.80.

SAMTLEBEN, G. Paulus als Apologet. *Kirchl. Monatsschr.*, XVI., 2, 67–77.

SCHMITT, LE DR. Petite apologétique, ou les fondements de la religion catholique. Traduit de l'allemand. Lethielleux. Petit 16mo. 80 cent.

STEUDE, E. G. Die apologetische Bedeutung der allgemeinen Religionsgeschichte. Schluss. *Bew. des Glaub.*, Dec., 457–85.

DOGMATICS.

ALEXANDER, W. Dogmatic Theology and Civilization. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VIII., 35–45.

BAGSHAWE, EDWARD. Notes on Christian Doctrine. London, Paul, Trübner & Co., 1896; 288 pp., 8vo. 5s.

BARTMANN, B. St. Paulus und St. Johannes über die Rechtfertigung. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897. M. 3.20.

BARRE, A. DE LA. Le miracle et les groupements hiérarchiques de forces. *Études relig.*, Dec. 15, 600–19.

BEARDSLEE, C. S. The Kingdom of God in the Christian Church. *Hartford Sem. Rec.*, Feb., 95–120.

BRAUN, FRDR. Die ewige Gottheit Christi. Präexistenz und Menschwerdung. Vortrag. Stuttgart, D. Gundert, 1897; 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

BRESINSKY, H. D. Selbstbeschränkung Gottes im Hinblick auf d. Darstellung seines Reiches, *Mittl. u. Nachr. f. d. ev. Kirche i. Russl.*, Sept., pp. 385–405.

DENIO, F. B. The Scriptural Teaching respecting the Holy Spirit. *Jour. of Bib. Lit.*, XV., 135–151.

DOLE, CHARLES F. The Forgiveness of Sins. (Pages for Religious Inquirers, No. 15.) London, P. Green; 18 pp. 1d.

EMERY, L. À propos d'une dogmatique. II. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, Nov. 550–78.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Christ's Attitude to his own Death. *Expositor*, Dec., 414–26; Jan., 16–30; Feb., 105–19.

FRÉMONT, G. Démonstration scientifique de l'existence de Dieu. Conférences par l'abbé G. Fr. Précédées d'une lettre de S. E. le cardinal Boyer. Poitiers, impr. et lib. Oudin, 1896; xxvi + 534 pp.

Gebet, Das, nach der hl. Schrift u. der monastischen Tradition. Von e. Mitgliede des Ordens des hl. Benedıktus. Aus dem Franz. Mainz, F. Kirchheim, 1896; xi + 208 pp., 8vo. M. 2.50.

GORDON, GEO. A. Immortality and the New Theodicy. Boston, Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1897; 16mo. $1.00.

HALL, A. C. A. Christ's Temptations and Ours. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897; 154 pp., 8vo. $1.00.

HARRIS, SAMUEL. God, the Creator and Lord of All. 2 vols. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1896; 8vo; cloth. $5.00.

HARTILL, ISAAC. Immortality. London, Alexander & Shepheard, 1896; 8vo; cloth. 2s. 6d.

HEINE, GERH. Ueber die Zuverlässigkeit der hl. Schrift. Für gebildete Nichtgelehrte. Essen, G. D. Baedeker, 1896; 114 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

KAFTAN, J. Das Verhältniss des evg. Glaubens zur Logoslehre. Vortrag. Freiburg, J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; 27 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

KOELLE, S. W. The Apocatastasis, or Restitution of all Things. London, E. Stock, 1896. 1s. 6d.

KÖLLING, W. Die *Satisfactio Vicaria*, das ist die Lehre von der stellvertretenden Genugthuung des Herrn Jesu. I. Bd. Die Vorfragen. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1896. M. 4.50.

LAMM, K. Christi Person u. Werk mit Bezug auf die Christologie Ritschl's u. dessen Schule. Frankfurt a. M., Heyder & Zimmer, 1896; vii + 150 pp. M. 2.

MILLIGAN, GEO. The Doctrinal Significance of the Revised Version. 3. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 171–4.

MOULE, H. C. G. The Spirit of Power. *Ibid.*, Feb., 236.

MONOD, W. Le Royaume. *Rev.chrét.*, Nov.

POIRINE, J. (l'abbé). Le Pater et l'heure présente. Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1897; 16mo. Fr. 3.

PORRET, J.-A. L'Espérance chrétienne, son contenu et ses fondements. Genève, Fischbacher; 8vo. Fr. 1.

POVELL, H. C. The Principle of the Incarnation. With especial reference to the relation between our Lord's divine omniscience and his human consciousness. London, Longmans, 1896; 516 pp., 8vo. 16s.

PUAUX, Fr. Par la foi non par la oue, étude évangélique. *Rev. chrét.*, Jan., 1–9.

REITSMA, J. Dogmatiek van de rechterzijde. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1897, 1–42.

SCHAEFFER, W. C. The Historic Purpose of the Divine Election; the doctrine viewed from the standpoint of Isaiah. *Ref. Church Rev.*, Jan., 40–52.

SCHEIDT, R. C. The Material Basis of Inheritance and the Problem of Evil. *Ref. Church Rev.*, Jan., 103–20.

SCHEUERMANN-LÜBAHN, E. Ausblicke in die Eschatologie. *Mitth. u. Nachr. f. d. ev. Kirche i. Russl.*, Dec.

SCHULZE, MART. Die Religion Jesu u. der Glaube an Christus. Halle, J. Krause, 1897; v + 77 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

SCHWAB, MOÏSE. Vocabulaire de l'angélologie, d'après les manuscrits hébreux de la bibliothèque nationale. Paris, Klincksieck, 322 pp., 4to.

SIMMS, E. Faith. *Pall Mall Mag.*, March.

STRAUSS UND TORNEY, V. VON. Zur Lehre vom Glauben und den Werken. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 78–99.

STRONG, AUGUSTUS H. Systematic Theology. Revised and enlarged. Fifth edition. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1897; 760 pp., 8vo. $5.00.

VALLING, J. F. The Holy Spirit of Promise. 1897; 8vo; cloth. 5s.

WADSTEIN, E. Die eschatologische Ideengruppe: Antichrist — Weltsabbat — Weltende u. Weltgericht, in den Hauptmomenten ihrer christlich-mittelalterlichen Gesamtentwickelung. Leipzig, Reisland, 1896; ix + 205 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

WAITE, JOHN. The Coming of Christ and Signs Preceding his Coming. London, Stoneman, 1896; 78 pp., 8vo. 1s.

WARFIELD, B. B. The Right of Systematic Theology. With an introduction by J. ORR. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1897; 8vo. 2s.

——— Christian Supernaturalism. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, VIII., 58–74.

——— The Indispensableness of Systematic Theology to the Preacher. *Hom. Rev.*, Feb., 99–105.

WENDT, HANS HEINR. Der Erfahrungsbeweis fur die Wahrheit des Christentums. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck u. Ruprecht, 1897; 40 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

WESTPHAL, A. Qu'est-ce qu'une église? sa nature, ses éléments constitutifs. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; xv + 145 pp., 16mo.

WILMERS, P. Précis de la doctrine catholique. Tours, Mame, 1897; xxiv + 587 pp., 8vo.

WINKELMANN. Dogmatische Studien zum Begriff der Offenbarung. 1. Heft. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1896. M. 2.

WORDSWORTH, CHRISTOPHER. On the Millennium. Two lectures. 1897.

## ETHICS.

BELL, F. W. B. VAN. Zedekunde. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1897, 113–30.

FAIRCHILD, JAMES H. The Religious Life; its nature and claims. *Bibl Sac.*, Jan., 21–37.

FARRAR, F. W. The Young Man Master of Himself. London, Nisbet; 150 pp., 12mo. 1s. 6d.

FINDLAY, G. C. The Basis of Morals; A College Address. *Expos. Times*, Jan., 150–3; Feb., 206–10.

FITZGERALD, P. F. The Rational or Scientific Idea of Morality. London, Swan Sonnenschein & Co., 1897. 7s. 6d.

FLETCHER, W. I. "The Master Passion." *Bibl. Sac.*, Jan., 86–96.

GOPFERT, ADAM. Moraltheologie. Bd. I. xii + 512 pp. M. 4; bd., M. 5.20. = Wissenschaftliche Handbibliothek. 1. Reihe. Theologische Lehr- u. Handbücher. XII. Bd. Paderborn, F. Schöningh, 1897; 8vo.

LEENDERTZ, A. C. De Ethiek van Kant, getoetst aan de eischen, door wijlen Professor Pierson gesteld aan de Ethiek der toekomst. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 130–66.

LÜTGERT, W. Sündlosigkeit und Vollkommenheit. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1896; 44 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

MACCUNN, J. Ethics of Citizenship. London, Maclehose; 160 pp., 8vo. 2s.

MUIRHEAD, J. H. Ethics from a Purely Practical Standpoint. *Mind*, Jan.

SCHEFFER, W. Nog iets over Christelijke zedeleer. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1897, 81–2.

SCHNEIDEWIN, MAX. Die antike Humanität. Berlin, Weidmann, 1897; xx + 558 pp., 8vo. M. 12.

WEDGWOOD, JULIA. Ethics and Literature. *Contemp. Rev.*, Jan., 63–80.

## PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS.

### GENERAL.

BASSERMANN, Die prakt. Theologie als eine selbständige wissenschaftliche Disciplin. Rektorats-Rede. *Prot. Kirch.-Ztg.*, 1896, No. 50, cols. 1165–81; also reprinted, 51 pp., 1897, 4to.

BAUMANN, J. Wie Christus urteilen u. handlen würde, wenn er heutzutage unter uns lebte. Stuttgart, Fr. Frommann, 1896; 88 pp., 8vo. M. 1.40.

EVANS, HOWARD. Religious Statistics of England and Wales. *Contemp. Rev.*, Feb., 277–9.

HAAS, Aus pommerschen Hexenprozessakten. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des pommerschen Volksaberglaubens. Programm, Stettin, 1896; 18 pp., 4to.

HERZ, M. J. Der Geistliche in den verschiedenen Verrichtungen seines Amtes. Paderborn, A. Hollert, 1897. M. 2.

HILLIS. N. D. The Social Law of Service. *Bibl. Sac.*, Jan., 141–52.

HORTON, E. A., E. E. HALE and others. Practical Christianity as I Conceive it. *Arena*, Dec.

JENKINS, H. D. The American Lyceum. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, Vol. VIII, 46–57.

KNOKE, KARL. Grundriss der praktischen Theologie. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896, viii + 232 pp., 8vo. M. 3.40.

LÜDEMANN, H. Reformation u. Täufertum in ihrem Verhältnis zum christlichen Princip. Bern, W. Kaiser, 1896.

MCCONNELL, S. D. The Church in America. Its relation to the religious life of the people. *The Churchman*, N. Y., Jan. 23, 1897.

MALAN, C. La vie religieuse premièrement dans sa genèse et dans son affirmation au dedans de nous, puis dans sa manifestation extérieure. *Revue de théol. et de philos.*, Jan., 5–21.

SCHICK, C. Die Synodalzimmer des griechischen Klosters in Jerusalem. *Mitth. u. Nachr. des Deutsch.-Palast. Vereins.* Leipzig, 1896, 71–2.

SCHNEIDER, E. Die Kernfragen des Christentums, behandelt in Form e. Zwiegesprachs. Ein Wegweiser zum Glauben. Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896; vi + 232 pp. M. 3.20.

SMEND, J. Ueber den Wert der Todeserinnerung f. unser inneres Leben. Strassburg, Heitz, 1896; 14 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

STANG, WILLIAM. Pastoral Theology. Bruxelles, Société belge de librairie, 1896; viii + 303 pp., 8vo. Fr. 8.

Theologischer Jahresbericht, herausg. von H. HOLTZMANN u. G. KRUGER. XV. Band, enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1895.
4te Abth.: Praktische Theologie und kirchliche Kunst, bearbeitet von Marbach, Ehlers, Woltersdorf, Kind, Everling, Hasenclever und Spitta. M. 6.
Braunschweig, 1896; pp. 475–616; 8vo.

WATSON, JOHN. The Cure of Souls: Yale Lectures on Practical Theology, 1896; x + 244 pp., Cr. 8vo. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1896. 6s.

### CHURCH POLITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

BENNETT, E. N. The Priest of Penitence. *Expositor*, Jan., 73–8.

Catholicus. The Pope and the Anglicans. The Policy of the Bull. *Contemp. Rev.*, Dec., 1896.

ERMONI, V. L'église romaine en face de l'église grecque schismatique. Paris, Poussielgue, 1896; 63 pp., 8vo.

GAIRAL, A. Les manifestations extérieures du culte catholique. *L'Université catholique*, Jan., 32–60.

GUÉRIN, PAUL. Les Sources théologiques. *Loci theologici.* Les conciles généraux et particuliers; 3e édition. 3 vols. Paris, Savaete, 1896. Fr. 20.

HOENSBROECH, GRAF P. v. Der Ultramontanismus in Deutschland. Leipzig, Buchh. d. Evang. Bundes, 1896. M. 0.30.

HOLDER, K. Zur Designation der Nachfolger durch die Päpste. Synodus dioecesana Pistoriensis et Pratensis, anno 1892. *Arch. f. Kirchenrecht*, 1896, 6.

KOEHLER, W. Die katholischen Kirchen des Morgenlandes. Beiträge zum Verfassungsrecht der sogenannten "uniert-oriental." Kirchen. Darmstadt, Waitz, 1896; xiii + 160 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

LACEY, T. A. The Sources of the Bull; the Pope and the Anglicans. *Contemp. Rev.*, Dec., 1896.

Leon XIII. De l'unité de l'Eglise, lettre encyclique. Paris, Dumoulin & Cie. 75 pp.

RAGEY, P. L'Anglo-catholicisme. *La Science catholique*, Oct. 15, 1896.

SMITH, SYDNEY, F. S. J. The Papal Bull. *Contemp. Rev.*, Jan., 30–49.

---

FÉLICE, PAUL DE. Les Protestants d'autrefois. Vie intérieure des églises. Mœrs et usages. (Les Temples. Les Services religieux. Les Actes pastoreaux.) Paris, Fischbacher. 12mo. Fr. 4.

Fortschritt, der notwendige, des heutigen nachreformatorischen Christentums. Eine unparteiische evangel. Allianzschrift v. W. F. Frankfurt a M., J. Schergens, 1896; 35 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

Hefte zur "Christlichen Welt." Nr. 25. Leipzig, Grunow, 1896. M. 0.40.

Zur gegenwärtigen Lage des Protestantismus. Ein Vortrag von A. HARNACK. 24 pp., 8vo.

LODS, ARMAND. Traité de l'administration des cultes protestants. Avec une introduction par J. Flach. Paris, Grassart, 1896; 8vo. Fr. 7.50.

USHER, E. P. Protestantism: a study in the direction of religious truth and Christian unity. London, Gay & Bird, 1896; 440 pp., 8vo. 7s. 6d.

ASSMANN, W. Die Sonntags-Heiligung u. Ruhe im Handelsgewerbe u. Gewerbetriebe. Bochum, W. Stumpf; 138 pp. 16mo. M. 0.60.

BÜCKNER, A. Die russisch-litauische Kirchenunion und ihre literarischen Denkmäler. *Archiv f. slav. Philol.*, XIX, Heft. 1 u. 2.

COWAN, H. The Influence of the Scottish Church in Christendom: Baird Lectures, 1895. London, Black, 1896; 312 pp., 8vo. 3s. 6d.

DALTON, H. Der Stundismus in Russland. Studien u. Erinnerungen. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1896; 59 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

EARLE, ALICE M. Sunday in New Netherland and Old New York. *Atlantic Monthly*, Oct., 543–50.

FALLOT, T. Qu'est-ce qu'une église? Un chapître du christianisme pratique. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; ix + 218 pp.

GRIFFIS, W. E. Christian Symbolism in Puritan Churches. *The Congregationalist*, Dec. 17, 1896.

GRONEMEYER, E. Evangelisch-lutherisch in der Landeskirche oder: Altlutherisch in der Separation? Offene Antwort auf den "Offenen Brief" des Hrn. Pastor Sommerfeld. Gütersloh, 1896; 88 pp. 8vo.

KAHL, W. Bekenntnissgebundenheit u. Lehrfreiheit. Berlin, J. Becker, 1897. M. 1.

Kirchenpolitische Briefe vom SPECTATOR. *Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung*, 1897, Jan. 9; Feb. 1.

LEWIS, ABRAM H. The Catholization of Protestantism on the Sabbath Question, or Sunday Observance non-Protestant. Plainfield, N. J., 1897; 60 pp. 10c.

MACALISTER, R. A. S. Ecclesiastical Vestments, their Development and History. The Camden Library. London, Elliot Stock, 1897. 6s.

MONTEFIORE, C. G. Unitarianism and Judaism in their relations to each other. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, Jan., 240–53.

ROHNERT, W. Die Unterscheidungslehren der Reformierten. (Aus: "Kirche, Kirchen u. Sekten.") Leipzig, Ungleich, 1896; 16 pp., 8vo. M. 0.20.

RUZITSCHITSCH, E. N. Das kirchlich-religiöse Leben bei den Serben. Göttingen, Akadem. Buchh., 1896; viii + 57 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume I JULY 1897 Number 3

# THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

By CHARLES M. MEAD,
Hartford.

OF late years much has been said about the Fatherhood of God. Since F. D. Maurice and F. W. Robertson impressed their religious views on the English-speaking public, the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God, and the corresponding doctrine of the universal sonship of men, have been proclaimed as a new, or rediscovered, truth of the gospel of Christ. Dr. Watson, in his readable book *The Mind of the Master*, says: "Two finds have been made within recent years: the divine Fatherhood and the kingdom of God" (p. 318).

If so important a truth has hitherto been lost, and has now been brought to light, it is certainly something to be profoundly grateful for. But the manner in which the alleged discovery is proclaimed cannot but provoke the inquiry, whether the novelty of it has not after all been too much magnified; or, in case there is any novelty about it, whether the novelty is an improvement. In some quarters it seems to be thought that, in the department of philosophical or theological thought, a proposition should be esteemed in proportion to its newness, just as dry-goods dealers evidently expect to attract customers by advertising an article as the "latest novelty."

That God has been conceived as a Father throughout the course of Christian history is a truth so patent that no one

would think of denying it. The Lord's Prayer, repeated over and over in private and in public ever since our Saviour first taught it, would, even if there were nothing else, have been enough to make it impossible for the conception to become obsolete. What possibility, then, it may be asked, is there of any new discovery in regard to this feature of Christian thought? The answer which most readily occurs is that the application of the name "Father" to God is now made *universal*, instead of being limited, as in the Old Testament, to the Jewish people, or, as in Christian theology, to the regenerate, or the elect. And then the correlative conception is emphasized, that *all* men, and not merely *some* men, are the children of God.

But after all this does not fully answer the question. For in some sense the universal Fatherhood of God has certainly been a general tenet of the Christian church from the beginning. The first article in the Apostles' Creed designates God as "the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth." The appellation is quite general, connecting God the Father, not with any particular part of the human race, but with the whole universe, "Father" and "Maker" being apparently used as synonymous. Bishop Pearson, commenting on this, says: "Wherever God hath been acknowledged, he hath been understood and worshiped as a Father; the very heathen poets so describe their gods; and their vulgar names did carry *father* in them, as the most popular and universal notion." Some thirty years ago, after Dr. Candlish, in his *Cunningham Lectures*, had advocated the proposition that God's Fatherhood, according to reason and Scripture, can be properly predicated only of his relation to Christ and Christians, Professor Crawford, of Edinburgh, published an elaborate reply, at the opening of which he remarks: "The prevalent opinion of the Christian church has ever been that all mankind may be held to be the children of God—as deriving their existence from him—as created after his likeness—as still retaining some traces of his image, though grievously defaced and distorted by the fall—and as largely partaking of his providential care and bounty. I am not aware,

indeed, that this general Fatherhood of God has ever hitherto been formally controverted."

So then, according to these weighty authorities, the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God has until recent times never been questioned, whereas Dr. Watson assures us that it is only within recent times that the doctrine has been discovered! The apparently irreconcilable contradiction between these two positions can be at all relieved only by a closer consideration of the definitions that have been given to the term in question. Principal A. M. Fairbairn, in his book *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, speaking of Dr. Crawford's definition of the divine Fatherhood, says that "all that we have is a figurative and euphonious way of describing creation and providence" (p. 445). Dr. Fairbairn argues that God is Father, not in a merely figurative, but in a real sense. "Fatherhood," he says, "did not come through creation, but rather creation because of Fatherhood. The essential love out of which creation issued determined the standing of the created before the Creator and the relation of the Creator to the created. Where love is causal it is paternal" (*ibid.*). So then the question is settled by a new definition of fatherhood. Heretofore the general opinion has been that a father in the strict sense is a male human being who has begotten a child. A man is not a father till the child has come into existence. And so far as paternal love forms an element of paternity, it, too, is not developed till after the child is born. But Dr. Fairbairn turns the thing end for end. Paternity and paternal love, according to him, precede and produce the child. Applied to human relations the proposition amounts to this: A man is a father as soon as he forms the intention of begetting children. And that which causes him to form the intention is his love for the as yet non-existent children! Such talk, seriously uttered with reference to the human relation of father and child, would be called balderdash. But uttered with reference to God's relation to men it undoubtedly has to many ears the sound of great profundity. Yet, as a definition of fatherhood in general, if there is any validity in it, it ought to be applicable to human paternity. For surely the original

conception of paternity came from the human relation of men to their offspring. *This* is *real* paternity. But Dr. Fairbairn, in order to prove that God is literally, and not merely in a figurative sense, a Father to men, invents such a definition of fatherhood that if we accept it we must conclude that nobody but God has ever been a father! That makes the demonstration easy; but it also makes it worthless.

Whether it is true that God created because he loved, it is not necessary to decide. There is no biblical warrant for the notion; but there may be a truth in it. Be that as it may, it makes no difference with the question before us. No one doubts the fact of the divine love as exercised toward men after they have been created. And because God has made men, and cherishes for them a love like that of a father for his children, he may be fitly called their Father. This designation, however, is inadequate. God may be *called* a Father, but he is more than that. Many other names, borrowed from human or physical relations, are used to describe the indescribable majesty and love of God. They all serve a purpose; but all together fall far short of the end of telling what God is in himself or to his creatures. When, now, it is attempted to make out that Fatherhood is the final and exhaustive idea of God, and when, in order to prove it, a definition of fatherhood is invented which contradicts the universal conception of what fatherhood is, one is tempted to ask, "Who is this that darkeneth counsel by words without knowledge?"

The literal and proper sense of fatherhood, I repeat, must be found in the human relation of father and child. If anyone else is called father besides the male parent of a human child, the term is used in a derivative, tropical, or improper sense. It is quite admissible to call some venerable and beloved pastor "Father" So-and-so, or to call Washington the father of his country. It is perfectly intelligible when one speaks of a wish as being father to a thought. These and other applications of the term are figurative; they convey a meaning because in the relations here spoken of there is something *analogous* to the normal relation which subsists between a father and

child. But if anyone should undertake to find in some one of these *derivative* senses the primary and *proper* sense of the word, he would be only introducing obscurity and confusion. Now the application of the name "Father" to the Supreme Being is a very natural one. But it is a secondary, derivative use of the term. When we call God our Father, the expression has a meaning only as some aspects of human fatherhood are presupposed and regarded as typical of God's relation to men. In short, God is our Father in a figurative sense. The attempt to find the literal and essential meaning of fatherhood in God's relation to us may present the appearance of profoundness, but it is a futile attempt; putting the figurative for the literal does not make it the literal. The tropical use of a word may be quite legitimate and even necessary; but nevertheless it is indispensable to clearness of thought that the literal and the tropical senses of a word should not be confounded.

There are three distinct senses in which God is called Father in the Scriptures. (1) He is in a very special sense called the Father of Jesus Christ. Whatever may be the meaning of the passages which speak of this relation, it is clear that there is something unique in it. No one else is son to God in the same sense in which Jesus is. He is *the* Son, as no one else is; and God is his Father, as he is Father to no one else. In speaking to his disciples he calls God "your Father;" and in speaking of God he says "my Father;" but he never associates himself with his disciples, saying of God "our Father." Even if we follow those who regard Jesus' Sonship as beginning with his birth from Mary, still his Sonship is unique. But when we regard the Sonship as belonging to the eternal Logos, the Second Person of the Trinity, the uniqueness of his Sonship is much more marked. That is a relation which belongs to no one else. (2) Next, God is called Father of the redeemed, or the regenerate, as distinguished from men in general. In this sense of the word Christ calls God the Father of his followers; and Paul says (Rom. 8: 15) that Christians have received the spirit of adoption, whereby they cry "Abba, Father." No one questions the fact of this special application of the name "Father"

to Christians. (3) Finally, God is called Father of men in general. In this case the appellation is derived from the universal benevolence which God exercises toward his human creatures, made in his image. He loves as a good father loves, even when the persons loved do not exercise filial love in return.

So far there seems to be nothing respecting which there need be any serious disagreement. And one may well wonder why there should have been so much parade made over the alleged discovery of the divine Fatherhood. So far as the two first mentioned applications of the name "Father" are concerned, there is certainly no material difference of opinion among ordinary Christians. It is with reference to the third particular—the universal Fatherhood of God—that credit is claimed for the school of Maurice. Even here, however, as we have seen, no real discovery has been made. God created men and exercises toward them love and guardian care. Therefore he may appropriately be called the Father of all men, since there is an obvious analogy between his relation to men and that of a man to the children whom he has procreated and whom he loves and cherishes. The disagreement, so far as there is any, relates not so much to the Fatherhood of God as to the correlative doctrine of the *sonship of men*. Are all men the children of God in the same sense in which God is the Father of all men? If God is the Father of men in a *literal* sense, then of course men are his children in a literal sense. But if God is the Father of men in a *figurative* sense—so called because he resembles a normal father in his relation to his children—it does not follow that all men are equally the children of God. In order to be such they must resemble, in their relation to God, *normal* children in relation to a literal father. If mere creation constitutes God our Father, then of course the matter is settled—all men are his children. But those whose views we are considering are not satisfied with this solution of the matter. Dr. Watson, though he does not seem to adopt Dr. Fairbairn's conception, yet says: "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" (p. 262). "The bond between son and father in the spiritual world is ethical," he says. "Jesus rested his own Sonship on community of character" (*ibid.*). Here then it is distinctly asserted that the biblical conception of Fatherhood has nothing to do with physical relationship, and that sonship means ethical community of character. And it seems inevitable to conclude, since this community of character is not a general fact, as between God and men, that men generally are *not* children of God. But instead of taking this logical step, Dr. Watson goes on to remark that, while the bond between Father and Son in the Trinity is perfect, "it is only a suggestion between a sinner and God"—a "capability," a "possibility." But if sonship *consists* in community of character, then there is no sonship until there *is* community of character. To say that all men are children of God because there is in them the *possibility* of becoming such is like saying that a rough block of marble is a bust of Shakespeare because such a bust may be chiseled out of it.

And yet it is insisted that it is an almost brand-new discovery of recent times that all men are by natural birth children of God. When clearness of thought is attempted, however, it is admitted that sonship means spiritual likeness to God, that men by natural birth do not possess this ethical oneness with God, and that consequently they are not *actually*, but only *potentially*, children of God. But did anyone ever deny that? Mr. F. W. Robertson, however, in his sermons on Baptism, says that this rite does not *make* men children of God, but *proclaims* them to be such. "Man is God's child," he says, "and the sin of the man consists in perpetually living as if it were false." The confusion of thought here is similar to that which characterizes Dr. Watson's remarks. What is meant by saying that men live as if their being children of God were a falsehood? It can mean nothing else than that their life is not the life of children of God. But if so, then what else is meant than that they are *not* children of God? No, it will be rejoined, this is not meant; they *are* children of God, but they are unfilial, apostate children. Indeed; but what does this mean? Apostasy implies a previous loyalty.

Is it meant that they have lapsed from a genuinely filial state into an unfilial one? that they were once normal children, but are now abnormal ones? No, this is not meant either. Well, then, is it meant that all men are made in the image of God, having a spiritual nature akin to the divine, and capable, though depraved, of fellowship with God? Probably this is not far from what is meant. But if it is, then there is nothing new in the doctrine; it is old and trite. At the best, it can only be claimed that a new *name* is given to a familiar truth. But that is a very different thing from the discovery of a new truth, or the rediscovery of a lost one. It may, or may not be, desirable to call all men children of God, in order to indicate that God loves all men and desires that none should perish, but that all should be born again and have eternal life. But this makes the question simply one of terminology. One person says: All men are sinners, but may *become* children of God. The other says: All men are sinners, but nevertheless *are* children of God; only they need to find out that they are children, and live as children should. At bottom there is no difference between the two positions. Both acknowledge that the natural man needs regeneration. Both hold that only when he is regenerated can he be called a child of God in the full sense.

It is difficult, in view of this obvious state of the case, to understand why the doctrine of the universal sonship should be proclaimed with so much flourish. One writer[1] insists that, unless man is by nature a child of God, he must be regarded as nothing but an animal. And Dr. Fairbairn (p. 446) declares: "It is the emptiest nominalism to speak of the adoption of a man who never was a son; for the term can denote nothing real. The legal fiction has a meaning and a use only where it represents or pretends to represent something in the world of fact; but to speak of the 'adoption' of a creature who is in no respect a son is to use a term which is here without the saving virtue of sense." Surely this is a case in which strong assertion takes the place of strong thought. Adoption, in the common legal sense, means the investing of a person with the status and privileges

[1] DR. G. A. GORDON, *The Christ of Today*, p. 80.

of sonship, who previously has *not* been a son of the person adopting him. If the meaning of the sentence just quoted is that the person adopted must have been *a* son, *i. e.*, the son of *somebody*, though not of the one adopting him (and it is difficult to find any other meaning in it), then it seems very much like a quibble. Inasmuch as in the literal sense the person adopted is not a son of the person adopting until the adoption takes place, it certainly seems necessarily to follow that, when the figure of adoption is used of God in relation to men, the meaning must be that the state of sonship *begins with the adoption.* To say that so simple and incontrovertible a proposition as this is "without the saving virtue of sense" is more likely to betray the weakness of the argument in whose interest the assertion is made than it is to frighten those whose views are thus denounced.

But the doctrine of the universal sonship of men is heralded as not only a recent discovery, but also as being the real, though forgotten, doctrine of the New Testament, and especially of Jesus Christ. It is worth while, therefore, to take a survey of the teaching of the New Testament on the point in question, and see precisely what it is. Let us begin with the passages which speak of God as Father. And first, those which occur in the gospels.

Here we may at the outset throw out of consideration all those passages in which God is called Father only in relation to Jesus Christ. There is no doubt that in some peculiar sense Jesus is called the Son of God, and that correspondingly God is called the Father of Jesus. Accordingly, when Jesus calls God "my Father," as he does in a large proportion of the cases in which he speaks of God, we can draw no inference as to God's Fatherhood in relation to men in general. The same is ordinarily to be said of the passages in which Christ speaks of God as "the Father;" *e. g.*, John 5:20, "For the Father loveth the Son." This phrase in the gospel of John is more frequent than "my Father," but is synonymous with it. So also in Matt. 11:27; 24:36; 28:32; Mark 13:32; Luke 10:22, the only instances in the other gospels. There are few cases in which the phrase "the Father" is not used in obvious reference to

Christ as Son. The most noteworthy case perhaps is John 4:21–23. Here Jesus says to the Samaritan woman: "The hour cometh, when neither in this mountain nor in Jerusalem shall ye worship the Father." Here, and in the verse in which he describes what kind of worship "the Father" desires, the term is not by the connection limited, in its relation, to Christ as Son. The only question is, whether God is here designated as the universal Father, or whether he is called the Father especially of those who worship him. The context does not absolutely decide this point. It is a case on which we must look for light to the general usage of the New Testament and especially of Christ himself. There is no other instance in the gospels in which "the Father" can so plausibly be understood to have a universal reference. *E. g.*, when Philip (John 14:8) says, "Lord, show us the Father," we observe that it immediately follows Christ's statement, "If ye had known me ye would have known my Father also." Philip's "the Father" is evidently the same as Christ's "my Father."

We turn now to the passages in which God is directly called the Father of others than Jesus Christ. The most numerous of these are found in Matthew's gospel, and here chiefly in the Sermon on the Mount. In this sermon Christ speaks sixteen times of God as the Father of those addressed. The question to be settled is how extensively the appellation is meant to be understood. It certainly cannot be taken for granted that Christ here means to assert the absolute universality of the Fatherhood of God. The sermon is said (Matt. 5:1) to have been addressed to Christ's "disciples." It is true we read that there were "multitudes" present; and at the close of the sermon it is said "the multitudes were astonished at his teaching; for he taught them as one having authority." But this does not neutralize the explicit declaration that the sermon was addressed to the "disciples," as distinguished from the "multitudes." A lawyer in a court-room *addresses* the jury. He is *heard* by the multitude who come as spectators. What he says to the jury cannot be understood as necessarily applicable to the general audience. If it is argued that, when Christ in addressing his disciples calls

God *their* Father, he must have been *understood* as *implying* that God was the Father of all men, this can be made out only when it is proved that the universal Fatherhood of God was already a familiar conception and belief of the Jews. But of this there is no evidence whatever. At the most they may have been accustomed to think of God as the Father of the Jews. In the Old Testament God is sometimes called the Father of his chosen people. But he is there nowhere called the Father of all mankind. It is *possible*, then, that Christ's hearers, when he spoke of God as Father, may have understood him to use the term in this Old Testament sense. But there is no ground for supposing that they could have understood him to use it in a wider sense, unless he explicitly said that he so meant it. But he nowhere does so.

The remaining passages in Matthew are 10:20; 13:43; 18:14, and 23:9. In the first three the persons addressed are expressly said to be Christ's disciples; and there is nothing in his use of the name "Father" to suggest that he means it to be understood in a general sense. But the passage 23:9 occurs in a discourse which is said (vs. 1) to have been addressed "to the multitudes and to the disciples"—a fact that is noted by Dr. Watson (p. 260), who, however, fails to note that it is the *only* instance of this sort. He observes concerning the passage: "This attempt to restrict the intention of Jesus [with regard to the Fatherhood of God] is not of yesterday; it was the invention of the Pharisees. They detected the universal note in Jesus' teaching; they resented his unguarded charity." Now it is true that in this discourse Jesus very severely denounces the Pharisees and Scribes. He earnestly warns his hearers—"the multitudes and his disciples"—not to do after the works of those teachers. It is to these hearers, not to the Scribes and Pharisees, that he says, "One is your Father, which is in heaven." So then, if Dr. Watson is right in affirming that the great heresy of the Pharisees was the notion that they were sons of God while the publicans and sinners were not, Jesus here turns the tables, and *excludes* the Pharisees from the number of those to whom he said, "One is your Father." We therefore

still fail to find an assertion of the universal Fatherhood of God.

In the gospel of Mark there is only one instance in point (11:25); and here the address is said to be to the disciples of Jesus. In Luke the only cases are 6:36; 11:2, 13; 12:30, 32; and here also the persons addressed are expressly said to be Jesus' disciples. In John's gospel there is only one instance in which the phrase "your Father" occurs, viz., 20:17, "I ascend unto my Father and your Father." And this is said to the apostles. So far, then, we find in Jesus' language no unequivocal assertion that God is the Father of all men.

We come to the same result when we examine the other books of the New Testament. The general fact is that, when God is called Father, it is with reference either to Christ in particular or to Christ's disciples. When Paul in a benediction says, "Grace to you and peace from God our Father," the pronoun can legitimately be referred only to the person writing and the persons addressed. This observation applies to the larger number of cases in which Paul calls God "Father." There are a few passages in which God is called "Father" in a somewhat more indefinite way. Thus, Eph. 2:18, Paul says, "Through him [Christ] we both have our access in one Spirit unto the Father." But here Gentile and Jewish *Christians* are addressed; and there is no warrant for understanding "the Father" to mean the Father of all men. The same remark applies to 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 5:20; 6:23; Col. 1:12; 3:17; 1 Thess. 1:1; 2 Tim. 1:2; Titus 1:4; James 3:9; 1 Peter 1:2, 17; 1 John 1:2, 3; 2:1, 13, 15, 16, 22, 23, 24; 3:1. With regard to these latter instances (in John's epistle), it is perhaps more correct to suppose that, as in his gospel, John uses "Father" as antithetic to Christ the Son. So 2 John, vss. 3, 4, 9; Jude, vs. 1. There remain, however, one or two passages to be especially noted. In Eph. 4:6 we read, "One God and Father of all." This expression in form comes nearer than most others in the Bible to an ascription of universal Fatherhood to God. But it is to be noticed that Paul is here expressly speaking of the body of Christ, which is said to have "one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God and Father of all," so that the most obvious

reference of "all" is to the members of the body of Christ. A more plausible proof text for the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God is Eph. 3:14, 15, "I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family [race, tribe] in heaven and on earth is named." The interpretation is to some extent a matter of dispute. But it is clear, in the first place, that there is here a designed play on the words πατήρ and πατριά; and, in the next place, it is nearly certain that the latter word (with πᾶσα) has a universal application. It *can* be supposed to be limited to the families of *believers* in heaven and on earth; but the more obvious and probable meaning is that God is the Father of all the races of men. And accordingly we have here the clearest affirmation of the universal Fatherhood of God to be found in the New Testament. Yet it is to be noted that the ordinary conception of Fatherhood, as involving the new birth and adoption into the family of God, is not necessarily to be regarded as here excluded. In verse 6 Paul speaks of the Gentiles in general as "fellow heirs, and fellow members of the body, and fellow partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus." That is to say, they are spoken of as if all were already actually members of the body of Christ, although in point of fact only a few were. The language is ideal and proleptic; and so in 3:15 the Fatherhood of God may be described as universal in the same way—ideally, in the divine purpose of love, comprehending all races of men. So much at all events the passage does assert—that God is a universal Father in the sense that his paternal love embraces all his intelligent creatures.

In the epistle to the Hebrews (12:9) there is a passage which has been adduced as an assertion of the general Fatherhood of God: "We had the fathers of our flesh to chasten us, and we gave them reverence: shall we not much rather be in subjection to the Father of spirits and live?" There is a plain antithesis here between the human fathers and the heavenly Father. God is spoken of as related especially to our spiritual nature—possibly an allusion to Num. 16:22; 27:16, where Jehovah is called "the God of the spirits of all flesh." The word "Father" is naturally suggested in the Hebrews passage by the reference

to the human fathers; and when God is called Father of spirits, the term is perhaps most naturally understood as equivalent to Creator, as in Job 38: 28 we read, "Hath the rain a father? or who hath begotten the drops of dew?" The Greek has the article, so that it reads, "Father of the spirits;" and it may be rendered (with R. V. marg.) "Father of our spirits." That would certainly best correspond with the antithetic expression, "fathers of our flesh." In this case the name "Father" would have a limited application. At the most the phrase in question does not very distinctly, though it possibly does vaguely, assert the universal Fatherhood of God.

I am not aware that there are any other passages which have been adduced as proving the doctrine in question. It is noticeable that the clearest assertion of it is found in the epistles of Paul, not in the words of Christ. Christ nowhere, unless in the very doubtful passage, John 4: 21, 23, speaks of God as the universal Father. When he is especially addressing the Pharisees, or those who are not in sympathy with him, he *never calls God their Father.* If the doctrine of the universal Fatherhood of God is so vital and fundamental as it is asserted to be, it is strange that Christ should not at least once have clearly affirmed it. But there is *not a solitary instance of the sort.* Yet, in spite of this, Dr. Watson makes bold to say (p. 257): "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 center." When we consider that, apart from the Sermon on the Mount, there are only about half a dozen occasions on which Christ is said to have used the name "Father" with reference to men, and then only with reference to his followers, we are able to judge how much weight is to be attached to these sweeping assertions.

"People with dogmatic ends to serve," says Dr. Watson, "have striven to believe that Jesus reserved Father for the use of 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" (p. 260). But such an assertion, unaccompanied by proof, can hardly be regarded as demonstrative, even when fortified by an imputation of bad motives to those who take the other side. The question can be settled only by an inductive study of the biblical usage. The foregoing examination has shown pretty conclusively that Jesus did not indiscriminately call God the Father of all men. Dr. Watson makes only one attempt to prove his point by a specific quotation, that is, when he calls attention to the "multitudes" who are associated with the "disciples" in Matt. 23:1. But a close view of the passage shows that Christ (in vss. 2–12) is addressing those who are assumed to be his followers: "One is your Teacher, and all ye are brethren." The word "disciples" undoubtedly means here, as it often does (*e. g.*, 10:1; 11:1; 12:1), the twelve apostles, and the "multitude" denotes the wider circle of Jesus' disciples. And in any case, as we have already seen, he expressly distinguishes his auditors from the Scribes and Pharisees, so that when he adds to the words quoted above, "And call no man your father on the earth, for one is your Father, which is in heaven," we certainly cannot understand the Fatherhood as here declared to be universal.

So then, when it is affirmed that "one searches in vain to find that Jesus had an esoteric word for his intimates and an exoteric for the people," the reply is that one searches in vain for any proof of the opposite. But more than this: When it is intimated that Christ nowhere suggests that his application of the term "Father" is not as broad as the whole human race, it is sufficient to refer to John 8:41, 42. Here we read that certain of the Jews, in their dispute with Jesus, said to him, "We were not born of fornication; we have one Father, even God." And what is Jesus' reply? "If God were your Father ye would love me." And in vs. 44 he adds, "ye are of your father the devil." It would be difficult to find a more explicit declaration that God is *not* the Father of all men than this. This passage shows that Jesus' conception of the Fatherhood of God is an

ethical one. Those who are alienated from him have not God, but the devil, for their father. One unequivocal utterance like this throws a flood of light on the question before us. *Here is a distinct assertion that the Fatherhood of God is not universal; and our Lord nowhere distinctly declares that it is universal.* This is the simple fact, and one does not need to have any "dogmatic ends to serve" in order to see it.

Let us now examine the New Testament passages which speak of men as the sons, or children, of God. And first, the gospels. The first instance is Matt. 5:9, "Blessed are the peacemakers; for they shall be called sons of God." This certainly does not apply to all men. Next, Matt. 5:44, 45, "Love your enemies, and pray for them that persecute you; that ye may be the sons of your Father which is in heaven." Here most emphatically sonship is made to consist in being like him who "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good." Christ does not say, "Love your enemies, seeing you *are* sons of God," but "in order that ye may *become* [γένησθε] sons of your Father which is in heaven." This passage shows that God may be called Father of one who is not, in the fullest sense at least, a child of God. Even though it may be urged that Christ is here speaking to his *disciples*, who are therefore conceived as already children of God, yet his language unmistakably represents them as not really, or not fully, children till they are like God. In the parable of the tares (Matt. 13:36–42) Christ distinguishes between "the sons of the kingdom" and "the sons of the evil one." This is not exactly an instance of men being called sons of God; but it is virtually that, and at any rate the application of the term is not universal. In Luke 6:35 we read, "Love your enemies and do them good, and lend, never despairing; and your reward shall be great, and ye shall be sons of the Most High." This is parallel with Matt. 5:45, and like that passage makes sonship consist in ethical likeness to God. In Luke 20:35, 36 Christ says that "they that are accounted worthy to attain to that world and the resurrection from the dead . . . . are sons of God, being sons of the resurrection." Here again the designation is a limited one. These are all of the recorded

instances of Christ's use of the phrase in question. The other passages in the gospels bearing on the point before us are the following: In John 11:52 it is said of Caiaphas' words, that they involved a prophecy that Christ would "gather together into one all the children of God that are scattered abroad." Here, too, the application of the designation is obviously a restricted one. More important is John 1:12, where it is said: "But as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God, even to them that believe on his name." This is explicit as an assertion that the sonship is *constituted* by faith. Those that receive Christ and believe on him have the right to *become* children of God. It is almost amusing to find Mr. Robertson (*Sermons*, second series, p. 87) referring to this passage as evidence that all men are by nature children of God. He repeatedly declares that every man is a son of God; but he adds, "To be a son of God is one thing; to know that you are, and call him Father, is another—and that is regeneration." According to this, however, John ought to have written, "As many as received him, to them gave he the right to learn that they have always been children of God."

There is, so far as I know, only one other passage in the gospels which has been appealed to in proof of the doctrine of the general sonship of men. It is Luke 3:38, where, at the close of the genealogy of Jesus, it is said of Adam that he was "the son of God." But obviously this passage fails to accomplish the purpose in question. It simply affirms that, whereas the other men mentioned had been procreated by a human father, Adam, having no human father, was created by God. That Adam is called *son* is simply enough explained by the natural desire of the writer to complete the genealogy by the use of the same form of expression which had been used all along before. But even if we give the greatest possible weight to the phraseology of the verse, it asserts only that *Adam* was the son of God, and cannot be pressed to involve the doctrine that all men are.

The gospels, therefore, and particularly the words of Christ, as recorded there, present not a single declaration to the effect

that all men are children of God. Wherever the conception is found, it clearly and unmistakably is limited to a portion of mankind. If now we turn to the other books, the result will be essentially the same. In Rom. 8:14 Paul says, "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God." In the next verse this is called "the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father." Here, as in vss. 16 and 19, it is manifest that Paul is speaking of the regenerate. In 9:8 he is still more explicit: "It is not the children of the flesh that are children of God, but the children of the promise are reckoned for a seed." In 2 Cor. 6:18 Paul quotes from the Old Testament, "Come out from among them . . . . and touch no unclean thing; and I will receive you, and will be to you a Father, and ye shall be to me sons and daughters." Here again the application is a limited one; and equally so in the similar quotation found in Rom. 9:26. In Gal. 3:26 we read, "For ye are all sons of God, through faith in Christ Jesus"—a declaration addressed to Christians and descriptive only of Christians. The same is to be said of Gal. 4:5–7 and Eph. 1:5, where again Christians are said to be *adopted* as sons—a conception which implies a previous state that was not sonship. The same remark applies to Eph. 5:1; Phil. 2:15; Heb. 2:10, 13, 14, and 12:5–8. In 1 John 3:1 the apostle says, "Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed on us, that we should be called the children of God; and such we are." And in vs. 2 he adds, "Behold, now are we children of God, and it is not yet made manifest what we shall be." The same expression occurs in 5:2, "Hereby know we that we love the children of God, when we love God, and do his commandments." It is obvious that, as the epistle is addressed to Christians, the appellation "children of God" is intended to be applied to them. It is surprising that the statement, "Now are we children of God," could ever be quoted, as it has been, to prove that according to John all men are by nature God's children. The most superficial reading of the epistle is enough to show that John means by the "children of God" the same that is meant by "the begotten of God" of whom he speaks in 2:29; 3:9; 4:7; 5:1, 4, 18, and of whom

he affirms that they do not, and even cannot, sin. It certainly requires a powerful imagination to suppose that *this* affirmation is made of mankind in general. If there were still the shadow of a doubt as to the limitation of the term "children of God" to the regenerate, it would have to disappear when one reads 3 : 10, "In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God." John, then, it seems, conceives men to be divided into two classes—the children of God and the children of the devil—precisely as we have seen that Jesus himself did in his dispute with the Jews, John 8 : 42, 44. There remains but one more passage in the New Testament, so far as I know, in which the children of God are spoken of, viz., Rev. 21 : 7; and here, too, they are sharply distinguished from the wicked.

There is, however, a passage in Paul's address at Athens (Acts 17 : 28, 29) which has been cited as teaching that all men are the children of God. Paul quotes the poet Aratus as saying of God, "For we are also his offspring." And then he adds, "Being then the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and device of man." Although the word "sons" or "children" is not used, yet this proposition, endorsed by the apostle, affirms a certain kinship as subsisting between God and man—a conception similar to that of man made in the image of God. To be sure, Paul here seems to be speaking of a "physical relation—the 'offspring' of the heathen poets," of which Dr. Watson affirms that it is almost a stupidity to explain that Jesus is not thinking when he speaks of Fatherhood. This may be so; but it remains true that, if we are to find the doctrine of the universal sonship of men taught in the New Testament, we must find it in this utterance of Paul; for it appears, as the result of an exhaustive examination of the passages in point, that the doctrine can by no stretch of honest and intelligent exegesis be possibly found anywhere else. Accordingly it turns out that here, too, as in reference to the universal divine Fatherhood, it is not Christ, as is so often and emphatically asserted, who champions the doctrine; it is found, if found at all, only in the teachings of the apostle.

This survey of the passages treating of the sonship of men is, as might have been anticipated, even more decisive than the examination of the passages in which God is called Father. God can more appropriately be compared to a good father than mankind as a whole to good children. He realizes the highest ideal of fatherly tenderness and love; men in general do not realize the ideal of filial devotion. It is, therefore, not surprising that we have found a few passages in which the universal Fatherhood of God seems to be asserted or implied; it is almost surprising that such passages are so few. But those which speak of men as the children of God, without an exception, clearly and unequivocally limit the application of it to a part of the human race. And, contrary to the representation which has been persistently made, this limitation is made by no one else so emphatically and unmistakably as by Jesus Christ himself.

But some persons may at this point object that, in the survey of the scriptural teaching on the matter in question, I have forgotten the most important item of biblical evidence bearing on the Fatherhood of God, viz., the parable of the prodigal son. No, I have not forgotten it; and I also do not forget that it is almost the only dependence of those who undertake to prove that in the Bible all men, whatever their character may be, are called children of God. But I furthermore remember the good old maxim, that a parable must not be made to run on all fours. It would indeed be a singular thing if Jesus had intended by a parable to contradict or correct what he had said in his more direct teaching. Just what the interpretation and application of a parable should be depends on the light which comes from the ordinary and more doctrinal utterances, not *vice versa*.

Now, that the parable in question was designed to convey a lesson concerning the attitude of God towards men, no one doubts. But we give it this application because of the general drift of Jesus' positive teachings; the parable itself makes no such application of itself. It immediately follows the parables about the lost sheep and the lost piece of money. And the occasion of giving them is explained by the statement, "And both the Pharisees and the Scribes murmured, saying, This man receiveth

sinners and eateth with them." There can be no doubt that the three parables all had one purpose, viz., to rebuke the uncharitableness and narrow-mindedness of the objectors. Christ aimed to teach the all-comprehensive love of God, and to lift his hearers above the notion that the divine favor is limited to the Jews as a race, or, among the Jews themselves, to a chosen few. Especially did he aim to expose the haughty self-righteousness of the Pharisees, just as he did by the parable of the Pharisee and the publican (Luke 18:9–14). This, now, being granted, it may be said, If it is conceded that the father in the parable represents God, does not that prove that God is the universal Father, and that all men are his children? Not at all, unless, reasoning in the same way, we are to infer from the first parable that God is a real shepherd to all men, and that all men are literal sheep. God is indeed called a shepherd in the Old Testament; and everyone feels the beauty and pertinency of the designation. But if, on the strength of this parable, one should undertake to derive a doctrine of the essential shepherdhood of God and the essential sheephood of men, we should begin to inquire into his sanity. Still worse would be the case, if, in interpreting the second parable, one should infer the essential womanhood of God and the essential coinhood of man. In the third parable Jesus, instead of illustrating his doctrine by a shepherd and sheep, or by a woman and her coins, tells a story in which a father and a son figure as the leading characters. The same truth is taught as before. But why must we insist on doing here what, in the other two cases, would be impossible and absurd? Precisely the same lesson might have been taught by a story of a wife deserting her husband and afterwards returning in penitence and being graciously received back by her husband. But we should not therefore conclude that husbandhood is "the final idea" of God, or wifehood that of men. Yet such a conclusion would be as legitimate as to infer from the parable of the prodigal son that God is literally the father of all men, and that all men are literally the children of God. If there are elsewhere express declarations of the alleged real Fatherhood of God, well and good; but a *parable* can be made to furnish neither proof

nor disproof of it. Such literalness of interpretation would at once defeat itself. If, because the prodigal is called a son, we must say that all men are children of God, then the question arises, whom the elder son in the parable represents. He was a *son*, surely, as much as the younger one was. By what right is the younger son made to stand for all mankind, leaving nobody for the elder son to stand for? And if by some device we can divide the world into the two classes represented by the two sons, we should still have the "citizens" whose swine the prodigal son tended, the "friends" of the elder son, and the "servants" of the father, to say nothing of the swine themselves and the fatted calf. Whom do they stand for? According to the literalness of interpretation, which forgets that in an extended parable much is to be regarded as only the costume of the story, and insists that the son, or the sons, of the parable must represent all men as being sons of God, it would follow that, since these other personages in the parable are not sons of the old man, and yet must stand for certain classes of mankind, God is after all father only to some men, but not to all! And so the very doctrine which the parable has been supposed to teach turns out to be contradicted by it.

We need not for a moment deny that there is a *peculiar* fitness in likening God to a father. The figure is a natural one; but still it is a figure, just as when God is called shepherd, husband, rock, or shield. What needs to be resolutely protested against is the attempt to treat a figure as if it were not a figure —the attempt to make out that, while the *other* names applied to God are to be understood as figurative, *this* one of father is to be taken as literal, and as embodying a profound metaphysical truth concerning the relation of God to men. It is inferred from it that man is "consubstantiated with God." We are told that man by nature sustains an "indestructible filial relation to the Infinite," and that the consciousness of this relation "is the condition without which an appreciation of Christian morality is not even possible." This means that sonship to God is for every man a literal fact, an inalienable connection with God, which must be described by the term "sonship," and can be expressed

by no other. A metaphysical dogma is deduced from a figure of speech; and then it is insisted that this dogma can be rejected only at the peril of making the natural man a mere animal, and shutting out from him the possibility of ever becoming anything else!

The foregoing discussion has indicated what the general fact is as to the scriptural doctrine concerning the Fatherhood of God. With hardly an exception the term "Father" is applied to God only with reference to those who in a special sense are represented as his people. In the Old Testament God is often spoken of as a Father to the Jewish people. In the New Testament he is called the Father of those who are united by faith to his Son Jesus Christ. As Abraham is called "the father of all them that believe" (Rom. 4:11), so God, in a still higher sense, is the Father of the faithful. And as Christ said to the unbelieving Jews that they were not Abraham's children, because they did not the works of Abraham (John 8:39), so he told them that they were not the children of God, because they did not love him whom God had sent (vs. 42). Sonship, according to the uniform teaching of Christ and his apostles, consists in a *spiritual* kinship with God, which begins, not with the natural birth, but with the new, the supernatural, birth. "Except a man be born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God" (John 3:3). It is those who love their enemies who *become* the sons of the heavenly Father (Matt. 5:45). "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, these are sons of God" (Rom. 8:14). Now, however, we are told that this consistent representation of Christ and the writers of the New Testament must be abandoned, and that we must substitute for it the doctrine that all men, whether regenerated or not, are the children of God. And this we are required to do on the ground of a certain *interpretation* of one parable—an interpretation which conflicts with the teaching of Christ everywhere else, as well as with the teachings of his apostles. Instead of interpreting the parable in accordance with the plainer and unmistakable purport of all the rest of the New Testament, we are actually told that everything in the New Testament which conflicts, or seems to conflict, with the doctrine of

the universal Fatherhood of God and the universal sonship of men must be interpreted, or corrected, according to the *alleged* meaning of this parable!

The conclusion of the whole matter is not hard to find. God being the Maker and Benefactor of men, he may fitly be likened to a father, and be called the Father of all men. The Bible lends some countenance to this wide application of the term, though its ordinary use of the appellation is a restricted one. If, then, God may properly be called the Father of all, it seems natural and fitting that all men should be called children of God. And, properly understood, there can be no objection to this. As the objects of God's creation, benefaction, and love, all men sustain a relation to God analogous to that of children to a father. Even without positive biblical warrant, such a usage would be justifiable. It must, however, be insisted that it is not the biblical usage. Nowhere, unless in one somewhat questionable passage, are men in general called in the Bible children of God. The allegation that this universal sonship of men is a biblical doctrine recently discovered, or rediscovered, is utterly baseless. And when, on the strength of this alleged discovery, the Fatherhood of God and the sonship of men, instead of being taken as figurative designations of a relation between God and men which has always been known and recognized, are set up as exact scientific statements of a profound ontological truth concerning man and God which can be expressed in no other way—then it is proper to enter an emphatic protest in the name of clear thought and sound exegesis. What there is true in the doctrine is not new; and what there is new in it is not true.

# THE FOURTH GOSPEL AND THE QUARTODECIMANS.

By JAMES DRUMMOND,
Oxford.

THE principal purpose of this article is to examine an argument which was at one time advanced as a conclusive demonstration that the fourth gospel could not have proceeded from the apostle John, which is now abandoned as delusive even by some of those who reject the Johannine authorship, but which Dr. Martineau has pressed with undoubting confidence in his recent work, *The Seat of Authority in Religion.* His judgment gives a new vitality and interest to the question, which more than justifies a full examination of the evidence. The attractiveness of the subject, moreover, is by no means confined to its bearing on the gospel, but extends to the history of an ancient controversy and the growth of discipline in the church, so that the historian and antiquarian as well as the critic may find something congenial in its treatment.

The argument, as it affects the gospel, may be stated as follows: The synoptic gospels contain the primitive apostolic tradition, and they concur in the statement that Jesus partook of the regular Jewish passover on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan (that is according to our mode of reckoning days, for with the Jews the evening was the beginning of the fifteenth), and consequently represent the crucifixion as taking place after the passover had been eaten. The fourth gospel, on the other hand, places the last supper on the evening of the thirteenth, and the crucifixion on the fourteenth, before the passover was eaten. We believe that, though the question is open to argument, this is probably a correct view of the facts; but it is important to remember in the present discussion that the altered dates in the fourth gospel are not made prominent, that they

entirely escape the notice of the casual reader, and have to be gathered from detached texts, to which, whether reasonably or not, different interpretations have been given.[1] It might be urged, at this point, that as the last gospel is at variance with the primitive apostolic tradition, and as John was one of the two disciples who were sent to prepare for the passover,[2] the claim of Johannine authorship becomes quite inadmissible. This, however, is only a particular instance of the larger argument founded on the unhistorical character of the work, and it is one of the instances in which the accuracy of the fourth gospel may be most plausibly defended. The present contention is of a different kind. The churches of the province of Asia, and some of the adjoining districts, celebrated Easter on the fourteenth day of the month at the time when the Jews kept the passover, and in defense of this custom they appealed to an ancient usage which had been sanctioned by the apostle John. It is maintained that this celebration must have been an annual commemoration of the Lord's Supper; that therefore John must have placed the last supper on the fourteenth, and cannot be the author of the gospel. If these points could be all established, the argument would certainly seem to be conclusive. A curious modification, however, which makes the argument much less telling, is introduced when it is denied that John was ever in Asia Minor at all, for then the Asiatic usage is severed from all connection with him, and he may have written the gospel which opposed that usage. The only thing that can be said in this case is that the gospel, being in conflict with the practice of the Asiatic churches, cannot have been received by them as a work of the apostle's. This last position has not, outside of the present argument, a particle of evidence; but if it could be established, the reply might fairly be made that they rejected it on dogmatic

[1] It would require a separate paper to discuss the various opinions which have been held both in ancient and modern times in regard to the precise historical facts, and in regard to the meaning of the gospel narratives and the possibility of harmonizing them with one another. Our opinion upon such points, however, does not seriously affect the substance of this essay, and I must be content with a provisional expression of my own view.

[2] Luke 22:8.

grounds, and because it was not written by a man that they foolishly confounded with the apostle, and that therefore their skepticism could not be set against the belief of the rest of Christendom. To maintain at the same time that the Asiatics had a correct tradition and impression of John's Judaic tendencies, and that all other traditions related to a man who was not the real John, is obviously absurd. We may, accordingly, confine ourselves to the most telling and consistent form of the argument; and as the whole question is one of considerable interest, I will go a little more into detail than the simple purpose of refutation requires.

Before entering on an account of the early controversy I may venture to remark that the very confidence with which the argument is pressed excites a preliminary suspicion that there must be a flaw in it, because it would legitimately lead to consequences which are quite contrary to the fact. Mr. Tayler, for instance, says: "The gospel which we find in general circulation under the name of John before the close of the second century contains statements respecting the last supper of Jesus with his disciples so entirely at variance with the belief on which the quartodecimans, as their very name implies, founded their practice, that, had they recognized it as a work of John, it is impossible that they could have appealed in their defense to his sanction. What is more remarkable still, those who were opposed to quartodeciman usage, and wished to enforce a catholic uniformity throughout the church, never once thought of appealing in the earlier stages of the controversy to the statement in the fourth gospel, which was decidedly in their favor. A word from one standing in so close a relation to Jesus as the beloved apostle would have settled the question forever. Yet not till quite the end of the second century do we find the name of John adduced to support the catholic view."[3] The reader naturally asks, Then why did not the appeal to the fourth gospel settle the question forever? The objectionable practice and the controversy continued for more than a century after the word was spoken by one who was believed to be the beloved apostle, and the dispute

[3] *An Attempt to Ascertain the Character of the Fourth Gospel*, 1867, p. 117.

was settled at last by an appeal, not to John, but to Constantine. Yet the Asiatics were never charged with holding false views in regard to the gospel, but their entire orthodoxy, except in a point of discipline, was fully and frankly admitted. The argument, therefore, proves a great deal too much, and consequently creates a suspicion of some fundamental flaw.

We will now proceed to a brief historical sketch which will be a useful preparation for the discussion of details.

Eusebius[4] relates that in the closing years of the second century there was no small disputation because the parishes of all Asia (that is, probably, of the province), appealing to an ancient tradition, thought that they ought to observe the fourteenth day of the month as the feast of the passover of salvation,[5] the day on which the Jews were directed to kill the lamb. Accordingly on this day, on whatever day of the week it fell, they put an end to the fast, whereas the churches throughout all the rest of the world, following an apostolic tradition, thought it unbecoming to terminate it on any other than the day of our Saviour's resurrection. Synods of bishops were held; letters were circulated; and there was a concurrence of opinion that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should not be celebrated on any other than the Lord's day, and that on this day alone should the fast at the passover be terminated. Several of these writings were extant in the time of Eusebius, and we should observe that among the bishops to whom he particularly refers are those of Pontus, for we thus learn that the quartodeciman view did not extend over the whole of Asia Minor. The bishops of Asia, however, were not convinced; and their leader, Polycrates, addressed a letter to Victor of Rome, defending their position. A portion of this letter has been preserved by Eusebius.[6] Polycrates says: "We therefore keep the day not in a reckless manner,[7] neither adding nor taking away. For in Asia also great lights have fallen asleep." He proceeds to specify Philip,

[4] *H. E.*, V, 23.

[5] Τοῦ σωτηρίου πάσχα, so-called, presumably, to distinguish the Christian from the Jewish passover.

[6] *Ibid.*, 24.

[7] Ἀραδιούργητον.

one of the twelve apostles, "and moreover, also, John, who leaned on the breast of the Lord, who became a priest, having worn the *petalon*, and martyr and teacher: he sleeps in Ephesus." Among more recent bishops, then deceased, he names Polycarp, Thraseas, Sagaris, Papirius, Melito, and says that "these all kept the day of the passover on the fourteenth according to the gospel, transgressing in nothing, but following according to the rule of the faith." He himself followed the tradition of his relatives, among whom he was the eighth bishop. He had been sixty-five years in the Lord, had met with brethren from all parts of the world, had gone through every holy scripture, and was not alarmed, for those who were greater than he had said, "We must obey God rather than men." He could mention the bishops whom he had summoned at Victor's request, who were very numerous, and signified their approval of the epistle. Victor's reply to this letter was an attempt to excommunicate as heterodox the parishes of all Asia, together with the neighboring churches. So extreme a measure, however, did not meet with universal approval, and remonstrances were addressed to the bishop of Rome, urging him to have some regard for peace, and for unity and love towards his neighbors. Among others, Irenæus wrote in the name of the brethren in Gaul. He admitted that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated only on the Lord's day, but he admonished Victor not to cut off whole churches of God for observing an ancient custom. For, he added, the dispute was not only about the day, but about the very form of the fast, some fasting one day, some two or more; and these varieties, which arose at an earlier time from simplicity and ignorance, did not disturb their mutual peace, but the difference of the fast proved the harmony of the faith. He then proceeded to relate an event which carries back our history from thirty to forty years. The presbyters who presided over the church of Rome before Soter (going back as far as Xystus, 115–125 A. D., according to Lipsius) did not themselves observe [? the day], and nevertheless they remained at peace with those who came from the parishes in which it was observed, although the contrast was made more obvious by the

proximity. Never were any rejected, and the Roman presbyters, though not themselves observing, sent the eucharist to those who observed. And when the blessed Polycarp was staying at Rome in the time of Anicetus (155 A. D.), the latter could not persuade him not to observe, as he had always observed with John, the disciple of our Lord, and with the rest of the apostles with whom he associated; nor was Anicetus persuaded to observe, for he said that he ought to adhere to the custom of the presbyters before him. Nevertheless these two men had communion with one another, and in the church Anicetus allowed Polycarp to celebrate the eucharist, so that they parted in peace. Irenæus does not tell us, in the quotations which Eusebius has given, from what sources he derived his information; but he must have had ample opportunities of learning the facts, and I see no reason for calling them in question.

Returning to the time of Victor, we find an incident of some importance, which is related only too briefly by Eusebius.[8] The bishops of Palestine met together and drew up a letter in which they made a lengthened statement[9] about the tradition which had come down to them, from the succession of the apostles, in regard to the passover. On this most interesting point we are unfortunately left without information, and we cannot say to what apostles they appealed, or through what men the tradition had come down; but in comparing this with the Asiatic tradition we must remember that considerably more than a century had elapsed since the last apostle left Palestine, and that the country had been so distracted by insurrections and wars that there may well have been some break in the continuity of ecclesiastical customs, whereas in Asia our evidence professes to go back to the time of Polycarp, who was himself a disciple of John. Nevertheless the Palestinian bishops themselves attached great importance to their decision, for at the end of the letter they expressed a desire that a copy should be sent to every church, so that they might not be responsible for those who "easily led their own souls astray." They added that a letter had been received from Alexandria, from which it appeared that there also

[8] *Ibid.*, 25. [9] Πλεῖστα διειληφότες.

the same holy day was observed. That day, as we have seen, was a Sunday; but what Sunday we have not yet been told.

Eusebius gives us one other glimpse into the controversies about the passover in the second century.[10] Melito, bishop of Sardis, who is mentioned in the letter of Polycrates as a supporter of the Asiatic custom, wrote two books on the Passover. The historian quotes only three lines from this treatise, and tells us nothing of its purport; but we learn that it was written in consequence of a great controversy which arose in Laodicea about the passover, when Servilius Paulus was proconsul of Asia,[11] on occasion of the martyrdom of Sagaris. It is generally assumed that this controversy related to the point in dispute between the eastern and the western churches, and it is possible that on the death of Sagaris, who, as we have learned from Polycrates, was a quartodeciman bishop, there may have been an attempt to introduce the western custom; but we must bear in mind that this is pure conjecture, and does not rest on a particle of evidence. Irenæus, as we have seen, expressly tells us that the controversy was not only about the day; and this particular dispute may have been about the fast, or about the meaning to be attached to the day, or about the evangelical chronology. Be this as it may, Melito's work induced Clement of Alexandria to write a treatise of his own on the passover, but hardly as a formal reply, for Eusebius only says he has mentioned Melito's essay as the cause of his composition. Some fragments have come down to us of a work by Apollinaris of Hierapolis on the same subject,[12] and it has been supposed that it too was written in reply to Melito; but of this there is no evidence whatever, and it is certainly curious that critics who so readily disbelieve facts which are more or less strongly attested so confidently accept statements which are not supported by testimony of any kind. What the position of Apollinaris really was we shall have to consider further on.

In spite of the strong measures adopted by Victor the several churches continued in the observance of their respective

[10] *H. E.*, IV, 26. [11] About 164–6 A. D.

[12] Preserved in the *Chronicon Paschale*.

customs till the time of Constantine, and the settlement of this question was one of the objects with which the Council of Nicæa was summoned.[13] It was decreed that all should celebrate the paschal festival at the same time,[14] and a letter from the synod announced the good news that all the brethren in the East, who formerly kept the passover with the Jews, would henceforth act agreeably to the Roman practice.[15] Constantine himself appealed to the churches in a letter which deals with the question at some length.[16] But even these combined authorities were not sufficient to terminate the controversy. Epiphanius tells us that men were still writing and disputing about it in his time, and that the Audians persisted in keeping the passover with the Jews.[17] Some of the Novatians also, in the latter part of the fourth century, dissented from the general practice, in opposition to the custom of their own sect.[18] But we need not dwell upon these later events; for any details which throw light on the subject under consideration will be noticed in the following discussion.

We must now endeavor to interpret this ancient controversy, and examine its bearing on the Johannine authorship of the gospel. We must consider first the origin, extent, and meaning of the celebration known among the early Christians as the passover.[19]

There can, I think, be no doubt that it was imported into Christianity from Judaism, though probably from the first it received an altered significance. Jewish Christians would naturally keep the passover with their countrymen, but would do so in remembrance, no longer of the deliverance from Egypt, but of Christ; and as the Old Testament was accepted by the church as sacred Scripture, the ceremony would easily pass on to the Gentiles, who would look upon their own rite as the true and spiritual fulfillment of the law. That this was actually the course of events may be inferred from all the evidence at our disposal.

[13] SOCRATES, I, 8. [14] SOZOMEN, I, xxi, 6. [15] SOCRATES, I, 9.

[16] Given in EUSEB., *Vit. Con.*, III, 17–20; SOCRATES, I, 9; THEODORET, *Ec. Hist.* I, 9.

[17] *Haer.*, LXX, 9.

[18] SOCR. IV, 28; V, 21; VII, 5; SOZOM., VI, xxiv, 6–7; VII, xviii.

[19] Τὸ Πάσχα.

The name of the festival is simply a repetition in Greek letters of the Aramaic form of פַּסְחָא, the Hebrew word for passover. The preservation of the same name points to continuity of practice; and we must observe that the use of this Jewish name is not local or temporary, but universal and permanent. Everywhere the old writers assume that the feast in question is the passover, and that it had been and was still kept by Jews as well as Christians. The significance of this fact is lost if we translate the word by our Easter; and I have therefore retained the translation which is habitually given to the Hebrew term.

How this festival of Jewish name was celebrated in the earliest times, and to what extent it partook of the character of the passover, our authorities do not inform us. In the fourth century it was regarded as the chief celebration in the year; the night before was turned into day by the splendor of the illuminations; and Easter day itself was kept with the utmost religious joy by all sections of the people.[20] No doubt the ceremonial would tend to become more magnificent as time went on; but from the first it must have had something to distinguish it from all other feasts, and to give appropriateness to the name by which it was called. The argument against the Johannine authorship of the gospel requires that at least its principal feature should have been the commemoration of the last supper on the presumed anniversary of the day when it was actually eaten; but this supposition is exposed to fatal objections. In the first place, it is totally destitute of evidence. Secondly, there would have been nothing distinctive in such a celebration, for the Lord's Supper was administered every week. But most important of all in our present inquiry is this, that if the question had been on what day it was proper to commemorate the last supper, the controversy must have had quite a different form from that which it actually assumed. The dispute could not have been between the fourteenth day of the month and the first day of the week, but must have been between the thirteenth and the fourteenth days of the month, the advocates of the former appealing to the fourth gospel.

[20] See details and authorities in the *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, article "Easter, ceremonies of."

There would then have been real ground for asserting an inconsistency between the alleged Johannine practice and the Johannine gospel; but of any question whether the thirteenth or fourteenth day should be kept there is not a trace. The western church might, however, have preferred regulating even the commemoration of the last supper by the day of the week, and not by the day of the year, but, if so, Thursday, and not Sunday, would have been the proper time. The supposition, therefore, that the passover was merely an annual celebration of the Lord's Supper must be discarded. With this conclusion the date of the last supper ceases to have anything to do with the controversy, and the argument collapses.

It has, however, been supposed that the eastern festival was much more Jewish in form than the western, whereas the fourth gospel wishes to separate the last supper from the passover. Even if this were true, it would not signify, unless the question had arisen in what form the last supper should be celebrated; but of this there is not a trace. Still it will be interesting to inquire how far the allegation can be sustained. All churches agreed, as we have seen, in calling the festival the passover, and thus recognizing its Jewish origin. In accordance with this name it was formerly supposed that at the time of the paschal controversy the whole church kept the Jewish passover, and that a lamb was slain; but afterwards it was admitted that this was not the case with the western church, but only with the eastern. But Schürer, on whose authority this statement is made, adds that even the latter view is now generally given up. He maintains that certainly the quartodecimans did not kill a lamb, for that portion of the celebration ceased even among the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem, and even before that time the Jews living away from Palestine partook of an ordinary meal.[21] It may be doubted whether the argument from Jewish custom is conclusive. The Jews naturally dispensed with the lamb when the temple was destroyed; but the Christians recognized the church

[21] See his dissertation, *De controversiis paschalibus sec. p. Chr. n. sæc. exortis*, delivered July 26, 1869; translated in the *Zeitschrift f. d. hist. Theol.* (1870), which last I have used; § IV.

as the true temple of God, and its members as spiritual kings and priests; and they might therefore consider it proper to kill the lamb wherever they were residing, and may have adopted that custom before the destruction of Jerusalem. At all events we are not without some traces of this custom. Epiphanius, speaking of the manner in which "the holy church of God" celebrates the passover, says: "We take the sheep from the tenth day, recognizing the name of Jesus on account of the iota."[22] Elsewhere, having quoted the commandment to take a sheep from the tenth day of the month, and keep it till the fourteenth, he adds that the church continues to observe the feast of the passover, that is, the appointed week, following the arrangement of the apostles themselves, from the second day of the week, which is the purchasing of the sheep; and if the fourteenth day of the month fell on the second or any subsequent day of the week, the sacrifice of the sheep went on.[23] The quartodecimans also would seem to have used the sheep, for Epiphanius[24] urges, as an inconsistency in their practice, that, if they keep the passover on the fourteenth, they have need to take the sheep from the tenth, and keep it till the fourteenth, and so their fast would continue, not for one day, but for five. These passages certainly suggest a general practice of killing a sheep at the passover on the part of Christians. In the ninth century one of the charges brought by the Greek against the Roman church, and repudiated by the latter as false, was that they blessed and offered a lamb at the passover, according to the custom of the Jews, upon the altar, together with the Lord's body. The charge may have been untrue in its precise form; but that it was not without foundation appears from a reference by Walafrid Strabo to the error of some "who consecrated with a proper [or special] benediction the flesh of a [or 'the,' the Latin leaving it doubtful] lamb at the passover, placing it near or under the altar, and on the day of the resurrection partook of the flesh itself before other food for the body; and the order of this benediction," he adds, "is still observed by many."[25] The formula

[22] The first letter of the word Jesus, and the symbol for ten. *Haer.*, L, 3.

[23] *Haer.*, LXX, 12. [24] L, 2. [25] *De rebus eccles.*, chap. 18.

of benediction has been preserved,[26] and it is stated in one of the Roman rituals that a lamb was solemnly partaken of by the pope and eleven cardinals.[27] The lamb was roasted, and the benediction pronounced, and the whole ceremony was in imitation of the last supper, as, indeed, is expressly stated, "in figure of the twelve apostles around the table of Christ, when they ate the passover." The lamb is not brought into connection with the altar; and it was to such a connection, and not to the eating of the lamb, that the Greek church objected. The ceremony took place in the secretarium, after the celebration of mass in the church.[28] The pope, having partaken of the lamb, handed it to the next basilicarius, saying, "Quod facis, fac citius. Sicut ille accepit ad damnationem, tu accipe ad remissionem." Distribution was then made to the rest who were present.[29] At the same time a curious custom prevailed "in the Catholic church within the Roman state," which further illustrates the connection of Easter with the passover. The archdeacon molded a preparation of wax and oil into the likeness of lambs, and these wax lambs were distributed among the people in the church after mass and communion, on the Saturday following Easter Sunday, that, "as

[26] On the day of the holy passover, after the celebration of mass, the following Benedictio agni in pascha was pronounced in the secretarium: "Post celebratam Dominicæ sanctæ paschæ solennitatem, postque etiam transactos jejuniorum dies, jam animabus spiritualibus dapibus refectis de mensa tuæ majestatis, offerimus famuli tui pro hujus fragilitate corpusculi aliquantulum reparandi, hanc usui nostro concessam creaturam agni, poscentes ut eum ore proprio nobis signantibus benedicas, ac dextera tua sanctifices, et universis ex eo sumentibus ministrata munuscula grata effici præstes, atque his cum gratiarum actione perceptis te DEUM, qui es cibus vitæ et animæ nostræ, magis et inhianter desideremus, et indefesse fruamur." This is immediately followed by a Benedictio aliarum carnium, in which there is an allusion to the command given to Moses and "thy people" to eat a lamb in Egypt, "in figura agni Domini nostri Jesu Christi, cujus sanguine omnia primogenita tibi de mundo redemisti." See MELCHIOR HITTORPIUS, *De divinis Catholicæ Ecclesiæ Officiis ac Ministeriis*, Coloniæ, 1568, where an *Ordo Romanus* is printed from an old manuscript. The above quotations are from p. 79. There is a full account of the offices for the entire period of Easter celebration; but the above are sufficient for our purpose.

[27] See GIESELER, *Kirchengesch.*, II, i, § 41, note 12, to which my attention was called by J. J. Tayler, p. 122, note.

[28] See the account quoted in note 26 from Melchior Hittorpius.

[29] See MABILLON'S *Museum Italicum:* Luteciæ Parisiorum, 1687–9, the *Ordo Romanus* auctore Benedicto (written before 1143), Tom. II, p. 142; also auct. Cencio, pp. 186–7.

the children of Israel in Egypt inscribed the sign T on the thresholds of their houses, that they might not be smitten by the angel, so we also ought to write this sign on the threshold of our houses by faith, from the blood of the passion of the Immaculate Lamb, Christ, lest we be smitten by the devil and by faults."[30] Urban V (1362–1370) sent the emperor (Charles IV) one of these wax lambs as "a great gift," accompanied by some Latin verses, which show that it was expected to act as a charm.[31] In the foregoing accounts it is clear that the survival of the proper passover was also a memorial of the last supper, and at the same time of the death of Christ as the true Paschal Lamb. It was not, however, celebrated on either the thirteenth or fourteenth of the month, but on Easter Sunday, when it brought the days of the fast to a close. The connection with the passover has not been wholly forgotten in later times. In the Missale Romanum authorized by the Council of Trent Easter is still the *dies paschæ*, and "on this day particularly" thanks are given to God, because "Christ our passover was sacrificed; for he is the True Lamb, who has taken away the sins of the world." Even the paschal symbols have not wholly disappeared from modern times. The following statements of Cardinal Wiseman's are interesting: "The midnight service of Easter eve, now performed on Saturday morning, gives a similar coincidence;[32] a stronger authority for this connection.[33] Before the mass new fire is struck and blessed, and a large candle, known by the name of the paschal candle, being blessed by a deacon, is therewith lighted. . . . . This year[34] being the seventh of the pontificate of the present pope, you will have the opportunity of witnessing another very ancient rite, only performed every seventh year of each reign. This is the blessing of the *Agnus Dei*, waxen cakes stamped with the figure of a lamb. It will take place in the Vatican palace on Thursday in Easter week, and a distribution of them will be made in the Sistine chapel on the follow-

[30] *Ibid.* in several "Orders," pp. 31, 138, 144 f., 163, 202, 375 f., 509 f.

[31] *Ibid.*, *Ordo* auct. J. Gaietano, p. 377.

[32] Referring to lighting the church with twenty-four candles.

[33] Between the lights and their mystical application.

[34] 1839.

ing Saturday. The origin of this rite seems to have been the very ancient custom of breaking up the paschal candle of the preceding year, and distributing the fragments among the faithful. Durandus, one of the eldest writers on church ceremonies, tells us that "on Saturday in Holy Week the acolytes of the Roman church made lambs of new blessed wax, or of that of the old paschal candle, mixed with chrism, which the pope, on the following Saturday, distributed to the faithful."[35] The Prayer-book of the Church of England introduces the words "Christ our passover is sacrificed for us" at morning prayer on Easter day. Mr. Tayler[36] refers also to the practice of the Armenian Christians, who not only ate a lamb on Easter Sunday, but actually smeared their doorposts with its blood.[37]

These instances certainly "justify the conclusion that in the Christian pascha there was a gradual transition from Jewish to Christian usage,"[38] or perhaps we should rather say, a gradual dropping of Jewish symbolism for Christian facts; but it seems to me a very strange inference that "the original dispute between the quartodecimans and the Catholics related to something more fundamental than a mere reckoning of days,"[39] for the instances which are cited point to Catholic practice, and Mr. Tayler himself has to concede that "Jewish usage lingered longer in the West than in the East," and that this is "contrary to what might have been expected from the earlier stages of the controversy." It would be truer to say that it is contrary to the hypothesis on which Mr. Tayler's argument is so largely based. We should observe also that the distinction between quartodecimans and Catholics is quite misleading for the period to which our inquiry properly belongs. The quartodecimans were Catholics,

[35] DURAND, *Rationale Divin. Offic.*, lib. VI, cap. 69, p. 349. Wiseman's work is entitled, *Four lectures on the offices and ceremonies of Holy Week, as performed in the papal chapels.* By NICHOLAS WISEMAN, D.D., 1839, pp. 104–6. My attention was called to this work by the Rev. C. Hargrove. Lambs made of sweetmeats may be seen in abundance in the shops in Rome at Easter.

[36] P. 122, note.

[37] Mr. F. C. Conybeare tells me that this is still the case; only they kill a sheep, not a lamb; and that the Greeks have the same practice.

[38] TAYLER, p. 122. [39] *Ibid.*

and in spite of Victor remained within the communion of the church.

If we pass for a moment to another region, a similar testimony reaches us from eastern Syria. In a Homily on the passover written by Aphraates in the year 343–4 there is a passage in which the Christian festival is shown to correspond, point by point, with the ancient institution. The Redeemer himself was the lamb, of whom not a bone was broken; and most of the ceremonies receive a spiritual or figurative interpretation. But a real lamb seems to have been offered as a symbol of the Lamb of God, for the commandment not to eat the passover raw or boiled with water is explained quite literally: "The sacrifice which is offered in the church of God is roasted at the fire; and it is not boiled, and is not offered raw." Such language is not applicable to the elements of the eucharist, and must refer to an actual lamb; and this inference is confirmed by a sentence a little further on: "And if he says 'Eat it as men who hasten away,' this is fulfilled in the church of God in this wise, that they eat the lamb 'as men who hasten away,' standing on their feet."[40]

So far, then, the evidence seems to warrant our saying that in the church generally the passover was a continuation of the Jewish festival, and resembled it sufficiently to justify the retention of the ancient name; and that, if a lamb was eaten, this practice was certainly not distinctive of the quartodecimans.

The church retained a clear consciousness of the connection between its own passover and the Jewish, and, though altering the day of celebration, appealed to the original commandment as of fundamental importance in determining the proper date for the observance. Thus the writer of the Paschal Chronicle (about 630 A. D.) calls attention to the fact that "the law expressly prescribes the holy and blessed passover of God, at the same time indicating the month in which one ought to do this, and ordering the day to be observed with great accuracy,"

[40] See *Aphrahat's des persischen Weisen Homilien aus dem Syrischen übersetzt und erläutert* von DR. GEORG BERT: in *Texte und Untersuchungen*, III, 3; Hom., XII, § 6, p. 191.

and proceeds to show why the Christians, though basing their calculations upon that day, postpone the keeping of the festival till the following Sunday.[41] But the legal passover was only shadowy and typical; Christ himself was the True Lamb in the feast of the passover, as the evangelist John teaches, and suffered in the feast. This is also written by the blessed Paul.[42] Accordingly, when the typical and shadowy passover was brought to an end by being fulfilled, "the genuine passover of the holy catholic and apostolic church of God began, in memory of which every year the church of God celebrates the holy feast of the passover, keeping without error the fourteenth day of the first lunar month, in which the legal passover was ordered to be observed;" but if this fell upon the Lord's day, the celebration was postponed till the following Sunday.[43] It is clear, then, that even at a comparatively late period the church professed to keep the passover in obedience to the requirement of "the divine law,"[44] only departing from the letter of the commandment, as it did in other instances, and filling the shadowy form with a Christian significance. There is nothing in the earlier accounts inconsistent with this view, while some points are, as we shall see, distinctly confirmed; so that we may, I think, regard it as established that the Christian passover was a continuation of the Jewish, more or less modified to suit Christian ideas.

We must now inquire whether there was any material difference between the Asiatic and the other churches except in regard to the time of observance; for it is sometimes thought that the quartodecimans kept the feast in a much more Jewish way, and that one object of the fourth gospel was to detach the festival from everything connected with Judaism. At first sight some of the allusions to the controversy may seem to justify this opinion. Socrates, in introducing the subject, contents himself

[41] Pp. 28 ff., ed. DINDORF, Bonn, 1832. [42] P. 10 f.

[43] P. 16. See also p. 419; and p. 423 f. where it is said that the apostles handed it down to the churches to keep the fourteenth of the first lunar month, and the writer adds as a reason for putting off the celebration till the following Sunday, "that we may not feast with the Jews." Epiphanius also says the law was not destroyed, but fulfilled, the type was not annulled, but presented the truth (*Haer.*, L, 2).

[44] See p. 29, line 21.

with saying that some were anxious to celebrate the feast in too Jewish a way.[45] Sozomen uses similar language,[46] and refers to quartodecimans as those who imitate the Jews.[47] On this subject the letter of Constantine speaks very strongly. It seemed unworthy to celebrate the most holy feast conformably to the custom of the Jews. Let there be nothing common with the most hateful mob of the Jews. We should have no communion with the practices of such wicked men, the slayers of the Lord. Eusebius, too, in referring to the discussion of the passover question at the Council of Nicæa, says that finally the easterns gave way, and thus one festival of Christ was established, and they withdrew from the slayers of the Lord, and joined their fellow-believers, for nature draws like to like.[48] These statements, if they stood alone, might lead us to suppose that the general body of the church was bitterly hostile to a Jewish mode of celebrating the passover, to which the quartodecimans tenaciously clung. But the moment we ask what it was that was Jewish in the quartodeciman practice, this supposition is dispelled. There is one invariable answer: The Jews were not to prescribe the time of the church's festival. Constantine says that the controversy was "about the most holy day of the passover," and the decision of the council was that all, everywhere, should keep it on one and the same day. Sozomen also says that "it seemed good to the synod that all should keep the paschal festival at the same season," and mentions no other point of dispute.[49] It is to this single question that all the arguments are directed, and I cannot recall any charge against the quartodecimans of following the Jews in any other objectionable particular. The argument, therefore, founded on the contrary supposition completely breaks down.

But we are not without positive evidence that it was only

[45] I, 8. [46] I, xvi, 4. [47] VII, xviii, 10.

[48] From a writing "On the Feast of the Passover," printed in MAI, *Nova Patrum Bibliotheca*, IV, pp. 209–216, § 8. This is a large section of the work on the Passover presented by Euseb. to Constantine, preserved by Nicetas, Serrarum Episcopus (end of the eleventh century), in his great manuscript catena to Luke. See Editoris monitum, prefixed to the extract.

[49] I, xxi, 6.

the scruple about the day which separated the quartodecimans from their brethren. Polycrates, in his letter, says, "We therefore keep the day without recklessness, neither adding nor taking away," and, having referred to the apostles and bishops whose authority he followed, declares that these all kept the fourteenth day "according to the gospel, transgressing in nothing, but following according to the rule of the faith." This, I think, is equivalent to a statement that, except in regard to the day, they followed the general practice of Christendom. It was on account of this single peculiarity that Victor wished to excommunicate them. It is to this that Irenæus addresses himself in his remonstrance. He refers, indeed, to differences of practice about the length of the fast, but this is only to convince Victor that mere varieties of usage cannot justify an excommunication. It seems clear that the Roman bishop had not included the nature of the fast in his indictment, and in any case this had nothing to do with Judaism. The testimony of Hippolytus is explicit. He ranks the quartodecimans among heretics, and describes them as "of a quarrelsome nature, uninstructed in knowledge, too contentious in disposition;" and still he has nothing to bring against them except their observance of the fourteenth day. "In everything else," he says, "they agree with all the things handed down to the church by the apostles."[50] Epiphanius also says, "They hold everything as the church," but in regard to the passover have been led astray by Jewish fables. The only Judaism which he ascribes to them is their adhesion to the fourteenth day, and the practice of the church which he justifies is the departure from the Jewish day.[51] In speaking of the Audians, a sect who followed the quartodeciman practice, he explains what is meant by "observing the passover with the Jews;" "that is," he says, "at the season in which the Jews keep their feast of unleavened bread, then they themselves are eager to hold the passover."[52]

Not only, then, is there no ground for the assertion that the quartodecimans clung to a peculiarly Jewish mode of celebration, which had been sanctioned by the apostle John, and was

[50] *Ref. omn. haer.*, VIII, 18. [51] *Haer.*, L. [52] *Haer.*, LXX, 9.

repudiated by the evangelist and the majority of the church, but such a notion is distinctly contrary to all the evidence we possess.

We must now inquire a little more fully into the character and meaning of the celebration. It was a festival, a time of rejoicing. This would follow from its being regarded as the passover, for the passover is always spoken of as a feast, and was signalized, not by a fast, but by a characteristic meal. Accordingly, the Christian passover is referred to as a feast so constantly that it is needless to refer to particular instances. I will notice only two writers who dwell upon its festive character. Eusebius alludes to it as a more splendid feast than that of the Jews. It took place at the most delightful time of the year, and at this season the Saviour of the whole cosmos, the great luminary, lightened the world with the rays of piety, and peoples everywhere kept the feast of their liberation from manifold atheism. Therefore no labor was allowed, but they imitated the rest which they hoped for in heaven; "whence not even in our prayers do we bend the knee, nor do we afflict ourselves with fasts." So full of joy was the time that they feasted for seven whole weeks, till "another great feast," pentecost, came in.[53] Gregory Nazianzen dwells in exalted language on the splendor of this "feast of feasts and assembly of assemblies."[54] To the general testimony I know of but one exception. Tertullian alludes to "the day of the passover, in which there is a common and, as it were, public religious observance of a fast."[55] Here, however, the writer is not describing the Easter ceremonial, but merely refers to the more public character of the fast which then took place, in contrast with the more private fasts which it was possible to conceal; and we may therefore assume that he is describing, not a characteristic of the day in the African churches, but a characteristic of the fast which, as we shall see, was terminated at the supposed hour of the resurrection, on Easter morning. This interpretation is confirmed by another passage, where are the

[53] In MAI, §§ 2–5.

[54] Quoted in *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 428.

[55] Jejunii religio; *De Orat.*, 18.

words, "When Jeremiah says, 'and I will gather them from the ends of the earth in a festive day,' he signifies the day of the passover and of pentecost, which is properly a festive day."[56] "Festive day" seems intended to describe either day indifferently. Be this as it may, there can be no doubt that with the mass of Christians the passover was kept as a festival, a time of rejoicing. Was this also the case with the quartodecimans? If I correctly understand Mr. Tayler, he thinks not. He maintains that the Jewish Christians "kept as the oldest Christian pascha the anniversary of the farewell supper on the evening of the fourteenth of Nisan."[57] A little farther on he says that "an obvious contrariety was soon experienced between the Jewish and the Christian idea associated with the word pascha. To the Jew it expressed rejoicing—the memory of deliverance; to the Christian it suggested, in the first instance, the remembrance of sorrow and loss, the death of his benefactor and best earthly friend. To the one it was a festival; to the other it was a fast."[58] But, strangely enough, when we pass over a few pages we meet with the following objection to the theory that the quartodecimans commemorated, not the last supper, but the death of Christ: "If the death-day of Christ was observed on the fourteenth of Nisan, it must have been observed as a fast day, and would, therefore, have been in harmony with the prolonged course of fasting which preceded the anniversary of the resurrection. But the complaint against the quartodecimans, as we have seen, was this: that by keeping the fourteenth of Nisan they interrupted with a feast, which the old pascha or passover properly was, the continuous fasting of passion week."[59] This is, I believe, perfectly correct as a statement of the fact; but then it is not easily reconciled with the previous passage, and it is quite as fatal to Mr. Tayler's own view as to the one against which it is urged. It becomes necessary, however, to examine the evidence relating to the quartodecimans' usage on this point.

We have already seen that the one charge brought against them was that they kept the passover on the wrong day, and

[56] *De Baptismo*, 19. [57] P. 114. [58] P. 115. [59] P. 121 f.

there is not a particle of evidence that they violated the practice common to Jews and Christians, of treating the celebration as a feast. Eusebius says, "They thought they ought to keep the fourteenth day of the moon at the *feast* of the saving passover," so that it was necessary to terminate the fast on that day, whatever day of the week it might be, whereas the other churches thought they ought not to break the fast except on the day of the resurrection; and to this effect was the decision come to by various synods.[60] This clear statement is confirmed by the letter of Constantine. His objection to the quartodecimans is that they "fulfilled that most holy *feast* in conformity with the custom of the Jews." He thought it most impious that there should be discord in regard to such a feast, for the day of our liberty which the Saviour handed down was one; and it was "unbecoming that in the same days some should be devoted to fasts, and others be holding banquets, and that after the days of the passover some should be engaged in feasts and recreation, and others be given to the appointed fasts." The sum of the whole matter was that the minority gave way, and "it was agreeable to the common judgment of all that the most holy *feast* of the passover should be celebrated on one and the same day." All this is so explicit that there can be no doubt what was the nature of the question in the time of Constantine, and what Eusebius believed it to have been in the time of Polycrates. Eusebius had all the documents before him, and in the passages which he quotes there is nothing inconsistent with this view. The whole dispute turns on the observance of one day rather than another. The fragment from the letter of Irenæus, too, while pointing out that different churches had different usages in regard to the character and length of the fast, makes no suggestion that the quartodecimans regarded the passover itself as a fast; and his language is fully explained by the supposition that their one error consisted in keeping the feast too soon. We need have no hesitation, therefore, in accepting Eusebius' testimony, and believing that from first to last this was the one point which caused a division in the church. I may add that among hereti-

[60] *H. E.*, V, 23.

cal sects, Montanists, Novatians, Audians, which conformed more or less closely to the Jewish time, there is no hint that the passover was ever anything but a feast.[61] To this extent, then, the whole church remained "Jewish," that the passover bore distinctly the marks of a festival.

The celebration was, as we have seen, preceded by a fast. This was under no fixed rule, but was of varying length in different places. Irenæus, in his letter, says some fasted one day, others two, others more, and some for forty hours of day and night. By the time of Eusebius the fast had extended to six weeks, or, more exactly, forty days, in imitation of the zeal of Moses and Elijah.[62] But we learn from Socrates that even in his time this was not a universal custom; for instance, the Romans only fasted for three weeks, making an exception of Saturday and Sunday.[63] In Constantinople and the surrounding countries as far as Phœnicia they extended the fast to seven weeks, while the Montanists restricted it to two.[64] As the church was without a fixed rule in regard to the duration of the fast, so was it with respect to the precise character of the abstinence,[65] and the meaning to be attached to it. With Eusebius it was "a symbol of sorrow, on account of our former sins, and in memory of the saving passion."[66] I am not aware, however, that there is any ground for attributing this meaning to it in earlier times. A distinct memorial of the passion would not have lasted for forty days, and it seems most likely that the fast was originally an ascetic preparation for the great festival of the redemption; that its length was determined by local feeling or by Old Testament examples; and that everyone attached to it such significance as the season and a time of self-discipline suggested. That the passion should be specially remembered on the previous Friday is only what we should expect. We need not, however, dwell further on these varieties of usage. Sufficient has been said to show that for centuries the church was largely tolerant of local

[61] See SOZOMEN, VI, xxiv, 6, 7; VII, xviii; SOCRATES, V, 21, 22; EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 1; LXX, 9.

[62] In MAI, §§ 4–5.

[63] V, 22.

[64] SOZOMEN, VII, xix, 7.

[65] SOCR., *ibid.*

[66] In MAI, § 11.

custom. An exception was made in regard to the quartodeciman peculiarity because the passover was the great festival of the year, and, as Constantine said, it seemed unbecoming that Christians should not unite in the time of its celebration. Other differences were quite subordinate, and did not mark such an obvious line of separation within the Christian church.[67]

That the fast terminated, at the latest, very early on Easter morning we know from express testimony. The first part of a letter addressed by Dionysius of Alexandria to his "beloved son and brother Basilides" relates to this question.[68] This Basilides, who, as we learn from Eusebius,[69] was bishop of the parishes in Pentapolis, had consulted Dionysius about the hour for concluding the fast. He did so owing to a difference of opinion among the brethren, some thinking they should do it at cock-crow, others "from the evening" (that is the evening before Easter Sunday), the brethren in Rome, as was alleged, following the former practice, "those here" (in Egypt, or perhaps the East generally) closing the fast sooner. He was at a loss how to fix an exact hour; for while it would be "acknowledged by all alike" that they ought to begin their festivities after the time of the resurrection of our Lord, and to humble their souls with fasts up to that time, the gospels contained no exact statement of the hour at which he rose. Dionysius in reply considers the accounts in the gospels, and then pronounces his opinion for the guidance of those who inquire at what hour or half hour or quarter of an hour they ought "to begin the rejoicing at the resurrection of our Lord from the dead." He blamed as negligent those who were in too great a hurry, and ended the fast before midnight; he highly applauded those who held out till the fourth watch; and those who took an intermediate position he would not molest, for all were not equally tolerant of the six days of fasting, and these days were kept with very different degrees of strictness. Mr. Tayler[70] says that the "strong assertion" in this passage (that all would acknowledge that the fast should ter-

[67] For fuller information and references about the fast see SCHÜRER, § VII.

[68] A careful edition of the letter is contained in ROUTH, *Reliq. Sac.*, III, pp. 223 ff.

[69] *H. E.*, VII, 26.

[70] P. 112.

minate at the hour of the resurrection) "should be noticed, as marking the point which the triumph of the Catholic principle had already reached," and, further, that "it is quite evident . . . . that in the time of Dionysius the word πάσχα, in the view which had then become predominant in the Catholic church, had passed on from its original association with the fourteenth of Nisan to a fixed position in the first day of the week, on which Christ was believed to have risen, and had acquired a meaning equivalent to our Easter, as the anniversary of the resurrection." These remarks appear to me to be very misleading; for they surely imply that the state of things portrayed in the epistle was comparatively recent, and that the general body of the church had once been quartodeciman, and had undergone a gradual change, which was still in progress. But of this there is not a particle of evidence. When we first hear of the question, the Roman custom is fully established, and believed to rest on a very early tradition. When it was introduced it is impossible to say with confidence; but there is no ground of any sort for the implied suggestion that the Churches of Rome and Alexandria were ever quartodeciman. Whether the passover commemorated only the resurrection will appear in the sequel.

Before leaving the subject of the fast we must observe that the night before the day of the passover was spent in a vigil. The reason for this observance was twofold: because in it Christ returned to life after his passion, and was, in it, to receive his kingdom.[71] Jerome relates a tradition of the Jews that Christ would come in the middle of the night, as in the Egyptian time when the passover was celebrated; and to this he traces the apostolic tradition that in the day of the vigil of the passover it was not allowable to dismiss the people before midnight, while they awaited the advent of Christ. After that time, presuming that they were secure, all kept the festal day.[72] Now a narrative in Sozomen[73] connects the feast of the resurrection

[71] LACTANT, *Div. Inst.*, VII, 19. See an account of the vigil in *Constit. Apost.*, V, 19.

[72] See GIESELER, *Kirch.*, I, i, § 53, note 11. See, also, SOCRATES, VII, 5, "the accustomed vigil."

[73] VIII, xxi.

with this vigil, and distinguishes it from the passover. He tells us that after the deposition of John (Chrysostom), "when the forty days' fast was already ceasing, in the sacred night itself in which the annual festival in commemoration of the resurrection of Christ is celebrated, his partisans were driven out of the church," and on the following day they celebrated the passover in a public bath, under bishops and presbyters and the rest whose function it is to administer ecclesiastical affairs. This seems to imply that even at this late period the distinctive feast of the resurrection took place at night, at the proper hour for the cessation of the fast, and that the passover, whatever may have been the mode of its celebration, was a separate rite, with its own significance. It is therefore not safe to assume that in the Catholic church the passover had become simply "the anniversary of the resurrection," though, as we shall see, the memory of Christ's triumph over death entered largely into the Christian interpretation of the festival.

In endeavoring to ascertain the meaning of the Christian passover we may begin with a late writer, whose statements are sufficiently full and explicit. The writer of the Paschal Chronicle, having remarked that Christ, as the True Lamb, was sacrificed for us at the feast of the legal passover, and rose the third day, when the priest was required to offer the sheaf, says that the typical passover was brought to an end, the real passover having come. In memory of this the church kept the feast of the passover every year; and the writer describes this as "the holy feast of the resurrection of Christ our God from the dead."[74] Although the passover is here called the feast of the resurrection, it is clear from what goes before that the memory of the passion was included. The resurrection was the crowning event, and presupposed the death, whereas the death did not necessarily presuppose the resurrection; and accordingly a reference to the resurrection might include both the death of the True Lamb and the presentation of the first fruits from the dead. Elsewhere the author points out the propriety of celebrating the feast of salvation after Christ's resurrection, which took place on the sixteenth

[74] P. 15 f.

of the month,[75] and from this year Christians began to keep the quickening feast of the resurrection.[76] It appears, however, that there were some who blamed the church for applying the name of πάσχα to the feast of the resurrection, not knowing apparently the meaning of the word;[77] for it is a Hebrew term signifying a passing over, a going out, an overstepping. The church, therefore, necessarily applies the name of πάσχα not only to the passion of the Lord, but also to his resurrection; for it is through his passion and resurrection that human nature has obtained the passing over, and going out, and overstepping of him who has the dominion of death; for if the death of Christ bestowed this boon upon us, much more his resurrection, when he rose from the dead, the first fruits of them that slept. The Israelites were instructed to call only the fourteenth day passover, owing to the events of their history; but the church, for the reason given, necessarily assigns this name not only to the passion and death of Christ but also to his resurrection. The author concludes his discussion with the words, "Christ our passover was sacrificed and rose for us, and we call the death and the resurrection of the Lord passover."[78] It is clear, then, that in the opinion of this writer of the seventh century the passover was a commemoration of the two great acts of redemption, but that there was a tendency to lay the chief stress on the closing act of triumph over death.

As the passover had this twofold reference, it is not surprising that earlier writers allude to it sometimes under one of its aspects, sometimes under the other. Sozomen speaks of the "first day of the resurrection feast."[79] The feast as a whole would naturally commemorate the more joyful event, and yet the first day, the proper passover, might seem to unite it with the passion, which had just preceded. Socrates accordingly assigns to the "feast of the passover" "the memory of the saving passion."[80] Going back to a still earlier time, we find that Constantine describes it as "the feast from which we have received the

[75] P. 413 f. [76] P. 420.

[77] The writer probably refers to a confusion between this word and πάσχω.

[78] Pp. 424 ff. [79] VII, xix, 6. [80] V, 22.

hope of immortality," and yet in the same letter he says that "our Saviour has handed down as one the day of our liberty, that is, the day of the most holy passion." Eusebius combines the two ideas, but makes the memory of the passion the more prominent. The Jewish passover, he says, was only typical, as is proved by Paul's saying, "Christ our passover was sacrificed for us." The Baptist gives the reason for the sacrifice: "Behold the Lamb of God who taketh away the sin of the world."[81] It is clear that the passion is here the uppermost thought; and we must observe that Eusebius sees no inconsistency between this and a feast of liberty,[82] and the celebration of that feast on the Lord's day. Indeed he insists that, whereas the Jews killed the sheep of the passover only once a year, "we of the new covenant on each Lord's day celebrate our own passover, are always filled with the saving body, always participate in the blood of the sheep, always gird up the loins of our soul with purity and sobriety, are always delivered from Egypt; for we must do these things, not once a year but every day." "Wherefore also every week we celebrate the feast of our passover, on the saving and dominical day, of the True Sheep, through whom we were redeemed, fulfilling the mysteries."[83] And again he says that we ought to eat the passover with Christ, removing from our minds all the leaven of wickedness, and anointing the doorposts of our mind with the blood of the Sheep sacrificed for us; and this not at one period of the whole year, but every week.[84] And yet again he says, "We celebrate the same mysteries through the whole year, fasting every Friday in memory of the saving passion, and every Lord's day quickened by the sanctified body of the same saving passover and sealing our souls with his precious blood."[85] The weekly celebration referred to must be the Lord's Supper; and we are thus reminded that even the Lord's Supper was not a mere memorial of Christ's farewell meal, but commemorated the new covenant and the price which was needed for its ratification, the body broken and the blood shed upon the cross; and in declaring the Lord's death until he came it at least suggested the thought of the resurrection. But I do not think

[81] In Mai, § 1. [82] § 3. [83] § 7. [84] § 11. [85] § 12.

we can infer from the words of Eusebius that the passover consisted only of the Lord's Supper; for he clearly implies that there was an annual festival which must have been distinguished in some way from the weekly service. He only extends the name to the Lord's Supper because it was a constant memorial of the true Passover Lamb, and ought to be followed by the spiritual results which were symbolized by the Jewish ceremonial.

A little earlier, Peter, bishop of Alexandria,[86] quotes from one Trecentius the statement, "For we have no other purpose than to keep the memory of his passion, and at the time when those who from the beginning were eyewitnesses have handed down."[87] This description of the feast is not called in question by the bishop, whose object it is to refute the view of Trecentius that the Jews were always in error, and that even their ancient celebration of the passover had nothing to do with Christians. We may, therefore, accept this as another example of the indifference with which the feast was described as a commemoration of the passion or of the resurrection. Going back for another century, we find that Tertullian, in recommending suitable days for baptism, connects the passover with the passion,[88] while he reserves the resurrection for Pentecost;[89] but this is quite an incidental expression suggested by another subject, and can hardly be taken as a proof that the African church did not commemorate the resurrection as well as the passion at their passover.

We must now turn to the quartodecimans. We have already seen that the only point of controversy between them and the rest of catholic Christendom related to the day of celebration. We might, therefore, infer that they too kept the passover in memory of the passion and resurrection; and this inference is confirmed by such evidence as we possess. According to Eusebius, in whose time, we must remember, the controversy was still agitating the church, the quartodecimans kept the feast of the

[86] Appointed 300 A. D.

[87] *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 7.

[88] Cum et passio domini in qua tinguimur adimpleta est.

[89] *De Baptismo*, 19.

passover on the day on which the Jews were commanded to kill the sheep, and thus terminated the fast without regard to the day of the week, whereas the rest of Christendom thought the fast ought not to be broken except on the day of the resurrection, and a decree was issued by letters from various synods that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection from the dead should not be celebrated except on the Lord's day, and on this day alone they should bring the fast to an end.[90] Here it is evident that in the church at large the memory of the resurrection was an essential part of the celebration; and it is equally clear that it was so with the quartodecimans, for the point of the objection to them is not that they confined their commemoration to the last supper or to the passion, but that they broke the fast, and thereby commemorated the resurrection too soon. No doubt the killing of the sheep reminded them as well as their opponents of the passion; but of a commemoration of the last supper of which Jesus partook with his disciples there is not a hint. Theodoret, in his very brief article on the quartodecimans, says that they kept "the feast of the passover" on the fourteenth day of the moon, and, having misunderstood the apostolic tradition, did not await the day of the Lord's resurrection but celebrated "the memory of the passion" on whatever day of the week the fourteenth might fall.[91] He might seem here to distinguish the memory of the passion from that of the resurrection, and to ascribe only the former to the quartodecimans. But I do not think this is intended; for it in no way affects the point of his objection, and the one really included the other. He speaks of the quartodeciman celebration as a "feast," which makes it probable that it referred to the joyful as well as the mournful part of the closing scenes of Christ's earthly life; and it was quite as inappropriate to celebrate one as the other on any day of the week indiscriminately. In any case there is no reference to the last supper.

We must turn, however, to such contemporary evidence as we possess. This fully confirms the representations of Eusebius. Polycrates, in his letter, speaks simply of keeping a particular

[90] *H. E.*, III, 23. [91] *Haeret. fab. comp.*, III, 4.

day, and not only makes no allusion to any difference of meaning attached to the day, but says expressly that in keeping it they transgressed in nothing, but followed "according to the rule of the faith." We have not the words of Victor's decree of excommunication; but from Irenæus' letter of remonstrance we may safely infer that it was based solely upon the difference in the time of observance. Irenæus concedes that the mystery of the Lord's resurrection ought to be celebrated only on the Lord's day, clearly implying that this was the point in dispute. He then informs Victor that this was not the only subject of debate; again, I think, implying that this was the only one of which the Roman bishop had taken notice. What other source of variation, then, does he mention? Not a difference in the character of the celebration, not a difference in the events which were commemorated, but only a variety in the length of the preceding fast. This did not interfere with the communion of the churches, but only confirmed the harmony of the faith. Eusebius gives us only portions of the letter; but the implication clearly is that in like manner the observance of this day rather than that ought not to interrupt communion. He supports this argument by an appeal to history. He says that the Roman bishops from Xystus[92] to Anicetus,[93] though not themselves observing, nevertheless maintained communion with those who did observe;[94] and when Polycarp visited Anicetus, though neither could persuade the other to depart from an ancient custom, the latter permitted the former to celebrate the eucharist in the church. Finally, the only part of the epistle from the bishops of Palestine which Eusebius thinks it necessary to quote contains an assurance that "in Alexandria also they celebrate on the same day as we do," as had been learned by an exchange of letters.

Thus all our evidence combines to show that the whole controversy turned upon the day on which the passover should be celebrated, and here the question lay, not between two consecu-

[92] About 115 A. D. [93] Died about 166.

[94] Ἐτήρησαν, μὴ τηροῦντες, etc., have no object expressed; but it seems evident from the whole scope of the epistle that the fourteenth day must be understood.

tive days of the month, but between a fixed day of the month and a fixed day of the week.

We must now review the arguments which were advanced on each side, so far as the fragments which have come down to us will enable us to do so; for we shall thus gain a clearer insight into the nature of the controversy, and test the modern allegation that the quartodeciman practice was founded on the synoptic chronology, that of the rest of the church on the Johannine.

First of all, appeal was made on both sides to tradition. The Asiatics appealed to the example of Philip of Hierapolis, one of the twelve apostles, John of Ephesus who leaned on the breast of the Lord, and an unbroken succession of bishops;[95] and, according to Irenæus, this appeal was made by Polycarp, when he visited Rome, and found there a different custom from his own.[96] On the other hand, the Roman Anicetus appealed only to the custom of the presbyters who preceded him; and it is remarkable that Irenæus, while agreeing with the Roman custom, traces it back only to the time of Xystus. It is not till a much later period that we hear of a western reliance on the apostles Paul and Peter.[97] Eusebius tells us that the bishops of Palestine, at the time of the controversy with Victor, referred to the tradition which had come down to them from the succession of the apostles. Socrates seems to treat all these traditions as of little value, because none of the combatants could produce a written authority.[98] I think this is almost an unreasonable skepticism in regard to the statements of Irenæus; but however this may be, it seems evident that before the controversy broke out the different customs had become established, and were followed as a matter of course till they were challenged from the outside, and then appeal was made in the first instance to tradition, and only afterwards more elaborate arguments were sought for to justify a practice which had become intertwined with the religious affections of the people.[99]

[95] Letter of Polycrates.

[96] Letter to Victor.

[97] SOCRATES, V, 22. SOZOMEN, VII, xix, 1.

[98] *Ibid.*

[99] In regard to the Palestinian appeal to the apostles I may venture to suggest that

When arguments were at last resorted to, it is impossible to say in what order they were devised and marshaled; but we may conjecture that recourse would be had in the first instance to the Jewish law. The festival was, by universal consent, the passover; and about the observance of the passover very precise directions were given in the law of Moses. Accordingly, Pseudo-Tertullian tells us that Blastus (a quartodeciman Montanist in Rome) affirmed "that the passover ought not to be kept except in accordance with the law of Moses on the fourteenth of the month."[100] Hippolytus too refers to the quartodecimans' regard for what was written in the law, that he should be cursed who did not keep the commandments;[101] and Epiphanius chides them for making use of the saying in the law, "Cursed is he who shall not keep the passover on the fourteenth day of the month."[102] These precise words are not found in the Old Testament, but they are contained inferentially in the curse against all who did not observe the law.[103]

The reply to this argument was easy: it would carry the quartodecimans a great deal farther than they were willing to go. They would be cursed if they were not circumcised, if they did not pay tithes, if they did not bring offerings to Jerusalem.[104] As the apostle had said, they would be debtors to do the whole law, if they bound themselves to one commandment. The true passover had come, and was no longer to be kept in the letter.[105] The Jewish ceremonies were only a shadow of things to come, and now that Judaism had been changed into Christianity, the literal and typical rites of the Mosaic law had ceased. It was not the purpose of the Saviour or his apostles to legislate about feast days, but to introduce an upright life and

the apostles were not very likely to adopt the somewhat complicated Roman mode of reckoning Easter, or to depart from the Jewish day of celebrating the passover; but having kept the passover at the usual time in memory of the passion, they may have observed the following Sunday with peculiar solemnity in memory of the resurrection. Thus a starting point would have been supplied for divergent practices.

[100] *Adv. omn. haer.*, § 8. [101] *Ref.*, VIII, 18. [102] *Haer.*, L, 1.

[103] See also the account of Sabbatius in SOCRATES, VII, 5.

[104] EPIPH., *ibid.*, 2. [105] HIP., *ibid.*

piety.[106] And if the quartodecimans thought that they ought to follow the Jewish practice because Christ did so, then they ought to do everything else which he did in a Jewish fashion.[107] We must not, however, conclude from this mode of reply that the opponents of the quartodecimans had detached their feast from the passover, and become indifferent to the ancient law, but only that they were willing to interpret it with a certain latitude of meaning. As the writer of the Paschal Chronicle says, the typical passover came to an end through the death and resurrection of Christ, the true passover; and in memory of this event the church of God kept the holy feast every year, "observing without error the fourteenth day of the first lunar month, in which the legal passover has been ordered to be celebrated, after the advent of the day in which the Holy Spirit taught that the spring equinox begins;" and if this happened to be Sunday or any succeeding day of the week the feast of the resurrection was kept on the following Sunday.[108] Thus the fourteenth day of the month, that is to say, the full moon at or after the vernal equinox, was carefully noted by the westerns as the indispensable basis of their calculations, and they thus showed their regard for the law, although they departed from its letter. This account is substantially confirmed by Eusebius some centuries earlier. In his treatise on the passover he gives a brief description of its original institution, as the source of the Christian observance, of which it was typical;[109] and in none of the replies to the quartodeciman argument is it maintained that the Christian feast was not the passover, and was in no way dependent on the ancient commandment.

Why, then, it may be asked, was not the fourteenth day universally observed? For if the day was a matter of indifference, it would have been most natural to adhere to the established custom. The change was partly owing to contempt for the

[106] EUSEB. in MAI, § 1; SOCR., V, 22 near beginning. See also a "Discourse on the Resurrection of Christ," attributed to Epiphanius (in MIGNE, column 468 f.), and APHRAATES, *Hom.*, xii, 4.

[107] SOCR., *ibid.* See also *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 12, 16. [108] Pp. 15 f., 18 f.

[109] MAI, §§ 1 and 6–7. See also EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 2, and APHRAATES, *Hom.*, xii,

Jews, and a wish to be dissociated from them as much as possible,—a state of mind which finds strong expression in the letter of Constantine. I can hardly suppose, however, that this was really operative in the first instance, and much better reasons existed. Among the Jews, it is alleged, certain irregularities had arisen. In order to bring the lunar year into agreement with the solar it was necessary periodically to intercalate a month. In consequence of this the determination of the equinox was sometimes neglected, so that, when the year was reckoned from one vernal equinox to another, the Jews sometimes celebrated two passovers in one year, and none in the next. To keep the passover in this way before the equinox was a violation of the law; and it was contended that, though the Jews in ancient times had observed the correct time for the feast, they had ceased to do so from the time of the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian; or, according to another opinion, from the date of the crucifixion. There was, therefore, a real reason for refusing to follow the Jews in their time of celebration, even on the part of those who considered themselves bound by the commandment; and Socrates tells us that this led to a division among the quartodecimans themselves, some thinking that they ought to follow the Jews, whilst others maintained that the passover ought always to come after the equinox in the Roman month of April.[110] Here, then, was the first cause of divergence, the quartodecimans for the most part adhering to the Jewish determination of the season; the westerns, who were accustomed to the solar year, universally celebrating the feast after the equinox.

This cause of divergence, however, is not mentioned in the earliest accounts, and it does not explain why the westerns departed from the fourteenth day. The reason for this may be gathered from the nature of the Christian festival, and is clearly

[110] V, 22. On the general subject see the same chapter; SOZOMEN, VII, xviii, 7; EUSEB., edited by MAI, § 12; Constantine's letter; EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 3 (the words should be noted: *παρατηρούμεθα μὲν τὴν τεσσαρεσκαιδεκάτην, ὑπερβαίνομεν δὲ τὴν ἰσημερίαν, φέρομεν δὲ ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν κυριακὴν τὸ τέλος τῆς συμπληρώσεως· λαμβάνομεν δὲ τὸ πρόβατον ἀπὸ δεκάτης*), LXX, 11; Peter of Alex. in *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 4 ff.; Dionysius of Alex. in EUSEB., *H. E.*, VII, 20; *Constit. Apost.*, V, 17.

stated by Epiphanius.[111] Regard was paid to three measures of time, the solar year, the month, and the week. The first decided the equinox, after which the festival must be held. The second fixed the fourteenth day, on which, under the law, the sheep was to be killed, and on which, accordingly, Christ was crucified. But a week was observed instead of a single day, partly because the sheep was set apart from the tenth day to the fourteenth, and partly because the events connected with the true paschal Lamb were not limited to a single day, but comprised the resurrection, which took place two days after the passion. The fourteenth day, therefore, was comprised within the week; but the breaking of the fast, and the celebration of the festival, were postponed till the Lord's day. If, however, the fourteenth fell on a Sunday, the feast was put off till the next Sunday. I cannot suppose that this was due merely to a wish to differ from the Jews;[112] but it seemed only natural to dedicate the fourteenth to the memory of the passion, and therefore to include it within the period of the fast. There was also a further reason for postponement in the fact that the resurrection took place subsequently to the fourteenth.[113] The writer of the Paschal Chronicle says that the postponement was made for two reasons: first, it would have been contrary to law to terminate the fast on the thirteenth, before the moon was actually full; and, secondly, it would have been unbecoming to carry on the fast into the Lord's day. It was therefore necessary to put off the celebration; but then, as the number ten includes the number nine, so the later date includes the earlier.[114] There is nothing in this explanation inconsistent with our oldest authorities, and it enables us to see how easily the conflicting usages arose. The Jewish festival passed into the Christian church, and was kept in memory of the death and resurrection of Christ, the great redemptive work which was symbolized by the ancient deliverance from Egypt. Nothing could be more natural than the Asiatic adherence to the time prescribed by the law; and, on the other hand, as the

[111] *Haer.*, L, 3; LXX, 11–12.

[112] *Chron. Pasch.*, p. 424. For the dislike of the Jews see also Constantine's letter.

[113] See *Chron. Pasch.*, pp. 413 ff., 30 ff.

[114] P. 30.

church became more and more Gentile, it was equally natural to modify the time in accordance with Christian memories, and keep the festival of the resurrection only on the Lord's day. The propriety of the latter observance constituted, as we have seen, the stress of the argument in the first instance.

So far the arguments on each side have little or no bearing on the gospel question; but we come now to an allegation which, if it could be substantiated, would lend some support to the opponents of the Johannine authorship. It is that the quartodecimans relied on the synoptic chronology, and rejected the Johannine, whereas the westerns adhered to the latter, and set aside the former. This contention appears to me to be founded on an entire misconception of the controversy, and not to be supported by the facts. In order that the argument might be valid, the dispute ought to have been whether the Christian passover was to be kept on the thirteenth or the fourteenth day of the month. Of such a dispute there is not a trace. The westerns, as we have seen, were as particular about observing the fourteenth of the month as the quartodecimans themselves; only, instead of holding the feast on that day, they calculated from it the Sunday on which the celebration should be kept. The controversy, therefore, was not between adjoining days of the month, but between the day of the month and the day of the week, and consequently was in no way connected with the varying chronology of the gospels. This being the case, it is not surprising that no allusion to different opinions about the gospels occurs in the histories of the controversy, and among the arguments contained in any connected treatise against the quartodecimans there is no appeal to the fourth gospel. This fact would be unintelligible if the westerns had really supposed that the gospel of John settled the question. It may be asked, then, What support is there for the modern allegation? It rests on a few arguments which have come down to us in complete isolation from their context; and as they relate to the date of the last supper, it has been assumed that they are parts of the quartodeciman controversy. We must examine these, as well as some other statements on the same subject, and I believe we shall find

that the difference of opinion about the evangelical chronology did not coincide with the separation between western and quartodeciman, but that defenders of both views were to be found on both sides, and that instead of admitting a discrepancy between the synoptics and John they had, with hardly an exception, some way of forcing the gospels to speak with one voice.

Before we proceed to the fragments themselves, we must notice the opinions of a few well-known writers, that we may have at least a small body of assured fact on which to base our judgment of a more obscure question. Turning first to Irenæus, we find a chapter in which he is specially defending the Johannine chronology against the opinion of the Valentinians, represented by Ptolemæus, that the ministry of Jesus lasted only for one year. He refutes this opinion by pointing out the number of passovers which, according to John, the disciple of the Lord, Jesus had celebrated, and he assumes without remark that finally Christ went up to Jerusalem, ate the passover, and suffered on the following day.[115] Here, then, while appealing to the fourth gospel, he tacitly assumes that in regard to the Last Supper and the crucifixion it is in agreement with the synoptics. This testimony is important because, as we know, Irenæus thought the quartodecimans mistaken, and therefore, according to the hypothesis we are considering, he ought to have believed that Jesus partook of the last supper on the thirteenth, and was crucified on the day of the passover; yet he gives not a hint that any difference of opinion on this question existed. It further deserves remark that, in connection with his whole argument, he appeals to "all the elders who in Asia had intercourse with John the disciple of the Lord."[116] This surely proves that it was possible for Asiatics at once to acknowledge the authority of the fourth gospel, and yet to believe that Jesus was crucified the day after the passover. We should observe also that Irenæus wrote a treatise on the passover,[117] and was, therefore, in all probability quite familiar with the arguments current in his own day.

[115] II, xxii, 3. [116] § 5.

[117] See Fragment VII in STIEREN's edition.

Origen, also, in commenting on Matthew 26: 17,[118] follows the synoptical account, and this without any allusion to a different date in John, although he was keenly observant of differences between the gospels. This is the more remarkable because he thinks it well to meet an argument which was founded on the synoptical record. Owing to the fact, he says, that Jesus celebrated the passover corporeally in the Jewish fashion some of the inexperienced may fall into ebionism, and maintain that we, as imitators of Christ, ought to do likewise. To this he replies that Jesus was made under the law, not in order that he might leave under the law those who were under it, but that he might lead them out of it. It was, therefore, unbecoming in those who had been previously outside the law to enter into it. Accordingly Christians came out from the letter of the law, and through a spiritual celebration fulfilled all things which were there commanded to be celebrated corporeally. They cast out the old leaven of malice and iniquity, and kept the passover with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth, Christ feasting along with them according to the will of the Lamb who said, "Unless ye eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye will not have life abiding in you." Here, then, we find the fourth gospel referred to, and Jesus represented as the paschal Lamb, and yet not a hint of any error in the usual interpretation of the synoptic chronology. We must further observe that there is no allusion to the peculiarity of the quartodecimans. The question turns, not on the day of observance, but on the manner of observance. The people who are corrected fall into ebionism, a reproach which was not brought against the quartodecimans; for though they were thought to resemble the Jews too closely in one particular, they were recognized as orthodox, and, as Eusebius says, when they gave way on the one question of the day of observance, they withdrew from the slayers of the Lord, and joined their fellow-believers, for nature draws like to like.[119] And again, one of the objections against the quartodecimans was that, although they followed the Jewish reckoning, they did not carry

[118] In *Matt. commentariorum series*, § 79, pp. 405 ff. (Lom.).

[119] In MAI, § 8.

out the legal prescriptions with sufficient care; for they confined their celebration to a single day, whereas they ought to have chosen the sheep on the tenth day, and so fasted for five days, thus conforming to the general practice of the church in celebrating a whole week.[120] We learn, then, from Origen's remarks, what we have already learned from the letter of Irenæus, that the controversy about Easter was not limited to the quartodeciman peculiarity. So important a division within the bosom of the catholic church brought the whole subject into prominence, and afforded an opportunity for broaching every kind of view. The legal requirements, the relation of the law to Christianity, the ceremonies to be observed, the narratives of the gospels, the year of the crucifixion, and the days of the last supper and the death of Jesus, all came under discussion.[121] We are not, therefore, warranted in assuming that there were only two compact parties, and that every argument and allusion must refer to the single point by which they were divided from one another. At one extreme were the men corrected by Origen, who thought they must adhere to the letter of the law. These were in all probability quartodecimans, though we are not told so; but it does not follow that they were representatives of the orthodox churches of Asia Minor. At the other extreme we are told of one Aerius, a contemporary of Epiphanius, who maintained that Christians generally were clinging to Jewish fables, and ought not to observe the passover, "for Christ our passover was sacrificed."[122] This view would fall in with the gnostic tendencies of the second century, but I have not observed any allusion to it at that period. Between these extremes came the catholic church, with its agreement about the general principles, and its internal division about the day of celebration

[120] EPIPH., *Haer.*, L, 1, 3; LXX, 12.

[121] For the fullest examples of treatises on the passover see EUSEB. in MAI and the *Hom.* of APHRAATES. I may refer also to the treatise of Irenæus, for we are told that he spoke in it of the practice of not bending the knee, and mentioned the feast of pentecost, from which we may conclude that, though his work was probably called forth by the quartodeciman controversy, it was not limited to the particular point in dispute. See STIEREN, Fragment VII.

[122] EPIPH., *Haer.*, LXXV, 3.

These varieties must be borne in mind in our subsequent investigations.

The opinion of Eusebius, which is fully explained in his treatise,[123] is particularly interesting and important, because it is given in connection with the quartodeciman controversy, and his statement is clearly a reply to a quartodeciman argument; and nevertheless he adheres to the synoptical chronology. The following is his mode of reasoning: "But if anyone[124] should say that it has been written that on the first day of unleavened bread the disciples came and said to the Saviour, Where wilt thou that we make ready for thee to eat the passover? and he sent them to such a one, having enjoined upon them to say, With thee I keep the passover, we will say that this is not a commandment, but a history of an event that happened at the season of the saving passion; but to relate an ancient practice is one thing, and it is another to legislate and leave injunctions for the future. But, further, the Saviour did not keep the passover with the Jews at the time of his own passion; for he did not himself celebrate his own passover with his disciples at the time when *they* [the Jews] killed the lamb; for they did this on the day of preparation[125] on which the Saviour suffered; whence neither did they enter into the prætorium, but Pilate comes out to them; but he himself, a whole day before, on the fifth day of the week,[126] reclined with the disciples, and eating with them, said to them, With desire I desired to eat this passover with you. Dost thou see how the Saviour did not eat the passover with the Jews?" Since the practice was new he desired it, but the old customs were not desirable, "but the new mystery of his new covenant, which accordingly he communicated to his own disciples, was, as we might expect, desirable to him, since many prophets and righteous men before him desired to see the mysteries of the new covenant." The passover of Moses was not suited to all nations, as it had to be celebrated in Jerusalem; wherefore it was not desirable. But the saving mystery of the new covenant was suitable to all men, and naturally was desirable to him.

[123] In MAI, §§ 8–12.

[124] No doubt, from the connection, a quartodeciman.

[125] That is, Friday.

[126] Thursday.

After he had had the feast the chief priests laid hands upon him, for they did not eat the passover in the evening; for otherwise they would not have had time to interfere with him. They took him to Caiaphas, and then to Pilate, and then the Scripture says that they did not enter the prætorium that they might not be defiled. But on that very day of the passion they ate the passover, demanding the saving blood, not on behalf of themselves, but against themselves. "But our Saviour kept his own desirable festival, not then, but a day before, reclining with the disciples." From that time Christ withdrew from the Jews and attached himself to his disciples. "Therefore we also ought to eat the passover with Christ," removing from our mind all the leaven of wickedness, and filled with the unleavened bread of truth and sincerity, having the true circumcision, and anointing the posts of our mind with the blood of the Sheep sacrificed for us; and this not at one period of the whole year, but every week; and let our preparation be "a fast, a symbol of sorrow, on account of our former sins, and in memory of the saving passion." The Jews fell from the truth from the time when they plotted against the Truth itself, driving from them the Word of Life; "and this the scripture of the sacred gospels presents clearly; for it testifies that the Lord ate the passover on the first day of unleavened bread; and, as Luke says, they did not eat their customary passover on the day on which the passover ought to have been killed, but on the following day, which was the second day of unleavened bread, and the fifteenth of the moon, in which, our Saviour being judged by Pilate, they did not enter the prætorium; and therefore they did not eat it according to the law on the first day of unleavened bread, when it ought to have been killed; for they themselves, too, would have kept the passover with the Saviour; but from that time, together with their plot against our Saviour, blinded by their own wickedness, they fell from all truth. But we celebrate the same mysteries through the whole year," fasting every Friday in memory of the saving passion, and every Lord's day quickened by the sanctified body of the same saving passover, and sealing our souls with his precious blood.

It was necessary to quote this passage at length, not only on account of its intrinsic interest, but because its position is completely misunderstood even by so careful a student as Schürer.[127] He declares that Eusebius replies to the quartodeciman argument that Christ really ate his own passover on the thirteenth. There may be some little obscurity in the former part of the argument, which is all that Schürer quotes; but the concluding section is perfectly explicit, and clears up whatever might have been doubtful in the previous exposition. It will be useful to analyze the several thoughts.

First, let us observe the nature of the quartodeciman argument. It is not that the annual festival was a commemoration of the last supper, and that therefore it ought to be kept on the same day as the meal it was designed to bring to memory. It is that Jesus himself observed the passover, and observed it correctly, on the fourteenth day of the month, and that therefore his disciples ought to do the same, instead of keeping their passover on a day of the month which Jesus had never sanctioned. To this argument Eusebius makes two replies: First, he urges that though it was quite true that Jesus had kept the passover at the time alleged, an historical record did not constitute a commandment: in other words, the mere fact that Jesus celebrated his passover on a particular day did not create a binding rule for his disciples. Secondly, although he adhered to the legal day, nevertheless he did not eat his passover with the Jews; for they postponed their observance till the next day, the second day of unleavened bread, and the fifteenth of the month, and so fell away from the truth. To appreciate the force of this argument we must remember that one of the reproaches against the quartodecimans was that they kept the feast at the same time as the Jews, and one of the objections made to this practice was that the Jews had got wrong in their calculations, and that therefore Christians ought not to follow them. Here Eusebius dates their error from the year of the passion, and shows that Jesus kept a passover of his own, apart from the Jews. This is proved first by the words recorded in Luke:[128]

[127] *De cont. pasch.*, § V, 3. [128] 22 : 15.

"With desire I desired to eat this passover with you." "*This* passover" was not the ordinary one, but that in which the mystery of the new covenant was instituted. It was only as new that it could be desired; for an old practice, which comes as a matter of course, is not an object of desire. And, further, Jesus desired to eat "with you," with his disciples, and not with the Jews. Thus he separated himself from the Jews in the meaning which he attached to the festival. But, secondly, he did so in regard to time likewise; for they kept the passover on the wrong day. This appears from the fact that they had time to carry out their plot against Jesus, from their inability to enter the prætorium, and from Luke's statement that the day of unleavened bread was the day when the passover ought to have been killed,[129] implying that it was not killed at the proper time. Thus it appears that Eusebius accepted the chronology of the synoptic gospels, and brought the Johannine account into agreement with it by pushing on the Jewish celebration of the passover from the fourteenth to the fifteenth day of the month.

The same view was taken by Chrysostom. He says: "The sanhedrin passed the night in watching for the accomplishment of their foul purpose: for they did not even at that time eat the passover, as St. John says. What are we to say? Why, that they ate it on another day, and brake the law. Christ would not have violated the proper time, but these men violated it, who were trampling on ten thousand laws. Boiling over, as they were, with rage, and having often attempted to slay him, and been unable, now that they had gotten him in their power, they chose even to give up the passover the more surely to glut their murderous appetite."[130]

Epiphanius, when controverting the opinions of Marcion, though he does not refer to the question of dates, sides with the synoptics by insisting that Jesus must have eaten flesh, because he kept the passover which is according to law, or according to

[129] Luke 22:7.

[130] In *Matth., Hom. 84:* quoted by McCLELLAN, *Four Gospels*, p. 487 f. (a few words are omitted, but the sense is given). In *Hom. 81* he says, "But why did he keep the passover? Showing by all means, up to the last day, that he is not opposed to the law."

the Jews; and Marcion, he says, cannot escape from this argument by pretending that when Jesus said he wished to eat the passover he referred to the mystery which he was about to institute, for it is expressly stated that he instituted the mystery "after he had supped."[131] Epiphanius in this passage of course wishes to base his argument entirely on the parts of Luke which were accepted by Marcion; but he could not have honestly reasoned as he does unless he believed that the last supper was a real passover meal celebrated in conformity with the Jewish law. Nevertheless in his article on the quartodecimans he says: "It behoved Christ to be sacrificed on the fourteenth day according to the law."[132] Here, then, it might be thought, he follows the Johannine account, and is induced to do so through his opposition to the quartodecimans. This, however, is not the case. In his article on the *Alogi* he clears up the difficulty in a passage which, though a little obscure in some of its details, is plain enough in its general meaning. He is there dealing with the objection, not that the last supper was differently placed, but that there were more passovers in the fourth gospel than in the others; and he maintains that the Jews kept the passover before the right time, so that Jesus, although he ate "the Jewish passover" with his disciples in order that he might not destroy the law, but fulfill it, was crucified on the fourteenth day of the month, and rose on the sixteenth, which in that year was the equinox. It was on the sixteenth that the sheaf was presented at the annual festival, and thus it prefigured the resurrection of him who was the first-fruits of the dead. This anticipation of the proper time for the passover was due to the nature of the lunar month, which necessitated the periodical intercalation of days and months to keep the calendar approximately correct.[133] Thus Epiphanius brings the sacrifice of the true paschal Lamb to the proper day of the month, not by availing himself of the apparent Johannine chronology, but by assuming that the Jews had got a day in advance; and we may fairly assume that he saw no discordance between John and the

[131] Luke 22 : 20. See *Haer.*, XLII, Refut. of Schol. 61 from Marcion's Gospel.

[132] L, 2. [133] LI, 26, 27, 31.

synoptics. The quartodecimans are refuted on quite other grounds.

A fragment of a chronicle wrongly ascribed to Eusebius, but probably proceeding from one Severus, also maintains the synoptic dates, although it accepts the Johannine view of the length of the ministry. The writer says that three years elapsed between the baptism and the crucifixion, and that our Lord ate the shadowy passover with his disciples, and introduced the authentic one, on the fifth day of the week, which was the fourteenth of the moon, and the twenty-second of March; that on the night between that and the twenty-third he was betrayed, and having been crucified rose again on the twenty-fifth. No notice is taken of any apparent inconsistency between the gospels.[134]

Aphraates likewise assumes that "our Redeemer ate the passover with his disciples on the usual night of the fourteenth."[135] Nevertheless the Christian passover was distinguished from the Jewish by the fact that the latter was kept on the fourteenth of Nisan, whereas the Christian "day of the great passion is the Friday, the fifteenth of Nisan," that being the day on which believers were redeemed from the service of Satan, as the Israelites had been from subjection to Pharaoh.[136] It appears, then, that in the far East the passover always began on the same day of the month, unless indeed that happened to be a Sunday, when the celebration was postponed till Monday;[137] and so far there was an agreement with the quartodecimans. But the day was the fifteenth, and not the fourteenth, and this day was fixed by the synoptic chronology. The whole week, however, was celebrated, in accordance with the law which prescribed the feast of unleavened bread, and the great feast day was the Friday.[138] Here there is an approach to the western custom of giving the preference to the day of the week. We ought further to observe that Aphraates does not connect the feast in any way with the resurrection. In this statement, then, we have not only another illustration of the various ways in which the

[134] See the Fragment in DINDORF'S *Chron. Pasch.*, II, p. 112.

[135] *Hom.* xii, 4. [136] § 6. [137] § 8. [138] §§ 6 and 8.

passover was regarded, but a valuable light upon the kind of argument which a quartodeciman might use. If the latter reasoned in the same way as Aphraates he could defend the observance of the fourteenth only by an appeal to the fourth gospel. We shall see that an Asiatic bishop, Apollinaris, did appeal to the fourth gospel to prove that the crucifixion took place on the fourteenth, and that he was, in all probability, a quartodeciman.

It is therefore abundantly proved that there were writers on the anti-quartodeciman side who accepted the synoptic account in its plain meaning. Before proceeding to writers who, in dealing with the eastern question, defend the Johannine view as it is now generally understood, we must notice two other testimonies which are given independently of that problem, one being doubtful, and the other opposed to the view which we have thus far presented. Justin Martyr says, "Christ was the passover who was sacrificed afterwards,[139] as also Isaiah said, He was brought as a sheep to the slaughter. And it has been written that on the day of the passover you seized him, and similarly in the passover crucified him."[140] I think Justin might have used these words whichever view he adopted. If he referred to the fourth gospel, then he not only knew it, but accepted it as an authoritative document. On the whole, however, it seems more likely that he followed the synoptics, and, if so, then it is clear that in the middle of the second century the belief that Christ was crucified on the fifteenth of the month did not interfere with the conviction that he was the true paschal Lamb.

Tertullian, having stated that Moses predicted the sacrifice of the Lamb by the people of Israel, proceeds: "He added that it is 'the passover of the Lord;'[141] that is, the passion of Christ. And this, also, has been so fulfilled that on the first day of unleavened bread you put Christ to death."[142] The day on which the lamb was killed is called "the first day of unleavened bread" in Matt. 26: 17; and that this is the day which Tertullian meant is expressly stated in an earlier passage, in which he says

[139] He has just referred to the original passover in Egypt.

[140] *Dial.*, 111. [141] Ex. 12: 11. [142] *Adv. Jud.*, 10.

that the passion was completed "on the first day of unleavened bread, in which they killed the lamb towards evening."[143] The curious thing about this statement is that Tertullian quotes the words of Matthew which distinctly refer to the day before the passion, and follows the synoptics in assigning only one year to the ministry, saying that Christ was about thirty when he suffered.[144] In what way he harmonized these views does not appear.

We come now to the fragments preserved in the Paschal Chronicle which have played such a conspicuous part in the inquiry into the nature of the quartodeciman controversy, and to assist our judgment of the meaning and value of these fragments it will be advantageous to summarize the arguments which we have found in treatises, of which the complete context is before us, and several of which expressly relate to the question about which the catholic church was so seriously divided. The question was whether Christians ought to keep the passover at the same time as the Jews, on the fourteenth of Nisan, whatever day of the week that might be, or only on Sunday, the Sunday being that which followed the first full moon after the vernal equinox. In favor of the western practice it was urged that it was supported by apostolic tradition; that the feast of the resurrection ought not to be kept before Sunday; that the law, being only typical, was not to be kept in the letter; that the record that Jesus kept the passover on the fourteenth did not constitute a commandment; that he himself was under the law in order to bring men out from under the law;[145] that the quartodecimans, though so strict about the day, did not keep the law properly; that the Jews had got wrong in their calculations, so that their passover was sometimes before the equinox; that Jesus did not eat the last passover with the Jews, because the Jews broke the law, and postponed their celebration; and, finally, that Christians ought not to have any part with traitorous Jews. It appears, therefore, that from existing

[143] § 8. [144] *Ibid.*

[145] This may be included, as appropriate, though actually said in relation to another point.

works we gain a pretty complete picture of the controversy, and yet we have not found a vestige of an appeal to the peculiar view of the fourth gospel. Nay, we have found that Irenæus, Eusebius, and Epiphanius, who wrote against the quartodeciman practice, adhered to the synoptic account of the last supper, as also did Origen, Chrysostom, and probably Justin. The conclusion is inevitable that the appeal to the fourth gospel was not a salient argument; that those who make it are expressing an individual opinion, and not the opinion of a party; and that their object is not to exalt the thirteenth above the fourteenth of the month, which had nothing to do with the question, but to show that Christ, in the last meal, when the new covenant was instituted, was not associated with the Jews. We have seen that some writers on the western side do not deny or object to Christ's recorded association with the Jews, while others get rid of it, not through an alleged anticipation of the passover by Jesus, but through a postponement of it by the Jews. Bearing all this in mind, we turn to the Paschal Chronicle.

We must notice first the author's own statements. His object, we must remember, is simply chronological, and he does not quote his authorities for the purpose of refuting the quartodecimans, but in order to confirm his own system of calculation. He has to determine the correct paschal cycle, and to ascertain the precise date of Christ's death in order that he may reckon the first Christian cycle from that definite point. Now there were two sources of uncertainty: (1) The Jews may in the year of the crucifixion have kept the passover in the wrong month; and (2) it was not agreed whether the passion took place on the fourteenth or on the fifteenth day. His first object, therefore, is to show that the Jews kept the passover correctly until the destruction of Jerusalem under Vespasian, and for this purpose he quotes Philo, Peter of Alexandria, and Athanasius.[146] Thus it was proved that the passover at which Christ suffered was held at the proper

[146] Pp. 3–10. It has been supposed that Athanasius refers in this extract to the quartodecimans. He speaks of "contentious persons, who have invented for themselves questions, under the pretext indeed of the saving passover, but in reality for the sake of their own strife, because seeming to be of us, and boasting to be called Christians, they emulate the acts of the traitor Jews." "For," he continues," what sort of even

time. The next question is: Was the moon full on Thursday or Friday? The crucifixion took place on Friday. We learn from the evangelist John that Jesus as the True Lamb suffered at the feast of the passover, that is, on the fourteenth day of the month.[147] Accordingly the problem was to find the year, within certain obvious limits, in which the first full moon after the vernal equinox fell upon a Friday. In order to establish his thesis that Christ was crucified on the very day on which the Jews were to eat the passover, he appeals first to the familiar texts in the fourth gospel; and to guarantee the correctness of the reading he refers to "the accurate books, and the very autograph of the evangelist, which has been kept till now by the grace of God, in the most holy Church of the Ephesians, and is there worshiped by the faithful."[148] Next he adduces the testimony of Paul, "'Christ our passover was sacrificed for us,' and not as some, carried away by ignorance, affirm that he was betrayed when he had eaten the passover; which neither have we learned from the holy gospels, nor has any of the blessed apostles handed down to us anything of the kind." On this statement we must remark that the synoptic gospels are represented as agreeing with the Johannine, that there is no mention of quartodecimans, and that among the men "carried away by ignorance" we have found several of the most learned theologians on the anti-quartodeciman side. Our author, it is true, assumes that the fathers are in agreement with him, and out of "much testimony of the holy fathers of the church" proceeds to quote, as a "few"

plausible defense could be made for them since it has been written, 'On the first day of unleavened bread,' and 'In which they ought to kill the passover.' But it was done properly at that time, but now, according to what has been written, they do always err in their heart." I hesitate about making use of this fragment, because even if Athanasius is attacking the remains of quartodecimanism, which held out against the decision of the Nicene Council, it does not follow that his argument would be applicable to the orthodox quartodecimans of an earlier time. Still it deserves notice that his conclusive argument is an appeal to the synoptics, and that the only thing that this appeal can refute is the opinion that not the last supper but the crucifixion itself took place on the day of the passover. We have here some indication that the quartodecimans of the fourth century relied upon the chronology of the fourth gospel to justify their practice.

[147] P. 10 f.

[148] P. 11. The same words are used in relation to the same text on p. 411.

samples, passages from Hippolytus, Apollinaris of Hierapolis, and Clement of Alexandria. These writers, therefore, are not cited in connection with the quartodeciman controversy, and their relation to it can be learned only from their historical position, and from the evidence afforded by the extracts themselves. In a later portion of the work our author adduces an argument from the synoptic gospels. It is clear, he says, that Jesus did not keep the passover on the fourteenth, but celebrated the typical supper before this, when the sanctification of the unleavened bread and the preparation of the feast took place, for he did not give his disciples the sacrificial lamb and unleavened bread, but bread and a cup.[149]

We will now take the extracts in their order. The first is from the *Syntagma* of Hippolytus against all heresies, and is as follows: "I see, then, that the affair is one of contentiousness; for he says thus: 'Christ kept the passover at that time on the day, and suffered; wherefore I ought also to do in the same manner as the Lord did.' But he has been led astray, not knowing that at the time in which Christ suffered he did not eat the legal passover; for he was the passover which had been preached beforehand, and was made perfect on the appointed day." The person who is here attacked was in all probability a quartodeciman, and may have been Blastus, who is mentioned as such by Pseudo-Tertullian,—*Against all Heresies*.[150] When the Asiatic custom was challenged, and it became necessary to seek for arguments to defend it, nothing could be more natural than to turn to the gospels, and show that Christ himself had kept the passover on the day appointed by the law. This was allowed by some of the ablest of their opponents, and we have seen that there were different ways of getting out of the argument, the genuineness and authority of the fourth gospel being admitted all the time. Hippolytus, departing from the opinion of his master Irenæus, disposes of the difficulty by denying the fact. It deserves remark that in his later work, the *Refutatio*, while he still thinks the quartodecimans contentious, he does not refer to this argument. Had he discovered that, though it was put

[149] P. 409 f. [150] § 8.

forward by Blastus, it was not commonly used by the Christians of Asia Minor?

The second extract is taken from the first book of Hippolytus' work on the passover: "That he did not speak falsely either in the first or in the last is evident, because he who long ago predicted, 'I will no more eat the passover,'[151] assuredly took the supper before the passover, and did not eat the passover, but suffered; for not even was it the time for eating it." The interest of this passage is that it gives us one more glimpse into the way in which the synoptics were harmonized with John, and proves that Hippolytus, at all events, had no intention of pitting one gospel against the rest.

We may notice next the two extracts from the work of Clement of Alexandria on the passover, as they do not give rise to any controversy. He says that in former years Christ kept the regular passover, but ceased to do so when he proclaimed himself as the paschal Lamb. Accordingly he suffered on the fourteenth, and the chief priests and scribes did not enter the prætorium, that they might not be defiled, but might eat the passover without hindrance in the evening. "With this exactitude of the days both all the Scriptures agree and the gospels are in harmony. The resurrection also testifies to it; at least he rose on the third day, which was the first of the weeks of the harvest, in which it had been enacted that the priest should offer the sheaf." These passages call for only one or two remarks. We have seen that treatises on the passover embraced a variety of subjects, and necessarily included the question of the day, which involved the year, of Christ's death; so that there is nothing here which can even suggest that Clement is arguing against the quartodecimans. Again, although he appeals to the verse in John, without which the case would be weak in the extreme, he nevertheless assumes that all the gospels are in agreement.

We are now prepared to criticise the fragments of Apollinaris' work on the passover. He says: "There are, then, persons who, owing to ignorance, are contentious about these things,

[151] See Luke 22:16.

being affected in a pardonable way; for ignorance does not admit of accusation, but requires instruction. And they say that on the fourteenth the Lord ate the sheep with the disciples, but himself suffered on the great day of unleavened bread, and they relate that Matthew speaks in accordance with their opinion. Hence both their opinion is inconsistent with the law, and the gospels seem, according to them, to be at variance." The next extract from the same treatise is a rhetorical glorification of the fourteenth day of the month. "The fourteenth day," he says, "is the genuine passover of the Lord, the great sacrifice; the child of God instead of the lamb; the bound one, he who bound the strong man; and he who was judge, the judge of the living and the dead; and the one who was betrayed into the hands of sinners to be crucified, he who was exalted on the horns of the unicorn; and the one who had his holy side pierced, he who poured forth out of his side the two purifiers, water and blood, word and spirit, and was buried in the day of the passover, the stone being laid upon the tomb." The value of these extracts, in their bearing on the authorship of the fourth gospel, is supposed to consist in this, that Apollinaris is attacking the quartodecimans, and alleges against them the date of the crucifixion which is found in the Johannine gospel, whereas they rely upon Matthew in their defense of a custom which they inherited from the apostle John. The inference is inevitable that they cannot have regarded as Johannine the gospel which they controverted on the authority of Matthew. This argument appears to me to rest on a complete misconception.

First, let us suppose that Apollinaris was not a quartodeciman. It does not at all follow that he is attacking quartodecimans; for he makes no allusion to the quartodeciman practice. The discussion of the date of the last supper necessarily entered into the question of Easter, and we have not hitherto met with any evidence of the prevailing quartodeciman opinion on this point. We have learned from Hippolytus that one quartodeciman believed that Jesus ate the legal passover at the time of the passion; but other quartodecimans may have taken a different view. Accordingly, Apollinaris may be attacking the observers of the western

custom, like Irenæus. The simple fact is that the opinion which Apollinaris advocates seems to have been taken up with some eagerness about the end of the second century, being supported also by Clement of Alexandria, Hippolytus, and Tertullian. In later time sit was defended by the unknown author of the Paschal Chronicle. But, in spite of the charge of ignorance, it was rejected by Origen, Eusebius, Epiphanius, Chrysostom, and, I believe, by the later church generally.[152] The necessary inference is that this particular point did not affect the quartodeciman controversy one way or the other. If the quartodecimans relied, as they might naturally do, on the fact that Jesus ate the legal passover (of course believing, as so many have done since, that the fourth gospel was in harmony with the synoptics), it was a tempting reply that he did not do so, as was proved by the testimony of John. But this reply failed to establish itself, for the evidence of the synoptics was too clear to be resisted; and other means of rebutting the argument had to be tried. As we have observed, even Hippolytus does not venture to repeat it in his *Refutatio*.

But, secondly, I see no evidence that Apollinaris was anything but a quartodeciman. He was bishop of Hierapolis, and as Philip of Hierapolis is the first of the Asiatic luminaries mentioned by Polycrates, it is probable that it was still a quartodeciman city, and had had a succession of quartodeciman bishops. We must add that Polycrates certainly implies that there was entire unanimity among the bishops in that region of the world. Schürer relies upon the fact that Apollinaris is not mentioned in the list which Polycrates gives of distinguished quartodecimans in his letter to Victor, though he was a celebrated man, while some of those who are named played no great part in the church.[153] But then Polycrates names only those who "have fallen asleep," and does not give the names of the "multitudes" of bishops who came together to consider the question, and signified their approval of his letter. Among the latter may have been Apol-

[152] Some of the chronologists seem to have taken the same view as the writer of the *Chron. Pasch.* See an anonymous extract in DINDORF, II, p. 118, and another in Latin, p. 222.

[153] *De cont. pasch.*, V, 1.

linaris, who was a contemporary of Irenæus,[154] and would not have been a very old man at the time.

Another item of evidence is furnished by the manner in which he speaks of those whose opinion he is combating. Hippolytus, living in the neighborhood of Rome, might easily fall into contemptuous language towards men whose numbers and weight were not familiar to him; but it is not likely that Apollinaris, unless he was a singularly conceited and ill-tempered man, would use similar language about all his brother bishops, including men of the greatest learning and distinction. Eusebius tells us that Melito, bishop of Sardis, wrote two books on the passover, and that these apparently were called forth by a discussion which arose at Laodicea about the passover, at the time when Sagaris was martyred, in the proconsulship of Servilius Paulus.[155] Of the nature of this discussion we are not informed; but as Sagaris and Melito were undoubtedly quartodecimans, and as we have no intimation that the church of Laodicea was ever anything else, it seems probable that the subject of debate was not connected with the quartodeciman practice. Clement's treatise was occasioned by that of Melito, but we are not told that it was an answer to it. The work of Apollinaris may have had the same origin, or it may have been an independent contribution to the Laodicean discussion. But supposing that it was an attack on the universal practice of the Catholic Christians of his country, is it likely that he would venture to ascribe to contentious ignorance the opinion of one of the most learned and orthodox bishops of his time? And if a man who set himself against the prevalent opinion and practice obtained a bishopric at all, would not such action have excited a storm, and made it impossible for Polycrates to assume, as he evidently does, that there was an unbroken unanimity in the Asiatic churches?

It is perhaps of small importance that Eusebius does not ascribe to Apollinaris any exceptional position; for he had not seen, and accordingly does not mention, his work on the passover. But if he had heard of any dissenting party in Asia

[154] EUSEB., *H. E.*, IV, 21. [155] About 164–6. *H. E.*, IV, 26.

Minor, he would probably have noticed it; and we can hardly suppose that in the remonstrance addressed to Victor there would have been no allusion to this party, and no remark on his injustice in endeavoring "to cut off in the mass the dioceses of all Asia, together with the neighboring churches."[156]

Lastly, the glorification of the fourteenth day is just what we should expect in a quartodeciman. If the fourteenth was the day in which the true passover was sacrificed, and Christian redemption was brought in, surely that was the one day on which Christians ought to celebrate the feast. The only objection to this argument is the baseless hypothesis that the Asiatic passover was a commemoration, not of the passion, but of the last supper. That some quartodecimans distinctly professed to keep the feast on the day of the passion we learn independently from Epiphanius,[157] who tells us that they claimed to have found from the acts of Pilate that the Saviour suffered on the eighth day before the Kalends of April, and they wished to keep the passover on that day, whatever the fourteenth might be. Of course men who adopted such a custom really ceased to be quartodecimans; and there is no apparent reason why Epiphanius classed them under that head except that they wished to keep the precise anniversary of the crucifixion.

For these reasons, then, I believe that Apollinaris was a quartodeciman; and if so, we learn that quartodecimans, like other Christians, were divided in opinion about the order of events in the closing scenes of Christ's life. These conflicting opinions had nothing to do with the great question which separated the two parties, except so far as they were dragged into it by individual writers. If a quartodeciman believed that Jesus kept the regular Jewish passover, what more natural than to appeal to his example; if he believed that Jesus, being himself the paschal Lamb, was slain on the fourteenth, again what more natural than to appeal to this fact as marking the unalterable day for the Christian celebration? It is very probable that the majority on their side, as on the side of the western practice, accepted the synoptic dates, which are far clearer than the

[156] EUSEB., *H. E.*, V, 24. [157] *Haer.*, L, 1.

Johannine, and in some way harmonized the latter with the former. The only distinct allusion to an inconsistency between the gospels on this point is in the first fragment of Apollinaris; but he does not say that the men whose ignorance he attacks maintained that the gospels were contradictory, but only that according to their view they seemed to be so. This is, to his mind, a conclusive argument, and it is pretty clear that he expects it to be equally conclusive to others. "The gospels" are evidently an accepted and authoritative collection, among which the thought of contradiction was inadmissible. No doubt the ignorant men were quite ready to retort the charge, and it would be interesting to know how Apollinaris managed to explain away the unambiguous language of Matthew. This practical ascription of infallibility to the evangelical records is in complete accordance with the results of our whole inquiry. The four gospels had been long in possession of the field as the most authentic documents of Christianity, and, as we have not found elsewhere, so neither can we find in the fragments of Apollinaris, the minutest particle of evidence that the Christians of Asia Minor looked askance at the gospel which was ascribed to the beloved disciple whose traditions still lingered among them.

This long inquiry has had chiefly an historical interest; but in throwing light upon the nature of early Christian practices, and on the mutual relations of parties, it has at the same time shown how untenable is the argument which is derived from quartodeciman usage against the Johannine authorship of the fourth gospel. The feast of the passover, as we have seen, was adopted by the Christian church, with such modifications as circumstances rendered desirable or necessary; and this being so, it was the most obvious and natural thing to keep it at the same time as the Jews, who were the custodians of the ancient law. John would follow the familiar custom; and although he would fill it with a Christian significance, and would probably, like Paul, recognize in Jesus the true paschal Lamb, by whose blood the new covenant between God and the world was sealed, he would see in this spiritual realization of a venerable symbol

no reason for altering a time which was settled by ancient prescription. On whatever day the crucifixion took place, it was associated with the passover, and that festival, with its changed meaning and its deep-rooted memories of the Beloved, would be always dear to his heart, and, as it returned year by year, would bring him ever fresh messages of world-wide grace and truth. The "feast of the Jews" had become the feast of the children of God; and he himself had looked upon the Lamb, and found in him a redemption from worse than Egyptian bondage. All this would have been easier and not more difficult, if Christ had been really crucified on the very day of the passover; but if we reject this as improbable, still we can see how the two events might become synchronous in thought, and the writer of the "spiritual gospel," in whose mind religious ideas are apt to clothe themselves in the form of visible facts, while the fact sometimes melts away into its religious meaning, might place together in his narrative two occurrences which, for him, were indissolubly associated. The appeal of some of his remote followers to our first gospel, in support of a practice which was alleged to be his, affords no evidence against this view, for the gospels, having been raised into a position of equal and divine authority, had become the hunting ground of polemics, and such arguments do not supply the reason for the observance, but are the after-thoughts of controversy. There is no tradition that John was guided by any of the considerations which were evoked in later times; and there is no ground for supposing that his respect for the familiar day was challenged till long after he had departed from the world. I am forced, therefore, to the conclusion that this celebrated argument against the Johannine authorship of our gospel rests on misconception, and, so far from being decisive of the question, does not possess the slightest validity.

# THE MORAL EVOLUTION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

By JAMES FREDERICK MCCURDY,
Toronto.

THE present paper is not written with a polemical purpose. It aims rather to be educative and suggestive. In it I shall try to indicate some of the essential ways in which the moral and religious teachings of the Old Testament came to their practical application among the people of Israel, in consonance with the changing historical conditions of that people. Some reasonable exposition of the morality of the Old Testament is greatly needed. Though a religious book throughout, and comprising nearly eighty per cent. of the whole of the Christian sacred writings, a large portion of it is almost entirely unused. This is true of teaching in secular schools and in Sunday schools, of pulpit exposition, and of private and domestic reading. Much of the Old Testament is discarded because it is thought to be irrelevant to the purposes of modern life. But much of it also is put aside because it is held to be positively immoral. There are four main positions or attitudes maintained toward the whole question.

The first opinion is that still held perhaps by the greatest number. They hold in effect that hostility or distrust toward the Old Testament is in its very nature wrong; that if any portion of it is objectionable to anybody, he himself is to blame. Their assumption is that the whole of the received text is not simply relatively or conditionally but absolutely true and infallible. They admit that there are moral difficulties, but they affirm that such difficulties are due either to our imperfect knowledge of the antecedents or to some other personal cause independent of the record itself.

People of another class go to the opposite extreme. They regard the Bible, indeed, as a religious book, in the sense that it stands for the religious faith and history of the ancient Hebrews.

But they maintain that it is not therefore necessarily a moral book. And their abhorrence of the inconsistencies and imperfections which they find there leads them to discountenance the whole Hebrew literature as one which has been foisted upon us by the Jewish and Christian church under false pretenses.

As a third group I would bring together all those who are indifferent to the claims of ecclesiastical authority as well as to traditional opinion, who trouble themselves little with questions about the inspiration and infallibility of the Scriptures, but who are drawn to them in so far as they find in them æsthetic beauty or moral worth or high spirituality. Their practical attitude may perhaps be indicated by saying with Matthew Arnold that they use and appreciate what suits their needs, and the rest they leave alone. Such persons are more numerous than is generally supposed. Their good standing in the world also makes their example of great influence.

The fourth class agrees with the first in this, that both alike regard the Old Testament as a living organism imbued with the Divine Spirit. But while those first named think of it as a sort of continued creation, those now to be characterized view it as an intellectual and moral evolution. They hold that the writers were recorders of the facts and sentiments which they have commemorated for us, but that they themselves contributed of their knowledge and reflection; that they, moreover, formed essential factors in the process of evolution, marking what they furnished with their own limitations and religious and moral deficiencies; that the facts which they have recorded were brought to their knowledge through ordinary channels of communication; and that their thoughts, however inspired from a higher source, were wrought out into coherent expression in their own minds. Of the divine inspiration they have no definite theory; they prefer to test the record by the accepted rules of historical and literary criticism. They find in it an ever-increasing purpose, a divine providence continually making its way, enlarging its sphere and scope, vindicating its methods and achievements. They find it at the beginning like a river in its early course, rising in moors or swamps, but receiving, as it moves and grows, springs

of pure and living water till it becomes limpid and sweet and undefiled.

At the outset it will be proper to state certain facts and principles which bear upon the question of the meaning and history of the Old Testament: (1) The Old Testament is not a single book, but an extensive collection of books whose composition ranged over many centuries and whose contents are varied in subject, in style, and in immediate purpose. (2) These books were written wholly upon Semitic soil, by Semitic people, for Semitic people, and concern themselves directly but little with matters of interest to those outside of the immediate Semitic environment. (3) More specifically these books are intensely Hebrew. While the setting and the wider relations are Semitic, the special interest is Hebrew throughout. (4) Again, while these books are diversified in their immediate subject-matter, they agree in this, that they are almost exclusively concerned with one aspect or another of *religion*, more definitely the religion and worship of Jehovah, the God of the Hebrews. Their ethical teaching, apart from the claims of Jehovah and his worship, is quite inconsiderable. (5) These books comprise the whole or almost the whole surviving pre-Christian literature of the Hebrew people. Consequently, in dealing with the Old Testament we have to deal with a national literature which is at the same time, as we have seen, a religious literature.

The main features and stages of Israel's history are easily recounted. As has already been said, the Old Testament has the Semitic world for its environment, and in harmony with this fact, the history begins with general Semitic conditions. The ancestors of the Hebrews were in fact the most representative Semites that we know of. Probably of Aramæan descent, and certainly of Aramæan affiliations, they lived successively in southern Babylonia, in western Mesopotamia, in Palestine among Canaanites and Amorites, on the desert border land, in Egypt with other semi-nomads, again in the desert, and finally again in Palestine; and all this before the national career was fairly begun. Moreover this genuine broad Semitic life was of very long duration. Between the migration of Abraham and the settlement in

Canaan stretched apparently one thousand years of continuous nomadic or semi-nomadic life and manners.

Thus we have to begin with the so-called patriarchal epoch. Before Abraham there is no Bible history in any true sense of the term; and where there is no history there is no morality, at least none that can be tested and described. Morality is always much of a social matter, and is particularly so among primitive peoples. What the community is in the habit of doing is in general the norm and guide of individual conduct. The practical limits are set on the one side by what the community tolerates, and on the other by what it desires. Further we know the facts of ancient tribal life only from the record of the deeds of the leaders. Hence the figures of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the Twelve stand out in solitary relief. By this we have secured the representative character of the early Old Testament history.

In reading the story of the ancient patriarchs we must be at once struck with the apparent freedom and breadth of movement and action which it reveals, the absence of moral restraints, the self-impulsiveness, so to speak, of moral choice. This phenomenon has, to a large extent, its explanation in the social and religious conditions of the nomadic life. We have to make, in any case, a distinction between classes of moral acts. There are some deeds which are wrong in the very nature of things, while there are others which are wrong because they are injurious to our fellows or to society. The latter class may at one time be permissible and at another reprehensible. A monumental instance is the discrimination made by Jesus between the ideal marriage bond and the loosening of the relation tolerated in an earlier stage of the history of Israel. Polygamy also is now regarded as immoral in civilized states. But it was sanctioned by high example in ancient Israel. The same is true of slaveholding. Indeed slaveholding was not, and could not be at any time, interdicted in ancient society. Yet the abuse of the relations thus tolerated or approved was always reckoned an offense. Harsh treatment, either of a wife or a slave, was always wrong. We thus arrive at the conclusion that institutions, themselves

relative and changeable, may vary some important conditions of moral obligation.

The fundamental consideration in such variable cases is the interest of society. Not that this was a mattter of agreement or of contrivance in any way. It was simply the unconscious adjustment of the community to its necessities. Society has progressed mainly by the suppression or gradual abandonment of habits and customs which have been found to be injurious. It is an important and difficult question, how far we are to distinguish between the evils which are in themselves wrong and those whose culpability varies with the requirements of society and its consequent varying moral standards. If we go far enough back in social history we shall come to a stage where almost any sort of action is justifiable under given circumstances. The decisive sanction was the will of the community; in other words, the usages and customs which formed the basis and bond of union. In ordinary cases individual choice was overborne by the interests of the clan or the family. A striking instance is afforded by the difference of treatment accorded to kinsfolk and clansmen, on the one hand, and to aliens, on the other. Kindnesses, or even the ordinary offices of humanity, would by usage, that is upon principle, be withheld from the latter. What would be counted a crime done to a tribesman was sometimes a meritorious and even an obligatory act when done to an outsider. For the avenger of blood there was no punishment, but rather approbation, since the duty to take up the cause of a kinsman, even if he were in the wrong, was paramount. Thus no claim of compassion could avail even in behalf of one who had unwittingly provoked such corporate resentment. It is difficult to see how social morality, which rests essentially upon the equal claims of all men for justice, if not for mercy, could flourish in these primitive communities. The matter was aggravated by the fact that the sole judge of the avenger was the family or tribal head. It would be strange, indeed, if the common virtues were maintained in the stress and strain of daily life when the vendetta was kept up by the community from a sense of right. When individual action was subordinated

to the claims of the community there was little room for that spontaneous choice between opposing courses which is at once the test of moral quality and the basis of moral discipline. Qualities of mind and heart essential to the moral life of the individual were, in the very nature of the case, not yet evoked, since in that stage of society the solidarity of the social unit was a much more obvious thing than the individuality of its several members. Indeed the notion that the members of the family or kin formed by themselves an undivided life lies at the very foundation of tribalism.

Another great moral determinant was the claim of the deities upon the obedience of their followers. The origin of the different classes of deities need not be discussed in this connection. The motive and mode of their worship are of more immediate importance. We may say in general that in the primitive tribal condition the obligations of a man to his deity are analogous in some respects to those which bind him to the usages or behests of his community. In a very profound sense the same ties united the members to one another and to their common divinity. Even if we do not accept the view that most tribal religion was based upon ancestor worship, we must concede that the tribesmen regarded themselves as being akin to their gods, as in fact sharing with them a common life. This was certainly one of the sources of the power wielded over them by the objects of their reverence and homage. There were two principal ways in which such power was exercised. One was connected with sacred places, the proper seats of the gods, where the rites of their worship were performed, and whose sacredness conferred a special sanctity or immunity upon special things or actions. Another was associated with the declared will of the gods, which was made known through various channels, but mainly by the domestic or communal priests, who ministered within the family or family group, or in the common sanctuary of the tribe.

We revert now to the moral standards and ideals of the so-called patriarchal society among the Hebrews. As to the accuracy of the record to which appeal is to be made, no special

discussion is necessary. All classes of critics, even to the most radical, will admit that for the purposes of such an inquiry as this the early stories of Genesis are quite available. For those who, unlike the present writer, cherish serious doubts as to the actual existence of the patriarchs, the record is still of value as a picture of primitive life and manners. Composite as the narrative is, and presenting some apparent inconsistencies, it yet answers to every test that may be applied to it from the side of archæological and sociological criticism, being in complete accord with the spirit and manner of the nomadic society of the ancient Semites. For our immediate topic, the exact date of the period of the history of "Israel" there represented is of little or no consequence. The question before us is that of the *relation* in point of morality between the beginning of Israel's career and its later historical development; and there can be no doubt that we stand here at the fountain head of the stream of national tradition.

We ask naturally, first, how the personages of this primitive time demeaned themselves, and, secondly, how their deeds seem to be regarded by the narrators. Actions of moral quality may for convenience be classed as those springing from ordinary human relations, and those which have a religious motive or warrant. Of the former class the most prominent offenses are deceit and fraud. Lying and cheating are thought to be distinctive vices of oriental life. The common belief is in some degree just. But oriental deception has become notorious, not merely because the civilization of western Asia has for many long ages been specially unfavorable to the promotion of veracity and justice, but also because it has come more prominently before the world than that of other communities of ancient and modern times in which the evils in question have been equally rife. The causes of the moral retardation of such an ancient and highly favored portion of the world need not be particularly discussed here. It is sufficient to say that the virtues of veracity and justice are seldom found to be highly developed in communities of a low political organization. That men are naturally liars is a fact of anthropological science as

well as of biblical and historical observation. It is only by slow gradations of self-discipline that truthfulness has been established anywhere as an attribute of individuals or communities.

It would therefore naturally be expected that the virtues of sincerity and rectitude would be rudimentary or wanting in savage tribes. Among nomadic or semi-nomadic peoples most of the conditions are wanting which seem suited to their development. The foundation of such virtues is the sense of responsibility to God or to man, or to both. But when religion consists mainly of ceremony or ritual there is little chance for the evoking of the former. And when property is attached so precariously to the individual, no large issues or powerful motives are present that might arouse and foster the latter. When the individual subordinates his personality to the interests of his tribe, the demands of conscience are weakened, or rather, perhaps, the sense of moral obligation cannot be developed. At the same time other virtues may be conspicuous which are in a line with the surrender of oneself to the cause of the community. Thus it happens that the early age of great races is an age of heroism, and that we find among them well-grounded traditions of noble deeds of courage and devotion that serve as an inspiration to all later generations.

In some such way must we represent to ourselves the earliest or patriarchal age of ancient Israel. The records are not biographies, but biographical or rather character sketches. But they are, therefore, all the more valuable as studies in morality. And how well does the conduct of the patriarchs illustrate the most outstanding moral defects of their race and civilization! The very first personal notice of Abraham after the account of his arrival in Canaan from over the River is an account of a transaction which represents him to have been notably wanting in sincerity and even in honor and common decency. I refer to the incident assigned by the Jehovist to the period of his residence in Egypt (Gen. 12:10 ff.), and by E to his sojourn in Gerar (Gen. 20:1 ff.).

Following up the patriarchal history we observe that the same deception is recorded by the Jehovist (Gen., chap. 26) as hav-

ing been practiced by Isaac upon the great chief of Gerar. This incident does not call for further remark except that the blessing which followed the deceit of Abraham did not fail to come upon Isaac also (vss. 12 ff.) It is, however, in the history of Jacob that we have the most abundant illustration of the want of veracity and honesty in the ancestors of Israel. Indeed, it would seem as though the whole kin were affected with hypocrisy and knavery, since the cousin who was brought from the old home in Charran to be the wife of Isaac, according to the laudable custom of the "first families" of the Semites, was the instigator, in her old age, of the most cunning, if not the most heartless, of all the fraudulent achievements of the race. In the deception practiced by Rebekah and her favorite son upon the blind old Isaac, there is, however, a certain palliation such as is not present in the actions first spoken of. It is manifest that the intriguers felt that the blessing extorted from Isaac *ought* to descend upon Jacob rather than upon Esau, and inasmuch as the word of the house-father was held to carry with it divine validity and potency, the securing of it by fair means or foul was deemed an urgent necessity. Once more the blessing was given, and was held to be effectual, in spite of the gross and elaborate imposture. The subsequent moral career of Jacob until his establishment in Canaan is in perfect keeping with the lessons learned in his youth. Accordingly, we find the passion for gain, which is in all ages a chief motive of deceit, united in him with the propensity to overreach and defraud. The result of his long course of double-dealing with his father-in-law, who was equally greedy and unscrupulous, was, as before, greatly to increase his material wealth. His favorite wife, his cousin and the daughter of his competitor, illustrates the same apparent principle, that dishonesty is the best policy, in the result of her attempt to convey with her to Canaan her father's household gods. At the same time it is undeniable that the outcome of the self-aggrandizement of Jacob, from the time when he cajoled Esau out of the birthright till his permanent settlement in Canaan, was better for "Israel" and for humanity than would have been his discomfiture by his rivals. Even from the indus-

trial and cultural points of view, not to speak of the spiritual interests ultimately involved, it was better that the higher type of nomad, the shepherd, should have the promise and the possession of Canaan, than that the lower and unprogressive type, the huntsman of the wilderness, should be the heir of the "father of the faithful." These considerations, we say again, are of no significance for the morality of the story; but they help to throw light upon the other important question, how the narrators, who gave us this part of the Old Testament, themselves regarded such startling transactions.

We may now briefly examine the moral conduct and standards of the ancestors of Israel in the equally fundamental matter of the relations of the sexes. At the outset we may say that in such a society as theirs there is no question of extreme grossness or utter self-abandonment to revolting vice. Their life was on the whole simple and moderate. It was, speaking generally, life in *cities* which promoted institutional vice, if the term may be permitted. And to this stage the early Hebrews had not yet become accustomed. Vices associated with the worship of those deities which were regarded as the type of the procreative or sexual instinct naturally flourished where great temples were erected and maintained to their honor. Thus it came to pass that that passion of human nature, whose unbridled indulgence has tended more than anything else to demoralize society and to bring about the destruction of families and nations, received, so to speak, an apotheosis in the transition from nomadic to city life. Every city had at least one temple whose maintenance and prestige were at once the boast of the community and the foundation of its hopes; and each of the temples had its band of prostitutes whose gains were devoted to the patron gods or goddesses, and whose very name betokened a formal consecration to their service. Of these more hereafter; I merely mention this systematized immorality here in order to indicate the prevalent moral conditions of the time.

We have accordingly to deny to the most ancient of the Hebrews any form of systematic and ostentatious sensuality. On the other hand if we were to judge by the accepted standards

of more modern morality we should have to put them in a scale far from the highest. Too great emphasis must not be laid, it is true, upon the practice of polygamy. The relative innocence of such alliances being granted, out of deference to wide and long-prevailing usage, we have therewith to extenuate those other attachments which are abhorrent to our modern sense. I refer to marriage between a brother and a half-sister (Gen. 20:12), between a son and his deceased father's wife, not his own mother, or concubine. A marriage with two sisters at once may even be tolerated, as in keeping with the freedom of this primitive time. On a much lower grade of moral development stands the system of concubinage, which was rife in the patriarchal age. But here we have to take into account the effect on the whole social fabric of the institution of slavery, the most important factor in ancient life and manners. While the whole household of the house-master was at his disposal, one or more women of the number held a superior rank as the actual or prospective mothers of his legitimate children, through whom the family was to be perpetuated. But since all the persons of his establishment were subject to his will, other women, already his slaves or made so by purchase, might become his companions for those purposes which in an ideal society are only subserved by a single marriage. Nothing more clearly illustrates the contending claims of wifehood and of family pride, and at the same time the rudimentary notions of propriety and delicacy prevalent among a primitive people, than the custom by virtue of which a wife may give to her husband one of her own maids as a concubine (Gen., chap. 16). In general the position of the wife as the property of the husband carried with it the consequence that the freedom of sexual relationship which was granted to him was denied to her, that the dismissal of a wife was customary and easy, while that of a husband was unknown. The conception of "adultery" held in such a society was accordingly quite different from ours, the infidelity of the husband not involving a separation from his wife; while that of the wife or the betrothed maiden was or might be a capital offense, according to the decree of the head of the family (Gen. 38:24).

As to the prevalence of adultery in this semi-historic period we are not informed. Probably the practice was not very common. We can speak with more definiteness as to the relations of people unmarried or unbetrothed. Happily it may be said that these were, as a rule, tolerably innocent. It is unnecessary to point out that it must be so among a nomadic people of long endurance and established fame. There would otherwise have been at least no guarantee of purity of race, the first essential of tribal stability. It is a pleasing feature of the oldest Hebrew society, as also of the oldest Arabian, that young men and women were at liberty to consort freely with one another—a thing impossible were sexual irregularity either approved or frequent. It is quite another question how sexual vice was regarded from the moral point of view. It is to be noted that while irregularities were in large measure checked by the usages and requirements of the community, there was often an opportunity afforded for the gratification of illicit passion by that class of unfortunate women which has not been absent from any civilized community that the world has seen. That professional harlotry was not unknown to the earliest Hebrew society we have abundant proof, though we have no direct evidence that any member of the degraded sisterhood belonged to the community of Israel. What is brought to our attention is the fact that the institution of sacred prostitutes was prevalent among the Canaanites of the time, and we have unmistakable references thereto in the stories of Genesis. Most significant, however, is the matter-of-fact way in which the notices are recorded. The action of Judah towards the supposed harlot on the way to Timnah (Gen. 38:15 ff.) is mentioned as the most natural thing in the world, even though the perpetrator was a man of wealth and position.

We have now to look at the Hebrew patriarchal society from a point of view which more nearly approaches the altruistic. This convenient but very elastic term comprehends the various sentiments and impulses that provoke to deeds of self-sacrifice in any form—magnanimity, generosity, compassion, self-denial. This branch of our essay seems to lead more directly to the essential basis of morality, which in all ages and places rests funda-

mentally upon the giving up of self. It may also help to unify the whole inquiry. For these primitive ages, however, the two qualities already discussed are much readier tests of moral *progress* than those about to be considered. Veracity and chastity are virtues which presuppose not only a strong personal self-discipline but also a public or social sentiment which is only attained after a long period of education and cultivation has gradually raised the moral standards of the community. If, therefore, there is any such thing as moral progress in human history, these later virtues must be given a higher place than the more primitive. Qualities which are more elementary still, such as endurance and courage, we do not need to discuss at all. They are found in all kinds and stages of society, and in fact may be said to be a necessary condition of the survival of any society whatever. Indeed they are so far from being criteria of moral progress that they are not even exclusively human. In civilized human society their significance does not consist in their exercise or display by itself, but only in the occasion or issue that has called them forth.

Instances of generosity and magnanimity are frequent in the patriarchal history. In the character of Abraham these virtues are perhaps the most distinguished traits. He is the type of an enterprising chief formed to be a leader of men and the pioneer of a great enterprise. It is a true instinct which associates these qualities with such an epoch-making man. It is only necessary to mention his treatment of Lot in the matter of a choice of residence (Gen., chap. 13), his rescue of Lot and the captive Amorites from the Elamitic army of invasion (Gen., chap. 14), his intercession for the doomed cities of the Araba (Gen., chap. 18), and his willingness to offer up his son as a sacrifice at the supposed pleasure of Jehovah (Gen., chap. 22). Of the moral character of Isaac we know nothing. He is represented as being largely under the control of his cunning Aramæan wife. He is evidently intended, however, to be merely a connecting link between Abraham, the head of the race, and Jacob, the head of the nation. Of the last named we cannot find any positively meritorious trait recorded. The only sort

of nobleness of which the family of Isaac could boast is to be credited to the wild and passionate hunter Esau.

The character of Joseph presents the highest type of ancient Hebrew morality. His story is remarkable from several points of view. But its most remarkable feature is the grandeur and symmetry of the moral portraiture of its hero. His would be a great character in any age; but the marvel of it is that it exhibits a life lived in that primitive stage of social development which, as we have already seen, is most unfavorable to the manifestation of high moral qualities. Fidelity, honor, sense of personal responsibility, ideal chastity, magnanimity, not of the pagan, not of the Old Testament, but of the Christian type —these are some of the traits of the favorite son of the subtle and selfish Jacob. At first sight it seems as though the whole story would have to be regarded as an idealizing parabolic representation drawn for the instruction and inspiration of the youth of a later reflective age of Israel's history. The difficulty seems to be that it postulates no sufficient moral antecedents, belonging apparently to that class of fiction in which, as in Dickens' stories for example, the hero becomes unexpectedly good and noble with no adequate inward motive or spiritual preparation. A little reflection will show that, however the story may have assumed its present literary garb at a later date, the incidents recorded are not impossible. The two most prominent admirable features of Joseph's character are his fidelity in service and his chastity. Now it appears that while Joseph stands out so conspicuously in these and other virtues he has also had a different *history* from any of the other patriarchs. He was not only a son of Israel, but a son of Israel in altogether new relations. It was his fortune, as the narrative so amply suggests, to exchange the simple life of a shepherd lad for the various and complex associations of a civilized society. This supplies just that environment which, as we saw above, was lacking for the moral development of the rest of the kin. The story accordingly shows what it was possible for a child of Israel to be under circumstances which might bring out his latent moral possibilities.

A closer examination leads us to the heart of the matter, and to the vital center of the whole question before us. The account of Joseph's moral testing is given in a single chapter. Joseph is invested with larger and sterner responsibilities than any he could have assumed in the semi-nomadic surroundings of his early days. Trained in such a school he is ready for the supreme ordeal, which comes from the temptation of his master's wife. His answer to her proposals (Gen. 39:8) states his moral position. He is a trustee of his master with full control over the household, except as to the wife. Absolute confidence is reposed in him, and this very fact is a reason why he should not abuse the trust. But there is a still more solemn restraint: "How can I do this great evil and sin against God?" He does not appeal to his own Jehovah as the God of righteousness. He is thinking of the marriage bond as of a contract before God, by whose sanction it is constituted and therefore made inviolable. He is not thinking of the possibility of his own moral defilement, nor of the degradation of the woman, who is already guilty in her "heart" (Matt. 5:28). It is the divine sanction of the marriage vow, held to by Hebrew and Egyptian alike, and indeed by all races and nations where the institution exists, that is by him transfigured into a moral law universal and inexorable.

The observation naturally suggests itself here that such an appeal to the divine authority in matters of moral conduct stands alone in the early Hebrew history. There is much said in the accounts of the patriarchs of their religious acts and of their fidelity to Jehovah. Their faith in him determines also their course in many important matters. But we do not find that it exerts a strong and steady determining influence towards righteousness or mercy. If it had, their moral history would have been very different from what the record shows it to have been. What, then, is the moral significance of their lives and conduct? We may emphasize at least three points as of decisive importance:

I. The first remark to be made is that they are shown by their biographies to have been men of large and original genius.

However we may be inclined, in accordance with a true conception of historical development, to minimize their influence in comparison with that of later rulers and seers, we cannot but concede to the early leaders of the race a strong, original, propulsive force in the social and religious sphere. As we have seen, the nomadic or semi-nomadic life is most unfavorable to innovation and progress. But the Hebrew patriarchs are distinguished by what they did, not by virtue of their tribal antecedents, but in spite of them. So much is this the case that perhaps the strongest indirect evidence for their actual existence and activity is the bent which was given in remote ages to the Hebrew people, which marks them out as singular among the nations, and which is naturally to be traced to the men who were their first leaders. It is, to be sure, in accordance with the nomadic habit to choose a new home by longer or shorter journeyings. But it is not in accordance with the tendencies and the antecedents of tribal life that a single family or clan should refuse alliance (*cf.* Gen., chap. 34) with more powerful communities on whose borders or in whose midst they dwell, and that it should for generation after generation maintain an isolated life (Num. 23:9), escaping the risks of conquest and the still more probable chances of absorption. This power of resistance and immunity, it may be said, was due to the peculiar institutions and beliefs of the early Hebrews. But whence came those beliefs and institutions? Without inquiring just now into their ultimate origin, we must agree that the instruments of enforcing and perpetuating them were the heads or chiefs of the family or clan. To them and to them alone is the initiative possible among a nomadic people. A distinctive merit of the Hebrew patriarchs accordingly is their originality and independence, the energy, enterprise, and success with which they broke through the force of tradition and custom. In this they were the prototypes and precursors, and, we may venture to add, the examples also of the moral and religious leaders who gave character to Israel through all its separate history.

II. It cannot be successfully denied that Jehovah was the God of "Israel" during the patriarchal period. This is ante-

cedently probable, since tribal unity itself was conditioned on the worship of some paramount divinity, who in this instance can only have been Jehovah, just as certainly as the leading families claimed descent from a common stock. It may be objected that these conditions apply necessarily only to the family of Jacob, and that we cannot draw an equally broad inference as to that of Isaac and Abraham. The objection is valid. I think it must be admitted that, in spite of the impulse that led Abraham to attach himself to Jehovah, his was not the only worship that prevailed among the heterogeneous elements of Abraham's household. Hence we are bound to lay all due emphasis upon the account (by E) in Gen., chap. 35, which describes Jacob's final choice of Jehovah as the God who had appeared to him and helped him, and his exclusion of the deities which had theretofore held the divided allegiance of his people. Furthermore, we may fairly insist that without the worship of Jehovah as the God of Israel the subsequent history of the clans till the settlement of Canaan would have been an impossibility. They could otherwise never have held together in Egypt or in the great wilderness, not to speak of the chances of defeat or absorption by the Canaanites.

III. But, it may be said again, this adherence to Jehovah, even if exclusive and unshaken, does not constitute morality. Such devotion, it may be urged, is merely a ceremonial, and, as it would appear from the history of Jacob, sometimes a purely selfish form of primitive religion. Let it be granted; we are not seeking merely for evidences of high moral sentiment and achievement among these primitive conditions. What we especially desire is an explanation of the morality afterwards characteristic of Israel. And here, as it would seem, we have the chief essential antecedent. While it is questionable whether in any age, or under any form of civilization, a deep and true morality can be developed except upon the foundation, or with the aid, of a religious sanction, it is certain that among a people such as ancient Israel religion is the only basis of any morality worthy the name. Where industrial pursuits were maintained systematically, if at all, by exclusive hereditary guilds; where

commerce was confined to traveling merchants and occasional caravans; where no political system above the assembly of the elders had ever been devised, the industrial, or commercial, or political morality that has formed the precarious support of the great western civilizations was beyond attainment as it was beyond imagination. To national as to individual morality a long antecedent process of discipline is a prerequisite. To Israel such a discipline could only come through the religion whose feeble yet sure beginnings were made by the fathers before the perilous adventure was made of the migration to Egypt. The strenuous adherence, even by a half-blind and groping instinct, to Jehovah as the tribal God was of itself a spiritual exercise that had a sort of moral quality, which, even when it did not result immediately in "good works," played an essential part in the divine process of the evolution of righteousness in the bosom of that race which first embraced Jehovah as its God. The story of Joseph is, therefore, profoundly true, whether it be actual history or a parable. Still more profoundly true is that marvelous saying which has immortalized and transfigured the primitive and rudimentary faith of the founder of the race: "And he trusted in Jehovah, and he reckoned it to him as righteousness" (Gen. 15:6).

What do we find to be the moral features of Hebrew society in the period of the judges? Did any decisive changes take place in the community of Israel which would tend to develop the national and individual conscience and make it a controlling force in speech and act as between Hebrew and Hebrew, and Hebrew and foreigner? Were the three prime qualities, rectitude chastity, and magnanimity, largely exemplified? How did the occupations of the people and their general social environment affect them? It must be confessed that the virtues most likely to be encouraged were those of the heroic or semi-barbarous type. Courage, endurance, fidelity to clan, family, and companions in arms, must have been often and signally displayed. The long struggle with the native Canaanites, over wide areas or in isolated holdings, for the possession of fortresses, fertile valleys and plains, vineyards and olive groves, or with various

swarms of foreign invaders, played a principal part in molding the Hebrew temper into strength, elasticity, and hardness. It was this discipline that gave to Israel the resisting and recuperative power which was and is the marvel of the ancient and modern world. Not very much, however, can be said of influences favorable to the development of the rarer and more precious moral endowments of a people. In a community trained to irregular warfare, swift reprisal, deadly revenge, with thoughts concentrated upon the ambush, the surprise, and the sudden onset, little stimulus could be afforded to any latent or incipient openness or candor which might have been educed in the more peaceful occupations of earlier days. Ehud (Judges, chap. 3) was doubtless a daring patriot; but he can be a moral hero only to those who hold that no means are reprehensible which can secure a desirable end. Like his, but much more treacherous, was the act of Jael, the wife of Heber the Kenite. In it we have not only gross deception, but a violation of the laws of hospitality. Doubtless it would be too much to expect that a shelter would be offered to an enemy as a matter of course, and the Kenites were at this time virtually a part of Israel. But when hospitality has once been freely offered it is inviolable, according to all inter-tribal usage. The outrage was heightened by the circumstance expressly recorded (Judges 4:17) that an alliance actually subsisted between the half-Israelitish Kenites and the followers of the Canaanitish king. It is of course thinkable that Jael was wiping out an old offense or indignity done by the unfortunate fugitive Sisera against the family to which she belonged, and that the paramount duty of blood revenge thus overrode the obligations of hospitality. But of this there is not a word in the extant accounts. On the contrary, the splendid lyric which celebrates the triumph of Israel over the last great combination of the Canaanites counts Jael blessed above all women who dwell in tents (Judges 5:24), because she had come to the help of Jehovah (*cf.* 5:23). It was accordingly the sentiment of contemporary Hebrews that help afforded to Israel and Israel's God was such a praiseworthy achievement that the most sacred bond of plighted faith might and should be broken, whose

observance stood in the way of its execution; that it was even laudable by means of such a pledge to lull into false security an enemy of Jehovah and of his people.

Such cases are characteristic of the times and the people, and so stand out boldly in the record. Without enlarging upon this special theme, we may inquire how it stood in this era with the virtue of chastity. A sample or two will suffice to show that the standard of morals which we felt bound to attribute to the patriarchal age of Israel had been lowered rather than raised during this later period. A sample or two will suffice for the proof. Gideon, one of the best approved leaders of Israel, had not only many wives, but a concubine as well (Judges 8 : 30 f.). What we call and condemn as lust in Mohammed we can only extenuate in Gideon on the ground that he lived in a remoter age. Jephthah was the son of a harlot (Judges 11 : 1). Samson resorted to harlots as a matter of habit (Judges 16 : 1, 4 ff.). Delilah, in spite of her Hebrew name, may have been a Philistine. But the Baal worship which was rife in most of Israel during this whole period must have brought with it its due measure of licentiousness more or less professional. Concubinage was but one remove from harlotry, as we learn from a memorable case (Judges 19 : 1 f.) which sheds more light upon the question of sexual morality in Israel during this time than all the remaining evidence combined. The readmission of the faithless paramour to her "husband's" favor, as well as the unrestrained confidence between him and her people (19 : 1, 3 ff.), illustrates the easy social manners prevailing throughout the Israel of the period. A still darker shadow is seen to rest upon at least a portion of the land in the prevalence of the worse than bestial crime in the city of Gibeah (19 : 22). It was apparently this enormity, as well as the shocking treatment of the hapless woman of the tragedy, that roused the resentment and the moral indignation of the rest of Israel, and brought about that cruel, unreasoning strife which resulted so disastrously for the tribe whose members had wrought the gross iniquity. Added to the feeling of horror at the crime in the minds of the northern Israelites was, of course, the sense of the wrong that had been committed against the members of

an allied tribe. But the whole narrative, ending with the rough and ready method of securing wives by capture (21 : 21 ff.), recalls vividly the essential spirit of the people and the age, their primitive habits and manners, and their rudimentary conception of the saving virtues of society.

An aspect scarcely more favorable is presented by the practice of the altruistic virtues. At least the Book of Judges gives no suggestion of their prevalence. It is to be admitted that allusions to the gentler side of life and conduct are hardly to be expected in the memorials of a rude and warlike age. And among the larger households in the more settled districts, particularly in the later days of the judges, there were doubtless many manifestations of neighborly kindness and perhaps even of chivalrous generosity. The institution of the *goël* especially gave scope and occasion for actions of the latter class. While in the rudeness and savagery and wildness of the times the services of the protector of kinship were perhaps most frequently in demand as an avenger of blood (Ex. 21 : 12 ff.), the necessities of unfortunate kinsfolks, particularly of widows and orphans, must have evoked innate feelings of generous compassion and moving sympathy in many a manly heart. Such a traditional picture as that which is presented at the close of the Book of Ruth can scarcely represent an isolated instance. It is not to be supposed, however, that this is an indication of the prevailing type of manners.

It was scarcely possible that any essential change in the national morals could take place during the historical period immediately following the judges. Yet the early vicissitudes of the kingdom had a great deal to do with building up the national character. And it was especially the new spirit infused into the people by the personality and achievements of David that prepared the way for that larger nationalism which made possible an historic Israel and is even yet not extinct in Judaism. The predominant note of the rise of the monarchy is patriotism. The deliverance of the individual family groups, the first thought of the beleaguered clansman, was found to depend upon common action against the Philistines. The idea

of a united Israel was first realized under Saul at the instance of the prophet-priest-judge Samuel. The rising tide of loyalty to Jehovah and his cause, as against the aliens and their gods, swelled by the first successes of Saul and still more by the impulse of the heroic daring of Jonathan, was checked by the king's mental and moral collapse; it retreated with the defection of David and the ensuing intestine strife; it fell to its lowest ebb with the tragedy of Gilboa. The accession of David to the tottering throne, and his steady advance to unchallenged preëminence, first within Israel itself and thereafter in Palestine and the whole of the West-land, were the real making of Israel into a nation. No later failures or disgrace or ruptures could efface the glorious memory of this triumph; nor could any subsequent national success rival it as an ideal of kingly achievement or as a measure of Israel's greatness. There was now wanting but one deep, common source of inspiration, one cardinal element of national solidarity,—the attraction of a central sanctuary. This idea, cherished so fondly by David, was realized in the temple of Solomon. Thus were established at last the main outward conditions of a permanent state under the most potent of guarantees. But of far more enduring importance than the promise of political stability, soon to be so rudely disturbed, was the foundation then laid for progress in morality and for the practice of a religion which should be something more than ceremonial formalism. The larger relations of political, business, and social life then inaugurated gradually brought with them a sense of responsibility which must have sobered and steadied the new self-conscious community. The oath or the vow made before Jehovah became more binding with the recognition of his enthronement for righteousness and justice upon Mount Zion, the place where he had chosen to set his name. It is not necessary to inquire now how and when such claims were ignored or weakened. We may content ourselves with remarking that while these were conditions essential to moral advancement, they might naturally be expected to be only slowly operative, finding their true scope and vindication in a later time. What, however, we wish particularly to know is the actual

moral standing of the best men of Israel in this age of the early or undivided monarchy. Examples here crowd upon us, and we must limit ourselves in the choice.

Again we have to emphasize the prominence of the military or heroic virtues. This is, in fact, preëminently the heroic age of Israel. Physical courage was universal, as befitted a people engaged in a protracted life and death struggle. Not to lack of bravery, but to want of discipline, to the decline of the kingly qualities in the monarch, to the effect of panic fear in a superstitious age, are to be ascribed the half-heartedness and the frequent retreats of the armies of Israel during the régime of Samuel and Saul. Of individual prowess every leader gave conspicuous proof during the whole of the period. David's worthies (2 Sam., chap. 23) were a choice product of the spirit that was now moving in Israel like a long pent-up flood. They were the finest flower of that age of Hebrew chivalry. Nor was there lacking that noble self-devotion which in the undisciplined warriors of a struggling community is even more imposing than in the gallant charge of a forlorn hope in a regular army. No deed of heroic daring done by David's men, inspired by his example, could surpass the brilliant achievement of Saul's knightly son at Michmash. A nation which bred such heroes could scarcely hereafter be utterly ignoble. And in these actions, also, the theme of song and legend till the latest generation, we must recognize indirect occasions and provocations of nobler manners and purer motives throughout the moral realm. No man can risk his life non-professionally in a worthy cause without being stirred to the depths of his soul by an electric thrill which reacts by moral sympathy through his whole spiritual nature. The daring exploits of prince and captain and common man in those days of fate are not a mere formal record. The clods, once disturbed by celestial fire, were henceforth magnetic and responsive to the touch of spiritual forces which else had found and left them useless and dead.

But these profounder movements had as yet scarcely begun; and it is a sad descent that brings us to the level of the everyday morals of the early monarchy. The virtue of veracity

seems especially wanting in the make-up of the men of the period. Deception seems the most natural thing to almost any of the leaders of the people. For the sake of brevity we shall confine ourselves to the career of David, assuming that he may have represented at least as high a standard of honor and rectitude as that held by the average Israelite of his time. We are at once struck with the fact that whenever any danger threatened, if a falsehood served his turn it was immediately employed (1 Sam. 19:13 ff.; 20:5 ff.; 21:2; 27:10 ff.; 2 Sam. 15:34). He deceived friends and enemies indifferently. His perils during his wanderings perhaps seemed to him to make deception necessary. It was especially in his relations with the Philistines that deceit was systematically practiced, ranging from simple disguise to the grossest of falsehoods. His affair with his faithful servant, Uriah the Hittite, shows him at his worst. In this case it was not a question of saving his own imperiled life, but of taking the life of another for the sake of gratifying his own darling lust. There is probably no record of treachery and lying consistently pursued that surpasses this in remorseless cruelty and moral baseness. If the narrative contained all that we know of David, the deed would have been universally regarded as one almost unequaled in the foul and blood-stained annals of kingly rule. We may at any rate say this about the matter, that it belonged to the stage in David's life when he was as yet untouched by any deeper religious feeling. But even after a moral and spiritual revolution had been wrought in him through the prophetic appeal he was not wholly innocent of dissimulation. As such we must characterize his conduct towards Joab and Shimei, since on his deathbed he gave orders for their death (1 Kings 2:5 ff.) after he had continued the one in the command of the army and forgiven the other for his unfaithfulness (2 Sam. 16:10 f.). This inconsistency, however, may have been due to the imbecility of age and a worn-out constitution.

In the relations between the sexes we see at best no marked advance. Not to speak of polygamy, concubinage was fashionable in the best families. Marriage with a half-sister was still

tolerated (2 Sam. 13:13; *cf.* Gen. 20:12). The promptness with which David, the outlaw-chief, espoused the wife of the newly dead Nabal, and with which David, the king, made a lawful wife of the widow of the murdered Uriah, speaks plainly of the subserviency of well-born women to the will of at least fascinating or influential men. The act of Absalom, by which he proclaimed to all Israel his usurpation of his father's rights (2 Sam. 16:21 f.), does not appear to have shocked the moral sensibilities of his fellow-citizens, or even of the "elders of Israel" (2 Sam. 17:4), who still adhered to his cause. If we pass to the more enlightened time of Solomon, we see enough to awaken the suspicion that the increase in outward prosperity and the glamor of a brilliant court were the aecompaniment of gross and unbridled sensuality. David's harem, extensive as it was, could not compare with that of Solomon. And one knows little of social history, or of human nature, if one supposes that the evil of excessive self-indulgence was confined to the recreant who sat on the throne, and who in these most vital matters was a law unto himself. Courtiers and nobles, and the wealthy and fashionable generally, were as certain then as they are now to imitate and rival the sins and follies of a prince. Nor can we shut our eyes to the presumptive certainty that sexual vice was not confined to the legalized license of polygamy and concubinage. The worship of the foreign deities introduced by Solomon along with his heathen wives of necessity included religious prostitution with its inevitable concomitants. True, we still have no reason to suppose that many daughters of Hebrew families gave themselves to this or to any form of illegitimate vice, "for no such thing ought to be done in Israel" (2 Sam. 13:12). But Ashtoreth, the goddess of the Sidonians or Phœnicians (1 Kings 11:5), could not enjoy the royal patronage without enforcing the usages inseparable from her debasing cult.

What shall be said of the manifestation of the altruistic virtues during the earlier times of the monarchy? The imagination summons up at once the moving figure of the heroic and magnanimous Jonathan. And we cannot but agree that an age

which produced a man so unique in nobility and grandeur of soul should not be called morally barren. We are seeking, however, for cases of sympathy with the poor and oppressed, of active concern for the friendless and the weak, and of the relaxation of the pitiless code of revenge upon family, or personal, or national enemies. Of what was done in private we know little. The temper of representative men may best be judged of by their conduct towards their rivals or foes. David's treatment of the Moabites (2 Sam. 8:2) and of the Ammonites (2 Sam. 12:31) was a war measure, and was neither better nor worse than that which the Assyrian kings before and after his time boasted of inflicting upon obstinate rebels. The claims of blood revenge were enforced as remorselessly as in the days of Gideon (Judges 8:18 ff.). The circle of leading men that stood nearest to David in kinship and public activity suffered particularly from the law of reprisal. And if we sift the surviving annals of his reign we shall find that, leaving aside the matter of Uriah the Hittite, nothing equals in reckless cruelty, on the one hand, and cowardly weakness on the other, the pitiful fate of Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, and of her innocent children, done to a shameful death as the victim of a blood feud. True it is that the saving quality in David's character, his most kingly and fascinating attribute of magnanimous repentance, here again manifested itself, and that by uniting in one common tomb the exiled remains of Saul and Jonathan, and the unburied skeletons of the poor outlaws, he sought to quiet the soul of the comfortless mother, and to reunite in Sheol the distracted ghosts of the family he had supplanted (2 Sam. 21: 11 ff.).

It is now time, however, to draw some general conclusions as to that portion of Israel's history which we have been permitted to survey. It may reasonably be said, in the first place, that morality still moved and worked its way within the sphere of the family, the clan, and the tribe. Its sanctions sprang from the beliefs of the community rather than from the independent conviction of the individual; custom ruled rather than conscience, prescription rather than self-impulsion. One essential

ground of the limitation is obvious. Duties and employments were few and simple. These were prescribed by paternal injunction; and when spontaneously assumed they created no new conditions that would bring intelligence into play and so evoke the moral sense through the balancing of conflicting claims. Secondly, the most striking apparent exceptions to this general fact were the leaders of the people, who seemed to hew out new paths for themselves, or were commissioned to fulfill higher functions than any yet known to the nation. It is difficult to say whether, upon the whole, the moral standards and actions of these chiefs of Israel were superior or not to those of the community at large. It may, however, be confidently affirmed that few of them were equal to their new responsibilities; that the very duties they were called on to fulfill, and the higher spheres they had to occupy, provided them with temptations to abuse of power, to self-will, and to self-indulgence which they seldom were able to resist.

But we have now to take account of a phenomenon of first-class importance for the determination of the moral attainments of the Hebrews of this period as well as for their rational explanation. I refer to the part played by the public teachers, which is forced upon our notice by the narrative itself.

What is perhaps most striking in the function of the great leaders generally, from the time of the earliest judges till the end of the undivided kingdom, is the fact that they have very little to do with the moral education of the nation. The judges themselves appear to have been but little interested in the rectification of popular misconduct. Nor were the priests, whose duties included also the judicial function, conspicuous for their high sense of moral obligation. The sons of Eli and the sons of Samuel, who came into office as a matter of course by hereditary succession, are much more likely to have represented the average priest and judge than their respective fathers, who are singled out for special distinction. Moreover, though Eli and Samuel must have known the character of their sons before they assumed their functions, it would seem that the one did not restrain his sons from evil, and that the other could not. What

we learn of the essential influence of the religious and moral functionaries comes out naturally in their bearing towards the leaders of the time. In this matter two interesting points declare themselves. First, we notice that no interference is made with the practice or conduct of any influential man till the time of the kings. Second, it is a *new order* of men who inaugurate or attempt a reformation in public morals. These men were the prophets.

What, then, was the character of this epoch-making intervention by the prophets? The first instance is that of Samuel in his rôle of mentor and censor to king Saul. And here we are surprised to find that he does not appear to have intervened in questions of morality at all. His only recorded protest against Saul's conduct is made on the ground of disobedience to an arbitrary command (1 Sam., chap. 15). When Saul spared Agag, king of the Amalekites, and the best of the spoil, it cannot be maintained that he did what was wrong in itself. Unfortunately we can, on the other hand, hardly visit with stern condemnation the terrible war of extermination waged by Israel. Such conflicts—blood feuds on a larger scale—were the order of the day among the neighboring peoples of the time, and Israel had suffered more than Amalek in the long series of reprisals. Unfortunately, also, we cannot put Saul's comparative moderation to the credit of his humanity. His preservation of Agag was too much a departure from the prevailing usages of war to have been intended for more than a temporary purpose; while his retention of the cattle would subserve the double purpose of sacrifice and feasting, which, indeed, were practically inseparable. On the whole, it would appear that the rebuke administered to Saul, and the terrible penalty annexed thereto, were inflicted not on the ground of the inherent wrongfulness of his acts, but because he had not deferred to the prophetic word. Samuel's significance generally, in the history of Old Testament morals, may be thus stated: He is the first in the long list of the leaders of Israel whose conduct in fundamental matters of morality is brought directly into view (1 Sam. 12:3). The last of the judges, he is the first the character of whose adminis-

tration of justice is spoken of at all. He tolerated the institution of the monarchy, but made it the prime essential of the character of the king that he should bow to the will of Jehovah, and to his representative, the prophet-priest. He virtually founded the prophetic guilds, the chief conservative influence in the life of northern Israel. His services to morality were great, but mainly indirect and potential.

A distinct advance along one line was made by the next kingly mentor, the prophet Nathan. His rebuke of David for his most atrocious crime goes to the foundation of the moral principle of conduct. As his parable shows, it looks at David's sin in the light of his relation to his environment; it shows the disturbance (or wrong) thereby occasioned in the system of which he was the moral center. To stigmatize a sin as a sin on account of its selfishness was something new in the recorded history of the world. True, the outrage was so obvious that it could not well escape challenge; but it is just one of the providential occasions of moral evolution that men and communities should be startled into a sense for better things by a sudden revelation of the effect of their offenses. Such a case is isolated, to be sure, in the moral ministry of the prophets of the time. But the crime was rank and grievous, and as it struck at the sanctity and peace of the home of the common man in Israel it must have become monumental. The rule that the sins and follies of a monarch excite emulation, rather than repulsion, finds in this instance, at least, a wholesome exception.

It is remarkable that no prophet appears as a censor of morals till the time of the divided kingdom with the exception of Gad, who acted as the minister of Jehovah in connection with David's ambitious scheme to take a census of Israel.

The reign of Solomon, so obscure in many ways, is remarkable also for the absence of reference to the prophetic ministry during its progress. Even the dedication of the temple seems to have been accomplished under his own auspices except as respects the ceremonial function of the priesthood. Indeed we are tempted to infer that after the death of Nathan the wise-foolish king was little amenable to the guidance of the prophets.

How greatly they were missed the religious and moral sequel plainly shows.

When we enter upon the era of the divided monarchy we find ourselves upon more familiar ground. The moral character both of rulers and people now takes its place in the record, and forms an essential part of the story. It gives in fact the chief interest to the narrative, in contrast to the whole preceding history, which finds its main motive in the personal experiences of the heroes of the nation. The moral features of the society both in the northern and in the southern kingdom until the fall of the former state are familiar to us from the writings of Amos, Hosea, and Isaiah, and need not be here detailed. We may, however, observe the various stages of progress. It may be pointed out that the condition of society in northern is more open to our inspection than in southern Israel, the greater simplicity and monotony of life and politics in the latter kingdom making it less conspicuous, whether for good or evil, until it was brought out of its narrowing isolation. Practically, however, it may be feasible to combine the parallel histories.

In the remainder of this essay I shall content myself with a somewhat formal enumeration of the condition of moral progress, and an indication of the modes and occasions in which these were most fully realized. Such a summary may serve the main purpose of the discussion, since the ground has now been cleared, and the essential elements of the Hebrew community have been dealt with up to the stage when it appears ripe for an inner reformation and development. A convenient form of statement would be to show first the inward conditions necessary for moral progress; and secondly the outward conditions that favored their realization. The main inward or subjective conditions would seem to be as follows:

1. A purer and loftier conception of the character of Jehovah. Morality has never progressed in any community without the stimulus of a religious sanction. Men have looked to their gods or God as requiring from them the most solemn duties of their lives. And, what is most significant, something besides

mere ceremonial service is always thought to be demanded, Even where the crudest forms of faith and worship prevail, and where morality in the positive sense can hardly be predicated of the votaries, such duties as are incumbent on them, that is, whatever has the character of solemn obligation, the motive of all moral action, is regarded as a behest of the supernatural power who is the real head and guardian of the family, clan, or tribe. Hence in proportion as the conception of the character of the presiding impelling deity is raised and refined the nature of the obligations are correspondingly purified and exalted. That is, moral conduct changes for the better.

2. A divorce between the worship of the single and only true God and the adoration or service of any and all other forms of plural devotion.

3. A practical sense, gained by experience, of the essential badness of false worship—not merely of the helplessness of the false gods; because to a people slowly emerging from superstition this is not so easily demonstrated.

4. The practical observation that God does not always punish his enemies directly, but that he does reward those who fear him and do his will; the experience of the חֶסֶד and the אֱמוּנָה of Jehovah; the completion of the formula, "Surely God is good to Israel," by the addition, "to such as are pure in heart."

5. Hence a new and higher conception of society must be gained. The ideal of the social order is no longer the family, the clan, the tribe, or even the organized nation, but the people of Jehovah.

6. On the side of conduct there must be a practical training in the common virtues which are at once the mainstay of the social order and the expression of the will of Jehovah: honesty, chastity, mercy, and helpfulness.

7. These and other essential virtues can only be vindicated along with the vindication of the lofty character and the pure worship of Jehovah. This vindication can be accomplished only after and through an inevitable prolonged struggle between parties in the community and the state.

8. Only by suffering, discipline, and the enduring of wrong

can the principles of a party of righteousness be put to the proof and finally secure a moral triumph :

> "There is no gain except by loss,
> There is no life except by death;
> There is no glory but in shame,
> No justice but by taking blame."

9. By adherence under stress of trial to the true worship of Jehovah and the practice of "righteousness," which is the obligation and test of his service; and on the other hand by an observation of the lives and fates of the opposing party in church and state, idolatry or mixed worship *plus* immorality—luxury, greed, sensuality, cruelty—is continually made more odious and disreputable.

The following are some of the accompanying or coöperant external conditions:

1. National unity. This was in a measure secured by the kingdom. Only by some such assimilation could the tribal habits, restricted views of obligation, local prejudices and antipathies, arbitrary administration of justice, be to any considerable degree done away. Terrible evils came with the kingdom. But by it the necessary antithesis of good and bad, pure and impure, righteousness and injustice, was brought to self-consciousness in an influential party loyal to Jehovah and his cause.

2. Industrial and commercial development. This was never reached to any high degree in Palestine proper, but the Hebrews had sufficient business training to enable them to realize as a people the advantages of honesty and veracity, and the evils of cheating and crookedness, in matters of bargain and sale. How greatly such convictions were needed may be suggested by the business habits of any nomadic or semi-nomadic community in the East.

3. Social changes, resulting in the creation of privileged classes of the rich and powerful, including kings and nobles. Everywhere, but especially in oriental countries, such changes develop the worst passions and instincts of human nature—selfishness, cruelty, self-complacent indifference to suffering and wrong. These classes also adhered to and patronized the forms

of false and mixed worship which minister to lust and fashionable vices and pleasures.

4. On the other hand, the plain-living votaries of Jehovah had their numbers chiefly augmented from the ranks of the poor and the oppressed. The gulf between the two classes became steadily wider and deeper. The true nature, the essential character of the antithesis became better appreciated. Vague and abstract conceptions of the relations of Jehovah to his people were replaced by a concrete realization of his power to help, to sustain, to uplift. Blind reliance upon, or dread of, his power was mitigated and neutralized by the consciousness of his love and grace. The prosperity of the wicked, accompanied as it was by hateful and injurious conduct, was now less envied. Jehovah put gladness into the heart of his follower more than they had when their corn and their wine increased.

5. A concentration of the national worship. The essential evil of the local sanctuaries was that the "high places" were infected with nature worship in one or more degrading forms; and that such associations, based on tradition and habit, and falling in with natural inclination, were ineradicable. In northern Israel such a centralizing system was never accomplished. In Judah it was favored by many circumstances, and when secured by a reforming monarch the prestige of the central sanctuary made it perpetual. Thus, in spite of frequent and gross debasement of the national worship, a solidarity of sentiment, a community of belief, a coöperation in policy and action were secured which were essential to the progress of the cause of righteousness.

6. An educative system was needed, and also a propaganda. These were mainly supplied by the genuine prophets of Jehovah. The priests as a class were incompetent and unspiritual, though there was no enmity between the two orders, and the priesthood contributed signally to the ranks of the prophets. The line of teachers and preachers began in the old prophetic schools or guilds. From simple and rude beginnings, at the opening of Israel's career as a nation, they maintained the one essential principle of fidelity to Jehovah, growing steadily in knowledge,

power, and inspiration; and thus they became the lights of Israel and of the world.

7. A literature was needed. This was provided in part by written prophecy, which began earlier than the date of our oldest extant prophetical books. Besides, we have to include much of the other "prophetic" literature. One of the most essential needs was a code of morals based on the nature and claims of Jehovah, and a system of civil law in conformity with its principles. These were drawn up mainly under prophetic influence, and based upon documentary remains of the "legislation" of Moses. What the great lawgiver had enjoined represented the highest level that could be attained by a society like that of Israel before the monarchy; for there was no essential social or moral advance in Israel till that era had well begun.

Some of the epochs in the history of Israel which contributed to the above conditions were those which may be marked by the names of Ahab and Elijah, Jehu and Elisha, Athaliah and Jehoiada, Jeroboam II and Amos, Ahaz and Isaiah, Hezekiah and Isaiah, Manasseh and Micah, Josiah and Hilkiah. Progress in Israel, religious and moral, was always made chiefly under the influence of leading men, whose inspiration and energy excited the half-dormant susceptibilities of a most highly gifted people. Hence the necessity of studying such epochs as these in connection with the necessary conditions of religious and moral development.

# THE SCOPE OF PAUL'S DOCTRINE OF GRACE.

By GEORGE H. GILBERT,
Chicago.

IN contrast with the narrow dogma of the Pharisaic theology, Paul teaches that God is God of all men, rich unto all who call upon him, as ready to justify Gentiles who do the unwritten law of the heart as he is to justify Jews who keep the written law.[1] All men have exactly the same need of salvation, and God's purpose in Christ is a purpose of grace for all the needy without distinction. The apostle, unlike the Jewish theology of his time,[2] found this catholic teaching in the Old Testament. In the promise that was made to Abraham he recognized an outlook upon unrestricted grace.[3] In the rabbinical theology the Gentile world is excluded from God's plan, and absolutely deserted by him. In the thought of Paul, the gospel was preached to Abraham. Universal salvation was promised, and it was to be appropriated by faith. This is the twofold thought of Paul's most doctrinal epistle, and constitutes what he calls *his* gospel.[4] Not only in the Old Testament but also in his own commission did Paul find proof of the truth that God's purpose of grace is universal in its sweep. He was sent to all the Gentiles without exception, to proclaim to all alike a free salvation.[5] But further, Paul's very conception of the character of God, and his deepest thought regarding Christ, logically involve the same universality. God is one, and therefore has one method of dealing with Jews and Gentiles.[6] God is impartial in himself, and hence judges all men according to the purpose of the heart.[7] Presence or absence of any external condition does not enter at all into the account.[8] God is also a God of love even toward

[1] Rom. 3:29; 10:12; 2:12–16.
[2] See WEBER, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, p. 69.
[3] Rom. 4:17; Gal. 3:8.
[4] Rom. 1:16, 17; 2:16.
[5] Acts 22:21; Rom. 15:19.
[6] Rom. 3:29, 30.
[7] Rom. 2:2–11.
[8] Rom. 2:12–16.

the ungodly.[9] He gives the best he has for the sake of the worst of men. His goodness goes so far that he tries to lead to repentance even the carnally minded Jews, who were practically despising his grace.[10] And because he is love he reveals himself to all men.[11] For the same reason he overlooked the ignorance and passed over the sins of all the generations before Christ.[12] Because he is love he wills that all men should be saved,[13] and his providential government has constantly in view that men should seek him.[14] Again, Paul's fundamental thought of Christ as the last Adam brings him into a relation to the entire race corresponding to that of the first Adam.[15] The universal dispensation of physical death through the first man is set over against the universal dispensation of spiritual life in Christ.[16] The comparison emphasizes universality. Christ stands at the head of a dispensation. Therefore when he died for all, all died.[17] When he rose, it was as the firstborn into a spiritual kingdom designed to include the entire race as far as they believed.[18] "As in Adam the sensuous and earthly life is comprehended in germ, so is its spiritual and divine life comprehended in Christ. And as the life of Adam was unfolded from him through sensuous generation and birth unto a natural humanity, so the life of Christ is unfolded from him by spiritual reproduction and new birth into a divine generation of men (zu einem göttlichen Menschengeschlecht)." [19]

Paul's teaching on an eternal *choice* of God is incidental, but is in harmony with his idea of universal grace. God's eternal choice is, according to the apostle, an eternal expression of his love toward those who will be impressed by that love. It is the response of his love to a foreseen acceptance of his grace. This foreknowledge of God Paul refers to directly but twice, once in regard to individuals, and once in regard to Israel.[20] In the first of these passages he makes it plain what idea he connects with

[9] Rom. 3:5.
[10] Rom. 2:4.
[11] Rom. 1:19; Acts 17:25.
[12] Rom. 3:25; Acts 17:30.
[13] 1 Tim. 2:4.
[14] Acts 17:27.
[15] 1 Cor. 15:45.
[16] Rom. 5:12–21.
[17] 1 Cor. 5:14.
[18] Rom. 8:29; 5:17.
[19] Beyschlag, *Christologie des N. T.*, p. 225.
[20] Rom. 8:29; 11:2.

the term. Those whom God foreknew he foreordained to become conformed to the image of his Son. Now Paul, in all his teaching, speaks of but one condition of being conformed to the image of Christ, and that is faith.[21] Hence Paul's completion of the thought in the expression, Those whom he foreknew, would be, Those whom he foreknew *as persons who would accept his grace in Christ.* Weiss makes the object of God's foreknowledge the *love* which he saw that certain souls would possess.[22] This he infers from the foregoing verse. But, in the teaching of Paul, faith, rather than love, is the human condition of righteousness,[23] and in the verse under consideration it is most natural to complete the thought of "foreknew" from the immediate context. God's foreknowledge of Israel, referred to in the same epistle, is to be understood in the same way. He foresaw what the people would become, and he chose accordingly. This passage is not concerned with the eternal salvation of Israel, but only with their choice to a historical mission. Hence election, which Paul, of course, *always* thinks of as being according to foreknowledge, no less than in the two passages cited, is a fact which he employs to encourage his readers and to exalt the dignity of the Christian state.[24]

The eternal *purpose* of God, like his eternal choice, is an expression of love toward those who receive his grace. It has special reference to the evolution and results of the Christian life. It concerns the actualization in time of the eternal gracious choice. Paul knows of but two grand objects of the eternal purpose of God. He purposed that Christ should be for us, and also that we should be for Christ. This is for him the whole sphere of the divine purpose. The wisdom which God appointed in eternity unto our glory was the wisdom of Christ, or was Christ himself, in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.[25] It is not an abstract but a personal wisdom which was determined upon by God, to be unto our glory. So the good

[21] *Cf.* GODET, *Biblical Studies, New Test.*, p. 273.

[22] *Biblische Theologie*, Dritte Aufl., p. 360.

[23] Rom. 3:22; Gal. 2:16, etc.

[24] *Cf.* WEISS, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 362; PFLEIDERER, *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 289.

[25] 1 Cor. 2:7; Col. 2:3; 1 Cor. 1:30.

pleasure which was purposed in behalf of the recipients of grace was in Christ, consisted in him, or was he.[26] This is one side of the eternal purpose. The other is equally clear in Paul's thought. It is that the believer should be conformed unto the image of Christ.[27] Paul speaks of nothing else as included in the divine purpose. Of an eternal appointment unto destruction he has no hint.[28] If it be logically involved in the idea of eternal choice unto salvation,[29] then it is equally involved in Paul's teaching that such appointment unto destruction is dependent on a foreseen unbelief, even as he plainly teaches that the object of foreknowledge as regards the righteous is their faith. This eternal purpose of God regarding men is assumed by Paul to include every soul. The gospel is offered to all alike. But when the gospel is accepted, and the acceptance confirmed by a Christian life, then the apostle regards it as practically certain that those who have thus accepted the gospel are elected.[30]

God's gracious purpose for the race was not made known to Jews and Gentiles alike. While it was distinctly contained in the promise to Abraham, it was not plainly made known to the Gentiles until the time of Paul.[31] The apostle does not inquire how far, if at all, the divine purpose of grace for the entire race benefited the Gentiles who lived before Christ. This was not a practical matter. However, we know that his conception of the Gentile world as a whole, a conception formed from his own observation, was that it had not life, was without God, and was sinking deeper and deeper in iniquity.[32] Yet he recognized the possibility of the salvation of Gentiles by the light of God in nature and conscience.[33] This was an advance upon the Jewish theology, according to which all the Gentiles who had not joined themselves to Israel would be given over to destruction.[34] It follows from Paul's doctrine of Christ as the only mediator between God and man, that whenever Gentiles are

[26] Eph. 1:9; 3:11; 2 Tim. 1:9. [27] Rom. 8:29; Eph. 1:5, 11.
[28] *Cf.* PFLEIDERER, *Das Urchristenthum*, p. 288.
[29] *Cf.* WEISS, *Biblische Theologie*, p. 358. [30] 1 Thess. 1:4.
[31] Gal. 3:8; Rom. 16:25, 26; Eph. 3:6; 2:12.
[32] Rom. 1:18–32; Eph. 2:12; 4:18. [33] Rom. 1:21; 2:14, 15; 26, 27.
[34] *Cf.* WEBER, *Die Lehren des Talmuds*, p. 76.

saved, he thought of their salvation as being through Christ. But how they are saved through Christ, seeing that they have not known him in his historical manifestation, the apostle does not inquire.

God's purpose of grace, universal in its sweep, will be only partially accomplished either for Jew or Gentile. In Paul's day the major part of the Jews did not hearken to the glad tidings.[35] They stumbled at the stone of stumbling. Paul, after he had labored among them at intervals for many years, has hope of saving *some* only.[36] His success among the Jews in Ephesus was exceptional; generally he was driven out of the synagogue as soon as his doctrine was fairly understood, having won few converts or none.[37] His chief enemies were everywhere the unbelieving Jews. Still he looked for a better day. He taught that God's plan would have a glorious realization even among the Jews at some day in the future. Israel as a whole would yet be saved.[38] Not, of course, the Jews of all the ages, past, present and future, but, as the context requires, the Jews of some unknown future period, after the fullness of the Gentiles should have come in.

As of the Jews, so also of the Gentiles, only a part accepted the invitation of the gospel. Some who had heard the word from Paul were perishing.[39] The minds of some were blinded by the god of this world, so that the light of the gospel could not dawn upon them.[40] And so it would continue to be in the future. The apostle foresaw grievous times of apostasy.[41] The worst manifestation of sin would immediately precede the parousia. Yet, at the same time, he taught that the gospel would have a wide triumph. The fullness of the Gentile world would some time come into the fellowship of Christ.[42] The language is rhetorical, but it certainly anticipates an extension of the gospel which would far surpass what Paul had seen. He well knew that only a handful out of the vast population of the

[35] Rom. 10:16, etc.
[36] Rom. 11:14.
[37] Acts 13:46; 14:5, 9; 17:5; 19:8.
[38] Rom. 11:12, 26.
[39] 2 Cor. 2:15.
[40] 2 Cor. 4:4.
[41] Acts 20:29, 30; 2 Tim. 3:1–13.
[42] Rom. 11:25.

Roman Empire had been won for Christ. This was indeed, as he says, a *reconciling* of the world,[43] but that which should yet be accomplished would be as *life from the dead*, a success far more glorious than he had seen. Thus he thought of the purpose of God as destined to have a widening fulfillment.

Glimpses of a still grander realization of the divine plan of redemption in Christ are found in the later epistles of Paul. For he teaches that as all things were created *unto Christ*, so eventually all things shall be *again* brought into organic and harmonious relation to him.[44] This "again" can refer only to that divine ideal of Christ's relation to the universe which existed in the mind of God, for from the beginning of history there has been no time when all things were in harmony with him. If, then, the preposition of the verb in Eph. 1 : 10 (ἀνακεφαλαιώσασθαι) be allowed this force, the word must involve a contrast between the historical realization and the divine ideal. But even if we drop the idea of *again*, as some writers do, there yet remains the gathering together of all things in Christ,[45] which in any case is the chief thought of the verse. All things without exception, material and spiritual, below man and above man, are included. For Paul thought of nature as sometime to be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God.[46] This is an event for the future age, when the glory which shall be revealed to us has been revealed, and when the salvation which is now fully possessed only in the anticipation of hope shall have become an actual possession of the soul. Perhaps he thought of a new earth which should be adapted to the spirit as the present one is adapted to the body. At any rate he thought of a deliverance from the bondage of corruption, a cessation of the groaning and travailing of nature, the unending strife and pain and death which are everywhere in the world. Instead of this there shall be the liberty of the glory of the children of God. Christ the realized center of all things—this is the order for the fullness of time. It is impossible to understand this as a universal restoration, including even the devil

[43] Rom. 11 : 15.

[44] Eph. 1 : 10.

[45] *Cf.* VON SODEN in *Hand-Commentar*, III, 1.

[46] Rom. 8 : 18–25.

and his angels, as Origen explained it, for this would lie counter to Paul's explicit teaching. It may be granted that the punitive righteousness of God is most emphasized in the earliest letters,[47] and it is unquestionably true that in later letters Paul says much about the universality of redemption, the all-embracing love of God, the relation of Christ to the entire race, and the subjection of all hostile powers to him; but it does not follow that he had abandoned the doctrine of the perdition of the wicked, and had come to believe that all souls would at last enter Christ's kingdom. When all things are brought into harmony with Christ, then there will have been a removal of the elements of disorder which infinite grace could not win, an abolition, as Paul says, of all hostile rule and authority.[48] All enemies shall have been put down and given over to their fate, far away from the face and glory of the Lord.[49] This having been done, it will be true, and gloriously true, that all things have been reconciled unto God through Christ.[50] In this outlook upon cosmical harmony in Christ we have the most comprehensive expression of Paul's thought of the Redeemer. This is the goal of history, the realization of the divine thought in creating all things unto Christ. But is this large conception of the influence of Christ's atonement Pauline, or must we say with Pfleiderer and others that it goes beyond Paul, and is a part of the Alexandrian speculation of the second century? Paul limited the influence of the atonement to humanity, it is said, and the conception of Colossians 1:20 has its roots in Philo. But, in reply to this view, it may be observed, first, that Paul speaks, in an unquestioned letter, of the glorification of nature as an indirect result of the work of Christ.[51] His influence thus goes out beyond man. Second, it should be especially noticed that the epistle to the Colossians does not teach such a reconciliation of angels as is that of men. For in 2:15 the idea of the reconciliation of the angels is unfolded, and it appears there that by reconciliation is meant the removal of the hostility of angels toward Christ, which was

[47] See USTERI, *Entwickelung des Paulinischen Lehrbegriffs*, p. 372.

[48] 1 Cor. 15:24.

[49] 1 Cor. 15:25; 2 Thess. 1:9.

[50] Col. 1:20.

[51] Rom. 8:18–25.

accomplished when by the death of Christ on the cross the law was done away through which they, the angels, had possessed power over man. And, third, in the epistle to the Philippians, which Pfleiderer admits to be genuine, Jesus is represented as receiving confessions of his lordship from all created beings, and as receiving this because of his death.[52] In other words his death has as far-reaching significance as is attributed to it in the epistle to the Colossians. Therefore we must regard it as a genuine teaching of Paul that there shall yet be, in the future age, a summing up of all things in Christ, when through the conquering power of his self-sacrifice there shall be realized a cosmical and eternal harmony.

[52] Phil. 2 : 9–11.

# THE HISTORY OF THE ORIGINAL PURITAN THEOLOGY OF NEW ENGLAND, 1620–1720.

By FRANK HUGH FOSTER,
Oakland, California.

THE first immigrants to New England were the Pilgrim Fathers, who landed at Plymouth in 1620. Though the church collected at Scrooby was the direct result of the Puritan movement in the English universities, the Pilgrims were for the most part themselves of humble origin, and were little fitted to contribute much to the theological development of the new state. There is but one figure among them of sufficient intellectual eminence to engage the attention of subsequent generations, that of John Robinson,[1] the pastor of the little flock at Leyden, who was member of two universities, and a foremost disputant in the ranks of the defenders of Congregationalism. His heroic devotion to principle, the picturesque vicissitudes of his career, his intellectual power and breadth, his prophetic vision, and above all his sincere and deep piety, made him a constant subject of quotation and an acknowledged authority among all the New England churches.

The writings of Robinson which have come down to us[2] are chiefly occupied with those matters which lay nearest to his heart as a Separatist. We have thus a long and elaborate discussion of ecclesiastical polity, treating nearly all the topics in controversy between the Independents and the Church of England. There is, however, one considerable treatise upon doctrinal the-

[1] Born 1575, died in Leyden 1625; graduated at Cambridge, became a fellow in 1598–9, minister in Norfolk in the English church, suspended for scruples about vestments, etc., ministered some time secretly to the congregation at Scrooby, emigrated with them to Holland in 1608; member of the University of Leyden, 1615. Discussed Arminianism publicly with Episcopius. See the "Life" in the edition of his works.

[2] Collected in an edition entitled *The Works of John Robinson, etc., with Memoir, etc.*, by ROBERT ASHTON, 3 vols., London, 1851.

ology, the *Defence of the Doctrine Propounded by the Synod at Dort*, which serves to show the harmony of doctrinal view between the Separatists and the Puritan movement in general, and later exerted a positive influence in prolonging that harmony throughout New England. It is what it purports to be, strictly a "defense," and in no respect goes beyond the common Calvinism of the day, or rises above its level. It is completely deficient in the philosophical element; but this is less to be wondered at in an age when Descartes had not yet introduced the methods, and called forth the spirit, of modern philosophy. It is, therefore, scarcely necessary to dwell upon this, the first in the long series of doctrinal treatises produced by the Congregational leaders. It may be dismissed with the following brief extracts, which will be sufficient to exhibit its flavor and distinguishing characteristics.

Robinson's reticence upon one of the great perplexities of theology is indicated in the following passage:[3]

If any demand how this can be, that God who forbiddeth and hateth sin, yet should so order persons and things, by his providence, and so from eternity purpose to order them, as that the same cannot but be? I answer, by free acknowledgment, that the manner of God's working herein is to me, and to all men, inconceivable; and withal avouch, that he, who will not confess, that God can, and could in Adam's sin, by his infinite wisdom and power, most effectually, and infallibly, in regard of such event, order and dispose of things, without violation to his holiness, or violence to the creature's will, as no mortal man is able to conceive the manner thereof, is himself in a high degree guilty of that pride which was Adam's ruin, by which he desired to be as God in knowledge. Gen., chap. 3. Who is able to understand the manner of God's working, in giving the Holy Ghost to men, and in directing the tongues and pens of the prophets infallibly, and so as they could not err? Much less discernible is God's manner of working in, and about the creature's sinful actions. And because many take great offense at this doctrine of truth and work of God, I will, the Lord assisting me, plainly and briefly as I can, prove that all events, even those most sinful, in regard of the creature's work in, and of them, come to pass necessarily, after a sort, in respect of God's providence, as being a hand steady and which swerveth not, in ordering the creature in and unto the same.

He thinks that the alleged inconsistency of God's commanding Adam not to sin and yet decreeing that he should sin, is sufficiently removed by the following distinctions:[4]

[3] ROBINSON, *Works*, I, pp. 274–5. [4] *Ibid.*, I, pp. 280–1.

For us, we do not hold, that God decreed Adam's sin, as they conceive, that is, either to approve it or command it or compel unto it, nothing less; but we affirm that God decreed to leave Adam to himself, in the temptation and not to assist him with that strength of grace, by which he could if he would, have upheld him; and so to order both him and all things about him, in that his temptation, as that, he by the notion and sway of his own free will following his natural appetite to the pleasant but forbidden fruit and that false persuasion wherewith his understanding was by Satan overclouded, should both choose and eat the forbidden fruit.

There is an evident struggle in his mind to maintain a certain freedom of the will of man from compulsion,[5] and in general to hold to that more generous type of theology characteristic of English Puritanism in distinction from continental.[6] Thus he is distinctly sublapsarian,[7] though he holds firmly to a limited atonement.[8] But when all credit for the influence upon his system of clearer intuitions of truth, or of the plain common sense of which he had a considerable share, has been given, the general accord of the whole with that extreme application of the doctrine of divine sovereignty and of the helplessness of man which was to spread a deadly paralysis through all the spiritual life of New England, is apparent from such passages as the following:[9]

They [Calvinists] believe, as the Scriptures teach, that all men in Adam have sinned, Rom. 5:12–15; and by sin lost the image of God in which they were made; so as the law is impossible, Rom. 8:3; unto them by reason of the flesh, and so cannot possibly but sin, by reason of the same flesh reigning in the unregenerate, and dwelling in all: which these light persons, expressly confess . . . . : and that this so comes to pass by God's holy decree, and work of providence answerable, not forcing evil upon any, but ordering all persons in all actions, as the supreme Governor of all: and that the wicked, being left of God, some, destitute of the outward means, the gospel; all of them, of the effectual work of the Spirit, from that weak flesh, and natural corruption, daily increased in them, sin both necessarily as unable to keep the law, and willingly, as having in themselves the beginning and cause thereof, the blindness of their own minds, and perverseness of their will and affections; and so are inexcusable in God's sight.

The founding of the Massachusetts colony, about ten years

[5] *Works*, I, p. 274 *et al.*

[6] Compare the Westminster Confession, chaps. iii, ix, and x.

[7] *Works*, I, p. 289. [8] *Ibid.*, p. 329. [9] *Ibid.*, p. 398 f.

later than the Plymouth, brought a different class to New England. There were many men of education and wealth among the laymen of Boston, and its clergymen were largely university men, well read in divinity, and intense in their attachment to the Calvinistic system. The overthrow of the monarchy in England resulted in 1646 in the formation of the Westminster standards. They were hardly issued when they were adopted in Massachusetts (1648) as the general standard of doctrine among the churches, and were later (1708) welcomed in Connecticut with equal cordiality. Old Calvinism, shaped by the prevailing acceptance of the Westminster Confession, continued to be the dominant and well-nigh unchallenged system in the New England churches even after Arminianism had begun to make serious inroads at the beginning of the eighteenth century.

For a while there could, of course, be little theological production amid the labors of subduing the wilderness. The standard writers of the old countries were enough for the time. Among these Wollebius,[10] a sublapsarian, free from the deformities of scholasticism, and Ames,[11] whose *Medulla* was employed as a text-book in the colleges, were the principal favorites. Indigenous production was called forth by a cause of a somewhat startling and unpleasant nature. This was the appearance of a book entitled *The Meritorious Price of our Redemption*,[12] by a layman, a man of considerable prominence as the founder of Springfield, William Pynchon,[13] which contained sentiments too much at variance with the current system to be received with equanimity. It was the first outbreak of the independent spirit of Congregationalism, and it was sternly suppressed. The book was first burned, and then refuted by order of the General Court,

[10] *Compendium Theologiæ Christianæ*, etc., published in many editions, 1633 and subsequently. In 1650 it was translated.

[11] *Medulla Theologica*, etc. Amsterdam, 1623. Many editions subsequently.

[12] Published in London, 1650. The refutation by John Norton was entitled: *A Discussion of that Great Point in Divinity, The Sufferings of Christ*, etc. London, 1653.

[13] An incorporator of the Massachusetts Company, came to America in 1630, first settled at Dorchester, then at Roxbury, was soon treasurer of the colony, emigrated to Springfield in 1636, returned to England in 1652, died October 29, 1662.

and Mr. Pynchon found it convenient to return to England, where he died.

Pynchon's work was the protest of plain common sense against the current representations of the atonement which taught that Christ suffered the very torments of the lost, and against the theory of imputation upon which such representations depended. He objected most strongly to these ideas because they involved the thought that Christ bore the wrath of God, whereas in fact his sufferings were inflicted upon him by the rage and enmity of "the old serpent."[14] His argument is principally scriptural, and is derived both from the silence of Scripture, which relieves us from the necessity of believing that Christ suffered the infinite wrath of God, and from its positive affirmations, which he often discusses at great length. It is, further, not necessary that Christ should bear the punishment of our sins, since his obedience is enough to satisfy for the sins of the elect. We see thus that Pynchon did not abandon the idea of a limited atonement.[15] And then Christ could not suffer the pains of hell, for they consist either in the "pain of loss," or separation from God, which he did not suffer, or in the "pain of sense," which consists in eternal sufferings, which also he did not suffer. He gives utterance to an axiomatic truth, afterwards to play a considerable part in New England: "The rule of God's justice doth require that soul only to die which sins . . . . Ezek., chap. 18. By this rule of justice God cannot inflict the torments of hell upon an innocent, to redeem a guilty person."[16] He also suggests the word "chastisement" as a suitable one to describe the nature of Christ's sufferings. Against imputation, he urges its injustice, for God's imputation is always connected with guiltiness; and also the fact that imputation would destroy the possibility of Christ's being a redeemer, for the redemption consists in the mediatorial obedience, and Christ would then have been a disobedient sinner.

Pynchon then goes on to say:[17]

> That which Christ did to redeem us from the curse of the law was not by

[14] Preface to the Reader.
[15] Page 2, comp. pp. 87, 88.
[16] Page 81.
[17] Pages 83, 84.

bearing the said curse really in our stead (as the common doctrine of imputation doth teach), but by procuring his Father's atonement by the invaluable price or performance of his own mediatorial obedience, whereof his mediatorial sacrifice of the atonement was the finishing masterpiece. This kind of obedience was that rich thing of price which the Father required and accepted as satisfactory for the procuring of his atonement for our full redemption, justification, and adoption.

And then he adds, with an idea closely akin to that of Anselm, if not actually a filtration down through the ages from that first great writer upon this theme:[18]

God the Father was more highly pleased with the obedience of the Mediator than he was displeased with the disobedience of Adam. If so, then there is no need that our blessed Mediator should pay both the price of his mediatorial obedience and also bear the curse of the law really for our redemption. I never heard that ever any Turkish tyrant did require such a double satisfaction of any redeemer for the redemption of galley slaves . . . . to pay both the full price which they demanded for this redemption of their galley slaves and to bear the punishment of their curse and slavery also in their stead. . . . . Why then doth the doctrine of imputation make God the Father to be a harder creditor in the point of satisfaction than ever any rigid creditor was among men? . . . . The gross substance of that blood that was shed . . . . is not to be taken by itself alone considered for that precious price. . . . . We must take the blood of Christ . . . . for his mediatorial obedience.

Pynchon consistently rejected the imputation of Christ's obedience to the believer, which he thinks inconsistent with justice, as well as useless, for "the law binds every singular person to perform exact obedience by his own natural power, without any help from any surety whatsoever, or without any supernatural help of faith." Besides, the active obedience of Christ cannot be imputed to us for a variety of reasons. He did not perform all the acts required of us, since he did not enter all the conditions of life. Then, he was bound to obey for himself, and the acts of his legal obedience were not mediatorial. Pynchon also explains the true nature of justification as consisting simply in "the Father's merciful atonement, pardon, and forgiveness. It is a gracious acquittal, as when a father forgives his son and receives him into favor."

[18] Pages 84, 85.

Norton in his refutation of Pynchon thus expressed his own doctrine:

> The Lord Jesus Christ, as God-man mediator according to the will of the Father and his own voluntary consent, fully obeyed the law, doing the command in a way of works and suffering the essential punishment of the curse [note the word "essential"] in a way of obedient satisfaction unto divine justice, thereby explicitly fulfilling the first covenant; which active and passive obedience of his, together with his original righteousness as a surety, God of his rich grace actually imputeth unto believers, whom upon the receipt thereof by the grace of faith, he declareth and accounteth as perfectly righteous, and acknowledgeth them to have right unto eternal life.

The reply was keen and able, but it was simply a defense of the old theology according to the command of the General Court, and added nothing to the common understanding of the theme. In a personal interview with him, Norton seems to have made more impression upon Pynchon, for in a communication to the General Court[19] he stated that he was now "inclined to think that his [Christ's] sufferings were appointed by God for a further end, namely, as the due punishment of our sins by way of satisfaction to the divine justice." After his return to England he recurred to the theme, publishing in 1655 *A Further Discussion of that Great Point in Divinity, The Sufferings of Christ*, etc., in which he reaffirmed his old positions. He tried to do something in the way of a development of the doctrine, bringing out with more distinctness the fact that Christ's sufferings were not substitutionary, since they do not fulfill the covenant made with Adam, but a new one "made by the persons of the Trinity from eternity." And he finally expresses his own theory somewhat more fully in the following language. Referring to his former treatise, he says: "The dialogue doth . . . . oppose the way of vindicative justice; but yet it makes all Christ's sufferings to be performed in a way of justice according to the order of justice in the voluntary cause and covenant. . . . . The dialogue . . . . shows from God's declaration in Gen. 3:15, that the devil must combat against the seed of the deceived woman, and that Christ in his human nature must combat against him and break his head plot by continuing obedient to the death, and that, therefore,

[19] *Massachusetts Records*, Vol. IV, Part I, p. 48.

his sufferings and death were meritorious because it was all performed in a way of justice, namely, in exact obedience to all the articles of the voluntary covenant." [20]

Thus Pynchon's work was one-sided, imcomplete, and immature. It was essentially a protest, not in any way a constructive effort. It had no immediate effect in producing modification of theory in New England, for most of the following writers pass over all he said as if they had never heard of him, or at least, never read him;[21] and doubtless few had. No trace of positive influence exerted upon the later New England writers has yet been discovered. The book seems to have exhaled its life in the flames in which it was burnt upon Boston market place. But the same sturdy protest against scholastic deformations of Christian doctrine was at a later day to receive a more cordial hearing.

If Pynchon thus exerted little positive influence, it seems to have been due to the stimulus afforded by such a phenomenon as heresy in New England that there soon began to be a series of systematic treatises upon divinity, John Norton[22] who had refuted Pynchon in 1653 appearing with his *Orthodox Evangelist* in 1654. This book, though small,— for it comprises but 355 quarto pages,— possesses a high degree of minuteness, accuracy, and technicality. Its epistle dedicatory expresses confidence in the progress of the truth. "Even fundamental truths . . . . have been and shall be transmitted more clear from age to age in the times of reformation." The body of the work begins with chapters upon the divine essence and the Trinity, and

[20] *Further Discussion*, p. 176.

[21] CHARLES CHAUNCY, in a volume of sermons (1659) entitled in Hebrew *The Lord our Righteousness*, says, pp. 52, 53: "Christ by way of satisfaction for sinners suffered the full and utmost punishment due to the sins of the elect . . . . the punishment of the second death. JOHN ELIOT, in *The Harmony of the Gospels in the Holy History of the Humiliation and Sufferings of Jesus Christ* (1678), teaches that Christ suffered the pains of hell, using the distinction which Norton had employed between a "penal" and a "local" hell (p. 119).

[22] Born in Stortford, England, May 6, 1606. Educated at Cambridge, came in 1635 to Plymouth, Mass., but soon became the minister of Ipswich. In 1652 became associate minister in Boston. Sent to England after the Restoration to assure the king of the loyalty of Massachusetts. Returning, died at Boston, April 5, 1663.

closes with a treatment of the state of the blessed; but it is chiefly occupied with the discussion of the way of salvation, thus foreshadowing the interest in anthropological themes characteristic of New England divinity. On the order of the decrees it is predominantly supralapsarian. On the will, it teaches that "the liberty of man, though subordinate to God's decree, freely willeth the very same thing and no other than that which it would have willed if (upon a supposition of impossibility) there had been no decree."[23] Again: "Man acts as freely as if there were no decree; yet as infallibly as if there were no liberty." There is no theory of the will, properly speaking, though Norton finds some help in the idea that the will is a second cause. He rejects the "indifferency of the will to act or not to act independent of the decree," but has no positive theory to offer, and upon the allied subject of conversion is led by his desire to meet the Arminians to lay so much stress upon divine sovereignty as to emphasize passivity in conversion overmuch.

Isaac Chauncy[24] published in 1694 *The Doctrine which is according to Godliness*, etc., which was a system of divinity in the form of question and answer, upon the basis of the Westminster Catechism. It was a vigorous and independent work, in complete conformity to the Westminster standards in every important point. On the will Chauncy says that God's decree "maintains the liberty of the creature's will, that all free agents act as freely according to the decree as agents by necessity do act necessarily." For the sake of maintaining the true deity of Christ he even ventured to contradict the Nicene Creed. "The Father doth not communicate Godhead in begetting, but Sonship only. It is very improper to say Christ is God of God [the Nicene phrase], but every person is essentially absolutely first, having the whole Godhead in it."

There exists in manuscript in the library of the Massachusetts Historical Society *A Whole Body of Divinity in a Catechetical Way* by Samuel Stone[25] of Hartford, copied by Samuel

[23] *Evangelist*, pp. 74–76.

[24] Son of Charles, president of Harvard College.

[25] Born in Hertford, England, about 1602; emigrated to Cambridge, New England,

Willard,[26] marked by the same originality of expression and the same agreement with Westminster. It serves to continue the line of systematic writers to Willard himself, who from 1688–1707 delivered a course of expository lectures upon the Shorter Catechism which was published in 1726 in a folio of 914 pages, under the title of *A Complete Body of Divinity*. It is a big, but not a great, work. In the treatment of the Scriptures he reverses the order of the proof as given in the Confession, putting the character of the Bible, such as its contents, work in the soul, majesty, etc., first, and coming to the testimony of the Spirit last, and that under the head of "Testimony," which is subdivided into two heads, the human, and the divine. Under the subject of the fall he has the remarkable statement that God "gave not to Adam those influences of confirming and assisting grace that were needful to his standing; and yet providence is not to blame, because Adam did not want any of those influences till he was willing to want them."[27] Thus sin comes from lack of grace, and lack of grace comes from sin! There is a blind effort here to place the responsibility of the existence of sin upon the free will of man, as Willard says elsewhere: "Adam sinned voluntarily or by consent, in that he abused his own free will."[28] As to the order of the decrees, Willard was a supralapsarian. The means of grace, preaching, etc., "have no efficiency in the production of this habit [of faith] by moral suasion,"[29] *i. e.*, preaching has no efficiency in regeneration.

Thus to all appearance the ancient Calvinism had fully maintained itself down to the close of the century. There was still found in 1707 a minister in one of the chief churches of Boston who was regularly lecturing upon divinity with the minuteness only to be expected in a theological school, and adhering with absolute faithfulness to the Westminster system. And yet beneath the surface there was widespread departure and alienation from

in 1633; pastor there; removed to Hartford, Conn., 1636, with the founders of that town; pastor there till his death, in 1663.

[26] Born in Concord, Mass., 1640; graduated at Harvard 1659; pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, 1676 (?) to his death, 1707.

[27] Pages 178, 179. [28] Page 186. [29] Page 434.

that system. Another side of the history of the first century needs now to be reviewed.

There is an analogy between ideas and material bodies in the particular of their gravity; and the first century of New England history was to show how the Puritan divinity, in the proportion and with the emphasis with which it was held, by a natural gravitation tended downward.

It was the beginning of a chapter of misfortunes when Mrs. Anne Hutchinson[30] arrived in Boston in 1635. She was a woman of talent, of a deeply religious nature, very much attached to her pastor, Rev. John Cotton,[31] who had left her home, Boston, England, to become the minister of the New England Boston. Much prayer had brought her to the conviction that she had been "trusting in a covenant of works," and in connection with the higher spiritual experiences which she had gained in her effort to throw herself more fully upon the mercy of God, she had become visionary and fanatical. So she conceived that it was "revealed" to her that she must go to New England and "be persecuted and suffer much trouble." Arrived here, she began soon to assemble the women in her house for religious meetings, repeating the sermons of Mr. Cotton with comments of her own, and before long had become the head of a considerable party, who were charged with Antinomian errors, and thus stirred up a controversy which divided the church and town, and excited so much feeling as to become the cause of a serious crisis in the life of the young community. A synod was called against her errors in 1637, and they were condemned. Subsequently she was banished, and died at the hands of the Indians upon Long Island.

[30] The best general view of this episode is found in PUNCHARD, *History of Congregationalism*, Vol. IV, pp. 196 ff. Original authorities are: WELDE, *A Short Story of the Rise, Reign, and Ruine of the Antinomians*, etc., 1644; E. JOHNSON, *The Wonder-working Providence of Sions Saviour*, 1654 (reprinted, Andover, 1867); COTTON MATHER, *Magnalia*, 1702 (Hartford ed., 1853, always cited in the following pages, Vol. II, p. 508), gives an account of no great value; C. CHAUNCY, *Seasonable Thoughts*, 1743, reproduces something from Welde.

[31] Born in Derby, England, 1585; fellow of Emanuel College, Cambridge, subsequently dean; settled at Boston, Eng., in 1612; emigrated to Boston, New England, in 1632 and died there in 1652.

It is exceedingly difficult, if not impossible, to arrive at this late day at an exact and reliable estimate of the nature and tendency of Mrs. Hutchinson's views. No one can read the various contemporary accounts without the feeling that misunderstanding played a great part in creating the conviction that she had seriously departed from the orthodoxy of the day. The most valuable source of information, Welde's *Short Story*, is of no great historical worth. It is marred by superstition,[32] its common honesty is somewhat doubtful,[33] and it must hence be employed with the greatest caution. As commonly understood, her peculiar views gathered about two points: the doctrine of the indwelling of the Spirit; and the assurance of justification. The Holy Spirit dwelt in a justified person personally. "Gifts and graces" were of no value in evidencing Christian character, but the witness of the Spirit was the only evidence. Hence the assurance of justification was immediately given to the soul by the Spirit. It was not evidenced by the sanctification of the believer, but was totally independent of this. Hence works were of no value, and hence the Christian might live in sin. Justification was entirely separated from faith. A man was justified before he believed. A further distinction was drawn between the covenant of works and that of grace. All who rested their evidence upon the fruits of the Spirit were said to be trusting in a covenant of works. The covenant of grace was restricted to those who experienced the inward witness of the Spirit.

It is at least probable that these expressions were only individual methods of emphasizing the dominant ideas of the Calvinistic system as then commonly preached, and especially as presented in the ordinary ministrations of Mr. Cotton, Mrs. Hutchinson's favorite minister. The second error which Welde mentions, "that a man is united to Christ and justified without faith; yea, from all eternity," seems nothing but an extreme formulation of the doctrine of election. In fact, Rev. John Wheelwright,

[32] It contains a most incredible account of the birth of a monster to the wife of a certain Wm. Dyer.

[33] See references under DEXTER, *Bibliography*, title No. 972.

in defending himself against Welde's charges, says[34] of this very charge: The writer holds it to be true "if it be meant respecting God's decree," but in no other sense. Many of the expressions quoted seem also to be of the same nature as that extreme application of the doctrine of union with Christ which was to appear subsequently in Rellyanism, itself only an exaggerated Calvinism. Such, for example, are these: "Christ is the new creature;" "All graces are in Christ as the subject and none in us, so that Christ believes, Christ loves," etc.[35] And Mr. Wheelwright's denials that he held that sanctification was no evidence of justification are repeated and explicit.

The mere unraveling of a snarl of insignificant temporary aberrations from truth is of no interest or importance in the present history. But besides the evident tendency to overemphasize the divine sovereignty and allied truths which already appears, there is one farther phenomenon, exhibited in connection with the synod, which is of the greatest significance. This is the substantial ignorance of the nature of saving faith brought to light by the discussions upon justification. Mr. Cotton seems, at first sight, to have been farther from the truth than his colleagues, and was brought with some difficulty to a partial agreement with them. He held that our "union with Christ" is complete before and without the work or act of faith, though not before or without the "habit" or gift of faith. It is evident from his own subsequent expressions[36] that he was after all in substantial agreement with the rest, for he says: "I looked at union with Christ as equivalent to regeneration." This as the divine part in conversion does at least logically precede the act of faith. But, however they might be divided upon this point, Mr. Cotton and all the rest were united in viewing man as passive in faith. For the sake of securing the honor of God as the author of regeneration, they held views of divine sovereignty, inability, and regeneration which in effect rendered man totally passive till the indispensable condition was fulfilled, upon

[34] *Mercurius Americanus*, 1645 (reprinted by the Prince Society 1876), p. 9.

[35] *Short Story*, errors 17, 16.

[36] *The Way of Congregational Churches Cleared*, etc., 1648, pp. 41 ff.

which faith followed, as a spontaneous act, it is true, but still as necessary.

In this confusion the New England fathers were not alone. It was generally true that but little light was to be found upon the nature of the action of the human mind in religious matters in any of the standard writers of the day. The will was still linked inseparably with the emotions in the common psychology, and its office and operation hence most obscured. The Westminster Confession confounds saving faith with historical faith in the expression: "By this faith a Christian believeth to be true whatsoever is revealed in the Word."[37] Even Calvin had said: "Faith . . . . is a certain and steady knowledge of the divine benevolence towards us." And though in case of both of these authorities there can be found other expressions calculated to give a good practical impression to the popular mind, yet when the emphasis was laid upon man's inability to repent which was laid in those days, the activity of man was brought into so great darkness and doubt that paralysis of the spiritual forces of the soul often followed, and the work of repentance which man "could not do" remained largely undone.

The consequences of this confused and paralyzing theology soon became apparent. Cotton Mather may tell the piteous story.[39]

When our churches were come to between twenty and thirty years of age, a numerous posterity was advanced so far into the world, that the first planters began apace in their several families to be distinguished by the name of grandfathers; but among the immediate parents of the grandchildren, there were multitudes of well-disposed persons, who, partly through their own doubts and fears, and partly through other culpable neglects, had not actually come up to the covenanting state of communicants at the table of the Lord. The good old generation could not, without many uncomfortable apprehensions, behold their offspring excluded from the baptism of Christianity, and from the ecclesiastical inspection which is to accompany that baptism; indeed, it was to leave their offspring under the shepherdly government of our Lord Jesus Christ in his ordinances, that they had brought their lambs into this wilderness. When the apostle bids churches to "look diligently, lest any man fail of the grace of God," there is an ecclesiastical word used for that "looking diligently;" intimating that God will ordinarily

[37] Chapter xiv. [38] *Institutes*, III, ii, 7. [39] *Magnalia*, Vol. II, pp. 277 ff.

bless a regular church-watch, to maintain the interests of grace among his people; and it was therefore the study of those prudent men, who might be called our seers, that the children of the faithful may be kept, as far as may be, under a church-watch, in expectation that they might be in the fairer way to receive the grace of God; thus they were "looking diligently," that the prosperous and prevailing condition of religion in our churches might not be *Res unius ætatis*,— "a matter of one age alone." Moreover, among the next sons or daughters descending from that generation, there was a numerous appearance of sober persons, who professed themselves desirous to renew their baptismal-covenant and submit unto the church-discipline, and so have their houses also marked for the Lord's; but yet they could not come to that experimental account of their own regeneration, which would sufficiently embolden their access to the other sacrament. Wherefore, for our churches now to make no ecclesiastical difference between these hopeful candidates and competents for those our further mysteries; and pagans, who might happen to hear the word of God in our assemblies, was judged a most unwarrantable strictness, which would quickly abandon the biggest part of our country unto heathenism. And, on the other side, it was feared that, if all such as had not yet exposed themselves by censurable scandals found upon them, should be admitted unto all the privileges in our churches, a worldly part of mankind might, before we are aware, carry all things into such a course of proceeding, as would be very disagreeable unto the kingdom of heaven.

No one can fail to perceive the surprise with which Mather, and doubtless all the rest of the New England leaders, looked upon this state of things. There were, no doubt, many elements entering into the production of the result,[40] some of which cannot now be fully understood. The early plan of requiring of candidates for church membership a long and detailed account of gracious exercises, however appropriate when the first little companies had gathered together under the stress of persecution in England, and when all their religious exercises must of necessity have been marked, could only serve as an unfortunate and embarrassing condition among a later generation, born and brought up in the perfect freedom of the New World, and without the thrilling experiences of their fathers to give point to

[40] It has been common to ascribe the movement for the "Half-Way Covenant" to the desire to enlarge the franchise, which was at first restricted in Massachusetts to church members. But there is no evidence that this consideration had any influence. See DEXTER, *Congregationalism as seen in its Literature*, p. 468. Also, *New Englander and Yale Review*, February 1892, article by PROFESSOR W. WALKER.

their views and depth to their experience. But with all the rest, there was a theological root to the trouble, and this was that doctrine of inability, one application of which we have already seen. The doctrine of the sovereignty of God is one which affects the church differently at different times. The first Puritans, sure in their own hearts that they were the elect of God, found the doctrine necessary to sustain them in the tremendous struggles through which they passed. As the waves of the storm rose higher about them, they looked more and more to God, who was yet ruler above all the commotion of the elements, and would save his people. Hence the doctrine nerved to greater activity; and it produced a similar effect, during the first period of the promulgation of Calvinism, among every nation which accepted the system. The Calvinists were the great active forces of an advancing Protestantism. But when such mighty stimulus was removed, when inability was preached to men who were not conscious that they were the elect, when passive waiting for the gracious deliverance of God was inculcated upon men whom the tide of events no longer forced to activity in spite of themselves and of their theories, it produced sluggishness, apathy, self-distrust, despair. It has never been a good way to induce men to repent to tell them that they cannot. Thus, in part, it was the theology of the period which wrought the paralysis which Mather sketches, and which continued in spite of all the ecclesiastical nostrums of the Half-Way Covenant, and sunk the churches lower and lower.

An inspection of the preaching of the early ministers of New England would show how predominantly depressing and discouraging their ministrations were. There were not lacking many appeals which were adapted to stir the conscience, produce repentance, and call out faith, for, when men are moved by the great forces of the soul, and the truths of the gospel are presented to them, they will respond in the natural manner, regardless of the theories which they may be taught and which at other times may paralyze their action. But when every allowance has been made for the brighter and better side of the early preaching, it still remains that the general impression of the

pulpit was that the sinner is "dead," helpless, cannot be interested in divine things, and has nothing to do but to wait for God. Innumerable quotations might be made to illustrate this statement;[41] but unless counterbalanced by others which space forbids, the impression they would give would be even too gloomy and hopeless. Suffice it to say that to the time of Increase Mather there was scarcely a single preacher who seemed to possess the evangelistic instinct and who could wield the evangelistic methods. In Mather's case hard common sense and practical tact outweighed theory. He flung the doctrine of inability into the depths and preached sermons which live and breathe today. But he only serves to show by contrast how unfavorable the general style was in its effect upon the majority of hearers.

Thus out of the undue and unseasonable emphasis which the Puritan theology laid upon the divine sovereignty and man's inability there had sprung a blighting influence which had reduced the number of conversions greatly, and was beginning to

[41] For example: JOHN HIGGINSON, minister of Salem, 1659–1708 (*Our Dying Saviour's Legacy of Peace*, 1686), was a rather cheerful preacher, bringing out man's activity in faith. JONATHAN MITCHELL, minister of Cambridge, 1650–1668 (*A Discourse of the Glory to which God hath called Believers by Jesus Christ*, 1721), is like the average. THOMAS COBBETT, minister in Lynn from 1637 to (?) 1657 (*A Practical Discourse of Prayer*, 1654), cannot deny the duty of the unregenerate to pray, and yet spends his time in finding reasons for their prayer though they are entirely wicked in praying; SOLOMON STODDARD, minister of Northampton, 1669–1729, takes up so much time, even in his *Guide to Christ* (1714), in getting around the difficulties of inability, that he has no time left for directions actually to exercise faith (compare also his *The Safety of Appearing at the Day of Judgment in the Righteousness of Christ*, etc., 1687, and his *The Nature of Saving Conversion*, 1719). To the same effect are: CHARLES CHAUNCY, *The Lord our Righteousness*, 1659; JOHN COTTON, *The Church's Resurrection*, 1642, *The Way of Life*, 1641 (rather helpful, but upon p. 187 hopelessly lost in reconciling election with the heinousness of sin upon the basis of inability), *The Covenant of God's Free Grace*, 1645, *Christ the Fountain of Life*, 1651 (see p. 173, The grace of Christ "conveys such a spirit of grace into us as gives us power to receive Christ"); THOMAS HOOKER, minister in Hartford, 1636–1647, *The Soul's Humiliation*, 1638, *The Unbeliever's Preparing for Christ*, 1638, *The Soul's Vocation*, 1638, and *The Poor Dying Christian drawn to Christ*, 1743 (all very gloomy); JOHN DAVENPORT, minister in New Haven, 1638–1668, then in Boston till he died in 1670 (see quotations in COTTON'S *Covenant of Free Grace*, pp. 34–40). Of Mather it is enough to quote the titles of two collections of sermons, *The Greatest Sinners Exhorted and Encouraged to Come to Christ and that Now, without Delaying*, 1686, and *Now or Never*, 1713.

deplete the churches of members. The Half-Way Covenant was the method hit upon to remedy the difficulty. It allowed parents, themselves baptized, of correct life, who would "own the covenant," that is, would acknowledge the rightfulness of God's claims upon them, and promise to submit to the discipline of the church, though not professing conversion, to have their children baptized. The arguments for this arrangement were strange. Though much drawn out, in substance they were all one. The infants in question were first proved members of the church (the position of the Episcopal church in England, but repudiated hitherto in New England), and from this their right to baptism was inferred. Thus, in effect, the character of the church was changed. The old Congregational idea had been that the church was the fellowship of believers, and that only they had a right to its privileges, including the baptism of their children. Thus while the church had an educational function and was to train up men to be Christians, it was viewed, in its strictly ecclesiastical character, not as a school, but as a fellowship of persons already thus trained and already converted. Now it was to perform the function of a school, and within its fold train up men to religion. The full scope of the change was not at first seen, but it was consummated when in 1707 Solomon Stoddard of Northampton proposed to admit the unregenerate to the Lord's Supper as a means of grace, that is, of conversion. Thus ultimately the doctrine of inability broke down the theory of the new birth in its relation to the church, as it early discouraged the actual exercise of repentance.

The precise causes leading to this remarkable result are somewhat difficult to trace. There was much dispute upon the subject, and the churches were brought to adopt the new method only with great reluctance. Increase Mather wrote in connection with John Davenport of New Haven strongly against it, but years afterwards took the other side.[42] His treatises upon the side of the new scheme throw some light upon the previous history of

[42] Against the synod, *An Apologetical Preface* to JOHN DAVENPORT'S *Another Essay*: for it, besides the book above mentioned, *A Discourse Concerning the Subject of Baptism*, etc., 1675.

the idea. He naturally attempts to gain some support for the plan from the earlier writers, and entitles his first book (of the year 1675): *The First Principles of New England concerning the Subject of Baptism.* In this he quotes John Cotton[43] as being in favor of the plan. The passages quoted pronounce, indeed, in favor of the baptism of the children of the unregenerate "children," but only upon condition that their "grandparents" assume the training of them. This was Cotton's position in public utterances of the year 1645. But the increasing pressure of the condition of things seems to have led him to waver, and at last, in a letter dated Nov. 8, 1648, and quoted by Mather[44] we have the following passage which looks somewhat doubtfully in the direction of the Half-Way Covenant:

> It is not necessary that they [upon a reformation of the church] should take carnal members of the parish into the fellowship of this renewed election of their ministers, and yet it is not improper but the ministers may perform some ministerial acts to them, as not only to preach the word to them, but happily [*i. e.*, haply] also to baptize their children. For such members are like the church members with us baptized in their infancy yet not received to the Lord's Supper when they come to age, nor admitted to fellowship of voting in admissions, elections, censures, till they come to profess their faith and repentance, and lay hold of the covenant of their parents before the church. And yet, they being not cast out of the church nor the covenant thereof, their children may be capable of the first seal of the covenant, so in this case till the parents themselves grow scandalous and thereby cast out of the covenant of the church.

Other evidences of a tendency to change the early practice before the synod had actually recommended it are adduced by Mather, but most of them are derived from unpublished MSS His father, Richard Mather, who had published a catechism in 1650 which was supposed to bear against the Half-Way Covenant, left a MS. in which he said that he was in favor of the Covenant, and that the catechism was to be interpreted in con-

[43] See pp. 2 ff. He quotes COTTON'S *Book of the Way of the Churches*, pp. 87, 88, 106, 115, and his *Keyes*. The former quotations contain nothing decisive and in the *Keyes* of 1644 (reprinted, Boston 1843), and the *Vindiciæ Clavium* 1645, there is nothing to the point. He quotes also HOOKER, *Survey of Church Discipline*, pp. 8, 48; but he is discussing another point there.

[44] *First Principles*, p. 5.

sistency with this. Other less famous men are quoted by Mather, and among them is the utterance of John Norton upon his dying bed (1663), who when asked what the sins of New England were for which God was displeased with the country said, among other things, "and for the neglect of baptizing the children of the church, those that some call grandchildren, I think God is provoked by it."

Thus it is evident that it was the pressure of an unexpected state of things which led these fathers reluctantly to a change in their methods. But the particular change made was determined by a peculiarity of their view of the Scriptures, by which the Old and New Testaments were brought upon pretty much the same level as doctrinal authorities, and the distinction between the systems and the dispensations of the two almost obliterated. A very prominent idea with them was that of the "covenant," derived, no doubt, from the Federal School of Holland. God stands in a covenant with believers and their households. Now, as he stood in a covenant with Israel also, the style of interpretation common in New England led to an identification of these covenants in all possible respects; and as an uncircumcised person was outside of the ancient covenant, and excluded from all share in the privileges of the people of God, and in the condition of a pagan; so it was thought that a child brought up in the Christian community and remaining unbaptized would also be outside of the covenant, the recipient of none of the special blessings of grace, and to a considerable degree in a hopeless state. If unbaptized children were indeed outside of the covenant, and thus in a condition but little better than "pagans," as the piteous phrase ran, the thing to be done was to get them into covenant relations that they might be saved. The fact that their parents did not seem to be saved, though in the covenant, escaped the fathers.[45]

It was therefore no superstitious regard for sacraments, no thought of baptismal regeneration, and no conscious lapse from the doctrine of the regenerate church to the view that the church is a school for the gradual training of Christians by the

[45] The full arguments of the synod are given in MATHER'S *Magnalia*, Vol. II, pp. 276 ff.

sacraments and Christian teaching, which created the Half-Way Covenant, but simply the passive theology of the times, which waited for God in the matter of conversion as for a sovereign whose gifts of grace were in his own inscrutable disposal, and without whom man was absolutely unable to do anything. To be sure, to baptize children was in the power of man, and this must be done. But repentance was the gift of God, and therefore not the act of man.[46]

But the remedy had no curative effect. The Half-Way Covenant was introduced very largely into the churches and remained sometimes till into the present century,[47] but the course of things was downward. The Indian war broke out (1675–6), agriculture suffered from drought and blight, commerce suffered at sea, pestilences and epidemics arose, and the consciences of the people, educated under the Jewish ideas of which we have already seen an example in the discussions upon the covenant, saw in these calamities the visitations of God for their sins. A

[46] The following extract is from MITCHELL and MATHER'S *Defence of the Answer and Arguments of the Synod*, 1664, p. 45: "It is the Lord's own way and his institutions only, which he will bless, not man's invention, though never so plausible. Neither hath God in his wisdom so instituted the frame of his covenant, and the constitution of the church thereby, as to make a perfect separation between good and bad, or to make the work of conversion and initial instruction needless in the churches. Conversion is to the children of the covenant a fruit of the covenant, saith Mr. Cotton. *If we do not keep in the way of a converting, grace-giving covenant, and keep persons under those church dispensations wherein grace is given, the church will die of a lingering though not of a violent death.* The Lord hath not set up churches only that a few old Christians may keep one another warm while they live, and then carry away the church into the cold grave with them when they die: No, but that they might with all the care and with all the obligations and advantages to that care that may be, nurse up still successively another generation of subjects to Christ, that may stand up in his kingdom when they are gone, that so he might have a people and kingdom successively continued to him from one generation to another."

INCREASE MATHER in his *Discourse Concerning the Subject of Baptism*, 1675, pp. 7 and 8, says: "The persons in question are either belonging to the visible church, or of the world only. The Scripture speaketh of those two terms, church and the world, etc. But to say that the persons in question and their children are of the world only, is in effect to say that they are visibly the devil's and none of the Lord's children."

[47] For example, in the First Church in Cambridge (Mitchell's church) till 1828. See *Manual*, 1872. Still the lists of those received in this particular church under the scheme show that it could have had little influence on the vital religion of the church.

"reforming synod" was accordingly called, and met in Boston in 1679. The document put forth by the synod mentions a great many particulars in which the churches had fallen away from their duty and stood in need of a reformation. The reader must make considerable allowance for the phraseology of the day, and for the over-strict views upon many topics which prevailed in New England at the time. Cotton Mather in his account of the matter seems to have an inkling that the terms of the document would be likely to give posterity an unduly unfavorable view of the condition of things, for he says:[48]

> Indeed, the people of God in this land were not gone so far in degeneracy but that there were further degrees of disorder and corruption to be found, I must freely speak it, in other, yea, in *all* other places where the protestant religion is professed: and the most impartial observers must have acknowledged that there was proportionably still more of true religion, and a larger number of the strictest saints in this country, than in any other on the face of the earth.

Still, with all allowances, it is evident that there was decline in the community. The positive sins mentioned, the increase of profanity, intemperance, and licentiousness shows that there was rising a community about the church which deserved the name of "the world," and that the church was not subduing it. Though the synod recommended vigorous measures, and though many churches held special meetings of reconsecration, the evil was not stayed. The Half-Way Covenant had a strong influence in this direction. Those who had come forward and owned the covenant and had their children baptized seemed satisfied with this, and as Mr. Stoddard said, there was a "general neglect" of the Lord's Supper. "About forty years past," he says in his sermon of the year 1707, "there were multitudes in the country unbaptized: but that neglect was taken into examination, and now there is an alteration in that particular. But to this day there are four to one that do neglect the Lord's Supper, as if it did not belong to them to magnify God on account of the work of redemption." The organized churches were, therefore, in danger of extinction, since the body of communicants,

[48] *Magnalia*, II, p. 317.

who were the members in full standing, and could alone perpetuate the organizations, was decreasing.[49] The evil began probably in connection with the difficulties which had led to the Half-Way Covenant; and we find that to meet it there had already been practiced some laxness in admitting members to the communion without a personal confession of faith. One of the remedies for the prevailing evils proposed by the "reforming synod" gives more than a hint of this. The synod said: "It is requisite that persons be not admitted unto communion in the Lord's Supper without making a personal and public profession of their faith and repentance, either orally or in some other way, so as shall be to the just satisfaction of the church; and that, therefore, both elders and churches be duly watchful and circumspect in this matter."[50] The careful phraseology shows that in some instances, at least, all proper confession of personal faith had been omitted.

But it was left to Rev. Solomon Stoddard of Northampton, Mass.,[51] to make an open proposal to adopt this lax practice as the regular method of the churches. In 1707 he preached the sermon from which a quotation has already been made, and which bore this title: "The Inexcusableness of Neglecting the Worship of God under a Pretence of being in an Unconverted Condition." The occasion was a somewhat public one, as the "Inferior Court" was then sitting. If was thus, no doubt, intended to have a general application, and to introduce a practice at least in some respects new. Yet it seems to have grown out of Mr. Stoddard's own experiences as a parish minister. In seeking to restore the Lord's Supper to its proper place in the public observance, he had apparently tried to persuade certain persons to come to the Lord's table, who had met him with the

[49] TRUMBULL, in his *History of Connecticut*, Vol. I, p. 472, says that in the year 1696 "the practice of making a relation of Christian experiences, and of admitting none to full communion but such as appeared to be Christians indeed, yet prevailed; and the number of church members, in full communion, was generally small. In those churches where the owning of the covenant was not practiced, great numbers of children were unbaptized."

[50] *Magnalia*, II, p. 326.

[51] Born 1643, died 1729, pastor at Northampton, 1669–1729.

excuse that they were unregenerate, and so had no right to the privilege he urged upon them. So he explains the object of his sermon, when it had been attacked by Increase Mather,[52] as being "to answer a case of conscience and direct those that might have scruples about participating in the Lord's Supper because they have not a work of saving conversion, and not at all to direct the churches to admit any that were not to rational charity true believers."[53] The doctrine he propounded to this end he expresses thus: "That sanctifying grace is not necessary unto the lawful attending of any duty of worship." The general argument is characteristic of New England, though now applied in a new way. It acquires all its strength from the identification of the Jewish system with the Christian at a multitude of points in which they are in fact widely separated. The Lord's Supper ought as much to be observed as any other act of worship, and unconverted persons are just as inexcusable for not attending it as any others; and this all the more, since the passover in the Old Testament was kept by all the people without regard to their holy estate.

The most startling view proposed in the sermon was that the unconverted should be urged to come to the sacrament as a converting ordinance. At first sight this looks like a return to the sacramentarianism of the Roman church, but it was not such in fact. On the contrary, Stoddard seems to have held a view of the Lord's Supper too low, rather than too high. Among the reasons he gives for his doctrine are that "it is needful that others [than the regenerate] should attend duties of worship that the worship of God *may be carried on.*" And again, "This is very useful that men may obtain sanctifying grace . . . . God in the Lord's Supper invites us to come to Christ, makes an affecting representation of his sufferings for our sins," etc.[54] He styles it a "seal of the covenant," but he says in his later treatise "that the sacraments do not seal up pardon and salvation to all that receive them, but they are seals to the truth of the covenant." Now, if Stoddard meant by the first clause of

[52] In *A Dissertation*, etc., Boston, 1708.

[53] *Appeal to the Learned*, 1799, pp. 2, 3.

[54] *Sermon* of the year 1707, pp. 15, 16.

[55] *Appeal*, pp. 22, 23.

this last sentence that the seals did not seal simply as outward elements, no one in New England would have disagreed with him; but he probably intended to deny that the sacraments had *any* personal application as seals of forgiveness to the believing recipient, and to limit their sealing efficacy to the covenant in general, that is, to make them mere monuments—a view far from the Scriptures, the Confessions, and the consensus of teaching in New England at the time. Thus the main thing about them was the affecting representation they made; their efficiency was that of a sermon, or a prayer, and hence they should be attended by the unregenerate, as these should be.[56]

This sermon was, however, not only a factor in the decline of the New England churches, but also incidentally a witness that the decline had already proceeded to quite an alarming point. Upon nothing had the earliest Congregationalists insisted with greater or juster emphasis than upon the necessity of a godly ministry. The Cambridge Platform made the divine calling an indispensable prerequisite of the office.[57] The minute pains taken to secure a regenerate church membership would have had no significance, had not even greater been taken to secure a ministry who could impress the truths of the gospel with power because they had a deep experience of the divine word themselves. But a declining church had now produced a declining ministry, and we find Mr. Stoddard gravely arguing for his new position that sanctifying grace was not necessary unto attending any duty of worship, from the further position, which is stated as an acknowledged principle, that "sanctifying

[56] Stoddard was, however, not a man to use theological terms with accuracy, and there are many contradictions in his forms of presenting his ideas which cannot be fully cleared up. He said, for example, that "those that are saints by calling are to be accepted by the church, whether they be converted or not" (*Sermon*, p. 23). But "called saints" are converted, calling being the divine side, and conversion the human side of the same thing. Again, the whole contention of his sermon was that persons that knew themselves to be unconverted should come to the Lord's table, and yet he said that it was not his object to "direct the churches to admit any that were not to *rational charity* true believers." But how could "rational charity" call a man a true believer who knew and said himself that he was not? That would seem to be very *irrational* charity.

[57] Chap. viii, § 1.

grace is not necessary unto . . . . preaching of the word!" He says: "It is upon all accounts most desirable that preachers should be godly men, and, *ceteris paribus*, they that are converted themselves are most likely to be instruments of the conversion of sinners and the edification of saints. Yet it is lawful for men in a natural condition to preach the word. Jesus Christ sent out Judas to preach the gospel as well as the other disciples."[58] And later he says again: "If a man do know himself to be unregenerate, yet it is lawful for him to administer baptism and the Lord's Supper. The blessing of this ordinance doth not depend upon the piety of him that doth administer it. . . . . Men that are destitute of grace are not prohibited in the word of God to administer the ordinances of God."[59] Now this, we are to note, is by no means the position that the unworthiness of the ministrant does not affect the validity of the sacrament administered, to him who receives it, though this acknowledged principle is used as an argument in its favor; but it is the position that an unconverted man may, so far as he is himself concerned, go on lawfully to administer the ordinances, or, in other words, that a man who knows himself to be in God's eye out of the church may do those things which belong alone to the members of the church to do!

How, now, could such a position be for an instant maintained had there not already been discussion among the churches upon this topic, which was called out by some patent and strange fact? How, unless there were already ministers who could not in honesty claim to be converted, and for whom some way of justification had been anxiously sought? The later complaint of Whitefield about "unconverted ministers," whom, to his own mind, he found in many places in New England, points in the same direction, and gives too much reason to fear that the decay in the churches had now confessedly reached even the ministers themselves.[60]

[58] *Sermon*, p. 6. [59] *Ibid.*, p. 14.

[60] Mr. Stoddard claimed that the direction of the synod of 1679, cited above, was not contrary to his position in the *Sermon* of 1707, for the words, as they ran in the synod's result ("that persons be not admitted unto communion in the Lord's Supper without making a personal and public profession of their faith and repentance"), were

The main object of Mr. Stoddard, in his sermon, was accomplished, and though Increase Mather opposed him with strong logic of the reason, that stronger logic of events was with the innovator, and the practice became general in the valley of the Connecticut at least to admit persons to the communion who did not profess to be converted.[61] Rev. Benjamin Colman, of Boston, also favored the idea,[62] and doubtless many others, though there was also always a large number who repudiated both the Half-Way Covenant and its daughter, lax communion. The spiritual dearth increased, revivals were uncommon, immorality grew apace, and the state of religion went lower and lower.[63] Theological modifications naturally entered with lax practice, and the Arminian writings of Tillotson, Whitby, Taylor, and Clarke, and subsequently the Socinian treatises of Emlyn (reprinted in America in 1756, and no doubt read long before that) and others were read and had a large influence. How far the Congregational clergy became Arminian at this time (about 1720) it is impossible to say. The impression was abroad that many, both in the ministry and the churches, were in greater or less sympathy with this style of thought. Proofs and traces of it will be found at a later point in this history; but it is now enough to note that so keen an observer as Jonathan Edwards thought Arminianism "prevailing" and was led to devote his principal writing to opposing it, and, indeed, began the great

substituted at his request for the more precise and searching formula at first reported in which the phrase was found, "without making a relation of the work of God's Spirit" (*Appeal*, p. 94). But this was scarcely so. That he made the proposal to change the wording, and that it was done upon his request, we must accept upon his assertion; but that the change had, in the mind of the synod at large, any such significance is impossible. Indeed, an anonymous writer, in reply to Mr. Stoddard (*An Appeal of some of the Unlearned*, 1709), said (p. 17): "The story told as to the blotting of a passage in the result of the synod, we are upon good information from the moderator himself, who drew that result, assured it is a mistake, and a gross one."

[61] TRUMBULL, *History*, Vol. II, p. 146: "A great proportion of the clergy at that time were of opinion that unregenerate men, if externally moral, ought to be admitted to all the ordinances." *Cf. ibid.*, p. 178.

[62] Sermon, 1727, title: *Parents and Grown Children should be together at the Lord's Table.*

[63] *Cf.* TRUMBULL, *History*, Vol. II, p. 137, with EDWARDS' *Works*, edition of 1830, Vol. IV, p. 19.

revival work of his life with a repreaching of the fundamental doctrines of Calvinism, the effects of which went far to show that his diagnosis of the disease was correct.

The course of this review has brought the reader to the lowest point of religious decline reached in New England, whether it be considered from a practical or a doctrinal point of view. Before he begins to trace the upward course of things, and to view the influences under which that took place, he should pause long enough to perceive that the progress downwards has its fruitful cause in the one fact of an alarming absence of vital piety in the New England communities. There was not regenerate material for the regenerate church. It was sought to remedy the difficulty in various ways, but they did not touch this underlying cause. The children of the unregenerate were baptized, but that did not secure their conversion, and the church continued to grow fewer and fewer in number. Then the unregenerate were invited to the Lord's table, but though a greater number of communicants was thus secured, the general condition of the community did not improve, and all that New England was founded for, or her pious sons still cared for, went slowly to ruin. And, doctrinally considered, the cause of all was the doctrine of inability, so preached as to deplete the churches, by discouraging repentance and faith.

The influence of the style of thought becoming largely prevalent in England has been hinted at. The complete understanding of this thought, of importance not only for its direct, but for many indirect, influences upon subsequent New England thinking, demands that a fuller consideration be given to it than is now possible.

# SOME OBSERVATIONS ON THE SOCIAL INSTITUTIONS OF THE ISRAELITES.

By FRANTS BUHL,
Leipzig.

1. THE word for pledge in Hebrew is עֵרָבוֹן, probably a Canaanitish expression from which is derived the Greek *ἀῤῥαβών*. By such a pledge Tamar made sure that Judah would send her the promised hire, Gen. 38:17. The corresponding verb is found in Neh. 5:3 (and also originally in vs. 2), where the poor Jews are obliged to yield up their sons, daughters, fields, vineyards, and houses as security to obtain money and grain.

Usually we find the same idea in the verb חבל with the noun חֶבֶל, which is connected with the root חבל "bind" (obligate). Dillmann, likewise, on Ex. 22:25, says: "One can, indeed, take a pledge as security for the thing lent, but if one takes the upper garment, it must be returned by sundown." Benzinger, *Archäologie*, p. 349, and others, hold the same opinion. It cannot be denied, however, that the thought secured through this translation is in and of itself not entirely satisfactory. For if the pledge furnishes security to the creditor we cannot really understand how he can return it at night. A glance at other passages where the root חבל occurs soon shows that in this place something else is intended. The verb is found in Prov. 20:16; 27:13; Job 22:6 with personal objects with the signification of "seize for a debt," *i. e.*, to take from the debtor a *penalty* if the debt is not paid. It occurs also with an impersonal object in the same sense in Amos 2:8: "They lay themselves down beside the altars upon clothes taken in pledge, and in the house of their god drink wine which had been paid as fines." The parallelism makes it clear that חֶבֶל in this place denotes the object which the creditor had taken from the poor in lieu of a debt. In this way Ex. 22:25 must also be explained. The justice of a pledge is not under discussion, but rather the humanity of the creditor

when the debtor has not been able to pay his debt. The same may be said of Deut. 24:6: "In case of an attachment thou shalt not take the mill of the debtor, for it is his means of life;" and in vs. 17: "Thou shalt not take the garment of a widow, if she is not able to pay." *Cf.* also Ezek. 18:16; Job 24:3.

The above-mentioned law of Ex. 22:25 is repeated in Deut. 24:12 f. But in the latter passage we do not find חבל but עבט. The most natural supposition is that this verb also signifies not a pledge of security but a penalty. And this is confirmed, too, by vs. 10 f., where it reads: "When thou dost lend thy neighbor any manner of loan, thou shalt not go into his house to take his pledge, but thou shalt wait without until he brings it to thee." This whole situation is that of an attachment (of the goods) of the poor rather than time an occasion when the poor man seeks a loan. The passage in Josephus (*Antiquities*, IV, 268) yields the same thought: *ἂν δὲ ἀναισχυντῶσι περὶ τὴν ἀπόδοσιν, μὴ περὶ τὴν οἰκίαν βαδίσαντας ἐνεχυριάζειν πρὶν ἡ δίκη περὶ τούτου γένηται*, etc.[1]

In consideration of this linguistic usage it is at least possible that חבל in the above-mentioned sense is connected with חבל "destroy." At any rate, a connection with the Arabic aḫbala and the Assyrian hubullu "tax" is of course obviously suggested.

Accordingly we cannot establish by the Book of the Covenant or by Deuteronomy that it was the custom among the early Israelites to give security to the creditor on the occasion of a loan.

It is, I judge, equally wrong to find proof in the Book of the Covenant that it was considered in the earliest times as a legitimate custom to demand *interest* of the debtor. As is well-known, in Deuteronomy and in the priestly laws this is expressly forbidden if the debtor is an Israelite. It would be, for this reason, somewhat remarkable if the Book of the Covenant permitted interest and forbade only unlawful interest without adding thereto a remark about the permissible interest. But a closer examination of the passage already considered, Ex.

[1] In modern laws we find many similar provisions, *e. g.*, it is not permissible in an attachment to seize the tools of a workman.

22:24, soon shows that the usual interpretation is not well founded. The passage is as follows: "If thou lend money to a poor farmer, thou shalt not be to him as a נֹשֶׁה; neither shall ye lay upon him usury." The change of number in this law undoubtedly denotes that the last sentence is a remark added at a later time, and that the original command read only as follows: "thou shalt not be to him as a נֹשֶׁה." But it does not follow from this that the original formulation of the command permitted interest and forbade usury, while a later hand, in consideration of the Deuteronomic specification, transformed the command into an absolute prohibition against receiving any interest.[2] The word נֹשֶׁה signifies rather one who brutally and relentlessly *exacts* debts, *e. g.*, in one case, where he seizes the poor in case of non-payment, or, in another case, where he compels him to hand over his sons as slaves. With this sense the word is found in 2 Kings 4:1; one of the wives of the sons of the prophets came sorrowfully to Elisha and said: "Thy servant, my husband, is dead, and thou knowest that he was a devout man; and now the נֹשֶׁה is come to take my two sons as slaves!" Likewise in 1 Sam. 22:2, "there were gathered together unto David all who had a נֹשֶׁה," *i. e.*, they who were oppressed by a נֹשֶׁה (*cf.* also Neh. 5:7). The point here is not regarding interest, but regarding the unmerciful demands made by the debtors. The upright Israelite, on the other hand, is to consider his relations to the debtor as a kind of benevolence, and to wait patiently if the latter cannot pay. The later interpolated phrase in Ex. 22:24 does not, therefore, change the original sense, but rather illustrates it, not incorrectly, by the prohibition against interest. If the poor man must pay, not only the money, but interest in addition, then he was, of course, irretrievably lost. Perhaps we may assume that the taking of interest was, in the main, unknown in the time of the Book of the Covenant, that only in later times was it introduced, and accordingly first prohibited in Deuteronomy. The two Hebrew expressions for the idea are נֶשֶׁךְ and תַּרְבִּית, and their significations are about as follows: נֶשֶׁךְ

[2] So, *e. g.*, WELLHAUSEN, *Komposition des Hexateuch*, 2d ed., p. 92; BENZINGER, *Archäologie*, p. 350.

(literally, "bite") denotes the discount from the loan, which the creditor himself retains, while the debtor, regardless of this amount, had to repay the full sum of the loan. On the other hand, תַּרְבִּית denotes the surplus with which on repayment of the loan he had to increase its amount.

2. The usual impression which we receive in reading the Old Testament is that the Israelite peasants and proprietors owned their land as private possessions. In addition to this there are several phenomena which prove that together with their private possessions they had a community possession, and that this last must be regarded as the more primitive order. It is well known that this phenomenon occurs elsewhere. In Russia the community possession, the so-called *mir*-husbandry, is still quite universal.[3] Also in Germany the village originally owned as one possession the fields, meadows, and woods which adjoined it; and later, after the individual peasants had secured their particular possessions, a part of the village property remained as commons. In villages possessing community property the fields determined on for cultivation were divided into as many parts of equal size and quality as there were full citizens in the village. The tracts were assigned by lot for a series of years, and at the expiration of this time were newly allotted. And even later, when the several parts of the common possession had become individual property, several facts remained to remind one of the earlier arrangement, *e. g.*, the mutual rights of pasturing on the fallow fields, the fixed succession of the sowing and of the fallow year, the mutual help in field work, the prohibition against changing the cultivated fields into meadows, etc.[4]

It is of special interest to find in Palestine even today similar customs, but with peculiar modifications. The land here falls essentially into two parts. The territory immediately surrounding the villages is private property (mulk) and as such is inherited or can be given away; it is usually occupied as garden

[3] MAINE, *Ancient Law*, p. 267; FENTON, *Early Hebrew Life*, p. 64.

[4] *Cf.* VON MAURER, *Geschichte der Dorfverfassung in Deutschland*, 1865–6, Band I, pp. 34–6, 96, 304 f. On the other hand no such arrangement was found among the Arabs. *Cf.* WELLHAUSEN, *Reste Arab. Heid.*, 2d ed., p. 107 f.

land. The cultivated fields, on the other hand, are government possessions (Miri, from Emir), but are leased and tilled by the whole village. Every year it is determined how many villagers can make claim to a field possession, and how large a portion shall fall to each, in accordance with the size of his establishment. In accordance with this order the cultivated land is divided into equal parts, which are designated by special names.

The names are written on little pebbles (ğaral, Hebrew goral), and these stones put in a bag. All the inhabitants of the village now arrange themselves in a half circle about the Imâm or chief man. The lot is determined as follows: A little boy under five years of age takes one of the stones out of the bag, while another boy mentions the name of one of the citizens. This act is greeted by the citizens with the cry Allâh jaḳûm biğaralî, "May God care for my lot." From the division made in this way there is no appeal. A stranger could become party to the allotment only with the permission of the whole village. All the fields which lie fallow are public commons.[5]

There are certain traces which prove that similar customs were in vogue among the early Israelites. In Micah 2:5 the opponents of the prophet give vent to their wrath against his threats as follows: "Therefore thou shalt have none that shall cast the line by lot for thee in the congregation of Jahve (קַוֵּהַל יהוה)." This expression presupposes that every member of the people possessing full rights was a party in the division of the land, which occurred in the congregation of Jahve, *i. e.*, in the individual Israelite assemblies. With this passage Wellhausen[6] doubtless rightly connects Jer. 37:12, where Jeremiah leaves the capital city and betakes himself to the land of Benjamin לחלק משם בתוך העם, *i. e.*, to be a party to the allotment of the land to the members of the tribe. Furthermore, the beautiful picture in Ps. 16 is clearly based on such a custom. The enemies of the singer have chosen the world with its idols, the singer alone has chosen the true God as his part. He

[5] *Cf. Palestine Expl. Fund. Quart. Statement*, 1894, p. 191 f., and the slightly different representation in *Zeitschrift d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins*, IV, p. 70 f.

[6] *Skizzen*, V, 135; *Israel. und jüd. Geschichte*[2], p. 89.

knows that he has received the better part which he expresses as follows: "The lines are fallen to me in pleasant surroundings, and over my lot I rejoice." Perhaps the variously explained תמך in vs. 5 of this psalm expresses a similar thought to the above-mentioned cry of the modern inhabitants of Palestine at the allotment of the common land (ḳâma bi), so that we have here an ancient custom faithfully preserved down to the present time. Finally, the manner of expression, not to have lot and part with someone (or in something) (2 Sam. 20:1; 1 Kings 12:16; Ecc. 9:6; *cf.* Ps. 50:18) was connected originally with such a disposition of the land by lot as a proof of citizenship.

What relation in later times the common land sustained to the particular possessions of individuals cannot be determined. The pasture ground remained common property longest, while the cultivated ground gradually became the private possession of individuals. At any rate, it is clear that the pasture ground, which, according to the priestly laws, should belong to the Levitical cities (Num. 35:2 f.), is to be regarded as common property. And when in Josh. 21:11 f. this migraš is distinguished from the "fields (שְׂדֵה) of the city," this is, of course, a later adjustment of older but contradictory statements; but the distinction is itself suggested to the author of this passage by the actual customs in existence in his day.

The insight which we have had in this way into the oldest conditions of Israelitish ownership of land puts us in position better and more correctly to understand other phenomena of Israelitish antiquity. Right here, first of all, belongs the so-called ge'ulla or redemption duty of the Israelite. In the laws only a single hint of this institution is found, but the remaining writings of the Old Testament contain occasional references which give us a sufficiently clear picture of the custom. The Go'el was, according to Hebrew linguistic usage, the nearest kin of an Israelite who for any reason could not secure his own rights; and on whose behalf it was the duty of the Go'el to step in and redeem him or his interests. To this duty belonged also the so-called ge'ullâ of land ownership. When Jeremiah sat in

the prison his nephew Hanan'el of Anathoth came to him and invited him to buy of him a piece of land in their native city, because the prophet had the משפט הגאלה, *i. e.*, the right of redemption. In spite of the desperate conditions, Jeremiah at once consents and buys the piece of ground for seventeen shekels of silver, the bargain being lawfully concluded by a contract drawn up and sealed (Jer. 32:8 f.). This story, whose prophetic meaning does not concern us in this connection, teaches that the right of redemption was in order when an Israelite for any reason, especially of course because of poverty, found himself compelled to alienate a part of his possessions. We understand this incident entirely erroneously if we speak of the "rights" of the kin. It was simply a duty, but a duty not toward the impoverished alone, for indeed he loses a part of his real estate, together with his civil rights which attach thereto, but a duty toward the community or toward the clan, הַמִּשְׁפָּחָה, 2 Sam. 14:7, which was settled in the particular neighborhood, and in whose interest it was important that no part of the land should fall into strange hands. This is simply an after-effect of the earlier common possession where the clan as such owned real estate, while the individual members possessed only the right of use.

We meet a second example in the Book of Ruth, whose contents become entirely clear when we explain it after the analogy of the passage in Jeremiah. The beginning of the story is well known. Naomi, who became a widow in Moab, and whose sons also died, returns with her daughter-in-law Ruth to Bethlehem. Ruth, who is kindly treated by a relative of her husband, betakes herself in the night, in accordance with the advice of her mother-in-law, to the threshing-floor where Boaz is sleeping. As he awakes she makes a request of him, "Spread the border of thy garment over me, for thou art Go'el!" This is a primitive symbolic custom whereby the design to marry is expressed.[7] Boaz praises her action and is pleased to

[7] *Cf.* ROBERTSON SMITH, *Kinship and Marriage in Early Arabia*, p. 87, following Tabarî: "In the Yâhilîya, when a man's father or brother or son died and left a widow, the dead man's heir, if he came at once and threw his garment over her,

grant her request; there is, however, another relative who stands closer, and upon whom the fulfillment of the kinsman's duty rests. What follows is intended to show how Boaz, in the tenderest and most considerate manner, introduced his advice without injuring the rights of the nearer kinsman. On the following morning he betakes himself to the meeting place at the gate of the city, and waits here until the relative above mentioned comes along. When he sees him, he says to him: "The field that belonged to the deceased husband, she is willing to sell." Usually מָכְרָה is translated "she has sold," so that the Go'el was obliged to buy back the field from the present owner. But this is not only contrary to the analogy of the passage in Jeremiah, but also to that of the clear meaning of the narrative itself. For according to vss. 5 and 9 the field is to be bought out of the hand (מִיַּד) of Naomi, *i. e.*, she is herself the owner of the field and is now, for the first time, desirous of selling it.[8] There is, indeed, an archæological difficulty in this event which remains the same with either translation. According to the customary law of the early Israelites the woman was not an heir. Only the son, or, in case there were none, the male relatives had the right of heirship. For this reason the widow of the very rich Nabal, Abigail, forsook her dwelling place to follow her new husband, David, 1 Sam., chap. 25; and for a similar reason the inhabitants of Tekoa, 2 Sam. 14:7, wished to slay the son of the widow, in order to destroy the heir.[9] Naomi had, however, lost her husband and her two sons, in which case the possessions of Elimelech really should have reverted to the next male relative. The story in the Book of Ruth can accordingly

had the right to marry her under the dowry (m a h r) of [*i. e.*, already paid by] her [deceased] lord, or to give her in marriage and take her dowry. But if she anticipated him and went off to her own people, then the disposal of her hand belonged to herself."

[8] We must conceive of the perfect מָכְרָה as a perfect of determination unless we prefer to read it as a participle מֹכְרָה.

[9] Only in respect to the female slaves who were given to the bride at the wedding does she appear to have had full property rights, and these belonged to her, too, after the death of her husband. Instead of male relatives, the daughters, in specific cases, according to the priestly laws, can be their father's heirs.

be explained only on the supposition that Elimelech, before his death, had in some way secured for his wife the possession of his realty in Bethlehem, a proceeding that according to later Jewish custom indeed was quite possible.[10] After Boaz had related to the Go'el the purpose of Naomi, the latter expressed himself—as Jeremiah above—as at once ready to fulfill his redemption duty and to buy the field. Now Boaz adds thereto that the field can be bought only on the condition that the buyer also marries (*i. e.*, buys) Ruth, in order to maintain he name of Elimelech on his heritage. That is, the oldest son whom Ruth should bear in this marriage is to be regarded as son and heir of Elimelech, and the field shall later belong to him. Thereupon the relative answered: "I cannot fulfill the redemption duty, for I would thereby damage (הַשְׁחִית) my own heritage." This refusal can be explained on the ground that the Go'el ran a risk by that stipulation of losing the purchased field at some later time without any compensation; but since he is to retain possession of the field until the first son born of Ruth shall have become of age, this could scarcely have been called a damage to his own possessions, and so it seems to me probable that the answer of the relative is only a courteous circumlocution for the thought that he did not wish to marry Ruth. Such considerate indirection at any rate would be genuinely oriental. Boaz, having now acted according to the national custom, buys the field from Naomi, and marries Ruth whose oldest son became thereby the heir of Elimelech.

We see then that the whole story in the Book of Ruth agrees exactly with what we meet in Jeremiah, and that the ge'ullâ

[10] According to the later Jewish law (*cf.* SAALSCHÜTZ, *Mosaisches Recht*, pp. 743, 746 f.) it was the duty of the heir to care for the widow; as her own property she received only what she brought with her in her marriage, and what her husband had presented her in the ketuba. An example of the testator's right to dispose of his property freely we find in Job (42:15) where Job makes his daughters heirs with his sons. For the corresponding customs among the old Arabs, see ROBERTSON SMITH, *Kinship and Marriage*, p. 95 f. In Medina the widows inherited nothing, neither did sisters or daughters—a thing, however, which Mohammed changed. The widow Chadîǧa in Mekka owned rich possessions, on which Robertson Smith remarks: "She may have received it through her former husband by a *donatio inter vivos* or even by will."

here is also simply a duty toward the community, which in the first place by a special modification becomes an act of kindness toward Elimelech. After these results we are justified in expecting a repetition of these facts in a third passage where the ge'ullâ occurs, in the law of Lev., chap. 25. And this is the case, according to my understanding, where we ought not to allow ourselves to be led astray by the obscurity which results from the mingling of earlier and later regulations in this chapter.

The law for the year of jubilee (Lev., chap. 25)—theoretically regarded, one of the greatest social conceptions—consists of two parts. The first part treats of property relations, the second of the personal freedom of the Israelites. In the second part the customs are simplest. If an Israelite is so impoverished that he must sell himself, there are two courses open to him: he either sells himself to an Israelite, or to a non-Israelite who lives in Canaan and has here acquired wealth. In the first case he is not to be counted as a real slave, but only as a penniless workman, and in the year of jubilee, which occurred every fifty years, he again received his freedom gratis. If, however, he should sell himself to a stranger, then his lord is obliged to set him free at any moment when he himself or his nearest relative can pay the necessary sum of money; and in either case he receives his freedom in the year of jubilee. In this way the whole status of the Israelite slave is modified, for he is not really sold, but only rented for a period of from one to forty-nine years; on this account the amount of money to be paid back becomes less each year, until in the year of jubilee it entirely vanishes. If we now turn to the first part of the law for the year of jubilee, where the property relations are regulated, we find here two distinct cases. In case an Israelite is obliged to sell a field and no redeemer is present, the same specifications as for slaves are in force; the realty is not truly sold, but rented for from one to forty-nine years, and can be bought back from the buyer at any time, the price at which it can be bought back decreasing yearly, until the seller in the year of jubilee receives back his property gratis. An exceptional rule was in force regarding the houses in the walled cities (excepting the Levitical cities)

because here the right of buying back lasted only one year, and the houses in the year of jubilee were not restored to their former owners. Verse 25 deals with the case in which a redeemer is at hand. This is usually translated as follows: If thy brother is impoverished and sells some of his property, then shall his redeemer that is next to him come, *and shall redeem that which he has sold*—that is, the same conception that in the history of Ruth we have rejected as erroneous. In this case it would appear to be more firmly established because of the analogy of the laws regarding slaves in vs. 47 f. But nevertheless this is mere appearance. Verse 48 says expressly that the slave may be redeemed *after he has sold himself;* but this addition is lacking in vs. 25, where the consecutive perfect וּמָכַר can just as easily signify *if he must sell.* And that this is in fact the thought in this place is clear from the statement: "his redeemer shall come *to him*," while at the redemption he must go to him who had previously bought the property.[11] It should be noted further that the Go'el should *buy* the property, but not that he should restore it to the former owner, nor that he should give it back in the year of jubilee. Everything points to the result that the ge'ullâ here must be understood just as in the other passages, *i. e.*, the redeemer does not buy the realty in order to return it to the impoverished, but to hold it for the clan or for the community. It follows further that the specifications of this ge'ullâ are not coördinated with those of the year of jubilee, and that the author of this law had simply adopted the old ge'ullâ custom as it was, so that his regulation of the property relations for the year of jubilee was only in force when the redemption in the earlier sense had not taken place. In other words, there are found in the laws for the year of jubilee two different principles; the one has in mind the interest of the clan or village community (vs. 25), while the other is to protect the personal possessions of the individual. The specifications regarding slaves, on the other hand, concern only the interests of the individual. This inconsistency of the laws of

[11] The translation of the words וּבָא אֲלָיו in the translation of Kautzsch by: *er soll für ihn eintreten*, is arbitrary.

the year of jubilee is but a new proof of the meaning of the old redemption custom and of the tenacity with which they clung to it.[12]

After we have discovered in this manner numerous traces of the old economy of the community, there remains the question whether the sabbatical year of the Israelites can be considered as a remnant of these old conditions. Wellhausen holds this view.[13] According to his conception the release required in the older laws (Ex. 23:10 f.) does not refer to the land but only to the harvest, so that in this year it was plowed and sown, but the harvest belonged in common to the entire population, "a limitation of the private ownership of realty for the good of the whole community." He holds also that this period was reckoned separately, not only for the individual owners, but for the individual fields of the same owner. A decision in reference to this last point is very difficult, but the conception of the seventh year as an absolute terminus seems, to me at least, to be more probable than the conception of Wellhausen and many others. Finally, on the other hand, the supposition of Wellhausen and Hupfeld that the fields were tilled in the seventh year, yet the harvest belonged to all Israelites in common, may be correct. The chief thing in this law is doubtless the right of the penniless to share in the harvest; if the law pertained only to the voluntary growth of the soil, then the population would be poorly cared for, because it states that the remnant should fall to the animals. If we conceive of this law as Wellhausen does, it reminds us less of the customs of the village community already described than of the fact that the Israelites were not original inhabitants of their land, and that originally all the members of this immigrated people had the same claim to the use of the land, an equality which had gradually been lost, but was in this year to be temporarily restored. It remained for the priest

[12] That the law in Lev., chap. 25, is made up of different layers of older and later material is a fact recognized by many. *Cf., e. g.,* DRIVER, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament* (German ed.), p. 58 (Engl. ed., p. 53); BAENTSCH, *Das Heiligkeitsgesetz,* p. 53 f.

[13] *Prolegomena,* 1883, p. 122 f.

code to construct out of this ancient law a new one, according to which in the seventh year the ground shall not be tilled, so that the land may enjoy a Sabbath's rest. That the penniless and even the animals could enjoy gratis the voluntary growth of the soil acquires, when viewed as a remnant of the older law, a secondary meaning (Lev. 25:1–7).

# THE CONCEPTION OF THE FUTURE LIFE IN HOMER.

By ARTHUR FAIRBANKS,
Yale University.

A SUCCESSION of studies with reference to the epic idea of the soul and the future life has evinced the interest of scholars in this subject since the beginning of the century. The vivid picture in the *Odyssey* of the life of souls after death wrought its impress not only on Greek literature, not only on later epic writings; it has furnished the literary idea of what follows death for much of the world's thought. All study of Greek belief in the future world must begin with the epic, and the relation of later belief to the epic account is an all-important question for the student of Greek religion.

The facts themselves as to the epic idea of the soul are clear enough, though they have often been misstated. These facts have received two quite opposite interpretations. In the present paper it is my object to restate these facts very briefly, and after summarizing the arguments in favor of the interpretation I accept, to point out if possible the reason for the most important step in the process of development which this interpretation assumes.

## I.

The statement of the facts is by no means so simple as might appear at first sight, nor does the difficulty arise primarily from any question as to the analysis of the poems. In the two or three passages which deal specifically with the life of the souls in Hades, the representation of the soul seems radically different from the conception of it in the poems as a whole. Accordingly I propose to consider first the poems as a whole, in order to determine the ordinary epic treatment of this theme; and to defer till afterwards the discussion of such passages as the eleventh book of the *Odyssey*.

In the first place the epic, as Plato long ago remarked (*Polit.*, 386–387), laid great stress on the hatefulness of death. It is κακός (3[1]: 173), στυγερός (12: 341), ἔχθιστος (9: 159; 3: 454). For Achilles it is the symbol of what is most to be dreaded (9: 159), and his shade in Hades (11: 489–491) esteems the most menial position on earth superior to the position of a king in the world below. Death is fated and cannot be escaped, it is the one shadow on the glad round of life.

And when death does come, the bodies are burned, while the soul leaves the body and goes to Hades. In conventional expressions it flies out of the mouth (22: 467), the limbs (16: 856), or the wound (14: 518), and in a single instance (16: 856 = 22: 362) it is represented as mourning its departure from manhood and youth. This soul preserves the distinct form of the man (23: 66, 107), possibly the form in the moment of death, so that it is called an εἴδωλον, and is in a sense the continuing *self* of the man. It has no substance, for the body is dead and to be burned. The souls are but shadows (10: 495), ἀμενηνὰ κάρηνα (10: 521). The reality of life, all power of achievement, all joy is left behind, and once for all the soul is cut off from this world. Apart from the passages to be considered later there are one or two references to the souls as conscious, but the whole drift of the poem is to the effect that life is ended, the whole tendency is to treat the soul, what is sent to the house of Hades, as practically lifeless and so unconscious (23: 103). This tendency goes so far that the departure of the soul to Hades frequently means the man's death and nothing more (14: 425; 18: 91). In a similar way the *man* is said to go to Hades (9: 523), the θυμός goes to Hades (7: 131), and so do the ἴφθιμοι κεφαλαί (11: 55), though these last expressions would be manifestly absurd if meant to be taken literally.

This view is in distinct antithesis both to the superstitious fear of souls among savage peoples, and to the later Greek view that the soul is immortal and divine. All the soul-worship, the possession by spirits good and evil, the consultation of spirits,

[1] Figures in bold-faced type are numbers of books of the *Iliad;* those in ordinary-faced type, of books of the *Odyssey*.

and prophecy by inspiration, of later times, are distinctly at variance with this epic view.

It was wisely remarked by Grotemeyer[2] that Homer uses the word ψυχή only when the idea of death is present at least in the background; accordingly the inference commonly drawn that because the soul left the body at death therefore it was in the body as a most important member during life, is very questionable. The effort to assign the soul a definite place in Homeric psychology is more than questionable, for the very reason that no such place is assigned it in the epic itself. For Schrader's[3] assertion that according to the epic the soul is immortal, uniting in itself all the mental activities, I can find no evidence. In the epic it goes to Hades, it remains there while the man is remembered,—more than this the epic does not tell us. It has no psychical activity whatsoever, but when it leaves the body the man is dead and so no longer thinks and feels. And it seems to me that Erwin Rohde[4] is equally far astray in explaining the Homeric passages in the light of the savage belief that each man had two or more souls. The soul leaves the body at death and goes to Hades,—this is really all we find in the epic as a whole with reference to the soul, and beyond this the only question remaining is the question, How could such a conception of the soul have arisen?

In Book 23 of the *Iliad* the soul of Patroklos appears to Achilles in a dream. In its complete likeness to the living man, and its entire lack of substance it comes under the description of the soul just given. This passage differs from others in giving the soul full consciousness and the use of language. Appearing to Achilles in a dream it chides him for neglect, it prophesies his death, and prescribes the manner of burial Farther there is the statement, in lines 72–74, often regarded as an interpolation, that the soul desires immediate burial in order that the other souls may permit it to pass the river into Hades and find rest there. After the body is burned, the soul

[2] *Homer's Grundansicht von der Seele.* Progr. d. Lehranstalt zu Warendorf, 1853–4.

[3] In *Neue Jahrbücher f. Philol. u. Paed.*, 1885, p. 148.

[4] *Psyche*, pp. 5–8.

can never come back to appear in dreams. It is not strange that Achilles refers to this experience in wonder, because it is so different from the idea of the soul in the rest of the *Iliad*. That the poet should represent the dream-image of a dead friend as appearing to the sleeping friend seems to us natural enough. But the prophecy of Achilles' death, the prescription of the method of burial, and the fact that such appearances of the soul are finally ended by the burning of the body,—these are not so easily explained as pure creations of the poet's imagination.

It is only in Books 11 and 24 of the *Odyssey* that we have any distinct picture of the life of souls in Hades. In the account of Odysseus' interview with Teiresias and with his mother the souls are represented as *shades*, preserving the likeness of the man (the likeness of the man in the moment of death, according to the writer of 11:38–43) but without substance. These shades come and go in troops; they are entirely unconscious, except that they are attracted by blood, and by drinking blood they temporarily regain life and consciousness. The verbs πετάννυμι, *fly*, τρίζω, *chirp*, are applied respectively to their motion and to the sounds they make. The nature of the soul is brought out more clearly by contrast with Teiresias. He is called a soul, he lives in Hades and shares the longing for blood; but he retains full consciousness and possesses the gift of prophecy, and apparently his consciousness is associated with a degree of real physical life. The scenery and surroundings of the interview with Teiresias stand in sharp contrast with the ordinary epic reticence in regard to the dead. In this passage all the souls differ from the epic idea of the soul in that they are attracted by blood, can drink blood, and thus temporarily regain life and consciousness; the description of their motion and their proper voice is added; and, in particular, a man still living gains access to the souls and has dealings with them. The last might be a poet's dream,—the method of evoking the dead, and the more complete description of their character as real beings can hardly have been pure invention.

The account of Odysseus' interview with the heroes of the Trojan war (11:385–562) presupposes a somewhat different

idea of the state of the dead, and this idea is more fully expanded in 24 : 1–202, with which it stands in close connection. Here the dead are represented as fully conscious, living on in the true sense of the word, though this life has not the substance or the satisfaction of the life on the earth. Agamemnon cannot have the joy of embracing Odysseus, but (omitting verse 11 : 390 as an interpolation) he recognizes him immediately. Agamemnon is accompanied by those who died at the same time, and Achilles comes with other heroes of the Trojan war. Here the souls are not only conscious, but apparently they also have a limited prophetic vision. They inform Odysseus about the state of affairs in Ithaka, both at the time of his visit to them and at the time of his return, although they do not know about their own sons. Achilles is still a king in Hades, little as may be his satisfaction in it, and Aias is still controlled by the hatred of Odysseus which caused his death. In Book 24 this picture of another world is drawn with greater clearness and detail, and finally, in the last section of Book 11, one of the very latest parts of the *Odyssey*, the scenery of the lower world and the sufferings of some evildoers there are pictured with great detail and vividness.

These accounts of a more genuine future life only serve to emphasize the fact that in the epic as a whole a rather skeptical view of the future life prevails. The conception of the soul as a semi-living self, fully conscious and even endowed with prophetic vision, living in a distinct world which is the counterpart of this world, stands in sharp contrast with the conception of it as the mere shadow of the self that is dead.

## II.

The presence in the epic of these two conceptions of the future life has suggested two quite opposite interpretations. On the one hand we find the view most fully set forth by E. Kammer[5] that the Homeric underworld is pure creation of the poet's

[5] *Die Einheit der Odysee*, 1874; *Cf.* NAEGELSBACH-AUTENRIETH, *Homerische Theologie*[3], 1884, and IWANOWITZSCH, *Opiniones Homeri et tragicorum Græcorum de inferis*. Berlin, 1895.

fancy, that we can see into the epic workshop and trace the fashioning of it; and on the other hand the view that these epic conceptions are based on actual ideas of the people, so that the poet found in *Volkssage* the materials for his picture.

Briefly stated the view of Kammer is as follows: The poet uses the phrase, "to go to the house of Hades," as a euphemistic expression for death, and only gradually do the conceptions of the house and of the god take shape in the poet's fancy. Such expressions as **14**: 457, "the spear that slew him will serve as a staff in Hades," and **16**: 857, where the soul is represented as mourning its departure from this world, show how this fancy works; and at length we find the wonderful thought of Achilles, that friendship breaks the bonds of death. At length the idea of the soul has developed into personality. Such a place as the land of souls is just the place for Odysseus to visit in his wanderings. This poetic vision of the future world, with its striking pictures of the life of the souls, marks the height of poetic power in this direction. The poet removes his magic touch, and Hades disappears.

Fascinating as this view proves in the presentation of Kammer, and widely as it has been accepted in the handbooks, we can hardly believe that a series of epic poets, not to say one Homer, should have had the poetic daring to construct out of pure fancy a world to follow death, nor does it seem to me credible that all the Greek belief in the future life should have been due to epic influence alone. The proof that this position is false is threefold: (1) There is reason to think that the Greeks were not without this belief before the epic; (2) it offers no satisfactory explanation for many details, as for example the rite for evoking souls (10: 516–540; 11: 24–50), and (3) it is based on a false idea of the way in which the poet creates his epic world.

In startling contrast with the view presented by Kammer are the words of a brilliant English essayist:[6] "The eleventh book of the *Odyssey* is steeped in the animism of barbarous peoples. . . . . The Cimmerian entrance to the world of souls, . . . .

[6] W. H. H. MYERS, *Classical Essays*, p. 11.

the cheeping and twittering of Homer's ghosts, the revival of ghosts with blood . . . . speak of the time when the soul is conceived as feeding on the fumes and shadows of earthly food, as when the Chinese beat the drum which summons the ancestral souls to supper, and provide a pail of gruel and a spoon for the greater convenience of any ancestor who may unfortunately have been deprived of his head." The interpretation of the Homeric picture of the future world in terms of popular belief was first attempted in Germany by the ethnologist Lippert, and recently the topic has been worked out with careful criticism and brilliant combination by Erwin Rohde.[7]

This view starts with the now well-grounded fact that before the rise of the epic, and in some parts of Greece simultaneously with the rise of the epic, there existed a developed worship of the dead as supernatural beings. The abundant traces of sacrifices at burial and after burial which have been found in the tombs of the Mycenean period give conclusive evidence that such worship was an established practice in this pre-Homeric civilization. Again, working back from historic times we get some clue to the age of many Thessalian cults from the existence of affiliated cults in southern Greece which probably were established at the time of the great migrations from the north. A few, at least, of these cults are cults of chthonic deities, *i. e.*, deities associated with the lower world and with the dead. The worship of such gods can only arise in connection with the belief in a life after death, and a worship of souls of the dead. Finally the Hesiodic account of the five ages of the human race, as analyzed by Rohde, shows, first, that there existed in northern Greece a worship of ancestors, and, secondly, that the poet felt it necessary to reconcile this worship of ancestors with the epic view of the future life.

The position thus reached is confirmed by the analogy of other races. Savage races all but invariably worship spirits of the dead, so that many students have attempted to derive all religion from this one root. In the older civilizations of the world, in Egypt, in India, and in China, there existed a vivid

[7] *Psyche: Seelencult und Unsterblichkeitsglaube der Griechen.* Leipzig, 1894.

belief in the future life and a worship of souls. Nor have we any reason to doubt that such a belief and worship existed in early Greece when we examine the fuller records of Greek civilization in the historic period. The fact that the epic stands out of line with one phase of popular belief as to souls in Greece need not surprise us any more than the contrast between the pan-Hellenic gods of the epic and the particular gods of local worship.

If we may assume that there was a more vivid belief in a real future life and a true worship of the dead before the epic, many difficulties in the interpretation of the epic disappear. What before was inconsistency is now understood to be the survival of some bit of earlier belief or practice. The picture of the lower world in the *Odyssey*, Books 11 and 23, remains a poetic picture, but it is found to be constructed out of elements by no means unfamiliar to popular thought. The very fact that the epic could develop the picture of an organized lower world under the rule of Hades and dread Persephone shows that the theme is not an absolutely new one. As Rohde[8] has so well shown, the rites of incantation for consulting the dead which are described in *Odyssey*, Books 10 and 11, cannot be pure invention; they can only be understood as survivals of some local practice which has been generalized for the poet's use. So, too, the rites of burial that are so fully described in *Iliad*, Book 23, are based on popular practice; and the elaborate sacrifices of cattle and spirited horses and of dogs who ate at the table of the man that was dead, in particular the sacrifice of twelve Trojan youths to be burned with the dead body, can only have originated when the dead man's soul was thought to derive some real and important benefit from them.

The very fact that the dead must be carefully disposed of suggests a different view of the soul from that which is put forward in the epic. Peoples who believe in the superhuman power of the soul seek to provide the souls of their dead with all that they need in order that they may be disposed to benefit the survivors rather than injure them. But primitive men often

[8] *Psyche*, pp. 14–22; 51–54.

devised a more effective way than this; quite commonly the body was burned, and with it all the man's possessions, in order to destroy every "standing-ground" for the soul in this world. According to the epic this last result is attained by burning the body, even if the practice was not introduced with this single purpose in view. The soul of the dead has no real existence for the epic poet,—but it must be carefully sent to Hades whence it can never return![9]

Another example of such survival, difficult to explain except on the assumption of an early belief in the supernatural character of the soul, is found in the prophecy at the moment of death, **16**: 851 and **22**: 358. Certainly the latter is a case of distinct vision into the future, vision such as belongs to the gods. It is clear enough, however, if we admit that in the *Odyssey*, Book 11, not only Teiresias, but also the heroes of the Trojan war, have the gift of prophecy; Patroklos (**23**: 80) foretells the future, and the words of Elpenor (11: 69 ff.) seem to me to be more than a mere conjecture of Odysseus' future course. Evidently the poet counted on an audience which understood the old prophetic power of souls.

To mention but one more instance, it is generally agreed that the κῆρες, the "fates of men," and the ἐρινύες, who avenge wrongs against strangers (17: 475), who enforce the rights of the firstborn (**15**: 204), and who fulfill curses against those that disregard family duties (**9**: 571, and 454), are spirits "from Erebos." Now spirits of the deep, if not themselves spirits of the dead, are at least spirits of the same type as souls, and the invoking of such spirits suggests an earlier belief in the potency of the soul after death very different from the common epic belief. It is difficult to overlook the parallel of races now practicing ancestor-worship, among whom the spirits invoked in behalf of family rights and duties are the souls of blood-relations. None of the explanations commonly offered for the oath of the gods by the Styx, that "greatest and most terrible oath

[9] Such an expression as 7: 409–410, "To propitiate the dead by fire," shows traces of the earlier view of the supernatural nature of the soul; and **22**: 358; 11: 73, where burial is considered necessary lest neglect of the soul be "an occasion of divine wrath," may be interpreted in the same way.

of the blessed gods," are entirely satisfactory. Hesiod alludes to the partial, temporary death of a divine perjurer, but in Homer there is no suggestion of such a punishment either for gods or men. The true explanation for Homer, I believe, lies in the fact that it is regularly the spirits of the lower world, the Erinyes (9: 454, 571; 19: 260) or the rulers of the lower world (9: 457, 569; 3: 279), who avenge a broken oath. From the proper epic point of view this punishment is once attributed to Zeus (4: 161). The oath is an institution which lies at the very basis of society, and the enforcement of it, as of other such social institutions, is most frequently attributed to spirits of the lower world. This belief awakens no surprise when we find that universally the worship of the dead has been a most important factor in enforcing the social institutions of the tribe that practiced such worship. The oath of gods by the Styx is the outcome of the same belief projected into the world of the gods.[10]

The utility of this hypothesis proves to be an added argument in its favor. We find traces of an early belief in the supernatural character of the soul which is quite opposed to the proper epic treatment of what follows death, and these traces can only be explained satisfactorily as survivals. The poems themselves, then, afford abundant evidence of the belief which they displaced.

## III.

The theory as it has thus been presented is incomplete at one point. If it is possible to point out the reason why the epic ignores the earlier belief in a real future existence of the soul, and to point out the source of the epic view, the position will be materially strengthened.

The influence which seems to me most potent in overthrowing the worship of souls as supernatural beings can best be illustrated by a brief survey of a parallel development of thought

[10] Many other points in the epic treatment of the gods can only be explained in the same manner, viz., as the projection of human belief and human practice into the world of the gods. I need only instance the relations of the gods to μοῖρα, *fate*, the use of a balance to ascertain the future which is so poetically described 8: 69 ff.; 22: 209 ff., and the marital relations of Zeus and Hera.

in the early history of the Hebrews.[11] Here also we find a literary account of the soul as practically non-existent after death; Job 7:8, "The eye of him that seeth me shall behold me no more; thine eyes shall seek me but I shall not be" (*cf.* Job 7:9–10; 14:10–12 and 14). The dead are spoken of as *rephaim*, powerless; Isa. 14:10, "Art thou also become *weak* as we are?" They do not remember God (Ps. 6:5), nor do they know what happens to their own families (Job 14:21). They are wholly cut off from God (Ps. 88:5, 10–12; 115:17; Isa. 38:18). Silence is another name for death (Ps. 31:17; 94:17; 115:17). So also we find a literary conception of Sheol, the abode of souls. It lies in the depths of the earth (Ps. 63:9). Its gates open to receive the newcomer (Isa. 38:10), but it is closed by bars (Job 17:16). Newcomers are greeted (Isa. 14:9; Ezek. 31:16–17), but this is the only reference to any life or activity among the dead. Sheol is an imaginative picture of what follows death, constructed out of elements existing in the popular belief.

The reality of the belief of the Jehovah worshiper that death ends all is attested by the early type of theodicy. Jehovah rewards his followers in this life for their uprightness: "He shall be like a tree planted by the streams of water, That bringeth forth his fruit in his season, Whose leaf also doth not wither; And whatsoever he doeth shall prosper." Ps. 32:10, "Many sorrows shall be to the wicked; But he that trusteth in the Lord, mercy shall compass him about." The iniquity of the fathers is visited on the children, not on the soul in Sheol, for Jehovah is the God who rules in this world. At the same time the religious man extends the power of Jehovah to include Sheol. God's anger shall pursue men down to lowest Sheol (Deut. 32:22; Job 26:5, 6; *cf.* Isa. 66:24; Ps. 139:8); and the shade rejoices in God's justification of him (Job 19; 25 as interpreted by Stade).

[11] The discussion is based on B. STADE, *Die alttestamentlichen Vorstellungen vom Zustande nach dem Tode*, Leipzig, 1877; and F. SCHWALLY, *Das Leben nach dem Tode nach den Vorstellungen des alten Israel*, u. s. w., Giessen, 1892. *Cf.* also the careful discussion by PROFESSOR G. F. MOORE, *Andover Review*, II, pp. 433–455, with note on the literature, pp. 516–518. DR. SALMOND'S treatment of this theme (*Christian Doctrine of Immortality*, pp. 159–281) is quite defective.

Worked in with the Jahvistic account of the future life are to be found survivals from an earlier belief in a real future life. That such a belief existed is evident from the burial customs of the Hebrews. The sackcloth about the loins, or even the entire absence of clothing, the veiled head, and the use of ashes which marked the mourner, have been explained as mere forms of grief; probably these, as well as the systematic ritual lamentations for the dead (Zech. 12:10–14), originated in an earlier worship of souls. The lamp for the dead (1 Kings 11:36, and elsewhere) is no doubt the survival of a rite of worship. Sacrifices for the dead (2 Chron. 16:14), gifts of food to the dead (Deut. 26:14), and sacrificial feasts for the dead (Jer. 16:5–7) are really rites of worship for the dead. There is abundant evidence that the worship of souls continued in spite of the worship of Jehovah, and was even tolerated by the representatives of the higher religion. Some forms of the worship of the dead are forbidden, and the very prohibition is proof that they existed. Excessive lamentation is forbidden, possibly because it was regarded as a form of worship (Ezek. 24:17, 23); sacrifices for the dead are referred to as forbidden (Ps. 106:28). To "round the corners of the head," to "mar the corners of the beard," to "make cuttings in one's flesh for the dead" and to "print any marks upon oneself"—all are forbidden as idolatrous practices (Lev. 19:27, 28; Deut. 14:1). Finally, certain practices at the grave and in subterranean vaults, which are condemned as abominations (Isa. 65:4; Ezek. 8:8 ff.), may have to do with some worship of the dead.

The particular form of their belief in souls appears more clearly in a series of passages commanding that the man who has a "returning spirit" (Isa. 19:3) be put to death (Lev. 20:6, 27, the spirit in the wizard; Deut. 18:11, the wizard the consulter of spirits). In 1 Sam., chap. 28, we have a full description of such a scene of incantation where the soul is brought up and consulted about the future. Saul seeks a woman that hath a familiar spirit that he may visit her and inquire of her. He bids her divine unto him by her familiar spirit, and bring up him whom Saul names. After being assured of her safety the woman

evokes a spirit whom she recognizes as Samuel. Saul does not see the spirit, but converses with it and learns his fate. This is the voice of the soul which Isaiah describes as chirping out of the ground (Isa. 29:4). The prevalence of the practice is attested by Isa. 8:19 (however that passage be interpreted), and by the reference in 2 Kings 21:6 to the official appointment of those that had "returning spirits" at Jerusalem by Manasseh. These passages make it evident that it was common to seek to learn the future by consulting the spirits of the dead; and that these spirits were sometimes thought of as in the necromancer, sometimes as subject to his bidding.

The development of Hebrew belief in the future life, then, is as follows: In the earliest period there was a general belief in the supernatural character of the soul after death, and worship of the souls of the dead was an important factor in religion. The religion of Jehovah is in principle directly opposed to this belief and this practice. It would turn the attention from the realm of the dead to this present world in which Jehovah is God. Spirits good and evil are made subject to Jehovah, and their worship is vigorously fought. The spirits of the dead, those most important spirits for the religious life, have no real existence from the theoretical standpoint of Jehovahism. The religion of Jehovah is unable to crush at once all that pertains to this lower worship which was held so sacred (rites of worship of souls are not forbidden, Deut. 26:14; Jer. 16:5–7), but the logical result of belief in Jehovah is that the spirits of the dead are mere shades, that Sheol is but another name for death. This correct inference is drawn by prophet and priest alike, so that it becomes the distinctly Old Testament view. The old religion of which worship of the dead constituted an important part is overthrown by the new religion, and life after death is represented as a shadowy, silent, sad existence in Sheol. The rewards of the righteous are in this world (long life, fruitful land, riches, victory over enemies, many children), while the wicked may expect a life of unhappiness ending with a premature violent death. The religious hope of the future was not a hope for individual immortality, but rather a hope that the nation would be saved when God

the Messiah appeared and claimed the nation as his own inheritance. It was a national, not an individual, hope.

For my present purpose it is unnecessary to trace the development of the new idea of individuality in Israel, and along with this the idea of an individual immortal life in the presence of God. The particular form of the new hope may have been determined largely by foreign influences, but the belief itself was the normal development of that same religious consciousness which seems to have been the most potent factor in *destroying* the early belief in the reality of the future life,—the worship of Jehovah supplanted the worship of souls, but it gave rise to a new hope of life after death in Jehovah's presence. The early belief in souls was a religious belief, it was set aside before a higher and truer religious faith, it was born anew in a higher form of the same religious consciousness which lies at the root of the whole process of development.

If now we compare the development of Hebrew belief in the future with the development of the corresponding Greek belief, the likeness is very striking. Among the Hebrews we have found (1) belief in the supernatural character of the soul, (2) this belief is gradually thrown into the background before a higher type of religion, and (3) at length there arises a new belief in the future which is in harmony with the higher religion. In Greece also the old belief in the soul as a supernatural being is reduced to the barest belief in a future life of the shades by the development of the greater gods in the heroic world of the epic; and later a genuine belief in a future life is revived by the rise of a deeper religious spirit in connection with the worship of some of the greater gods.

The question is forced upon the student of Homer, why a real worship of the dead has been supplanted by a belief in shades that have no true life. Rohde—in the book which must serve as the basis for all study of Greek belief in the future—gives two reasons which in part account for this change. He points out[12] the fact that the epic took shape among the Ionians of

[12] *Psyche*, pp. 38–39.

Asia Minor, a people who had left their homes in Greece proper. The result of this migration was to cut them off from the old localities of worship. Some of the most important cults were doubtless brought with them from their former home, but so distinctly local a worship as the worship of ancestors at their graves must have been left behind. It is a universal rule that worship is the root of belief, and that when worship ceases belief rapidly wanes; so in this instance belief in the supernatural character of the soul soon ceases when souls of ancestors are no longer worshiped.

Rohde points out[13] once more that different ideas of the soul are favored by different types of burial. When the body is buried in the ground the soul has a point of contact with the world of the survivors; at this point he may return to help or to injure; at this point, therefore, his needs must be met and help may be gained from him. When the body is burned the hold of the soul on this world is destroyed, and the belief naturally arises that it cannot return hither. The dead still require careful burial; but after that none need to fear them, none dare to hope for help from them. Cremation may have been practiced by the Ionians in Greece proper; it may have been adopted from the peoples they found in Asia Minor; it may have been due, as Rohde suggests, to the unsettled character of the first colonies there; in any case, it favored the epic idea of the future life.

Plausible as these reasons may seem, I cannot see that they account satisfactorily for so radical a change. Cremation does not necessarily cut off the soul from this world. Migration is a great solvent of religious belief; the whole epic treatment of religion would hardly be possible unless the ties with local worship had been cut; yet its negative influence would be quite as likely to destroy belief in the gods generally as to destroy a really active belief in the supernatural character of the soul.

The true reason for the momentous change under consideration is only to be found in the general process of religious development of which it forms a part. The work of the epic

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 26–29.

movement in developing pan-Hellenic gods was not unrecognized in Greece; it has only been obscured to later students by the very success of the epic in making national gods.

Arising among a people (in Asia Minor) for whom the ties of local worship were materially weakened by migration; developed by the bard of the banquet room and the market place, but kept on a relatively high plane by the fine taste of the audience whose favor was sought; giving free scope to the poet's imagination, but never losing contact with actual life — it was only such an epic which could create the gods of a great people by giving birth to its long-developing religious ideals. The influence of the epic on religious belief and worship was to turn attention from the local form of a god to the pan-Hellenic god whose favorite home was in that locality, from the Cyprian Aphrodite to the Aphrodite who returns to her sacred precinct and fragrant altar at Paphos. It was part of the religious movement occasioned by the epic when at length many local gods were merged in Olympic deities, as Trophonios became Zeus Trophonios, Pæan became a name for Apollo, and Despoina was identified now with Demeter, now with Persephone. A host of lesser spirits and of gods worshiped in less known localities are neglected entirely by the epic, or appear only as attendants of the gods. In the epic world man is freed entirely from the anxiety of superstition; his life is in the hands of a few great gods enough like himself so that he knows how to win their favor.

The epic is no sacred book, but a purely literary product. At the same time it marks a process of religious development of utmost significance for later Greece. What part did the belief in the soul have in this process of development? Clearly the spirits of the dead, like all lesser spirits, are neglected and thrown into the background by the religion of the epic (if I may use this phrase to denote the religious movement in connection with which the epic arose). The souls once worshiped as supernatural lose all their life and reality before the great gods of Olympos. Anxious dread of harm from souls neglected disappears; curious effort to learn the future from the dead, who

have wider vision, appears but in the one instance where epic love for marvelous wanderings leads the poet outside the pale of epic belief; looking forward to what follows death with mingled fear and awe is replaced by joy in the present, that abruptly ends with death. I maintain that for the Homeric Greek, as for the Hebrew under the Mosaic dispensation, it was the influence of a dawning belief in a higher type of gods which made the soul fade into a shadow; which checked the worship of souls until only a reminiscence remained in certain funeral rites; which set aside any real belief in a future life until men formed a hope for the future which was in line with the higher plane of religion. I would carefully restrict the comparison to the one general point, viz., the influence of the higher religion on the worship of souls. The epic poet bears no resemblance to the Hebrew preacher of righteousness; the world-wide difference between the spiritual character of the higher Hebrew religion and the epic view of the Olympic gods explains why the changes in the idea of the future are so much more clearly marked in Palestine than they are in Greece. Yet for the Greek as for the Hebrew the earlier belief in the soul and the early worship of souls were an expression of the religious instinct; for the Greek in like manner this belief and worship was in a measure set aside by the higher gods of a new phase of religion; and, finally, belief in a real future life was revived on a higher plane in connection with the more spiritual worship of Dionysos and Demeter.

# CRITICAL NOTES.

## THE SO-CALLED AGRAPHA.

To KNOW a little more of the life of Christ, whether of his works or words, than the tradition embodied in the gospels tells has from early times been the eager desire of men. Apocryphal books almost without number have one after another held the attention of great numbers of Christians, only to be recognized in the end as disappointing fictions. One line of serious investigation, however, has been followed persistently and hopefully — the search for scattered sayings of the Lord preserved outside of the canonical gospels, the so-called Agrapha. One of these is familar to all, the word quoted in Paul's speech at Miletus, Acts 20 : 35, and was early noticed. That the writings of the Fathers contain others which may have claims to genuineness was also seen centuries ago, and the great patristic editors of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries collected in their notes much valuable material bearing on the subject. Collections of the sayings themselves were also made, and under various names (among which that of "Agrapha" seems first to occur in 1776) have been current ever since Grabe published in 1698 in his *Spicilegium* eleven *Dicta Jesu Christi quæ in IV. Evangeliis non extant.* Of recent collections of the more important Agrapha, R. Hofmann's, in his *Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, Westcott's, in his *Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, and Schaff's, in the first volume of his *History of the Christian Church*, are easily accessible and convenient examples. These and similar collections have generally contained from twenty to thirty sayings, and have been largely dependent on the lists of Grabe and Fabricius.

It has long been clear that such collections as these and such special investigations of Agrapha as are to be found in Hilgenfeld's *Novum Testamentum extra canonem receptum*, Nicholson's *The Gospel according to the Hebrews*, and Zahn's *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons* had only prepared the way for an exhaustive collection and investigation of the material relating to the subject. This was undertaken by Dr. Alfred Resch, in his *Agrapha : Aussercanonische Evangelienfragmente in möglichster Vollständigkeit zusammengestellt und quellenkritisch*

*untersucht*, published in 1889 in volume V of von Gebhardt and Harnack's *Texte und Untersuchungen*. Resch has carried on this and similar researches in the interest of his theory of the origin of the synoptic gospels. He holds to an original Hebrew (not Aramaic) gospel, consisting chiefly of a report of sayings of Jesus, written by the apostle Matthew, which all three synoptic evangelists largely used, each making his own translation, and which was also used by Paul and the other New Testament writers. Through this solution of the synoptic problem he has been led on to the view that the differences from the ordinary text of the gospels exhibited by patristic references to the life and sayings of our Lord are to be explained by the same original Hebrew gospel, which, though never mentioned, yet persisted into late times, and was consulted and valued by ecclesiastical writers down to the fifth century, if not later.

This theory naturally sharpened Resch's eye greatly for what would be after all the only convincing proof that he could offer for his theory, namely, passages quoted by the New Testament writers or the Fathers, but not found in the canonical gospels and naturally to be ascribed to this Hebrew gospel. The peculiarities of patristic quotations of well-known sayings can be accounted for, as he himself saw, by the assumption of variations in the text of our gospels or of inexact quotation, but the existence of a considerable number of sayings of Jesus not drawn from the gospels might be a strong argument for the source which Resch believes in. This argument would be strengthened if it could be made plausible that various passages in the New Testament epistles also are really dependent on sayings of Jesus which have been preserved outside of the canonical gospels.

With this purpose Resch made a collection of Agrapha which entirely supersedes in completeness all previous lists. He has used diligently and exhaustively the work of his predecessors and made wide researches on his own account. All the cases that could be found in which the saying in question had been quoted by any ancient writer have been put together, with full text and references, and in each case a parallel has been supplied from the New Testament, intended to show that either Luke or the writer of one of the epistles was acquainted with the saying in its Hebrew form. Elaborate critical discussions are appended, and it is everywhere pointed out with great ingenuity how the theory of a Hebrew original explains the divergent forms in which the saying appears. In all seventy-five Agrapha are collected, which Resch believes probably to have come from this

Hebrew primitive gospel, and to be the genuine words of the Lord. As an appendix he gives a large collection of "Apokrypha," being sayings ascribed to Jesus or notices of his life which he holds not to have historical value, together with a number of sayings ascribed to the apostles. Among these "Apokrypha" figure prominently the quotations of Clement, Origen, Eusebius and Jerome from the gospel according to the Hebrews, which Resch believes to have been a work of no independent significance. Apart from the gospel according to the Hebrews and the gospel according to the Egyptians, Resch very properly neglects in his investigation the apocryphal gospels.

In completeness Resch left little to be desired. Two passages from the Talmud can be added to his collection. Seven sayings from the gnostic book *Pistis Sophia* perhaps deserve to be included in the list of "Apokrypha," twelve passages from the New Testament or from New Testament MSS. ought to be counted in, and a few other single Agrapha have been pointed out, but it is unlikely that later gleaners in the field will find much to add. What is needed is rigorous criticism of the material now in hand, for in this respect Resch's work has been generally found highly unsatisfactory. The defects of his method are several. He has failed to take into account the great number of possible explanations in cases where he tries the perilous method of explaining variation by a retranslation of both forms of the saying into Hebrew, and his use of Hebrew itself in such cases has been declared by a competent critic[1] to be marked by insufficient scholarship. In this matter, and in his argument in general, what he has to say often becomes plausible only if one has already accepted the theory of a primitive Hebrew gospel, called (what is almost inconceivable) ἡ γραφή by Paul, and used abundantly but left punctiliously unmentioned by the Fathers. But this theory rests largely on Resch's results in this very investigation of the Agrapha; and it is itself from the start so obviously loaded down with improbabilities that to assume it as the basis of the investigation is a glaring *petitio principii*. In many cases the saying in question is not stated by the patristic writer to be from the Lord, and owes its admission to the list of Agrapha solely to the fact that not having been traced elsewhere it commends itself to Resch as appropriate to his assumed Hebrew gospel. But a perhaps even more important defect of method is the total absence of criticism in respect to the relations of the sources. Apart from some mere blunders, in

[1] A. Rahlfs in W. Bousset's review of Resch, *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1893, col. 377 f.

which a passage from a patristic writer is found quoted, in a catena for instance, and made to do duty over again, Resch has generally neglected to ask whether the writers on whose testimony reliance is placed had ever read the works of their predecessors. Thus a more or less closely related series of Fathers, running from Clement of Alexandria through Origen, Dionysius of Alexandria, Pamphilus, Basil, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, Jerome, Cyril of Alexandria, may be presented as if they offered independent witness to the existence of a Hebrew gospel from which each had separately derived the Agraphon in question. Resch's witnesses are often reduced from a large number to one or two, when the question of their probable dependence on one another is fairly examined. Resch's thesaurus, then, simply provides the means, if supplemented by some few additions that can be made, for drawing up a list of those Agrapha which can present some claim to be deemed genuine sayings of the Lord.

## I.

1. From all the material that has been gathered, that part must first be excluded in which the writer who quotes the alleged Agraphon has not affirmed it to be a saying of Christ. These constitute in themselves a little more than half of the Logia held by Resch to be probably genuine.

*a*) In some cases close examination shows that the writer was not giving a quotation at all, but was merely paraphrasing, in homiletical fashion, the thought of Jesus. One of the best examples here is furnished by Resch's Logion 6.

Hippolytus (?), *Demonstratio adv. Judaeos*, VII:

*ὅθεν λέγει· γενηθήτω, ὦ πάτερ, ὁ ναὸς αὐτῶν ἠρημωμένος.*

Whence he says: "Let their temple, Father, be desolate."

This occurs in the course of an exposition of Psalm 69:19–28, and although the subject of λέγει is undoubtedly Christ, the context shows that the apparent quotation is meant merely as an explanatory paraphrase of verse 25 of the psalm.

*b*) In addition to these a large number of cases are found in which ecclesiastical writers make quotations, as if from the Scriptures, the source of which has not been found. Some of these untraced quotations are in the New Testament itself (for instance, Eph. 5:14; James 4:5). These have, whenever possible, been seized upon by Resch as fragments of his lost Hebrew gospel. It is plain

that they can be regarded as such only after the existence of such a gospel has been proved. In most, if not all, cases there is no reason whatever to suppose that the words of the Lord are here quoted. One example of the many which might be adduced is the following:[2]

Clemens Alex., *Strom.*, I, 8, 41:

*οὗτοι οἱ τὰ κατάρτια κατασπῶντες καὶ μηθὲν ὑφαίνοντες, φησὶν ἡ γραφή.*

"These are they who ply their looms and weave nothing," saith the Scripture.

The fact that the source of this is unknown, and that it is not inconceivable in the mouth of Jesus, is surely no sufficient reason for ascribing it to him.

2. Among the sayings also which are actually quoted by ancient writers as from the Lord, a few can be at once excluded, because they are plainly merely parallel, or at most expanded and inferior, forms of genuine sayings found in our gospels. These may often have stood in their uncanonical form in some apocryphal gospel.

For instance:[3]

*Clem. Hom.*, XII, 29:

*ὁ τῆς ἀληθείας προφήτης ἔφη· τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ, μακάριος δέ, φησί, δι' οὗ ἔρχεται· ὁμοίως· καὶ τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν, οὐαὶ δὲ δι' οὗ ἔρχεται.*

The prophet of truth said: "Good things must come, but blessed," saith he, "is he through whom they come;" in like manner "it must needs be also that evils come, but woe to him through whom they come."

The pointlessness of the uncanonical addition, which is found also in Aphraates, betrays it here as secondary to the canonical saying, Matt. 18:7, Luke 17:1.

3. Another small group consists of cases in which a saying from some other source, usually from some part of the Bible, is wrongly ascribed to the Lord. That in all early Christian literature eleven such mistakes should be known is not surprising. The following example, not given by Resch, illustrates sufficiently the group:

Proverbs 15:1:

*ὀργὴ ἀπόλλυσιν καὶ φρονίμους.*

*Didascalia Apostolorum syriaca* (p. 11, l. 12):

*ὅτι λέγει κύριος· ὀργὴ καὶ φρονίμους ἀπόλλυσιν.*

For the Lord saith: "Wrath destroyeth even wise men."

[2] Resch, Logion 38. [3] Resch, Logion 13.

The *Apostolic Constitutions* has in the corresponding place (II, 3) σοφία instead of κύριος. Perhaps the error is due to the Syriac translator or scribe.

II.

When these various classes of Agrapha wrongly so-called have been excluded, there remains a large number of sayings, including most of those commonly gathered into the incomplete lists, which purport to be words of the Lord and of which the probable genuineness must be considered in each case by itself. In every one the final judgment will rest on the answer to two questions: *first*, is it reasonable to suppose that trustworthy tradition on this matter should have reached the writer who makes the saying known to us? and, *secondly*, is the saying conceivable in the mouth of Jesus as known to us in the gospels? In the answer to both these questions a considerable subjective element must necessarily enter, and in individual cases there will doubtless always remain differences of judgment. The matter is complicated by the possibility often present that a saying in its transmitted form clearly apocryphal may yet have a kernel of genuineness. I believe, however, that in all but a few cases the evidence is clear, in most of these plainly to the disadvantage of the Agraphon.

A

It may be well first to collect here a few of the more interesting Agrapha which seem plainly not to be genuine words of the Lord.

Clem. Alex., *Strom.*, V, 10, 64:[4]

λέγει γὰρ ὁ προφήτης· παραβολὴν κυρίου τίς νοήσει εἰ μὴ σοφὸς καὶ ἐπιστήμων καὶ ἀγαπῶν τὸν κύριον αὐτοῦ; ἐπὶ ὀλίγων ἐστὶ ταῦτα χωρῆσαι. οὐ γὰρ φθονῶν, φησί, παρήγγειλεν ὁ κύριος ἔν τινι εὐαγγελίῳ· μυστήριον ἐμὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς τοῦ οἴκου μου.

For the prophet saith: Who shall know the parable of the Lord except the wise and understanding and that loveth his Lord? It belongeth to a few only to receive these things. For not grudgingly, he saith, did the Lord declare in a certain gospel: "My mystery is for me and for the sons of my house."

This saying seems to have been taken up by some apocryphal gospel from Isaiah 24:16, where it is found in the translations of Theodotion and Symmachus.

[4] Resch, Logion 17.

Origen, *In Joann.*, Tom. II, 6:[5]

*ἐὰν δὲ προσίεταί τις τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον, ἔνθα αὐτὸς ὁ σωτὴρ φησιν. ἄρτι ἔλαβέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἐν μιᾷ τῶν τριχῶν μου καὶ ἀπήνεγκέ με εἰς τὸ ὄρος τὸ μέγα Θαβώρ.*

And if anyone goes to the gospel according to the Hebrews, there the Saviour himself saith: "Just now my mother the Holy Spirit took me by one of my hairs and carried me off to the great mountain Tabor."

Jerome, *De viris illustribus*, II:[6]

Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebræos et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatum est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis ivit ad Jacobum et apparuit ei. Iuraverat enim Jacobus se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini (*v. l.* Dominus), donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus.

Rursusque post paululum: Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque additur: Tulit panem et benedixit ac fregit et dedit Jacobo Justo et dixit ei: Frater mi, comede panem tuum, quia resurrexit filius hominis a dormientibus.

Also the so-called gospel according to the Hebrews, which was recently translated by me into Greek and Latin, which Origen, too, often uses, relates after the resurrection of the Saviour: But when the Lord had given the linen cloth to the priest's servant, he went to James and appeared to him. For James had taken an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour in which he had drunk the cup of the Lord (*or*, in which the Lord had drunk the cup) until he should see him rising from them that sleep.

And again, a little farther on: "Bring me," saith the Lord, "a table and bread." And there follows immediately: He took the bread and blessed and brake and gave to James the Just, and said to him: "My brother, eat thy bread, inasmuch as the Son of Man hath risen from them that sleep."

Irenæus, V, 33, 3 f.:[7]

Quemadmodum presbyteri meminerunt, qui Joannem discipulum Domini viderunt, audisse se ab eo, quemadmodum de temporibus illis

[5] Resch, Apokryphon 14.
[6] Resch, Apokryphon 50.
[7] Resch, Apokryphon 95.

docebat Dominus et dicebat: Venient dies in quibus vineæ nascentur singulæ decem millia palmitum habentes, et in uno palmite dena millia brachiorum, et in uno vero palmite [*l.* brachio] dena millia flagellorum, et in unoquoque flagello dena millia botruum, et in unoquoque botro dena millia acinorum, et unumquodque acinum expressum dabit vigintiquinque metretas vini. Et cum eorum apprehenderit aliquis sanctorum botrum, alius clamabit: Botrus ego melior sum, me sume, per me Dominum benedic. Similiter et granum tritici decem millia spicarum generaturum, et unamquamque spicam habituram decem millia granorum, et unumquodque granum quinque bilibres similæ claræ mundæ: et reliqua autem poma et semina et herbam secundum congruentiam iis consequentem: et omnia animalia iis cibis utentia, quæ a terra accipiuntur, pacifica et consentanea invicem fieri, subiecta hominibus cum omni subiectione.

Hæc autem et Papias, Joannis auditor, Polycarpi autem contubernalis, vetus homo, per scripturam testimonium perhibet in quarto librorum suorum: sunt enim illi quinque libri conscripti. Et adiecit dicens: Hæc autem credibilia sunt credentibus. Et Juda, inquit, proditore non credente et interrogante: Quomodo ergo tales genituræ a Domino perficientur? dixisse Dominum: Videbunt qui venient in illa.

As the elders, who saw John the disciple of the Lord, relate, that they had heard from him, how the Lord used to teach concerning those times, and to say: "The days will come, in which vines shall grow, each having ten thousand shoots, and on each shoot ten thousand branches, and on each branch again ten thousand twigs, and on each twig ten thousand clusters, and on each cluster ten thousand grapes, and each grape when pressed shall yield five-and-twenty measures of wine. And when any of the saints shall have taken hold of one of their clusters, another shall cry: I am a better cluster; take me, bless the Lord through me. Likewise also a grain of wheat shall produce ten thousand heads, and every head shall have ten thousand grains, and every grain ten pounds of fine flour, bright and clean, and the other fruits, seeds, and the grass shall produce in similar proportions, and all the animals, using these fruits which are products of the soil, shall become in their turn peaceable and harmonious, obedient to man in all subjection."

These things Papias, who was a hearer of John and a companion of Polycarp, an ancient worthy, witnesseth in writing in the fourth of his books, for there are five books composed by him. And he added, saying: "But these things are credible to them that believe." And when Judas the traitor did not believe, and asked, How shall such growths be accomplished by the Lord? he relates that the Lord said: "They shall see, who shall come to these [times]."

Hippolytus, *Comm. in Danielem*, lib. IV (ed. Bratke, p. 44):

*τοῦ οὖν κυρίου διηγουμένου τοῖς μαθηταῖς περὶ τῆς μελλούσης τῶν ἁγίων βασιλείας ὡς εἴη ἔνδοξος καὶ θαυμαστή, καταπλαγεὶς ὁ Ἰούδας ἐπὶ τοῖς λεγομένοις ἔφη· καὶ τίς ἄρα ὄψεται ταῦτα; ὁ δὲ κύριος ἔφη· ταῦτα ὄψονται οἱ ἄξιοι γινόμενοι.*

So when the Lord told the disciples about the coming kingdom of the saints, how it was glorious and marvelous, Judas, amazed at what was said, said: And who then shall see these things? And the Lord replied: "These things shall they see who become worthy."

Matt. 6:13 (Textus Receptus):

*ὅτι σοῦ ἐστιν ἡ βασιλεία καὶ ἡ δύναμις καὶ ἡ δόξα εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας. ἀμήν.*

"For thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory. Amen."

*Codex Algerinæ Peckover*, 713[evv], Matt. 17:26 f.:

*ἔφη αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἄραγε ἐλεύθεροί εἰσιν οἱ υἱοί. ἔφη Σίμων· ναί. λέγει ὁ Ἰησοῦς· δὸς οὖν καὶ σύ, ὡς ἀλλότριος αὐτῶν.*

Jesus said unto him: Therefore the sons are free. Simon said: Yea. Jesus saith: "Give thou therefore also, as if a stranger to them."

Mark 9:49 (Textus Receptus):

*καὶ πᾶσα θυσία ἁλὶ ἁλισθήσεται.*

"And every sacrifice shall be salted with salt."

This seems to be derived from Lev. 2:13.

Mark 16:15–18:

*καὶ εἶπεν αὐτοῖς· πορευθέντες εἰς τὸν κόσμον ἅπαντα, κηρύξατε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον πάσῃ τῇ κτίσει. ὁ πιστεύσας καὶ βαπτισθεὶς σωθήσεται, ὁ δὲ ἀπιστήσας κατακριθήσεται. σημεῖα δὲ τοῖς πιστεύσασιν ἀκολουθήσει ταῦτα, ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου δαιμόνια ἐκβαλοῦσιν, γλώσσαις λαλήσουσιν, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ὄφεις ἀροῦσιν, κἂν θανάσιμόν τι πίωσιν οὐ μὴ αὐτοὺς βλάψῃ, ἐπὶ ἀρρώστους χεῖρας ἐπιθήσουσιν καὶ καλῶς ἕξουσιν.*

And he said unto them: "Go ye into all the world, and preach the

gospel to the whole creation. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned. And these signs shall follow them that believe: in my name shall they cast out devils; they shall speak with tongues; and in their hands they shall take up serpents, and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover."

These verses from the unauthentic ending of the gospel of Mark seem to be a general summary of the commission of the apostles resembling the fragments of the *Kerygma Petri* quoted by Clement of Alexandria.

B

It is of greater interest to look at the Agrapha which seem to have considerable historical value. As to how much value is to be ascribed to each, opinions vary greatly; and the right of all but a very few to a place in the list at all is disputed.[8]

1. Acts 20:35:[9]

*μνημονεύειν τε τῶν λόγων τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν· μακάριόν ἐστιν μᾶλλον διδόναι ἢ λαμβάνειν.*

And to remember the words of the Lord Jesus, how he himself said: "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

2. Justin, *Dial.*, 47.[10]

*διὸ καὶ ὁ ἡμέτερος κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς εἶπεν· ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.*

Wherefore also our Lord Jesus Christ said: "Where I find you, there will I also judge."

3. Origen, *De orat. libell.*, c. 2.[11]

*τὸ μὲν ὃ δεῖ· αἰτεῖτε τὰ μεγάλα, καὶ τὰ μικρὰ ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται, καί· αἰτεῖτε τὰ ἐπουράνια, καὶ τὰ ἐπίγεια ὑμῖν προστεθήσεται.*

That which is needful: "Ask for the great things and the small shall be added unto you;" and, "Ask for the heavenly things, and the earthly shall be added unto you."

Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, I, 24, 158) quotes the first part of

[8] For fuller discussion of these and the other Agrapha, the reader is referred to Resch, *Agrapha*, 1889, and to the present writer's *Die Spruche Jesu die in den kanonischen Evangelien nicht überliefert sind*, Leipzig, 1896.

[9] Resch, Logion 12. [10] Resch, Logion 39. [11] Resch, Logion 41.

this saying, and Eusebius (*In Psalm.* 16:2) introduces the same part with ὁ σωτὴρ ἐδίδασκεν λέγων.

4. Clemens Alex., *Strom.*, I, 28, 177:[12]

εἰκότως ἄρα καὶ ἡ γραφὴ τοιούτους τινὰς ἡμᾶς διαλεκτικοὺς οὕτως ἐθέλουσα γενέσθαι, παραινεῖ· γίνεσθε δὲ δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται, τὰ μὲν ἀποδοκιμάζοντες, τὸ δὲ καλὸν κατέχοντες.

Apelles ap. Epiphanium, *Haer.* XLIV, 2:

οὕτως γάρ, φησίν, ἔφη ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ· γίνεσθε δόκιμοι τραπεζῖται.

*Didascalia*, II, 36 (Syr., p. 42):

ὅτι εἴρηται αὐτοῖς (*i. e.* τοῖς ἐπισκόποις)· γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι.

*Pistis Sophia*, p. 353 (Lat., p. 220):

Respondens σωτηρ dixit Mariæ: dixi vobis olim: estote sicut sapientes τραπεζιται, scilicet bonum suscipite malum eiicite.

*Clem. Hom.*, II, 51:

εὐλόγως ὁ διδάσκαλος ἡμῶν ἔλεγεν· γίνεσθε τραπεζῖται δόκιμοι.

"Be approved money changers."

For this very often quoted saying, these five witnesses are apparently independent.

5. Rev. 16:15:[13]

ἰδοὺ ἔρχομαι ὡς κλέπτης· μακάριος ὁ γρηγορῶν καὶ τηρῶν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ γυμνὸς περιπατῇ καὶ βλέπωσιν τὴν ἀσχημοσύνην αὐτοῦ.

"Behold, I come as a thief; blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments, lest he walk naked, and they see his shame."

6. Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, 39, 17:[14]

ἐκτέθειται (*sc.* ὁ Παπίας) δὲ καὶ ἄλλην ἱστορίαν περὶ γυναικὸς ἐπὶ πολλαῖς ἁμαρτίαις διαβληθείσης ἐπὶ τοῦ κυρίου, ἣν τὸ κατ' Ἑβραίους εὐαγγέλιον περιέχει.

And (Papias) has set forth also another story about a woman accused of many sins before the Lord, which the gospel according to the Hebrews contains.

This is undoubtedly the same as John 7:53—8:11, the section on the Woman taken in Adultery.

7. Jerome, *In Ezech.* 18:7:[15]

In evangelio quod iuxta Hebræos Nazaræi legere consueverunt inter maxima ponitur crimina, qui fratris sui spiritum contristaverit.

[12] Resch, Logion 43.

[13] Resch, Logion 74.

[14] Resch, p. 341.

[15] Resch, Apokryphon 7.

In the gospel which the Nazarenes are accustomed to read, that according to the Hebrews, there is put among the greatest crimes, "he who shall have grieved the spirit of his brother."

The judgment as to the value of sayings quoted from the gospel according to the Hebrews will depend on the view taken of the origin and character of that book. If it was a secondary apocryphal gospel, based on the Greek canonical gospels, it will probably have contained little or nothing of independent value. If, on the other hand, it was a gospel embodying the traditions of the evangelical history preserved from the beginning in an isolated body of Palestinian Jewish Christians, it may well have contained, together with grotesque and apocryphal enlargements, some valuable matter peculiar to itself; and the probable genuineness of the sayings must then be determined in each case for itself.

8. Jerome, *In Ephes.* 5:3, 4:[16]

In Hebraico quoque evangelio legimus Dominum ad discipulos loquentem: Et numquam, inquit, læti sitis, nisi quum fratrem vestrum videritis in caritate.

In the Hebrew gospel, too, we read of the Lord saying to the disciples: "And never," said he, "rejoice, except when you have looked upon your brother in love."

9. *II. Clem. Rom.*, V, 2–4:[17]

λέγει γὰρ ὁ κύριος· ἔσεσθε ὡς ἀρνία ἐν μέσῳ λύκων. ἀποκριθεὶς δὲ ὁ Πέτρος αὐτῷ λέγει· ἐὰν οὖν διασπαράξωσιν οἱ λύκοι τὰ ἀρνία; εἶπεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῷ Πέτρῳ· μὴ φοβείσθωσαν τὰ ἀρνία τοὺς λύκους μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν αὐτά· καὶ ὑμεῖς μὴ φοβεῖσθε τοὺς ἀποκτέννοντας ὑμᾶς καὶ μηδὲν ὑμῖν δυναμένους ποιεῖν, ἀλλὰ φοβεῖσθε τὸν μετὰ τὸ ἀποθανεῖν ὑμᾶς ἔχοντα ἐξουσίαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος, τοῦ βαλεῖν εἰς γέενναν πυρός.

For the Lord saith: Ye shall be as lambs in the midst of wolves. But Peter answering saith unto him: What, then, if the wolves should tear the lambs? Jesus said unto Peter: "Let not the lambs fear the wolves after they are dead; and ye also, fear ye not them that kill you and are not able to do anything to you; but fear Him that after ye are dead hath power over soul and body to cast them into the gehenna of fire."

It seems not impossible that this is the original connection of Matt. 10:16 (Luke 10:3) with Matt. 10:28 (Luke 12:4 f.).

[16] Resch, Apokryphon 8.

[17] Resch, Apokryphon 10.

10. Origen, *In Matt.*, Tom. XV, 14, Vetus interpretatio:[18]

Scriptum est in evangelio quodam, quod dicitur secundum Hebræos, si tamen placet alicui suscipere illud non ad auctoritatem sed ad manifestationem propositæ quæstionis: Dixit, inquit, ad eum alter divitum: Magister, quid bonum faciens vivam? Dixit ei: Homo, leges et prophetas fac. Respondit ad eum: Feci. Dixit ei: Vade, vende omnia quæ possides et divide pauperibus et veni, sequere me. Cœpit autem dives scalpere caput suum et non placuit ei. Et dixit ad eum Dominus: Quomodo dicis, legem feci et prophetas, quoniam scriptum est in lege: diliges proximum tuum sicut te ipsum, et ecce multi fratres tui, filii Abrahæ, amicti sunt stercore morientes præ fame, et domus tua plena est multis bonis, et non egreditur omnino aliquid ex ea ad eos. Et conversus dixit Simoni discipulo suo sedenti apud se: Simon, fili Joannæ, facilius est camelum intrare per foramen acus quam divitem in regnum cœlorum.

It is written in a certain gospel, the so-called gospel according to the Hebrews, if anyone likes to take it up not as having any authority but to shed light on the matter in hand: The other, it says, of the rich men said unto him: Master, by doing what good thing shall I have life? He said to him: Man, do the law and the prophets. He answered unto him: I have. He said to him: Go, sell all that thou hast, and divide to the poor, and come, follow me. But the rich man began to scratch his head, and it pleased him not. And the Lord said unto him: "How sayest thou, I have done the law and the prophets, since it is written in the law: Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, and behold, many brethren of thine, sons of Abraham, are clad in filth, dying of hunger, and thy house is full of good things, and nothing at all goes out from it to them." And he turned and said to Simon his disciple who was sitting by him: Simon, son of John, it is easier for a camel to enter through the eye of a needle than for a rich man into the kingdom of heaven.

11. Eusebius, *Theophania Syr.* (ed. S. Lee), IV, 12, pp. 233–4, 235:[19]

The cause therefore of the divisions of the soul that comes to pass in houses he himself taught, as we have found in a place in the gospel existing among the Jews in the Hebrew language, in which is said: "I will select to myself the good, those good ones whom my Father in heaven has given me."

[18] Resch, Apokryphon 17.

[19] Resch, Apokryphon 21 b.

12. Talmud, *Aboda Zara*, 16b, 17a.

The rabbis have the following tradition: When Rabbi Elieser was once imprisoned for heresy (*mînuth*, *i. e.* inclination to the forbidden Christian religion), he was brought before the (Roman) court to be judged. The judge said to him: Does such a mature man as thou art occupy himself with such vain things? Elieser replied: The Judge is just to me. The judge thought that Elieser was speaking of him, in fact he referred to his Father in heaven. Then the judge said: Because I believe thee, thou art acquitted. When Elieser came home, his disciples came to comfort him, but he would accept no comfort. Then R. Akiba said to him: Permit me to say to thee something of that which thou hast taught me. He answered: Say on. Then said R. Akiba: Perhaps thou hast at some time heard a heresy which pleased thee, because of which thou hast now been imprisoned for heresy. Elieser replied: Akiba, thou remindest me. I was once walking in the upper street of Sepphoris; there I met one of the disciples of Jesus of Nazareth, named James of Kephar Sekhanja, who said to me: In your law (Deut. 23:19) it reads: Thou shalt not bring the hire of an harlot into the house of thy God. Is it lawful that from such gifts one should have a draught house built for the high priest? I knew not what to answer him. Then he said to me: Thus taught me Jesus of Nazareth: "Of the hire of an harlot hath she gathered it, and to the hire of an harlot shall it return (Micah 1:7); from filth it came, to the place of filth shall it go." This explanation pleased me, and therefore have I been arrested for heresy, because I transgressed the word of Scripture: Remove thy way far from her (Prov. 5:8), from her, that is, from heresy.

13. Codex Bezæ, after Matt. 20:28.[80]

*ὑμεῖς δὲ ζητεῖτε ἐκ μικροῦ αὐξῆσαι καὶ ἐκ μείζονος ἔλαττον εἶναι. εἰσερχόμενοι δὲ καὶ παρακληθέντες δειπνῆσαι μὴ ἀνακλίνεσθε εἰς τοὺς ἐξέχοντας τόπους, μήποτε ἐνδοξότερός σου ἐπέλθῃ, καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ σοι· ἔτι κάτω χώρει, καὶ καταισχυνθήσῃ. ἐὰν δὲ ἀναπέσῃς εἰς τὸν ἥττονα τόπον καὶ ἐπέλθῃ σου ἥττων, ἐρεῖ σοι ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ· σύναγε ἔτι ἄνω, καὶ ἔσται σοι τοῦτο χρήσιμον.*

"But ye seek from the small to increase and from the greater to be less. But when ye come in invited to a feast, sit not down in distinguished places, lest one grander than thou arrive, and the giver of the feast come and say to thee, Go farther down, and thou be ashamed.

[80] Resch, pp. 70 ff.

But if thou sit down in the meaner place, and one meaner than thou arrive, the giver of the feast will say to thee, Join [us] farther up, and that shall be to thine advantage."

14. Acts 1:5; 11:16.

*Ἰωάνης μὲν ἐβάπτισεν ὕδατι, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐν πνεύματι βαπτισθήσεσθε ἁγίῳ οὐ μετὰ πολλὰς ταύτας ἡμέρας.*

"John indeed baptized with water, but ye shall be baptized with the Holy Ghost not many days hence."

15. 1. Thess. 4:15–17.

*τοῦτο γὰρ ὑμῖν λέγομεν ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, ὅτι ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι εἰς τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ κυρίου οὐ μὴ φθάσωμεν τοὺς κοιμηθέντας· ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ἐν κελεύσματι, ἐν φωνῇ ἀρχαγγέλου καὶ ἐν σάλπιγγι θεοῦ, καταβήσεται ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οἱ νεκροὶ ἐν Χριστῷ ἀναστήσονται πρῶτον, ἔπειτα ἡμεῖς οἱ ζῶντες οἱ περιλειπόμενοι ἅμα σὺν αὐτοῖς ἁρπαγησόμεθα ἐν νεφέλαις εἰς ἀπάντησιν τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἀέρα· καὶ οὕτως πάντοτε σὺν κυρίῳ ἐσόμεθα.*

For this we say unto you in a word of the Lord, that we that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall in no wise precede them that are fallen asleep; for 'the Lord himself shall descend from heaven, with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first; then we that are alive, that are left, shall together with them be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air;' and so shall we ever be with the Lord.

C

In addition to these fifteen Agrapha for which some considerable probability can be claimed, the following deserve to be mentioned. They are sayings which one hesitates to reject altogether, while obstacles exist to their acceptance. They vary greatly in character, and commend themselves in very different degrees.

1. Origen, *Hom. in Jeremiam*, XX, 3.[21]

Legi alicubi quasi Salvatore dicente, et quæro sive quis personam figuravit Salvatoris, sive in memoriam adduxit, an verum sit hoc quod dictum est. Ait autem ipsi (*l.* ipse) Salvator: Qui iuxta me est, iuxta ignem est; qui longe est a me, longe est a regno.

I have read somewhere what purports to be an utterance of the

[21] Resch, Logion 5.

Saviour, and I query (equally if someone put it into the mouth of the Saviour, or if someone remembered it) whether it is true which is said. But the Saviour himself saith: "He who is near me is near the fire, he who is far from me is far from the kingdom."

2. *Excerpta ex Theodoto* ap. Clem. Alex., § 2.[22]

διὰ τοῦτο λέγει ὁ σωτήρ· σώζου σὺ καὶ ἡ ψυχή σου.

For this reason the Saviour saith: "Be saved, thou and thy soul."

3. *Apostolic Church-Order*, c. 26 (Hilgenfeld, *N. T. extra canonem*[2], IV, p. 118).[23]

προέλεγε γὰρ ἡμῖν, ὅτε ἐδίδασκεν, ὅτι τὸ ἀσθενὲς διὰ τοῦ ἰσχυροῦ σωθήσεται.

For he said to us before, when he was teaching, "That which is weak shall be saved through that which is strong."

4. *Didascalia*, II, 8 (Syr., p. 14, l. 15).[24]

λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· ἀνὴρ ἀδόκιμος ἀπείραστος.

For the Scripture saith: "A man is unapproved if he be untempted."

Tertull., *De bapt.*, c. 20.

Vigilate et orate, inquit, ne incidatis in tentationem. Et ideo credo tentati sunt, quoniam obdormierunt, ut apprehensum Dominum destituerint, et qui cum eo perstiterit et gladio sit usus, ter etiam negaverit. Nam et præcesserat dictum: Neminem intentatum regna cœlestia consecuturum.

Watch and pray, he saith, that ye enter not into temptation. And so I think they were tempted, because they fell asleep, so that they failed the Lord after his arrest, and he who continued with him and used the sword even denied him three times. For the saying had also preceded, "that no one untempted should attain to the heavenly realms."

5. Codex Bezæ, after Luke 6 : 4.[25]

τῇ αὐτῇ ἡμέρᾳ θεασάμενός τινα ἐργαζόμενον τῷ σαββάτῳ εἶπεν αὐτῷ· ἄνθρωπε, εἰ μὲν οἶδας τί ποιεῖς, μακάριος εἶ· εἰ δὲ μὴ οἶδας, ἐπικατάρατος καὶ παραβάτης εἶ τοῦ νόμου.

On the same day, seeing one working on the Sabbath, he said to him: "Man, if thou knowest what thou doest, blessed art thou; but if thou knowest not, thou art accursed and a transgressor of the Law."

[22] Resch, Logion 8.
[23] Resch, Logion 15.
[24] Resch, Logion 26.
[25] Resch, Logion 27.

6. Jerome, *Adv. Pelag.*, III, 2.[26]

Ecce mater Domini et fratres eius dicebant ei: Joannes Baptista baptizat in remissionem peccatorum; eamus et baptizemur ab eo. Dixit autem eis: Quid peccavi, ut vadam et baptizer ab eo? nisi forte hoc ipsum, quod dixi, ignorantia est.

Behold, the Lord's mother and his brethren were saying to him: John the Baptist baptizes unto the remission of sins; let us go and be baptized by him. He said unto them: "What sin have I done, that I should go and be baptized by him? unless perchance this very thing which I have said is an ignorance" [*i. e.* a sin].

Jerome says that he has taken this from the gospel according to the Hebrews.

7. Clemens Alex., *Strom.*, V, 14, 96.[27]

*ἴσον γὰρ τούτοις ἐκεῖνα δύναται· οὐ παύσεται ὁ ζητῶν ἕως ἂν εὕρῃ, εὑρὼν δὲ θαμβηθήσεται, θαμβηθεὶς δὲ βασιλεύσει, βασιλεύσας δὲ ἐπαναπαύσεται.*

For those words have the same meaning with these others: "He that seeketh shall not stop until he find, and when he hath found he shall wonder, and when he hath wondered he shall reign, and when he hath reigned he shall rest."

Clement elsewhere (*Strom.*, II, 9, 45) quotes a part of this saying and says that it comes from the gospel according to the Hebrews.

8. *II. Clem. Rom.*, XII, 2.[28]

*ἐπερωτηθεὶς γὰρ αὐτὸς ὁ κύριος ὑπό τινος, πότε ἥξει αὐτοῦ ἡ βασιλεία, εἶπεν· ὅταν ἔσται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἔξω ὡς τὸ ἔσω, καὶ τὸ ἄρσεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρσεν οὔτε θῆλυ.*

For the Lord himself, having been asked by someone when his kingdom should come, said: "When the two shall be one, and the outer as the inner, and the male with the female, neither male nor female."

Clemens Alexandrinus.[29]

*a*) *Strom.*, III, 6, 45:

*τῇ Σαλώμῃ ὁ κύριος πυνθανομένῃ, μέχρι πότε θάνατος ἰσχύσει, οὐχ ὡς κακοῦ τοῦ βίου ὄντος καὶ τῆς κτίσεως πονηρᾶς, μέχρις ἄν, εἶπεν, ὑμεῖς αἱ γυναῖκες τίκτετε.*

[26] Resch, Apokryphon 2.

[27] Resch, Apokryphon 11.

[28] Resch, Logion 30.

[29] Resch, Apokryphon 16.

When Salome asked how long death should have power, the Lord (not meaning that life is evil and the creation bad) said: "As long as you women bear."

*b*) *Strom.*, III, 9, 63:

οἱ δὲ ἀντιτασσόμενοι τῇ κτίσει τοῦ θεοῦ διὰ τῆς εὐφήμου ἐγκρατείας κἀκεῖνα λέγουσι τὰ πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένα, ὧν πρότερον ἐμνήσθημεν· φέρεται δέ, οἶμαι, ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους εὐαγγελίῳ. φασὶ γὰρ ὅτι αὐτὸς εἶπεν ὁ σωτήρ· ἦλθον καταλῦσαι τὰ ἔργα τῆς θηλείας, θηλείας μὲν τῆς ἐπιθυμίας, ἔργα δὲ γέννησιν καὶ φθοράν.

And those who oppose the creation of God through shameful abstinence allege those words also spoken to Salome whereof we made mention above. And they are contained, I think, in the gospel according to the Egyptians. For they say that the Saviour himself said: "I came to destroy the works of the female," the female being lust and the works birth and corruption.

*c*) *Strom.*, III, 9, 66:

τί δὲ οὐχὶ καὶ τὰ ἑξῆς τῶν πρὸς Σαλώμην εἰρημένων ἐπιφέρουσιν οἱ πάντα μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ κατὰ τὴν ἀλήθειαν εὐαγγελικῷ στοιχήσαντες κανόνι; φαμένης γὰρ αὐτῆς· καλῶς οὖν ἐποίησα μὴ τεκοῦσα, ὡς οὐ δεόντως τῆς γενέσεως παραλαμβανομένης, ἀμείβεται λέγων ὁ κύριος· πᾶσαν φάγε βοτάνην, τὴν δὲ πικρίαν ἔχουσαν μὴ φάγῃς.

And why do not they who walk any way rather than by the gospel rule of truth adduce the rest also of the words spoken to Salome? For when she said: Therefore have I done well in that I have not brought forth, as if it were not fitting to accept motherhood, the Lord replies, saying: "Eat every herb, but that which hath bitterness eat not."

*d*) *Strom.*, III, 13, 92:

διὰ τοῦτό τοι ὁ Κασσιανός φησι· πυνθανομένης τῆς Σαλώμης, πότε γνωσθήσεται (*l.* γενήσεται) τὰ περὶ ὧν ἤρετο, ἔφη ὁ κύριος· ὅταν τὸ τῆς αἰσχύνης ἔνδυμα πατήσητε καὶ ὅταν γένηται τὰ δύο ἕν, καὶ τὸ ἄρρεν μετὰ τῆς θηλείας, οὔτε ἄρρεν οὔτε θῆλυ.

Therefore Cassian says: When Salome inquired when those things should be concerning which she asked, the Lord said: "When ye trample on the garment of shame, and when the two shall be one, and the male with the female, neither male nor female."

9. Luke 9:55 f. (Textus Receptus).

καὶ εἶπεν· οὐκ οἴδατε οἵου πνεύματός ἐστε ὑμεῖς· ὁ γὰρ υἱὸς τοῦ ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἦλθε ψυχὰς ἀνθρώπων ἀπολέσαι ἀλλὰ σῶσαι.

And he said: "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man came not to destroy men's lives but to save them."

10. Luke 23:34 (Textus Receptus).

ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς ἔλεγε· πάτερ, ἄφες αὐτοῖς· οὐ γὰρ οἴδασι τί ποιοῦσι.

And Jesus said: "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do."

11. 1 Cor. 11:24 f.

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

τοῦτο ποιεῖτε ὁσάκις ἐὰν πίνητε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

"This do in remembrance of me."

"This do as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me."

The first impression gained from a critical study of the Agrapha is that but trifling intrinsic interest attaches to even the better attested group of sayings. Standing, as many of them do, torn from their context, they are often highly obscure, and except for a few that have been transmitted to us in connection with the New Testament, they add almost nothing to the gospel record. The second striking fact about them is their small number. If the Fathers, who plainly interested themselves in extra-canonical traditions, have preserved for us only these few sayings of the Lord, the reason can hardly have been other than that there were but few Agrapha to preserve. It seems as if the canonical gospels had gathered up practically all the tradition that came over into the great church from the Palestinians. The destruction of Jerusalem and the withering of Jewish Christianity cut off the Gentile church from new supplies drawn from a living tradition, and the church was thrown wholly on what the early Christians had brought it. The evangelists collected and arranged this treasure, and did their work so well that only stray bits here and there, and these of little value, were left for the gleaners. In this contrast between the richness of the gospels and the insignificance of the Agrapha and in the illustration it gives of the historical position assigned on other grounds to the gospels, not in any testimony to a supposed primitive Hebrew book, lies the chief significance of the Agrapha for the study of the New Testament.

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

# THE HEBREW ECCLESIASTICUS.

## SOME OF ITS ADDITIONS AND OMISSIONS.

IN a recent article[1] the present writer pointed out that the lately discovered fragments of a Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus contain some seven new lines, but on the other hand omit some seventeen common to the Greek, Syriac, and Latin versions. It is proposed here to deal with the inclusions and exclusions of the various texts somewhat more fully.

It is obvious that so long as we possess only part of this Hebrew text we have not only to make use of it to aid in the determination of the true text of the portions it covers, but also to deduce from a survey of the phenomena of these chapters canons regarding the relative value of the versions to be applied in those portions where the latter are the only sources available.

These canons can, it is true, be determined only after a careful and minute comparison of the various texts, a work which should not be done hastily. For such examination as one has subjected them to only reveals how perplexing the mutual relations are. It may perhaps be of some use, however, in indicating points of view, to make a preliminary study of a more limited kind. We propose therefore to consider the presence or absence of entire lines or groups of lines. Of omissions or additions or substitutions of phrases or words, accordingly, even when they very materially modify the sense, we shall take no account. Our problem is thus rather the comparative completeness than the relative purity of the several texts. The distinction is perhaps a little arbitrary, but it has the advantage of giving us a manageable subject. If the points we shall collect suggest any provisional generalizations, these may be useful as working hypotheses in the wider and more important investigation that lies beyond.

1. *Total number of lines to be considered.*—It will be convenient to begin by asking what is the number of distinct lines now attested in one source or another. Of course it is not quite possible to say categorically how many these are. Opinions will differ as to where lines should begin and end; and also as to what lines in the several texts are equivalent and what distinct. We shall for our present purpose

[1] *Expository Times*, March 1897, pp. 262–7. The reference there in footnote 1 on p. 265 is to the present article, which was written at the same time.

regard as equivalent any lines occurring in the same general context if they have anything at all in common. After examining with some care we have concluded to reckon such lines at 760: it will appear more clearly as we proceed, how far it is possible to give any exact number at all. The largest number of these 760 lines contained in any one source is 726 in the Latin. This is followed by the Greek with 720 and the Hebrew with 717. The Syriac comes last with 546.

2. *Distribution amongst the sources.*—As to the character of the attestation of these 760 lines, we note first of all that almost two-thirds of them, more exactly 504 lines, are attested by all our four sources—Hebrew (*H*), Greek (*G*), Syriac (*S*), and Latin (*L*). To this common matter, with which for our present purpose we have of course nothing to do, *L* adds 222 lines, *G* 216, *H* 213, and *S* 42. The first thing that strikes one here is the disproportionately small number of lines that the Syriac has to contribute in addition to the common basis. And this only comes out more strikingly if we start, not from the 504 lines common to all four texts, but—as would for some purposes be more convenient—from the 521 common to the three versions (*GSL*). To *this* common basis of 521 lines, then, *L* adds 205 lines, *G* and *H* 199 and 196, respectively, but *S* only 25.

The omissions of the Syriac version are of two kinds—detached lines, and continuous passages. If any inferences, however, as to the relation of the Syriac and Hebrew texts are to be drawn from chaps. 39–49, it must be remembered that the most of *S*'s great lacunæ occur here. In fact out of the total of 214 lines excluded by the Syriac, the great lacunæ account for no less than 138.[2] Whatever theory be adopted in explanation of these lacunæ, however, the seventy-six detached lines that the Syriac excludes leave it beyond a doubt the shortest text.[3]

3. *Range of the Greek text.*—The frequent omissions of the Syriac were, however, already a well-known feature. The really new fact is that the Hebrew additions to the common basis are practically equal in extent to those of the Greek. This is, however, accidental; the equality of amount is not due to identity of range; the one text is full where the other is lacking. The Greek has as many as twenty-nine

[2] The passages omitted are 39: 17*c*–20*a* = 9 lines; 41: 13*a*–42: 8*d* = 50 lines (broken into two by the insertion of several lines representing the end of chap. 41, and containing some very remarkable additions, on which see below, No. 9, *b*); 43: 11*c*–33*b* = 55 lines; 45: 8*c*–14*b* = 24 lines.

[3] The omissions of the other texts are as follows: *L*, 34 lines; *G*, 40 lines; *H*, 43 lines.

lines not to be found in the Hebrew, and the Hebrew twenty-six not in the Greek. This leaves indeed no less than 187 lines common to Hebrew and Greek in addition to the general substratum of 504 common to all the four texts. But this need not be taken to mean a specially close relation between the Greek in particular and the Hebrew. For, as a matter of fact, it is only when supported by other witnesses also that these two texts go together either in including or in excluding a line. They never do so alone.

(*a*) The *inclusions* may be taken first. The 187 Greek lines just referred to as found also in Hebrew are all likewise to be found in the Latin — except two[4] that are found in the Syriac.[5] Indeed it would be in some ways natural to regard rather the Latin than the Hebrew as parallel to the Greek. For while, as we have just seen, the Hebrew confirms the great mass of such additional lines of the Greek as are shared by *L*, *L* goes on with *G* after *H* stops. At all events it is plain that the Greek never once stands alone with the Hebrew in contributing a new line.

(*b*) And the same thing is true of the *exclusions*. When the Greek excludes a line it is invariably confirmed in so doing by one of the other versions — *S* eleven times, *L* twenty-two times. As we have just seen that the Greek hardly ever (only thrice[6]) agrees with the Syriac in inclusions, our attention is at once attracted when we observe it beginning to run parallel with it in omissions. And this relation of Greek and Syriac becomes more interesting still when we note the behavior of the Hebrew. This is quite startling. With few exceptions[7] it supports the Greek in its exclusions whenever the latter goes with the Syriac, and opposes it when it goes with the Latin.

4. *Range of the Syriac and Latin texts.*— The Syriac and the Latin thus stand relatively to the Greek in converse positions. Their connection with each other, on the other hand, resembles in one point that of the Greek and Hebrew. The latter pair agree, as already stated, only when supported by one other witness or more. And so

[4] Viz., 39 : 16 *b* and 45 : 25 *c*.

[5] With a single exception (40 : 12 *a*, common to *GS*) the remaining 29 Greek lines (*i. e.*, over and above the 504 common to all four texts, and the 187 common to *HGL*) which the Hebrew does not confirm, are in the Latin — for the two lines that are formally peculiar to the Greek (39 : 17 *ab*) are really, as we shall see (below, No. 9, *a*), in *L* as 39 : 21 *ab*. Two-thirds (17) of them, however, are simply the lines common to the three versions but excluded by the Hebrew.

[6] See two preceding notes.

[7] On these see below (No. 8 (*c*) for *S*, and No. 9 (*b*) for *L*).

*S* and *L* agree only in company with *G*.[8] It is not surprising to find this group, the three versions, then, generally confirmed by the Hebrew (504 out of 521 times).

(*a*) As for the Syriac in particular, it diverges from the Hebrew, as we have already remarked, by omitting a large number of lines, and it is only when it omits along with *G* that its omissions in the main do not constitute a divergence from *H*. Its additions (25) are much less numerous than its omissions (207), and mostly single-handed (22). Unlike the omissions, they are almost all[9] supported by *H*.

(*b*) The Latin is quite the reverse. The longest of our sources, it hardly ever (only thrice[10]) omits alone. Its length, however, is not due to the absence of omissions, for there are over a score of these, and almost all of those shared by *G* (the vast majority) are not omitted by *H*. *L*'s length is due to its additions. By far the most of these are shared by *G* (194) and confirmed by *H* (185). But when *G* omits (11), *H* (and *S*) omits also (10).

5. *Range of agreement of the three versions.*—With regard to lines attested by *GSL* all we shall say at this point is that in the vast majority of cases they represent an *H* text. Of the seven lines that *H* adds and the seventeen it omits as compared with the versions, we shall speak later on. Meanwhile, reviewing the details we have gathered, what generalizations can we make?

6. *General result.*—When the Greek and Syriac agree in excluding a line—a minority, however, of *G*'s exclusions, and a mere fraction of *S*'s—they are supported by the Hebrew, that is to say, their text is then similar in range to *H*'s. On the contrary, when it is only the Latin that *G* agrees with in excluding lines, *i. e.*, in all the rest (the majority) of *G*'s omissions, it is opposed by *H*, that is to say, its text is defective in range as compared with that of *H*. In another respect also *S* and *L* are opposite. While *L* hardly ever omits single-handed, in the 194 cases where *S* does so it is all but universally (185 times) deserted by *H* also. That is to say, to the observation that when *G* and *S* agree in exclusions their text is similar in range to *H*'s we must add the complementary observation, that when either of them goes beyond the other in excluding lines, it is producing a text more limited in range than *H*.[11] If then, we could suppose that the character of the various

[8] On the two formal exceptions (39 : 17 *ab*) see below, No. 9 (*a*).

[9] On the five exceptions see below, No. 9 (*b* and *c*).

[10] Viz., 39 : 16 *b*, 45 : 25 *c*, and 40 : 12 *a*—the last omission confirmed by *H*.

[11] In the case of *S*'s extra exclusions of this kind it is to be noted that *L* as well as *G* represents *H*'s text.

versions is about the same throughout the rest of the book as in chaps. 39–49, we should have three general tendencies discernible in inclusions and exclusions: a tendency on the part of *H* to confirm *GS* exclusions, to oppose *GL* exclusions, and to confirm *GL* inclusions. This may be expressed antithetically as a tendency to confirm *GS* exclusions and *S* or *GL* inclusions; to oppose *L* inclusions and *GL* or *S* exclusions.

7. *Meaning of the facts.*—Do these facts suggest any theory? It is not indeed the object of the present article to propound one. But, in view of the interest felt just now in *H* in particular, it is natural to ask whether it may not be that *S* represents at basis a text resembling in its range that of *H*, but only partially preserved or seriously mutilated. It certainly seems to be the case that whenever, of the versions, *S* includes lines single-handed, we may expect to find *H* including also. Furthermore, if *S* omits, *H* omits also, provided that *G* does so too. Of course this is in a very small proportion of cases. Still it is not unnatural to regard *S* as to this extent faithfully reproducing a text equivalent in range to *H*, free for example from the extra matter in *L*. When, however, *S* and *G* go beyond this in excluding lines — what is to be said? Can the same explanation apply to both? *S* goes its way quite independently. Does this represent a mutilated manuscript? or a Syriac recension? *G* on the other hand is accompanied by *L*. Does this represent faithful adherence of the Latin to the limits of the Greek? or a common restricted source? One thing is clear: *L* also admits text-matter going beyond the range of *H*, and it is only sometimes that *G* then keeps it company.

8. *Character of inclusions and exclusions.*—So far we have considered simply the relative range of the various sources, whether greater than, equal to, or less than *H*; or asked, what inferences could be drawn from difference of range. Nor is this the place or time to try to estimate the relative value of these sources as determined by the character of the text in distinction from its range. Such a task could be satisfactorily grappled with only in the course of a critical comparison of them line by line and word by word.

Our study would, however, be incomplete without an account of the inclusions and exclusions that we have observed. Further examination may very likely modify in some points the classification of hemistichs on which the above analysis is based; it is proverbially easy, in the course of the frequent modifications which the details of such an analysis have to undergo, for errors and discrepancies to fail

of detection; and as already intimated opinions will always differ in some cases as to how the lines should be counted; but such corrections or modifications will probably hardly affect the general result. We propose, therefore, to quote the lines that seem to be omitted by the Hebrew text,[12] and then those that appear there for the first time. In citing the verses we shall in some cases append a comment on the lines; but the primary object is, not to pronounce judgment, but to collect the material in a convenient form so that anyone who cares may study it for himself. The general nature of the exclusions and inclusions will appear at once.

9. *Exclusions of H.*—The Hebrew omits some 43 lines, viz., 2 found in *G* alone, 4 in *S*, 1 in *GS*, 10 in *L*, 9 in *GL* and 17 in *GSL*. *a*) *Lines peculiar to G.*—These appear to be only two, 39:17 *ab*:

None can say, What is this? Wherefore is that?
For in his season they shall all be sought out.

But these are really the same as those occurring in *L* as 39:21 *ab*, which seem to be a fusion of 39: 21 *ab* [*H*] and 21 *cd* [*H*]. If now we look at these two couplets in Hebrew

אין לאמר זה למהזה כי הכל לצרכו נבחר
אין ל[אמר] זה רעמזה כי הכל בעתו יגבר

we see how easily one might be a variant of the other: the marginal reading removes even the difference in the last two words, while the Latin and Greek, as we have seen, appear to fuse the two couplets together. It is at least worth while considering whether the whole four lines may not be a Hebrew gloss. *b*) *Lines peculiar to S.*—These appear to be four. But one of these again, 48:3*c*:

On the altar and on wicked men,

is surely a gloss on bringing down fire from heaven. The same cannot be said of 39:21*c*:

By his word he maketh the sun to rise, and by his word he maketh it set

In so doubtful a context it is hazardous to pronounce definitely. 41:20*a* $\alpha\beta$:

[He is a great robber]
The salutation thou givest him he returneth thee not:
The trust thou hast committed to him, how will he restore it thee?

This couplet may possibly have originated as an explanation of a cor-

[12] Latin quotations are given in the original, but instead of printing the Greek lines the rendering of the English Revised Version is usually adopted.

rupted and therefore misunderstood vs. 20*a*. *c*) *Lines peculiar to G8.* —There seems to be only one not confirmed by *H*, viz., 40:12*a*:

All bribery and injustice shall be blotted out:
Syr. Every sinner and ungodly man shall perish.

The next hemistich is also omitted by *H* (and cod. 307 of the Greek) though *L* preserves it. Both hemistichs could perhaps easily be spared. *d*) *Lines peculiar to L.*—There are 10 such, but 41:21 *aa*:

Ne avertas faciem a proximo tuo [et ammirabilis magnificentia eius],

and 43:30*b* *aβ*:

Benedicentes dominum, exultati illum quantum potestis,
Maior est enim omni laude,

may be duplicates of what precedes them; and so 47:8*f*:

Et dedit illi contra inimicos potentiam.

may =vs. 8*d* of *H* (*cf.* the final ה which the editors detect), as vs. 8 *ca* seems to be an expansion of vs. 8*c* in *H*. 48:2*c*:

Non poterant enim sustinere precepta domini.

looks not unlike an explanatory gloss, while 48:20*c* *aβ*:

Non est commemoratus peccatorum illorum
Neque dedit illos inimicis suis,

is not improbably a later expansion. 47:25*c*:

Et ab omnibus peccatis liberant eos

hardly looks as if it were original. On the other hand 48:6 *aβ*:

Et confregisti facile potentiam ipsorum

may be an independent reading to which vs. 6*b* of *H* was subsequently appended. The very interesting line 48:11*c*:

Post mortem autem non erit tale nomen nostrum,

we are precluded from pronouncing upon by the unfortunate break in the Hebrew manuscript which deprives us of vs. 11*b*.

Apart from one or two doubtful cases, then, the peculiar additions of *L*, which is, moreover, as we saw, the longest of the sources, seem hardly to have, at least in any marked degree, the distinctive note of originality. *e*) *Lines peculiar to GL.*—These are nine, and after what we have seen of the vast number of cases (185) where the combination *GL* is supported by *H*, one is interested to discover the character of the additions not so confirmed. Apart from 41:22*ab*:

Et ne scruteris ancillam eius
Neque steteris ad lectum eius

which occur in a context varying too much in the different texts to be of use to us here, and 43:15*ab*, 16*ab* where we have not the means of determining which two of the four lines it is that *H* omits; and 47:25*b*:

Till vengeance should come upon them,

about which different opinions might be held; the *GL* lines are at least not beyond the suspicion of being subsequent accretions. 42:5*b*:

And of much correction of children.

Note the transpositions in the context. 43:31*ab*:

Who hath seen him that he may declare him?
And who shall magnify him as he is?

It could be argued that the context does not greatly need the couplet. 44:15*b*:

And the congregation telleth out their praise.

Like line *a* (also omitted by *H* but preserved in *S*) this might be an addition explaining how "their name liveth to all generations."

Thus the combination *GL*, which we have found to be usually parallel to *H*, seems, when representing a more extensive text than *H*, to be not infrequently of questionable value. *f*) *Lines peculiar to GSL.*— It remains to examine the cases where all the three versions agree in going beyond *H*. 40:2*ab*;

The expectation of things to come and the day of death
[ ] their thoughts, and [ ] fear of heart.

Would the context lose by the omission of the couplet? 40:12*b*:

And faith shall stand forever.

Clause *a* is omitted by *L*, and both are perhaps not very necessary. 42:18*cd*:

For the Most High knoweth all knowledge
And he looketh into the signs of the world.

The Syriac is much briefer: is the whole a gloss? 42:22*ab*:

How desirable are all his works,
One may behold this even unto a spark.

So in the English version. The Greek readings vary, and the meaning is obscure. The Syriac differs much.

On 43:15–16 see above. 44:12*ab*:

Their seed standeth fast
And their children for their sakes.

44:15*a*:

People will declare their wisdom.

Somewhat like a gloss on "their name liveth," vs. 15*b*, which is parallel, is omitted by *S*. 44:21*c*:

That he would multiply him as the dust of the earth,
And exalt his seed as the stars (Syr., above all nations).

These lines may have been supplied from Genesis; but the context seems to require them, and they may have been omitted in *H* by *homoioteleuton* (*cf.* גוים at end of vs. 21*b* and 'ammē at end of vs. 21*d* in *S*). The second is omitted by cod. 248. 45:26*b*:

To judge his people in righteousness;

*S*, "in his name;" the parallelism seems to require a line. 46:12*a*:

May their bones flourish again out of their place (Syr., like lilies).

The absence of this line from *H* is noteworthy. Does the way vs. 12*b* is written in the Hebrew manuscript indicate that it is a later addition? 47:16*ab*:

Thy name reached unto the isles afar off,
And for thy peace thou wast beloved.

The play on Solomon's name in εἰρήνη (corrupted in the Syriac and transposed into shem'ākh), and that on Jedidiah in ἠγαπήθης, plead for the originality of the lines (*cf.* similar paronomasia in the case of Samuel 46:13*b*, Rehoboam 47:23*c*, Hezekiah 48:17*a*, Isaiah 48:20*d*).

It would seem, therefore, that in cases of *GSL versus H*, every line must be judged on its own merits.

10. *Additions of H.*—The new lines in *H* seem to be only seven in number. 39:20*b*:

[Is there] limit to his salvation?

39:30*c*:

All these are created (margin, chosen) for their uses.

41:9*aβ*:

[And if ye] beget, it shall be for sighing.

45:7*e*:

And clothed him with bells.

45:25*f*:

Who crowned you with glory.

46:19*ef*:

Also till the time of his death
He was found prudent in the sight of the Lord and in the sight of all living

It will be evident at once that none of these lines is of importance. Some are obscure, probably corrupt, and others, read in Hebrew, look, as already noted, suspiciously like duplicates of lines in the immediate context.[13]

[13] It is hardly necessary to repeat that the comments or queries appended to many of the above citations are not meant in any sense as a mature estimate of their char-

Our preliminary survey leaves us, therefore, with the assurance that the newly discovered Hebrew text is a most valuable witness, but with the suspicion that it may not be free from both omissions and interpolations. A real estimate of its worth must depend on a critical examination of the character of its readings. It is fortunate that this new text has become available in time for Professor Smend to make use of it in the commentary on Ecclesiasticus on which we believe he is engaged.[14]

HOPE W. HOGG.

OXFORD, ENGLAND, Feb. 20, 1897.

acter. They are merely intended to justify the very general and quite provisional conclusion finally reached.

[14] It may be worth while to exhibit some of the facts chronicled above in tabular form. We append therefore two tables. The first is a simple list showing the attestation of the different lines. The second deals with lines found in the versions, and contains a series of numbers presented in the form of vulgar fractions. The numerator tells how many of the lines mentioned in the denominator are confirmed by the Hebrew. That is to say, the fraction represents the probability of a line attested in a certain way being found in the Hebrew. It is not meant to imply that such numerical estimates can be of much practical value in dealing with the portions of the text not yet recovered in Hebrew; but this seemed the most interesting form in which to present the facts. It may be well to add that in speaking, as we have frequently done, of the Hebrew as "confirming" a reading, we are not to be understood as ascribing any particular degree of authority to the Hebrew text. The word was used simply for the sake of brevity.

TABLE I.

ATTESTATION OF LINES.

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| *H* | 7 | *HG* | 0 | *HGS* | 2 |
| *G* | 2 | *HS* | 18 | *HSL* | 0 |
| *S* | 4 | *HL* | 1 | *HGL* | 185 |
| *L* | 10 | *GS* | 1 | | — |
| | — | *GL* | 9 | | 187 |
| | 23 | *SL* | 0 | *GSL* | 17 |
| | | | — | *HGSL* | 504 |
| | | | 29 | | |

TABLE II.

INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS OF THE VERSIONS.

*G*'s inclusions: alone, $\frac{0}{2}$; with *S*, $\frac{2}{4}$; with *L*, $\frac{185}{504}$
*G*'s exclusions: " 0; " $\frac{10}{11}$; " $\frac{317}{504}$

*S*'s inclusions: alone, $\frac{1}{18}$; with *G*, $\frac{2}{4}$; with *L*, 0
*S*'s exclusions: " $\frac{8}{504}$; " $\frac{10}{11}$; " $\frac{2}{4}$

*L*'s inclusions: alone, $\frac{1}{11}$; with *G*, $\frac{185}{504}$; with *S*, 0
*L*'s exclusions: " $\frac{1}{2}$; " $\frac{317}{504}$; " $\frac{2}{4}$

# RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

DIE GRUNDFRAGE DER RELIGION: Versuch einer auf den realen Wissenschaften ruhenden Gotteslehre. Von DR. JULIUS BAUMANN, ordentlichem Professor der Philosophie an der Universität Göttingen. Stuttgart: Frommann, 1895. Pp. 72, 8vo. M 1.20.

IN a book called *The Fundamental Facts for a Scientific Theory of the World and of Life* the author declared repeatedly that the results of the natural sciences doubtless still leave room for a scientific conception of God. In the present book he attempts such a doctrine.

A preface of fifteen lines gives the author's explanation for his own previous inability to formulate this doctrine, namely, his habit of allowing the idealizing activity of the human mind to preponderate in the conception of God. On the contrary we must proceed from the real and return to the real, and only bring idealizing into play as a means of making the real more exact according to its own suggestions. The author speaks first of religion in general, discusses the question whether religion is subjective or objective, and thereupon places before us the Christian religion as it is found in Harnack's *History of Doctrine*, closing with the presentation of a doctrine of God which rests upon the real or exact sciences and therefore is objective.

The treatment of religion in general emphasizes the fact that it is a part of the natural furniture of normal human spiritual life, and that even the lowest religion has a drift toward that which is higher.

The discussion of the subjectivity or objectivity of religion is extremely unsatisfactory. On pages 11–16 we learn, by means of unceasing confusion of the notions of surety, conviction, and proof, that the internal certainty of religion is nothing at all; then objectivity is disposed of, on pages 17–22, by giving a short summary of the claims of Jesus and of the Old Testament prophets, and there is no due conclusion of any kind.

It is not clear why the author in the third chapter, pp. 23–41, takes up in particular Harnack's *History of Doctrine*. He could have disposed of the claims of subjectivity in religion in a much shorter way, and in a way more fitting for so brief a treatment, than by the discussion

of a single person. In descending into the details in this manner and even going into a characterization of Harnack's personality, the author loses altogether the objectivity of his philosophical presentation of the question. This third chapter concludes as the second did: Thus far all is subjective and uncertain.

The fourth chapter gives us, then, the author's own "objective doctrine of God" on pages 41–72. Here is the main part of the whole book: a scientific doctrine of God which at one stroke is to give us something that all theology has thus far sought in vain. We take this chapter up with vivid interest to see what can possibly be in it. Remember that from this point onwards everything is to be strictly "scientific," there is to be none of the sentimental, fanciful style that may, for example, be found in the works of a novel writer. On page 43 we reach the wonderful sentence: "Points of similarity and mutual connection between things in their activity press upon us the thought of a single cause from which they probably proceed." The overpowering scientific novelty, necessity, and convincingness of this surprising sentence are of course enough to persuade anybody to read further and find out whether there is more of this wisdom. We can assure the curious that the next fourteen pages give nothing but the frivolous process of constructing heaven and earth and a few other things on the dry sand crust of that sentence.

It is worthy of note that the author more than once in the coolest and most determined way recommends both suicide and murder.

Upon page 57 it at last occurs to the author that in order to be scientific he should ask himself whether his doctrine be sound or not, and whether it really be settled upon a firmer basis than any preceding doctrine of God. It is a most happy thought that he inquire whether his point of departure be worth anything or not for the purposes of his argument. What is the result? Bitter disappointment for the reader who has thus far accepted all his statements as worthy of belief. It turns out that the whole system has not a shadow of a scientific foundation. When the author comes to himself he confesses that the world can be logically conceived of in other ways than his way, and that he at best can only claim "probability" for his theory.

Reality? Science? Religion? The author presents out of his own resources neither reality nor science nor religion.

CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG.

UNTERSUCHUNGEN ZUR PHAENOMENOLOGIE UND ONTOLOGIE DES MENSCHLICHEN GEISTES. Von DR. G. CLASS, ord. Professor in Erlangen. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1896. Pp. viii+238. M 4.

DR. CLASS describes this investigation as an honest attempt to combine Schleiermacher's conception of the "personal individuality" (s. the second *Monolog.*)—*persönliche Eigenthümlichkeit*—with Hegel's conception of the "objective spirit." But the stimulus to the undertaking is not to be found in either of these philosophers' writings, but in a more modern movement. Schleiermacher's conception is one that is determined by the problems of personal obligations and the solution is one that comes from the marvelous spiritual insight of this religious hero, whose instincts were in advance of his times. Hegel, on his side, moves within speculative conceptions which could be clearly defined and deduced in detail, without going beyond the mental horizon of his own period. No abstract thought of that time was able to realize and work out the position which Schleiermacher suggests as that in which "every man shall present (*darstellen*) humanity in his own peculiar manner."

But since that period we have become so conscious of the process of development revealed by the modern physical, biological, and social sciences, that application of Hegel's method to the whole concrete content of life is becoming a possibility. That this will involve a restatement of the method is in all probability true. For Hegel, *being* is both one of the movements in the process and the whole content which is to be revealed.

It will be necessary to define *being* in terms of the process as the physicist defines matter in terms of velocities and changes in velocity, and the comparative physiologist defines the organ of digestion in terms of the process of digestion. From this standpoint the individual organ presents in its own peculiar manner the whole organism. A fixed content or substance of any sort can never solve the problem of the particular and the universal. It is only in an organic activity that the individual can be completely individualized and yet present simply the whole.

I have said that it was a modern stimulus that lay behind this contribution. It seems to me to be the demand that is to be felt not only in philosophic circles but as strongly in religious thought. Our whole religious thought has gone upon the assumption that the personality was a fixed substance with which we had to deal—a something given

at birth and to be carried eternally. Through its faculties large stores of knowledge may be acquired and it may be developed in character, but its essence is a fixed entity. Against this static view of the self all of the social sciences have been more or less unconsciously working. The individual has been reduced to conditions operating upon him from a so-called outer environment. This reconstruction of the individual goes so far that with a large class of persons we tend to deny even responsibility, the most central of all the expressions of personality. On the other hand we are steadily quickening what may be called a social consciousness, that has heretofore been quite unrecognized, and has least of all had a part in the conception of the personality. The most dominant religious conception of the individual has been one drawn from an *exclusive* relationship to the Deity, that transcends all other relationships. The individual was thought of as existing quite independently of the world in which he is found and all of its conditions and relations. He was conceived of as placed here to be tried and disciplined and pass finally to a world of relations which were those essentially expressing his nature and personality. Every connection here is of a purely provisional character and transitory existence, of no value except for the effect which our actions with reference to them may have upon the individual nature given from above and to return to its home.

To such an individual all the social relationships here can be only of a purely superficial character except in so far as they react upon a nature that is independent of them. It would be impossible to regard such a nature as the expression of the social relationships within which it finds itself. There would be no meaning in arousing a consciousness of these relations as the essence of the self. The most that could take place would be a judgment from without as to our duty with reference to them. But if I am not mistaken the tendency not only of our social sciences but also of the forces of society itself is to substitute in the individual a vivid immediate consciousness of himself as a nodal point in the operation of these social forces, for the conception of an individual who stands outside of the processes and enters in or stays out as his conscience dictates or his desires demand. The harsh judgment of the old-fashioned individualist upon the labor union, which seems to him to swallow up and destroy the independence of the laborer, is due to the inability to appreciate the formation of a new and deeper individuality. Now it is evident that from this standpoint perfect individuality or a fully developed personality instead of being

something given and simply to be recognized is the result of a deep and profound consciousness of the actual social relations. Furthermore, as a prerequisite of this consciousness, we imply the formation of the most extensive and essential social relationships, whose control must lie within themselves and in their interaction upon each other rather than in any external judgment. From this standpoint personality is an *achievement* rather than a given fact, and it is in response to the demand for a generalized statement of this phase of ethical experience that this book seems to me to spring.

The solution which the author offers is based upon the conception of "objective systems of thought" which tend to express themselves practically in the spiritualizing — *Vergeistigung* — and universalizing of the historical element as presented in human nature. That which psychology investigates, especially that which falls within the scope of physiological psychology, would according to the author be a realm of mere facts — *das Thatsächliche* — in contradistinction from the realm of the spiritual or that which expresses the meaning of the world — *das Sachliche*. The former includes also all that falls within the natural sciences, all that is essentially pragmatic in its statement. It will be observed that this distinction differs from that between the particular and universal found for example in Plato and Aristotle, in that the spiritual is conceived of as having this essentially practical impulse — this tendency to universalize that which in itself is still merely particular, and secondly in that these systems of thought express this tendency in the individuals, to whose essential peculiarities reference has already been made. In other words the systems of thought as they appear — *die historischen Inhalte* — represent even in their most universal expressions the essential peculiarities which make up the character of the individuals in society. It is not so much in the thought-complexes themselves that these individual characteristics lie as in the fashion in which they tend to spiritualize *das Thatsächliche*. "The historical contents" in which these thought-complexes appear differ essentially, then, in the peculiarities which express themselves in the individuals, who make up the movement; they differ also in a way that is not essential, in so far as the amount of truth expressed in them varies.

This statement can make no claim to completeness because the contribution itself is fragmentary in its character. It starts out with a dualism between the fact and its meaning which is nowhere explained or even announced as an essential postulate. This does

not fall within the scope of the brochure, so that this is no criticism. But it must explain the fragmentary statement that is here made of Dr. Class's position. It is only in so far as the book bears upon the problem we have referred to that I have tried to criticise it. From this standpoint it is easy to see what has been done and has been left out. If I am not mistaken the author has simply turned the problem around and affirmed it instead of offering any solution, *i. e.*, he has asserted simply that the individual is the essential expression of the meaning of the universe, that he is the carrier and essence of it, that therefore the individual peculiarities which are found within him must have also an ultimate logical statement in the movement of the thought process. He has felt that these individual peculiarities are to be expressed in the very movement of social life, not in static entities that lie outside this movement. But he has not done more in his statement, so far as I can read out the meaning of his system, than shut the whole problem up in his postulates. He postulates the individualities, he does not account for them either metaphysically or logically.

The best part of the book is the phenomenology, which is full of acute and profound observations upon the ethical value of the individual, in his development and in his relations to society.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. GEORGE H. MEAD.

THE PHILOSOPHY OF BELIEF, OR LAW IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By the DUKE OF ARGYLL, K.G., K.T. New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. 555; cloth. $5.

THIS is the third work in a series of which *The Reign of Law*, 1866, and *The Unity of Nature*, 1884, by the same author, are the other two, and *The Philosophy of Belief* is based upon the conclusions reached in these. Its apparent aim is to show that the principles and doctrines set forth in the Scriptures are the same in character with the presuppositions and discoveries of science and philosophy, and hence furnish a rational ground for an acceptance of Christian teaching and an explanation of its success in the world.

The first division of the book treats of Intuitive Theology. It is said, we perceive in Nature, which is "a name for the sum of all existence, visible and invisible," "the essential qualities of mind as distinguished from the qualities of matter and of the physical forces." The ubiquitous presence of mental agency is recognized by men uni-

versally; not by mediate inference, however, but it is photographed, so to speak, upon the sensitive organism of the human mind; and common modes of speech prove it, for language is a faithful picture of thought. The main characteristic of that Mind seen in nature is prevision, design, purposiveness, which has significance only as inhering in personality. This is intuitive *theology;* for the untrained and unsophisticated thinker, unaware of the artificial distinction between nature and the supernatural, and unconsciously assuming nature to be a unit and himself to be a part of nature, regards himself as in some sense a product of that Living Power seen in the world, and as in some degree like to it. *Here religion begins.*

The language of science involves the same conceptions as underlie common speech. Attempts have been made by such able men as Cuvier, Huxley, and Spencer to denude the language of scientific description of all teleological, *i. e.*, theological, implications, but the complete failure of such efforts proves that "the indelible impressions which nature makes upon the receptive and unconscious mind," allied with the speech-making faculty in man, are too powerful to be destroyed by theories or personal predilections. In their writings the common occurrence of expressions which are "literally charged with teleological presupposition," *e. g.*, "function," "structure," "plan," "homology," "survival of the fittest," "conformity to type," makes it evident that the question of the Why? as well as of the How? of things is inseparable from the study of nature, and that any statement of its facts implies a "mental motive" as explaining the operations of one reasoning intelligence to another intelligence.

But with the recognition of Mind in nature we are yet only on the threshold of theology. A multitude of questions at once arise,—questions as to the ultimate aim of the works of that Intelligent Being, the extent of that Contriving Power, his relations to those moral qualities which are the highest in our own nature, and such like,—and the utter failure of all mythological and metaphysical systems to satisfy these cravings is evidence that the solution of the problem of "our own relations with that Personal Mind in nature" must be found in some other way. Without such solution there cannot be actual religion, for while the one fundamental fact already noted affords a starting point for religion, it does no more. But the very consciousness of ethical and spiritual faculties in ourselves and the instinctive desire to know their significance implies that an answer to our questionings can be given. It will be consistent with those conceptions already

obtained and as self-evidently true, because the unity of nature depends upon that Mind with which we feel ourselves related.

The declarations of "The Theology of the Hebrews" touching the character of the Godhead and the nature of man are next examined. The Old Testament is treated as a consistent whole. God is a living person, Author and Governor of the world, working out a purpose and making use of natural causes (even in miracles) as means. One divine law pervades all things. The "irrational distinction" between the natural and the supernatural is not found in Hebrew thought. Nature is intelligible and its laws are moral, — Hebrew theology herein differentiating itself from all other ancient religions and philosophies, — but all is the expression of a reasonable and righteous divine will. The law of God is the "highest object of human knowledge, next to the personal God whose will it is," and it is reverentially regarded as an expression of his personal character. Hence Hebrew theology is "anthropopsychic" rather than anthropomorphic, because man is really theopsychic. God's will can be known as truth, and through it intelligent communion with God may be enjoyed. Vast vistas of progress, that is, foreviews of the operations of God's will in the world, are presented to the gaze of some (prophets) who enter into special experiences of that communion. The law of God shall triumph over corruption in the world. The kingdom of the world shall be God's and the blessedness of it shall be man's; and as the end is thus personal, so the means to be used is more and more clearly seen as a Person, who is to exhibit God's law in its fullness and bring the world to a willing subjection to it. This is the highest point of Hebrew theology.

"Perfect continuity exists between the fundamental conceptions of Hebrew theology and those of Christian doctrine," only the universal reign of law is more consciously avowed in the latter. Human reason is appealed to as capable of judging of relations between the divine and the human, of Jesus' fitness to be Messiah, of the truth or falsity of worship, of the harmony of the incarnation and self-sacrifice of Christ with man's deepest moral qualities and needs. *Faith* is no mere intellectual conviction, nor is it the opposite of intellectual doubt, but the highest exercise of the reason perceiving and accepting the moral nature of God as containing the law of human life and the satisfaction of its wants. *Inspiration* is intuition, "an unusually direct impulse from God," and "according to the natural constitution and course of things;" it is to be tested by the understanding.

*Regeneration* is a moral change effected through apprehension of the truth and therefore taking place according to the eternal laws of God's kingdom. Even doctrines, such as the Trinity, which fall back upon the authority of a teacher, respect the reason in that it is accorded the right to test the teacher's authority.

Similarly, of Christian ethics. Its precepts appear, not as mere arbitrary commands, but as having their origin in the very nature of things. This is illustrated in its doctrine of rewards, as it appears, for example, in the Beatitudes. The Golden Rule of Christ rests upon an instinctive standard by which motive is to be tested. But the distinctive peculiarity of Christian ethics is that it supplies a motive found nowhere else,—"love and loyalty to a personal incarnation of the divine nature." That is, because Christ died for mankind, the claims of all men are identified with the claims of Christ; and what is this but the realization of man's union with God?

The Christian doctrine of prayer rests upon the conception of the universe as one harmonious system, pervaded by one law, controlled by one free personality for a purpose, that purpose requiring for its fulfillment the employment of means of which prayer is a portion. The true purpose of God and the rightful aim of man are identical. The New Testament teaching that our relationship to God is "closer than that of sonship—some relation of absolute derivation for which we have no name," makes it "intelligible why it is in the nature of man to pray, and why it is in the nature of God to hear."

Thus while reason furnishes the norm for an intelligible explanation of nature, Christianity supplies the material. "Christian belief as a system of philosophy" satisfies the human mind.

The book is well written. There is scarcely a dull paragraph in it. It is suggestive and inspiring. The author's penetrating knowledge of the Scriptures must have come from long and loving meditation. But his psychology is weak and leads to inconsistencies. A work of such wide range invites much criticism. However it will suffice here to indicate just one point: Christian theology is not Christian faith. A man becomes a Christian in many cases before he understands the philosophy which may underlie Christianity. The secret of the power of Christianity is not that it gives a satisfying "account of the constitution of the universe and of man's relation to it," but that it presents a Christ who satisfies the conscience and becomes our assurance of personal acceptance and fellowship with God.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. GEORGE CROSS.

LA MORALE DES PHILOSOPHES CHINOIS: Extraits des livres classiques de la Chine et de l'Annam. Par J. L. DE LANNESAN, Ancien Governeur de General de l'Indo-Chine. Paris: F. Alcan, 1896. Pp. 125, 18mo. Fr. 2.50.

IF the viceroy of British India should publish a book on the civilization of the Hindoos it would command attention independently of its literary or scientific value. Thus the work under review derives its chief interest from the fact that it is the production of a governor-general of Indo-China, the empire which the French have been building in the farther East to compensate for the loss of India.

Just how or when he prepared it the author does not inform us; but the book reveals its origin as the outcome of a praiseworthy attempt to understand the guiding principles of the people over whom he was called to rule. He was struck with the fact that candidates for the civil service were required by the old laws to pass examinations in letters, history, and philosophy, a system borrowed from China. On investigation he discovered that the text-books were Chinese, the most important of which were the Four Books of Confucius and Mencius. These he set himself to study in the somewhat diluted translation of Pauthier, tabulating the sayings of the Chinese sages relating to personal conduct, family discipline, and public government. The effect on his mind was profound, as it must be on the mind of any competent investigator. He finds there ethical doctrines of a higher order than those which prevailed in Greece or Rome. They compare not unfavorably with the teachings of the Christian church, and in his view have the advantage of being less encumbered with transcendental elements.

It is not surprising that the author, wholly unacquainted with the Chinese language, should fall into some mistakes. The most serious are (1) that of supposing that the worship of ancestors enjoined in the Four Books constitutes the entire religion of the Chinese, whereas the popular religion is a complex mixture of three systems into which ancestor worship enters as a common element; (2) that in their scheme of morals the Chinese take no account of a future life and make no appeal to supernatural sanctions.

Confucius, it is true, discouraged inquiry into the mysteries of the unseen world, but the Chinese, including his followers, hold in general a strong belief in the reality of a life to come. The worship of ancestors, in which their spirits are invoked as living and conscious, implies it. That shadowy conception has gained precision and force from

Buddhism, which makes the transmigration of souls the basis of retribution. Nor is the belief in a moral government of the universe more firmly held by any than by the followers of Confucius, whom our author looks on as Sadducean skeptics. To them today, as to their great teacher twenty-three centuries ago, heaven is the embodiment of a sovereign power that makes for righteousness. "On families who treasure up good actions, Heaven sends down a hundred blessings; on families that treasure up evil actions, Heaven sends down a hundred miseries," says their oldest book; and no one doubts the truth of the saying. "Plant a bean, you gather a bean; plant a melon, you gather a melon," is a maxim universally known, which connects cause and consequence in the chain of law. One aspect of that law is set forth still more impressively in the following saying: "Heaven's net is vast, and its meshes invisible, but no sinner can slip through."

(3) Throughout his book, as in his title, the author assumes that the two or three sages whom he cites are the sole representatives of Chinese philosophy. He accordingly asserts that Chinese philosophers never occupied themselves with metaphysical questions such as those concerning the freedom of the will, etc. The fact is that prior to the triumph of Confucian orthodoxy all China was boiling over with hot discussions on every conceivable phase of man and nature, discussions which answer pretty nearly to those of the sophists in Greece. A stock subject was the moral quality of human nature. It gave rise to three schools—those who regarded human nature as evil; those who asserted its goodness, and those again who maintained that it is neither good nor evil, but may be made the one or the other by education. A report of one of these discussions our author quotes from Mencius as some people quote a chapter from the Book of Job, accepting all the utterances as equally orthodox!

The object of the author, it must be confessed, is not to enlighten the student of international ethics, but to convince his countrymen of their mistake in "speaking of China and Annam as semi-barbarous regions." That the sayings which he cites exhibit a lofty ideal is not to be disputed. He finds love to men inculcated as the strongest of social bonds and duty measured by a golden rule identical in substance with that laid down by Jesus Christ. His inference of the high civilization of those countries would be just if all the strata of society were saturated with the maxims of Confucius, which is far from being true; even where those maxims are known and professed they cannot be described as "quick and powerful and sharper than a two-edged

sword." Their transforming energy is not to be compared with that of the gospel of Christ.

PEKING, CHINA. W. A. P. MARTIN.

THE THRESHOLD COVENANT, or the Beginning of Religious Rites. By H. CLAY TRUMBULL. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. xi + 335. $2.

DR. CLAY TRUMBULL, who by his travels and writings has done much to bring eastern life and custom home to our mind, first gave us in his book entitled *The Blood Covenant*, which appeared in 1885, a deeper insight into the conceptions and motives underlying the primitive forms of sacrifice and blood union in their relations to the deity and to human fellowship. He opened new avenues of religious and psychological research for both the theologian and the anthropologist. To understand the meaning and trace the origin of religious and social rites in prehistoric times, something more is required than mere knowledge of ethnological facts and power of combination. Only that psychological intuition which puts the student into sympathy with primitive man succeeds in solving prehistoric questions best. And this happy faculty Dr. Trumbull possesses in an eminent degree.

That the intermingling of blood was, or is, used as a means of uniting persons for a lifelong friendship was a fact well known since the time of Herodotus. But that the very meals or wine used in marriage ceremonies, that almost every rite or symbol of consecration is historically connected with this primitive custom, came upon the scholarly world as a revelation. The whole idea of sacrifice, which Robertson Smith in his *Religion of the Semites* fails to explain satisfactorily, appears in a new light. There is a longing of soul for soul in the most primitive man which the evolutionist overlooks, and this *plus* makes the researches of Dr. Trumbull so suggestive and fruitful. "A covenant of blood, recognized as the closest and the holiest and the most indissoluble compact conceivable" naturally prompted a desire for a similar "union with the divine nature." Here is the whole process of sacrificial worship explained.

In treating, however, of the signs of the blood covenant on the door-post made at the passover and their many parallels, our author was led to a special study of the *threshold rites*, which gave rise to the book before us. And a highly instructive and valuable book it is, indeed.

The primitive altar of the Semite and probably of man in his nomadic state everywhere is—not the fireplace in the center which presupposes already a higher stage of civilization, but—the door-sill. Whosoever has crossed the threshold of the Bêdouin has claim upon his protection. The guest, then, is welcomed by a sacrifice of an animal at the door-post, for which salt and bread become substitutes in the course of time. The threshold, says Trumbull, was the original hearthstone; the fire of the household had its place at the entrance of the cave, or tent. The door-post had the blood signs and the guardian spirits, or *penates*. It had to be crossed, if stepping on the threshold was not prohibited altogether as a violation of its sacredness, with the highest reverence. In Arabia they say, *bismillah*, "In the name of God!" when passing the door-sill. In many countries the coffin is carried out of the house through the window, instead of passing the door. It is, therefore, at the door that the Hebrew slave was attached anew to his master by the rite of boring the ear, and in all probability the *Elohim* at the door-post had originally the character of penates, whatever construction a later interpretation of the law put upon the term (Ex. 21 : 6) [p. 65]. At the threshold most marriage ceremonies take place among primitive people, and the bride often steps over the blood of the sacrificed lamb which flows upon the threshold, as she enters the bridegroom's house (pp. 26 ff.). Sometimes the goddess of the homestead is offered bread and salt on the threshold while her blessing is invoked for the married couple. The German "*Polter-Abend*," when boys and girls assemble at the bride's door the evening before the wedding and break earthen jars with loud cries, is but a survival of a primitive threshold offering (p. 33). There is hardly a doubt, although Dr. Trumbull fails to mention the fact, that the very name given in the Bible to marrying, *nasa' 'ishah*, "to carry a wife," is, taken together with the wife-capture of the Benjaminites at Shiloh, derived from a custom still found in Syria, that the bridegroom carries his bride over the threshold to demonstrate, or consecrate, his ownership. The instances given by Dr. Trumbull (pp. 25–45) prove that the custom is almost universal, and while the evolutionist finds therein traces of primitive wife-capture, Trumbull's idea of the sacredness of the threshold has the greater probability on its side.

Another indication of the altarlike character of the threshold Trumbull finds in the many instances of sacrifices brought at, and of bodies buried beneath, the doorway (pp. 45–57). The stories of

human sacrifices in connection with the founding of cities are current everywhere, in the Bible (Josh. 6:26, 1 Kings 16:34), in pagan and Christian folklore and in history; only gradually they make room for animal sacrifices. At any rate the door is made the seat and center of holiness both for the domestic household and the whole city. "The gate of the city" is the seat of judgment in the whole East today as well as in antiquity. And the "*Guer*" or "sojourner of thy gates" is undoubtedly the protection-seeking stranger admitted into Israelitish fellowship by the authority sitting at the gate.

I cannot but allude here to the many interesting details presented by our author (pp. 66–98) concerning the various covenant tokens found in different lands upon the threshold being survivals of the original blood marks as symbols of life, or of presentations of the deity. There is no doubt that the Red Hand still seen on Jewish and Syrian doors in Palestine and vicinity is but a remnant of a Canaanite custom of having lascivious forms of Petachi or Kabirim, זכרותך, on the doorposts (Isaiah 58:8 and Ezekiel 16:17), whereas the Jewish *Mezuzzah*, in accordance with the commandment, "Thou shalt write them on the doorposts of thy house and on thy gates" (Deut. 6:4–9; 11:20), has been introduced as a prophylactic against the idolatrous practice. The name *kuzu bemukhsaz kuzu* כוזו במוכסז כוזו on the outside of the parchment scroll of the Jewish Mezuzzah (p. 70) stands for יהוה אלהינו יהוה, the succeeding letter of the alphabet being used in place of each letter of the sacred monogram. The hand with its outstretched or uplifted "five fingers," says Trumbull, serves as an amulet to ward off the evil influences; the same quality is ascribed also to the Mezuzzah in the rabbinical literature. I wonder whether the word חמושים (Exodus 13:18) does not derive its etymology from the talismanic power of the יד רמה, the uplifted hand with its "five" fingers, and means: The Israelites went up from Egypt "charmed" against the evil powers, or "well equipped."

Following our author from house to temple altar (pp. 99 ff.), we are confronted with the fact that the threshold is the prominent part of every public building, the *askuppu* (מִשְׁקַף) and the *sippu* (סַף) as they are called in the Assyrian documents (p. 110). The threshold was not only the holy place of the Philistine temples upon which the priests were not allowed to tread (p. 117), but also in the Hebrew tabernacle the doorway was the place for the altar of sacrifice and for the consecration of the priesthood (p. 118 f.). To be guardian of the threshold was a high position of honor. It is not necessary for me as

reviewer to mention all the analogies Dr. Trumbull finds to this the world over. Suffice it to say that the church door among Christians assumed the same character of sacredness as did the temple doors. Shoes were put off before it, and marriages celebrated there, and I will add that the same was the case with the ancient synagogues. And if the baptismal fountain had its place in front of the church, just as all the temples of old had a water spring under or near the threshold, so may the same be said of the wash-basin in the vestibule of the synagogue.

Much might be said in regard to the foundations of temples and cities on places near springs and on foundation stones "old as the world," or to the sacredness of boundary lines, but it would lead too far away from the main subject, and this is the *idea of the threshold covenant and the Hebrew passover or cross-over sacrifice* (pp. 193–240). When the writer of this had finished reading these two chapters, he thanked and blessed the author for the new light he cast upon a very difficult problem in biblical theology.

The idea that the Israelites should celebrate the *passah* or passover, "because the Lord passed over the houses of Israel when he struck Egypt with plagues" (Exodus 13 : 27), is as unhistorical as it is repulsive to our mind, and I always felt that the verb *pasach* must have some connection with "leaping"—פסח. I thought of the leaping in of spring which drives the angel of destruction, winter, out. But this view is rather Aryan than Semitic. Dr. Trumbull has solved the problem. *Pesach* signifies the *crossing* over the threshold by Jahveh to become the Covenant-God and guardian of Israel's households and protect them against any destroyer raging without. And the blood in the hollow of the door-sill (סַף) smeared upon the threshold and the doorposts is not a mere notification for Jahveh of Israelites dwelling within, but a protective sign of the covenant. It is a mistake, says Dr. Trumbull, to translate *saph* "basin" or "cup;" it is, as R. Ishmael in Mechiltha explained it, the threshold with a hole dug into it. Nor is *pasach* "pass over," but "cross over." "Jehovah did not merely spare his people when he visited judgment on the Egyptians. He covenanted anew with them by crossing over the blood-stained threshold into their homes, while his messenger of death went into the houses of the Lord's enemies and claimed the firstborn as belonging to Jehovah." It was "a marriage of Jehovah with Israel." Therefore was idolatry on the part of Israel the sin of adultery. Trumbull refers to the custom of Jews "of opening the outer door in the passover night

in the hope that God's messenger will cross the threshold and enter the home as a welcome guest." He might have dwelt on the name given in the law to the passover night, "night of watching," "for that night is a night of watching unto all the children of Israel for generations" (Exodus 13:42), which passage is distinctly understood by the rabbis (Mechiltha eodem, Talmud Pesachim 109$^b$, the Book of Jubilees 18:14) and priestly tradition (according to Josephus, *Antiquities*, XVIII 2, 2) to signify that no evil powers have access to Jewish houses in that night. And I am inclined to believe that this idea of a "night of watching" underlies the New Testament story of the night at Gethsemane in which Jesus is the only one that keeps watching for the great end. That the bride—Israel—was waiting for the Messianic bridegroom to come at the passover time was an old Jewish tradition before it took the Christian form. Here Trumbull is certainly correct, no matter whether all his symbolisms are accepted or not. Symbolism is always an elastic subject and leaves much room to subjectivism. On the whole, our author has given us a storehouse of information, and no student will lay aside his book without having been stirred up to new thought.

It is quite noteworthy that scholars like Professors Hilprecht, Hommel, W. Max Müller, Cheyne, Dr. Jastrow, Professor Mahaffy and others have corroborated the views presented, and in the Supplement many valuable suggestions are made by them.

The following observations were suggested to me, as I read the book and the supplementary notes:

1. Professor Hommel (p. 334) compares מִפְתָּן, "threshold," to the Babylonian *patanu* = "to hold the sacrificial meal" and thinks that *pitnu* is "threshold," while *pathen* פֶּתֶן, the "adder," has its parallel in נְחוּשָׁה which is both "serpent" and "vulva." But then the word *poth*, "woman" and "door" (p. 253), is etymologically connected also.

2. Psalm 84:10, quoted on p. 120, receives an altogether new light from Dr. Trumbull's explanation of סַף, "threshold," as a sacred place. According to the same the form הִסְתּוֹפֵף signifies not "to be doorkeeper," but "*to place one's self under the protection of the threshold.*" Consequently the sense of the words of the psalmist is, "I rather seek refuge at the threshold of the house of my God than to dwell in the tents of haughty wickedness. For sun (in the Persian or Assyrian sense spreading its rays as wings of protection) and a shield is the Lord God, etc.

3. The root of פָּסַח being "leaping," hence פֶּסַח "the halting and

lame," the rite performed by the priests of Baal in Elijah's presence (1 Kings 18 : 21, 26) must have consisted of leaping over the sacrificial blood exactly as the Baal Markod, "the dancing Baal," was conceived of by the Phœnician. This leads to a proper understanding of the difficult passage 2 Samuel 5 : 6–8. The Jebuzite said to David, "Thou shalt not come hither unless thou hast removed the העורים והפסחים. And David captured the fortress of Zion and said, Whosoever smites the Jebuzite, he must cast down the cataract both את הפסחים ואת העורים hateful to the soul of David. Therefore they say, The blind and the lame shall not enter the house of the Lord." That the text has been tampered with, can be learned from the parallel in the Book of Chronicles (1 Chron. 11 : 5–6). There can be little doubt that "the blind and the lame" were the dreaded guardian spirits, the protecting deities of Jerusalem, called thus either by the people or by the late scribes of Judea, while in fact they were "the watchers"=עִירִים and the פּוֹסְחִים, "threshold crossers or leapers of the Jebuzites." Only thus light is thrown on a passage describing the greatest triumph of David and his general.

K. KOHLER.

NEW YORK.

KURZGEFASSTE GRAMMATIK DER BIBLISCH-ARAMÄISCHEN SPRACHE; Litteratur, Paradigmen, kritisch berichtigte Texte und Glossar. Von D. KARL MARTI, ord. Professor an der Universität Bern. Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard; London: Williams & Norgate; New York: B. Westermann & Co., 1896. Pp. xx + 134 + 90, 12mo. M 3.60; bd., M 4.60.

THIS book is one of the best numbers of the *Porta Linguarum Orientalium*, and expounds the elements of the biblical Aramaic. It contains 128 pages of grammatical principles, four of literature, fourteen of paradigms, thirty-four of text (comprising all the biblical passages), thirty-nine of glossary.

In the preface Dr. Marti makes it clear that his book is intended for beginners, and hence differs in scope from the excellent treatment of the language in Kautzsch's grammar, while he regards the "adumbratio chaldaismi biblici" (in Baer-Delitzsch's edition of Daniel, Ezra, and Nehemiah) as an insufficient guide to the language, to say nothing of the many errors that are contained in the tables. The purpose of the author is carried out with a considerable degree of success throughout the

sections on orthography and orthoepy, etymology, and syntax. The essential principles of the language are set forth with great clearness and with sufficient fullness, while the exceptions and peculiar forms receive due attention. While the work of previous scholars has been subjected to a critical estimate in all parts of the grammar, the syntax manifests especially the evidence of independent and careful examination of the phenomena of the language. The latter is divided into five chapters: (1) The Use of the Verbal Forms; (2) Verbal Government; (3) The Combination of Nouns; (4) The Simple Sentence; (5) Combinations of Sentences and the Connection of Sentences (*Satzgefüge*).

The literature is tolerably complete.

In the paradigms the various prefixes and affixes of verbs are first given, then follow: (1) the *Pĕ'al* and *Pĕ'il* of the strong verb (omitting forms not found in the text), (2) a paradigm of sample forms from all the stems, samples sufficient to make the inflection clear, (3) sample forms of ב gut. and ל gut. verbs, (4) sample forms of פ"נ, פ"ו, פ"י, and פ"א verbs, (5) separate paradigms of verbs ע"ו, ל"א, ע"ע, (6) a table of pronouns and pronominal suffixes, (7) the verb with suffixes, (8) nouns, (9) nouns with suffixes, (10) a most useful table of prepositions with suffixes.

The text is accompanied with footnotes, giving, (1) brief explanations of the happy changes introduced into the passages, and, (2) references to the grammar. The glossary contains the best results of modern lexicography, including many derivations from the Iranian tongues, given on the competent authority of Dr. C. F. Andreas, of Berlin.

For beginners this work will prove by far the most useful help now in use.

CHARLES RUFUS BROWN.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE SEPTUAGINT UPON THE PESHITTA PSALTER. Dissertation submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the University Faculty of Philosophy, Columbia College, by J. FREDERIC BERG. New York (Printed by W. Drugulin, Leipzig, Germany), 1895. Pp. viii + 162, 8vo.

IT is a question how far a Doctor's dissertation is legitimate subject of criticism in a journal of theology. The interest of the candidate is

to show that be has improved his opportunities; the interest of the faculty is to ascertain whether his acquirements are such as to authorize his promotion. The reviewer is precluded from judging such a work simply as a contribution to theological science. It is rather as evidence of the sort of work done in the universities, that it must be judged. The book is divided into two parts, one of which treats of the external evidence of the influence of the LXX upon the P$^{e}$šiṭṭâ; the other of the internal evidence. In the former we receive, first, a history of the question with a statement of its importance. Then follows an account of the version which is the main subject of inquiry; next, a discussion of the literary and ecclesiastical standing of the LXX. In Part II we have the detailed comparison of the texts. Three appendices give: Quotations in the Syriac New Testament from the P$^{e}$šiṭ â Old Testament; Tabulation of the Variants of the several [Syriac] MSS. from the text of Lee; and, a List of the Books Consulted.

An inquiry of this kind, to be useful to the scholar, should confine itself to a single well-defined subject. The danger of the young author is that he will make his field too broad, and from this danger Dr. Berg has not wholly escaped. His subject is the Influence of the LXX upon the P$^{e}$šiṭṭâ Psalter. What we want to know is whether such an influence is discoverable, and what is its extent. In order to answer these questions we need above all things to know what is the original text of the Syriac and what is the original text of the Greek. The answer to these two questions is by no means so easy as one might suppose. If once we have these texts the real question comes into view. Suppose we have the original text of G and the original text of S and suppose further that they agree in a particular reading against the Massoretic text. It does not yet follow that the agreement is due to the influence of one upon the other. It is always supposable that S had a Hebrew text which agreed with the text from which G was translated. It is evident that to prove this or to disprove it is of the greatest consequence. As the author very well says, the Hebrew MSS. "are all descended from the same archetype." The important question is whether the Syriac will help us to correct the errors in this archetype.

The author seems not to have had this question clearly in mind. He concludes indeed that the basis of the Syriac Psalter was the Massoretic text, and that the translators were *influenced* by the LXX. But does that account for the whole of the Syriac? This is what we want

to know, and what we do not decisively ascertain. To help us in answering this question, it would have been better to discuss minutely the character of the various readings than to have given so much general knowledge.

However, it may be unfair in judging a man for what he has done, to find fault with him for not doing what he did not try to do. What the author before us tried to do he seems to have done fairly well.

LAKEWOOD, N. J. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

SEPTUAGINTASTUDIEN, II. Von EBERHARD NESTLE. Wissenschaftliche Beilage zum Programm des Königlichen Gymnasiums in Ulm. Ulm, 1896. Pp. 22, 4to.

THE first part of the *Septuagintastudien* was published in 1886. It gave a history of the Sixtine edition of the LXX. This (the second) part is largely an appendix to that. Its immediate occasion was a remark in the public press concerning Professor Nestle's expected collaboration in the new critical edition. A correspondent of the newspaper in question had expressed the hope that Professor Nestle's criticism "may not turn out to be too much in the spirit of the Evangelical Alliance." The remark shows so ludicrous a misapprehension of what is meant by a critical edition of the LXX, that our author thinks some instruction necessary. He points out that Sebastian Frank, as long ago as 1531, was better informed concerning the Greek version of the Old Testament than is the modern German journalist. After quoting at some length from Frank, or rather from Sebastian Fischer who copies Frank, Professor Nestle gives an account of the well-known letter of Aristeas with a popular sketch of the history of the LXX.

The second part of the programme is occupied with notes of various kinds, appendices and corrections to the first half of the *Studien*, a description of the phototypic reproduction of the Codex Vaticanus, remarks on the different scribes of the MS., and remarks, palæographical and other, connected with the same subject. In regard to the character of the Vaticanus Nestle is inclined to side with Professor Moore (*Judges*, p. xlvi not lvi as given by Nestle) rather than with Cornill in his estimate of its text.

The pamphlet will be read with interest and profit by every Old Testament student.

LAKEWOOD, N. J. HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG DES JUDENTHUMS. Eine historische Untersuchung von EDUARD MEYER. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1896. Pp. viii+245, and a map; 8vo. M 6.

IN this monograph the distinguished historian of "antiquity" has performed a signal service to biblical criticism and to the study of the most important of all national histories. Its aim, to use the author's words, is to prepare a foundation for a genetic historical sketch of Judaism by methodically examining and sifting the material for the history of its origin. It has grown out of the series of studies which the author had to undertake as preparatory to Vol. III of his monumental *Geschichte des Alterthums*. A variety of occasions have led to unanticipated breadth and depth of treatment, and have thus added to the interest and value of the results. It is unnecessary to dwell upon the importance of Meyer's subject. The period was that of the regeneration and reorganization of the *reliquiæ* of ancient Israel into the Jewish church and commonwealth. It was also that of the great political and social upheaval and readjustment which made the transition from Semitism to Aryanism in western Asia. The Hebrew records, especially Ezra and Nehemiah, contain material which pretty fully describes the former, while it essentially illustrates the latter. If these records may be used as they stand they constitute an inestimable authority.

But the question has been of late years pressing itself, whether the writings in question may be properly so utilized. They consist partly of personal memoirs, and partly of copies of official documents, which are in themselves sources of the first class for historical construction. But they have manifestly been edited much later by a compiler, apparently identical with the Chronicler, who lived about 300 B. C. It has long been felt that the whole matter of the books requires a thorough testing. It is generally conceded that whatever materials lay before the Chronicler he has freely worked them over, expanding, omitting, condensing, transposing. But the reliability of the framework of the narrative was not seriously impugned till, in 1893, Kosters, in his *Herstel van Israel in het Perzische Tijdvak*, attempted to show that while portions of the later history, relating to Ezra and Nehemiah, are trustworthy in the main, the account of the return is fictitious, the attempts to rebuild the temple having been made by Hebrews who remained in the country under Zerubbabel and Joshua. This hypothesis has had wide currency. It has been largely adopted in Holland and Germany; some of Kosters' most important conclusions have been

accepted by Cheyne in England; and in *Beiheft II*, of *ZATW* (1896), Dr. C. C. Torrey, of Andover, follows up the attack by renouncing the Chronicler and all his works except the personal memoirs of Nehemiah (chaps. 1—6).

The gist of the problem may be shown by a statement of what Meyer takes as his task in the present essay. As an historian he is, in the first place, rightly displeased at the attitude of current Old Testament criticism towards the Aramaic original documents of the Book of Ezra. Not only Kosters and his followers, but Nöldeke and Stade also, declare that these are spurious, containing at best but a distorted picture of what was really done at the periods in question. He finds that they, and in fact most recent critics, have put these records aside without special examination because they do not agree with their presuppositions as to the actual course of events. He finds, for example, Stade saying that the author has perhaps imagined the contents of the letters that passed between the Persian officials and the Great King, referring to "the well-known habits of ancient writers" in such matters. Against this, Meyer protests that he knows of no such habits of ancient authors, that they "transferred the language of important documents to their own texts just as accurately as do our modern historians" (p. 2, note). Meyer therefore proposes to begin with an examination of these sources, and thus determine whether we are at liberty to set up hypotheses as to the matters of fact, or whether the alleged facts are attested by original documents, which in this case must serve as the basis of all attempts at reconstruction (p. 5). A study of these records (Ezra, chaps. 4—7) therefore forms the subject of chap. i (pp. 8–71). This begins with a highly instructive examination of the language in which they are written. The use of the much suspected Aramaic is shown to be not only possible, but necessary. A spurious document, like Ezra 1 : 2–5, would have been written by the Chronicler in Hebrew, but instructions such as these of the Persian kings, intended especially for the western provinces of the empire, must have been either accompanied by an Aramaic translation or have been penned originally in that tongue, which was for that region the official language as long ago as the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings 18 : 26). For example, in the memorial of Rehum (Ezra 4 : 8 ff.), according to the emendation of Meyer, we must render, "And the dispatch was written in Persian, and translated into Aramaic," the point being that the Chronicler felt himself able to give its exact wording, having access to it in an Aramaic translation. As parallel to this proceeding the

instructions of Darius I to the Persian official Gadatas in Magnesia, on the Mæander, is cited (p. 19 f.). In this document, also, the clumsy Greek betrays the work of a translator from the Persian. So with the answer of the Great King to Rehum (4 : 17 ff.), the decree of Darius (chap. 6), and the commission to Ezra (chap. 7). Further, the number of Persian words, which are subjected to a careful examination, and the Persian forms of expression apparent throughout, betray a Persian original which must have been in existence long before the time of the Chronicler. Other evidences of authenticity, as well as the details of the proof of the foregoing, must here be passed over for want of space.

As a conclusion to this chapter Meyer adds a remark upon the importance of these documents as revealing the historical occasions of the founding of Judaism. Dissenting from the current view that the new political and ecclesiastical system exhibited in the book of the law arose merely from inner necessity, he maintains that in these authentic records we see plainly the hand of the Persian government guiding and maintaining the new settlement. In like manner, according to the Egyptian tradition, Darius appears as the last great legislator of Egypt, and the chief priest of Sais repairs to Susa to secure the authority of the court to reorganize the college of sacred scribes and to set the cultus on a new footing. A like policy was pursued by the Persians towards their Greek subjects (p. 70 f.). In this conclusion it is possible that Meyer goes too far. It is one thing to say that those who introduced, or reëstablished, the legal system did so with the approval or even with the coöperation of the Persian authorities, and another thing to say that "the community in Palestine would never of its own motion have taken the law upon itself, so unpractical as it was and so regardless of mundane relations, unless it had been compelled so to do."

In chap. ii the return of the Jews, at the instance of Cyrus, which the authentic report of "Tattenai" (Ezra 5 : 6 ff.) shows to have actually occurred, is fully discussed. Then follows an explanation of the revival under Haggai and Zechariah due, as Meyer maintains, to the Messianic expectations awakened by the disturbances throughout the empire preceding the accession of Darius. Finally, against Kosters and Wellhausen, he shows that the retrospective language of Rehum to Artaxerxes (Ezra 4 : 12) refers to the company which returned with Ezra to Jerusalem, thus proving that Ezra must have preceded Nehemiah and not have come during Nehemiah's second governorship, as Kosters maintains.

Chap. iii (pp. 94–198) discusses, from the sources, "the Jewish commonwealth from the exile until Nehemiah." In this investigation the lists of the people returned from exile and settled in Judea (Neh. 7; 11; 12), whose general accuracy he upholds, play an important part. The extent of the Jewish settlement, the distribution of the settlers, the foreign elements, the political and social organization of the community, the constitution of the priesthood, are the principal remaining topics of this intensely interesting division of the book.

Chap. iv (pp. 199–234) deals with "the law book of Ezra," with the time of its introduction, with the gradual composition of "Ezra and Nehemiah," with the character of Ezra's "book of the law," with the final redaction of the historico-legal digest, with the priestly code and the Diaspora, with the Proselytes in the priestly code and the pre-exilic μέτοικοι (*gērīm*). Of the conclusions arrived at upon these weighty matters it can only be said here that Meyer opposes Wellhausen and his school also with regard to the "book of the law." Their assumption is that "the so-called Hexateuch, *i. e.*, the Pentateuch + Joshua, formed at one time a single work, sharply set off from the other historical books." This assumption is wrong . . . . There never was a Hexateuch as an independent literary work, and the surviving historical literature does not fall into the two parts: Hexateuch and Judges, Samuel, Kings, but forms a single work which is divided into the two parts: Law and Earlier Prophets.

An "historical retrospect" (pp. 234–243), written with Meyer's well-known largeness of view and fine historical insight, closes the work. It is needless to commend the book as a whole to the earnest attention of students. It forces itself upon us all. As to its chief positions, so boldly taken, so ably defended, and so fully illustrated, it would be presumptuous to give a decision except after a prolonged study of the sources, the times, and the factors of the history — political, social, moral, and religious — such as the author himself has made. Upon the historical questions he is probably in the right. In this department of criticism he is unrivaled among oriental students in knowledge, in discipline, in breadth of view. As a literary critic he is not quite so strong. It appears to the present reviewer, at least, that, for example, he underestimates the sentimental character of the preaching of the second Isaiah and the Messianic prophets generally. When he ascribes the return of the Jews and the building of the temple to the revival of Messianic hopes inspired by the contemporary prophets (p. 234 f.), he on the one hand ignores the practical character and habits

of the Hebrews and their untiring devotion to their land and religion, and on the other fails to perceive that the wide and lofty prophetic style was not and was not intended to be always taken literally. Incidentally we may remark that he misunderstands (p. 108 f.) the statement of Sennacherib (Taylor Cylinder, col. III, 11 ff.) as to his treatment of the Jewish prisoners. It is really said there that he carried 200,150 persons away as captives, not that he "numbered them as spoil." Hence Meyer's basis for computing the population of the Judaite kingdom of the time is insecure.

Kosters' view of the historical situation may be regarded as overthrown. Also the critical positions of Wellhausen and Stade are in large measure discredited. Meyer seems to have rehabilitated the authority of Ezra and Nehemiah, though not at all in the traditional fashion. True, he has not thereby placed the Chronicler above suspicion in matters not depending upon accessible documentary information. But he has immensely enhanced his credit as a conservator of the records of the past. I may venture to express the opinion that a more considerate treatment will yet be extended to the Chronicler in the criticism of the preëxilic Chronicles. Who knows but that in some cases documents from among the state or temple archives may not have been used directly by him? The history of Uzziah of Judah we owe almost entirely to him; and his account, in spite of Wellhausen, Stade, and the rest, is proved to be in the main correct by outside evidence and by the historical situation which he alone could have created. Meyer himself says that some of his own most important conclusions in the present work have been reached unexpectedly, supporting as they do the traditional views. Such open-mindedness and sympathetic impartiality are among the most encouraging signs of the time.[1]

UNIVERSITY COLLEGE,
Toronto.

J. F. MCCURDY.

---

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES AND OTHER DISCOURSES. By R. W. DALE, LL.D. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1895. Pp. ix + 315.

THIS volume, edited after Dr. Dale's death by his son, contains twenty sermons. The first ten are expositions of the epistle of James

[1] [Attention may be called to EDUARD MEYER'S pamphlet just published: *Julius Wellhausen und meine Schrift: Die Entstehung des Judenthums.* Eine Erwiderung; Halle, M. Niemeyer, 1897; 26 pp., 8vo, in which the author replies to the review by Wellhausen of this book in *Gotting. Gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1897, No. 2.—ED.]

(1—4:6), the rest are upon miscellaneous subjects. The expository sermons were inspired by, and, to a large extent, are based upon, Mayor's Commentary, which Dr. Dale is said to have read with delighted interest. The writer of the epistle is represented as a brother of our Lord, "either the son of Joseph by a former marriage or the son of Joseph and Mary." He probably became a believer when he "heard from Mary . . . . and from the apostles that Jesus had risen from the dead." His early unbelief may have been due to the difficulty he and his brothers felt when Jesus "broke through the austere restraint which they had associated with the highest form of righteousness." James "retained so much of his Judaism, even after he became a Christian, that his epistle in its spirit and color has almost as much of the Old Testament in it as of the New. He speaks like a Jewish prophet as well as like a preacher of Christ." The epistle is regarded as written "within twenty years after the death and resurrection of our Lord" (p. 123), and before Paul wrote to the Romans and Galatians (p. 75), to Christian Jews who "retained a good deal of their Judaism." While "meant for Jews everywhere, James, when he wrote it, was thinking most of the great Jewish population that occupied a considerable part of the country between the Euphrates and the Tigris." Such is the critical basis, adopted, in the main, confessedly from Mayor, upon which Dr. Dale proceeded to build a series of practical, interesting, and stimulating sermons. The preacher, though never far from his text, is constantly near to the lives and needs of his hearers. All the sermons in the book illustrate that broad and sympathetic knowledge of human life and of current religious thought which was characteristic of Dr. Dale. Human and humorous is his description of people "who find relief in talking," and talk so incessantly that they disable themselves from thinking and even listening, whose minds become like "reservoirs with a large leak and a small supply of water." In the sermon on Christian Worldliness he says: "Worldliness is a quality and temper of life and not a mere question of particular acts and habits." A sermon for the times is the controversial discussion of the relation of the parable of the prodigal son to the doctrine of the atonement. In this and throughout the volume there is a frank recognition of a tendency among his hearers to vague and liberal views and a strenuous insistence upon what he regards as central doctrines of Christianity, namely, personal faith in Jesus Christ, the eternal Son of God, who died for our sins and whom we are to serve with ardent devotion as our living Lord. The deep conviction and practical purpose of the

preacher prevent his aiming at beauty of style or subtlety of thought. He is generally simple, direct, and forcible. But there are passages of genuine eloquence which, enhanced by the personality of the speaker, must have made a remarkable impression. The volume is a welcome addition to Dr. Dale's works and is worthy of his great reputation.

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE. CHARLES F. BRADLEY.

A CRITICAL AND EXEGETICAL COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. LUKE. By the REV. ALFRED PLUMMER, M.A., D.D., Master of University College, Durham, formerly Fellow and Senior Tutor of Trinity College, Oxford. "The International Critical Commentary." New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. lxxxviii + 590. $3.

OF the general plan of the "International Commentary" it is not needful to speak, since it has been now for some time before the public. Dr. Plummer's commentary on Luke is the third volume in the New Testament section of the series. Of some special features of this latest volume, and of some preliminary statements which the author makes, a few words should be said. He purposely omits, or touches but slightly, "various questions, especially as regards the relations of the third gospel to the first and second." He does this with the thought that these matters can be more efficiently treated in the commentary on the synopsis of the four gospels, which is to form a part of the present series. This may be a wise division of the work, and yet the reader frequently wishes that he might know how Dr. Plummer would solve the critical questions which a comparison of the text of Mark and Matthew with that of Luke presents.

Again, the author forewarns us that we may expect errors and omissions of various kinds as a consequence of the fact that he did not have the advantage of another's supervision. If now we do *not* find an unusual number of errors and omissions, we shall feel that the fidelity and accuracy of the author are worthy of special recognition; but, on the other hand, if the errors are unusually numerous, we may account for the fact, but hardly justify it, by the author's apologetic word. It is expected that a critical commentary in this age will be very accurate even in slight and formal details, and if the attainment of this end requires more than one pair of eyes, then plainly more than one pair must be found.

Dr. Plummer suggests that the special features of his commentary are (1) illustrations from Jewish writings; (2) abundant references to the Septuagint, Acts, and other New Testament books; (3) frequent quotations from the Latin versions, and (4) attention to Luke's style. The suggestion that we may find the book rich along these lines awakens our interest, and if it be found true the fact will go far toward making for the volume a place of its own by the side of the older commentaries.

It is a special feature of the "International Commentary" thus far that it gives altogether the most thorough introduction to the separate books of the Bible to be found in any commentary, and even more elaborate than we find in the special treatises on Introduction. This seems to us a feature of great value. The volume before us has eighty-eight pages of Introduction and covers the entire subject in a careful manner. Some points in this are of special interest. In discussing the sources of the gospel (xxiii–xxix), the author seems to incline to the view that Luke did *not* have the second gospel before him, though admitting that this *may* have been the case. He thinks it decidedly improbable that Luke had the first gospel as a source and cautions us against assuming a single book of "Oracles." He evidently inclines to the view that the first and third evangelists used two similar collections of λόγια. All these positions indicate a certain dissatisfaction with the current dicta of German critics on the synoptic problem.

Dr. Plummer thinks that most of the matter which is peculiar to Luke was in writing before he made use of it, but he also thinks it "quite evident that in appropriating material Luke works it over with his own touches and sometimes almost works it up afresh." It is to be desired that all that is involved in this view of Dr. Plummer shall become the common and accepted possession of the church.

The author adopts the view that Luke's gospel was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, 75–80 A. D., and makes a good argument for this position.

Before leaving the Introduction we may notice some typographical errors and peculiarities. The errors, with one exception, are in the Greek and German text. In the footnote on p. xx we have *Ramsays* for *Ramsay*. The errors in the Greek text may be classified as follows: (1) *Wrong accentuation.* Under this head we note σύνεσει (xxx), πάγις (xlv, lvii), ἰάσις (lii), κατακολούθειν, διηγήσις, and προσεργαζέσθαι (liii), ἐξουθένειν (lvi), ἄναγειν (lix), ἐλεημόσυνη (lx), σιάγονα and ἀφές (lxxvi),

and ἐντόλας (lxxix). (2) *Wrong letters or omission of letters.* Here belong Βοονεργές for Βοανεργές (xxxiv), ἀσπασπούς for ἀσπασμούς (li), and στρέψ for στρέψον (lxxvi). (3) *Excess or omission of accents and breathings.* The following cases were observed: ἀνθρωπον (xliv), ὀφείλάς (xlv), θύμιᾶν (liii), συνέκδημός (lvii), ἀστειος (lix), μεσονυκτιον and εξ (lx), οὐρανων (lxvi), ἐλεᾶτε (lxxiv), γινεσθε and αἴροντός (lxxvi), ἴδετε and θέῳ (lxxviii), and πενιᾳ (lxxix).

In the German text to be found in the Introduction there are three typographical errors in a quotation on p. xxvi, and two in titles of books on p. lxxxiv. It is not necessary to specify them more closely.

We shall not refer to typographical errors in the body of the commentary. It is sufficient to have called attention to the defects of this sort in one part of the book. The commentary proper appears to be freer from formal errors.

We referred above to certain typographical peculiarities, and thought especially of the prefix of S. or St. to the names of evangelists and apostles. This is a practice for which, we think, nothing good can be said, and it seems particularly objectionable in a book which confessedly omits valuable matter from lack of space. Another typographical detail which seems to be unjustifiable is the habit of writing *mother* with a capital when referring to the mother of Jesus.

We pass now from the Introduction and from all merely formal aspects of the book to a critical consideration of its content. The quality of the work may be shown by studying the interpretation of a few words or passages. And, first, we may notice certain positions and results which we may count among the recognized gains of modern study of the gospels. Take, for example, the titles of Jesus. In regard to the designation *Son of the Most High* (p. 23) the author says that it "expresses some very close relation between Jesus and Jehovah, but not the divine Sonship in the Trinity." The title *Son of God* (p. 25) is recognized as a designation of the Messiah, and the author does not intimate that, in his judgment, the Jews of Christ's time or Christ himself regarded it as affirming any metaphysical relation between Jesus and God. The title *Son of Man* (p. 156) is also regarded as Messianic, and considerable weight is given to the meaning of the term in the Book of Enoch.

In the explanation of the account of the temptation (pp. 105–114) we notice that the author does not think of Satan as having been visible during the temptation, or as having transferred Jesus bodily to the mountain top and to the pinnacle of the temple. The transfer

was simply in thought. Yet the temptation is not less a fact because transferred to the mind. It is not a dream, a vision, a myth, or a parable.

In regard to demoniacal possession the author lays stress on the fact that, according to the uniform statement of the synoptic gospels, Jesus went through the form of casting out demons (p. 136). "No explanation," he says, "is satisfactory which does not account for the uniform and repeated testimony of the evangelists." He seems to hold that the narratives, if historical, require belief in the reality of demoniac possession.

The note on the transfiguration of Jesus well illustrates the general spirit of the book (p. 253). The author does not doubt that there was something miraculous in the transfiguration, but he thinks that the text leaves the *manner* of the event uncertain. He apparently sees no objection to the view that it was a vision. He does not concede any force to the objection that a vision is perceived by only one, while here three men saw the same things. He quotes with approval the remark of Weiss on this point, that the vision was sent directly by God and not produced by natural causes.

Once more, the author's general conception of the parables of Jesus, as inferred from the detailed explanation, must, we think, be regarded as historical. In his explanation of the story of the rich man and Lazarus there are two sentences which we cannot forbear quoting. "It is no purpose of the parable to give information about the unseen world. The general principle is maintained that bliss and misery after death are determined by conduct previous to death; but the details of the picture are taken from Jewish beliefs as to the condition of souls in Sheol, and must not be understood as confirming those beliefs" (p. 393). With this special declaration, and with the general view which it seems to imply, we are in hearty accord.

Finally, we wish to mention the author's attitude toward Christ's relation to questions of criticism as indicated in his comments on Luke 20:42. It is "a matter of spiritual interpretation that Ps. 110 is Messianic. But the authorship of the psalm is a question of criticism; and nothing in the method of Christ's teaching, or in the contents of Scripture generally, warrants us in believing that he here frees us from the duty of investigating a problem which is capable of being solved by our own industry and acuteness."

These passages may serve to indicate, in part, the critical position of the author. They might be largely increased. The quality of the

work, in the main, and the critical position of the author, seem to us worthy of marked approbation. There are, however, some not unimportant points on which the comments may fail to satisfy the reader.

We will look, first, at certain references to the nature and self-consciousness of Jesus. In speaking of the circumcision the author says that Jesus fulfilled the law as a loyal son of Abraham, and that his circumcision was "a first step in his obedience to the will of God, and a first shedding of redeeming blood" (pp. 61–62). But how can we speak of a babe of eight days as taking a first step in obedience to the will of God? Was it voluntary on his part whether he should be circumcised or not?

We meet something more questionable in the comments on Luke 2 : 49 (pp. 77–78). It is the reply of the boy Jesus to his mother in the temple, "Wist ye not that I must be in my Father's house?" Dr. Plummer sees in this reply "a gentle but decisive correction of his mother's words, 'Thy *father* and I.'" He continues: "It is notable that the first recorded words of the Messiah are an expression of his divine Sonship as man. . . . . They must mean more than that Jesus is a son of Abraham, and therefore has God as his Father." It is not quite plain what the author means, but he seems to imply that Jesus at twelve years of age was the Messiah, and conscious of "divine Sonship." This appears to be confirmed by a remark in connection with the baptism of Jesus (p. 99), that the descent of the Spirit "may have illuminated him so as to complete his growing consciousness of his relations to God and to man." The clause, "his relations to God," naturally covers his Messiahship, and therefore the author seems to hold that Jesus had a "growing consciousness" of this long before his baptism. Now for this view we believe there is no support in the words of the boy Jesus. He calls God his *Father*, but so also does the author of the Book of Wisdom (14: 3; 2 : 16). The Old Testament speaks of God as the Father of Israel, but Israel did not have therefore the consciousness of being the Messiah. Any Jewish child could call God his Father, and the child Jesus, who had no consciousness of sin, must feel that God was his Father.

Therefore we must agree with recent scholars like Baldensperger (whose book is not once mentioned by Dr. Plummer), Wendt, Beyschlag, and others, that the gospels do not know of Messianic consciousness in Jesus prior to his baptism. The ethical basis of Messiahship was there, in the consciousness of perfect moral union with the Father, but there is no trace of Messianic consciousness until the descent of the

Spirit at the Jordan. Moreover, the synoptic account of the baptism of Jesus precludes the prior existence of a consciousness of Messiahship. Had Jesus known that he was the Messianic Son of God before his baptism, then there was no need to assure him of this fact in the hour of baptism, and no reason why the Messianic temptation should *follow* the baptism rather than precede it.

Dr. Plummer does not touch the difficulties connected with the conception of the voice and the Spirit's descent as external phenomena, for example, that the voice speaks in the *third* person according to Matthew, and in the *second* person according to Mark and Luke.

It may be noticed before passing from the author's comments on the person of Jesus, that he not only admits the limitation of his knowledge, but that he apparently admits very considerable limitations (see on 7:9; 17:14, 17). This seems to us a true historical view of the subject.

The next point which may be briefly considered is the author's treatment of baptism (p. 88). In a footnote of a line and one-half he says that *βαπτίζω* is an intensive from *βάπτω*, and means to immerse. In the text he concludes a paragraph in which he has pointed out the exceptional character of the baptism of John, with these words: "It is only when baptism is administered by immersion that its full significance is seen." But is he not bound, as an exegete, to say somewhat more about the New Testament use of *βαπτίζειν* than that it means to immerse? We have no interest in any particular form of baptism, believing that one form is as good as another, but the question here is whether Dr. Plummer takes account of all the data, and whether his statement will stand. One cannot learn from his pages that there is so much as a possibility of taking *βαπτίζειν* in any other sense than to immerse. But when we look into the matter a little we find two or three very significant facts. In Luke 11:38 a Pharisee wondered that Jesus *οὐ πρῶτον ἐβαπτίσθη πρὸ τοῦ ἀρίστου*. Did he, however, wonder that Jesus did not *immerse* himself before eating? Or did he rather wonder that Jesus ate with "common" hands (Mark 7:2)? And if he meant this, which seems to be beyond question, then *ἐβαπτίσθη* in Luke 11:38 does not mean to immerse, for its subject is not hands, but a pronoun referring to Jesus himself. Again, in Luke 11:39 the word *καθαρίζειν* seems to be used as a synonym of *βαπτίζειν*. The Pharisee wondered that Jesus should eat with unwashen hands; Jesus replied that the Pharisees purified the outside but neglected the inside.

The antithesis is plain. But καθαρίζειν means to purify ceremonially, and therefore βαπτίζειν *might* be used in that meaning. Again, while Matthew and Luke speak of *purifying* the outside of cups and other vessels (καθαρίζειν), Mark speaks of βαπτισμοὺς ποτηρίων (7 : 4). This indicates that the noun βαπτισμός might mean purification. Finally, we find βαπτίζειν clearly used in the sense of *to purify* in the Wisdom of Sirach 31 : 30 :

> βαπτιζόμενος ἀπὸ νεκροῦ καὶ πάλιν ἁπτόμενος αὐτοῦ,
> τί ὠφέλησεν τῷ λουτρῷ αὐτοῦ;

it is apparently so used also in Judith 12 : 7, where we read

> ἐβαπτίζετο ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ ἐπὶ τῆς πηγῆς τοῦ ὕδατος.

Judith could scarcely have immersed herself in a πηγή. In view of these facts the reader may judge whether the author gives an adequate statement of the data and also whether his conclusion is valid.

Speaking on Luke 9 : 17 the author says that "the σπυρίς was large, capable of holding a man (Acts 9 : 25). The κόφινος was the wallet carried by every traveling Jew, to avoid buying food from Gentiles." Accordingly we are to think that after the feeding of the four thousand the disciples took up enough fragments to fill seven baskets, each basket large enough to hold a man; and after the five thousand were fed, they took up enough to fill twelve wallets. But does it follow that because the basket in which Paul was let down from the wall is called σπυρίς, therefore this word *always* means a basket large enough to hold a man? And the remark about κόφινος seems quite as unsatisfactory. For surely κόφινος means a *basket*, but the English word *wallet* does not mean a basket at all.

But these illustrations must suffice. In closing, a word more may be permitted in regard to those features of the book which the author specially mentions in the Preface. The references to Luke's style are often suggestive. The quotations from the Latin versions will be found useful if the reader has not neglected his Latin. If any fault is found with the references to the Septuagint it will perhaps be that they are too few. In regard to the illustrations from Jewish writings, the reader will be grateful for what there are and wish there were many more. It is doubtless true, as Dr. Plummer says, that these writings are being used more and more as helps in the interpretation of the New Testament, but it may be doubted whether we have yet done more than merely open this rich mine. It seems to us that the editors

of this series of commentaries owe it to the theological public to make a thorough study of the Jewish writings produced between the close of the Old Testament canon and the end of the first Christian century.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. GEORGE H. GILBERT.

ACTA MARTYRUM ET SANCTORUM (Syriac.) Edidit PAUL BEDJAN. Tome VI. Parisiis, via dicta de Sèvres 95; Lipsiae: Otto Harrassowitz, 1896. Pp. xi + 691, 8vo. M 24.

THE untiring activity of Father Paul Bedjan has added another volume of Syriac texts to the many which he has already published. The *Approbatio* and *Imprimatur* printed upon the back of the title-page show that the Roman church has come again to value the literature in which so many of the documents of the early Christian faith are to be found. In doing so, she is following some of the best traditions of the past. Formerly, the connection of the Roman church with that of Syria had its point of contact in the Maronites of the Lebanon, with whom, since the middle of the fifteenth century, a close union has existed. In 1584 a Maronite college was established in the Eternal City; and the attempt was made to get the Syrians to be themselves the interpreters of their national literature to Europe. The attempt was successful; for we very soon see learned Maronites assisting in the publishing and editing of Syriac works under the protecting hand of the Propaganda. The services which, in this way, the Roman church has rendered to Syriac letters is not small; and nearly all of the earlier printed Syriac books bear its *Imprimatur*. At least thirty missals and other prayer books were issued from their presses between the end of the sixteenth century and the present day. Among those of the Syrian church whom they have "brought out," may be mentioned George Michael Amira (*Grammatica Syriaca*, Rome 1596), Gabriel Sionita (*Liber Psalmorum*, Paris 1624), Joseph Acurensis (*Grammatica linguæ Syriacæ*, Rome 1647), Abraham of Ḥakel or Ecchelensis (*Hebediesu Catalogus*, Rome 1653; Grammar, Rome 1628), Isaac Shadrewāyā or Scidrensus (*Grammatica linguæ Syriacæ*, Rome 1636) in the seventeenth century. In the eighteenth we have the three Assemani: Joseph Simeon (*Bibliotheca Orientalis*, Rome 1719–28), Stephanus Evodus (*Acta Sanctorum*, Rome 1748; *Bibliothecæ Laurentinæ Catalogus*, Florence 1742; St. Ephraim's works, Rome 1732–46; and with Joseph Simeon the great Vatican Catalogue, Rome 1758);

and Joseph Aloysius (*Codex Liturgicus*, Rome 1749–66). In our own century, such men as Joseph Guriel (*Elementa Linguæ Chaldaicæ*), Elias John Millos (*Directorium Spirituale*, Rome 1868), George Ebedjesu Chayyath (*Elements de Lecture*, Mosul 1869), Augustinus Shebābē (ed. *Bar Hebraei Carmina*, Rome 1877), John Nutain Darauni (ed. *Bar Hebraei Carmen de Divina Sapientia*, Rome 1880), H. Gismondi (ed. *Ebed-Jesu Carmina*, Beirut 1888), Gabriel Cardahi (*Linguæ et artis Metricæ Syrorum Institutiones*, Rome 1880; *Dictionarium Syro-Arabicum*, Beirut 1887), J. Brun (*Dictionarium Syriaco-latinum*, Beirut 1895), and the non-Maronite Joseph of Mosul (Grammar, Mosul 1879; *Antiqua Ecclesia*, Rome 1870) show that the old Syriac church is still able to produce scholars of a certain order.

With the exception of the last named, all these scholars belong to the western (or, as it was once called) the Jacobite wing of the Syrian church. The Nestorians, or Eastern Syrians, have been slow to make use of the advantages of the printing press. In fact, the persecutions which they have for so long a time suffered at the hands of Kurdish marauders made it almost necessary for them to be rediscovered by American missionaries. But the excellent work done by these missionaries, and latterly by the Archbishop of Canterbury's mission, has been largely devoted to creating a modern Syriac written language and a modern Syriac printed literature. The more recent connection of some of the Nestorians with the church of Rome shows its effect in the renewed interest which the "heretical" church takes in its own past. Of all the native Syrians who have devoted themselves to such studies, Father Bedjan certainly comes nearest to our western idea of an editor of ancient texts. His labor, I understand, is primarily intended to be of value to his own people. His first publications clearly show this: *Breviarium Chaldaicum* (3 vols., Paris 1886–7); *Doctrina Christiana* (Urmia 1886); *Liber Psalmorum* (Paris 1886); *Histoire Sainte* (in modern Syriac, Paris 1888); *Manuel de Piété* (Leipzig 1893); *Compendium Conciliorum Oecumenicorum xi* (Paris 1888). Of greater interest to us is his work as editor, and he has already published: *Histoire de Joseph de Saint Ephrem* (Paris 1887); *Histoire de Mar Jab-Alaha* (Paris 1888: 2d ed. 1896); *Gregorii Bar Hebraei Chronicon Syriacum* (Paris 1890), and especially his *Acta Martyrum Sanctorum*.

The volume of this large work which the author has "le consolation d'offrir aujourd'hui" is the sixth of the series; and the seventh is promised for this year. It contains 689 pages of text, of which 530 give us matter now published for the first time. Bedjan has used

in all his publications (as far as I possess them) the excellent Nestorian type of Drugulin in Leipzig, and his pages are remarkably free from printers' errors. The British Museum has, this time, furnished nearly the whole of the material. I have collated quite a number of pages with the same matter published elsewhere, and have found the two to agree, with the exception of a few minor points. This exception is due to the leveling process to which Bedjan has subjected his texts, obliterating the peculiarities of the individual scribes in favor of the ordinary Nestorian punctuation and vocalization. In a few cases the manuscript readings are noted on the margin; but, if former editors are to be trusted, this has only occurred in a few places. And yet the peculiar crotchets — even the mistakes — of scribes are often of great value to the student of Syriac grammar and palæography.

There are only four pieces which are not published in this volume for the first time; a smaller amount than in any of the preceding five. 1. The *History of the Victories of Saint Eusebius, Episcopus of the Church of Rome in the days of Julian the tyrant and uncircumcised one* (pp. 218–297) had already been published (Bedjan himself found this out too late) by Georg Hoffmann in his *Julianos der Abtrünnige* (Leiden, 1880), pp. 5–59. Bedjan's excuse for this oversight will probably be the same as my own was (*ZDMG*, XLVI, 780), the meagerness of Hoffmann's title. But we are glad to have further copies of this "Martyrdom." Whoever the author is, he was a master of Syriac style, and I quite agree with Bedjan's judgment (p. viii): "Quant à la beauté du style, il est audessus de tout éloge." For several years I have used it as a text-book for advanced reading in Syriac. I have compared the two texts and find that they agree substantially, with the exception mentioned above. Such forms as ܐܙܕܡܥ (219, 2), ܡܕܒܝ (219, 12), ܐܙܕܡܥ (222, 4), ܐܙܠܫ (222, 10), ܐܝܬܝܗܒ (219, 20), ܫܡܫܡܢ (220, 18), ܡܕܡܫܡܢ (223, 9), ܡܐܬܟܠ (240, 15), are of interest, and show us the liberty which a scribe allowed himself. A number of the corrections by Hoffmann and Nöldeke in the preface of the Kiel edition might have been inserted with profit, *e. g.*, 220, 8. On the other hand, Bedjan has some new readings which are very happy, *e. g.* ܡܛܠ (221, 6), the emendations 240–1; but why ܘܢܨܠ (220, 20) for ܘܢܨܐ? 2. The same criticism may be made of the *Acta Sanctæ Pelagiæ* (pp. 616–649), ed. from the publication of J. Gildemeister (Univ. Programm, Bonn, 1879), but "corrigée et vocalisée" by Bedjan. *Cf.* Usener's excellent treatise, *Legenden der Heiligen Pelagia*, Bonn, 1879. 3. *The Victories of Abraham Kidūnāyā* (pp. 465–499), the friend of St.

Ephraim (B. B. in Payne Smith col. 3485), who himself has written a life of Abraham and mentions him in his testament (Wright, *Syriac Literature*, p. 38). To judge from the life of Abraham (εις τον βιον του Μακαριου Αβρααμιου) published in the second volume (pp. 1 ff.) of his collected works, we have here this very "life" in the original Syriac. The text is a reproduction of Lamy's edition (*Acta beati Abrahæ Kiduniæ monachi aramaice.* Anal. Bolland X, pp. 5–49, Brussels, 1891). 4. *Martyrdom of the Holy and Godly Saint Māmā, who was crowned in Cæsarea of Cappadocia*" is taken from "la publication que les Bollandistes ont faite, t. IX (1890)." I have not been able to see the original edition.

The following are here edited for the first time:

I. *On Clemens, the disciple of Simon Cephas, on his parents and brothers — how they also became disciples*, pp. 1–17.

II. *Martyrdom of Onesimus, Disciple of the Apostle Paul, on the 15th of Š'bhaṭ.* The same history is found in Surius, *De Probatis Sanctorum historiis*, I, p. 1008. "Certamen Sancti Apostoli Onesimi, discipuli Sancti Apostoli Pauli Principi Apostolorum." It is there ascribed to Simeon Metaphraste.

III. *Martyrdom of the three sisters, illustrious virgins* πιστις, ελπις, αγαπη; *and of their mother* σοφια (pp. 32–52). A different account is found in Surius, IV, 446, "Martyrium Sanctarum Mulierum, sophiæ, et ejus filiarum fidei, spei et charitatis, authore Simeone Metaphraste."

IV. *Martyrdom of Charisius* (P. S. 1822 ܚܪܝܣܝܣ) *and Nicephorus and Papias* (pp. 52–56). Nestle (*Theol. Lit. Zeit.*, 1896, No. 16, col. 420) suggests *Dioscurus* as the proper reading of the first name.

V. *On Polycarp; how he suffered martyrdom at the time of Verus, in the city of Smyrna* (pp. 56–67). The same life is inserted in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccles.*, iv, chaps. 13, 14, and is found in Surius I, p. 629.

VI. *Martyrdom of Acacius the Roman* ("he was a Cappadocian by origin, a Roman 'by station'") *who suffered martyrdom and was crowned in the city of Byzantium* (pp. 68–82). A similar account is in Surius III, 104: "Martyrium Sancti Acacii centurionis (= Roman), authore Simeone Metaphraste."

VII. *Account of the victories of Saint Gregory, Episcopus of Neo-Cæsarea* (pp. 83–106).

VIII. *Account of Saint Cosmas and Damian, illustrious physicians* (pp. 107–119). A church in Edessa was named after these martyrs (Wright, *Joshua Stylites*, p. 51). *Cf. Acta Sanctorum* for September 7th.

IX. *Account of the holy Saint Eudoxius* (during the reign of

Trajan) (pp. 119–132). According to the Bollandists the author is Simeon Metaphrastes (Bedjan, p. vii).

X. *Martyrdom of Saint Theopompus the Episcopus, of Theonis the Sorcerer, and of four grandees of the King* (pp. 132–170). The date given is "the first year of the persecution brought on the Christian Church by Emperor Diocletian."

XI. *Account of the victorious martyrs Probus, Taracus, and Andronicus* (pp. 171–209). The date given is "the second Consulate of Diocletian, the first of Maximian." The Latin text is to be found in the *Acta Sanct.*, October, V, 566 (Bedjan, p. v).

XII. *Victory of the holy martyrs Leontius and the excellent Publius* (?) (pp. 210–217), "at the time when the Emperors Diocletian and Maximian reigned." According to Nestle (*Theol. Lit. Zeit.*, 1896, 16, p. 420) this is not the same person as the Leontius Miles mentioned in the *Acta Sanct.* of June 18th.

XIII. *Funeral oration held by Saint Amphilochius, Episcopus of Sconium, which he composed on Saint Basil, Episcopus of Cæsarea in Cappadocia* (pp. 297–335). "It is not the same as the life given in the *Acta Sanct.* for June, t. II, p. 938" (Wright, *Catalogue*, p. 1125).

XIV. *Account of the life of the saintly and holy Saint Eusebius, Episcopus-Elect and Metropolitan of the city of Samosata* (pp. 335–377) at the time of Julian the Apostate (p. 336).

XV. *Letter of Gregory Theologus to Eusebius, Episcopus of Samosata* (pp. 377–8), to which a second is added (pp. 378–380). It is the same as the Greek πρὸς Εὐσέβιον Σαμοσατέων ἐν ἐξορίᾳ ὄντα (*Sancti Gregorii Nazianzeni Cognomento theologi opera*, Lutetiæ 1619, I, p. 792).

XVI. *Account of the praiseworthy acts of Julianus Sābā* (pp. 380–404). "This man formerly lived in the land of the Parthians. Now the place where he fixed the hut in which he dwelt is called *Arza-Aika* (Bedjan reads *Osroene*), which stretches westward to the bank of the river called Euphrates; eastward to the boundary of the Roman power. Adjacent to it is Assyria, which is the boundary of the Persian Empire, which also formerly went by another name." This life has been ascribed to Ephraim (*B. O.*, I, p. 33), but Bedjan (p. x) doubts this. According to Wright (*Catalogue*) it is in reality by Theodoret.

XVII. *Account of Saint Andronicus and Athanasia his wife and of their beatified departure from this life* (pp. 405–417). *Cf. Acta Sanct.*, October, IV, p. 998. Andronicus was a silversmith (ἀργυροπράτης) of Antioch.

XVIII. *Martyrdom of Eleutherius Episcopus, and of his mother Anthia and of Ḳurbur (!) the ὕπαρχος, who suffered martyrdom in Rome, before Emperor Hadrian on the 26th day of Adar* (pp. 417–430). *Cf. Acta Sanct.*, April, II, 530.

XIX. *Account or Martyrdom of Saint Mār (i) Māmā and of his father Theodotus and his wife Rufini* (pp. 431–445). *Cf.* Surius, iv, 730. "Martyrium Sancti Martyris Mamantis authore Simeone Metaphraste."

XX. A series of short notices of Saint Denis of Athens ("disciple of Paul"), Saint Athanasius, head of the Episcopi of Alexandria (twentieth year of Constantine the Great), Saint Julian Papa (time of Constantine, Constantius and Constans), Saint Gregory of Nyssa, Saint Gregory of Nazianz, Saint John Chrysostomos, and Saint Cyril of Alexandria (pp. 459–464).

XXI. *Account or Martyrdom of the victorious Saint Theodorus who suffered martyrdom in the city of Euchaitis* (pp. 500–535). A different account is found in Surius, I, p. 887; *Acta Sanct.*, February, II, p. 31.

XXII. *Account of the excellent doings of the holy Saint Domitius, the victorious one* (pp. 536–556). The time is that of the Emperor Valens.

XXIII. *Account of the holy doings of the victorious Mār (i) Abhai, Episcopus of Nicæa who lived at the time of the rule of Arcadius and Honorius, also of Theodosius, Christian Emperors* (pp. 557–616). There is another MS. in the Vatican (*B. O.*, II, p. 505).

XXIV. *Sermon of the holy Mār (i) Jacob* [of Serug] *on the victorious Mār (i) Sargis* (Sergius) *and Baccus* (pp. 650–661). A history of these saints has been published by Bedjan in Vol. III, pp. 283 ff.

XXV. *Sermon of the same Mār (i) Jacob on the forty holy martyrs* [of Sebaste] (pp. 662–673). An account of these martyrs can be found in Vol. III, pp. 355 ff.

XXVI. *Sermon on those that have died, by the same Mār (i) Jacob* (pp. 674–689). *Cf.* Vol. V, pp. 615 ff.

From the foregoing list it will be seen that Bedjan has placed a great deal of material at the service of the historian of the church. Lives of saints are not always edifying and interesting; but they often contain a good deal of historical material. Let us hope that some students will be found in America who will make the proper use of these documents.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY. RICHARD GOTTHEIL.

WOMAN UNDER MONASTICISM. Chapters on Saint Lore and Convent Life between A. D. 500 and A. D. 1500. By LINA ECKENSTEIN. Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896. Pp. xvi + 496. $4.

MISS ECKENSTEIN'S book is one of the few thoughtful contributions by a woman to the past history of woman. Usually books of this kind are characterized by limited knowledge of the subject, inferior judgment, and yet a certain red-hot zeal for the holy cause of propaganda that knows neither modesty in the presentation of view nor respect for truth, the only thing which really can be of avail to us. Miss Eckenstein assumes no attitude either of defense or of attack, she is at once an earnest, exceedingly painstaking student and a faithful recorder of the many different phenomena which she meets in her course of study. Aside from the general remarks she makes in the preface she passes very little judgment upon what she meets. If in the mind of the thoughtful reader the book has any very serious fault, it is this, that Miss Eckenstein draws so few parallels, presents so few far-reaching conclusions. She records and classifies rather than compares and defines. Besides its value as a scholarly effort the book would have a greater influence upon the public and be a riper individual product, if it had more distinctive philosophical bearing. But the scholar and the historian are so seldom united that we are perhaps not justified in demanding such a rare combination.

The book is a substantial volume of nearly 500 pages, containing a survey of woman's life during one thousand years of monastic influence. The author divides her attention between the Frankish Empire, England, and Germany, beginning with the first traces of Christian transformation of heathen life, giving as much historical background in either case as the clear presentation of the subject demands. Within the compass of twelve chapters the author treats of such different and interesting topics as "The Tribal Goddess as a Christian Saint" (chap. 1, § 2); "The Revolt of the Nuns at Poitiers" (chap. 2, § 2); "Nun Hrotsvith and her Writings" (chap. 5, § 3); "Herrad and the Garden of Delights" (chap. 7, § 2); "Prophecy and Philanthropy" (chap. 8); "Aspects of Convent Life in England" (chap. 10); and sundry others, until she closes with "The Dissolution of Cloister Life" (chap. 12). If it were permissible to express personal preference for any of these subjects, I should say that to me the interest centers in the introductory chapter, where the parallel is drawn between the woman of the mother-age and the unmarried woman of

mediæval life, where savage habits and the craving for independence are manifested in such diametrically opposed types as the loose woman on the one side and the nun on the other. Such hints as these (even where the suggestion cannot bear the weight of evidence and must be, at any rate, deemed hypothetical only) widen the horizon, stimulate investigation, and relieve one from the narrow scope of inquiry which otherwise interferes with the enjoyment of the work. For a student of civilization, it is interesting also to find the woman-saint in many cases but a transcription of a heathen goddess or some other remarkable figure, traces of primeval life mingled with heathen and Christian elements, the Amazon, the saint, and the witch in one. It is equally suggestive to read that women notoriously bad (chap. 1, § 3) were elevated to saintliness by popular belief, in spite of the opposition to church and law, the sympathy of the common people being appealed to by this irrepressible individualism reminding them of a willful past. One is forcibly reminded of the present existence of such sympathy for the unlawful when an enlightened public laments the hanging of a notorious murderer or thief and covers his grave with roses.

It appears a little too confined to attribute the weird characteristics of certain women-saints to tribal goddesses alone and forget the close similarity of such figures as the *Ontkommer* or *Kümmerniss* (p. 36) with certain ambiguous pagan deities. (The *Venus barbata* spoken of in the footnote no doubt is a hermaphrodite). Miss Eckenstein, where she speaks of tribal goddesses, has not made very many new discoveries, but she has applied her own conclusion to ideas expressed by Simrock, Panzer, and Grimm and made the suggestions presented by these writers appear even more plausible.

In certain places Miss Eckenstein does not exercise sufficient criticism, but honors certain statements by the old writers at their face value, as for instance when she admires the poem by Radegundis to her cousin (p. 61) as an expression of genuine feeling—a poem which plainly bears the stamp of imitation from Latin writers. Radegundis probably never wrote such a thing in spite of her being a queen. It was probably composed for her by a clerk. Fortunatus himself may have put his hand to the pen and assisted his dear "mother" and friend, voicing the sentiments far more eloquently than the dull grief in the queen's breast could ever have expressed itself.

In regard to the composition of the book and the handling of material it appears that in many cases the contents of sections might have been considerably reduced, certain typical instances chosen by way

of illustration and others less typical dropped. The mass of detail taken up and faithfully recorded sometimes threatens to exhaust the reader's patience. Also in regard to the style it might be said that the sentences are sometimes intolerably long and badly linked, the "wheres" and "whiches" being uncommonly numerous and making the reading heavy. German thoroughness is unfortunately not always combined with English conciseness of expression.

In justice to Miss Eckenstein it must be said that she has established her scholarship, has done an enormous amount of work, and collected valuable information. The use of the book in our libraries, which are not too well supplied with English treatises upon the life and history of the Middle Ages, cannot be too heartily recommended.

M. WERGELAND.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

UEBER DIE "LEGES EDWARDI CONFESSORIS." Von F. LIEBERMANN. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1896. Pp. 139. M 3.

THIS volume is one of several special studies by Professor Liebermann in English history in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. In the same general style are *Quadripartitus, ein englisches Rechtsbuch von 1114* (1892); *Conciliatio Cnuti* (1893); *Ueber die Leges Anglorum* (1894); *Ueber Pseudo-Cnuts Constitutiones de Foresta* (1894).

Under thirteen heads the author learnedly discusses the *Leges Edwardi Confessoris*. He shows that this was not the original title, and that of the two early forms of the text the earlier and shorter is the more trustworthy. From internal evidence he forms a conjectural opinion of the time and place and occupation of the author, who seems to have done his work between 1136 and 1154, to have lived in the neighborhood of Coventry, and to have been some sort of church official. In a literary way the *Leges* is of slight importance, but philologically it is of the greatest value. By the phraseology employed floods of light are thrown on the language, history, constitution, and laws of England in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Out of the *Leges* much valuable information can be gleaned concerning the external and internal condition of England in that day. The possessions, officials, immunities, and privileges of the church can here be studied. The place and power of the king in the governmental scheme, and the orders and grades in the English state and society are here set forth. In the *Leges* we learn how England was divided

in population and in territory for purposes of civil order, what courts were instituted for the maintaining of justice between man and man, what crimes were most frequent and flagrant, and what punishments were meted out for these offenses.

The *Leges Edwardi Confessoris* is a valuable source of original information concerning the England of the twelfth century. In a literary, philological, and historical way it is of great value. From it, at first hand, we gain trustworthy knowledge respecting the church, the king, the nobility, the territorial and political subdivisions, the judicial processes, the laws, crimes, and punishments. These points Professor Liebermann with great clearness and a wealth of learning brings out and emphasizes in the dissertation before us.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. ERI B. HULBERT.

A HISTORY OF AURICULAR CONFESSION AND INDULGENCES IN THE LATIN CHURCH. Vols. I, II, III. By HENRY CHARLES LEA. Philadelphia: Lea Brothers & Co., 1896.

IT is with justifiable pride in American historical scholarship that we welcome another contribution from the pen of Mr. Lea. Those who have read his previous works on *Studies in Church History*, *Superstition and Force*, *The History of the Inquisition*, *The History of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, will find their highest anticipations realized in *History of Confession and Indulgences*.

It will be seen that all Mr. Lea's subjects are closely related, and that naturally his thorough treatment of each one has thrown light on all the rest. We have then here a group of studies as exhaustive and as masterly as they could well be. Our author has not merely been fortunate in his grouping, but in other respects he was peculiarly qualified for his great undertaking. To begin with he had the natural endowments for an historian. Among these are a great capacity for acquiring and sifting facts, large sympathy with the weaknesses and even the follies of humanity, the generalizing power that is able to bring order out of widely diverse and numerous masses of facts, the judicial calm that arises above passion or partisanship, the love of truth that rests only in perfect justice. When such a mind is turned upon complex and conflicting historical situations we expect thoroughness, orderly arrangement, and illumination. So it seems to us that in the work before us we have a treatment of confession and indulgences that will render further investigation of this particular kind unnecessary for years.

Mr. Lea does not propose a philosophical treatment of his subject —a method of historical treatment perfectly legitimate—but rather a treatment that must always precede philosophical consideration. He proposes an investigation of the facts. He proposes, moreover, that his facts shall come in every case from the original sources and that they shall be entirely representative. The temptation of a Protestant writer on a subject of this kind is always, even if unconsciously, to be unjust. Our author has accordingly refrained from consulting Protestant writers and confined himself "exclusively to original and to Catholic authorities, confident that what might thus be lost in completeness would be compensated by accuracy and impartiality." He has purposely refrained from extensive comment and preferred to allow the facts to tell their own story. It will thus be seen that the treatise is to be purely and broadly historical and not in any sense polemical. The entire work of more than sixteen hundred pages is a vast collection of facts that at first might seem labyrinthine; but really it is not so, for the facts have been correctly grouped and so lead to their conclusions with irresistible power. Exact references are made to the sources of information, so that should anyone doubt the statements of facts, and consequently the validity of the inferences, verification is always possible.

The first two volumes treat of Confession and Absolution, the third of Indulgences.

The great ideas and systems, good and bad, that have controlled the world have never sprung full grown into existence. In almost all cases they have had microscopic beginnings, have had to struggle for existence, for growth, and for dominion. This was exactly true of confession and indulgences. In the days of primitive Christianity men had immediate access to the Father through the Son. There was little, if any, thought of priestly intervention. But on account of the necessary growth of organization and the ever-present weakness and sinfulness the necessity for discipline became urgent. Penance, reconciliation, heresies, the pardon of sin by priests, the power of the keys, confession, jurisdiction, the confessional, indulgences have their beginnings. Then, as the centuries move on, there is developed a spiritual autocracy the like of which the world has never seen. It is perfectly easy to understand how all these ideas could start. A beginning having been made the development departed farther and farther from the spirit, emphasized more and more the letter, extended its ramifications in all possible directions, became ever more artificial, until there grew

up a vast and all-embracing system of externalism entirely mechanical, from which the original spirit had taken its flight. In this complete change of attitude the church "has abandoned its function as the guardian of morality, and has devoted itself to smoothing and broadening the steep and narrow path. In each successive age it has claimed that the increasing wickedness of man renders impossible the maintenance of the old severity, and by condescending it has stimulated rather than repressed the evil. Its effort has been, not to make men better, but to save them from the consequences of their sins. The power which it claims as entrusted to it by God has been wielded to elude and not to vindicate the justice of God. . . . . If the sinner cannot be induced to abandon his sin he can at least be kept in ignorance that he sins; his fear of hell can be removed by absolution and of purgatory by an indulgence; his conscience can be soothed and he can be kept in obedience to the kindly mother church, whose benignity thus assures him of heaven without imposing burdens on earth too heavy for his weakness."[1]

It is difficult for one not acquainted with mediæval times to understand how these ideas could so entirely dominate everything.

A good illustration is seen in the Jubilee—an outgrowth of indulgences. It was appointed in 1300 by Boniface VIII. Plenary indulgence was offered to every Christian who for certain days would worship at the tombs of Peter and Paul. This led immense hosts of pilgrims to set out for Rome. They entered like invading armies. "Aged men were brought on litters, and from Savoy there came one more than a hundred years old, carried by his son. In Rome the crowds were so great that many were crushed and famine was feared. . . . . Ventura says that during his stay of fifteen days he many times saw men and women trampled under foot, and more than once he narrowly escaped the same fate. On Christmas eve the crowd was estimated by the Romans at two millions." They came from all quarters of Christendom. The profits to the church were enormous. At first the Jubilee was to occur every hundred years, but the demand became so great that the time was reduced to fifty years, then to thirty-three years, then to twenty-five.

The thinkers of the times, as of late times, had many hard nuts to crack, but they went at it with mediæval assurance. Unfortunately the great men of the different periods often failed to agree. But as the age was entirely uncritical these disagreements did not prevent the

[1] Vol. III, p. 583.

rapid growth and universal extension of confession and indulgences. Mr. Lea, with his infinite wealth of facts, flashes the clear, cold light of history into all these intricate windings, and we are able to understand how these things so impossible to us, with our enlightened and critical Protestantism, were possible then.

The Reformation came in time to save the church from becoming an instrumentality of unmixed evil. Protestantism arose as a permament competitor and Romanism was forced into new adaptations, but it has really abated none of its claims, and our author concludes that "there is no reason to doubt that it has entered upon a new career of even wider influence and prosperity than those that have preceded it."

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

STUDIES SUBSIDIARY TO THE WORKS OF BISHOP BUTLER. By the RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE. New York: The Macmillan Co. London: Henry Frowde. Pp. vii+370. $2.

THIS volume contains twenty-one essays, "which are meant to be supplementary to the works of Butler." The first part, headed "Butler," is of a more general character, discussing such subjects as Butler's method, its application to the Scriptures, his censors, his mental qualities, theology, his celebrity and influence; the second part, "Subsidiary," examines specific doctrines, as a future life, necessity or determinism, teleology, miracle, and the mediation of Christ. The aim is explanatory and apologetic, to show the character and value of Bishop Butler's works, particularly the *Analogy*, to meet the objections of his censors, and to recommend his writings "for permanent and classical study by the more thoughtful minds." The method in these writings is valued more highly than the argument. This method does not aim at scientific demonstration, for it is admitted that this is not possible in matters pertaining to revelation and spirituality. The reasoning of the Bishop is more concerned with practice than with knowledge. Since "probability is the guide of life," he is everywhere intent on discovering what is probable or likely in religion, holding that the strongest reason amid conflicting evidences demands the assent of the mind. Butler "was engaged in an endeavor to show to those who demanded an absolute certainty in the proofs of religion that this demand was unreasonable; and the method he pursued in this demonstration was to point out to them how much of their own daily

conduct was palpably and rightly founded upon evidence less than certain." In pursuing this method the Bishop is careful neither to understate the argument of an opponent nor to overstate his own. The study of his works disciplines the mind so as to view a controverted subject impartially and in every light, and to make for it only such claims as the facts warrant. Revealed religion must be subjected to the same tests as the other highest concerns of life. The tests establish that this religion is such as might be expected according to the analogy of nature; it is adapted to our faculties, to our earthly condition, and to our practical needs; it thus meets our just intellectual demands and imposes on us the moral responsibility of accepting the argument of greatest probability as the guide of life. It is the exposition, the defense, and the application of this method of Bishop Butler to which the volume before us is devoted.

The strong faith of Mr. Gladstone naturally finds arguments in favor of Christianity in Butler's works where the skeptic sees none or is actually confirmed in his doubts. Nevertheless our author reveals the same fairness which he so highly praises in the *Analogy*. The chief value of the volume consists in the clear statement and strong defense of the purpose and method of Butler, and in a criticism of the objections urged against them. The *Analogy* presupposes the existence of God; its arguments are directed against deism, not against atheism. Everyone knows that the advance of science, the theory of evolution, and biblical criticism have made demands on apologetics which no work of last century can meet. Mr. Gladstone admits "that the work of Butler, faithfully adjusted as it was to the needs of his own day, is inadequate to the needs of ours. . . . . His argument does not of itself confute the agnostic, the positivist, the materialist; and it is also true that, the argument against miracles not having been fully developed when he wrote, his observations on this point, as they stand, are incomplete." Yet even for our day the *Analogy* is of great value on account of its method, its direct arguments, and its inferences. We may agree with the agnostic that there is a realm of the unknowable and yet take our stand with Butler in the vindication of a valid faith on the basis of indisputable probability.

There is no preface, introduction, or index, all of which might be helpful to the reader. Some of the essays appeared in *Good Words* before they were published in this volume. All refer to Butler, but their connection, particularly in the first part, is not always systematic. The volume closes with "Probability as the Guide of Life," which is

already discussed in the first chapter, "On the Method of Butler," and on which so much of the defense of Butler's works depends. This, however, is incidental and does not affect the substance.

The work makes us wonder at the broad and profound scholarship of one so absorbed by practical affairs as Mr. Gladstone has been. He lays under contribution the ancient classics, the church fathers, German and French as well as English writers, history, philosophy, and theology. Especially is the clearness and comprehensiveness of his thinking manifest in discussing the nature and value of evidence.

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

IMMANUEL KANTS AUFFASSUNG VON DER BIBEL UND SEINE AUSLEGUNG DERSELBEN. Ein Compendium Kantscher Theologie. Von C W. VON KÜGELGEN. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme)., 1896. Pp. ix + 96. M 1.60.

THIS brief treatise is interesting and valuable. The author has wisely allowed Kant to state his own view of the Bible and to give abundant examples of his mode of interpretation. The work is accordingly in large part made up of pertinent quotations from the great philosopher, arranged naturally under appropriate headings, introduced, accompanied, and followed by brief, discriminating, and helpful statements of the author. The reader is put in the way to verify the author's work, for at the beginning is given a full list of the works quoted and their respective editions, and the quotations are referred each to its own place in these works. The value of the little volume is also much increased by its full index of included names, subjects, and Scripture quotations. The whole number of these quotations is three hundred. This shows at once the large use of the Bible made by Kant, and the condensed comprehensiveness of the author's exhibit. We have at the outset, largely in Kant's own words, an account of the early home influences under which the boy came into his knowledge of Holy Scripture. Both father and mother were devout, earnest Christians, faithful in their observance of the ordinances of the church, and careful to train their child in their own mode of thought and life. To the minister of their church they entrusted the early school education of their son, and this minister was like the parents in mind and spirit. Kant, in later years, spoke of his parents with profound

respect. He had no sympathy with their *pietism*, as he regarded it, but commended in emphatic language their pure, strong, virtuous characters.

The public authorities in 1788 placed Kant's works on the philosophy of religion in the "Index Librorum Prohibitorum," charging these works with a perversion of many fundamental doctrines of Christianity and the Bible. This led Kant to write in his own defense an answer stating his view of the mutual relation of the Bible and philosophy and explaining his own use of the Bible in his philosophical discussions. In these he had not perverted and depreciated Christian doctrines because it was alien to the purpose of such discussions to pass judgments favorable or unfavorable upon those doctrines, and he had never so done. In this answer, however, he proceeds to give his view of the Bible. Its one proper function is the moral improvement of mankind, and in its fitness to accomplish this lies its whole value. Quite rrespective of its claim to be a revelation from God, it is the right and duty of man's reason to judge of its moral truth and consequent worth. The moral law is supreme in man and its principles are given only in man's moral reason. It is for philosophy to recognize those principles and give them adequate expression. If the theologian is not in harmony with this philosophy, so much the worse for the theologian. In interpreting the Bible one's moral reason must be his guide. Anything contradictory to the principle of this reason must be rejected, whether it be an interpretation of a passage or the passage itself. Scripture that in some circumstances and for some people is a vehicle of truth may for others or in other circumstances be the reverse. Faith apart from right moral principle is worthless.

To Kant it is a matter of indifference whether the historical parts of the Bible are authentic or not. If they aptly embody and disclose moral principles in their right relations and applications, it is enough. The biblical account of the origin and development of the human race which connects man's universal sinfulness with the first man is, for Kant, only the historical form of stating the results at which one's reason arrives by reflecting on the moral life as known in self-consciousness. Obligation implies power; and since we find in our conscious personal life no sinless starting point, the start in sinlessness was carried back to the beginning of the race. Kant seems to regard the Book of Job as the most significant part of the Old Testament, as the best and purest statement of whatever is valid in that Testament.

Job makes his conscious rectitude the basis of his faith. He founds his theology upon this consciousness. His friends take the current view and oppose him. They argue from a fixed faith in what is without man to what must be within him. This opposition between him and them in the central principle makes conflict of view all up and down the line. The book in its close justifies Job rather than them, because he was right and they wrong as to principle, but blames him because largely in error in the application of the principle.

Kant praises the Old Testament for insisting everywhere upon a supreme authority to which every man is subject, but maintains that by making the motives to obedience so dominantly temporal it nearly emptied the law of all true moral contents and worth. Action whose motive is only reward has no moral value. The New Testament changes all this. It presents to view in the person of Jesus Christ the true idea of a normal human life,—a life in which all the motives are found in the intrinsic worth of virtue itself and in which all the virtues come to the full. The idea is the same whether the history as fact is or is not authentic, and the value of the history is in the idea. There is nothing improbable, much less impossible, nothing implying the miraculous in the supposition that the eternal idea of sinless humanity should have been realized in an actual person such as Jesus of Nazareth. Still, fellowship with him is simply making in some measure real that which is presented in him as ideal, and this realization in ourselves of the ideal is effected through our own power of self-determination. For this the authenticity of the history is not essential. And it is delusion to imagine that any other agent than our own wills, in whole or part, by an immediate agency in us originates and develops the holy life. The history represents Jesus Christ as rising bodily from the dead and ascending into heaven. The essential truth contained in this is that the moral cannot be regarded as subject to the physical. Hence the perfect man cannot be so subject to death that his existence should be brought to an end by it or his true life in any degree impaired. This principle of the supremacy of virtue in the universe is the element of truth also in all the accounts of miracles.

The movement begun by Christ and having in him its norm is still going forward in the world. All churches and other organizations whose bond of fellowship and conscious aim is moral are a visible part of this kingdom, with which must also be recognized a complementary invisible part. In this kingdom, alike in the individual and the com-

munity, the perfection of Christ is only partially realized. There is a mixture of good and evil. These two are recognized as antagonistic. Their perpetual opposition in the same life, whether individual or associated, is intolerable. Out of these two convictions of the practical reason "the doctrine of last things" has taken its shape. It is presented in the form of predicted history. There is to be a millennium, a second advent, a final judgment, a separation of the holy from the unholy, a fixed state, eternity. Such representations have as fact nothing valid for life; it is only as symbolic exhibitions of moral principles and their power in life that they avail. The value of the principles is in themselves; the value of the history in its exhibition and enforcement of the principles.

It would be interesting to follow the philosopher in his interpretation of individual passages, but for this there is no space. That he is honest cannot be doubted. That his one-sided ethical philosophy everywhere dominates his view and interpretation of Scripture is evident. As our author says in closing his treatise: "It was a part of Kant's life work to deliver the philosophy of religion from the speculative intellectualism of his time so as to give to the practical reason its due place." In consideration of this great service we may pardon some defects. But one cannot lay down the little treatise without a deep regret that one whose power was so great in one direction might not have had also the completeness and sweetness of life which would have come to him from the childlike faith and piety of his parents.

WATERVILLE, ME. GEO. D. B. PEPPER.

CHRISTLICHE ETHIK. Akademische Vorlesung von DR. THEOL. ROBERT KÜBEL, ord. Professor der Theologie in Tübingen. Herausgegeben von Gottlob Weisser, Stadtvikar in Stuttgart. 2 vols. München: Beck, 1896. Pp. xvi+256; vi+365, 12mo. M 8.

THIS is a posthumous work consisting of the lectures on Christian Ethics which the late Dr. Kübel had given for a number of years in the theological department of the University of Tübingen. The author's manuscript is the basis of the work, and this has been compared with the editor's notes taken in 1888 and also with the notes of one who heard the course when last given in the year 1894. The entire con-

tent, however, is Kübel's, the editor having confined himself to adding headings to important subdivisions within the paragraphs, making a few changes of style in the interest of clearness, verifying quotations and supplying indices to the biblical passages referred to and to the subject-matter.

The first half of the introduction discusses the nature of morals and ethics, the relation of morality to religion, and the nature, sources, and method of Christian ethics.

There can be no absolute separation between religion and morality; each in its perfection involves the other. As to the essence of morality, every spiritually mature and moral man must admit that it is only as being and becoming determined that he can determine himself. Now the absolute determining life-power we men call "God." Only on the ground of theonomy, therefore, can there be autonomy. The essence of religion, on the other hand, involves the feeling of being determined by an absolute life-power. This feeling, however, is not yet religion itself, but only its subjective-objective ground. Religion is in fact not actualized until man affirms this original and immediate self-witness of God by and in him. This affirmation is a moral act. Genuine religion must then be or become also moral. It is only as not yet perfected that either can stand without the other. The genuine moral-religious man accepts for himself theonomy fully and completely and thereby becomes truly autonomous. The entire riddle is solved only by the Christian pneumatonomy which is autonomy, but only on the basis of living theonomy. Christian morality is, too, free life and conduct in which, however, not man as man but the Christian is the acting subject. All in this life and conduct rests on the accepted fact of salvation through Christ and has in this fact its characteristic determination. The highest purpose of this conduct as well as the moral power from which it proceeds, and the moral law according to which it proceeds, Good, Virtue, and Duty, therefore, have a quite specific character through this relation to Christ. And this relation is not at all a mere determination of the Christian alongside of other purely human determinations, but the central determining factor of his very being. Just as there is no absolute distinction between morality and religion, so there is no absolute distinction between human and Christian morality.

Christianity = genuine humanity. It is through Christ's teaching that we first learn what is really human, genuine manhood, not through mere nature and history but from the New Testament. Christianity

demands and gives a "new" man—but yet a man. The relation of purely philosophical to Christian ethics is a positive one on the formal side in so far as the latter, if it is to proceed scientifically, must follow the laws of all scientific thinking and presentation; on the material side in so far as the Christian morality presented is the fulfillment of the philosophically described human morality. The relation is a negative one, however, in so far as the source of the Christian doctrine of morals is neither philosophical thinking and speculation, nor primarily the empirical experience of the individual or humanity, but alone the revelation of God in Christ and its original attestation in the Scriptures. Even the Christian experience of the individual or of the community can be a source only so far as this rests upon and is ever newly determined by this revelation. Kübel's final definition of Christian ethics is, "the scientific presentation of Christian moral conduct as life in the spirit of Christ through the word of Christ."

The last half of the introduction gives in concise outlines an excellent review of Christian ethics from the time of the apostolic Fathers down to recent Catholic, Protestant, and rationalistic writers upon the subject. The body of the work is divided into two main parts, the first of which is entitled "The demand and possibility of Christian morality;" the second "The realization of Christian morality in life." Among the prominent subjects of discussion in the first part may be noticed: Conscience, The Will, Principle and source of sin, Law and Christianity, Christ as Teacher, Pattern, Redeemer and Saviour, The biblical doctrine of the kingdom of God, Nature and development of the church, Ethical significance of the sacraments; in the second part: The new birth, The highest good, The conflict of duties, Christian virtue, Moral life of the Christian family, state, and church. The content of the work is exceedingly rich. Almost every phase of life and conduct receives some attention. Of especial interest is the discussion of education and the relation of church and state.

While there seems to be little that is new in the work, it is none the less useful as a general introduction to the subject and a convenient book of reference. The treatment is scholarly, moderate in tone, and reverent in spirit. The value of the book is greatly enhanced by a full analytical table of contents, an index of subjects, and an index of biblical references—some eleven hundred in number.

F. C. FRENCH.

VASSAR COLLEGE.

THE PRINCIPLES OF ECCLESIASTICAL UNITY. Four lectures delivered in St. Asaph Cathedral, on June 16, 17, 18, and 19, by ARTHUR JAMES MASON, D.D., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge and Canon of Canterbury. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co. 1896. Pp. 162, 8vo. 3s. 6d.

CHURCH UNITY. Five lectures delivered in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, during the winter of 1896, by CHARLES W. SHIELDS, D.D., LL.D., E. BENJAMIN ANDREWS, LL.D., JOHN F. HURST, D.D., LL.D., HENRY C. POTTER, D.D., LL.D., AMORY H. BRADFORD, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. viii+231, 8vo; cloth. $1.

THESE books, containing discussions of the same topic, one the expression of English views, the other of American, were produced and issued from the press during the same year. They are an evidence of the strength and breadth of the irenic movement.

Dr. Mason, in his four lectures, treats of "The Duty of Unity," "The Internal Principle of Unity," "The External Principle of Unity," and "The Application of the Principles."

In his first lecture he animadverts at some length on the Pope's letter, in which his Holiness denies the validity of Anglican orders. He thinks that the address from the Vatican would have been more "Christianlike" and effective, if it had not been "shot out to English people at large, without so much as a recognition that there existed any special claimant to represent the ancient Church of England." Still he regards it better that the Pope should have spoken even with seeming discourtesy than not to have spoken at all. After this suggestive treatment of the Pope's missive, he sets forth cogently the duty of ecclesiastical unity as taught in the Scriptures.

But first there must be internal unity; its principle, "a common faith," its model, "the unity of the Father and the Son." This unity must be based on Holy Scripture, "interpreted not only in the light of accurate scholarship, but also in the light of history." Guided by the Divine Word we shall find the "adoring love of Christ" to be "the true fundamental article of the Christian creed."

As to the external principle of unity, the lecturer declares that "intercommunion is the visible proof and the indispensable means of ecclesiastical union," by which he means that all Christians must unite in partaking of the Lord's Supper, administered by those who are legitimately authorized to officiate. Only those who belong to

the apostolical succession are duly qualified to administer the Supper. He is so positive that this is the true external principle of unity, that with "St. Austin to the Donatists" he cries: "We cannot come out to you; do you come in to us!" (we quote his own words.) But every division of the universal church might quite as reasonably utter the same cry, which would convince any sane mind that ecclesiastical union, so long as such an attitude is maintained, is the chimera of chimeras.

In his last lecture, as might have been expected, he finds apparently almost insuperable difficulties in the application of his principles.

While there is much in these lectures which is worthy of hearty commendation, there are statements which will not bear the test of Scripture. The lecturer calls the Lord's Supper a "sacrament," the New Testament does not; the table of the Supper he calls an "altar," but no one can find any such notion in the New Testament. He says that "all Anglicans believe" that Christ is present in the Supper in such a real sense "that they actually receive him into themselves in the Holy Communion." This is bald sacramentarianism, both unscriptural and mischievous, and "*all* Anglicans" certainly do not believe it.

The subjects of the lectures delivered in the Union Theological Seminary are "The General Principles of Church Unity," "The Sin of Schism," "The Irenic Movements since the Reformation," "The Chicago-Lambeth Articles," and "The Unity of the Spirit — a World-Wide Necessity." The lecturers alike deplore division, and advocate unity, but disagree as to what unity means. One of them contends for organic unity; another that such unity is not what is most desirable, but rather unity of spirit; and the last lecturer supports this view by saying that "the ideal of the church will be realized when its members are harmonious, not because of one organization, but because filled with one spirit."

In our criticism we wish to suggest, first, that the times are evidently propitious for unity. Nations are no longer isolated. The barriers which separated them have been largely swept away. They are brought close to each other by the steamship and telegraph. Smaller states are being merged into larger. Churches whose differences have become trivial are being united in one body. Theological rancor has almost wholly disappeared. Love has become the watchword of Christendom. Different denominations are coöperating with

each other in many Christian enterprises. Christians of different names pray alike and are praying together. They also sing the same hymns. Already there is a marked unity of spirit.

Second, real organic unity can come only from unity of spirit and of belief. In securing organic unity we shall inevitably be compelled to reckon with conscience. Honest, earnest Christian men can never be brought to sustain by word or act any organization which they believe to be contrary to the truth. If they could it would be an immeasurable calamity.

Third, the truth of which we speak is that of the Scriptures. All true Christians, outside of the Roman Catholic church, profess to regard the Scriptures as ultimate authority in all matters of faith and practice. The first of the four principles set forth in the Chicago-Lambeth articles, as a basis of unity, is the Scriptures. This is fundamental and comprehensive. It includes all that is requisite to secure organic unity, if that is thought to be necessary. If a creed is desirable, let it fairly express the truth of the Scriptures. Let all Christendom receive the two ordinances, baptism and the Lord's Supper, and administer them according to the Scriptures. Let all who build and govern churches do as the apostles did, never transcending the Scriptures. Let all believe what the Scriptures teach, and do what the Scriptures command. There may be for a time differences of interpretation, but the principle fully received and resolutely carried out, will eventually secure both unity of spirit and of organization. We do not want four principles of unity, according to the Chicago-Lambeth proposal, but one; not four standards of agreement, but one; not a quadrilateral, but a straight line, which in faith, as well as in mathematics, is the shortest distance between any two given points.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SOCIAL RIGHTS AND DUTIES. Addresses to Ethical Societies. By LESLIE STEPHEN. Two vols., cloth. Pp. iv+255 and iv+267. London: Swan, Sonnenschein & Co; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1896. $3.

THE author of these essays is eminent among the none too numerous writers who keep a firm hold upon all the various classes of considerations which are presumed to be familiar to cultured men. His world is the world to which the typical American college man has

been introduced, but he has confined himself to no narrow corner of it. He has rather kept the whole world under his eye and, according to academic standards, his thought is in the least degree provincial. There are few writers in whose essays the American college man may find a larger proportion of sentiments and sentences which he might be expected to express for himself if he attended to the same topics and had skill in formulating his reflections. This is not faint praise. It recognizes Mr. Stephen's merit as a thinker of more nearly the whole world known to educated men than is usually kept in view. Thanks to this merit the educated man who reads Mr. Stephen's essays gets from them constant help in assorting his ideas. He seldom finds in them any material fact which he should not have known before, nor does he find correlations of the facts which are very obscure, yet by help of the essays he reaches frequent percepts which his unorganized and uneven knowledge had not discovered. Mr. Stephen, in other words, is a remarkably efficient organ of today's social mind, in that he elaborates great numbers of conclusions which are implicitly in the knowledge which the "liberal education" of our day is supposed to impart. Upon a wide range of subjects he codifies formal principles with which educated men of judicial temper will very rarely join issue. He thus draws lines for the broad treatment which the educated man should give to the problems that confront our generation. His views are a partial collection of the more fundamental thoughts by which the educated men of England and America are consciously or unconsciously controlled. These essays are consequently a mirror in which we may frequently see our own minds in unfamiliar attitudes. In the two volumes before us the author has written about the aims of ethical societies, science and politics, the sphere of political economy, the morality of competition, social equality, ethics and the struggle for existence, heredity, punishment, luxury, the duties of authors, the vanity of philosophizing, and forgotten benefactors. If we wish to know the probable trend of our own general beliefs in case they should be brought to bear upon the same themes, the essays in this collection will furnish the information with a high degree of exactness.

This is not to say that Mr. Stephen is more infallible than many another in the application of formal principles to material conditions; nor that all educated men think alike upon particular questions, or would think alike if they adhered to their major premises; nor that answers which Mr. Stephen offers to definite questions are the same

which every educated reader will give. On the contrary, his well-balanced formulas no more save him than they would less judicial thinkers from the erroneous conclusions that follow from false values assigned to his terms. For a single instance — competent critics will hardly be found to challenge these propositions: "We believe that morality depends upon something deeper and more permanent than any of the dogmas that have hitherto been current in the churches. It is a product of human nature, not of any of these transcendental speculations or faint survivals of traditional superstitions. Morality has grown up independently of and often in spite of theology" (Vol. I, p. 20). Men who know most about the practical value of dogmas may be as sure as Mr. Stephen that they are not the source but the expression of morality. They will then by no means find themselves driven to his conclusion that "a religion really to affect the vulgar must be a superstition; to satisfy the thoughtful it must be a philosophy;" and, further, "it is impracticable so to fuse the crude with the refined as to make a working compromise" (Vol. I, p. 12). The data of ethics are all the available facts about the elements which have to be combined by the will in the various sorts of moral acts, and about the consequences that flow from conduct. The Christian revelation is an exhibit of some of these facts and relations. Its essence is not at all in any philosophy which purports to rationalize these data. It is consequently altogether gratuitous to posit a necessary antithesis between Christianity and ethics.

ALBION W. SMALL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DISCOURSES ON THE EPISTLE OF PAUL TO THE PHILIPPIANS. By REV. FREDERICK A. NOBLE, D.D., Pastor Union Park Congregational Church, Chicago. New York, Chicago, Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Company. Pp. 385; cloth. $1.25.

THE twenty-three sermons which make up this volume are in the main expository. Taken as a whole they are of a high order. The preacher has so divided the epistle that each passage for exposition furnishes a well-defined subject. Around this subject, which is the central, unifying thought of the passage, he has admirably grouped its subordinate thoughts; so that unity, the fundamental law of all effective discourse, has been very perfectly realized.

The preacher has evidently mastered the thought of the epistle; at all events, he has made up his mind as to what Paul meant when he wrote it. He presents his views of the apostle's thought luminously and with the accent of conviction. He illustrates those views from a wide range of observation and reading. While he is too wise to turn aside from his purpose to discuss before a popular audience questions of criticism, he evidently has in mind the results of the best exegetical scholarship of the day. He also presents, irrespective of fear or favor, all the doctrines and duties of this epistle, so rich in profound thought and so full of the experiences of Paul, the prisoner. He thus has occasion to treat of subjects which one who preaches only topical sermons might not touch during his entire ministry. This is one of the incidental, but vastly important benefits which flow from the thorough popular exposition of an entire epistle.

The style of these discourses is clear and forceful, and scattered here and there over these pages are passages of rare beauty. In fact there is so much which is worthy of commendation, that it seems almost ungracious to present any adverse criticism. But we meet occasionally a lumberly sentence. For instance, they "came into the acceptance of Christ," instead of "they accepted Christ;" "it is the perception which takes place with the ethical senses whereby as in the flash of an instant, some things are seen to be right and others wrong." Here we find at least seven superfluous words. How many ethical "senses" have we? "In the flash of an instant" is tautological; if the flash had been more than an instant it would not have been a "*flash*" at all. In setting forth what Paul meant by "knowledge," he closes a paragraph with this sentence: "It is not *gnosis* merely; it is *epignosis*." For most of his hearers, he crowned that paragraph with darkness.

But the gravest defect in these discourses is a lack of directness. They remind one more of an essay read in some literary club, to those seated cozily around the author, to whom courtesy forbids him to make earnest personal appeal, than of the divine message of an ambassador of Christ, who grapples with an audience that he may stir them up to strive after a higher, holier life. These sermons have but little of that important applicatory element which is so prominent in the sermons of Maclaren, the prince of modern expository preachers.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

*Kadesh-Barnea; or, The Power of a Surrendered Life*, by Rev. J. W. Chapman, D.D. (Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1897, pp. 124, cloth, 50c.), is a little volume which attempts to discover a spiritual meaning in the historical incidents of the Old and New Testaments. In it Egypt is represented as a type of worldliness. The Red Sea stands for the death of Christ in its power to deliver us from the dominion of sin. Kadesh-Barnea is a picture of the man who comes close to highest spiritual reality, but finally turns back to the wilderness life.

One cannot but feel that a great deal of this teaching is read into the Scriptures. There can, however, be no objection to the use of these historical incidents, by way of illustrating gospel truth, if no effort is made to make them prove a doctrine or to put a new interpretation upon the written Word. Dr. Chapman manages to bring forward some striking and suggestive analogies between the experiences of the ancient Israelites and the duties and dangers of the modern Christian life.— JNO. L. JACKSON.

*Messages of Today to the Men of Tomorrow.* By George C. Lorimer, D.D. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1896, pp. xii+464, price $1.50.) The world of yesterday is the leader and teacher of the world of today. We build on the past, and build for the future. The author of this plump volume gathers into twelve "messages" a lot of wholesome advice, the substance of which "has been given in familiar talks to hundreds of young people on both sides of the Atlantic" (p. viii). These "messages" cover a wide range of topics, which touch many phases of modern life. Some of the themes are "cherishing ignoble ambitions," "migrating to the city," "overcoming timidity in battle," "seeking something for nothing," "living beyond their means," "achieving worldly success," "keeping bad company," "dealing honestly with time," "cultivating a love of books," and "receiving the religion of revelation." Every chapter abounds in quotations from literature and events from personal experience to illustrate and emphasize the lessons and admonitions of the author. Considerable diversity is manifest in the method of presentation. Occasionally the abundance of quotation seems to interfere with the discussion of the natural divisions of the theme. The sermonic character, the repetition of thought in different words, is seen on almost every page, and to the scholar seeking facts becomes wearisome. But the author writes for the young, for future genera-

tions. The impetuous vigor of his thought sweeps along with a splendid momentum in spite of a certain heavy verbiage, and the conclusion is a clincher of the thought which he has been, through several paragraphs or pages, driving home. The author's wide range of thought and reading enrich every page and stimulate the reader to nobler deeds. While vigorous pruning might profitably have reduced the size of the book, its strong, bold utterances of the truth will tell for righteousness and for God. We miss the indispensable indexes. —IRA M. PRICE.

*Village Sermons.* By the late F. J. A. Hort, D.D., D.C.L., LL.D. (London: Macmillan & Co., limited. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897, pp. 269, cloth, $1.75.) Twelve out of twenty-four sermons in this volume are upon the books of the Old and New Testaments. Those who have thought of Dr. Hort only as a scholar will be impressed by the absence of the controversial element, and by the practical character of his preaching. Questions of authorship, time of composition, and matters of criticism are entirely ignored. The preacher evidently sought to quicken and develop the religious life of those who heard him. How far he succeeded in accomplishing his object cannot be determined by these sermons. If the hearers were hungry for religious truth, they doubtless found food in the words of their teacher; if they were indifferent, it is probable that they went from the service as they came. The sermons lack incisiveness and grip. They are not adapted to awaken emotion, nor do they appeal strongly to the will. Many of them are little more than paraphrases of the biblical material with which the preacher is dealing.

Lack of careful revision on the part of the editor is found on page 9, where we have the phrase, "but all who are in any way depressed or beaten down low in any way." —LATHAN A. CRANDALL.

# CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

THE SOURCES OF JOSEPHUS FOR THE HISTORY OF SYRIA (*Antiquities*, 12 : 3—13 : 14). By ADOLF BUCHLER; *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January 1897, pp. 311–49.

WHEN Josephus was about to write the history of the Jews under the reign of the Seleucides, he was obliged to have regard also to such sources as had the general affairs of the Syrian Empire for their object. In order to write his history clear and intelligible, it was indispensable for him to relate the incidents of the Syrian Empire in so far as they affected and exercised an influence on Judea. It is strange that in many instances where we would expect a reliable, extensive account he communicates extracts only from Hellenistic writings of doubtful value. It is only in chapter 12 : 3 that the *Antiquities* again contain matter of historical value, chiefly drawn from the first book of the Maccabees. The information about the events in Syria, drawn from the works of pagan Greek historians, also commences at the same passage of the *Antiquities* where the extracts from the first book of the Maccabees begin, and they continue in every chapter up to 13 : 14, so that we may conjecture at the outset that the authority from which Josephus drew commenced its narrative with Antiochus the Great. Where did Josephus take his material? A discussion of the "evidence of Nicholas of Damascus in *Antiquities* 13 : 8 14 §" of "the reference formulas ὡς καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις δεδηλώκαμεν, 13 : 10, 1," etc., where the references have nothing corresponding to them in Josephus, but did probably in Nicholas; "the historical work of Nicholas of Damascus in general," and of "the authors quoted by name in *Antiquities* 12—14," shows that Josephus had borrowed the whole material of the first seventeen books of his *Antiquities* from Nicholas of Damascus, except those data which were taken from the Bible, the letter of Aristeas, the first book of the Maccabees, and some other source that dealt with the high priests. From the same comprehensive work, which contained the history of all peoples, and which was based on primary and reliable sources, he took also the references to such authors as are quoted by name, and the

passages cited from their works, with the exception of Strabo. The very formulas used in referring to a history of Syria are Nicholas' property. Josephus had, however, only sparingly used those portions which bear upon the ancient peoples, because Nicholas had touched upon a few points of contact only between those peoples and the Jews. On the other hand, Josephus had made ample use of the descriptions devoted to the kingdom of the Seleucides, because there had been intimate relations between Jews and Syrians for a period of two centuries. The original work of Nicholas must have been comprehensive and exhaustive, and rich in references, especially in those books that were devoted to the history of ancient peoples. But in Syrian history Polybius and Posidonius were the principal authorities, and their names are given only when the different opinions of other authors are contrasted with theirs.

It appears from several facts that Nicholas, like Polybius, commenced his descriptions of the kingdom of the Seleucides with Antiochus the Great, but that he had treated the history of the preceding kings only very briefly and summarily. It is possible, although not very plausible, that the information for the eleventh book of the *Antiquities* and for 12 : 5, 3—13 : 7 taken from the first book of the Maccabees took the place of almost everything that Nicholas had said about the relations between the Jews and the Seleucides. Josephus' object was to give the heathens a description of the greatness of his fathers. But the latter was much more amply exhibited in the first book of the Maccabees than in the work of Nicholas, who hardly mentions the deeds of the Jews. For the period from Alexander to Antiochus the Great also Josephus found the description of Jewish history as given by the Jewish Hellenists quite sufficient for the object he had in view, and even going beyond it. He therefore disregarded Nicholas and kept to the former, but he failed to notice that he neglected Judea entirely, and transferred the central point of his history to Alexandria and the court of the Ptolemies. This assumption is, for all that, improbable; for in the *Antiquities* from 12 : 5, 3 to 13 : 7, in spite of the servile adherence to the first book of the Maccabees, a good many sentences have been taken from Nicholas' Syrian history, whereas we do not find the long gap from Ptolemy the son of Lagus to Antiochus the Great interrupted by a single event from the universal history of Syria and Egypt. If there had been a history of Nicholas or if Josephus had read Strabo's work he would have found there many remarks about that period.

Büchler's article is a thoroughgoing discussion. The author differs from Bloch (*Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*) and Nussbaum (*Observationes in Flavii Josephi Antiquitatum libros* 12:3—13:14), who came to the conclusion that Josephus had drawn these particulars from Polybius and Posidonius, and also from Destimon (*Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus*), who held that Josephus, although acquainted with the works of these historians, had not made any direct use of them, but had found them blended already with Jewish sources, to which he added only a few abstracts, for the most part without value, from Jewish legendary works; he also differs from Gutschmid, Carl Müller, and others, who thought Josephus had read Berosus for himself. Büchler reaches his results by a detailed examination of internal evidence, no item of which is conclusive, but the sum of which makes the construction of Büchler probable. It awakens a somewhat unpleasant feeling to be told that "the very formulas used" by Josephus "in referring to a history of Syria are Nicholas' property," for one is surprised that any historian should copy cross-references which he knew pointed to nothing in his own writings. It is a slight shock, also, to learn that Josephus copied a list of authorities from Nicholas "to impress his pagan readers," some of whom might be supposed to know more about Manetho, Berosus, Hesiod, and others than they would find borrowed by Josephus, and see his second-hand show of learning. Still Büchler makes out a pretty good case for the large use of Nicholas by Josephus, and makes us the more regret the loss of the Damascus scholar's great work, "which contained the history of all peoples" in 142 books. What would we not give for a history of his own times by this friend and counselor of Herod the Great!

HUGH M. SCOTT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

ZUR LEHRE VON DER PERSON CHRISTI. Von dem selig. PROF. DR. HERM. SCHMIDT; *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, VII. Jahrgang, 2. Heft, 1896, pp. 972–1005.

1. *The religious postulates in the doctrine of Christ.*—The doctrine of the person of Christ cannot be constructed out of our experience. The historical Christ can be known only from history itself, and every attempt to set forth his real nature must accord with the authentic witnesses of his life. A satisfactory Christology must grasp a correct idea of the kingdom of God, note its essential correlation with the person of Christ, and show how redemption must from the beginning have been taken up into the divine purpose of creation, and how, accordingly, creation is as truly mediated through Christ as is redemption. Moreover, a Christology which conserves the fundamental postulates of the common faith must be able to explain the value of Christ's person, suffering and death for the forgiveness of sin, to make his exaltation to the right hand of God intelligible to us, to point out the absolute authority of revelation which this exaltation furnishes, and

finally, to confirm the Christian's blessed hope and assure him of membership in the kingdom of God.

2. *The unity of the person of Christ.*— It is of the first importance in Christology to explain the historical appearance of Jesus Christ so as to put forth no proposition which is inexplicably at variance with historical reality. The doctrine of two natures is prejudicial. An assential property of the human nature and the human spirit is personality. The historical representation of our Lord is that of a unity which altogether excludes the idea of an artificial distinction of sides in his personality, so as to say, "Here the human nature speaks, here the divine." Rather may we say that his person is divine-human, and so also is his nature, for person is nothing else than the self-positing of one's own proper essence and nature. We do not speak of the sensuous and spiritual sides of man's nature as two natures in man, but as one human nature in which the sensuous and the spiritual are so included and combined as to be truly another nature. So we affirm of Christ a unitized divine-human nature, in which the human and divine are essentially modified. Our terminology thus guards against the monophysite heresy by affirming, not two complete natures in one Christ, but one new nature constituted out of elements essential to human nature and also of the fullness of God.

3. *The relation of the God-man to the Logos.*— The Logos is the self-manifestation of God as it is necessary for the process of the inner life of God. He is the mediator of all revelation. The creature itself would not exhibit the content of the life of God if that which is most central in his own Ego found no creaturely representation. The Son, the only begotten, is the specific and peculiar exhibition, in human form, of this central content of the life of God; he is to be conceived as including the Logos in his separate and distinctive existence. As personal subject, distinguished from God, Jesus is not the Logos but the Son. Therefore the expression Logos has no place in the sayings of our Lord, but whenever he speaks of his preëxistent form he calls himself the Son. In the Pauline Christology also the Son is conceived as the subject of the preëxistence (Gal. 4 : 4; Rom. 8 : 3; comp. 1 Cor. 15 : 47). There is thus a duality of the Logos given. So far as he is the self-manifestation of God for his own consciousness and life he can have no separate existence. As little as the image which I form within the mind ceases to exist in my consciousness while I bring it forth into objectivity, so little does the Logos cease to exist within the Godhead while he is manifested in outer form. The Logos without the flesh is

no personality in the human sense, but the human side to Christ also has no reality except in connection with the Logos. The Son is not identical with the divine Logos so far as he has creaturehood and distinctive being; but the divine Logos is also not a distinct person in the human sense as we use that term of the Son.

4. *The self-renunciation of the Son.*—There lies in the idea of the self-manifestation of God a defining and limiting of the content of divine life, and a concrete divine human life is not thinkable without a *kenosis, i. e.*, without a provisional resignation of divine glory and the form of God. But the subject of this *kenosis* is not the Logos but the Son of God. In the only passage where the word *kenosis* occurs the concrete Jesus Christ is named as subject. We are justified therefore in so combining the doctrine of the Son with the Johannean doctrine of the Logos as to understand the Son as the God-man, that is, the Logos entered into a human form of existence and having first thereby become an Ego distinct from the Father and existing for himself. And so the name Logos designates only the hypostasis in the inner life of God, which for the sake of definite manifestation in creaturely existence is called the Son of God in power, and may have being for itself distinct from the Father. This Son, that is, the God-man as such, had no actual existence previous to his entrance into the personal experience of humanity, but the Logos by virtue of his indwelling determination to assume human existence in the Christ, and before the actual realization of such existence, supplies the essential element of preëxistence. So far as the concrete God-man, Jesus Christ, knew himself in his unity with the Logos, he would also be conscious of his preëxistence as a veritable reality. The divine-human glory was also united with the God-man with the entering of the Logos into him; but in his humbling himself, our Lord accepted during his whole earthly life a condition of existence that was actually lacking in his glory. The *kenosis* is continuously realized in the ταπείνωσις.

5. *The state of humiliation.*—The renunciation of the God-man consists in his putting himself in the condition of human experience—popularly but quite suitably expressed as a coming down from heaven upon the earth. He thus becomes Son of Man, in the likeness of sinful flesh, and subject to the sufferings and obstacles of human life. He is involved in that same condition of vanity (ματαιότης) unto which the whole creation is subjected. He laid aside the divine attributes of omniscience and omnipotence so as to be spoken of as learning (Luke 2 : 52), asking questions (Mark 6 : 38), and even acknowledging lack

of knowledge (Mark 13:32). The circle of his Father's activity surpasses his own. Even in the ethical sphere he is so circumscribed by his connection with sinful flesh that in the passiveness which this flesh presents before the world there lie inducements to a selfish using of the world. Hence the power of the temptations of our Lord. Nevertheless, there was given him the consciousness of ability by a simple act of will to withdraw himself from these conditions, and make good his claim to a state in keeping with his identity with the Logos (Matt. 26:53, 54; John 10:18).

6. *The Son of God in the renunciation.*—The *kenosis* cannot be thought of as a renunciation of glory which would leave only a potential existence of the divine humanity, and reduce the historical God-man to the level of common human nature. Such a view would lead directly to Ebionitism. The *kenosis* proceeds only so far as the connection with actual human experience necessarily demands. The self-consciousness of Christ includes his own immediate consciousness of God, and he has within himself an intuitive knowledge of the nature of God (Matt. 11:27; John 1:18). He is the witness of heavenly things (John 3:13). In his mental operations he was absolutely without error. He knew what was in man, and saw through the moral and religious significance of events with perfect clearness. In like manner he outlined, in his prophecies and parables, the future development of the kingdom of God. He is the manifested wisdom of God, and his words and works have no other motive than the will of the Father (John 14:10). He is at once the revelation and witness of the love of God. He was conscious of ability to use at will the power, lying in his identity with the Logos, of availing himself of divine omnipotence and omniscience. It was his glory to manifest this power in miracles, not arbitrarily, but in perfect harmony with the will of the Father. If his works are ascribed to the power of the Spirit (Matt. 12:28), it is because his life with the Father is mediated through the Spirit, and his corporeal life is also conditioned by the same Spirit. So far as this divine life is mediated in the Son through the Logos, he is also during his actual human existence the Lord of the Spirit (John 20:22; 2 Cor. 3:17).

7. *The divine humanity in its consummation.*—The resurrection was the crisis at which the actual humanity of the Son of God became exalted to a state of completeness commensurate with his own true nature. It was impossible for the Sinless One to be held permanently under the power of death. As the human manifestation was a product

of the Spirit, so is the risen body the adequate exhibition and organ of this Spirit. Paul well calls it a spiritual body. It is the Spirit of the Logos already present in this humanity, and therefore the resurrection is not only the work of God on the creaturely life which belongs to the God-man, but also the work of the God-man himself through whom the divine life-process is effected. In the nature of the spiritual body lies, further, the indissolubility of the life. In the heavens, as the world of completed revelation of God, this life attains its supernatural consummation, and so the ascension has from the first been seen to be the self-evident consequence of the resurrection. In his exalted state, at the right hand of God, he is the guarantee for his church that, having begun the kingdom of God, and gathered his people for this purpose, he will also as the personal head lead them on to the goal. The God-man is now, as to his human side, taken up into the process of the heavenly life, and yet he never bears in his state of exaltation a creaturely side apart from the sphere of the inner life of Deity. In that exaltation the Lord exists in the same condition of glory which he had before, namely, a glory in keeping with the human nature united with the Logos to which he was from eternity determined.

An able and vigorous effort, from the standpoint of Lutheran orthodoxy, to restate and defend the doctrine of the person of Christ. The author affirms some propositions which in the nature of things cannot be proven, although it may be said that it is equally impossible to disprove them. The distinction between the Son and the Logos, and the idea that the subject of the *kenosis* is not the Logos but the Son, who is possessed of a divine-human consciousness of preëxistence although not actually preëxistent, is a somewhat novel dogma, but well worthy of consideration.

MILTON S. TERRY.

THE MISSION OF JUDAISM. By OSWALD J. SIMON; with opinions of twenty-one prominent writers, Jews and Christians, and a reply by Simon; *Jewish Quarterly Review*, January and April 1897, pp. 177–223; 403–28.

UNITARIANISM AND JUDAISM IN THEIR RELATIONS TO EACH OTHER. By C. G. MONTEFIORE; *ibid.*, 240–54.

OSWALD J. SIMON, a scholarly English Jew, contributed an article to the *Fortnightly Review* for October 1896 on "The Mission of Judaism" which attracted wide attention. In this article he argued that the time has come when progressive Judaism, with its high theism

and accumulated deposits of ethical wisdom as well as ethical fervor, should reach out and join hands with the non-Jewish elements in the community who share their monotheistic faith and their passion for ethics. He would have Jewish synagogues open on Sunday; services held in English and conducted in such a spirit as not to carry the national accent or emphasize the race demarkation. He would have them "fill a gap" in the religious world, not "assail any existing religious organizations." The January number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review* contains an interesting symposium upon this suggestion, in which some twenty-one different scholars, lay and clerical, Christian and Jew, men and women, take part. The list includes the chief rabbi Dr. Adler, Lady Magnus, and James Martineau, who is characterized as the "greatest non-Jewish Unitarian of the age." The same number contains a recent address delivered to the students of Manchester College, Oxford (the Unitarian theological school), by the learned editor of the *Review*, C. G. Montefiore, entitled "Unitarianism and Judaism in their Relations to Each Other." The symposium as well as the address is again considered and summed up in an article entitled "The Mission of Judaism," by Mr. Simon, in the April number of the same magazine. All this matter makes a most interesting and suggestive contribution to the religious literature of the day, and the readers of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY will find it most suggestive food for thought. It is one more striking illustration of the theological tendency of the day which is well expressed in the Platonic phrase quoted by Mr. Simon, "a longing after the whole of things both divine and human." The religious mind of this generation is, to borrow another word from Plato, "synoptic." Religious progress by the emphasizing of antagonisms and the widening of chasms, or even the destruction of error, is giving way to the religious progress that is won by the discovery of harmonies, by the bridging of theological and dogmatic chasms, and by the encouragement of the virtues, the cultivating of the good. Men are saved more and more by a positive passion for righteousness rather than by a negative dread of the opposite.

Montefiore's address begins by telling of how the Central Unitarian Association of England sixty-seven years ago offered prizes for three essays intended to convert respectively the Roman Catholics, the Mohammedans, and the Jews. Miss Harriet Martineau wrote the essays, which "probably converted nobody but brought her in forty-five guineas." The lecturer goes on to show that those were the days

when the people held that one religion was wholly true and another wholly false, and it was the business of Jew and Christian to pick what holes they could in the teaching of the founder of a rival faith. Things have changed. Now it is the imperfections rather than the excellences of a religion that bring pain to a rival, and present "the greater difficulty in our theistical explanations of the world and of its history." "We would fain," he tells us, "there was as much goodness and truth as possible in all the creeds which have influenced the lives and the actions of so many millions of our fellow-men." It is from this standpoint that this learned Jew talks to the young Unitarian ministers of Oxford of their common work. He enumerates at least three points at which they come into vital touch, viz.: (1) The doctrine of the Unity has somewhat different opposites and different implications to those of fifteen centuries ago. He says: "We are still too apt to interpret or emphasize the great doctrine of the Unity in a numerical rather than in a metaphysical sense." It is not now a mere question of philosophy, but a religious question that calls for a conception of God that will be "intimate, fervent, emotional." (2) The Jew might join hands with the Unitarian with advantage to both in their search for the truth as far as it can still be found about Jesus and the New Testament. He conceives a new and valuable work possible in this direction. He calls the three hundred years preceding, and the one hundred years following, the crucifixion of Christ the most mysterious periods of all human history. He conceives their position a most advantageous one from which to begin an effectual study of the origin of Christianity and the right appraisement of its founder. (3) And, lastly, he asks for this alliance in order to prove that the supposed meagerness of their religious belief is in truth adequate for the highest religious life. No aspect of creed or environment should be allowed to divert the main emphasis, which should always be on the religious life itself.

In this he evidently agrees with Mr. Simon, who recognizes that religion is to be spread by contagion and not by precept; who tells us that the education of the world has in it three stages of development, viz., law, argument, example. Happy is he who has reached the third stage in his religious education. Mr. Estlin Carpenter, in the symposium alluded to, asks whether Judaism has produced any figures like those of Francis of Assisi, or Wesley, to which Mr. Simon replies: "I need only refer him to the twelfth-century Jewish mystics and to Akiba. For saintliness of life, for martyrdom, and heroic

devotion to a divine ideal, I challenge any scholar to produce the superiors, if indeed the equals, of those who laid down their worldly goods and their lives at the Spanish Inquisition."

It is but fair to say that the national equation is apparent in much of this discussion. Here in America the mission work of Judaism urged by Mr. Simon is already being carried on by many able rabbis, who every Sunday speak to many non-Jewish minds on the highest themes. And the "synoptic" tendency which seeks to establish a common religious home where the soul may be aided in its aspirations and sustained in its struggles upon the universal needs of human nature, the ethical hungering of the human heart, and the common ties of humanity is already manifesting itself in many practical ways. Mr. Montefiore and others of these writers clearly assert that the religion that rests in negations, that needs the existence of some would-be orthodox or Trinitarian church as its foil, has small hold upon the future. The making of saints is the test as well as the business of all religions.

CHICAGO, ILL. JENKIN LLOYD JONES.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

**April--June.**

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

## GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

### ENCYCLOPÆDIA AND METHODOLOGY.

Ancient Faith, The, in Modern Light. Edinburgh, T. and T. Clark, 1897; 8vo. 10s. 6d.

T. V. TYMMS. Christian Theism.
EDW. MEDLEY The Permanent Significance of the Bible.
A. CAVE. The Bible View of Sin.
S. G. GREEN. Deity and Humanity of Christ.
R. V. PRYCE. The Redemption Work of the Lord Jesus Christ.
S. GREWTH. New Testament Witnesses concerning Churches.
J. PARKER. The New Citizenship.
W. BROCK. Christianity and the Child.
J. G. ROGERS. The Pulpit and the Press.
H. R. REYNOLDS. The Witness to the Spirit.

DOWDEN, JOHN. Outline of the History of the Theological Literature of the Church of England, from the Reformation to the Close of the Eighteenth Century. The Bishop Paddock Lectures. London, Soc. Prom. Christ. Knowl., 1897; 8vo. 3s.

HUNT, THEO. W. Tennyson's "In Memoriam." *Bib. Sac.*, April, 249–63.

Realencyclopädie f. protestantische Theologie u. Kirche. Begründet v. J. J. Herzog. 3. Aufl., hrsg. v. A. Hauck. 2. Bd. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1897; iii + 780 pp., 8vo. M. 10.

SCHREMPF, CHR. Zur Theorie des Geisteskampfes. Erlebtes und Erdachtes [Umgearbeiteter Abdr. aus: "Die Wahrheit."] Stuttgart, F. Frommann, 1897; 56 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, hrsg. von H. HOLTZMANN u. G. KRÜGER. 16. Band, enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1896. Erste Abtlg.: Exegese, bearbeitet von Siegfried und Holtzmann. Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1897. Pp. 1–156.
M. 6; complete, M. 20.

*Theologische Rundschau*, hrsg. v. W. BOUSSET. 1. Jahrgang. 12 Hefte. (To begin Oct. 1, 1897.) Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr. M. 6.

WRIGHT, G. F. The Paradoxes of Science. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 205–31.

### HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ALBEE, ERNST. The Ethical System of Gray. *Philos. Rev.*, March, 132–45.

Beiträge zur Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters. Texte und Untersuchungen. Hrsg. v. C. BAEUMKER u. G. v. HERTLING. II. Bd., Heft 3. Münster, Aschaffendorff; vii + 145 pp., 8vo. M. 5.
3. BÜLOW, GEO. Des Dominicus Gundissalinus Schrift von der Unsterblichkeit der Seele. Hrsg. u. philosophisch-geschichtlich untersucht. Nebst einem Anhang, enth. die Abhandlung des Wilhelm v. Paris (Auvergne) *De immortalitate animae*.

BENDIXEN, R. Rocholls Philosophie der Geschichte und die sittliche Weltordnung. *Bew. des Glaub.*, May, 206–15.

CARR, E. S. Spencer's Philosophy of Religion. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 232–48.

CECIL, HUGH MORTIMER. Pseudo-Philosophy at the End of the Nineteenth Century. 1. An irrationalist trio: Kidd, Drummond, Balfour. London, W. C., University Press, Ltd., 1897. 10s. *net*.

CRESSON, ANDRÉ. La Morale de Kant. Étude critique. Paris, Alcan, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 2.50.
Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques.

CROZIER, JOHN BEATTIE. History of Intellectual Development. Vol. I. London and New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897; 8vo. 14s.
History of the Evolution of Greek and Hindoo Thought, of Græco-Roman Paganism, of Judaism, and of Christianity down to the closing of the Schools of Athens by Justinian, 529 A.D.

DANCKELMANN, E. Kant als Mystiker?! Eine Studie. Leipzig, H. Haacke, 1897; 24 pp., 8vo. M.0.50.

DEUSSEN, PAUL. Jakob Böhme. Über sein Leben und seine Philosophie. Rede. Kiel, Lipsius & Tischer, 1897; 31 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Religious Thought in the Victorian Era. *Independent*, June 17, 5–6.

GUMPERZ, HEINR. Grundlegung der neusokratischen Philosophie. Wien, F. Deuticke, 1897; ix + 355 pp., 8vo. M. 2.50.

GÜTTLER, C. Eduard Lord Herbert von Cherbury. Ein krit. Beitrag zur Gesch. des Psychologismus und der Religionsphilosophie. München, C. H. Beck, 1897; vi + 248 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

HALDANE, E. S. Jacob Bohme and his Relation to Hegel. *Philos. Rev.*, March, 146–61.

HOLLARD, R. Quelques observations sur l'"Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion" de M. A. Sabatier. *Rev. chrét.*, April, 281–92.

HUNT, J. Religious Thought in England in the Nineteenth Century. New York, T. Whittaker, 1897; 399 pp., 8vo. $3.50.

JOSEPH, MAX. Die psychologische Grundanschauung Schopenhauer's. Eine krit. Untersuchung. Berlin, Mayer & Müller; 176 pp. M. 3.60.

LAURIE, S. S. The Metaphysics of T. H. Green. *Philos. Rev.*, March, 113–31.

MEINARDUS, DR. David Hume als Religionsphilosoph. Coblenz, W. Groos in Komm., 1897; 102 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

PARKER, CHARLES P. The Philosopher of Harmony and Fire: Heraclitus. *New World*, June, 291–306.

PLATZHOFF, E. Charles Secrétan, der Philosoph der Freiheit, 19. Jan. 1815–21. Jan. 1895. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus d. Schweiz*, 1897; 33–53, 104 ff.

PRAT, F. Savants et mystificateurs. Le roi des faussaires. *Études*, May 20, 491–506.

ROBIOU, M. L'état religieux de la Grèce et de l'Orient au siècle d'Alexandre. 2e mémoire: les régions syro-babyloniennes et l'Éran. Paris, 1896; 4to. Fr. 5.

STÖLZLE, REMIGIUS. Karl Ernst von Baer und seine Weltanschauung. Regensburg, Nationale Verlagsanst., 1897; xi + 687 pp., 8vo. M. 9.

STUCKENBERG, J. H. W. Prince Bismarck's Religious Views. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 399–404.

WIEDEMANN, ALFRED. Religion of the Ancient Egyptians. G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1897.

WILHELMI, J. H. Th. Carlyle u. F. Nietzsche. Wie sie Gott suchten, u. was für e. Gott sie fanden. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; iv + 88 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

### PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

BENDER, H. Philosophie, Metaphysik u. Einzelforschung. Untersuchungen über das Wesen der Philosophie im allgemeinen und über die Möglichkeit der Metaphysik als Wissenschaft und ihr Verhältniss zur naturwissenschaftlichen Forschung im besondern. Leipzig, H. Haacke, 1897; 96 pp., 8vo. M. 1.80.

BERDING, FR. Philosophische Aufsätze. Hannover, Hahn, 1897. M. 1.50.

BOSANQUET, B. Psychology of the Moral Self. London and New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 8vo. 3s. 6d. *net.*

BOWNE, BORDEN P. Theory of Thought and Knowledge. New York, Harper Bros., 1897; 386 pp., 8vo. $1.50.

BREMOND, H. M. Brunetière et la psychologie de la foi. *Études*, March 5 and 20, 647–59, 748–63.

DELANNE, GABRIEL. L'Évolution animique. Étude de psychologie physiologique suivant le spiritisme. Paris, Chamuel, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 3.50.

DESSOIR, MAX. Geschichte der neueren deutschen Psychologie. 2. Aufl. 1. Halbbd. Berlin, C. Duncker, 1897; Vol. I., pp. 1–356, 8vo. M. 8.

EBBINGHAUS, HERM. Grundzüge der Psychologie. Leipzig, Veit & Co. 1. Halbb.; 320 pp., 8vo. M. 6.60.

EISLER, RUD. Einführung in die Philosophie. Eine Übersicht der Grundprobleme der Philosophie und ihrer wichtigsten Lösungsversuche. Leipzig, Schnurpfeil, 1897; 160 pp., 16mo. Bd., M. 1.

=53–55 of: Wissenschaftliche Volksbibliothek.

ELEUTHEROPULOS, ABR. Das kritische System der Philosophie. Grundlegung einer Sittenlehre (Ethik), die als Wissenschaft wird auftreten können. 1. Abtlg.: Das Recht des Stärkeren. Die Rechtlichkeit oder ein politisch-rechtliches Traktat. Zürich, C. Schmidt, 1897; xlvii + 168 pp., 8vo. M. 4.

EMIN EFENDI, MEHEMED. Kultur und Humanität. Völkerpsychologische und politische Untersuchungen. Würzburg, Stahel, 1897; iii + 168 pp., 8vo. M. 3.60.

ERHARDT, FR. Metaphysik. 1. Bd.: Erkenntnisstheorie. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1897. M. 12.

FENN, WILLIAM W. The Possibilities of Mysticism in Modern Thought. *New World*, June, 201–18.

FISCHER, KUNO. Kleine Schriften. Heidelberg, C. Winter; 8vo.
Bd. VII.: Der Philosoph des Pessimismus. Ein Charakterproblem. 60 pp. M. 1.20.

HAYWARD, E. F. Thought as a Remedial Agent. *New World*, June, 282–90.

JAMES, WILLIAM. The Will to Believe. London and New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. 7s. 6d.

KLAPP, L. Die Ursachen des Rückganges der Religion in unserm Volk. Vortrag. Hamburg, Hoffmann & Campe, 1897; 20 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

KLEEKAMM, J. Die menschliche Seele, ihre Geistigkeit und Unsterblichkeit. Heiligenstadt, Eichsfeld, F. W. Cordier, 1897. M. 0.50.

LADD, GEO. TRUMBULL. Philosophy of Knowledge: an inquiry into the nature, limits, and validity of human cognitive faculty. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1897; xv + 614 pp., 8vo. $4.

LEGGE, F. The Devil in Modern Occultism. *Contemp. Rev.*, May.

LEROY, H. Démons et démoniaques. *Études*, May 5, 332–48.

LLANO, A. Agnosticism and Disguised Materialism. *Philos. Rev.*, March, 170–5.

MALLOCK, M. M. The Metaphysical Basis of Protestantism. *Dublin Rev.*, April, 278–98.

MARSHALL, H. R. The Function of Religious Expression. *Mind*, April.

MAUSS, MARCEL. La Religion et les origines du droit pénal. II. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, XXXV., 31–60.

PETRONIEVICS, B. Der ontologische Beweis f. das Dasein des Absoluten. Versuch einer Neubegründung mit besonderer Rücksicht auf das erkenntnistheoretische Grundproblem. Leipzig, Haacke, 1897; 29 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

PFLEIDERER, EDM. Zur Frage der Kausalität. Eine erkenntnisstheoretische Untersuchung. Tübinger Univers.-Progr. Tübingen, F. Fues, 1897; 77 pp., 4to. M. 2.80.

ROBERTSON, JOHN M. Nietzsche's Indictment of Christianity. *Univ. Magaz. and Free Rev.*, June.

ROMANES, C. J. Thoughts on Religion. May number of "Religion of Science Library Edition." Open Court Publishing Co., 1897. Paper, $0.50.

SCHILLER, F. C. S. Darwinism and Design. *Contemp. Rev.*, June.

SCHÖLLER, RUDOLF. Über Verkündigungen, die als göttliche Offenbarungen ausgegeben worden sind, und über die Folgen, die sich hieraus ergeben haben. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus d. Schweiz*, 1897, 65–104.

SCHULTZE, FR. Vergleichende Seelenkunde. I. Bd., 2. Abthlg. Leipzig, E. Günther, 1897; 182 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

SEFERIADES, S. P. Étude critique sur la théorie de la cause (thèse). Paris, Arthur Rousseau, 1897; 245 pp., 8vo.

SETH, ANDREW. Two Lectures on Theism. (Princeton Lectures.) New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 64 pp., 8vo. $1.

THOMAS, J. B. Goldwin Smith on Agnosticism. *Hom. Rev.*, June, 489–93.

TYLER, C. M. Bases of Religious Belief, Historic and Ideal. New York, E. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897.

VEECK. Phantasie u. Religion. Bremen, M. Nössler, 1897. M. 0.80.

WENTSCHER, M. Ueber den Pessimismus u. seine Wurzeln. Akademische Antrittsrede. Bonn, Röhrscheid & Ebbecke, 1897; 27 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

### RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

AUDIFFRENT, G. Le Positivisme et la science contemporaine. Sauveterre-de-Guyenne, Larrieu; Paris, Ritti, 1897; 76 pp., 8vo.

BASCOM, JOHN. Evolution and Religion. New York, E. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897.

BROGLIE, DE. Religion et critique, œuvre posthume de l'abbé de Broglie. Mesnil, Firmin-Didot & Cie.; Paris, Lecoffre, 1896; lx + 360 pp., 18mo.

CAILLARD, E. M. On the Use of Science to Christians. London, James Nisbett & Co., 1897. 1s. 6d.

ECKARD, J. Volksparteiliche Presse u. Religion. Eine quellenmässige Darstellung. Stuttgart, J. Roth, 1897; viii + 272 pp. M. 2.

HART, H. MARTYN. A Way that Seemeth Right: an examination of "Christian Science." New York, Jas. Pott & Co., 1897; v + 111 pp. $0.75.

LARSEN, H. M. Die Naturwissenschaft in ihrem Schuldverhältniss zum Christenthum. Eine religionsgeschichtliche Skizze. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1897; iv + 90 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

MACKENZIE, W. Douglas. Evolution Theories and Christian Doctrine. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 542–82.

MANATT, J. IRVING. Science and Immortality. *Independent*, April 15.

MORTON, HENRY. Science and the Supernatural. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 568–70.

PEARSON, KARL. The Chances of Death, and Other Studies in Evolution. With illustrations. 2 vols. London and New York, Edw. Arnold, 1897; 8vo. 25s. *net.*

SMYTH, N. The Place of the Death in Evolution. New York, C. Scribner's Sons, 1897; xi + 227 pp., 12mo. $1.25.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY.

BÖHMER, J. Deutschtum und Christentum. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 254–72.

BÜHLER, GEO. The Discovery of Buddha's Birthplace. *London Athenaeum*, March 6, 319–20; *Jour. Roy. As. Soc.*, April, 429–35.

CHARBONNEL, V. Le congrès des religions et la Suisse. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 2.

GRANT, G. M. L'Orient et la Bible. Les Grandes religions. Traduit par C. de Faye. Genève et Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 2.50.

HINSDALE, B. A. The Genius of Christianity. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 193–208.

HOWARD, CLIFFORD. Sex Worship: an exposition of the Phallic origin of religion. Washington, D. C., published by the author, 1897; iii + 166 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.25.

JOSEFFY, WM. Gott u. Götter. Kreislauf der Religionsideen u. Mythen bei allen Völkern des Erdballs. 1. Cyclus. Budapest, S. Deutsch & Co., 1897; 64 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

KAUFMANN, C. M. Die Jenseitshoffnungen der Griechen u. Römer nach den Sepulcralinschriften. Ein Beitrag zur monumentalen Eschatologie. Freiburg i. B., Herder'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897; viii + 86 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

KRAUS, FRDR. S. Böhmische Korallen aus der Götterwelt. Folkloristische Börseberichte vom Götter- u. Mythenmarkte. 2. [Titel-]Aufl. Wien, A. Reimann, 1897; vii + 147 pp., 8vo. M. 2.40.

LAFFITTE, P. Les Grands types de l'humanité. Appréciation systématique des principaux agents de l'évolution humaine. Tome III.: Le Catholicisme. Saint Paul, saint Augustin, Hildebrand, saint Bernard, Bossuet. Paris, 10 rue Monsieur-le-Prince, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 7.50.

SIECKE, E. Die Urreligion der Indogermanen. Vortrag. Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1897; 38 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

STUBENVOLL, F. B. Religion und Aberglaube. Leipzig, F. Jansa, 1897; 96 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

Bibel, die, der Hindu. Züge aus dem ind. Religionsleben. Basel, Missionsbuchh., 1897; 16 pp., 8vo. M. 0.10.

DELFOUR. L'Islam. *L'Univ. cathol.*, March, 405–25.

GENÄHR, J. Die Religion der Chinesen. *Zeitschr. f. Missionsk., etc.*, XII., 79–92.

JAMES, F. HUBERTY. Taoism. *Outlook*, April 24.

——— The Theism of China. *New World*, June, 307–23.

MODI, JIVANJI JAMSHEDJI. L'Antiquité de l'Avesta. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, XXXV., 1–30.

PALMER, GEO. H. Similarities and Contrasts of Christianity and Buddhism. *Outlook*, June 19, 443–50.

PARIS, PIERRE. Bulletin archéologique de la religion romaine, 1895–6. *Rev. de l'hist. des relig.*, XXXV., 61–87.

PARKER, E. H. A Plain Account of the Life, Labours and Doctrines of Confucius. *Imper. Asiat. Quart. Rev.*, April, 387–412. With 8 plates.

STEWART, C. E. Account of the Hindu Fire-Temple at Baku. *Jour. Roy. As. Soc.*, April, 311–19.

## EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

### OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

ADENEY, WALTER F. How to Read the Bible. New York, Thom. Whittaker, 1897; 134 pp., 8vo. $0.50.

BURN, J. H. Frederick Field, M.A., LL. D. II., III. *Expos. Times*, March, 274–8; April, 325–8.

EBELING, H. Die Bibel Gottes Wort u. des Glaubens einzige Quelle. 2. Aufl. Zwickau, J. Herrmann, 1897; 95 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

FARRAR, F. W. The Bible, its Meaning and Supremacy. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897; xviii + 359 pp., 8vo.; cloth.

HODGE, WILLIAM H. The Biblical Usage of "Soul" and "Spirit." *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 251–67.

HULSMAN, G. Moderne wetenschap op bijbelsche traditie? Utrecht, Kemink & Zoon, 1897; 123 pp., 8vo. F. 0.90.

KENYON, F. G. Our Bible and the Ancient Manuscripts: a history of the text and its translations. 3d edition, 1897; 268 pp., 8vo; cloth. 5s.

LÖBER. Etwas oder nichts; eine schwierige Wahl. *Neue. Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 195–227.

ROSS, D. M. Professor Drummond's Religious Teaching. *Expositor*, May, 390–400.

SELLIN, ERNST. August Köhler; Nekrolog. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 273–97.

SHEARER, W. C. Henry Robert Reynolds, B.A., D.D. *Expos. Times*, April, 308–11.

STALKER, JAMES. Henry Drummond. *Expositor*, April, 286–96.

SYM, A. P. The Revisers and the Personality of the Holy Ghost. *Ibid.*, May, 380–1.

Urtext und Uebersetzungen der Bibel in übersichtlicher Darstellung. Sonderabdruck der Artikel: Bibeltext und Bibelübersetzungen aus der dritten Auflage der "Realencyclop. für protest. Theol. u. Kirche." Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1897; iv + 239 pp. M. 3.

WILLIAMS, J. E. HODDER. Professor Drummond: an appreciation. *New Century Review*, I., 352–4.

YULE, H. W., and GWILLIAM, G. H. John William Burgon. *Expos. Times*, May, 344–9.

ZAPLETAL, F. V. Hermeneutica biblica. Freiburg, Schweiz, Universitäts-Buchh., 1897. Bd., M. 3.40.

### THE OLD TESTAMENT.

#### GENERAL.

BAUMGARTNER, ALEX. Geschichte der Weltliteratur, in 6 Bdn. 1. Bd.: Die Literaturen Westasiens und der Nilländer, in ca. 7 Liefgn. 1. Lfg., pp. 1–80. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; 8vo. M. 1.20.

BROOKE, S. A. The Old Testament and Modern Life. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co.; 352 pp. $1.50.

DUHM, BERNHARD. Die Entstehung des Alten Testamentes. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 8vo. M. 0.60.

JACOB, G. Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament. Studien in arab. Dichtern. IV. Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1897; 25 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

SEISS, J. A. Some Sacred Words: The Trisagion, the Hallelujah, and the Amen. *Luth. Church Rev.*, April, 190–202.

#### GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BESWICK, S. Bible Chronology on an Egyptian Basis. I.–III. *Biblia*, March, April, May.

Chedorlaomer. *Expos. Times*, March, 272.

CHEYNE, T. K. The Connection of Esau and Usöos of Philo of Byblus. *ZATW*, XVII., 189.

——— Arpachshad. *Ibid.*, 190.

COOKE, J. HUNT. The Merenptah Inscription. *Ibid.*, May, 38–41.

DIEULAFOY, MARCEL. Le Roi David. Paris, Hachette, 1897. Fr. 3.50.

FAST, TH. Wadi el-Kelt. *Mittheil. u. Nachr. d. deutsch. Pal.-Vereins*, 1897, 21–8.

GWATKIN, WM. E. Solomon. *Sem. Mag.*, April, 353–9.

HIRSCH, L. Reisen in Süd-Arabien, Mahra-Land und Hadramūt. Leiden, Verlagsbuchhandlung und Druckerei, vorm. E. J. Brill, 1897; xii+232 pp., 1 Tafel u. 1 Karte; 8vo. M. 9.

HOMMEL, FR. Arpakshad. *Expos. Times*, March, 268–71; *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 349–51.

HOONACKER, A. VAN. The Return of the Jews under Cyrus. *Expos. Times*, May, 351–54.

On E. Meyer's recent book: Die Entstehung des Judenthums.

JACOBÈ, FR. L'hypogée d'El-Berith à Sichem; note d'archéologie biblique. *Rev. d'hist. et de littér. relig.*, II., 134–40.

——— La *Kesita*, question d'archéologie biblique. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, I., 515–19.

KENNEDY, A. R. S. Did the Jews Return under Cyrus? *Expos. Times*, March, 268–71.

MARIMER. La *Schefèla* et la montagne de Juda, d'après le livre de Josué. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 51–68.

MARQUART, J. Fundamente israelitischer und jüdischer Geschichte. Göttingen, Dieterich, 1897; vii + 75 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

MCCURDY, JAMES F. Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries. The Decline of Assyria; — Dissolution of the Assyrian Empire. *Hom. Rev.*, March, 218–21; April, 314–17.

MULLENS, JOSIAH. Merenptah and Israel. *Expos. Times*, March, 286–7.

NÖLDEKE, TH. Ḥarrān. *Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*, XI., 107–9.

OFFORD, JOSEPH. Pre-Mosaic Palestine. *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, 1897, 7–26.

SAYCE, A. H. Light from the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets on Palestine before the Exodus. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 387–91.

——— Maspero's "Struggle of the Nations." *Expos. Times*, May, 379–80.

——— Palestine at the Time of Abraham, as seen in the Light of Archæology. *Hom. Rev.*, March, 200–6.

SCHÜRER, E. Die Juden im bosporanischen Reiche u. die Genossenschaften der σεβόμενοι θεὸν ὕψιστον ebendaselbst. (Aus *Sitzb. d. Akad. d. Wiss. zu Berlin.*) Berlin, G. Reimer, 1897; 26 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

SIMON, M., und L. COHEN. Ein neuer Maphtèach. Berlin, M. Poppelauer, 1897; viii + 38 pp., 4to. M. 3.

Schlüssel zur leichten Umrechnung jüd. u. christl. Daten sowie zur Bestimmung des Wochentages e. jeden belieb. Datums f. d. Jahre 4105–5760 A. M.=345–2000 A. Chr., nebst e. Tabelle über die Wochenabschnitte f. alle Sabbathe des Jahres. (In deutscher, franz. u. engl. Sprache.)

STADE, B. Vier im Jahre 1896 publicierte altsemitische Siegelsteine. *ZATW*, XVII., 204–6.

STRACK, M. L. Die Dynastie der Ptolemaer. Berlin, Besser. M. 7.

TOMKINS, H. G. Khiana or Khâna. *PSBA*, XIX., 113, 114.

UNGER, G. F. Die Regierungsjahre der makkabaischen Fürsten. *Sitzb. der philos.-philol. u. hist. Klasse der Akad. zu München*, 1896. Part III., 357–97.

WEBER, HEINR. LEO. Biblische Alterthumskunde. Prag, Brandeis, 1897; 182 pp. M. 0.40.

= Nos. 48–49 of Jüdische Universal-Bibliothek.

WELLHAUSEN, JUL., on Meyer's Entstehung des Judenthums. *Expos. Times*, April, 320–2. (See Wellhausen's Review in *Gotting. Gel. Anzeigen*, 1897, No. 2.)

WHYTE, ALEXANDER. Bible Characters; Adam to Achan. London, Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1897. 3s. 6d.

### GRAMMAR AND TEXT.

BACHER, W. Berichtigungen und Nachträge zu dem Artikel: Ein hebräisch-persisches Wörterbuch aus dem 15. Jahrhundert. *ZATW*, XVII., 199–200.

BÜCHLER, ADOLPHE. La longueur des pages et des lignes dans les anciens manuscrits de la Bible. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 94–8.

BUDDE, K. Professor Nöldeke on צַלְמָוֶת and צֶלֶם. *Expos. Times*, May, 384.

CHEYNE, T. K. Hebrew Proper Names: an explanation. *Expos. Times*, April, 329.

GRIMME, H. Abriss der biblisch-hebräischen Metrik. *ZDMG*, L., No. 4.

HORN, PAUL. Zu Šîrvânî's hebräisch-persischem Wörterbuch. *ZATW*, XVII., 201–4.

KENNEDY, J. Old Testament Criticism and the Rights of the Unlearned. London, Rel. Tract. Soc., 1897; 96 pp., 12mo.

KRAETZSCHMAR, R. Der Mythus von Sodoms Ende. *ZATW*, XVII., 81–92.

LEANDER, P. Einige Bemerkungen zur Quellenscheidung der Josephsgeschichte. Gen. 41:33–6, etc. *ZATW*, XVII., 195–8.

ELWANG, WM. W. The Old Testament Canon. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 125–41.

FABANI, C. I sette giorni della creazioen ossia scienza e bibleia. Varese, 1896; 743 pp., 8vo. 4. l. 50 c.

FISKE, AMOS K. The Unknown Homer of the Hebrews. *New World*, March, 32–8.

J., D. R. L'Évolution de la critique protestante. *Rev. bénéd.*, Feb.

KEERL, K. Der Baum der Erkenntnis und die Schlange des Feldes. *Bew. des Glaub.*, March, 101–20.

LAMBERT, M. La longueur des pages et des lignes dans les anciens manuscrits de la Bible. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 99–101.

——— 1. Quelques singularités de la vocalisation massorétique. 2. La permutation du ח et du ש. *Ibid.*, 1897, XXXIV., 117–19.

NÖLDEKE, TH. צַלְמָוֶת und צֶלֶם. *ZATW*, XVII., 183–7. בחל (Prov. 20:21; Zech. 11:18). *Ibid.*, 187–8.

PICK, BERNHARD. The Text of Jeremiah in the Polychrome Edition of the Old Testament. *Hom. Rev.*, April, 354–7.

SELBIE, J. A. Studies in Hebrew Proper Names. *Expos. Times*, April, 329–31.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

A New Theory of the Deluge (FR. v. SCHWARZ, Sintfluth und Völkerwanderungen). *Expos. Times*, March, 271–2.

BEHRENDS, A. J. F. Criticism and the Old Testament. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 411–18.

CHAUVIN, C. L'Inspiration des divines écritures, d'après l'enseignement traditionnel et l'encyclique "Providentissimus Deus." Essai théologique et critique. Paris, Lethielleux, 1897; xv + 231 pp., 8vo.

CHEYNE, T. K. Is this Archæological Criticism? *Expos. Times*, March, 284–5. On the English edition of Maspero's "History of the East."

MARGIVAL, H. Richard Simon et la critique biblique au XVII^e^ s. 3^e^ art.: Les travaux préparatoires à l'histoire du Vieux Testament. R. Simon et Port-Royal. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, II., 1897, 17–42.

MEISSNER, B. Der gegenwärtige Stand der Quellenforschung im Hexateuch. *Zeitschr. f. d. evang. Relig.-Unterr.*, Jan., 1897.

ORR, JAMES. Israel in Egypt and the Exodus; with reference to Professor Flinders Petrie's Recent Discovery. *Expositor*, March, 161–77.

——— On the Exodus. *Expos. Times*, April, 289–90.

OSGOOD, HOWARD. Morals before Moses. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 267–78.

——— Rationalism's Claim to exclusive Scholarship. *Homiletic Review*, April, 291–6.

——— Origin and Aim of the Present Form of Rationalistic Criticism. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 395–9.

RAINSFORD, M. The Tabernacle in the Wilderness and the Gospel according to Leviticus. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1897; viii + 294 pp., 8vo. 4s. 6d.

ROSENTHAL, L. A. Nochmals der Vergleich Ester, Joseph–Daniel. *ZATW*, XVII., 125–8.

SCHÖPFER, A. Bibel und Wissenschaft. Grundsätze und deren Anwendung auf die Probleme der bibl. Urgeschichte: Hexaëmeron, Sintflut, Völkertafel, Sprachverwirrung. Brixen, 1897; viii + 280 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

SCHULTE, A. Zu *ZATW*, XVI., 327. Deuteronomios. *ZATW*, XVII., 181–2.

SPLITTGERBER, A. Die Stellung Christi zum Alten Testament. Ein Spiegelbild für die moderne Kritik. Schluss. *Kirchl. Monatsschr.*, XVI., Heft 4.

STOSCH, G. Alttestamentliche Studien. II. Teil: Mose u. die Dokumente des Auszugs. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; iii + 167 pp., 8vo. M. 2; bd., M. 2.50.

WILDEBOER, G. De vóór-Talmudische joodsche Kanon. *Theol. Studiën*, 1897, 159–77.

ZAHN, AD. Phil. Melanchthon und das Gesetz Moses. Auch ein Wort zum 16. Februar, 1897; Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897. M. 0.30.

ZOCKLER, O. Deutsche Streiter wider die alttestamentliche Radikalkritik. III. and IV. *Bew. des Glaub.*, March, 120–8; April, 164–74.

THEOLOGY.

DALMAN, GUST. Studien zur bibl. Theologie. 2. Heft. Die richterliche Gerechtigkeit im Alten Testament. (Aus: *Kartell-Zeitg. akad. theol. Vereine auf deutschen Hochschulen.*) Berlin, G. Nauck in Komm., 1897; 19 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

KÖNIG, ED. Die formell-genetische Wechselbeziehung der beiden Wörter Jahweh and Jahu. *ZATW*, XVII., 172–9.

LARSEN, H. M. Den bibelske Monotheismes Særstilling i Religionshistorien. København, Gyldendal, 1897; 278 pp., 8vo.

LINDSAY, J. The Significance of the Old Testament in Modern Theology. London, Blackwood & Son, 1897; 8vo. 1s.

ROBERTS, A. On the Knowledge of a Future State Possessed by the Ancient Hebrews. *Expositor*, May, 377–89.

SATTERLEE, H. G. The Old Testament and Immortality. *Independent*, April 15.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, P. Die prophetische Offenbarung nach Wesen, Inhalt und Grenzen, unter dem Gesichtspunkte der alttestamentlichen Weissagung geschichtlich und psychologisch untersucht. Giessen, 1897; vi + 169 pp. M. 3.50.

SELLIN, ERNST. Beiträge zur israelitischen und jüdischen Religionsgeschichte. Bd. 2. Israels Güter und Ideale. 1. Hälfte. Leipzig, A. Deichert's Nachf., Geo. Böhme, 1897. M. 6.

THE LAW.

BASSFREUND, J. Das Fragmenten-Targum zum Pentateuch, sein Ursprung und Charakter und sein Verhältniss zu andern pentateuchischen Targumim. Frankfurt a. M., 1897; 8vo. M. 2.50.

HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques: La descente des Israélites en Égypte jusqu'à la mort de Joseph. Suite: Gen. 47:28—50:14. *Rev. sém.*, 1897, 97–113.

KLOSTERMANN, A. Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuchs. II., III. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII. 228–53, 298–329.

LAMBERT, MAYER. Notes Exégetiques: Genèse 47:18. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, XXXIII., Oct.–Dec., 304–5.

NAUMANN, O. Das Deuteronomium: Das prophetische Staatsgesetz des theokratischen Konigtums, mit seinen Eingangs- und Schlussworten, aus der Propheten-Geschichte u. Theologie erläutert. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; xii + 252 pp., 8vo. M. 4.

SAYCE, A. H. Archæological Commentary on Genesis, 10:15—13:7. *Expos. Times*, March, 256–9; May, 356–9.

STADE, B. Gen. 2:20, 23; 3:14. *ZATW*, XVII., 207–12.

TRUMBULL, H. CLAY. God's Ensign at Rephidim. *Expositor*, April, 297–300.

THE PROPHETS.

DAHLE, L. Profeten Jonas, hans Person og Samtid. Christiania, L. C. Kielland, 1897; ii + 147 pp., 8vo. Kr. 1.50.

HOFFMANN, GEO. צְרִיחַ, 1 Sam. 13:6. *Zeitschr. f. Assyr.*, XI., 322–4.

Isaiah. Edited by RICHARD G. MOULTON. Modern Reader's Bible. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 260 pp., 18mo. 50c.

MCCURDY, J. F. Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries. The book of Nahum and the fall of Nineveh. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 408–11.

RICARD, O. Profeten Jeremias, hans Person, Liv og Taler. København, Bethesdas Bogh., 1897; 104 pp., 8vo. Kr. 1.

SCHMALZL, PETER. Der Reim im hebr. Text des Ezechiel. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1897; 127–33.

TRUMBULL, H. CLAY. Light on the Story of Jonah. Philadelphia, J. D. Wattles & Co., 1897; 18 pp., 8vo. 20c.

WALLER, C. H. Notes on the Prophet Jeremiah. London, Eyre & Spottiswoode, 1897; 52 pp., 8vo. 1s.

WOLF, E. F. H. Micha's aankondiging van den Heerscher uit Bethlehem Efratha. *Tijdschr. voor geref. Theol.*, IV., 5, Maart, 305–23; Mai, 367–87.

WOODWORTH, R. B. "A Peculiar Treasure." Mal. 3:17. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 240–2.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BARNES, W. E. Chronicles a Targum. *Expos. Times*, April, 316–19.

BEER, GEO. Textkritische Studien zum Buche Job. II. *ZATW*, XVII., 97–122.

BRUSTON, CH. Psalms 40:8; 41:6. *ZATW*, XVII., 193–4.
On T. K. Abbott, *Ibid.*, XVI., 293.

CHEYNE, T. K. On Proverbs 27:21, 22; Psalms 12, 7 (6) (against E. Nestle). *Expos. Times*, April, 335–6.

——— Professor Budde's Job. *Ibid.*, May, 384.

——— The text of Psalm 12:7. *ZATW*, XVII., 189–90.

CHEYNE, T. K. Professor Budde's Job, pref. ix and xx; an Explanation. *Expos. Times*, March, 288.

COBLENZ, FEL. Ueber das betende *Ich* in den Psalmen. Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung des Psalters. Preisschrift. Frankfurt a. M., J. Kauffmann, 1897; 191 pp.

EKDAHL, N. F. Det nya psalmboksförslaget. *Kyrkl. Tidskr.*, 1897, 3–4.

HALÉVY, J. Job 38:12–15. *Jour. Asiat.*, Jan.-Feb., 155–6.

——— Notes pour l'interprétation des psaumes. Suite: Ps. 77–83. *Rev. sém.*, 1897, 113–31.

HENSLOW, GEO. Song of Songs, 6:2. Rev. Vers. *Expos. Times*, May, 381.

HOMMEL, FR. Zerah the Cushite, 2 Chron. 14:9. *Ibid.*, May, 378–9.

JACOB, B. Beiträge zu einer Einleitung in die Psalmen. II. לְהַזְכִּיר; — Excurs über זֵכֶר זָכַר und Ableitungen. *ZATW*, XVII., 48–80.

——— Zu Psalm 12:7. *Ibid.*, 93–7.

KÖNIGSBERGER, B. Hiobstudien. Exegetische Untersuchungen zum Buche Hiob, nebst einer Einleitung zum Buche. Breslau, W. Koebner in Komm., 1897; 58 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

LASSE, J. Der 90. Psalm. *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.*, 255–63.

NESTLE, EB. Psalm 12:6 and Prov. 27:21–22. *Expos. Times*, March, 287–8.

——— Ps. 12:7 and Prov. 27:21, 22. *Ibid.*, May, 379.

OEHLER, V. FR. Der zweite Psalm in zeitgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; 50 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

STAERK, W. Die Gottlosen in den Psalmen. *Stud. u. Kritiken*, 1897, 449–88.

TECHEN, L. Syrisch-hebräisches Glossar, zu den Psalmen nach der Peschita. *ZATW*, XVII., 129–71.

WILDEBOER, G. Zu Psalm 17:11, 12 *ZATW*, XVII., 180.

APOCRYPHA AND SEPTUAGINT.

Book of Judges in Greek according to the text of the Codex Alexandrinus, edited by E. A. BROOKE and N. MCLEAN. 2s. 6d.

Codices græci et latini photographice depicti duce Biblioth.-Præfect. GUIL. NIC. DU RIEU. Tome I. Fol. Leiden, A. W. Sythoff. xiii + 306 pp. Bd. M. 160.
I. Vetus Testamentum græce. Codicis Sarraviani-Colbertini quae supersunt in bibliothecis Leidensi, Parisiensi, Petropolitana, phototypice edita. Præfatus est HEN. OMONT.

COWLEY, A. E., and AD. NEUBAUER. The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus (chaps. 39:15—49:11), together with the early versions and an English translation. Followed by the quotations from Ben Sira in Rabbinical Literature. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1897; with two facsimiles; 4to. 10s. 6d., *net.*

GASTER. Two unknown Hebrew Versions of the Tobit Legend. Text *PSBA*, XIX., No. 3; 14 pp.

HALÉVY, J. Étude sur la partie du texte hébreu de l'ecclésiastique récemmen découverte. *Rev. sém.*, 1897, 148–65.

HARRIS, J. RENDEL. Mr. Carles' Apocalypse of Baruch. *Expositor*, April 255–65.

HATCH, EDWIN, and H. A. REDPATH. A Concordance to the Septuagint and other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books). Part VI. (completing the work). Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1897; 4to. 21s.

HOGG, HOPE W. Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew. *Expos. Times*, March, 262–7.

HORT, F. J. A. A Criticism of Dr. Hatch's "Essays in Bibl. Greek." II. *Expositor*, March, 178–84.

LÉVI, ISRAËL. La *sagesse* de Jésus, fils de Sirach, découverte d'un fragment de l'original hébreu. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXVI., 1–50.

NESTLE, EB. Eine Erweiterung der hebräischen Bibel. *Beilage zur Allgem. Zeitg.* München, Feb. 17.

On the newly discovered Hebrew portions of Ecclesiasticus.

——— Zum Prolog des Ecclesiasticus. *ZATW*, XVII., 123–5.

NOLDEKE, TH. The Original Hebrew of a Portion of Ecclesiasticus. *Expositor*, May, 347–64.

REDPATH, H. A. Codex Zittaviensis, for the LXX. *Expos. Times*, May, 383.

SCHMIDT, GOTTFR. Die beiden syrischen Übersetzungen des 1. Maccabäerbuches. *ZATW*, XVII., 1–47.

SELBIE, J. A. The Slavonic Enoch. *Expos. Times*, May, 383–4.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

BÜCHLER, ADOLPHE. Les sources de Flavius Josèphe dans ses antiquités, 12:5—13:1. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 69–93.

COHN, L. Kritisch-exegetische Beiträge zu Philo. *Hermes*, 1897; 107–48.

DRÜNER, HANS. Untersuchungen über Josephus. Inaug.-Diss. Marburg, 1897; 94 pp., 8vo.

KRELL, EMIL. Philo *περὶ τοῦ πάντα σπουδαῖον εἶναι ἐλεύθερον*; die Echtheitsfrage. Gymnasial-Progr., Augsburg, 38 pp., 8vo.

PHILONIS ALEXANDRINI opera quae supersunt, ediderunt L. COHN et P. WENDLAND Vol. II., edidit P. Wendland. Berlin, Reimer, 1897; xxxiv + 315 pp., 8vo. M. 9.

RABBINICAL AND TALMUDICAL.

BACHER, W. Le passage relatif au Messie dans la lettre de Maïmonide aux juifs du Yémen. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 101–5.

BLAU, LUDWIG. Massoretic Studies. IV. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 471–90.

BRAUN, M. Geschichte der Juden in Schlesien. II. (pp. 41–79; and xv–xxxiv). Breslau, W. Jacobsohn & Co., 1897; 8vo. M. 1.50.

DÜNNER. Glossen zum babylonischen u. jerusalemischen Talmud. II. Thl. Tractat Kethuboth, Kiduschin u. Gitin (in Hebrew). Frankfurt a. M., J. Kauffmann, 1897; 227 pp., 4to. M. 4.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. Das Judenthum in der vorchristlichen griechischen Welt. Ein Beitrag zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Christenthums. Wien, Breitenstein. v+74 pp., 8vo. M. 1.25;

——— A Fragment of a Shorthand Hagadah. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 520–22.

FÜRST. Nouvelle remarque sur le mot נרורל. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 119–20.

GÜDEMANN, M. Nationaljudenthum, 1. u. 2. Aufl. Wien, Breitenstein, 1897; 43 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

JASTROW, MARCUS. The History and the Future of the Talmudic Text. A lecture. Philadelphia, 1897; 29 pp., 8vo.

KAUFMANN, D. A Letter by Moses di Rossi from Palestine, dated 1535. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 491–500.

——— Elia Menachem Chalfan on Jews teaching Hebrew to non-Jews. *Ibid.*, 500–509.

KRAUSS, SAM. Imprecation against the *Minim* in the Synagogue. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 515–18.

LEVI, I. Le passage relatif au Messie dans la lettre de Maïmonide aux juifs du Yémen. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 105–7.

MEISSNER, BR. תחני פתח עבר נהרא. *ZATW.*, XVII., 191–2.

PICK, B. Historical Sketch of the Jews since their Return from Babylon. With illustrations of modern Jewish customs and life. *Open Court*, May.

RATNER, B. Seder Olam Rabba. Die grosse Weltchronik. Nach Handschriften u. Druckwerken hrsg. m. krit. Noten u. Erklärungen versehen. Wilna und Frankf. a. M., J. Kauffmann, v+151 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50.

RUBIN, S. Jalkut Sch'lomo. Literarische Abhandlungen (in hebr. Sprache). Krakau; Wien, Ch. D. Lippe, 1897; 108 pp., 8vo. M. 2.40.

SAADIA BEN IOSEF AL-FAYYOÛMÎ. Œuvres complètes publié par Joseph Derenbourg, continuée sous la direction de MM. Hartwig Derenbourg et Mayer Lambert. Vol. IX. Traité des successions. Paris, Leroux, 1897; xxiv + 173 pp.

SCHWAB, MOÏSE. Un rituel cabbalistique. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV., 127–30.

SIMON, O. J. The Mission of Judaism: A reply. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 403–28.

ZIMMERN, HELEN. David Levi, Poet and Patriot. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 363–402.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT.

### GRAMMAR AND TEXT.

BLAKENEY, E. H. Note on Tense-Translation in the New Testament. Luke 2:52; 10:24. John 1:14, etc. *Expos. Times*, May, 381–2.

SALMON, GEO. Some Thoughts on the Textual Criticism of the New Testament. London, John Murray, 1897; 8vo. 6s. 6d.

THEIMER, ALOIS. Beiträge zur Kenntniss des Sprachgebrauchs im Neuen Testamente. Programm. Horn, 1897; 40 pp., 8vo.

VITEAU, J. Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament, comparé avec celui des Septante; sujet, complément et attribut. Thèse. Rennes, impr. Simon; Paris, lib. Bouillon, 1896; v + 330 pp., 8vo. =Fascicule 114e de la Bibliothèque de l'école des hautes études.

WINER. Grammatik des neutestam. Sprachidioms. 8. Aufl. Neu bearb. v. PROFESSOR D. SCHMIEDEL. II. Theil, Syntax, 1. Heft. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; pp. 145–208. M. 1.

### LIFE OF CHRIST.

BABUT, HENRY. La pensée de Jésus sur sa mort, d'après les évangiles synoptiques. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 3.

BALJON, J. M. S. Het doel van Jezus gelijkenissen. *Theol. Studiën*, 1897, 178–94.

COURBET, PIERRE. Nouvelles études sur le Christianisme. Jésus-Christ. Paris, Bloud et Barral, 1897; 68 pp., 18mo.

DUGGAN, J. The Life of Christ. London, Kegan Paul, 1897. 6s.

LARSEN, A. C. Paulus og Kristus. København, Schubothe, 1897; 125 pp., 8vo. Kr. 2.50.

LESÊTRE, H. (L'ABBÉ). Histoire de la passion d'après les quatre évangélistes. Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 1.50.

MACNAUGHTON, JOHN. The Relation of Jesus to the Jewish Law. *Queen's Quart.*, April, 241–56.

MASON, ARTHUR JAMES. The Conditions of our Lord's Life on Earth. New York and London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897.

NEBE, F. Die Bedeutung der Versuchungen Jesu in der Versuchungsgeschichte nach Matthäus. *Mancherlei Gaben u. ein Geist*, Dec., 1896.

PASCAL, BLAISE. Abrégé de la vie de Jésus-Christ. Publié par Prosper Feugère, d'après un manuscrit récemment découvert. 2e édition. Paris, Leroux, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 2.

PLATHNER, FR. Was hat der Herr Jesus Christus beschworen? u. was lehrt dagegen die moderne Theologie? Hannover, H. Feesche, 1897; 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

STALKER, JAMES. The Trial and Death of Jesus Christ. New York, American Tract Society, 1897; 321 pp., 8vo. $2.50.

STAPFER, E. Jésus-Christ pendant son ministère. Paris, lib. Fischbacher, 1897; 354 pp., 16mo.

STEWART, ALEXANDER. The Homelessness of Christ. Matt. 8:19, 20. *Expos. Times.* March, 247–50.

WEBER, A. S. The Witness of Jesus of Himself and Christianity. *Ref. Church Rev.*, March, 169–82.

WHITELAW, TH. Could Jesus Err? II. *Expos. Times*, May, 365–7.

### APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

BARING-GOULD, S. The Synagogue and St. Paul. *New Cent. Rev.*, I, 336–46.

BEURLIER, ÉMILE. Les juifs et l'église de Jérusalem. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, II., Jan.–Feb., 1–16.

DELBRÜCK, K. Paulus unser Vorbild, Des grossen Apostels Lebensgeschichte. Leipzig, G. Strübig, 1897; v + 200 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60; bd., M. 2.40.

JACQUIER, E. Une église chrétienne au temps de saint Paul. (Church at Corinth.) *L'Université catholique*, Feb. 15, 176–98.

LUCKOCK, H. M. Footprints of the Apostles as traced by St. Luke in the Acts. 2 vols. London, Longmans & Co., 1897; 8vo., cloth. 12s.

RAMSAY, W. M. St. Paul's Handicraft (σκυτοτόμος). *Expos. Times*, March, 286.

SCHNELLER, LUDWIG. Kent gij de Apostelen? Wandelingen door het heilige Land gedurende het Paaschen Pinksterfeest en den tijd der Apostelen. Utrecht, Breijer; viii + 242 pp., 8vo. Fr. 1.90.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

BADHAM, E. P. St. Mark's Indebtedness to St. Matthew. London, Unwin, 1897; 160 pp., 8vo. 3s. 6d.

BLUDAU. Die Apokalypse und Theodotions Danielübersetzung. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 1897, 1–26.

CAMERLYNK, A. Saint Irénée et le canon du Nouveau Testament. Louvain, Istas, 1896; iv + 116 pp., 8vo. Fr. 2.50.

CONYBEARE, F. C. Christian Demonology. III. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 444–71.

FALCONER, R. A. The Prologue to the Gospel of John. *Expositor*, March, 222–34.

FRITCHEL, SIGM. Ist der Lobgesang der Engel, Lukas 2 : 14, drei- oder zweitheilig? *Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, XX., Heft 5–6.

LOISY, A. Le prologue du quatrième évangile. *Rev. d'hist. et de littér. relig.*, II., 43–60, 141–63.

MAYOR, J. B. Authenticity of the Epistle of St. James defended against Harnack and Spitta. I. *Expositor*, May, 321–38.

RAMSAY, W. M. Pauline Chronology. *Expositor*, March, 201–11.

Against Harnack, "Chronologie der altchr. Lit." I., 235 ff.

——— The Census of Quirinius. Luke 2 : 1. *Expositor*, April, 274–86; June, 425–35.

ROEHRICH, EDOUARD. La composition des évangiles. Paris, Librairie Fischbacher, 1897; 548 pp., 8vo.

STEUDE. Ueber den Quellenwert der synoptischen Evangelien. *Bew. des Glaub.*, March, 89–101.

SLOTEMAKER DE BRUINE, J. R. De israëlietische achtergrond in het nieuwe Testament. *Theol. Studiën*, 1897; 27–69.

TRABAUD, R. Le cadre juif de l'histoire évangélique. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, Jan., 22–39.

THEOLOGY.

ANGUS, JOSEPH. Regeneration. The Divine Fatherhood. The Divine Sonship that Saves Men. Six lectures. London, Alexander & Shepheard, 1897; 8vo; cloth. 6s.

BARTMANN, B. St. Paulus u. St. Jacobus über die Rechtfertigung. 1897; ix + 163 pp., 8vo. M. 3.20.

=Bd. II, Heft 1, of "Biblische Studien," hrsg. von O. Bardenhewer. Freiburg i. B., Herder.

BEARDSLEE, C. S. The Kingdom of Heaven in the Gospels. *Hartf. Sem. Record*, May, 233–62.

BRUN, L. Paulus's lære om loven. Christiania, Steen, 1897; 92 pp., 8vo. Kr. 1.20.

BRUSTON. C. La notion biblique de la descente du Christ aux enfers. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, Jan., 57–78.

——— La notion biblique de la descente du Christ aux enfers. Seconde partie. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, 1897, 169–82.

CAIRD, EDWARD. Christianity and the Historical Christ. *New World*, March, 1–13.

EHRHARDT, EUG. Le principe de la morale de Jésus. Leçon d'ouverture lue à la séance de rentrée des cours de la faculté de théologie protestante de Paris, le lundi 2 Novembre 1896. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 8vo. F. 1.

Canon Gore on the Theory of Evolution and the Christian Doctrine of the Fall. *Expos. Times*, April, 292–4.

KUTTER, H. Das Hohepriesterthum Jesu Christi nach dem Hebräerbrief. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus der Schweiz*, 1897, No. 1, pp. 16–33.

MEYER, F. B. A Witness of the Resurrection. Acts 1 : 22. *Independent*, April 15.

NIEBERGALL, F. Das Heil im Kreuze Jesu Christi. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VII, 97–139.

RIGGENBACH, ED. Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Apostels Paulus. Ein erweiterter Vortrag [aus: *Ev. Kirchenbl. für Württemberg*]. Stuttgart. D. Gundert, 1867; 27 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

SIMON, THEODOR. Die Psychologie des Apostels Paulus. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; ii + 118 pp., 8vo. M. 2.80.

WAYLAND, H. L. Mistakes about the "Prodigal Son" Parable. *Hom. Rev.*, March, 262–4.

WERNLE, PAUL. Der Christ und die Sünde bei Paulus. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 8vo. M. 3.

WHITELAW, TH. Could Jesus Err? *Expos. Times*, April, 299–304.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

ADAMSON, TH. The Spirit of Power as set forth in the Book of the Acts of the Apostles. Chas. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1897; 85 p., 8vo. M. 0.50.

BAIN, J. A. KERR. The Gospel according to James, 4:8. *Expos. Times*, April, 295–9.

BURGE, T. A. Acts xiii–xxviii. London, Burns & O., 1897; 124 pp., 8vo. 1s. 6d.

BURN, A. A. The Outside and the Inside of the Cup: Note on St. Luke 11:39–41. *Expositor*, May, 373–6.

BURRELL, DAVID JAMES, and Jos. D. The Early Church. Studies in the Acts of the Apostles. New York, Am. Tract Soc., 1897; 312 pp., 8vo. $1.25.

DALE, R. W. The Syro-Phœnician Woman. *Expositor*, May, 365–72.

Great Text Commentary. St. John 9:4, 10:10. *Expos. Times*, March, 264–70; April, 306–8.

Great Text Commentary. St. John 11:25–26. *Ibid.*, May, 349–51.

GREGORY, D. S. The Acts of the Apostles. *Hom. Rev.*, March, 264–70.

LAMAR, J. S. The Baptism of Fire. Matt. 3:11. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 243–4.

STOCKMEYER, IMMAN. Exegetische u. praktische Erklärung ausgewählter Gleichnisse Jesu. Vorlesungen, hrsg. v. Karl Stockmeyer. Basel, R. Reich, 1897; x + 537 pp., 8vo. M. 8.

VERUS, S. E. Vergleichende Uebersicht (vollständige Synopsis) der 4 Evangelien in unverkürztem Wortlaute (Luther. Uebersetzung, revidirte Ausg., Halle, 1892). Leipzig, Van Dyk, 1897; xxix + 392 pp., 8vo. Bd. M. 2.40.

WHITEFOORD. Religious Enthusiasm. A study of St. Luke 19:40. *Expos. Times*, May, 362–5.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

BOYS-SMITH, E. P. "Interpretation" or "Revealment," 2 Pet. 1:20. *Expos. Times*, April, 331–2.

BRINEY, J. B. The Type and Antitype. 1 Pet. 3:21. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 244–5.

BROISE, R.-M. DE LA. Mulier amicta sole (Rev. 12:1). Essai exégétique. *Études*, May 5, 289–308.

BROWN, D. A Rendering Revised: 1. John 5:18. *Expos. Times*, May, 374–5.

FINDLAY, G. G. St. John's "Last Hour." 1 John 2:18–27. *Expositor*, April, 241–55.

GARRISON, J. H. Who are those whom God foreknew, Rom. 8:28–30; The Witness of the Spirit, Rom. 8:14–17. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 238–43.

GREGORY, D. S. First Pauline Group of Epistles. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 454–9.

LIDDON, H. P. Explanatory Analysis of St. Paul's First Epistle to Timothy. London and New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897; 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LISCO, H. Judaismus triumphatus. Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung der 4 letzten Kapitel des 2. Korintherbriefes. Berlin, F. Schneider & Co., 1897; vi + 392 pp., 8vo. M. 7.50.

MANEN, W. C. VAN. Paulus III. de Brieven aan de Korinthiers. Leiden, E. J. Brill, 1896.

MATHESON, G. The Christian Promise of Empire. Rev. 3:21. *Expositor*, March, 184–93.

——— The Lamb on the Throne, Rev. chaps. 5 and 6. *Ibid.*, April, 265–73.

——— The Wrath of the Lamb, Rev. 6:16. *Ibid.*, May, 339–46.

NISIUS, J. B. Zur Erklärung von Phil. 2:5–11. *Zeitschr. f. kath. Theol.*, 276–306.

SCHULTE, ADB. Der Brief an die Römer, übersetzt und erklärt. Nebst einem Anhange: "Zur Deutung des Namens Maria." Regensburg, Nationale Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897; viii + 272 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

SPENCE, R. M. Private Interpretation. 2 Peter 1 : 20. *Expos. Times*, March, 285–6.

STELLHORN, F. W. Einleitendes zu den Pastoralbriefen. *Theol. Zeitbl.*, Jan.

STIFLER, JAMES M. The Epistle to the Romans. A commentary, logical and historical. N. Y. and Chicago, F. H. Revell Co., 1897; 274 pp., 8vo. $1.25.

THOMSON, P. Interpretation or Reveal-ment. 2 Pet. 1:20. *Expos. Times*, April, 331.

WOLF, EDMUND J. & HORN, E. T. Annotations on the Epistles to Timothy, Titus, and the Hebrews; and on Philemon. New York, The Christian Lit. Co., 1897; 8vo.

## EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

### LITERATURE AND HISTORY.

* * * Constitution apostolique sur l'interdiction et la lecture des livres. *Études*, Feb. 20, 1897, 521–35.

ACHELIS, H. Über Hippolyt's Oden u. s. Schrift "Zur grossen Ode." *Nachr. v. d. Kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Gottingen, 1896*, 3, 272–6.

ANZ, WILH. Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus. Inaug.-Diss. Halle; 58 pp., 8vo.

*Apocrypha Anecdota*. Second Series, No. 15 of Texts and Studies, contributions to biblical and patristic literature, ed. by J. Armitage Robinson, D.D. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 102 + 875 pp., 8vo. $2.50 *net*.

Contents: Introductory comments on the Greek texts of and notes on seven apocryphal fragments: Acts of John, Andrew, Peter; Letters of Herod, Pilate; Tiberius to Apocalypse of Baruch; Testament of Job.

BACON, B. W. Are the Critics come to Canossa? *Outlook*, May 8.

A propos of Harnack's History of Ancient Christian Literature, Vol. II., pt. 1.

BELLET, CH.-F. L'ancienne vie de saint Martial et la prose rythmée. *L'Univ. cathol.*, March, 321–52.

BENSON, EDW. WHYTE. Cyprian: his life, his times, his work. London, The Macmillan Co.; New York, D. Appleton & Co.. 1897; 8vo. $7.

CHEVRIER, E. Études sur le christianisme primitif. Paris, Picard & fils, 1896; viii + 227 pp., 8vo.

CONYBEARE, F. C. The Armenian Acts of Apollonius, and other Monuments of Early Christianity. 2d edition, with an appendix. London, Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., 1897; 370 pp., 8vo. 6s.

——— A New Second-Century Christian Dialogue. *Expositor*, April, 300–20; June, 443–63.

Questions and Answers; or, an Interchange of Arguments between Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, and Zacchaeus, a Jew.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, editum consilio et impensis academiae litterarum caesareae Vindobonensis.

Vol. XXXII., Pars I.: Ambrosii, Sancti, opera. Pars I.: Exaemeron, de paradiso, de Cain et Abel, de Noe, de Abraham, de Isaac, de bono mortis. Recensuit C. SCHENKL.

Wien und Prag, F. Tempsky; Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1897; 497 pp., 8vo. M. 12.80.

G. DE L. Un mouvement de la foi du second siècle. L'épitaphe d'Abercius. *Études*, May 20, 433–62.

GROSS, OTTO. Die Gotteslehre des Theophilus von Antiochia. Programm des Realgymnas., Chemnitz, 1897; 34 pp., 4to.

HILGENFELD, A. Die Grabschrift des Aberkios. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, XL., 1897, 297–8.

HIPPOLYT's Werke. I. Bd.: Exegetische und homiletische Schriften.

1. Hälfte: Der Kommentar zum Buche Daniel und die Fragmente des Kommentars zum Hohenliede, hrsg. von N. BONWETSCH.
2. Hälfte: Kleine exegetische und homiletische Schriften, hrsg. von HANS ACHELIS.

Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897; 8vo. M. 18; bd., M. 20.50.

HUFMAYR, E. Die pseudocyprianische Schrift *De Pascha Computus*, Gymnas. Progr., Augsburg, 40 pp., 8vo.

KAUFMANN, C. M. Die Legende der Aberkiosstele im Lichte urchristlicher Eschatologie. *Katholik*, 1897, March.

KLAP, P. A. Tertullianus en het Montanisme. II. *Theol. Studiën*, 1897, 120–58.

LATAIX, JEAN. Le commentaire de saint Jérome sur Daniel. I. Opinions de Porphyre. II. Opinions d'Origène. III. Traditions juives. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, II., 164–73, 268–77.

LEJAY, PAUL. Chronique de la littérature chrétienne : La messe latine. *Ibid.*, II., 173–92, 277–88.

MORIN, G. Notes d'ancienne littérature chrétienne. *Rev. bénédict.*, No. 3, March.

Papias, Logia of, new discovery in Egypt. *Expos. Times*, April, 259.

RAABE, R. Ἱστορία Ἀλεξάνδρου. Die Armen. Übersetzg. der sagenhaften Alexander-Biographie ("Pseudo-Callisthenes") auf ihre mutmassl. Grundlage zurückgeführt. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs, 1896; viii + 107 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

REICHE, A. Die künstlerischen Elemente in der Welt- und Lebensanschauung des Gregor von Nyssa. Ein Beitrag zur Philosophie der Patristik. Jena, O. Rassmann, 1897; 60 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

RENESSE, EMIL VON. Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1897; 144 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

ROBINSON, J. A. Three Notes on the Gospel according to the Hebrews. *Expositor*, March, 194–200.

SPANIER, MOR. Exegetische Beitrage zu Hieronymus' "Onomastikon." Magdeburg, J. Neumann, 1896; viii + 41 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

Texte u. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur, hrsg. von O. v. GEBHARDT und A. HARNACK. Leipzig. J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchh., 1897; 8vo.

XV., 4: Zur Frage nach dem Ursprung des Gnosticismus. Ein religionsgeschichtl. Versuch. iv + 112 pp. M. 3.50.

XVI., 2 (=Neue Folge, I., 2): Studien zu den Kommentaren Hippolyt's zum Buche Daniel u. zum Hohen Liede, von G. N. BONWETSCH. 86 pp. M. 3.

VERNET, F. Les femmes chrétiennes aux origines du christianisme. *L'Université catholique*, XXIV., Jan., 11–32.

WERBER, KARL. Tertullian's Schrift *De spectaculis* in ihrem Verhältnisse zu Varro's *Rerum Divinarum libri*. Gymnas.-Programm, Teschen; 31 pp., 8vo.

WEHOFER. Eine neue Aberkioshypothese. *Röm. Quartalschr.*, 1896, 4; 351–78.

WEYMANN, C. Beiträge zur Geschichte der altchristl. Literatur. *Philologus*, 1896, 462–73.

ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

FRIEDLIEB, H.-J. Archéologie de la passion de nôtre-seigneur Jésus-Christ, d'après les principes de l'harmonie des évangiles au point de vue historique et critique; adapté en français par F. Martin. Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 6.

GAMURRINI, G. F. Di una iscrizione cristiana trovata a Pagliano presso Orvieto. *Bullet. di archeologia Cristiana*, Nuovo, II., 3.

HERKENRATH, R. Studien zu den griechischen Grabinschriften. Priv. Gymnas.-Programm. Feldkirch, 1897; 56 pp., 8vo.

LE BOURGEOIS, L. E. Les martyrs de Rome, d'après l'histoire et l'archéologie chrétiennes. T. 1er; les martyrs des voies Nomentane et Tiburtine. Aix, impr. Nicot, 1897; xxxi + 418 pp., 8vo.

LÜDTKE, W. Untersuchungen zu den Miniaturen der Wiener Genesis. Diss. Greifswald, Bindewald, 1897; 50 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

M., H. and M. A. R. T. Handbook to Christian and Ecclesiastical Rome. Pt. I. The Christian Monuments. Illustrated with 23 cuts & plans. London, A. & C. Black, 1897; New York, The Macmillan Co.; 8vo, cloth, xi + 547 pp. $2.50.

MARTIN, F. Les reliques de la passion. Paris, P. Lethielleux, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 2.

MICHON, ÉTIENNE. Inscriptions latines d'Arabie. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 288–98.

MOMMERT, C. Die Grabeskirche des Modestus nach Arkulfs Bericht. *Zeitschr. des deutsch. Palast.-Ver.*, XX., 34–53.

SCHULTZE, V. Der "Physiologus" in der kirchlichen Kunst des Mittelalters. *Christl. Kunstbl.*, 1897, No. 4.

STEINLE, VON. Christliche Ikonographie. *Katholik*, May.

STEARNS, C. C. Christ and the Creed in Early Christian Art. *Hartf. Sem. Rec.*, May, 196–205.

WIEGAND, FRIEDR. Die Kuppelmosaiken im katholischen Baptisterium zu Ravenna. *Neue kirchliche Zeitschr.*, VIII., 420 ff.

# HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

## GENERAL.

ANDRÉ, FANNY. Dans le Poitou protestant. Souvenirs de vacances. *Rev. chrét.*, May, 343–57.

BIERMANN, G. Geschichte des Protestantismus in Oesterreich-Schlesien. Prag, F. G. Calve, 1897; vi + 223 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

BUND, J. W. WILLIS. The Celtic Church of Wales. London, David Nutt, 1897; vii + 533 pp. 12s. 6d. *net.*

CLARK, J. WILLIS. Customs of Augustinian Canons. Cambridge, Macmillan & Bowes, 1897.

DYER, G. History of the Christian Church. Vol. I. Founding of the New World, 1–600 A.D. Cincinnati, Curts & Jennings, 1897; 8vo. $1.50.

FARRAR, F. W.; ROBINSON, J. ARMITAGE; MEYRICK, F., and others. Lectures on Ecclesiastical History delivered in Norwich Cathedral, with preface by the Dean of Norwich. New York, T. Whittaker, 1897; x + 502 pp. $2.25.

France (la) chrétienne dans l'histoire, ouvrage publié sous le haut patronage de S. Em. le cardinal Langénieux et sous la direction du R. P. BAUDRILLART, de l'Oratoire. Mesnil et Paris, Firmin-Didot & Cie., 1897; xxxi + 699 pp., 18mo.

FUNK, F. X. Kirchengeschichtl. Abhandlungen u. Untersuchungen. 1. Bd. Paderborn, F. Schöningh, 1897; vi + 516 pp. M. 8.

GÖRRES, F. Rekkared der Katholische und das Judentum. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, XL., 1897, 284–96.

HURST, JOHN F. Church History as an Aid to the Pulpit. *Hom. Rev.*, May, 392–5.

——— History of the Christian Church. 2d edition. New York, Eaton & Mains, 1897; 947 pp., 8vo. $5.

NETOLICZKA, OSK. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. 4. Aufl. von F. Lohmann's Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Der Neubearbeitg. 2. Aufl. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; viii + 183 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

PAPE, PAUL. Bibliographie der kirchengeschichtlichen Literatur vom 1. October 1895 bis 1. Januar 1897. Erste Hälfte. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.* XVIII., 145–60.

RAMSAY, W. M. The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia: Being an essay of the local history of Phrygia from the earliest times to the Turkish conquest. Vol. I., Part 2: West and West Central Phrygia. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1897; 456 pp., 8vo. 21s.

RIEDLE, IGN. Das Hochstift Freising, seine Domkirche und seine Bischofe 720–1803. Geschichtl. Erinnerungen f. das Volk in Stadt u. Diözese. Freising, F. P. Datterer, 1897; 65 pp., with 6 illustrations, 16mo. M. 0.60.

SAUERLAND, H. V. Sancti Clementis, primi Mettensis episcopi, vita, translatio ac miracula. Trier, Paulinus-Druckerei, 1897; 44 pp. M. 1.

SCHONBACH, A. E. Das Christentum in der altdeutschen Heldendichtung. Vier Abhandlungen. Graz, Leuschner & Lubensky, 1897; xii + 267 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

SPENCE, H. D. M. The Church of England, a history for the people. Cassell & Co, 1897. Vol. I. 6s.
To be completed in 4 vols.

STORY, ROBERT HERBERT. The Apostolic Ministry in the Scottish Church. (Baird Lecture, 1897.) London, Blackwood & Sons, 1897. 7s. 6d.

WOODHOUSE, F. C. Monasticism, Ancient and Modern. Its Principles, Origin, Development, Triumphs, Decadence, and Suppression. With an inquiry as to the possibility of its revival London, Gardner, Darton & Co., 8vo. 7s. 6d. *net.*

## THE EARLY PERIOD.

ASMUS, J. R. Ein Bindeglied zwischen der pseudo-justinischen Cohortatio ad Graecos und Julian's Polemik gegen die Galiläer. (Dion Chrysost. or. XII.) *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, XL., 1897, 268–83.

BRUCKNER. Leben und Schriften Julians. Leipzig, I. C. Hinrichs, 1897.

DIONYSIUS, the Areopagite, Works of. Translated by J. Parker. 1897; 12mo, cloth. 6s.

HORT, FENTON J. A. The Christian Ecclesia. A course of lectures on the early history and early conceptions of the ecclesia, and four sermons. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 302 pp., 8vo. $1.75.

LADEUZE, P. Les Diverses recensions de la vie de S. Pakhôme et leur dépendance mutuelle. *Le Muséon et la rev. des relig.*, 1897, 148–72.

MANCINI, A. La storia ecclesiastica di Eusebio e il "de mortibus persecutorum." *Stud. stor.*, V., 4, 555–71.

MASON, A. J. The Mission of St. Augustine to England according to the Original Documents, being a handbook for the thirteenth centenary. Cambridge, University Press, 1897; 8vo. 5s.

MÖLLER, J. Das Leben des Aurelius Augustinus, Bischofs von Hippo. "Handreichung zur Vertiefung christlicher Erkenntnis." I., Heft 1. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897. M. 0.60.

MORIN, G. Deux passages inédits du *de Psalmodiae bono* de saint Niceta, ive et ve siècle. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 282–8.

——— Epistula ad virginem lapsam. Opuscule inédit du ive siècle. *Rev. bénéd.*, 5, 193–202.

MOORE, T. Beginnings of the English Church and Kingdom, explained to the People. Dedicated to the memories of St. Augustine and King Ethelbert. London, Skeffington & Son, 1897; 8vo. 5s.

NISSEN, WALD. Die Regelung des Klosterlebens im Rhomaeerreiche bis zum Ende des 9. Jahrh. Programm, Hamburg, Herold; 30 pp., 4to. M. 4.

SCHLATTER, A. Die Tage Trajans und Hadrians. "Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie." I., Heft 3 *a*. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897. Ca. M. 1.

SCHULTZ, W. Cyprianmanuscripte in Madrid und im Escorial. *Theol. Litztg.*, No. 16.

SYNNERBERG, C. Randbemerkungen zu Minucius Felix. [From "Finska Vetenskaps-Societetens Förhandlingar."] Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1897; 23 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

THOMAS, ÉMILE. Rome et l'empire aux deux premiers siècles. Paris, Hachette & Cie., 1897; 16mo. Fr. 3.50.

WRIGHT, CHARLES H. H. Christian Classics Series: The writings of St. Patrick. London, Religious Tract Soc., 1897. 2s.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

ADAMS, D. C. O. The Saints and Missionaries of the Anglo-Saxon Era. First Series. 8vo, cloth. 5s. *net*

BEER, R. Urkundliche Beiträge zu Johannes de Segovias Geschichte des Baseler Konzils auf Grund von Forschungen in den Archiven und Bibliotheken von Basel, Genf, Lausanne, und Avignon. Wien, 1897; 60 pp., 8vo. M. 1.30.

BIENHEUREUX, LE. Innocent V., pape. Abrégé de sa vie. Lille, Desclée, de Brouwer & Cie., 1896; 31 pp., 32mo.

CONDER, C. R. The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem, 1099 to 1291. London, 1897; 8vo. $2.

COOKE, J. H. The Early Churches of Great Britain. 1897. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

CRIVELUCCI, A. Le chiese cattoliche e i Langobardi ariani in Italia. *Studi. stor.*, V., 4, 531–54.

DUCHESNE, L. Les premiers temps de l'état pontifical. 6e art.: Les papes d'empire. *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. relig.*, II., 193–222.

EISENHOFER, LUDW. Procopius von Gaza. Eine literarhist. Studie. Gekronte Preisschrift. Freiburg, Herder, 1897; vii + 84 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

FOSS, R. Leben und Schriften Agobards, Erzbischofs von Lyon. "Beiträge zur Forderung christlicher Theologie." I., Heft 2 *b*. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897. Ca. M. 1.

FREYSTEDT, A. Studien zu Gottschalks Leben u. Lehre. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 1–22.

HEGER, C. Zum Gedächtnis Adalberts, des ersten Apostels der Preussen. Festschrift zum 900-jähr. Todestage des Märtyrers. Königsberg, W. Koch, 1897; v + 109 pp., 8vo; 6 tables. M. 0.50.

HIRSCH-GEREUTH, A. v. Studien zur Geschichte der Kreuzzugidee nach den Kreuzzügen. 1897; viii + 176 pp., 8vo. M. 6.40.

= Heft 11 of: Historische Abhandlungen, hrsg. v. Th. Heigel u. H. Grauert. München, Dr. H. Lüneburg.

JOACHIMSOHN, P. Die Streitschrift des Minoriten Gabriel von Verona gegen den Böhmenkönig Georg Podiebrad vom Jahre 1467. Progr. Realgym., Augsburg, 1897; 43 pp., 8vo.

KNAPPERT, L. Christendom en Heidendom in de "Kerkgeschiedenis" van Beda den Eerwaardige. II. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, XXI., May, 272–301.

LARMINIE, WILLIAM. Joannes Scotus Erigena. *Contemp. Rev.*, April.

LITTLE, W. J. KNOX. St. Francis of Assisi: his times, life, and work. London, Isbister & Co.; 8vo. 10s. 6d.

LOSERTH, J. Studien zur Kirchenpolitik Englands im 14. Jahrh. I. Thl. Bis zum Ausbruch des grossen Schismas, 1378. [Aus "Sitzungsber. der K. Akad. d. Wiss."] Wien, C. Gerold's Sohn in Komm., 1897; 135 pp., 8vo. M. 3.

MACFADYEN, ALFRED N. Pius II.: "How I became Pope;" translated. *Contemp. Rev.*, April.

Mediæval Moulders of the Church and Makers of its History. A symposium. *Luth. Church Rev.*, April, 206–75.

Constantine the Great—Athanasius—Ambrose—Augustine — Jerome — Chrysostom — Chrysostom as a Preacher — Gregory the Great — Charlemagne — Hildebrand.

MURAWSKI, BERN. Kurzes Lebensbild des hl. Adalbert, Apostels der Preussen. Zum 900-jähr. Jubiläum seines Martyrertodes bearb. Gnesen, J. B. Lange, 1897; iii + 59 pp., 8vo. M. 0.30.

PICAVET, F. Gerbert, un pape philosophe d'après l'histoire et la légende. Paris, Leroux, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 6.

Tome IX. de la *Bibliothèque de l'Ecole des hautes études* (Section des sciences religieuses).

REINHARDSTÖTTNER, K. v. Gottfried von Bouillon. *Forschungen zur Kultur- u. Literaturgesch. Bayerns*, 5. Buch.

RÖHRICHT, R. Über das *Itinerarium* des Johannes von Schauwenburgh. *Zeitschr. des deutsch. Palästina-Ver.*, XX., 54–7.

SEEBASS. Über die sogen. Regula coenobialis Columbani und die mit dem Poenitential Columbas verbundenen kleineren Zusätze. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 58–75.

WAPPLER, PAUL GEO. Papst Benedikt VIII., 1012–24. Diss. Leipzig, Schäfer & Schönfelder, 1897; 103 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

## THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

BAUCH, GUSTAV. Andreas Carlstadt als Scholastiker. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 37–57.

——— Melanchthoniana. *Ibid.*, 76–90.

BÖHTLINGK, A. Doctor Martin Luther und Ignaz von Loyola. Eine geschichtliche Parallele. Heidelberg, Hörning, 1897; 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

BRANDENBURG, E. Luther, Kursachsen und Magdeburg in den Jahren 1541 und 1542. Mit 6 ungedruckten Briefen Luther's. *Deutsche Zeitschr. f. Geschichtswiss.*, neue Folge, Jhrg. I., Heft 4.

BURKHARDT. Die Judenverfolgungen im Kurfürstentum Sachsen von 1536 an. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 593–8.

CHALLICE, RACHEL. Spanish Protestants in the Sixteenth Century. Compiled from the German work of DR. WILKENS. With an introduction by the late the Most Rev. Lord Plunket, Archbishop of Dublin, and a preface by the Rev. Canon Fleming. London, Wm. Heinemann, 1897; 8vo. 4s. 6d. *net.*

FAUTH, FRZ. Martin Luther's Leben dem deutschen Volke erzählt. Mit 35 Orig. Abbildungen, von Ed. Kaempffer. Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1897; vii + 228 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

FRIEDENSBURG, W. Beiträge zum Briefwechsel der katholischen Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter aus italienischen Archiven u. Bibliotheken. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 106–31.

FROBÖSS, G. Der Anschluss der Gemeinde in Witten a. R. an die evangelisch-lutherische Kirche in Preussen. Auf Grund amtl. Quellen dargestellt. Breslau, E. Dülfer in Komm., 1897; 32 pp., 8vo. M. 0.30.

HAUSSLEITER. Die Thesen zur Disputation Melanchthons am 16. November 1538. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 588–93.

HORTON, R. F. Oliver Cromwell. A study of personal religion. London, James Clark & Co.; New York, Th. Whittaker; viii + 208 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $1.25.

JÜRGES, PAUL. Ein Autographon Melanchthons über den Begriff der Kirche. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 104–6.

KELLER, LUDW. Die Anfange der Reformation u. die Ketzerschulen. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der Waldenser beim Beginn der Reformation. iv + 61 pp. M. 1.50.

= Vorträge u. Aufsätze der Comenius-Gesellschaft, 4. Jahrgang, Stück 1 und 2. Berlin, R. Gärtner; 8vo.

KHULL, FERD. Des Ritters Hans von Hirnheim Reisetagebuch aus dem Jahre 1569. Gymnas.-Programm, Graz, 1897; 32 pp., 8vo.

NATHUSIUS, M. VON. Die christlich-socialen Ideen der Reformationszeit u. ihre Herkunft. v + 167 pp. M. 2.40.

Heft 2 of: "Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," hrsg. v. A. Schlatter und H. Cremer. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897.

POCOCK, NICHOLAS. Bull of Paul IV. (1555) concerning the Bishopric of Bristol. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, April, 303–7.

RUMP, J. Melanchthons Psychologie (seine Schrift *de anima*) in ihrer Abhangigkeit von Aristoteles und Galenus. Kiel, Marquardsen, 1897. M. 3.50.

STÄHLIN, ADF. v. Philipp Melanchthon. Fest-Rede. Augsburg, Schlosser, 1897; 29 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

TSCHACKERT, PAUL. Ungedruckte Melanchthon-Handschriften des Gottinger Stadtarchivs. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 90–103.

——— Justus Jonas' Bericht aus dem Jahre 1538 über Martin Luthers Eintritt in das Kloster 1505; aus dem Handschriftl. Zusatz zu einem Urdruck der Confessio Augustana. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 577–80.

——— Unbekannte Aurifaber-Handschriften zur allgemeinen Reformationsgeschichte. *Ibid.*, 1897, 581–7.

——— Melanchthons Bildungsideale. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; 21 pp., 8vo. M. 0.30.

VOGT, V. O. Melanchthon's Stellung als Reformator. Schluss. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, XL., 1897, 161–210.

### THE MODERN PERIOD.

BERGER, DANIEL. History of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ. Dayton, O., Unit. Brethren Publ. House, 1897; xvi + 682 pp., 8vo; cloth.

BERGER, SAM. L'Église luthérienne et la France. *Rev. chrét.*, March, 161–74.

BRINHACK, FRANZ. Geschichte des Cisterzienserstiftes Waldassen unter dem Abte Wigand von Deltsch (1756–1792) nach handschriftlichen Quellen bearbeitet. Programm des Gymnasium Eichstätt; 47 pp., 8vo.

BURKHARDT, G. Die Brüdergemeinde. 2. Tl.: Die Brüdergemeinde in ihrer gegenwärtigen Gestalt. Im Auftrage der Unitäts-Ältesten-Konferenz bearbeitet. Gnadau, Unitätsbuchh., 1897; v + 83 pp., 8vo. Bd., M. 1.20.

BYINGTON, E. H. John Eliot, the Apostle to the Indians. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 563–8.

CAMM, B. The Gunpowder Plot. *Dublin Rev.*, April, 299–318.

CLEMEN, OTTO. Zur Geschichte des Socianismus. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 140–3.

DAVIS, O. S. Robinson's Controversies. *Hartford Sem. Rec.*, May, 205–24.

DELMONT, T. Bossuet et les saints pères, d'après des documents originaux et inédits. Mesnil, Firmin-Didot & Cie.; Paris, Putois-Crette, 1896; xx + 704 pp., 8vo.

Flugschriften des Evangelischen Bundes. Hrsg. vom Vorstand des Ev. Bundes. Leipzig, Buchh. des Evang. Bundes v. G. Braun, 1897; 8vo.

134, 135. MÜLLER, HANS. Kurfürst August der Starken Uebertritt zur römischen Kirche. 56 pp. M. 0.50.

Geschichtsblätter des deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins. VI. Zehnt, 5.–7. Heft; 8vo. Magdeburg, Heinrichshofen's Sort.

5–7. TOLLIN, HENRY: Das Bürgerrecht der Hugenotten zu Frankfurt a. d. Oder. 71 pp. M. 1.50.

GRABINSKI. Les prêtres romains et le premier empire. *L'Univ. cath.*, March, 376–404; April, 529–55; May, 29–72.

GUÉPIN, A. Un apôtre de l'union des églises au xvii^e siècle. Saint Josaphat et l'église gréco-slave en Pologne et en Russie. Poitiers et Paris, librairie Oudin; xlvii + clviii + 386 pp., 8vo.

HAVERSTICK, A. C. The Historic Church for America. Milwaukee, Wis., The Young Churchman Co., 1897; 48 pp. $0.10.

KNOD, G. Eine Bologneser Juristenmatrikel auf der Biblioteca Estense in Modena. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 132–40.

LUNN, JOHN ROBERT. Bishop Barlowe's Dialogue on the Lutheran Factions. Edited by J. R. L. London, Ellis & Keene, 1897. 2s. 6d.

MAYER, E. M. Eine salzburgische Visitationsreise in Steiermark und Kärnten im Jahre 1657. Reprint from Programm der Landes-Oberrealschule, Graz. 13 pp., 8vo.

MODL, MART. Kurzer Abriss der Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchengemeinde A. B. zu Bielitz vom Zeitalter der Reformation bis auf die Jetztzeit. Bielitz, O. Biegel, 1897; 33 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

MOLÈNES, ÉMILE DE. Torquemada et l'inquisition (Documents inédits). La Jurisprudence du Saint-Office. L'Enfant de la Guardia. Le Cœur et l'hostie, etc. Paris, Chamuel, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 3.50.

NEWMAN, JOHN HENRY. The Devotions of Bishop Andrews († 1626). Translated from the Greek and arranged. New York, G. H. Richmond & Co., 146 pp. $2.

O'GORMAN, T. The Roman Catholic Church in the United States. New York, The Christian Literature Co., 1897. Cloth, $3.

PARISET, GEORGES. L'État et les églises en Prusse sous Frédéric-Guillaume Ier (1713–1740). Paris, Colin; 8vo. Fr. 12.

PRÖLL, LAURENZ. Die Gegenreformation in der Stadt Bruck a. d. Lahn, e. typisches Bild, nach den Aufzeichngn. des Stadtschreibers Georg Khirmeir entworfen. Wien, Mayer & Co., 1897; 108 pp., 8vo. M. 2.20.

SACHSE, J. F. Genesis of the German Lutheran Church in the Land of Penn. II. *Luth. Church Rev.*, April, 283–301.

SMITH, JUSTIN ALMERIN. A History of the Baptists in the Western States, east of the Mississippi. Philadelphia, Amer. Bapt. Pub. Soc., 1896; 420 pp. $1.25.

TACHELLA, E. Les anciens Pauliciens et les modernes Bulgares catholiques de la Philippopolitaine. Suite. *Le Muséon et la rev. des relig.*, 1897, 113–30.

WATRIGANT, H. La Genèse des exercises spirituels de saint Ignace de Loyala. *Études*, May 20, 506–30.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

ALLIES, MARY H. Pius, the Seventh, 1800–1823. London, Burns & Oates, 1897.

BALDENSPERGER, W. Karl August Credner, sein Leben u. seine Theologie. Leipzig, Veit & Co., 1897; 99 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

BLAIKIE, W. G. Thomas Chalmers. Famous Scots Series. Edinburgh, Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1897; imported by C. Scribner's Sons, New York; 60 pp., 12mo. $0.75.

DELAPORTE, P. V. Le Cardinal Guibert. *Études*, March 5, 577–97.

DESJARDINS, G. Le Cardinal Desprez, archevêque de Toulouse. *Ibid.*, May 20, 549–55.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Oxford and Jowett. *Contemp. Rev.*, June.

HEMMER, H. M. Manning avant sa conversion. 2e et dernier art. *Rev d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, II., 97–133.

HORTON, R. F. The Free Church in England. *Fortnightly Rev.*, April.

Jowett and Oxford Liberalism. *Blackwood's Mag.*, May.

Martineau, James Dr. *Academy*, April 24, 455.

MCKIM, RANDOLPH HARRISON. Leo XIII. at the Bar of History: a discussion of the papal plan for Christian unity. Washington, Gibson Bros.

MEYBOOM, H. U. In Memoriam: A. D. Loman. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, XXI., May, 345–8.

MONSER, J. W. The Duke of Argyll and his Work. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 224–37.

SABATIER, AUG. La Situation politique et religieuse en France. *Rev. chrét.*, April, 298–303.

SCHELL, H., u. A. EHRHARD. Gedenk-Blätter zu Ehren des hochw.-geistl. Rates Dr. Jos. Grimm, weil. Professor der neut. Exegese an der Universität Würzburg. Würzburg, A. Göbel, 1897; iv+132 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

TISSOT, D. Schleiermacher an Dr. Lücke. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, 1897, 128–143.

## SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

### GENERAL.

BARING-GOULD, S. The Lives of the Saints. Vol. II. London, John C. Nimmo, 1897. 5s.

BOWMAN, JOHN C. The Relation of the Reformed Church to New Theology. *Ref. Church Rev.*, March, 141–56.

SWANDER, J. I. The Present Trend of Theological Thought. *Ibid.*, March, 157–68.

VERDUN, P. Le Diable dans la vie des saints. Poitiers, Blais & Roy; Paris et Lyon, Librairie Delhomme & Briguet, 1897; 2 vols.; 324 pp., 12mo.

### HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

EATON, A. W. The Heart of the Creeds. Historical Religion in the Light of Modern Thought. New York, Thom. Whittaker, 1897; 200 pp., 8vo. $1.00.

GROSS, O. Die Gotteslehre des Theophilus von Antiochia. Chemnitz, 1897; 34 pp., 4to.

HAHN, AUGUST. Bibliothek der Symbole und Glaubensregeln der alten Kirche. 3. vielfach veränderte u. vermehrte Auflage von Dr. G. Ludwig Hahn. Mit einem Anhang von Dr. Adolph Harnack. Breslau, E. Morgenstern, 1897. M. 6.50.

INGOLD, A. P. Bossuet et le jansénisme, Notes historiques. Paris, Hachette, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 5.

KATTENBUSCH, FERD. Das apostolische Symbol, seine Entstehung, sein geschichtlicher Sinn, seine ursprüngl. Stellung im Kultus u. in der Theologie der Kirche. Ein Beitrag zur Symbolik und Dogmengeschichte. II. Bd. Verbreitung und Bedeutung des Taufsymbols. 1. Hälfte. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1897; pp. 1–352. M. 11.

LÄNGIN, G. Der Christus der Geschichte und sein Christenthum. Der Gemeinde dargestellt. I. Abth. Leipzig, O. Wigand, 1897; xxvi+136 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

NITZSCH, F. Eine bestätigte Konjektur; historischer Beitrag zur Lehre vom Gewissen. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 23–36.

PALMIÉ, FR. Der Pietismus und A. H. Francke. "Handreichung zur Vertiefung christl. Erkenntnis." I., Heft 3. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897. M. 0.60.

PAULUS, F. Melanchthon und die Gewissensfreiheit. *Katholik*, May, 460–9.

STANGE, CARL. A. Ritschl's Urteil über die beiden Prinzipien des Protestantismus. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 599–621.

### APOLOGETICS.

SAINT-PROJET. Apologie scientifique de la foi chrétienne. 4e édition. Paris, Poussielgue, 1897; xxvii+564 pp., 12mo.

SCHANZ, P. Über neue Versuche der Apologetik gegenüber dem Naturalismus und Spiritualismus. Regensburg, Nat. Verlagsbuchh., 1897; viii+407 pp. M. 6.

TERRY, MILTON S. The New Apologetic. New York, Eaton & Mains, 1897; 199 pp., 8vo. $0.75.

### DOGMATICS.

ALTHAUS, PAUL. Die Heilsbedeutung der Taufe im Neuen Testamente. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; xii+321 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50; bd., M. 5.40.

BAGSHAWE, E. Notes on Christian Doctrine. London, Kegan, Paul, etc., 1897.

BLAIKIE, W. GARDEN; SAYCE, ARCHIBALD H.; RICE, EDWIN WILLIAM (and others). Is Christianity True? Philadelphia, The Amer. S. S. Union, 1897; ii+114 pp. $0.50.

BONAVENTURE, M. L'Eucharistie et le mystère du Christ, d'après l'Écriture et la tradition. Élévations et considérations. Saint-Brieuc, Prud'homme; Paris, Poussielgue, 1897; vi+724 pp., 4to.

BORNEMANN, W. Christliche Vollkommenheit nach katholischer und evangelischer Auffassung. Vortrag. Magdeburg, Creutz, 1897; 31 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

CHABLE, FL. Die Wunder Jesu in ihrem innern Zusammenhange betrachtet. v+xii+106 pp., 4to. M. 2.

Bd. 2, Heft 4, of: Strassburger theol. Studien, hrsg. v. Alb. Ehrhard u. Eug. Müller. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; 8vo.

COOKE, J. HUNT. Heaven: An Inquiry. London, Baptist Tract Soc., 1897. 2s.

EINIG, PETRUS. Institutiones theologiae dogmaticae. Tractatus de Deo uno et trino. Trier, Paulinus-Druckerei, 1897; vii+209 pp., 8vo. M. 2.80.

ELLIS, ROWLAND. The Christian Faith. Edinburgh, St. Giles' Printing Co., 1897.

FAUVETY, CHARLES. Théonomie. Démonstration scientifique de l'existence de Dieu. Nouvelle édition. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 16mo. Fr. 2.50.

GARVIE, ALFRED E. The Ritschlian Denial of the Resurrection. *Expos. Times*, April, 333–5.

GIFFORD, E. N. The Incarnation. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1897. 3s. 6d.

GORDON, E. C. Probation — Death — Judgment. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 218–30.

HANSJAKOB, HEINR. Die wahre Kirche Jesu Christi. 2. Aufl. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; 80 pp., 8vo. M. 1.30.

HAWKESWORTH, ALAN O. De incarnatione verbi Dei; together with three essays subsidiary to the same. With a commendatory preface by the Very Rev. E. A. Hoffman, S.T.D., LL.D. Albany, Riggs Printing & Publishing Co., 1897; vi+116 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $1.25.

HILGENBERG, R. Zwei Briefe uber das Glaubensbekenntniss. Cassel, E. Hühn, 1897; 46 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

JALAGUIER, P.-F. Introduction à la dogmatique. Œuvre posthume, publiée par Paul Jalaguier. Avec une préface de M. A. Decoppet. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; xxiii+673 pp., 8vo. Fr. 10.

KINROSS, JOHN. Dogma in Religion and Creeds in the Church. Edinburgh, J. Thin, 1897; 8vo. 5s.

KIRCHBACH, WOLFG. Was lehrte Jesus? Zwei Evangelien. Berlin, F. Dümmler, 1897; viii+248 pp. M. 5; bd., M. 6.

KLENCKE-MANNHART. Der Jesus Christus unserer Zeit. Dresden, Selbstverlag, 1897; 19 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

LAIDLAW, J. Foundation Truth of Scripture as to Sin and Salvation. New York, imported by C. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 131 pp., 12mo. $0.45.

——— The Miracles of Our Lord. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark; imported by C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1897; viii +93 pp., 18mo. $0.20 *net*.

Bible Class Primers, edited by Professor Salmond, D.D., Aberdeen.

LASSON, G. Zur Theorie des christlichen Dogmas. Berlin, R. Gaertner, 1897; iv+123 pp. M. 2.80.

MORRIS, D. The Growth of Sacrificial Ideas connected with the Holy Eucharist. New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897; ii+78 pp. $0.75.

OETTINGEN, A. v. Lutherische Dogmatik in 2 Bdn. I. Bd.: Principienlehre. Apologetische Grundlegung zur Dogmatik. München, Beck, 1897; xx+478 pp. M. 8; bd., M. 10.

OTTIGER, S. J. Theologia fundamentalis. Tom. I.: De revelatione supernaturali. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; xxiv+928 pp., 8vo. M. 12; bd., M. 14.

PEIPERS, DAV. Das protestantische Bekenntniss. Ein Beitrag zur Lösung der Bekenntnissfrage in der evgl.-prot. Kirche, insbesondere der hannov. Landeskirche. (Nebst Aktenstücken.) Göttingen, Dieterich, 1897; vi+388 pp., 8vo. M. 7.50.

REISCHLE, M. Der Streit über die Begrundung des Glaubens auf den "geschichtlichen" Jesus Christus. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VII., 171–264.

SAMTLEBEN, G. Das Wesen und die Bedeutung der Wunder Jesu. *Bew. des Glaub.*, April, 129–38.

SCHAEFER, RUD. Das Herrenmahl nach Ursprung u. Bedeutung, mit Rücksicht auf die neuesten Forschungen untersucht. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; vii+420 pp., 8vo. M. 6; bd., M. 7.

SCHINZ A. Essai sur la notion du miracle considérée au point de vue de la théorie de la connaissance. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, 1897, 97–127.

SCHWARZKOPFF, PAUL. Die Irrtumslosigkeit Jesu Christi u. der christliche Glaube. Ein Nachwort zu der Schrift: "Konnte Jesus irren"? Zum Zwecke der Verteidig. und Abwehr. Giessen, J. Ricker, 1897; vi+122 pp., M. 2.

SMITH, R. C. The Enthronement of Faith. *Outlook*, May 29.

TIXERONT, J. L'idée du sacrifice dans la religion chrétienne. *L'Univ. cath.*, XXV., 5–12.

VIATOR. What will be the Creed of the Future? *Dublin Rev.*, April, 334–44.

WARFIELD, B. B. The Development of the Doctrine of Infant Salvation. *Christ. Lit.*, March, 473–83; April, 577–97; May, 1–14; June, 97–105.

WOHLENBERG, G. Jesu Auferstehung von den Toten. Vortrag. Schwerin Bahn, 1897; 31 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

WRIGHT, W. J. The Speculative View of Faith. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 142–60.

ZITZLAFF. Die wahre Bedeutung der Glaubensrechtfertigung. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 489–576.

ETHICS.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. The Larger Love. 1 John 4:8. *Outlook*, May 15.

BARNES, S. G. Love and Law. *Hartf. Sem. Rec.*, May, 181–96.

BELL, F. W. B. VAN. Zedekunde. II. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, XXI., May, 229–72.

BORNEMANN, W. Christentum u. ethische Kultur. Vortrag. Magdeburg, Creutz, 1897; 32 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

BOVON, J. Morale chrétienne. Tome premier. Lausanne, Bridel et Cie, 1897; 440 pp., 8vo. Fr. 8.
Vol. II. (concluding the work) in press.

L'Influence de la religion sur la morale. *Rev. chrét.*, March, 175–87.

CARUS, PAUL. Is Ethics Possible? Editorial reply to Llano's Developmental Ethics. *Open Court*, May.

HELWIG, P. I. Eine Theorie des Schönen. Amsterdam, Delsman & Nolthenius, 1897. M. 3.

KILPATRICK, T. B. Christian Conduct, a further study in New Testament morality. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark; imported by C. Scribner's Sons, New York, 1897; 145 pp., 18mo. $0.20 *net*.
= Bible Class Primers, Professor Salmond, D.D., Aberdeen.

LLANO, A. Developmental Ethics. *Open Court*, May.

MALTESE, F. Il problèma morale. Vittoria, tip. Velardi e figlio, 1896; 92 pp., 8vo.

PAULSEN, FRDR. System der Ethik, m. e. Umriss der Staats- u. Gesellschaftslehre. 2 Bde., 4. Aufl. Berlin, Besser, 1897; xiii + 435 and vi + 616 pp., 8vo. Bd., M. 13.

SCHOPENHAUER, ARTHUR. On Human Nature; essays in ethics and politics tr. by T. Bailey Saunders, New York, The Macmillan Co.; 132 pp., 12mo. $0.90.

SPITZER, HUGO. Kritische Studien zur Aesthetik der Gegenwart. Wien, E. Fromme, 1897; 37 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

STERN, WILH. Kritische Grundlegung der Ethik als positive Wissenschaft. Berlin, F. Dümmler's Verlag, 1897; iii + 471 pp., 8vo. M. 7.20.

SUPER, C. W. No National Stability without Morality. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 293–303.

## PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

CANNON, J. F. Ian Maclaren's "The Mind of the Master." *Presb. Quart.*, April, 190–200.

CHAPMAN, E. M. The Idea of the Kingdom of God: its influence upon the history of the English-speaking peoples in the present century. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 525–41.

CHAPUIS, PAUL. Sommes-nous encore chrétiens? *Rev. chrét.*, April, 241–62.

CHÉROT, H. Une prochaine canonisation. Le Bienheureux Pierre Fourier. *Études*, April 5, 5–34; 20, 166–93; May 20, 462–91.

DABNEY, R. L. The Decline of Ministerial Scholarship. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 161–74.

DEWIT, JOHN. The Planting of Princeton College. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 173–97.

GARRISON, J. H. A Nineteenth Century Movement. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 145–66.

GEORGE, J. Religion u. Kirche im Zukunftslichte. Religiös-populäre Betrachtg. unter Anlehng. an einen Naumann'schen Artikel: "Der unbekannte Gott." Zittau, Pahl, 1897; 72 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

HORN, EDWARD T. Rabbinism in the Church. *Luth. Church Rev.*, April, 180–9.

MEAD, G. W. Modern Methods in Church Work: the gospel renaissance. New York, Dodd, Mead & Co. 303 pp., 12mo. $1.50.

WALKER, G. L. Some Aspects of Religious Life in New England. Lectures by G. L. Walker, D.D. Boston, Silver, Burdett & Co., 1897; 207 pp., 8vo. $1.25.

WOHLENBERG, G. Die alttestamentlichen Propheten als Vorbild für uns Pastoren als Prediger. Leipzig, Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh., Nachf.(G. Böhme), 1897.

HOMILETICS AND CATECHETICS.

BELL, G. C. Religious Teaching in Secondary Schools. London, Macmillan & Co., 1897; 3s. 6d. New York, The Macmillan Co.; xiv + 181 pp., 8vo. $1.

HEADLAM, STEWART. Laws of Eternal Life: studies in the church catechism. London, William Reeves, 1897. Cloth, 2s.

JUNG, R. Beitrag zur Geschichte der evangelischen Volksschulen des Siegerlandes. Siegen, H. Montanus, 1897; 31 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

KOETSVELD, C. E. VAN. Die Kinder in der Bibel. Für unsere Kinder geschildert. Aus d. Holl. v. C. Th. Müller. Leipzig, Jansa, 1897; viii+176 pp., 8vo. Bd., M. 2.50.

LAMPRECHT, K. Leitfaden f. den Unterricht in der Bibelkunde f. evangelische Schulen. Langensalza, Schulbuchh., 1897; vii + 78 pp., 8vo. M. 0.70.

LINDSAY, JAMES. The Teaching Function of the Modern Pulpit. London, Wm. Blackwood & Sons, 1897; 8vo. 1s. *net.*

POLSTORFF. Katechetisches Handbüchlein zum Mecklenburgischen Landeskatechismus. 2. Aufl. Güstrow, Opitz & Co., 1897; 55 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

SADTLER, B. Education, State and Church. *Luth. Church Rev.*, April, 135–44.

WITHERSPOON, T. O. The Sunday-School — Its Present Peril. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 175–89.

CHURCH POLITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

BAUR, IOA. Argumenta contra orientalem ecclesiam eiusque synodicam encyclicam a. MDCCCXCV. Insbruck, F. Rauch in Komm., 1897; viii + 100 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

BERKEMEIER, G. C. The Church — *de ecclesia. Luth. Church Rev.*, April, 157–66.

BURNHAM, M. Congregational Church Polity. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 167–92.

DESJARDINS, G. La Nouvelle constitution apostolique sur l'index. *Études*, March 20, 737–47; April 20, 208–20; May 5, 361–77.

DUTTON, W. E. The Eucharistic Manuals of John and Charles Wesley. London, John Hodges.

FÉLICE, PAUL DE. Les Protestants d'autrefois, mœurs et usages. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 3.50.

FISHER, GEO. PARKE. The Validity of Non-Prelatical Ordination. Philadelphia, Pres. Board of Publ., 1897; 8vo. $0.10.

HINSCHIUS, PAUL. Das Kirchenrecht der Katholiken u. Protestanten in Deutschland. Vol. VI., 1: System des katholischen Kirchenrechts m. besond. Rücksicht auf Deutschland (Fortsetzung). Berlin, J. Guttentag, 1867; viii +425 pp., 8vo. M. 14.

HOLD, CIRN. Vernünftiges Denken u. katholischer Glaube. Erwägungen für die gebildete Welt. Kempten, J. Kosel, 1897; vii+234 pp., 8vo. M. 2.40.

HUGHES, H. P. Free Church Unity: the new movement. *Contemp. Rev.*, March.

GAIRAL, A. Les Manifestations extérieures du culte catholique. Suite. *L'Univ. cath.*, April, 503–28; May, 92–105.

GERNET, AXEL V. Verfassungsgeschichte des Bisth. Dorpat bis zur Ausbildung der Landstande. vii+201 pp. M. 3.
= Bd. 17 of Verhandlungen der gelehrten estnischen Gesellschaft. Dorpat (Zurjew) und Leipzig, K. F. Koehler, 1897; 8vo.

JESSOPP, DR. Hints on Church Reform: a reiteration. *Nineteenth Cent.*, March.

KÖHLER, K. Ueber die Moglichkeit des Kirchenrechts. *Deutsche Zeitschr. f. Kirchenrecht*, VI., Heft 3.

KOPLIN, A. B. How Can We Best Cultivate a Denominational Consciousness among our People? *Ref. Church Rev.*, March, 183–90.

LAUGIER, F. Le Schisme constitutionel et la persecution du clergé dans le Var. Draguignan, imp. Latil., 1897; xx+339 pp.

LEJAY, PAUL. Chronique de littérature chrétienne. La Messe latine. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, II., 277–88.

LIMERICK, PHILIP. The Religious Orders in the Roman Communion. *Contemp. Rev.*, April.

MARTINDALE, C. O'N. The Normative Church Polity and Some Abnormal Outgrowths. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 231–9.

MILAŠ, NIKODIM. Das Kirchenrecht der morgenländischen Kirche. Nach den allgemeinen Kirchenrechtsquellen u. nach den in den autokephalen Kirchen gelt. Special-Gesetzen verf. Übers. v. Dr. A. R. v. Tessic. Czernowitz, H. Pardini, 1897; xvi + 621 pp., 8vo. M. 10.

NECKERMANN, GEO. Geschichte des Simultaneum Religionis Exercitium im vormaligen Herzogthum Sulzbach. Regensburg, J. Hebbel, 1897; 159 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

NORBERT, P. Les Religieuses franciscaines. Notices sur les diverses congrégations de sœurs du tiers-ordre régulier de Saint-François établies actuellement en France. Avec grav. Paris, Poussielgue, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 3.50.

PLAGGE, JOS. Die gemischten Ehen im Lichte der Vernunft, des Glaubens u. der Erfahrung. 2. Aufl. Paderborn, Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1897; xii + 160 pp., 12mo, $0.75.

PRADIER. Les Grands fondateurs d'ordre S. Dominique. Tours, Mam et fils, 1897; 144 pp., 12mo.

RAINY, PRINCIPAL. The Pope and the Archbishops. *Contemp. Rev.*, May.

RENTOUL. The Early Church and the Roman Claim. Melbourne, Melville, Mullen & Slade, 1897.

RÖHM, J. Der Protestantismus unserer Tage. München, R. Abt, 1897; x + 411 pp., 4to. M. 10.

ROUND, J. HORACE. The Sacrifice of the Man. *Contemp. Rev.*, May.

SCHEUFFGEN, F. J. Die Hierarchie in der katholischen Kirche. Ein Nachschlagebuch f. Jedermann. Mit 1 Bilde des Papstes. Münster, A. Russell's Verlag; viii + 275 pp., 8vo. Bd., M 3.

SILBERNAGEL. Strafverfahren bei der bayerischen Benediktiner-Kongregation im 18. Jahrhundert. *Archiv f. Kath. Kirchenr.*, 77. Bd., Heft 2.

SOLLY, H. Unitarianism and Orthodoxy. Introduction by R. F. Horton. London, J. Clarke, 1897; 100 pp., 12mo. 1s.

STIEGLER. Dispensation und Dispensationswesen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung bis zum 9. Jahrhundert. *Archiv. f. Kath. Kirchenr*, 77. Bd., Heft 2.

Sunday Observance. *Macmillan's Magazine*, May.

LITURGIES AND HYMNOLOGY.

DICKINSON, E. The Ideal of Church Music. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 320–33.

EHRENSBERGER, HUGO. Libri liturgici bibliothecae apostolicae Vaticanae manu scripti, digessit et recensuit Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; xii + 591 pp., 8vo. M. 25

MACALISTER, R. A. S. Ecclesiastical Vestments; their development and history. New York, T. Whittaker, 1897; 8vo. $2.

MALLARY, R. D. Is the Recognition of the Church Year by All Christians Desirable? *Bib. Sac.*, April, 304–20.

MENCIK, F. Über ein Wiedertäufergesangsbuch [aus "Sitzungsber. d. bohm. Gesellsch. d. Wiss."]. Prag, 1897. F. Rionác in Komm; 15 pp., 8vo. M. 0.24.

O'MAHONY, T. J. Alleluia's Story. *Dublin Rev.*, April, 345–50.

SMEND, JUL. Der erste evangelische Gottesdienst in Strassburg. Vortrag. Strassburg, Heitz, 1897; 32 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

STAPFER, EDM. Une nouvelle Liturgie. *Rev. chrét.*, May, 321–33.

SERMONIC LITERATURE.

BURTON, NATHANIEL J. In Pulpit and Parish: Yale lectures on Preaching. Boston, Pilgrim Press, 1897; 640 pp., 12mo. $1.75.

CREIGHTON, MANDELL. The Heritage of the Spirit, and Other Sermons. New York, E. P. Dutton & Co., 1897; 222 pp., 12mo. $1.25.

KAFTAN, J. Suchet, was droben ist! Predigten. Freiburg i. B. u. Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 8vo. M. 2; bd., M. 3.

MAURER, M. Der Brief des Apostels Paulus an die Philipper, für die Gemeinde in 26 Betrachtgn. ausgelegt. Herborn, Buchh. des Nass. Colportagevereins, 1897; 160 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

PARKHURST, C. Talks to Young Men. New York, The Century Co., 1897; v + 125 pp. Cloth, $1.

———. Talks to Young Women. New York, The Century Co., 1897; v + 136 pp. Cloth, $1.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume I OCTOBER 1897 Number 4

# THE GROWTH OF THE PESHITTÂ VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

## ILLUSTRATED FROM THE OLD ARMENIAN AND GEORGIAN VERSIONS.

By F. C. CONYBEARE,
Oxford, England.

The Peshiṭṭâ the sheet anchor of those who uphold the Textus Receptus of the New Testament.—But in the Peshiṭṭâ we have only a late recension of the Syriac text.—Witnesses to the pre-Peshiṭṭâ text of the Pauline letters, viz., Ephrem's commentary, and the old Georgian and Armenian versions.—Ephrem's text of Pauline letters shown by examples to have been in the main identical with Peshiṭṭâ.—Proof from examples that Georgian and Armenian texts of Pauline letters have a Syriac basis.—Syriac readings in the Georgian version of Pauline letters.—Syriac readings in the Armenian version of Pauline letters.—Recapitulation of results gained so far.—An agreement of Georgian or Armenian with Ephrem against Peshiṭṭâ reveals an older form of the Syriac.—Examples of such agreement in the epistle to the Romans.—Also from the epistles to the Corinthians.—Ephremic readings in the Armenian Vulgate.—Other archaic readings in the Armenian and Georgian versions.—Summary of results: The Peshiṭṭâ text of the Pauline letters is a later recension of the Syriac text used by Ephrem and by the first translators of the Armenian and Georgian versions.—That in the gospels equally it is not the Peshiṭṭâ but the Sinaitic-Curetonian Syriac which is the basis of the Georgian and Armenian is certified by a collation of Luke, chaps. 3–5.—And of Matthew, chaps. 1–8.—And of Mark, chap. 12.—Summary of conclusions. The Armenian and Georgian translations of the fourth century are full of Sinaitic-Curetonian readings, and contain no Peshiṭṭâ readings which are not in $Syr^{sin}$ or $Syr^{cur}$. Therefore the prevailing Syriac text in the fourth

century was not the Pᵉshiṭṭâ, but Syr$^{sin}$ and Syr$^{cur}$.—The readings of Syr$^{sin}$ preponderate in the Georgian and Armenian versions over those of Syr$^{cur}$.—Untenability of any view of the Pᵉshiṭṭâ which requires us to suppose that the Syriac missionaries of the fourth century ignored the Pᵉshiṭṭâ and wilfully circulated "a *corrupt* form of Syriac text."

I. It was almost a historical occasion when at the commencement of the Oxford Easter term in this year members of the university who take an interest in the textual criticism of the New Testament were invited to meet in New College and discuss the problem of the origin of the Western text. The Rev. Dr. Miller, the literary executor of the late Dean Burgon, opened the discussion. His line was to rescue the Textus Receptus from the position of inferiority assigned to it by Westcott and Hort. Then followed Professor Sanday, who in friendly but learned language disclaimed Dr. Miller and Dean Burgon and all their views. Both these speakers had touched on the problem of the old Syriac versions. The Pᵉshiṭṭâ is, said Dr. Sanday, the sheet anchor of those who defend the Textus Receptus or Antiochian text. This text is, according to Professor Sanday, an eclectic one formed at Antioch in the fourth century, under the influence of Lucian the Martyr. No, argued the other side. It cannot be a text so late in its formation, for it is the text of the Syriac Pᵉshiṭṭâ, and the Pᵉshiṭṭâ is a version of the second century, and surpasses even the Greek text in the number and antiquity of its oldest manuscripts. Then Dr. Gwilliam, the well-known Syriacist, who is editing the Pᵉshiṭṭâ for the Clarendon Press, stood forth to plead the cause of its antiquity and superiority over the "heretical" Syriac text lately brought back from Mt. Sinai by Mrs. Lewis. He was followed on the same side by Mr. Bonus,[1] another eminent Syriacist, who argued that in the immobile and stationary East any sweeping revision of the Syriac text read in the churches is unlikely to have been made as late as the last half of the fourth century. Lastly, Mr. Headlam, of All Souls, uttered what was perhaps the most pertinent remark in the whole discussion. Dr. Gwilliam had

[1] Author of the *Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti;* Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1896.

dwelt with emphasis on the number and antiquity of the oldest codices of the Peshiṭṭâ and on the perfect and minute accord with one another of these early codices. Such accord, replied Mr. Headlam, is in itself evidence of the lateness and newness of the text which these codices contain. If it were an old text, if it had a history behind it, then its codices would be full of variants. There are no variants in these Peshiṭṭâ manuscripts; therefore the Peshiṭṭâ was a brand-new text or recension when these manuscripts were written.

But none who joined in the discussion seemed to be aware that there exist two ancient versions of the New Testament, the Georgian or East Iberian of the Caucasus, and the Armenian, both made from an early Syriac text and both fraught with the most important evidence about the point in dispute, viz., whether the Peshiṭṭâ is or is not the earliest Syriac and in that sense the best and least corrupt form of it. The object of this article is to set forth this evidence, and in doing so we shall begin with the earliest writings of Christianity, namely, Paul's epistles, and then proceed to the gospels.

II. Is the Peshiṭṭâ text of the Pauline epistles an adaptation or modification of an earlier Syriac text, or is it original? The example of another version illustrates my meaning. Jerome's Latin text of the Bible is a recension of an earlier Latin version, a remodeling of an older translation by Greek and even Hebrew originals. Is the Peshiṭṭâ text the result of a similar recension or is it the earliest Syriac version all unchanged and in its full integrity as it left the hand of the translator? Let us anticipate and state the conclusion to which this study will compel us. It is this: the Peshiṭṭâ text is a secondary one, a recension made about the end of the fourth century of an earlier Syriac translation. In making this recension the Greek manuscripts were consulted afresh, and the Peshiṭṭâ text must never be regarded as a second or third century document without being tested and proved to be so on independent grounds.

III. In the case of the gospels we have the Curetonian and the Sinaitic Syriac text to help us to resolve the question of the integrity and originality of the Peshiṭṭâ text. But for the Syriac

text of the Pauline letters we have no such direct aids. We must depend upon two sources only.

Firstly, on a commentary written in the middle of the fourth century by S. Ephrem; of which, however, we have not got the original Syriac. All that remains to us of it is an old Armenian version, made perhaps as early as the fifth century and printed at Venice in 1836. In using this book great care must be exercised, for the Armenian translator worked with the Armenian Vulgate at his elbow, and wherever he can he cites the texts according to that. The scholar who depends on the Latin version of this commentary also issued at Venice is in a worse quandary still, for besides ascribing to Ephrem what is merely the reading of the Armenian Vulgate, the citations of which should have been put in a distinct type, he will, owing to the carelessness of the Latin translator, not even get hold of readings of the Armenian Vulgate, and give us instead Jerome's Latin Vulgate.

Secondly, we must depend on any old versions which may have been made from the (so far hypothetical) pre-P$^{e}$shiṭtâ Syriac text. Such versions are the old Armenian and the old Georgian or Colchic versions. We shall see that these are based on a form of Syriac text earlier than the P$^{e}$shiṭtâ, or at least in many ways differing from it in order to approximate to the text used by Ephrem. But it will also be found that these two versions as they have come down to us have undergone, and in a greater degree, just the same process by which the P$^{e}$shiṭtâ was evolved out of the earlier text; namely, they are recensions of more primitive texts according to Greek manuscripts, consulted afresh.

We have set forth both our conclusions and the sources by comparing which we shall arrive at them. Now let us enter into the actual comparison. We shall confine ourselves nearly entirely to Romans and First and Second Corinthians; and will have to pick our examples, for a detailed comparison of all our sources would fill a volume.

IV. We will first compare Ephrem's commentary, which we shall call *E*, with the P$^{e}$shiṭtâ, *Sch*, in order to prove that *E*, how-

ever different in many respects, was yet closely akin to *Sch*. I give first the peculiar reading or rendering found in *Sch* and then the passage of *E* which echoes it.

Rom. 1:2, "called *and sent*." Comp. *E*: "Paul, he says, *called*.[a] That is, because he was called by means of the revelation on the way to Damascus, and he was sent by Jesus Christ to preach the gospel." 1:3, 4, "Who was born in the flesh of the seed *of the house* of David and was made known as the Son of God." Comp. *E*: "because of his Son, who just now was manifested in the flesh of the seed of the house of David, the very same who was revealed to be the Son of God." 1:4, "Who arose from the dead." Comp. *E*: "Who arose, he says, from the dead—implying that no one else raised him." 1:10, "And I also pray, that henceforth *a door may be opened* to me." Comp. *E*: "And I pray that, not after a long time, but even now, there may be opened to me a door of a road to see you." 1:14, 15, "Because to every man I am a debtor that I preach. And so I am eager to preach." Comp. *E*: "But to them in any case, whether they listen or not, I am anyhow a debtor to preach. And I am desirous to preach." Read in the Greek προθυμοῦμαι instead of πρόθυμον καί.

Rom. 3:8, "Or surely not as they blaspheme us and say, that we say." Here βλασφημούμεθα is rendered as if βλασφημοῦσι, the second καθώς and τινες not being expressed. Comp. *E*: "Sed hoc quasi illud quod dicit qui blasphemant nos et dicunt de nobis, faciamus malum," etc. 3:21, "But now that not the law—the righteousness of God has been manifested. And there testify thereto that law and the prophets." Comp. *E*: "*Without the law*, he says, *the righteousness of God* has been manifested. Because not from that (law) do we learn faith and gentleness, but from the gospel. Nay more—the very law testifies concerning our righteousness." 5:6, "But if the Messiah because of our weakness in this time in place of the ungodly died." Comp. *E*: "For if Christ because of our weakness in this latter time in behalf of the ungodly . . . died." 1 Cor. 14:25 *Sch* renders "and will worship God *and say*." *E* writes: "He falls prostrate, does homage, and says." 16:15, "But I ask of you, brethren, about the house of Stephanas, because ye know that they are the first fruits." Comp. *E*: "But about the house of Stephanas, you of yourselves know that they were to me *fruit*."

[a] The italicized words in citations from Ephrem are identical with the Armenian Vulgate.

These examples are enough, but anyone who takes a P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ text and the Armenian text of Ephrem can mark hundreds of passages where Ephrem even in his Armenian dress reproduces the characteristic idioms and turns of the P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ. It is certain, therefore, that in the main Ephrem's Pauline text was the same as the P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ.

V. Next in approaching the peculiar problem which we have set ourselves to clear up, we must first prove that the Georgian and Armenian versions have a Syriac basis at all. We shall, therefore, begin by adducing, first, passages where these two versions agree in reproducing *Sch*, then passages in which one or other of them does so separately. This will prove positively that these versions are in a general way based on a Syriac text. The triple agreement of the Syriac, Georgian, and Armenian I shall denote by the symbol *Sch G A*. Here are examples of it:

Rom. 1:9, "nam testis mihi est." 1:17, omit δε before δίκαιος. 1:29, "filled with all injustice, fornication, malice, greed of gain" (*G* adds πονηρίᾳ after πλεονεξίᾳ). 2:4, ἀγνοῶν rendered "dost thou not know." 2:16, "on the day in which." 4:12, τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως rendered "of the faith *of the* circumcision;" so also Ephrem's commentary. 4:18 *A* renders "who in the *hopeless hope* trusted to become," *G* "who in the hopeless hope trusted that he may become;" such a rendering must rest on the Syriac use of dlo to express "without;" *Sch* = "et quod non spes, spei confisus est, ut fiat." The agreement of *G* with *A* is very marked, yet *G* adheres most closely to *Sch*. 4:20, δοὺς is rendered in *Sch* "and he gave;" *G A* = "he gave." 5:3, εἰδότες is rendered in *Sch* and *A* "for we know;" *G* = "we know," excising the "for." 5:11, *Sch* = "And not thus only, but also we shall glory;" *G A* = "(And [*A*]) not so much only, but also we glory." 7:16, σύνφημι is rendered in *Sch G A* "I testify of the law;" this agreement is against *E*, which = "Sed si quod non volo et odi, hoc facio, dico de lege quæ impedit me ab illis, quia bene est." 11:21 is rendered in *Sch* "Perhaps he will also not spare you;" *G A* = "Ne forte nec tibi parcat," which exactly renders *Sch*. Here Iren$^{int}$ has "Ne forte nec tibi parcat." 11:31, omit the second νῦν. 12:19, *Sch* = "And be ye not exacting yourselves;" *G A* = "Do not ye of yourselves seek vengeance." 13:11, "is nearer *to us*," as if ἡμῖν stood for

ἡμῶν. 14:5, omit γὰρ. 14:6, add καὶ ὁ μὴ φρονῶν τὴν ἡμέραν κυρίῳ οὐ φρονεῖ. 15:25, διακονῆσαι for διακονῶν; *Sch* = "that I may minister." 1 Cor. 1:28, add καὶ before τὰ μὴ ὄντα. 3:5, "For what is Paul or what Apollos." 3:13, φανερὸν γενήσεται is expressed as one word, "revelabitur." 4:6, add φρονεῖν after γέγραπται. 4:8, "Ye are already satisfied *and* already (om. *Sch*) have become rich *and* (om. *A*) without us." 4:17, "in all the churches." 5:4, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 7:7, θέλω γὰρ. 7:15, ἡμᾶς for ὑμᾶς. 8:11, καὶ ἀπόλλυται. 9:22, add ὡς before ἀσθενὴς. 10:11, ταῦτα πάντα for ταῦτα δέ (*Sch* = ταῦτα δὲ πάντα). 10:23, add μοι after ἔξεστι (twice). 11:24, after εἶπεν add λάβετε καὶ φάγετε. 11:24, add κλώμενον. 11:31, εἰ γὰρ. 12:9, ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ for ἐν τῷ ἑνί. 12:19, "where *were* the body." 12:26, δοξάζεται ἓν μέλος. 13:11, "*But* when I became a man." 13:12, add ὡς before δι' ἐσόπτρου. 14:10, *Sch* = "Ecce enim genera linguarum multa sunt in mundo," omitting εἰ τύχοι. The same omission is in *A*, which = "nam tot genera linguarum sunt in mundo;" and so also *G*, only omitting *nam*. The old Latin codd., f. vg., have *tam multa* and Ambrst. *nam multa*, but *Sch G A* are alone in omitting εἰ τύχοι. 14:37, κυρίου εἰσὶν ἐντολαί. Here *E* cites the words of Arm. Vulgate. 15:18, *Sch* = "And doubtless also those that slept in Christ are lost;" *G A* = "So then those that slept in Christ are lost indeed." 15:20, before ἀπάρχη add "et factus est." 15:21, *Sch G A* concur in ignoring the word ἐπειδὴ; *Sch* = "And as by means of man there was death;" *G A* = "For through man was death." 15:37, εἰ τύχοι is omitted, except perhaps in *A*; *Sch* = "Thou sowest not the body that is to be, but the grain naked of wheat or barley or of other that is sown;" *A* = "Not the same body which may be to be born, sowest thou; but grain naked, if it be of wheat or if of other things sown (*or* sowable things);" *G* = "Not that body which is to be, dost thou sow; but a naked grain, whether of wheat, or whether other which is sown." Here *A G* are obviously based on *Sch*. 15:47, after δεύτερος ἄνθρωπος add κύριος. 16:19, "Priscilla." 16:23, τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. 2 Cor. 1:11, *Sch* = "by the aid of your prayer for us;" *G* = "by the joint aid of your prayers for us;" *A* = "by the aid of your prayer for us." An attempt has been made to make *G* more faithful to the Greek text by adding a preposition *thsana* = σὺν before the word "aid." 2:13, τῷ μὴ εὑρεῖν is rendered "quod non inueni." 3:3, "but on the fleshly tablets of the heart," καρδίας. 5:10, *Sch* = "that each (*lit.* man by man he) be repaid in his body whatsoever he has done in it, whether good or whether bad;" *A* has the same rendering, only substituting

for the words "in it" the word "previously" *or* "formerly;" *G* also renders the Syriac faithfully in all respects, except that it omits the words "in it" altogether. Tertullian, *res carn.*[43], renders similarly: "uti unusquisque reportet per corpus secundum quæ gessit." 5:17, add πάντα after γέγονεν.

A more extended comparison would yield the same results, but the above examples sufficiently demonstrate the Syriac basis of *A* and *G*. Many of the points of agreement with *Sch* are, it is true, found in one Greek manuscript or another; but as they usually occur in a grouping of Greek manuscripts and fathers (ℵ$^c$DEFGKL Euthal. cod. Theodoret Theophylact.) which *Sch* mostly follows, this fact does not diminish the probability that their presence in *A* and *G* is due to Syriac influence, when this is once conclusively established by such a passage as 1 Cor. 15:37.

VI. So far we have given only examples of the concurrence of all three sources, *Sch*, *A*, and *G*. We next will instance cases where *G* and *A* separately agree with *Sch*. *G* = *Sch* in the following places:

Rom. 1:3, τοῦ γεννωμένου. 1:23, ἑρπετῶν rendered "reptiles *of the earth.*" 2:20, ἔχοντα is rendered "*et est tibi.*" 3:22, "Sed iustitia dei per fidem Iesu Christi ad omnes et super omnes credentes." The addition ἐπὶ πάντας is in the group of manuscripts mentioned above. 4:5, πιστεύοντι δὲ κ.τ.λ. is rendered in *Sch* "sed credit tantummodo in eum qui iustificat." Comp. *G*: "sed credit tantummodo in iustificantem." 4:15, παράβασις rendered "transgression *of the law.*" 6:19, γὰρ omitted after ὥσπερ. 7:3, after ἀνήρ add αὐτῆς. 8:36, "*and* we are accounted." 9:22, ἤνεγκεν ἐν πολλῇ μακροθυμίᾳ σκεύη ὀργῆς; *G* = "qui toleravit in multa longanimitate *super* vasa iræ;" so *Sch*, "brought wrath upon the vessels of wrath," which is repeated in Ephrem's comment: "longanimitate magna tulit ille iram super uasa iræ." The Armenian reviser struck out the preposition which answered to *super*, yet ungrammatically left *vasa* in the case governed by that preposition. The Greek codices FG add εἰς, and some old Latin sources read "in uasa" or "in uasis." 11:2, "when he had complained to God about Israel *and said.*" 11:6, add εἰ δὲ ἐξ ἔργων κ.τ.λ. 11:9, after τράπεζα αὐτῶν add ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν. According to Tischendorf this addition is only found in the following sources: 4 k$^{scr}$ syr$^{sch}$ ar$^{e}$ æth. vg$^{six}$ et c$^{dd\ pane}$ Thdrt. Pelag. 11:15, after πρόσλημψις add *eorum*. 11:22, omit the

second θεοῦ after χρηστότης. 11 : 23, τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ, "in *their* want of faith." 13 : 1, after οὖσαι add ἐξουσίαι. 14 : 13, omit οὖν. 15 : 12 is rendered in *Sch* "et is qui surget, erit princeps gentium, et in eum sperabunt gentes;" *G* = "and he who is to rise up [is] to be prince of Gentiles, and in him will Gentiles hope." The reviser has struck out the second *is*, which the structure of the sentence, based as it is on the Syriac, requires. 15 : 14, καὶ πεπληρωμένοι . . . καὶ δυνάμενοι καὶ ἄλλους νουθετεῖν.

1 Cor. 3 : 4, add λέγει after ἕτερος δὲ and for ἄνθρωποι read σαρκικοί. 3 : 5, for τί οὖν read τί γὰρ. 4 : 17, omit Ἰησοῦ. 6 : 10, order: οὔτε πλεονέκται οὔτε κλέπται. 6 : 17, ἕν πνεῦμά ἐστιν is rendered in *Sch* "est cum illo unus spiritus," which probably underlies *G*: "unus spiritus est cum domino." 7 : 3, τὴν ὀφειλὴν is rendered in *Sch* "the kindness which is due," in *G* "the due of respect." Perhaps, however, these renderings are based on different Greek originals, *Sch* on the reading τὴν ὀφειλομένην εὐνοίαν and *G* on τὴν ὀφειλομένην τιμήν, read only in a citation of this verse by Chrysostom. 7 : 7, θέλω γὰρ. 7 : 16, *Sch* renders ἢ τί οἶδας, ἄνερ, εἰ thus: "or thou man, dost thou know if;" *G* = "or thou, what dost thou know, O man, if." The addition of "*thou*" seems due to the Syriac. 7 : 17, before ἕκαστον add καὶ. The only codices which have this reading are *F G* and the old Latin fg. 9 : 15, *Sch* = "neque propter hoc scripsi;" comp. *G*: "neque propter hoc scripsi hæc," where *hæc* must have been inserted by the reviser. 9 : 20, omit μὴ ὢν αὐτὸς ὑπὸ νόμον. In his commentary Ephrem ignores these words and probably omitted them. 9 : 22, πάντας or τοὺς πάντας instead of πάντως τινάς. 10 : 19, order: ὅτι εἴδωλον . . . ὅτι εἰδωλόθυτον. 12 : 31, καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὁδόν is rendered "an excelling path." 14 : 10, τὸ ἐκ μέρους καταργηθήσεται is rendered in *Sch* "then will vanish whatever is little;" comp. *G*: "tunc paruulum quidque euanescet." 2 Cor. 2 : 4, "but that ye may know the love exceeding which I have towards you."

Many of these readings of *G* are inexplicable save as renderings of *Sch*; and we certainly ought to ascribe to the same influence the residuum of which Greek codices provide equivalents.

VII. Professor Armitage Robinson, in his volume entitled *Euthaliana* (Cambridge, 1895), has pointed out that an old Syriac version ultimately underlies the Armenian New Testament. The following are examples of the agreement of *Sch* and *A*; I include cases in which the point of agreement is also reflected in *G* or in *E* or in both:

Rom. 4:9, ἢ ἐπὶ for ἢ καὶ ἐπὶ; here *G* adds καὶ. 4:11 is an instructive verse for comparison. *Sch* = "Signum ille enim recepit circumcisionem et sigillum iustitiæ fidei—suæ quæ in præputio. ut fiat pater apud omnes eos qui credunt ex circumcisione. ut imputetur etiam ad eos pro iustitia." Here *Sch* has these peculiarities: (1) it renders καὶ as if γὰρ; (2) περιτομῆς as περιτομὴν, with a few Greek codices; (3) adds καὶ before σφραγῖδα; (4) renders εἰς τὸ εἶναι as *ut fiat;* (5) δι' ἀκροβυστίας as "ex circumcisione," so that the sense becomes "the father of all them of the circumcision who believe;" (6) εἰς τὸ λογισθῆναι is rendered "ut imputetur;". (7) adds καὶ before αὐτοῖς, with many Greek codices; (8) adds εἰς before δικαιοσύνην, with a few Greek codices and old Latin texts. Of these peculiarities the Armenian exhibits (2), (4); (5) it improves upon, for it renders "pater omnium credentium qui ex circumcisione sint;" it also exhibits (7). The Georgian also has (2), (4), and (5), for it = "credentium *circumcisorum;*" also it has (6), (7), and (8). We complete the comparison by adducing here Ephrem's comment on this verse: "Quasi *signum*,[3] ait, fecit circumcisionem in suffragium iustitiæ *quæ ex præputio.* id est iustitiam quam assecutus per præputium, fieri eum pater *omnium credentium* ex præputio, eo ut imputetur eis, veluti et illi, fides sua ad iustitiam. ut appelletur is pater circumcisionis eorum qui confirmati sunt in uestigiis fidei præputii Abrahami." Therefore Ephrem in his text of the Pauline letters had (2), (5), (6), (7), (8). Perhaps after πιστευόντων there originally stood τῶν in the Greek text. It is curious that εἰς τὸ εἶναι is simply rendered *fieri* in the commentary. The Georgian is nearest to the Syriac text of the *Sch* which Ephrem read.

Rom. 4:12, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς στοιχοῦσιν τοῖς ἴχνεσιν τῆς ἐν ἀκροβυστίᾳ πίστεως . . . *Sch* here = "sed etiam illis qui complent uestigia fidei circumcisionis patris nostri Abrahami," as if πίστεως ἀκροβυστίας stood in the Greek. *A* = "sed etiam quorum (= eorum qui) incedant in uestigiis (= along the tracks) circumcisionis fidei." So also *G*, except that it renders τοῖς ἴχνεσιν in the sense "super uestigia." Ephrem had the P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ text, for he comments, as we saw: "eo ut appelletur ille pater circumcisionis eorum qui confirmati sunt in uestigiis fidei circumcisionis Abrahami." Thus the Armenian and Georgian translated the Syriac originally, and a later revision simply altered the order of the words to suit the Greek.

Rom. 4:14. The Greek is: εἰ γὰρ οἱ ἐκ νόμου κληρονόμοι, κεκένωται ἡ πίστις καὶ κατήργηται ἡ ἐπαγγελία. *A* and *Sch* = "Si enim qui ex lege

[3] The Italics represent verbal agreements of the version of Ephrem with Armenian Vulgate.]

erant hæredes, inanis erat fides et nulla (erant [*Sch*]) promissa." It can be no accident that both versions add *erant* after *νόμου* and resolve the passive perfects in the same way. The Georgian translates identically with *Sch*. Ephrem also read the verse as in *Sch*, for he comments: "Quod si a lege erat hæreditas, fides uana fiebat et promissa antiquata." 4:18, *κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον*; *Sch* = "sicut scriptum;" comp. *A*: "sicut dictum est." Here *G* faithfully renders the Greek.

1 Cor. 13:3, *Sch* and *A* = "If I should feed out *to the poor* (or destitute) all I possess." The words italicized are added in no other source. Ephrem's commentary quotes the Armenian Vulgate. 1 Cor. 11:17, *Sch* = "Hoc autem quod præcipiens sum, non tanquam laudans sum vos, quia non ad prius nostrum incedistis, sed in malitiam descendistis;" *A* = "Sed hoc præcipio non *tanquam* laudarem, quia non in melius sed in malitiam *nisi estis*." The addition of tanquam and the inaccurate rendering of *συνέρχεσθε* are certainly due to the Syriac. 5:11, *τῷ τοιούτῳ μηδὲ συνεσθίειν*; *Sch* and *A* = "with such a one ([*Sch*] with him who is such) not even to eat *bread*." No other source adds "bread." 4:3, *ἢ ὑπὸ ἀνθρωπίνης ἡμέρας*; *Sch* = "uel ab omni filio hominis;" *A* = "or by any man whatever;" Ephrem had the reading of *Sch*, for he comments "aut omnino a filio hominis;" *G* boldly renders the Greek. In the same verse the *Sch* rendering of the first words, *ἐμοὶ δὲ εἰς ἐλάχιστόν ἐστιν*, has also influenced *A*; for *Sch* = "mihi autem hoc diminutio est mihi," and *A* = "mihi autem et hoc ignominia est." 4:6, *ἵνα μὴ εἷς ὑπὲρ τοῦ ἑνὸς φυσιοῦσθε κατὰ τοῦ ἑτέρου*. *A* = "ne (*lit.* ut non) homo præter socium gloriemini super socium" (*or* de socio, "about a comrade"). This rendering is clearly due to *Sch*: "et homo præter (*or* propter) socium ne glorietur propter hominem." 3:4 well illustrates the mutual relations of the three versions. *Sch* renders: "Quando dixit enim homo *ex vobis*, Ego Pauli sum, et alter dixit, Ego Apollos *sum*. Non ecce *carnales* estis;" *A* = "Quando dicit aliquis *ex vobis*, Ego Pauli sum, et alter, *quod* Ego Apollos, non homines estis;" *G* = "Quando enim aliquis dixit, quod Ego Pauli sum, et alter *dixit*, Ego Apollos sum. Non carnales estis?" Thus *A* takes *ex vobis* from *Sch*, and *G* takes from the same the second *dixit*, the second *sum*, and also *carnales* for *ἄνθρωποι*. 2 Cor. 11:2, *ἡρμοσάμην . . . παρθένον ἁγνὴν*. *Sch* and *A* = "I have espoused you to a husband *as* a chaste virgin." 11:9, *Sch* = "I was burdensome to none *of you*." Here the addition "of you" occurs also in *A* and *G*, but in no other texts. 13:2, *καὶ προλέγω* is rendered by *Sch* and *A* "and *again* I say to you beforehand;" *G* also makes the addition: "et *hic etiam* prædico." In the same verse

after ἀπὼν νῦν all three versions add γράφω. Gal. 1 : 8, ἱστορῆσαι Κῆφαν *Sch*, *A*, and *G* render "to *see* Cephas."

Here are a few more instances from the Hebrews in which the Pᵉshiṭṭâ rendering may be recognized behind the Armenian text:

Heb. 1 : 1, "God anciently *conversed* with *our* fathers." 1 : 3, ὑποστάσεως rendered *Being*. 1 : 7, "*Who made* his angels a wind?" 1 : 8, "But of the son *he said;*" so also *G*. 2 : 14, "that by *his* death he might bring to naught him *who held*." 3 : 2, πιστὸν ὄντα rendered "who was faithful;" so *G*. 3 : 7, διὸ, καθὼς λέγει τὸ πνεῦμα rendered in *Sch* "Because the Holy Spirit said;" comp. *A*: "Wherefore thus saith the Holy Spirit." 4 : 1, δοκῇ τις is rendered "anyone be *found*" in *Sch* and *A*. 4 : 7, "Again he established *another* day." 4 : 16, "to the throne of *his* grace." 5 : 2, *Sch* renders μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν thus: "And he can humble himself and *sympathize* with the ignorant;" comp. *A*: "In a measure a sharer in suffering (*or* sympathizer) is he able to be." 5 : 13, ὁ μετέχων γάλακτος is rendered in *Sch* and *A* "whose *food* is milk." 6 : 1, ἐπὶ τὴν τελειότητα, "to the completion." 6 : 10, "*in that ye have* ministered and *do* minister." 6 : 12, ἵνα μὴ νωθροὶ γένησθε *Sch* renders "And that ye faint not;" comp. *A*: "That ye be not faint in mind."

VIII. Here let us recapitulate our results so far ascertained. They are these:

1. The Syriac Pᵉshiṭṭâ is constantly recognizable under the Armenian text of Ephrem's commentary on the Paulines.

2. The same Pᵉshiṭṭâ text is—not to the same extent indeed, yet often and unmistakably—recognizable under the Armenian and Georgian versions, sometimes of both together, sometimes of them separately.

3. Therefore the Armenian and Georgian versions have a Syriac basis, and these versions, as we have them, are recensions of the more primitive versions from Syriac, made with the help of Greek manuscripts. Fortunately for our argument, the recension was not so thorough as to efface all traces of the Syriac basis. The revision of the Armenian was made about A. D. 400 by S. Mesrop and S. Sahak, of the Georgian probably about the same time, but perhaps later.

IX. Now we must turn to the main problem which we set out to solve. Was the Syriac text used by Ephrem in all respects identical with the Peshiṭṭâ as it stands today? or was it an earlier form of Syriac of which the Peshiṭṭâ is a development?

If we can detect in Ephrem and Georgian, or in Ephrem and Armenian, or in Ephrem and both these versions at once, peculiar readings which are absent from the Peshiṭṭâ, then such peculiarities must once have stood in the Syriac text, but were revised out of it in some stage of the development of that text subsequent to what is preserved to us in these three sources.

X. We select some examples of the agreement of Armenian and Georgian, together or separately, with Ephrem *against Sch*:

Rom. 6:18, *Sch* = "And when ye were freed from sin ye became slaves;" but *G* = "But *now* ye are freed from sin and are enslaved." Ephrem comments: "But now as ye are liberated from sin and have passed under the yoke of righteousness." Comp. Æth.: "Et nunc uero . . ." 8:14, ἄγονται is rendered literally in *Sch* and *A* "they who are led;" but *G* renders "ambulant." Ephrem had such a rendering in his Syriac, for he comments: "For whoever *are led by the Spirit of God*,[4] that is, who walk in spiritual paths." 8:22, the γὰρ after οἴδαμεν is omitted in *G* as in Æth. Ephrem also omitted it, for he comments thus: "We know, he says, that all creation . . ." The omission is the more marked in the commentary because *A* like *Sch* adds γὰρ. 8:28, τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν τὸν θεὸν πάντα συνεργεῖ εἰς ἀγαθόν. *G* renders: "For the lovers of God everything *succeeds* unto good." So Ephrem comments: "If anyone love God, everything succeeds for them unto good." Here *A* = "Iis qui amant deum, in omni cooperans est in bona," and *Sch* = "He aideth them in all things for good who love God." 11:19, ἐρεῖς οὖν· ἐξεκλάσθησαν κλάδοι. Here *A* and *Sch* render literally: "And perhaps you will say, The branches were plucked off." But *G* = "Dices? Si rami fracti sunt;" which is the way Ephrem read the passage, for he comments thus: "Forsitan dicas, Si rami primi fracti sunt." Here *F G* have εἰ κλάσθησαν, and $d^{x}$ fg $or^{int\ 2,213}$ have "si fracti sunt." It is certain, therefore, that εἰ has been revised out of the Peshiṭṭâ. 12:3, *G* and *A* add τοῦ θεοῦ after χάριτος; *Sch* omits, but Ephrem's commentary implies it, for it runs: "This, says he, we say because of the grace of God." 12:3, μὴ ὑπερφρονεῖν παρ' ὃ δεῖ φρονεῖν,

[4] The words italicized are from the Armenian Vulgate.

ἀλλὰ φρονεῖν εἰς τὸ σωφρονεῖν, ἑκάστῳ ὡς ὁ θεὸς ἐμέρισεν μέτρον πίστεως. *G* = "ne plus cogites quam fas, sed cogitate ad sanctitatem unusquisque sicut et deus diuidet iuxtra mensuram fidei." Here *Sch* = "that ye be not thinking outside of what is proper that ye think. But that ye be thinking with modesty, each one so as God divided to him faith by measure." Ephrem comments thus: "Ne plus cogitetis *quam* quod *fas* est, id est, ne quærant sibi dona permagna plusquam uim suam . . . sed *cogitare* ad obedientiam sanctitatis, id est, servare mansuetudinem sobrietatis, ut unusquisque sicut deus diuisit iuxta mensuram fidei." Here note that Ephrem agrees with *G against Sch* and also against *A* (1) in omitting φρονεῖν, (2) in the rendering *sanctitatem*, (3) in the rendering "iuxta mensuram fidei," to which, however, *Sch* approximates. It is clear that the existing P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ text has here been remodeled and no longer presents what Ephrem and the Georgian read in it. 12:4, *G* and *A* omit γὰρ after καθάπερ. So did Ephrem, who comments: "Ecce est sicut divisa sunt munia membrorum corporis." *Sch* adds γὰρ, and the addition must be due to a recension later than Ephrem. 12:5, οὕτως οἱ πολλοὶ ἓν σῶμά ἐσμεν. *G* = "Sic quoque nos omnes unum corpus sumus." But *Sch* and *A* = "Sic quoque nos qui plures sumus unum sumus corpus," according to the Greek. Ephrem read the same text as we have in *G*, for he comments: "Nam omnes nos unum corpus sumus in Christo." 14:9, *G* = "Christus mortuus est et resurrexit et uixit." So Ephrem comments: "Christ died and rose, lived." But *Sch* = "died and revived and arose," a transposition of the older text. *A* omits ἀνέστη. 14:22, σὺ πίστιν ἣν ἔχεις κατὰ σεαυτὸν ἔχε. Here *G* and *A* omit ἣν. *Sch* retains it: "Tu quæ est in te fides, in te ipso." But Ephrem omitted ἣν, for his comment is: "But if thou shalt say, I eat with faith, if thou hast faith, unto thine own self boast therein unto God." I confess, however, that Ephrem suggests a Greek text ἣν ἔχῃς, "if thou hast." 14:23, *G* adds *edit*, "eats," after ἐκ πίστεως. Ephrem had the same addition, for he comments: "But he who is discriminating, if he eats, he is condemned, for it is not by faith he sanctifies and eats." *Sch* and *A* do not add *edit*. 3:15, αὐτὸς δὲ σωθήσεται, οὕτως δὲ ὡς διὰ πυρός. Here *G* adds σωθήσεται after οὕτως δὲ. Ephrem had the same addition in his text, for he comments: "Quamuis enim et resurrectio suscitet et uiuificet eum, nihilominus ipse eomodo fit uiuus (*i. e.*, is saved) et miserandus quasi in ignem." *Sch* has simply: "eomodo autem quasi ab igne."

1 Cor. 5:1, ὅλως ἀκούεται ἐν ὑμῖν πορνεία, καὶ τοιαύτη πορνεία ἥτις οὐδὲ ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν (ὀνομάζεται add ℵ$^{c}$ LP *Sch*). *Sch* = "In short, there is

heard of among you fornication, and such fornication as not even in the house of heathen is heard of." Thus *Sch* accords with the Greek, except in implying addition of ἀκούεται rather than of ὀνομάζεται. But *A* has ὅλως ὀνομάζεται ἐν ὑμῖν and does not add ὀνομάζεται after ἔθνεσιν; and this must have been Ephrem's reading, for he comments: "Ecce enim apud uos fornicatio, qualis etiam in gentibus non, facta est inter uos, superbientes inter uosmet, ecce apud uos *nominatur*, filius *uxorem patris sui* habet." In the above, of the whole sentence *nominatur* is almost the only word in common with the Armenian Vulgate; and is not, I think, due thereto. There is no formal citation of that Vulgate. The interrelation of *G* and *A* is very strikingly illustrated in this verse and deserves notice, although it does not affect the point before us, which is the character of Ephrem's Syriac text. *G*, then, has ὅλως ἀκούεται and adds ὀνομάζεται after ἔθνεσιν, in both respects differing from *A* and approximating to Stephanus' text. Yet both *A* and *G* interpolate, the one after, the other before, ἐν ὑμῖν, the word "unde," "whence" "for what," in Armenian *ŭndêr*, in Georgian *rasa*. That this peculiar addition is due to the same Syriac text having been originally translated by *G* and *A* alike is almost certain.[5] If it is not so, then we can at least infer that *G* is a rendering of *A*, or *vice versa*. In any case it conclusively proves that *G* and *A* were once a single text and as versions flow from one archetype; and that the manifold varieties which now divide them must have resulted from the separate revision of each made at an early date with the help of Greek manuscripts.

1 Cor. 5 : 8, εἰλικρινίας is rendered "justice" in *G*; *A* and *Sch* render the Greek. Ephrem had "justice" in his text, for he comments: "nor in works of evil, but in the leaven of justice, that is, in works of justice and of truth." 5 : 12, after γὰρ μοι *G* and *A* add καὶ. *Sch* is without it, but Ephrem read it, for he comments: "How is it mine also to judge the men of the world." 6 : 11, καὶ ταῦτά τινες ἦτε. *G* = "Et hocmodo quondam fuistis," which is reflected in Ephrem's commentary: "*Et uos* hocmodo quondam *quidam* (= τινες) *eratis*." Here, although the commentary is colored by the Armenian Vulgate, it does not derive therefrom this peculiar rendering of ταῦτα, for *A* = "Et uos tales quidam eratis." *Sch*, however, = "And these things have been in some of you." The reviser of the Syriac was not satisfied with the rendering of ταῦτα as = "hocmodo" and corrected it at the expense of accuracy in the rest of the clause. 8 : 4, καὶ ὅτι οὐδεὶς θεὸς εἰ μὴ εἷς.

[5] For *rasa* = τίνος and *ŭndêr* = πρὸς τί, and these words seem to be independent renderings of a Syriac word rather than renderings one of the other.

*G* renders: "And that none is God other than the only one God." Ephrem had the addition *solus deus* in his text, for his comment is: "Quippe nihil idola sunt in mundo, et omnia quæ nomine appellantur dei, non est omnino aliud quam unus solus deus." *Sch* and *A* lack the addition *solus deus*. It has been revised out of them because it was not in the Greek codices. 8:7, τῇ συνηθείᾳ. Ephrem's text may have had this reading, for he comments: "Sunt enim nonnulli simplices inter fideles qui exeunt ad manducandum in domo idolorum," συνηθείᾳ being misunderstood in the sense of "simplicity," by confusion with εὐηθείᾳ. Whether *G* read συνειδήσει is doubtful, for it = "through doubt," which seems to be an attempt to render the Armenian equivalent for συνειδήσει, which is also rendered in *Sch*.

Here are some additional examples from Romans of the agreement of Ephrem with *G* against both *A* and *Sch*:

Rom. 4:16. *G* renders the Greek text διὰ τοῦτο ἐκ πίστεως, ἵνα κατὰ χάριν, εἰς τὸ εἶναι βεβαίαν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν πάντι τῷ σπέρματι as follows: "Propter hoc de fide, ut gratiâ sit firma promissio omni semini." This rendering is clearly recognizable in Ephrem's comment: "Propter hoc non, ait, ab operibus, sed de fide, ut secundum gratiam firma sit promissio omni semini." The Pᵉshiṭtâ has recast the verse as follows: "Quapropter per fidem, quæ est per gratiam, iustificabimur, eo ut promissum confirmetur toti semini." *A* exactly renders the Greek, save that it adds "sit" after χάριν, which may represent the η added after ἵνα in codd. $A^{45,80}$. It is noticeable that the old Latin codd. d e vg Ambrst exactly reproduce the reading of *G* and *E*: "ut secundum gratiam firma sit promissio." It looks as if these sources were influenced by the old Syriac, or the Syriac by them. 4:19, *G* adds οὐ before κατενόησεν, which Ephrem also had in his text, for he comments: "Et hoc quod dicit: Nullo modo considerauit carnem suam mortam." *Sch* and *A* omit οὐ. 5:1, δικαιωθέντες οὖν ἐκ πίστεως εἰρήνην ἔχωμεν πρὸς τὸν θεόν is rendered: "So then we have been justified . . . and peace was unto us towards God." Ephrem reflects this: "So then we were justified by faith of the baptism, and there was unto us peace towards God." *A* exactly renders the Greek, and the Pᵉshiṭtâ has remodeled the verse thus: "Because we are justified then by faith, there shall be unto us peace towards God." 5:13, ἄχρι γὰρ νόμου is rendered in *G* thus: "Usque ad legis adventum." Perhaps the addition "adventum" is to be detected under the comment of Ephrem: "For until the law of Moses, whose commands were multiplied, sin . . ." 5:14, τοῦ μέλ-

λοντος is rendered in *G*: "of the coming *times*." So in Ephrem's comment: "For he himself is a type of the coming times" (*futurorum temporum*). *Sch* has recast it thus: "He that is type of him that must be." *A* = *futurorum* simply.

XI. I add a few more from the epistles to the Corinthians:

1 Cor. 10:25, μακέλλῳ is rendered in *G* and *E* "in a shop or tavern," in *Sch* and *A* "in a fleshmarket or slaughterhouse." 10:28, *G* and *E* add the words τοῦ γὰρ κυρίου ἡ γῆ καὶ τὸ πλήρωμα αὐτῆς. They are lacking in *Sch* and *A*, and must have been struck out of these versions by some reviser. 11:29, ὁ γὰρ ἐσθίων in *G* and *E* is rendered "*But* he who eats;" *Sch* and *A* render γὰρ. 15:41, ἀστὴρ γὰρ κ.τ.λ.; *A* and *Sch* = "et stella quam stella major est in gloria;" but *G* = "*For even as* one star excelleth star in glory;" and Ephrem had the addition "even as," since he comments: "As star excelleth star in its light, so heavenly beings excel earthly in the resurrection of the dead." 15:54, τότε γενήσεται ὁ λόγος. So *Sch* and *A*. But *G* renders γενήσεται as "implebitur," which Ephrem had, for he comments: "There shall be completed in him the statement which was written about him."

2 Cor. 1:6. For purposes of comparison we break up Tischendorf's text into clauses: (1) εἴτε δὲ θλιβόμεθα ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως καὶ σωτηρίας (+ θλιβόμεθα add *Sch*); (2) εἴτε παρακαλούμεθα, ὑπὲρ τῆς ὑμῶν παρακλήσεως (+ καὶ σωτηρίας add *G*, *Sch*, and *A*); (3) τῆς ἐνεργουμένης ἐν ὑπομόνῃ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων ὧν καὶ ἡμεῖς πάσχομεν; (4) καὶ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν βεβαία ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν. The above is the order in which *A* and *Sch* take the whole verse, both adding the words καὶ σωτηρίας in clause (2). But *G* takes the clauses in this order: (1), (3), (4), (2), and does not read καὶ σωτηρίας a second time.

We give Ephrem's commentary on vss. 4–6 inclusive, separating and distinguishing with corresponding numerals in the margin those clauses which correspond to the four clauses of vs. 6:

Vs. 4. Is, ait, qui consolatus est nos in omnibus tribulationibus nostris . . .

ut et nos ceteros contribulatos consolemur per uerbum quod audiunt a nobis,

(3) et per patientiam tribulationis quam aspiciunt in nobis (= ἐν ὑπομονῇ τῶν αὐτῶν παθημάτων . . . πάσχομεν).

supplicationibus illis, id est propter supplicationes quibus nos supplicati sumus a deo pro uobis

(= διὰ τῆς παρακλήσεως ἧς παρακαλούμεθα αὐτοὶ ὑπὸ [*lege* ἀπὸ] τοῦ θεοῦ).

(3) ut sustinere ualeretis uos sicut nos.
Vs. 5. Quoniam sicut abundarunt, etc.
Vs. 6.
(1) Si enim tribulamur pro uestra consolatione et salute tribulamur,
(?3) id est ut uideatis et imitatores sitis nostrum,
(3) et adsit uobis uirtus tolerandi passionum easdem passiones, quas et uos . . . passi sumus.
(4) Et hæc spes nostra, quæ pro uobis erat, firma fuit.
Vs. 7. Scimus enim, etc.

In the above commentary, whereas Ephrem harps already twice upon clause (3) in dealing with vs. 5, he does not comment at all on clause (2); for the words "id est ut uideatis et imitatores sitis nostrum" cannot be regarded as a comment on it, but are rather one more echo of (3). But the very clause (2), which Ephrem thus ignores, is in *G* misplaced. We should expect him to comment on it after (4); and I suspect it was so placed in the Syriac original of his commentary, and that the Armenian translator omitted his comment because, as judged by the Armenian Vulgate, it was out of place.

2 Cor. 3:9, *εἰ γὰρ τῇ διακονίᾳ τῆς κατακρίσεως δόξα*. So the P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ. But *G* reads *ἡ διακονία . . . δόξα*, and *A ἡ διακονία . . . ἐν δόξῃ*. Ephrem had the reading of *A*, for he comments: "Nam si ministratio damnationis, scilicet quia exigebat illa debita, in gloria fuit." Here *A* alone preserves the ancient Syriac text in full; *G* half preserves it, but has adjusted itself to the nominative *δόξα*; the P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ has been remodeled throughout to suit a Greek text such as Tischendorf here adopts. 5:4, *ἐν τῷ σκήνει* is rendered in *G* "in hoc corpore." But *Sch* = "in this house;" and *A* = "in this enclosure." Ephrem had the Georgian expression, for he writes: "*For we who are in this enclosure*,[6] that is, in this body, lament."

XII. It is more difficult to detect Ephremic readings in the Armenian Vulgate, because the Armenian translator of Ephrem gives all biblical citations, where he can, in the very words of that Vulgate. In such cases, if the Georgian adds its suffrage, we are practically sure that we have recovered the earliest form of the Syriac text. For all the embarrassment due to the above cause, we can be sure in not a few cases that Ephrem's peculiar readings underlie the Armenian Vulgate. For example:

[6] The italicized words are from the Armenian Vulgate.

1 Cor. 15 : 17, ἔτι ἐστὲ ἐν ταῖς ἁμαρτίαις ὑμῶν is rendered in *A* thus: "et adhuc in iisdem peccatis remanebitis." Ephrem's commentary implies *in iisdem*, yet without a formal citation of the Armenian Vulgate being dragged in by the translator. *G* and *Sch* reflect the Greek literally.

XIII. But, apart from the commentary of Ephrem, there are many archaic readings in the Armenian and Georgian versions which though reflected in the old Latin versions are yet absent from the Peshiṭtâ. Whence did the Armenian derive these? Certainly they are a legacy from the older form of Syriac on which it is based and not the fruit of later revision. Here are examples:

1 Cor. 12 : 27, ὑμεῖς δέ ἐστε σῶμα Χριστοῦ καὶ μέλη ἐκ μέρους. Here the Greek codex D has μέλη ἐκ μέλους and the old Latin d e f vg; also Syr$^{p}$, Origen, Eusebius, etc., have the same reading. But *G* and *A* = μέλη ἐκ μελῶν αὐτοῦ. That such a reading existed in Greek is probable from Severian's comment cat$^{243}$ οὐκ εἶπεν μέλη ἐκ μελῶν, ἀλλὰ μέλη πολλὰ ἐκ μελοῦς ἑνός· μέλος γὰρ ἡ κεφάλη τοῦ ὅλου σώματος, and is certain from the version "ex membris" given in Amb$^{luc\ 15\ et\ 17}$. The *A* and *G* must have derived their reading from the older form of the Syriac, for *Sch* reads: "and members in your place;" a reading which suggests the botching hand of a reviser. Ephrem does not comment on the verse. 12 : 28, after γένη γλωσσῶν *A* adds "interpretationes linguarum," an addition akin to "interpretationes sermonum" found in vg$^{cle}$ hart$^{xx}$ Syr$^{p}$, Ambrst, but in no Greek codex. So in Col. 2 : 1 *G* adds: τῶν ἐν Ἱεραπόλει. *G* must have derived this addition from the more ancient Syriac text of the Paulines which he used. From the Peshiṭtâ as also from *A* a reviser's hand has effaced it. Ephrem does not comment on this verse.

We add in a summary way a few more such readings which *A* and *G* must have derived from the Syriac, but which the Peshiṭtâ has lost. They are all from passages on which Ephrem has no comment by which to ascertain what he read.

Rom. 1 : 18, ἀποκαλύπτεται = "*is to be* revealed." 2 : 1, ὁ (aft. πράσσων) = "wherein (*or* wherewith) thou judgest." 2 : 10, omit δὲ after δόξα. 3 : 19 = "to those *under* the law." 1 Cor. 11 : 34, διατάξομαι = "*then* will I direct." 12 : 12, omit γὰρ after καθάπερ. 13 : 1 = "factus sum ego *veluti* æs, quod sonat." Here f vg have *factus sum velut;*

item Aug$^{\text{iop}\,6}$ *factus sum tanquam.* 14:7, ὅμως . . . rendered by *G* "eodem modo inanimata sonitum edunt;" by *A*: "eo modo quo inanimata sonitum darent." 15:21, omit ἐπειδὴ. 2 Cor. 3:11, πολλῷ μᾶλλον translated "How much more?"

XIV. Most of our examples have been drawn from Romans, First Corinthians, and Second Corinthians as far as chap. 6; but the interrelations of Ephrem, of *A G* and *Sch* retain the same character throughout the Pauline epistles. We can deduce from the above facts the following conclusions:

1. Ephrem for his commentary used a Syriac text closely similar to but not identical with our Pᵉshiṭṭâ. For the idioms and peculiar translations of the latter confront us on every page of the commentary, in spite of its Armenian dress. We perpetually have a text cited from the Armenian Vulgate, and by way of comment there follows a literal Armenian version of the Pᵉshiṭṭâ form of the same verse; or sometimes the two versions are blended together in one whole.

2. In a vast number of passages in the *G* and *A*, both together or separately, the peculiar idioms and turns of *Sch* are recognizable.

3. In a great number of passages, however, *G* and *A*, both together or separately, agree with Ephrem *against Sch*. In such cases old Latin codices and Fathers constantly add their suffrage to the group Ephrem *G A*.

4. In some passages on which Ephrem does not comment, *A* and *G*, both together or separately, show *against Sch* characteristic variants — often supported by old Latin sources — which must belong to their original Syriac basis.

5. Ephrem himself without *G* and *A* exhibits many archaic readings not to be found in *Sch*; and Professor Theod. Zahn, in his review of Moesinger's Latin translation of Ephrem's commentary, indicates many such. For them we refer our readers to his articles in the *Theologisches Literaturblatt* for 1893, Oct. 6, 13, and 29.

6. These last three considerations (viz., 3, 4, and 5) prove that the Syriac version used by Ephrem and by the first translators of *G* and *A* was a more primitive form of Syriac than our Pᵉshiṭṭâ.

The latter is a recension of that primitive form. The reviser's aim was to adjust the Syriac text to new Greek codices, and he specially eliminated characteristic early readings. But he also made numberless small changes in the direction of greater literality.

7. The existing *G* and *A* versions are themselves recensions of more primitive texts,[7] in which — could we recover them — we should have faithful witnesses to the earliest form of the Syriac text of the Paulines. Inasmuch as these texts were separately revised from fresh Greek codices (the *A* about 400 and *G* probably not much later), their agreement is a clue to what belonged to their common Syriac basis.

8. *G* and *A* were either originally translated from the same Syriac codex, or they have been at a time anterior to the revisers of these corrected from one another. The supposition that *G* was originally a rendering of *A* would explain much, but certain other features into which we need not now enter forbid such a supposition.

9. So far as regards the Paulines no weight attaches to two pronouncements recently made by well-known scholars, viz., (1) that the text of *Sch* is not one which has been built up by revision into what we already have in the codices of the fifth and sixth centuries, but is, on the contrary, the second-century version unchanged; and (2) that in the conservative and immobile East no recension of oriental versions was possible or probable so late as 400.

On the contrary, the *G* and *A* versions were radically revised and adjusted to fresh Greek codices just about that date; and that, although it would be difficult to find two churches more conservative and immobile than were the Georgian and Armenian, both originally offshoots of the Syrian church. The revision of the Peshiṭṭâ itself about the same time was less radical; yet there was such a revision as makes it unsafe to assume that any particular Peshiṭṭâ reading is earlier than 400 A. D., unless

[7] The first Armenian version of which some earlier Armenian Fathers make mention in contradistinction to the revision by Mesrop belongs by the authority of the same Fathers to the age of Gregory the Illuminator, *i. e.*, 300–325 A. D.

it be endorsed by *E*, by *G*, or by *A*, our three witnesses to the more primitive text which preceded the Pᵉshiṭṭâ as we have it.

XV. So far we have dealt only with the Paulines. Is it possible that the conclusions proved as touching them will be found to apply equally to the gospels. Let us take three chapters at random, Luke, chaps. 3—5, and, adopting the English Revised Version as our standard of comparison, see whether many variants therefrom of the *A* and *G* do not derive from Syriac texts; and if from them, then from which. *Syriac* stands for *Sch* and Syr$^{sin}$ where they agree. An asterisk prefixed indicates that the very same variant is in the Georgian. I do not confine myself to noticing only those variants which appear in *Syriac* or in Syr$^{sin}$ alone, for I wish to give the reader an idea of the constitution of the Armenian text.

*Luke 3:4, βοῶντος, "of a cry." *3:7, ἔλεγεν οὖν rendered "and he said;" so *Syriac*. 3:8, omit ἐν ἑαυτοῖς; so Syr$^{sin}$. 3:9, ἤδη rendered "Behold;" so *Syriac*. 3:9, after πᾶν omit οὖν with b f f$^{2}$. 3:11, "Let him give *one;*" so Syr$^{sin}$. *3:14, "Satis sint uobis mercedes vestræ;" so *Syriac*. 3:16, "He made answer to all and said;" omitting ὁ Ἰωάννης;" so Syr$^{sin}$. *3:16, "Of whom I am not able to carry the shoes;" so the old Latin a b f f$^{2}$ l q Amb$^{luc\ 2.80}$, Eus$^{dem\ 428}$. The latter reads ἄξιος with *G* instead of ἱκανός. 3:17, διακαθᾶραι rendered simply "to cleanse;" so *Syriac*. *3:18, omit μὲν οὖν; so *Syriac*. 3:20, "*And* he shut up John;" so *Syriac*. *3:22, "a voice came out of heaven *which said;*" comp. *Sch*, "and said," which is in *G*. *3:23, after Joseph add "the son of Jacob;" so Greek codex D. 3:33, after Amminadab add "the of Aram, the of Admê." *Sch* adds "son of Ram." *G* adds "the of Aram," and for "the of Aram" has "the of Ioram." 4:2, *A* = "and he did not eat *and did not drink*." *4:4, "answered him *and said;*" "by bread alone, *but by every word of God*." *4:5, add "into a high mountain." 4:7, "wilt *fall down and* worship." *4:8, omit καὶ before ἀποκριθείς; so Syr$^{sin}$. 4:10, "he *has* charged his angels." 4:11, "*that* on their hands." *4:12, omit καὶ before ἀποκριθεὶς; so Syr$^{sin}$. 4:14, "through all the regions *of the district*." 4:16, 17, "on the Sabbath day, *and they gave him the book of Isaiah the prophet*, and he rose up to read;" so Syr$^{sin}$. 4:17, "and *when* he had opened the book he found that place;" so Syr$^{sin}$. *4:18,

"He hath sent me to heal the broken in heart, to proclaim;" "recovering of sight," ἀνάβλεψιν rendered "to see." *4 : 20, ἀποδοὺς rendered "he gave it;" so *Syriac.* 4 : 23, "whatsoever we have heard which thou didst;" so *Syriac.* 4 : 25, "*and* there was a great famine;" so *Syriac.* 4 : 33, 34, "with a loud voice *and said, Let go.*" 4 : 35, omit καὶ before ἐπετίμησεν; so Syr$^{sin}$. *4 : 35, "the devil threw him down . . . and came out;" so Syr$^{sin}$. 4 : 36, omit καὶ before συνελάλουν. *4 : 36, συν in συνελάλουν ignored; so *Syriac.* 4 : 40, ἤγαγον] ἔφερον; so D. 4 : 41, "Devils came out," omitting δὲ καὶ; *Syriac* omits καὶ. 4 : 41, "And *he* rebuked them *and* suffered;" so *Syriac.* 4 : 41, "they knew him that he was the Christ;" so Syr$^{sin}$.

In chap. 5 we need only give variants which either come in *Syriac* or Syr$^{sin}$ or are otherwise of a salient character.

*Luke 5 : 5, omit καὶ before ἀποκριθείς; so *Syriac.* *5 : 5, χαλάσω rendered "*we* will let down; so Syr$^{sin}$. 5 : 8, "*When* Simon Peter saw it;" so *Syriac.* *G* = "*et* cum." *A* omits *et.* *5 : 10, "capturus eris *ad uitam;*" so *Syriac.* *5 : 12, omit δὲ after ἰδὼν; so Syr$^{sin}$. *5 : 12, ἐν τῷ εἶναι. *A* "on his arriving." So *G* "when he arrived." *5 : 17, "And the power of the Lord was in the healing them;" so *Syriac.* 5 : 19, *A* = "They ascended onto the housetop and suspended him from the tilings and let (him) down with his bed." *G* has "and lifted up the tiling and let down the man with the couch before them." 5 : 25 *A* renders "took the of his on which he lay;" comp. Syr$^{sin}$, "took up that (*m d'm*) on which he lay." *G* = "and took up the bed on which." 5 : 30, "murmured about him to his disciples and said." 5 : 31, "in no wise are wanted physicians for the healthy, but for the sick;" so *Sch.* Syr$^{sin}$ is wanting. 5 : 36, "no one layeth from a new garment on an old coat;" omitting ἐπίβλημα and σχίσας. *G* omits σχίσας and ἀπὸ. 5 : 37, after τοὺς ἀσκούς add τοὺς παλαιούς; so D Cop. *5 : 38, add καὶ ἀμφότεροι τηροῦνται.

So far we have consulted the Georgian version only where it agrees with *A*. But there remain in *G* some noticeable readings. For example:

Luke 3 : 1, *G* omits τῆς ἡγεμονίας, and the omission must be connected with the fact that Syr$^{sin}$ and *Sch* use wholly different words to render τῆς ἡγεμονίας. 3 : 4, after προφήτου add λέγοντος, which Syr$^{cur}$ also has, as well as *Sch.* 3 : 7 = "dixit ad venientem *ad ipsum* multitudinem;" so *Syriac.* 3 : 8, καρπὸν ἄξιον in singular, with D 106, e go Cop.

3:8 = καὶ μὴ δόξητε καὶ λέγητε ἐν ἑαυτοῖς (*lit.* in animis uestris) with L Did[manich] apud Comb[auctor 2.30], and compare F 252 δόξησθε. 3:9, ἤδη δὲ "iam *enim*;" so f ff[2.vid] g[1] l vg. 3:11, omit ὁ ἔχων before βρώματα. 3:12, "There came *to him* also publicans." 3:17, "*he will* cleanse . . . *and will* gather;" so *Syriac.* 3:19, ἐλεγχόμενος: "because he had reproved him about Herodias;" so Syr[sin]. *Sch* = "because he was reproved by John." 3:19, after τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ add Φιλίππου. Tischendorf, ed. oct., remarks that Armenian codices make this addition, but it is not in six tenth-century codices which I have collated. 3:23 is rendered: "Et ipse Iesus incœpit circa esse triginta annorum, qui putabatur filius Iosephi, τοῦ Iacobi . . ." 4:2, "and when those days were accomplished he hungered." 4:7, omit οὖν. 4:8, add "Get thee behind me, Satan." 4:11, omit καὶ ὅτι. 4:14, after πνεύματος add ἁγίου. 4:15, δοξαζόμενος, "and he was glorified;" so *Syriac.* 4:16, κατὰ τὸ εἰωθὸς αὐτῷ: "as he was accustomed;" so *Syriac.* 4:20, "and *he closed* up the book *and gave* it . . . *and sat* down;" so Syr[sin]. 4:22, after λόγοις add αὐτοῦ. 4:23, after σεαυτὸν add: "and they said to him." Comp. Syr[sin]: "And the things which ye have heard that I have done in Capernaum, *ye will say to me*, Do here also . . ." The words italicized come in no other text and clearly underlie *G*. 4:24, "But he *himself* said *to them;*" Syr[sin] adds "to them." 4:25, ὅτε for ὡς; so Syr[sin]. 4:28, θυμοῦ, "with a spirit of anger." 4:28, ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ] præm. "qui erant." 4:33, "there was in *their* synagogue;" so Syr[sin]. 4:35, φιμώθητι, "Shut thy mouth;" so *Syriac.* 4:35, εἰς τὸ μέσον; add *eorum.* 4:36, συνελάλουν rendered as if ἐλογίζοντο. 4:39, "and immediately the fever left her and she arose;" so Cyr[mai 167]. 4:41 = "Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God." 4:41, omit ἐπιτιμῶν. 5:1, ἐν τῷ τὸν ὄχλον κ.τ.λ. rendered: "quum multitudo stiparet;" so *Syriac.* 5:1 and 2, παρὰ τὴν λίμνην = "along (*or* at) the *edge* of the lake;" so *Syriac.* 5:2, ἀπ' αὐτῶν, "from the *ships.*" 5:3, "and he sat and taught from the ship to the crowd;" so *Syriac.* 5:10, after μὴ φοβοῦ add "Simon." 5:17, "And it was on one day, and *Jesus* himself was teaching *them* and there sat *there* Pharisees." *Sch* adds "Jesus." 5:26, καὶ ἐπλήσθησαν φόβου λέγοντες κ.τ.λ., "and *fear fell upon them and* they said that we have seen *wonderful greatness* today." For the first clause Syr[sin] is wanting, but for the latter comp. Syr[sin], "We have seen wonderful and great things (*potius*, greatness) today."

Thus in a space of 180 verses we have no less than twenty-seven variants found in both *Sch* and Syr[sin]; and twenty-two

more found only in Syr$^{sin}$ and not in *Sch*. Not a few of these forty-nine variants are renderings of Syriac idiom and represent nothing at all in Greek. In addition we have eight readings of D or of the old Latin.

XVI. I have so far chosen examples from Luke, because I have been able to compare the Georgian printed text of that gospel chiefly with old manuscripts. Now I give a few examples of agreement of *G* with Syr$^{sin}$ from the early chapters of Matthew, which I have also been able to compare. This time I prefix an asterisk where the Armenian has the same text.

Matt. 1 : 17, omit *οὖν*. 1 : 20, *τὸ γὰρ ἐν αὐτῇ γεννηθὲν*; "Nam id quod *ex illa* genitum." Here Syr$^{sin}$ and Syr$^{cur}$ have m n h, "from her," but *Sch* b h, "in her." 1 : 22, *διὰ τοῦ προφήτου* is rendered "*by the mouth of* the prophet," a rendering of *διὰ* which, though not found here in Syr$^{sin}$, yet occurs in other passages, *e. g.*, just below, Matt. 2 : 15. 2 : 3, *ἀκούσας δὲ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἡρώδης*. *G* = "*When* Herod the king heard *this;*" comp. Syr$^{sin}$, "Now *when* Herod," etc. 2 : 16, *κατὰ τὸν χρόνον*. *G* = "according to (*or* unto) *the similitude of* the time *as* he ascertained." This is an exact rendering of Syr$^{sin}$ l d m u t h o d z b n o d o m r u. *Sch* omits l d m u t h o. 2 : 9, *ἐστάθη ἐπάνω οὗ ἦν*. *G* = "et stetit in loco illo in quo erat." So Syr$^{sin}$: "stood at the *place* of there where." *2 : 18, *θρῆνος καὶ κλαυθμὸς καὶ ὀδυρμὸς*; so Syr$^{sin}$ and Syr$^{cur}$. 3 : 4 = "sed ipsi Iohanni indumentum ad induendum eius ex crinibus cameli," an exact version of Syr$^{sin}$. *3 : 10, omit *οὖν*; so Syr$^{sin}$. 3 : 16, *ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτὸν*. *G* = "it came *and it abode upon* him." Syr$^{sin}$ has "and it abode upon him," omitting the words "it came." The Georgian reviser has added these words to render the Greek *ἐρχόμενον*, but without effacing the rendering of the old Syriac. Thus *G* is a conflation of Syr$^{sin}$ and of the fourth or fifth century Greek. 4 : 4, "But *Jesus* answered." Here "Jesus" is only added in Syr$^{sin}$, Syr$^{cur}$, it$^{mu}$, and in the Greek D. *4 : 7, omit *πάλιν* before *γέγραπται*; Syr$^{sin}$ also omits. *4 : 10 = *ὕπαγε ὀπίσω μου*; so Syr$^{sin}$ and Syr$^{cur}$. 4 : 11, omit *ἰδού*; so Syr$^{sin}$. 4 : 14, *τὸ ῥηθὲν διὰ Ἡσαίου*. *G* omits *διὰ* with Syr$^{sin}$. *4 : 18, *παρὰ τὴν θάλασσαν*. *G* "on the brink of the sea of Galilee;" so Syr$^{sin}$ and also *Sch*. 5 : 9, "quia *illi* filii dei appellabuntur;" so Syr$^{sin}$. *6 : 1, *δικαιοσύνην*," your almsgiving;" so Syr$^{sin}$ and also *Sch*. 8 : 23, "and he went up to a ship and his disciples followed;" so Syr$^{sin}$. 9 : 13, add *εἰς μετάνοιαν*; so Syr$^{sin}$.

Here, then, in the space of the first nine chapters of Matthew

the Georgian version alone presents seventeen readings which are nearly all markedly drawn from Syr$^{sin}$, and two more found in *Sch* as well; and I have examined only the first four chapters with any care. Wherever we turn it is the same, *e. g.:*

Luke 20:29, *G* adds παρ' ἡμῖν with Syr$^{sin}$. John 4:7, "Give me to drink *water;*" so Syr$^{sin}$, but also *Sch*. 4:27, *G* = "and the while over *their talking.*" Comp. Syr$^{sin}$, "and while he was speaking."

XVII. In concluding let us take at random a chapter of Mark and test the Armenian and Georgian for Syriac readings, beginning with the Armenian. Where *G* agrees we asterisk. We give first variants found in Syr$^{sin}$ alone. They are these:

Mark 12:14, *A* = "Et illi uenientes interrogabant eum subdole et aiebant." Here *subdole* is from Syr$^{sin}$; *interrogabant* is however in *G* and *Sch*. *A* as it stands is in old Latin b and ff, and, except for *et aiebant*, in iq as well. *12:17, add ἀποκριθείς. *12:23, "In the resurrection *then when they shall arise.*" *12:24, "*respondit* Iesus et dixit." *12:32, "quod unus est *Deus.*" 12:28 and 29, "What commandment is first? And Jesus said *to him*, First *before all*, Hear, Israel," omitting πάντων in vs. 28 and adding it in vs. 29. *12:35, omit καὶ before ἀποκριθείς. 12:36, add καὶ before αὐτὸς; so D also. 12:37, "*If therefore* David himself" and omit καὶ before πόθεν. 12:41, "Jesus *stood* over against the treasury."

The following interpretations in the same chapter of the Armenian are common to both Syr$^{sin}$ and *Sch*:

*12:5, "And *again* he sent another." 12:6, "*Perhaps* they will reverence my son." 12:10, "*And* have ye not read." *12:17, ἐθαύμαζον instead of ἐξεθαύμαζον. 12:25, "non viri feminas sumunt, neque feminæ virorum fiunt." *12:30 and 31, add "This is the first commandment and the second is like it." 12:38 = "*seeking after* salutations." 12:40, omit καὶ before προφάσει.

Thus in one chapter of forty-four verses we have ten readings of Syr$^{sin}$ alone and eight of Syr$^{sin}$ *plus Sch* common to *A* and *G*. At the same time the nature of the revision which *A* underwent in the fifth century is illustrated by the additions and changes made to the text in this chapter, *e. g.:*

12:26, before τῶν νεκρῶν add τῆς ἀναστάσεως. 12:7, add θεασάμενοι αὐτὸν ἐρχόμενον with many cursives and Syr$^{p}$. But certain other addi-

tions are less likely to have been due to such a revision, *e. g.*: *12 : 1, "dicens" or "et dicere" after λαλεῖν, with old Latin c and b. 12 : 14, add εἰπέ οὖν ἡμῖν with D and many old Latin codices, but *G* omits this. 12 : 17, "*Go*, render unto Cæsar," an unique reading. *12 : 20, "There were seven brothers *with us*," with ℵ*, D, and old Latin codices. *12 : 4, ἀπέστειλαν ἠτιμωμένον.

The Georgian version of the same chapter presents other points of agreement with the Syriac absent from the Armenian, *e. g.*:

12 : 2, "at the season *of fruit;*" Syr$^{sin}$ only. 12 : 2, omit παρὰ τῶν γεωργῶν; so *Syriac.* 12 : 6, omit αὐτὸν ἔσχατον after ἀπέστειλεν; so *Syriac.* But *G* has ἔσχατον at the beginning of the verse with *Sch*, for it renders: "nouissime, unus filius erat dilectus suus," where *suus* is also shared by *A*. 12 : 7, "*his* heir;" so Syr$^{sin}$ only. 12 : 14, omit ἢ οὔ; so Syr$^{sin}$ only. 12 : 19, καὶ καταλίπῃ γυναῖκα rendered "and he hath a wife" (*lit.* and there is [to him] a wife); so Syr$^{sin}$ only. 12 : 29, "The first *of all the commandments* is this;" so *Sch*, but also the mass of Greek codices. Therefore it is probably due to the reviser of *G*. 12 : 32, omit καὶ before εἶπεν; so *Syriac.* 12 : 37, "*our* Lord;" so *Syriac.* 12 : 43, "And *Jesus* called his disciples and said to them;" so *Syriac.* 12 : 43, omit τῶν βαλλόντων; so Syr$^{sin}$ only, with Greek codices 1, 13, 248, and old Latin a, b, c, ff$^{2}$, g$^{2}$, iq. No Armenian uncials have the omission.

This brings up the number of readings derived from Syr$^{sin}$ in this single chapter in one version or the other to fifteen; of readings common to Syr$^{sin}$ and *Sch* to fourteen.

XVIII. We have now adduced enough evidence upon which to base conclusions about the relation of the gospels in *G* and *A* to the Syriac texts. They are the same conclusions at which we arrived in regard to the Paulines, only the fuller light of the Lewisian codex (Syr$^{sin}$) replaces the twilight of Ephrem, half obscured in his Armenian dress.

1. The Georgian and Armenian gospels were both in the first instance translated from a Syriac text; and they have also so many peculiarities in common that it is almost necessary to suppose that one and the same Syriac manuscript was used by both sets of translators. It is even arguable that the primitive Armenian was made from the primitive Georgian or *vice versa.*

In any case, these two versions flow from one and the same archetype.

2. *G* and *A*, now one, now the other, often both, contain readings found in Syr$^{sin}$, but *not* in *Sch*. But they give next to *no* readings from *Sch* which are not in Syr$^{sin}$ as well. Moreover, in a considerable number of cases Syr$^{sin}$ is the only extant source which contains the readings of *G* and *A*, and these readings are often literal renderings of the tricks of translation of Syr$^{sin}$. It follows that a Syriac version of the same type as Syr$^{sin}$ was used by the first translators of *A* and *G*, and not a P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ text. The only path from the latter to either *A* or *G* lies through Syr$^{sin}$ or Syr$^{cur}$.

3. The primitive Armenian and Georgian versions were revised from Greek codices about 400. Possibly the Georgian revision was later. In any case the revisions were made independently, for the original text is seldom supplemented and remodeled along the same lines. The result of the revision has been to give to both these versions a superficial resemblance to the so-called traditional text.

4. In the Armenian church the revised version utterly effaced the more primitive form of Armenian text, so that no manuscripts of the latter survive. The same is probably true of the Georgian, but manuscripts in this tongue are so few and difficult of access that we must speak with caution. The only old Georgian manuscripts which I have been able to see closely agree with the printed text. It is clear that in both churches manuscripts of the older form of text were rigorously suppressed, and they would in any case vanish by not being copied.

5. The Georgian and Armenian churches were offshoots of the Syrian, and must have used for translation that form of Syriac text which was accredited and commonly used in Syriac churches and by the Syriac missionaries. Since they both used a text akin to Syr$^{sin}$, it follows that that was the accredited text, and that the P$^{e}$shiṭṭâ text was not yet in vogue; probably because—as its contents suggest—it was not yet in existence.

6. In addition to readings of Syr$^{sin}$, *G* and *A* exhibit, separately or in common, a number of characteristic readings only

found in D and in the old Latin versions. These readings are most unlikely to be the fruit of revision, especially when they come in both *G* and *A*; they must therefore be regarded as a part of the original stock of those versions; for they must have stood in the Syriac text originally translated. Syr$^{sin}$ therefore cannot be regarded as a pure and full exponent of what stood in the first Syriac version; it marks a stage of it when many characteristic elements, which remain in *G* and *A*, had already been purged out of it.

XIX. It is outside the scope of this article to examine *G* and *A* with reference to the differences which divide the Sinaitic Syriac from the Curetonian. It is enough now to remark that *G* and *A* often follow the Curetonian and set aside Syr$^{sin}$; *e. g.*, in Luke 9:53 *G* has "and they did not receive *them*," which is, according to a leading Syriacist, "one of the Curetonian text's 'peculiar and unsupported readings.'" In the same context, Luke 9:52, *A* has "entered into *one* village of the Samaritans,' which is again Curetonian; and just below, Luke 9:58, *A* has "*And* the Son of man" instead of "*But* the Son . . . ," which is also peculiar to Cureton's Syriac. On the whole, however, where Syr$^{sin}$ and Syr$^{cur}$ differ, *G* and *A* incline to Syr$^{sin}$. But what is everywhere most noticeable is their wholesale rejection of Pᵉshiṭṭâ readings in favor either of Syr$^{sin}$ or of Syr$^{cur}$. They scarcely ever present a Pᵉshiṭṭâ reading without its being endorsed by one or the other of these earlier forms of the Syriac; and the handful of exceptions are explicable from the Greek manuscripts which were used for the revision of *A* and *G*.

XX. We return once more to the opinion of a writer whom we have already quoted from the pages of the *Church Quarterly Review*, Vol. XL, London, 1895, p. 131:

It is admitted by all that a Syriac version of the New Testament has existed from (perhaps) the second century. The place of this version has been taken by the Pᵉshiṭṭâ from the earliest times. Its text stretches back into the farthest regions of Syriac literature. It is a witness to the best form of the Greek text of the New Testament, that text which has been preserved in all parts of the Christian church, and is more attested by the earliest Greek Fathers than any other. On the

other hand, the Curetonian-Sinaitic text is a witness to the corrupt form of text which prevailed in the west and in Syria, amongst those to whom Greek was not a familiar language. It may be an ancient witness.

But is it likely that if the Pᵉshiṭṭâ text was already in regular use from 300 to 400 A. D. the Georgian and Armenian churches and the Syrian missionaries who first evangelized those nations would not have chosen it for translation rather than "a corrupt form of text"? What significance to attach to the writer's words which follow, "amongst those to whom Greek was not a familiar language," I do not know. Does he suppose that a Syriac version was any the worse because it was made for people who talked Syriac and did not know Greek? His words are only true in a sense which he would repudiate, namely, that the Pᵉshiṭṭâ is a recension of the Curetonian-Sinaitic text made about 400 A. D. from new Greek manuscripts. The *G* and *A* as we have them are similar recensions, and it is entirely to this fact that is due the circumstance that either they or the Pᵉshṭṭâi are witnesses to what this writer is pleased to call "the best form of the Greek text of the New Testament." That the Textus Receptus is "more attested by the *earliest* Greek Fathers than any other" I gravely doubt; but it is an assertion which I gladly leave to others to deal with.

# THE FALL AND ITS CONSEQUENCES ACCORDING TO GENESIS, CHAPTER 3.

By H. G. MITCHELL,
Boston.

A COMPLETE discussion of the Fall would require a threefold treatment: (1) an analysis of Genesis, chap. 3, for the purpose of determining its exact teaching; (2) a comparison of the Hebrew story with any similar traditions among other peoples, for the purpose of discovering its relation to them; and (3) an examination of the doctrine of the story in the light of all the knowledge on the subject obtainable, for the purpose of determining its theological value. The present paper, as its title is meant to indicate, will deal only with the first of these topics. Indeed its scope will be still further limited. Since it has been satisfactorily (to the writer) shown that the Jahwist's account of Paradise originally contained but one miraculous tree, and that the second is an interpolation, the tree of life will be ignored or only incidentally mentioned; in other words, the object will be to show what Gen., chap. 3, in its original form taught concerning the Fall and its consequences.[1]

At the outset the question forces itself upon one, whether the story of the Fall is meant for history or allegory; *i. e.*, whether its author therein attempts to describe the actual experience of a first man and woman or simply to hold a mirror

[1] The reasons for pronouncing the tree of life an interpolation are briefly: that (1) the references to it have all the marks of textual corruptions; (2) it is entirely ignored throughout most of the story; and (3) it is not a necessary part of the narrative. The changes in the text required to restore it to what, so far as the tree of life is involved, is supposed to have been its original form, are the following: In chap. 2: 9 omit *the tree of life* and the *and* after *garden*, and in vs. 17 for *the knowledge of good and evil* read, as in 3: 3, *which is in the midst of the garden*. In chap. 3 omit vss. 20, 22, and 24, and for vs. 22 substitute 6: 3. For a detailed discussion of these changes see BUDDE, *Biblische Urgeschichte*, pp. 46 ff., and compare B. W. BACON, *Genesis of Genesis*, pp. 227 ff., 338 f.

up to human experience in general. The tendency among later exegetes seems to be in favor of the latter opinion.[2] It is, of course, impossible to decide this question in advance of the investigation proposed, but it will not be improper to adopt a provisional standpoint, and give one or two reasons for its adoption. It seems fair, then, to assume that the author of this chapter, when he wrote it, aimed to give his readers a literal explanation of the origin of evil in the world, because (1) it is in accordance with his habit as observed in the rest of his work to do so. Reuss admits (*A. T.*, III, pp. 208 f.) that the story in its present setting must be taken literally. The same, however, can be said of it as a part of the Jahwistic document; and that, not only on the strength of 2: 10–15, which is now generally regarded as a later edition, but also in view of such passages as 6: 1 f., 4 and 11: 1 ff., where current myths have evidently been transformed into supposed history. If, therefore, the story sometimes smacks of the mythical, this fact should be utilized to explain its origin rather than to determine its interpretation. (2) The standpoint adopted is warranted also by the closeness of the relation between this and following passages undoubtedly meant to be taken in a literal sense. A passage from the history of Noah will serve as an illustration. There can be no doubt that the original Jahwist meant to represent him as a historical character. But in 5: 29 the conditions into which he is born are explained as the result of the curse pronounced upon the earth after the Fall. And, when one stops to think, one cannot conceive of the author as basing the structure which he evidently purposes to rear on any but the most solid foundations.[3]

These are the reasons for assuming that the story in question should be interpreted literally. As the discussion proceeds it will appear that this is the only standpoint from which it can be understood.

[2] See REUSS, *Altes Testament*, III, pp. 199 ff.

[3] By a similar line of reasoning it can be shown that the view, adopted by some timid interpreters, according to which the first chapter of Genesis is to be treated as poetry, and not as history, is utterly without foundation.

I. The first step in the inquiry is to ascertain, if possible, what, according to the Jahwist, was the original condition of man. For this purpose the preceding chapter also must be consulted.

When Jehovah made man he put him into a garden furnished with "every tree that is pleasant to the sight and good for food" (2:9). This implies, what the sequel only too clearly teaches (3:6), that man, as he came from the hand of his Creator, was endowed with the capacity to enjoy the world into which he had been ushered. A little later he manifested signs of possessing a considerable degree of intellectual power; for, when Jehovah brought to him the beasts that had been created to keep him company, he was able not only to perceive that they all differed from himself, but also to give to each of them the name that fitted its nature. The woman shared this second, as well as the first, capacity with her husband, for she was able to balance motives and eager to increase her powers. The social instinct manifested itself in the first man as soon as he was created, and, when Jehovah, declaring that it was not good for him to be alone, made him a companion, the pair, although they seem not at first to have recognized a sexual distinction between them, immediately developed a fitting attachment for each other. Finally, it is evident that the author meant to picture these first human beings as endowed with free wills, or the ability to determine their own actions and destinies.

Such, according to the Jahwist, was the equipment of the race at its origin. It lacked only one of its subsequent endowments, "the knowledge of good and evil." What is meant by this expression? Wellhausen (*Prolegomena*, p. 318) insists that, in good and evil, not a moral distinction in actions, but a classification of things as helpful or harmful, is intended, and that a knowledge of them is only another name for culture, civilization. This view is opposed by Budde (*Biblische Urgeschichte*, pp. 65 ff.) who bases his contention that a moral distinction is intended on two considerations: (1) that, granting that *good* and *evil* originally had a purely utilitarian application, when the Jahwistic document was written they had evidently acquired a

moral signification (Amos 5: 14 f.), which finally appears in expressions similar to, or identical with, the one in question (2 Sam. 14: 17; 1 Kings 3: 9); and (2) that in the story of the Fall the application of the terms to moral qualities is proven by the fact that the first knowledge actually acquired by Adam and Eve was that of their own nakedness.

The position taken by Budde seems the correct one, and his arguments valid. There is another line of reasoning to the same conclusion. It may be urged (1) that the lack of the knowledge of good and evil, whatever these terms may mean, evidently implies the lack of the capacity to distinguish between them; but (2) that, in this case, the application of the terms to moral qualities appears from the fact that, in the threat attached to the prohibition of the tree in question, the capacity to distinguish between things advantageous and disadvantageous is taken for granted. What would have been the use of the declaration, "In the day when thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die" (2: 17), if he to whom the words were addressed had no notion of the desirable as distinguished from the undesirable?

The first man and woman, therefore, according to the Jahwist, although they were otherwise perfectly equipped, were originally without the capacity to distinguish for themselves between right and wrong; in other words, were in the condition of children who, as the saying is, have not arrived at the age of accountability. Further than this, they were forbidden to eat of the tree the fruit of which would bring them to moral maturity. This prohibition has puzzled the commentators. Budde (*B. U.*, p. 72) suggests that possibly it was only a temporary regulation; that perhaps Jehovah would finally have permitted man to partake of the tree if he had proven obedient, and secured him against any evil consequences. The favorite opinion on the point, however, is that, had the temptation been resisted, the result would have been the development in the first pair, thus voluntarily choosing good, of a knowledge of the distinction between it and its opposite, or, as Strack (*Genesis*, p. 15) puts it, "Had he (man) withstood the temptation, he would have known that he had remained loyal to the will of God, *i. e.*,

good, and kept himself aloof from evil. He would, thus, without partaking of the fruit, by overcoming temptation have attained the knowledge of good and evil, only in a very different and not maleficent manner." Delitzsch (*Genesis*, p. 97) and Dillmann (*Genesis*, p. 69) coincide in this view, and even Budde (*B. U.*, p. 74) regards it as preferable to the one previously suggested.

Both of these views, however, are the product of a false method of interpretation, and clearly mistaken. The question for the present is not, what must have been Jehovah's motive, but what is expressed or implied with reference to it in the language of the story. The author of it says simply that Jehovah forbade the man to partake of the tree, and, in the absence of an indication of any sort to the contrary, the prohibition must be understood as absolute. But if the first man could not hope ever to be *permitted* to enjoy the forbidden fruit, there is even less reason for asserting that, according to the Jahwist, he could ever have acquired the knowledge of good and evil in any other way. The "tree of the knowledge of good and evil" was evidently so called because it possessed the property of imparting the capacity for making moral distinctions. The author himself says that this property resided in the fruit of the tree and that it was manifested when the fruit was eaten, and he is absolutely silent as to any other method of attaining the same result. The theory, therefore, that, if the first pair had not eaten of the forbidden fruit, the tree would have had any influence upon their moral condition, is as gratuitous as to suppose that they could have satisfied their hunger by sitting under the shadow of the other trees of the garden.

What, then, is the explanation of the prohibition in question? Having found the ingenious theories quoted unsatisfactory, is it not best to adopt the conclusion that would naturally occur to the unsophisticated reader, viz., that Jehovah forbade the first man and woman to eat of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil because, although he had made a contrary choice possible, it was his will that they should remain in the condition in which they had been created, and that, therefore, if they had

not disobeyed, they would always have remained in that condition?

There now arises the further question, why Jehovah should not be willing to permit his favorite creatures the knowledge of good and evil. To this also there have been various answers. It has been asserted, *e. g.*, that the author of the story, influenced by the ideas concerning their gods current among the surrounding peoples, intends to represent Jehovah as moved by jealousy in the matter; but it is doubtful if there is really any ground for this opinion. The words put into the mouth of Jehovah in vs. 22 cannot be quoted in support of it, since, as has already been stated, they did not belong to the original form of the story. The case with vs. 5 is different, but it does not favor the view in question. Indeed, if, as is probable, the declaration of the serpent implies a charge of jealousy, the fact that the charge is made by the tempter indicates that the author intended it to be taken as a misrepresentation. On the other hand, in view of 11:6, it is hardly safe to say that the Jahwist thought of Jehovah in this case as acting from a purely benevolent motive. It is more probable that, in his mind, the ideal, and therefore the original, relation of man to God was one of absolute dependence, and that the latter in denying the former the knowledge of good and evil was asserting his prerogative as Creator, as well as attempting to secure the best interest of his creature.

To the fully developed man of the present day the original condition of the race, as depicted in the third chapter of Genesis, was not an enviable one, but the author of the chapter evidently took a different view of it. To him it doubtless seemed better to be without the troublesome power to decide for oneself in matters of right and wrong. It was much simpler to live by the word proceeding from the mouth of Jehovah. True, one could not be good in the fullest sense of the term, but one could forego that possibility, especially since goodness of the childlike kind was rewarded by the most abundant blessings that one at the date of the story could imagine. Was it not enough to enjoy the best that the earth could produce, without toil or pain, or,

so long as the single condition on which it all depended was fulfilled, anxiety lest the happiness enjoyed should ever come to an end?

II. How long the first pair remained obedient to the divine will and enjoyed the delights of the garden in Eden, does not appear. The impression left by the story is that not much time had passed before a great change was wrought in them and their circumstances. In this change three factors were involved. There was, first, the tree with its forbidden fruit, the means by which the knowledge of good and evil was ultimately attained. It seems to have had no office apart from the event of the Fall, for, although the likeness of this story to certain myths current among other peoples naturally suggests the question whether the author did not think of the tree as explaining the possession by Jehovah and his celestial associates of the capacity denied man, the fact that the tree did not exist until man was created (2:7, 9) makes such a supposition decidedly improbable. The safer view is that the Jahwist, believing, as has been suggested, that childhood was the ideal state, represented it as the original condition of the race, and, without further thought as to its fitness in the connection, introduced the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, suggested, perhaps, by the symbolic trees of ethnic religions, to explain how the first man and woman attained moral maturity. To the question whether Jehovah, by putting the tree in their way, did not make himself responsible for their disobedience, he would doubtless have replied that the second factor, the freedom of the first pair to eat or refrain from eating, especially in view of the penalty attached to its improper exercise, relieved their Maker of any such responsibility. At any rate, their freedom is taken for granted.

It was not enough for the author's purpose, however, that the object forbidden was desirable and the persons involved free to elect to enjoy it. The force of the penalty threatened, which would naturally operate to prevent disobedience, must, in some way consistent with his ideas of Jehovah, be weakened. This is the office of the third factor, the serpent.

The first question, of course, is, Who or what was the ser-

pent? Those who adopt the allegorical interpretation of the story declare that it cannot have been the animal of that name, and risk their theory largely on their ability to make this assertion good. Unfortunately, however, this theory will not bear thoughtful application. Reuss, *e. g.* (*A. T.*, III, pp. 206 f.), claims that the serpent is a personification of the instinct that impels man to emerge from the condition of childhood, but he does not attempt to explain what is meant by the curse pronounced upon the serpent. In fact he says that it has no real significance, which is equivalent to saying that his interpretation fails to interpret. The view of Schultz (*Alttestamentliche Theologie*, pp. 609 ff.), that the serpent symbolizes the animal principle in man, is, if anything, still less satisfactory; for (1) the author of the story evidently did not distinguish between two or more species of life in man, but thought of all life as a simple manifestation of the spirit of Jehovah in the human form (see 2:7; 6:3). (2) On the supposition that he did make such a distinction he cannot have meant the serpent to be a symbol of the animal life, since, although the woman takes note of the fact that the tree is delightful to the eyes and its fruit apparently good for food, the serpent takes no account of these attractions, but presents the higher advantages to be obtained through the tree (3:5). (3) This view renders the author's statements concerning the penalties inflicted confusing and unintelligible. Did Jehovah punish the first pair first figuratively and then literally?

Another theory with reference to the serpent is that it was a mask for Satan. Delitzsch is very strenuous in his insistence upon this interpretation. He says (*Genesis*, p. 98) that, if the doctrine that man fell from the favorable position in which he was placed at his creation through seduction by Satan be abandoned, nothing is left in the place of the religion of redemption, restoration, and perfection but a rationalistic, *i. e.*, anti-supernaturalistic, deism. One shrinks from differing from this sainted teacher or criticising him and his fervent statements, but it would be impossible to accept his interpretation at this point even if, which must also be denied, the alternative that he presents were the only one, and for the following reasons: (1) There is

nowhere in the language used any evidence that a concealed personality was in the mind of the writer. (2) If it were admitted that the serpent was a mask for some other being, there would still be good ground for denying that the being supposed was Satan; for (*a*) the doctrine of Satan as an evil power opposed to the Deity is considerably later than the story of the Fall (*cf.* 2 Sam. 24:1 and 1 Chron. 21:1; see also Piepenbring, *Theology of the Old Testament* pp. 256 ff.); and (*b*) the introduction of a positively evil being would have forestalled the very object of the story, viz., to explain the origin of evil in the world. (3) This interpretation also, like the allegorical, breaks down when applied to the penalty inflicted on the serpent; for, either (*a*) the serpent alone is punished, and the power of which it was the tool overlooked, or (*b*) Satan is condemned to a degradation which hardly harmonizes with his subsequent position as a son of God and member of the heavenly court. See Job 1:6.

If, now, the serpent is neither a figure of thought nor a mask for Satan, the presumption is that it is to be understood as a real animal. That this is the correct view appears from the following considerations: (1) It is distinctly classified among the beasts of the field, *i. e.*, wild animals (3:1). (2) It is described by a mark, cunning, that belongs, or has always popularly been supposed to belong, to actual serpents. See Matt. 10:16. (3) The object of the author required the introduction of a tempter that could not be called wicked. (4) The penalty inflicted upon the serpent exactly fits the animal of that name, and corresponds to those inflicted upon the man and the woman. There are, of course, objections, *e. g.*, that it is ridiculous to suppose that the serpent ever had the power of speech, or any other form than that in which it now appears; but they have no weight against the interpretation proposed, since the question now is, not what were the original form and capacity of this animal, but how this author conceived of it. If it be objected further that the Jahwist could not have had any such notion of the serpent as that supposed, it is only necessary to remind the objector that a serpent that talks can hardly be called more wonderful than a tree with the property of imparting the knowledge of good and evil.

The tempter of Gen., chap. 3, then, is an animal, with the characteristics popularly attributed to, but not the actual body of, the serpent, and its part in the story is intended to explain the union of so subtile a nature with the repulsive form in which it is now embodied. The scene between it and the woman is very skillfully managed. Jehovah had said that, if she and her husband ate of the tree in the midst of the garden,—the proper name of the tree was not given to it in the original form of the story,—they should surely die, or, to put it differently, as surely as they ate of the tree they should die. Thus they had the best of reasons for shunning the tree and none for meddling with its fruit. When the serpent appears its first move is to deny what Jehovah has asserted. "Ye shall not surely die," it said, and from one point of view the denial was justified; viz., on the supposition that the woman understood that death would be the direct and immediate effect of partaking of the forbidden fruit. This, as the sequel shows, was not what Jehovah meant, but the serpent cunningly takes his own interpretation for granted, and proceeds to disclose what will be the effect of indulgence: "Your eyes," he says, "shall be opened, and ye shall be as God, knowing good and evil." This announcement,—which was literally true,—by bringing before her mind a great present advantage, causes the woman to forget what is now, at most, a remote consequence of disobedience, and may, perhaps, after all, be only a bugbear. She yields to the serpent's suggestion, takes of the fruit, and finally persuades her husband to share her transgression.

The objection will doubtless be made that the serpent is, after all, an evil character. It must, however, be remembered that the author distinctly describes it as a beast of the field, and, further, that this same writer, apparently without disapproval, relates that the best of the patriarchs used deception to accomplish their purposes, for it is he who represents Isaac as lying to retain Rebecca (Gen. 24: 7) and Jacob as first getting Esau's birthright (27: 19), and finally Laban's property (30: 36 ff.), by indirection. If any further evidence that deception was not regarded as a sin by the early sacred writers is necessary, 1 Kings 22 : 19 ff.,

the passage in which Micaiah ,pictures Jehovah as sending a lying spirit to deceive Ahab to his ruin, ought to be sufficient. See Piepenbring, *T. O. T.*, pp. 34 ff.

III. The man and his wife alike disobeyed. What followed? On this third point the author is very explicit,—and so are the theologians. So many of the latter, however, seem to have missed the meaning of the former that it will be best to depend upon the original authority. What, then, does the Jahwist report as having happened when the two had eaten of the forbidden fruit? "The eyes," he says, "of both were opened," and then he explains this expression by adding, "and they knew that they were naked" (3:7). In vs. 5 the same expression is explained by the addition of, "and ye shall be as God," and this, in turn, by the further addition of, "knowing good and evil." It is clear, therefore, that immediately upon eating of the forbidden fruit the words of the serpent were fulfilled, and Adam and Eve acquired the power hitherto denied, which at once manifested itself in their recognition of their nakedness. Their next move was to make themselves "girdles." It has been held that the emotion which may be supposed to have followed the recognition of their nude condition, and impelled them to clothe themselves, was shame in the bad sense of the term. Thus Dillmann (*Genesis*, p. 73), commenting on this passage, says, "Without sin there is no shame." This, however, can hardly have been the idea of the author. He is tracing the operation of the newly acquired faculty. In so doing he ignores, for the time being, the means by which it has been acquired, and seemingly intends to convey the impression that Adam and Eve themselves forgot it. The emotion which they experienced, therefore, cannot, in his mind, have been of the kind alleged, but must have been conceived of as the natural confusion at discovering oneself naked which is perfectly consistent with innocence. This conclusion is favored by the following context. The author says that, when, at the close of the day, Jehovah was heard approaching, the man and his wife hid themselves among the trees of the garden, and that the man, on being called, excused his disappearance by saying, "I was afraid because I was naked" (3:10). This statement is

best interpreted as giving the real reason for their flight; for Adam, being virtually a child, should return an artless answer, and such an answer is required to make the scene from the literary point of view worthy of the Jahwist. See Gen., chap. 44. If, however, the author intended to represent Adam as so artlessly betraying himself, he must have imagined the pair so preoccupied with their new faculty that, like children, they were oblivious of everything else.

The question, "Who told thee that thou wast naked?" brings the man face to face with the penalty that he has hitherto ignored. It is the fear of the consequences of his act that leads him to try to escape responsibility for it. He pleads that he was tempted by his wife, and she, in turn, accuses the serpent of deceiving her. Jehovah takes no account of their excuses, but proceeds at once to pronounce sentence, beginning with the serpent. This animal is degraded from its original rank among its fellows and condemned to wriggle in the dust, exposed to the instinctive hatred of mankind. The woman learns that she is to suffer, especially in childbirth, and become the dependent of her husband. The punishment decreed for the man is that he be obliged to wring from a stubborn soil the subsistence that has hitherto cost him no effort. Finally, with the announcement that within a hundred and twenty years the ills decreed will culminate in death, Jehovah drives the disobedient pair from the garden.

In what respects, then, did Adam and Eve differ from their former selves when they were expelled from Paradise?

Their physical condition, it is plain, was greatly changed. They had heretofore enjoyed a painless, careless existence, with an unending vista of happiness. They now entered upon a scene of toil and suffering, with death and its terrors at no great distance in prospect.

They had also undergone a moral change. This has been described as a corruption, disorganization, of their nature. Does the story, or the author of it, warrant such a view? Disorganization of this sort would show itself (1) in a confused moral judgment, (2) a torpid conscience, (3) a weakened will, or (4)

unruly emotions. It can hardly be the idea of the Jahwist that the moral judgment of the first pair was disturbed by their transgression, for, according to his account, when they yielded to temptation they did not possess the knowledge of good and evil, and the operation of this faculty, when first acquired, was perfectly normal; as soon as their eyes were opened they saw that they were naked. He says, further, that on seeing that they were naked they at once, in obedience to a normal impulse, took measures to clothe themselves, thus indicating that their consciences were active and their wills unimpaired. On the fourth point, chap. 3:16 has been supposed to require a different conclusion. In it Jehovah is made to say to the woman, "Thy desire shall be toward thy husband and he shall rule over thee." Dillmann, after Knobel, paraphrases the passage as follows: "Thou shalt eagerly long for him, for intercourse with him;" and adds, of the subjection decreed, "This dependence, in itself, is to the author an evil; besides it occasions the repeated recurrence of pregnancy and childbirth." This interpretation, however, is by no means unobjectionable. The word rendered *desire* is found in only two other places in the Old Testament, Gen. 4:7 and Cant. 7:11 (10). In the former, where the text is doubtful, it can only mean *inclination*, and in the latter, where it is used of a man, it has the force of *affection*. There is ground, therefore, for the opinion that the author in this passage meant to make Jehovah say that the very tenderness of the woman for her husband would prove a disadvantage to her. But it is not necessary to insist upon a changed interpretation, for, granted that the old one is correct, it has not the significance alleged, since the increased sensuality of the woman is represented, not as the effect of partaking of the forbidden fruit, but as a part of the penalty for so doing. Thus it appears that the Jahwist does not teach that the moral nature of mankind was wrecked by the first disobedience, but, on the other hand, that it was this act which made the first pair independent moral beings. He must, therefore, have thought of them as leaving Paradise, in spite of the lapse of which they had been guilty, in possession of the same ability to obey the will of

Jehovah, however it might be revealed to them, which they had when they were created.

The discussion has now reached the limits proposed. It is not necessary to recapitulate the results obtained, but to prevent misunderstanding a word should be added concerning their relative importance. In the progress of the discussion certain details of the story, because they have been misinterpreted, had to be treated at greater length than others. It would be a mistake to suppose that those most fully discussed are the most important or that any of them are so important as the ideas underlying the whole. It is these last, the freedom of the will and the sovereignty of God, which gave to the story its value to those for whom it was originally written, and which still bear witness to the inspiration of its author.

# ALEXANDRIA AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.

By J. S. RIGGS,
Auburn Theological Seminary.

ALL great realities awaken a twofold interest in view of what they are and how they came to be. A masterpiece, whether in literature, art, or life, by its very inspiration urges us to study its secret. Along two lines work on the New Testament has been tireless and abundant—one in setting forth the power, beauty, and worth of the truth itself; the other in making clear the conditions which were antecedent to its deliverance, the environment in which it was proclaimed, and the results which its deliverance brought about. It is along this latter line that our theme lies, and the purpose of this paper is to answer as briefly as is consistent with clearness the question "What did Alexandria do in the preparation of the New Testament message?" Did she have a mission which should place her name beside those of other great cities whose growth and influence were factors in God's plan for the accomplishment of this last revelation to us, or are we wrong in supposing that the language of her streets and the impress of her thought is found in these sacred pages? To anyone who knows anything of the thought and life of the first Christian centuries there can be no question about the wide-reaching influence of the Egyptian capital. Her schools were the pride of scholarship, and her methods the charm of both teacher and pupil. Some of the greatest names among the Fathers were familiar in her streets, and the discussions of her schools are manifest in nearly every department of Christian thought. But with the development of catechetical instruction, with the strange commixtures of gnostic teachings and with the intellectual, stirring theology of these later days, we have not now to do. We are to look at that period which begins with the first of the Ptolemies, in the earlier part of the

third century B. C.—the golden age of Hellenism—and which ends for us with a name which belongs rather to the sovereignty of thought than of force—Philo Judæus. He died about the year 40 of our era. This period, no less than the one succeeding it to which we have referred, was one of intellectual agitation, earnest questionings, and complex interpretations. Indeed its problems were brought face to face with the teachings of Christ and his apostles soon after these teachings were given, and its one fascinating method of solving the declarations of poets and prophets worked out many a fanciful comment upon the scriptures of the New and Old Testaments. I refer, of course, to the allegorical system of interpretation.

Did space permit, it would be of interest to present a somewhat detailed picture of Alexandria as it was in the days of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The liberal policy of Alexander, with its ideal of placing centers of Greek culture over all the then known world, was earnestly followed by the Ptolemies, and Alexandria soon became in consequence a capital of wealth and power. Its ports, palaces, theaters, and temples were all built upon a magnificent and costly scale. In the time of Philadelphus, not only was it a city of imposing avenues and multiform activities, but leaving out of sight all the smaller public edifices, there were at least thirty remarkable structures which would claim the attention of visitors as do today the Louvre in Paris, the Palais de Justice in Brussels, or Westminster in London. This will give some idea of its dignity and importance. In order, however, to prepare the way for an estimate of the influence exerted upon the preparation of the New Testament message, it is necessary for us to linger a moment at three points in the city—in the Jewish quarter, at the Museum, and in the market place. They are the critical points for the study of Alexandria's peculiar place and purpose.

The mission of Alexandrian Judaism was peculiar. From the first it had in the varied history of the city a conspicuous part. Alexander had given the Jews equal rights and privileges with all other citizens at its foundation. They had their own *alabarch* or governor, who, in conjunction with the Sanhedrin, exercised

control over them. To be sure, a wall at one time about the Jewish quarter marked the hostility which they experienced from the Greeks and native Egyptians because of political jealousy and religious hatred, but here the Jews prospered and in the midst of their wealth found time for intellectual improvement. Their energy, temperance, and mental quickness won for them that position of dignity and self-respect which they eagerly sought for here and in other Greek cities, and the charms of Greek culture proved irresistible. Within that inner wall Plato was studied as well as Moses, and Greek was the "common language." "The presiding genius of Egyptian Judaism was the royal house of Ptolemy." Within a stone's throw of their city boundary stood the Museum and they could not go over to the docks without coming into contact with the manifold influences of Greek life and custom. In this northeastern part of the old city began, then, that amalgamation which was so long to be serviceable in the history of thought. Here were started the questions which brought the law into comparison with philosophy and which opened the way for the interpretation of one in the terms of the other. Hence came, doubtless, the call for the Greek version of the books of Moses. That busy, thriving section was linked in a strange way with the fortune of the gospels and the epistles. In order to see more clearly the connection we must hold awhile by the Museum. Our use of this ancient word does not lead us to think of a university, but as the muses and their priest were associated with the schools, it is nothing else than the great center of learning that here opens before us. And there could not be found in all Alexandria a better expression of the broad, noble policy of the Ptolemies to make their city a center of intellectual and political worth than this same Museum, With its theater for lectures and public assemblies, its large dining room for its professors, its long marble colonnades adorned with obelisks and sphinxes, and its famous library open to all who would use it, either for studying or for copying its treasures, it brought to the very door of the Jews the wisdom and culture of the heathen world. Nor was the equipment merely in metal and marble. The names of some of the librarians

are guarantee for the earnest work that was done here.[1] Every facility in the way of retirement and help was given to men. Lectures could be heard upon poetry, mathematics, science, philosophy, and medicine. The Platonist, the Aristotelian, the Epicurean, and the Stoic were among those who here earnestly discussed the problems of creation, life, and destiny; and the spirit that was busy allegorizing the old Greek poets was making inquiry into the thoughts of all philosophies for an explanation of the mysteries of mind and nature. Is it supposable that Jews were never found listening eagerly to the expositions of the classics of other lands and times? This was a place of marked intellectual activity, and that, too, with a fascination which comes from untrammeled speculation and comparative study.

The third point of interest for us in the city is widely different in character from that we have just noted. The market place of Alexandria was crowded with life and business. Wares from every part of the world were exhibited, "the amber of the Baltic, the salt fish of Pontus, the coffee of Cyprus, the timber of Macedonia and Crete, the pottery and oil of Greece, the spices of Arabia, the splendid birds and embroideries of India and Ceylon, the gold and iron of Africa, the apes, leopards, and elephants of tropical climes." Greeks, Egyptians, Romans, and merchants from the provinces of Asia Minor were busy in trade, and the variegated scene on the shore was matched by that of the harbor itself where ships from many ports lay at anchor. One fact invests this scene with supreme interest for us. There is everywhere one medium of communication — the Greek. In some cases it was spoken with halting, awkward expression; in others with confusion of foreign idiom and with the admixture of strange words; yet it was Greek. Just so at the Museum and all along the streets and in the Jewish quarter itself. Cosmopolitan as the life was, it found its unification in this. There was one language in palace, court, school, theater, and shop.

[1] Zenodotus, the grammarian; Callimachus, the poet; Eratosthenes, the astronomer; Apollonius of Rhodes; Aristophanes, the founder of philological criticism; Aristarchus, the critic.

The Jews, the culture of heathendom, the language which was the common vehicle of thought—these were the factors toward the result into which we wish to make inquiry. In looking into the New Testament for marks of their influence our attention must be directed to two things: (1) the language, (2) the thought.

I. *The language of the New Testament.*—It does not take a student long to discover that in reading the Greek of the New Testament he has not before him the diction of the prose classics with which he has become familiar. Not only, generally speaking, is there greater simplicity of structure, but there are peculiarities of idiom and forms of expression which at once demand attention. The whole atmosphere is changed. It is another kind of speech that is being made the vehicle of thought. It is not our purpose now to enter fully into the character of the Greek of the New Testament, but we must deal with enough of the facts to make manifest the relationship of Alexandria to this whole phenomenon. There were Greek colonists in Egypt before Alexander came to it, but it was his arrival and his policy which put Greek into the foremost place and made it, as we have just seen, the one language of intercourse. But it was not pure Greek, and by "pure" is meant the refined Greek of the classics of the best days of Athens' glory, that Alexander brought to Egypt. It is said that the Macedonians and the Greeks proper could not understand each other,[2] in which case Attic, which was the basis of their court language, had been seriously modified in the mouths of these northerners. We do not need to go so far away as Macedonia to realize that change in the Attic of Plato began very early. Aristotle is himself on the border line between classic and post-classic Greek and is often reckoned with those on this side of the dividing line. He admits many new forms and new words into his pages. A living language can never be insensible to its environment, and when we remember what the main purpose of a common medium of intercourse was we can better understand the influence of that environment. Those Macedonians, Egyptians, Jews, and Romans who met

[2] MULLACH, *Geschichte der Vulgärsprache*, p. 14.

together in the market place of Alexandria were not there to turn neat periods, indulge in fine phrases, or polish a thought to the finish required by some delicate Greek particle. They were there to be understood, and to accomplish their object they took hold of the plainest Greek they could find, and to help themselves out turned some of their own words and idioms into Greek forms. Add the resultant modifications to that which already existed in the predominating type of Greek of the court and official life, viz., the Macedonian, and you have the kind of Greek which was characteristic of Alexandria, and perhaps, also, though not in the same degree, of other cities under the sway of Alexander's policy. "The later Greek," as it is called, is just this mixture. It was the real "common dialect." Viteau goes so far as to say that to this Greek and to this alone which had nobler forms on its literary side ought the appellation of "the Greek language" properly be given, for before that it had been mainly dialectic and without universal recognition.[3] If we have rightly conceived of the position and importance of Alexandria, it is not difficult to see how it became a new center for the diffusion of this speech. But important as this modified speech is—for it appears in the New Testament—it is not the chief point of interest in the inquiry into the development of language in Alexandria. The Jews of the city were as important a factor in its commercial life as they have been in the same kind of life everywhere since where they have had an equal chance, and commerce brought them into close contact with Greek. It was, therefore, with this very kind of plain, coarse, corrupted Greek that they had to do. This they gradually took up as their own speech, coloring it, of course, largely with the Hebrew idiom. It is this peculiar kind of Hebraistic Greek that appears in the Septuagint and in a less degree in the New Testament. Surrounded as they were by Greek life and customs and compelled to use the common medium of intercourse, it is not strange that the Jews forgot their own tongue, and the most plausible reason for the Greek version itself was this very need of the sacred books in a tongue they could understand. It certainly accounts for the character

[3] J. VITEAU, *Étude sur le grec du Nouveau Testament*, Paris, 1893.

of its Greek, which, as I have said, is nearer the language of the street than is that of the New Testament. The higher and better expressions of the "common dialect" are found in such works as the Wisdom of Solomon and the works of Philo. These manifest, indeed, the same general character of vocabulary, but are characterized by a nobler style. It is because of the fact that we possess all these works of sacred and secular writers that we are able to speak more intelligently of Hellenistic Greek—for, properly speaking, all Greek spoken by foreigners was Hellenistic—but in the Septuagint, in the Wisdom of Solomon, and in Philo we have the meeting place of Hebrew and western thought, and the interesting study for us is the use made of the Greek to give expression to them all. In two particulars the Septuagint, the preparation of which ranged over perhaps about 100 years, is supposed to have influenced the vocabulary of the New Testament. These two particulars are (1) range of vocabulary, (2) significance of vocabulary. It would be natural to suppose that the Greek version which came into immediate and widespread use in the dispersion would have had the effect of stereotyping the speech of the Jews. That it was thus widely used the quotations from it in the New Testament seem to show, as do also the allusions to it and reminiscences of it found all through the epistles, but when we come to estimate just the influence of this wide reading upon the vocabulary of the New Testament we can, as far as range of vocabulary is concerned, agree with Professor Abbott of Dublin, who says that "the amount of the influence of the Septuagint version on the language of the New Testament is very often exaggerated.[4] Let me here express my indebtedness to the work of Dr. Kennedy[5] for his valuable help toward seeing this more clearly. If we leave out proper names and their derivatives, there are 4829 words in the New Testament vocabulary; of these 3850 are found in Greek previous to Aristotle (322 B. C.), *i. e.*, in the period of classic Greek. That leaves about 950 post-Aristotelian words in the New Testament. Of these, 314 are found in the Septuagint.

[4] *Essays Chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments*, p. 67.

[5] *Sources of New Testament Greek*, pp. 62, 88, 93.

As about one-half of this latter number occurs in the writings of the "common dialect," we have about 150 which are peculiar to the Septuagint and the New Testament. "About 30 per cent. of the total number of 'biblical' words in the New Testament occur in the Septuagint." These figures must change the usual conception of the relation of the Septuagint to the New Testament as far as range of vocabulary is concerned. Several reasons might be given for the real facts as we find them, prominent among which would be the need of a wider range of conceptions than the Old Testament writers had been called upon to express, but these reasons are aside from our purpose. Much might be said of the influence of the Hebrew idiom upon the Greek, and it is beyond question that this was, in a measure, stereotyped by the Septuagint. There is a much greater advance in vocabulary than in diction in the New Testament, though the Greek of the Acts, of James, and of the epistle to the Hebrews attains a high level of pure expression. To be sure the writers of the New Testament were themselves Jews, and the influence of their mother tongue, the Aramaic, is evident, but beyond and in addition to this they carry over the familiar idioms of the Hebraistic Greek of the Old Testament. There are also evident, in the diminutives and compounds which in some instances, at least, have no added force, peculiarities of the popular speech of the Alexandrian streets.

Turning from range of vocabulary to the significance of it, we are no longer in a region where mere numbers can tell the whole story. Words must be weighed rather than counted. The contact of Hebrew and heathen thought compelled the transfer of the conceptions of the Old Testament into a medium which, flexible as it was, and finished as it had been, was yet a stranger to all those conceptions. It was no easy task to make the transfer. Two factors were adapting the medium to its more effective use for Christ's own truth, the actual work of the translators of the Septuagint and that discussion of the relation of the Old Testament conceptions to philosophic dogmas which gave a broader, richer meaning to some of the Greek words afterwards to go into the New Testament. Take, *e. g.*, such a list

of words as these, all of which had been used in the LXX with a peculiar "biblical" sense, and what is meant will appear: *ἄγγελος, ἀδελφός, διάβολος, δόξα, ἔθνος, εἴδωλον, εἰρήνη, ἐκκλησία, ἡμέρα, θάνατος, θεός, ἱλασμός, κόσμος, κρίσις, λύτρωσις, μυστήριον, σάρξ.* These words all had their own meanings in classic Greek, but no dictionary of simply classic speech could adequately define them. Take such a word as *πνεῦμα*; Professor Jowett tells us that "to have given a Greek in the time of Socrates a notion of what was meant by the Holy Spirit would have been like giving the blind a conception of colors or the deaf of musical sounds." That very word starts in the Old Testament with a conception entirely foreign to Greek thought. This latter connects it always with its physiological aspect: wind, breath. As the expression of a psychological conception it is unknown in classic Greek. Of course the New Testament has deepened and at the same time more sharply defined the word, but the beginnings of this process are in the Old Testament. The word was carried over to a new sphere by the Septuagint. The deeply interesting study of these changes is brought out in Cremer's great work, which deserves faithful usage by all New Testament students. The center of philosophic discussion in Alexandria was the Museum. Here, through all the years of the city's glory, was carried on that development, refinement, and adjustment of thought which demanded a developed medium of expression. All philosophy in Alexandria had a deeply theological interest; so much so that it has been denied that philosophy pure and simple could be heard there. Ueberweg thus sums up the subjects of their discussions: "The dualistic opposition of the divine and the earthly; an abstract conception of God excluding all knowledge of the divine nature; contempt for the world of the senses on the ground of the Platonic doctrines of matter and of the descent of the soul from a superior world into the body; the theory of intermediate potencies or beings through whom God acts upon the world of phenomena; the requirement of an ascetic self-emancipation from the bondage of sense, and faith in a higher revelation to man when in a state called enthusiasm." Here is a broad range of speculation, and quite a literature remains to

tell of its character. We know how it tried to "purify" the thought of God, even by tampering with the text of the Old Testament, and how its idealizing tendency is manifest in such works as the Book of Wisdom and in Philo. Out of it came the power to express in more significant forms the highest truths of which we are capable. It prepared the way for the "Logos," indeed made that word familiar all about the Mediterranean, and when we come to mark the relation of the epistle to the Hebrews to the Book of Wisdom we shall see how the New Testament takes up its phraseology and uses it for its own purpose. It is to be noted that all that was serviceable for the New Testament was the vehicle of thought, not the thought itself. John's Logos differs from the Logos of Philo, as we shall later see, but that John took a term familiar in Alexandria and Ephesus is beyond doubt. Professor Jowett's reflection upon the language of Philo will confirm what is meant: "As we read his works the truth flashes upon us that the language of the New Testament is not isolated from the language of the world in general; the spirit rather than the letter is new, the whole, not the parts, the life more than the form." No study brings one more clearly face to face with the divine in this message from heaven to us than just this.

Such in brief is the part Alexandria had to take in helping toward the formation of the Greek of the New Testament. By reason of it she stands upon that line which begins in the days of Athens' glory and runs on through five hundred years of varied Greek life. Even as concerns the language in which the New Testament was written, had Christ come sooner than he actually did the "medium" for his truth would not have been fully ready. The form in which we now have the New Testament belongs also to "the fullness of time." Alexandria had a definite mission with regard to that form.

Already we have come close to the second division of our theme in hints regarding the Logos and the epistle to the Hebrews. We turn now to ask directly the relationship of Alexandria

II. *To the thought of the New Testament.*—It is impossible, in

a limited space, to touch upon all the numercus parallelisms which have been asserted to exist between the New Testament and the Jewish-Greek literature of the Alexandrian era. We shall confine our attention to only those which stand out with considerable prominence: the Logos doctrine of John, the teaching of Paul in the epistle to the Colossians, and the epistle to the Hebrews. There are in each points worthy of consideration. Chronologically, in accordance with such judgments as those of Pfleiderer, they should be placed in the order: Hebrews, Colossians, John, which order marks the development and culmination of Christological thought. We shall take them rather as they meet us in the books of the New Testament, and begin with the Logos of John. Whatever may be said as to the limits of the Johannine interpretation of Christ's thought in the fourth gospel, there can be no question that the prologue is his own. Christ does not, as is well known, use the word "Logos" regarding himself. We can quite agree with Beyschlag that there is no Alexandrianism in the direct teachings of the Master himself. Why, then, should John take this peculiar term, and what is its origin? As part of our answer we must give some idea of the way in which the word had been used in Alexandria, and what occasioned its employment. Among the first and fundamental inquiries of Greek philosophy was one regarding the eternal ground of phenomenal existence and another regarding the relation of the infinite cause to the finite world and to the soul of man.[6] The answer to the first inquiry was sought in a primitive substance such as fire, air, water: as regards the relation of the Infinite, there was on one side a denial of a transcendent cause, or on the other the assertion of its entire separation from the world. It could come into contact with the finite only by some intermediary being or form. A materialistic or pantheistic conception of the universe was impossible to the Jews; hence, they were never attracted by those systems which in varying forms identified the Logos with the substance of things. It was the idealism of Plato which offered them help in their religio-philosophic problems, and when he identified this first cause with "the good" *τὸ ἀγαθόν*, and

[6] See DRUMMOND'S *Philo Judæus*, I, p. 28.

Aristotle made him so far above the universe that he could not come into immediate relations with it, is it any wonder that an allegorical method of interpretation attempted, by explaining away the anthropomorphic and anthropopathic expressions of the Old Testament, to elevate and "purify" the Jewish conception of Jehovah, and to show how that Jehovah and the τὸ ἀγαθόν were identical? But the more that line of endeavor was followed, the more completely was the practical value of religion destroyed. A god upon a far away throne of isolated majesty, or one set off in a lonely and self-centered consciousness might be, philosophically considered, a perfect god. It was simply impossible to rest in such cold, dreary abstractions as this. The situation gives us just *the* difficulty which religious philosophy had then to meet, indeed, which it usually has to meet, viz., the satisfaction of the soul through some possible way of communion with God. The doctrine of the Alexandrian Logos came in for just this purpose. Plato had no doctrine of the Logos, but in his teaching regarding the cosmical soul he prepared the way for the Jewish thinkers who studied him. When Philo came to write, this singular word of John's prologue had been for five centuries in Greek thought, now corresponding to the rational law apparent in the world, now to human reason, now to that which was called "the mind," now to the "universal soul" itself, but in all cases occupying an intermediate position, and manifesting that which otherwise could not be known or understood.

Before now we refer to the resemblances and differences in the descriptions of Philo himself, it will be needful for us to look along one other line of thought which converges in him with the one already noticed. It comes from the Hebrew Scriptures, and branches off into Alexandrian literature at the point where the doctrine of wisdom is taken up by the writer of the Book of Wisdom, and set forth in terms of rare beauty. It is apparent in the Old Testament itself in those descriptions, "the Angel of Jehovah" (Ex. 23:21), and "the Word of Jehovah" (Ps. 33:6, 9; Isa. 55:10, 11). In the poetical personifications of this "word," and in the attempted explanations of the former phrase lie the beginnings of the conceptions of an "objective" manifes-

tation of God which was more distinctly set forth in the book of Proverbs in the description of wisdom (chap. 8–9), and which was developed in this form by both *Ecclesiasticus* — a Palestinian work, and in the *Wisdom of Solomon* — an Alexandrian writing, both from the second century B. C. In this latter work the old problem meets us of the reconciliation of the doctrine of a transcendant god — one above and outside the universe — with the doctrine of a god whom we can in some way get at for help and comfort. It is solved by the teaching regarding "Wisdom," "who was present with God when he made the world, and knows what is acceptable in his sight and right in his commandments," . . . . "who knows and understands all things," and who by coming to us, saves us. (*Book of Wisdom*, 9: 9, 11, 18.) "She is the brightness of the everlasting light, the unspotted mirror of the power of God and the image of his goodness. Being one she can do all things, and remaining in herself she maketh all things new, and in all ages entering into holy souls she maketh them friends of God and prophets." (*Ibid.* 7: 26–28.) Weber, in his "Teachings of the Talmud," shows us how in the Targums the "Memra," or "Word of God," is personified to take again this intermediate place. "God dwells in and works through this word."

After briefly noting the striking features of Philo's Logos, we shall be ready to estimate the relation of the whole to the New Testament. At the end of the long line of teachers and thinkers in Alexandria before the dissemination of the gospel message stands this famous Hellenist. He, in a measure, gathers up all that had gone before, and elaborately attempts the fusion of the best elements of Greek culture and Jewish theology. At times we seem to have an almost astonishing anticipation of something which meets us in the pages of the New Testament, only to find, after all, that it is to be taken in another sense widely removed. It is, therefore, not surprising that in some instances directly opposite conclusions should be formed regarding his teachings. Of one thing we may be sure, and that is that he reflects fully and clearly the intellectual tone and aim of Alexandrian culture in the years before Christ's com-

ing. When he calls the Logos God and distinguishes between θεός and ὁ θεός as John does; when he posits the intermediate work of the Logos in creation; views the Logos as the enlightening power in the world; declares that it lifts up the souls of the good to God and dwells in the hearts of the righteous; defines him by such terms as ὁ θεῖος λόγος, πρωτόγονος, παράκλητος, εἰκὼν θεοῦ, ἀρχιερεύς, we find ourselves close to the thought of the New Testament. Philo, from his point of view, could just as well have written: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not anything made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men." So far John and Philo are in perfect accord. But there is another side of this whole teaching concerning the Logos in Philo, and with that John's teaching is in the sharpest contrast. It is difficult to say whether Philo taught the real personality of his Logos. He certainly would have quickly and emphatically denied the possibility of an incarnation, for he believed that matter is evil. Greek philosophy, Jewish speculation, Jewish-Greek religious philosophy could never have written, "And the Word became flesh." As Dr. Plummer puts it in his Commentary on John (Cambridge Grk. Test.): "The personification of the divine word in the Old Testament is poetical, in Philo metaphysical, in St. John historical." John's reflection upon the life of his Master, with the help of the Spirit, and perhaps of the christology of Paul's later epistles and of the teaching of the epistle to the Hebrews, gave him the content of his prologue. At any rate, he took this much-talked-of word out of the region of mere speculation and made it stand for a reality that had lived and acted, suffered and triumphed amid the familiar scenes of Judea and Galilee. Whether John had read Philo we cannot say. We do know that Alexandrian teachings were spread far and wide and had influenced Palestinean theology.[7] The persistent repetition of the teaching of the intermediary character of the Logos, all through Greek philosophic thought, as well as the

[7] See GFRÖRER'S *Das Jahrhundert des Heils;* II. Theil.

equivalent doctrine of Wisdom and of the Word in Jewish theology—did not these lead John to the selection of this term? It commended his gospel to Greek readers at once, whether they would receive it or not; it gave definite, sharp, clear outline to the vague, uncertain, shifting speculations regarding that being who could represent God to man and present man to God; it put matter in its right place; it gave inspired assent to all that was good and true in the thought that Alexandria herself had worked out. The very discussions of the schools made way and place for the word. John's use of it is one of the instances wherein a word that had long served a noble purpose was glorified by being made the minister of the Holy Spirit in the revelation of truth. Formal then as the relation of Alexandria is to John's prologue, we can better appreciate all that that prologue means by some understanding of the unwearied but unsatisfying philosophizing of the Egyptian capital.

Along that line of historical criticism of the New Testament, which really began with Ferdinand Baur, of Tübingen, some gains have been made to the number of genuine books, but much is yet under discussion. Both the pastoral epistles and the closely interrelated letters to the Ephesians and the Colossians have been persistently denied a place among the writings of Paul. The epistle to the Colossians is characterized as "Deutero-Pauline," and mainly for the reason that it shows traces of Alexandrian modifications of Pauline thought. It comes, therefore, in view of this, into the line of our inquiry. Has the letter the impress upon it of the Judea-Greek thought of Egypt? It is the christology of the epistle that has been for certain objectors its condemnation. Now, we may admit at once that in this respect the epistle is unique. Nowhere else has Paul reached such a height, nor with such fullness set forth the supremacy, majesty, and comprehensiveness of the name of Christ. Before we examine the alleged Alexandrian influence behind, and informing the teaching, let us for a moment recall the reason for it. Thessalonica had had her troubles; Corinth had heard the derision of the Greeks about the resurrection doctrine; Galatia had been bewitched by Judaizing teachings; in

Colosse a new and complex error had shown its seductive face. It came with large promises; it demanded definite and rigorous conditions. It had a new way of implying the insufficiency of Christ's redemption and offered a supplement that appealed to pride. It had behind it a doctrine with which every Alexandrian thinker was familiar, whether he accepted it or not—the essential evil of matter. This was accompanied by the usual teachings of the separateness of a good God from the world, and the necessity of getting free from all contaminations of sense. Intermediate beings were necessitated in view of the former; asceticism in view of the latter. Cerinthus, the exponent of just such heresy as this in John's time, was, at one time, a resident in Alexandria. It was a kind of teaching that was in the air. The valley of the Lycus was admirably suited to it, for, as one has said of it, "the decay and mixture of old creeds in the Asiatic intellect had created a soil of loose fertility—a footfall there sufficing to upturn to the warm air half-germinating theosophies." The Colossians were told that if they would prove their worthiness by their rigid self-denials they might raise themselves higher and higher toward that mysterious unseen world in which dwelt those beings who had come out from the abyss of divinity, and of whom Christ was one. They could thus have a knowledge that could belong only to the initiated. They could have the sweet satisfaction of being spiritually above their fellows here, and of being redeemed, in part, by their own actions hereafter. Impelled anew to vindicate the supreme honor of his Master, the apostle wrote these sentences in the first and second chapters of the epistle (1:15–20; 2:9–15), which should do away with their vague and complex imaginings and stop their misguided strivings. In reading them one is at once struck with those terms which afterward played such an important part in the gnosticism which flourished in Alexandria and went thence to other parts of the world, *e. g.*, *πλήρωμα*, *γνῶσις*, *ἐπίγνωσις*, *σοφία*, *σύνεσις*, and the characterizations of the orders of the spiritual world, *θρόνοι*, *κυριότητες*, *ἀρχαί*, *ἐξουσίαι*. We are also impressed with the phraseology which has become familiar to us in the study of Philo and the Jewish-Greek Alex-

andrian literature. Of this kind is the description of Christ as the *εἰκὼν τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἀοράτου* (1:15), or as *πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως*, and the definition of his work according to the Stoic model in the term *συνέστηκεν*—(1:17). May it not be true, in view of all this, that we have at least an Alexandrian follower of Paul in these christological sections? The question carries us at once to the examination of these singular terms and of the thought in relation to that of the other and accepted epistles of Paul. That Alexandrian phraseology has been borrowed here, as in the case of the Logos of John seems clear enough. In connection with his doctrine of the Logos Philo uses just such descriptions as we find in this epistle with the exception of the word *πλήρωμα*, which does not ever have with him the sense required here. But just as the Logos was in the mind of John a different conception from Philo's, so with Paul a difference goes through all the interpretations which open up these terms. The widening, spiritualizing work of Alexandria had been busy with them, and while it failed in getting the right notion of the eternal Logos and his relation to God, its very struggles with conceptions in this profound and speculative region of thought called into being expressions, which, now, in our New Testament set forth to us, as far as human language can, the truth in these high matters. Paul took in part Alexandrian terms to meet Alexandrian speculation and to set right the would-be wisdom about him. We say, Paul, though mindful of the supposed contradictions to his own ways of thinking, which are said to exist in this epistle. If it be true that everywhere else Paul makes not Christ but God the ultimate end of creation—a conception never assigned to the Logos of Alexandrian speculation—yet in his thought the universe has its final aim in the kingdom of God, or in Christ its king, and of that glorious manifestation which shall issue in just this kingdom all creation is expectant[8] (Rom. 8:22). If it be said that the teaching that the indwelling of the divine fullness in the incarnate Christ is directly opposed to all that Paul elsewhere says about his emptiness and humiliation, it may be replied that correct exegesis puts the epistle's teaching into direct line

[8] See BRUCE'S *Paul's Conception of Christianity*, p. 335.

with all that is elsewhere given (see Lightfoot). It is true that angels and angelic powers have a new position and prominence in the words of this epistle, but that is because they had usurped the place of Christ in the false teaching under correction. The very way in which the apostle refers to them shows that he thinks little of their orders and ranks, in view of the wholly inferior position that is theirs when compared with Christ, who is Lord over all. Both the epistle to the Romans (8 : 38) and those to the Corinthians contain similar enumerations. Indeed, there is not a doctrine in these noble passages which is not in its germ stated in the undisputed epistles. These doctrines awaited but the occasion of this critical moment in Colosse for their full explicit statement. To argue that because all the terms here used appeared in the gnosticism of the early second century, therefore this epistle must date from that time, is to forget that this whole trend of thought had existence before this time. If one looks into the various works which deal with this strange compound of western and oriental notions, he will find hardly any two agreeing as to the time or place of its origin. It came out of the fusion of racial habits of thought, and was busy with its solutions in one form or another before the apostle's day. As another has said, "it is found in the Zend Avesta ; it is found in Philo." As Paul uses them, the words would not be adequate for the later expression of its conceptions. No, we are not dealing here with the gnosticism of the second century, but with a Judeo-Christian form of speculation that gained its inspiration in all probability from Essenism, as that had in part from such philosophic teachings as found place in Alexandria. The epistle is not Alexandrian in thought ; it has borrowed Alexandrian phraseology, but it has put to it the sober, spirit-inspired teachings of the apostle.

One other field of investigation remains, and then we are ready to summarize results ; that is the epistle to the Hebrews. It is worthy of separate and fuller treatment. For, apart from its value as an exposition of the place and lasting validity of Christianity, it compels care in all statements regarding standards of canonicity and the measurement of worth by known

authorship. The same criticism which has made Colossians Deutero-Pauline, has made this epistle Alexandrian in origin and tone. Nay, more, the criticism which dismisses none of the Pauline letters as by a later hand has marked the Alexandrian impress upon this epistle. It does not fall within the scope of this article to discuss the question of authorship, nor to make an extended estimate of the Greek as Greek, nor to compare the style with that of Paul. The one question which interests us is, "Have we evidence of Alexandrian influence of any kind?" The answer must consider (1) the expression of the thought, (2) the thought itself. As introductory to the former, let me call attention to the purity and finish of the Greek. There are some Hebraistic terms in it such as were common to the Christianized Greek of the time, *e. g.*, κληρονόμος, ἁγιάζειν, σάρξ καὶ αἷμα but as a whole, we have here to do with some of the best Greek in the New Testament. We are not now concerned with Professor Plumptre's supposition that the author of the *Book of Wisdom* and of the epistle to the Hebrews may have been Apollos, but we are indebted to him for some facts which are useful for our study. We have already spoken of the *Book of Wisdom* as standing in the line of the development of the Logos doctrine on the Jewish side. Is it not significant that this book has in it some of the most characteristic words of the vocabulary of the epistle to the Hebrews? In describing Christ as "the effulgence of his glory" the distinctive term ἀπαύγασμα is from the Alexandrian book, as is also the word πολυμερῶς in the same verse, and when the writer would describe the word of God as "quick and powerful and sharper than any two-edged sword," the significant term of the comparison lies again in a description of the Logos found in the same book (*Wis.*, 18 : 15). Besides these, six other significant phrases appear in these two works which are peculiar to Alexandrian thought and to this epistle as *e. g.*, ὑπόστασις, θεράπων, καινίζει. A further list of twenty-one words, such *e. g.*, as τελειόω, βεβαίωσις, ἐντυγχάνειν, πρόδρομος,[9] etc., is used in a characteristic sense in both writings. If we add to these another group of forty-four words and

[9] See *Expositor*, Vol. I, 1875, p. 335.

phrases which are common to Philo and our epistle, and which are used in the latter in such a way as to be characteristic, *i. e.*, not as common, ordinary terms, we must acknowledge that there has been some Alexandrian influence at work upon the vocabulary. Some of these words, such as ἀπαύγασμα, τελειότης, ὑπόστασις, δημιουργός, συνείδησις belong to those to which reference has been made as being prepared by the discussions of the schools for the important part they have to take in the New Testament. Nor is the influence, as far as language is concerned, limited to mere words. There are parallelisms with the thought of Philo which give us parallel descriptions, and we find in all three writers, the author of the *Book of Wisdom* Philo, and the penman of the Hebrews a like fondness for compound words and such rhetorical effects as are gained by assonance and oxymoron. The finished style indicates a cultured mind familiar with Greek idiom, and capable of the nicest use of it. Again, the quotations in the epistle follow the Greek of the Septuagint, even when that differs from the Hebrew, and, what is more to our purpose, follow the text of the Alexandrian version of the Septuagint. There can be little question, then, that, as far as the expression of thought is concerned, we have the clearest traces of the influence which we have been seeking. Our final question is about the thought itself. Among modern interpreters of the epistle Pfleiderer has most clearly set forth what he conceives to be the Alexandrian molding of the substance of the letter, and he finds the following decisive marks of its shaping hand: (1) The conception of the universe as presenting the opposition of the invisible, imperishable, archetypal world, to the visible, perishable world of appearance, copied from the former. This takes the κόσμος νοητός of Philo, and applies it to the blessings of salvation. "It combines the religious conception of the kingdom of the Messiah, or of heaven with the philosophical idea of a heavenly or archetypal world." Of course, the whole is changed from ideal abstraction to concrete blessed realities. (2) The conception of Christ which, following the lead of the teaching regarding σοφία in the *Book of Wisdom*, lays more emphasis upon his metaphysical

oneness with God and raises him to the cosmical principle of the universe, although this conception "remains in the background without exercising any real influence on the writer's view of the historical Christ." (3) That conception of the death of Christ which makes it the overcoming of the devil, who has the power of death. The dualism of the epistle is of two cosmical forms, Christ and Satan; and Christ destroys the form of Satan. With these formative conceptions all the attendant teachings regarding redemption — faith, righteousness, and ultimate salvation — are in accord, and the whole from an entirely different point of view, and with different means presents substantially the teachings of Paul. This whole view is certainly fascinating. It agrees well with what we might suppose from our study of the language of the epistle. How far can it be said to be true? One thing is sure: the spirit of Philo is not in the book. The antithesis between shadow and substance is clear enough, and the changeless validity of Christianity as over against the temporal, perishable, cultus of the Jewish temple, is set forth in the realities of the heavenly sanctuary, the eternal High Priest, and the mighty intercession. Over the angels, over Moses, over every earthly priesthood He has been exalted, and our hope centers in that world to which He has gone; our faith makes it real to us. This is the very essence of the doctrine of this great epistle. While it is true that the conception of a supersensuous world as in contrast to this earthly world is a biblical conception; while it is true that other teachings, such as that of the heavenly Jerusalem, or of the angels, or of the two ages, or of Satan as having the power of death are Palestinian, it may be no less true that the FORM under which the whole is here presented is Alexandrian. Underneath and conditioning the whole presentation of the truth, is the antithesis between the "ideal world," *i. e.*, heavenly world, and the reflection of it seen in the crude forms of the temple, and the wearisome repetitions of the altar and the priesthood, which antithesis should bring every thoughtful Jew to realize how meager, after all, in these things alone, were his privileges. It was a new way of setting forth the universal, eternal truth of the gospels; of

telling of the comprehensiveness and glory of the "last" revelation; of "retranslating out of a particular dialect into a world-form," the message about a spiritual kingdom. The upper world and the future world became one as "the object of hope, the goal of perfection, the day-dream of rest, the conviction of faith." The dualism between flesh and spirit, so prominent in Paul, gives place to another which results from this antithesis between the world of blessed perfection above and imperfection here. Christians have tasted of "the powers of the age to come." They are to leave the first principles of Christ, among which is reckoned the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and press on to perfection. This last is one of the significant words of the epistle. There enters into it the thought of satisfaction with cleansing from sin by the sacrificial act of our great High Priest, but it looks also to that consummation which comes when the world above, now ideally present, shall be ours in full possession. So the eschatology is molded by this underlying conception. Before the earthly sanctuary began, the heavenly was, and it shall be, forever in the heavenly Jerusalem where he, who is Priest forever after the order of Melchezidek, shall make intercession for us. Space permits only thus the merest outline of the form of presentation. The cold, vague speculations of the Platonist, quickened and made definite by the truth of the Christian, seem to have given form to the truth of this splendid epistle. Little need have we to try and force its teachings into the world of the Pauline type; rather, our Testament is richer in the varying forms by which it seeks to present Christ and his kingdom to us. When James and Peter, and Paul and John, and the unknown penman of this noble letter are compared, they show no contradictions. Alexandria is not out of harmony with Ephesus or Jerusalem, but, in working out her mission, has done a part that is worthy of recognition, and rich in results. With all her endeavor to separate the nucleus of truth from its Jewish encasement, and give it universal scope, she could never have succeeded alone. Philo himself is the best evidence of that, but all her endeavor was making much ready for the time when Christ himself should set aside Jewish and heathen temple alike, and when he

came and taught us to worship "in spirit and in truth," and opened to us the kingdom which shall be eternal as he is eternal, then, in part, Alexandria's words and forms were used to tell the "good tidings." To know it is but to deepen our interest in that busy complex life in the Egyptian capital; to broaden our understanding of the purpose of God among the nations; to give new pleasure to our study of the word itself.

# JONATHAN EDWARDS' IDEALISM.

## WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE ESSAY "OF BEING" AND TO WRITINGS NOT IN HIS COLLECTED WORKS.

By EGBERT C. SMYTH,
Andover.

IN 1829 the Rev. Sereno Edwards Dwight, D.D., published, in an appendix to the first volume of his edition of the works of President Edwards, his great-grandfather, two series of papers, one entitled "The Mind," and another named by their editor "Notes on Natural Science." In the preceding "Life" Dr. Dwight claimed that most of these essays were composed by Edwards between some time in his sophomore year at college and his call to the church in Northampton, Mass.—that is, between the fifteenth and twenty-third years of his age, inclusive. Many of these articles, including some of the most remarkable, were assigned by Dr. Dwight to the period of Edwards' college life. That discussions so independent and original in conception, acute in distinction, sequacious and persistent in reasoning, and embracing so great a variety of subjects, often complex and difficult, should emanate from a youth from fourteen to sixteen years of age is indeed extraordinary. It is not, therefore, surprising, especially as Dr. Dwight makes but brief reference to the grounds of his opinion and affords his readers no means for its verification, that the more critical spirit of the present day has questioned, or hesitated to accept, its conclusiveness, and has suggested a renewed examination of the manuscripts.[1] Having an opportunity to make such an investigation through the originals of some of the early writings of Edwards, including the series on science, but not the one called "The Mind," and also through copies of a large number of remarks on subjects in

[1] *Cf.* GEORGES LYON, *L'Idéalisme en Angleterre au XVIII^e siècle*, Paris, 1888, pp. 429–31; A. V. G. ALLEN, *Jonathan Edwards*, pp. 16, 17.

divinity, belonging to a series also supposed to have been begun in college days, and which was continued through life, I have presented the evidence thus obtained in a paper which has been published by the American Antiquarian Society in its *Proceedings*.[2] Dr. Dwight's judgment of the early date of the compositions is confirmed.

The inquiry thus made developed satisfactory reasons for the opinion that a paper whose title, given by its author, is "Of Being" was one of the earliest that were prepared, whether for the series in science or philosophy or divinity. Nor merely this. It has a special importance in relation to its author's subsequent thinking. It expresses metaphysical presuppositions and judgments which entered into the first definite and independent formation of his theological opinions. It sets forth *in nuce* a view of the universe which, so far as appears, he never lost. It helps to a better understanding of some of his teachings which are most repugnant to his critics. Its idealism is a fitting philosophical counterpart to a main article of his faith, to a leading principle of his theology, and to an effective and permanent element of his power as a preacher. I refer to his well-known doctrine of an immediate divine communication to men of spiritual light and life.

It is the object of this paper to point out some indications — mainly derived from writings not contained in Edwards' collected works, but known to me through the manuscripts referred to above — of this importance which attaches to the essay on Being, and, more largely, to its author's idealism.[3]

As preliminary I will adduce some statements of the essay just recalled: Something exists. It is impossible to think otherwise. The supposition that Nothing is "is the greatest contradiction, and the aggregate of all contradictions;" "it is

[2] *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the annual meeting held in Worcester, October 23, 1895;* new series, Vol. X, Part 2, pp. 212–47, Worcester, 1896. Also, *ibid.*, October 21, 1896, Vol. XI, pp. 176, 251, 252.

[3] The essay "Of Being," as edited by Dr. Dwight, may be found in his edition of the *Works*, Vol. I, pp. 706–8. An exact reprint from the original, with a facsimile of a part of it, is given in the *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society*, above referred to.

necessary some being should eternally be." This eternal being must be infinite, omnipresent, not solid, something we can never conceive of as not being. It is space; and space, to "speak Plain," is God. This necessary universal, eternal Something exists "nowhere else but either in created or uncreated consciousness." The universe exists "nowhere but in the divine mind;" "spirits only are properly substance;" all else is "more like a shadow."

One indication of the importance to Edwards of the thought and argument of this paper, and especially of its idealism, is the frequency and manner with which he recurs to it. It stands practically at the head of the "Notes on Natural Science," since the only preceding portion, which treats "Of the Prejudices of Imagination," is introductory to the series. It is immediately followed by, and connected with, the elaborate essay on "Atoms," with its numerous corollaries, in which the conclusion that "there is no proper substance but God himself" is variously reaffirmed and applied. It forms thus a basis for subsequent physical discussions. It appears also to have been one of the earliest of all in the three series, viz., "The Mind," the "Notes on Natural Science," and the "Miscellanies," or discussions of topics in divinity. In the list of subjects set down to be handled in the first of these divisions, or books, the external world is mentioned as a topic to be treated in the "Introduction;" the subject of "Prejudices" is entered second, and this direction is given: "In treating of Human Nature, treat first of Being in general." Proceeding to the essays, we find in the ninth in order of composition this statement: "Space, *as already observed*,[4] is a necessary being, if it may be called a being; and yet *we have also shown* that all existence is mental, that the existence of all exterior things is ideal."[5] The previous observation and proof on which stress is here laid do not appear in any preceding number or numbers of the series entitled "The Mind." They are to be found in the essay "Of Being." Pass-

[4] The *italics* in this and the following quotations are inserted by the writer of this article.

[5] *Works*, ed. DWIGHT, Vol. I, p. 673.

ing to the "Miscellanies"—whose notation begins with the letters of the alphabet, used first singly, then doubled, and proceeds with Arabic numerals—we read in f, that is, in the sixth of a long succession which mounts up beyond at least fourteen hundred numbers, and includes some hundred and fifty which Dr. Dwight assigns to the last two years of college life and the two following of graduate residence:

Spiritual happiness, *as we have shown and demonstrated*[6]—contrary to the opinion of [most who believe] that nothing is substance but matter—*that no matter is substance but only God*, who is a Spirit, and that other spirits are more substantial than matter; so also it is true that no happiness is solid and substantial but spiritual happiness, although it may seem that sensual pleasures are more real, and spiritual only imaginary; just as it seems as if sensible matter were only real and spiritual substance only imaginary.[7]

Following the series entitled "Miscellanies" further, we read in an Observation marked pp, that is, the forty-second in the series:

We know there was Being from eternity; and this being must be intelligent, for how doth the mind refuse to believe that there should be being from all eternity, without its being conscious to itself that it was; that there should be from all eternity, and yet nothing known, all that while, that anything is. This is really a contradiction; and we may see it to be so, though we know not how to express it. For in what respect has anything had a being, when there is nothing conscious of its being; for in what respect has anything a being that [of which] angels nor men, nor created intelligences know nothing, but only as God knows it to be? Not at all more than there are sounds where none hears it, or colour where none sees it. Thus, for instance, supposing a room in which none is; none sees the things in the room; no created intelligence. The things in the room have no being any otherways than only as God is conscious [of them]; for there is no colour there, neither is there any sound, nor any shape, etc."[8]

Here there is a reaffirmation of the idealistic thought, and even of the argumentative illustration, which appear in "Of Being."

No. *27a* reasons thus:

God is a necessary Being, because it is a contradiction to suppose him not to be. No being is a necessary being but he whose nonentity is a contradic-

[6] A superfluous "that" is omitted.

[7] MS. copy, f, p. 1173.

[8] *Ibid.*, pp, p. 1.

tion. *We have shown* that absolute nothing is the essence of all contradictions; but being includes in it all that we call God, who is, and there is none else beside Him.[9]

In No. 94 = 146, whose theme is the Trinity, Edwards boldly applies his philosophy to this mysterious doctrine. I will recur to this paper later, and reproduce at this point merely a reference in it to the essay "Of Being":

I will frame my reasoning thus: If nothing has any existence at all but in some consciousness or idea or other; and therefore the things that are in us created consciousness have no existence but in the divine idea; or, supposing the things in this room were in the idea of none but of God, they would have existence no other way, *as we have shown in the natural philosophy*, and if the things in this room would nevertheless be real things; then God's idea, being a perfect idea, is really the thing itself; and if so, and all God's ideas are only the one idea of Himself, as has been shown,[10] then God's idea must be his essence itself, it must be a substantial idea, having all the perfection of the substance perfectly; so that by God's reflecting on Himself the Deity is begotten: there is a Substantial Image of God begotten. I am satisfied that though this word *begotten* had never been used in Scripture, it would have been used in this case; there is no other word that so properly expresses it.[11]

In No. 108 = 160, a charming paper in which an accomplished man of letters and affairs has recognized an anticipation of a leading thought in Wordsworth's theory of poetry, occur these words:

Now we have shown that the Son of God created the world for this very end, to communicate Himself in an image of his own excellency. He communicates Himself, properly, only to spirits, and they only are capable of being proper images of his excellency, for they only are proper *beings, as we have shown.*[12]

No. 365=417, on "The Being of God," affirms:

The only reason why we are ready to object against the absolute, universally unconditional, necessity of God's being is, that we are ready to conceive as if there were some second cause. We are ready to say, Why could

[9] *Ibid.*, 27*a*, p. 1.

[10] In a preceding part of this number, viz., 94.

[11] *Ibid.*, 94, pp. 80, 81. The word *begotten* is underscored in MS. copy.

[12] *Observations concerning the Scripture Œconomy of the Trinity, etc.;* New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1880; Appendix, p. 94. *Library of the World's Best Literature*, Vol. VIII, under *Jonathan Edwards;* New York, J. A. Hill & Co. MS. copy, 108, p. 695.

not there have been nothing? as if this were a second cause. It is because of the miserableness of our conceptions that we are ready to imagine there is any such supposition, we cannot tell whether there be any such supposition or no, except we know what nothing was, but we cannot know what it is, because there is no such thing.[13]

Again, in No. 587:

God is a necessary Being, as it is impossible but that God should exist, because there is no other way. There is no second to make a disjunction, there is nothing else supposable. To illustrate this by one of God's attributes, viz., Eternity. It is absolutely necessary that eternity should be, and it is because there is no other way. To say, Eternity, or not Eternity, is no disjunction, because there is no such thing to make a supposition about as no eternity, nor can we in our minds make any such supposition as not any eternity. We may seem to make such a supposition in words, but it is no supposition, because the words have no sense in thought to answer them; they are words as much without any sense in thought . . . . as these: A crooked straight line, or A square circle, or A six angled triangle. If we go to suppose that there is no eternity, it is the same as if we should say or suppose that there never was any such thing as duration, which is a contradiction, for the word never implies eternity, and it is the same as to say that there never was any such thing as duration from all eternity, so that in the very denying the thing we affirm it.[14]

In the same vein is Observation 650=702:

It is from the exceedingly imperfect notions that we have of the nature or essence of God, and because we cannot think of it, but we must think of it far otherwise than it is, that arises the difficulty in our mind of conceiving of God's existing without a cause. It is repugnant to the nature of our souls, and what our faculties utterly refuse to admit, that anything, that is capable of being one part of a proper disjunction, should exist, and be as it is, rather than not exist, or exist otherwise, without cause. Our notions of the divine nature are so imperfect, that our imperfect idea admits of a disjunction; for whatsoever is not absolutely perfect doth so. With regard to everything that is imperfect there is dependence, or contingent existence, implied in the nature of it, or we can conceive of its being a part of a disjunction. There is a *Thus*, and an *Otherwise*, in the case. As soon as ever we have descended one step below absolute perfection possibility ceases to be simple; it divides and becomes manifold. Thus, for instance, we cannot conceive of God without attributing succession to Him; but that notion brings along with it contingent existence, and introduces with it a manifold possibility. There is nothing that exists in a successive duration but it will necessarily follow from thence that it is simply possible that it might exist infinite otherwise than it doth, and that it

[13] *Ibid.*, 365, p. 8. [14] *Ibid.*, 587, p. 10.

might not exist at all. It is a contradiction to suppose that Being itself should not be. If any one says, No, there may be nothing; he supposes at the same time that nothing has a being. And, indeed, nothing, when we speak properly, or when the word has any meaning, *i. e.*, when we speak of nothing in contradiction to some particular being, has truly a being.[15]

No. 880=932 is an elaborate and powerful exposure of the unreasonableness of the supposition that the order of the universe may arise from the eternity of the process, irrespective of an intelligent and purposive cause. The necessity of being is argued as in previous citations. I will give a brief extract:

There is a reason to be given why God should have a Being; the reason is because there is no other way, there is nothing else supposable to be put with the Being of God as the other part of the disjunction. If there be, it is absolute and universal nothing. A supposition of something, a supposition is of the being of God; it does not only presuppose it, but it implies it: it implies it not only consequentially but immediately. God is the sum of all being; and there is no being without his Being: all things are in Him, and He in all. But there is no such thing supposable as an absolute universal nothing; we talk nonsense when we suppose any such thing; we deceive ourselves when we think we do, in our minds, suppose it, or when we imagine we suppose it to be possible. What we do when we go to think of absolute nihility (if I may so speak) is only to remove one thing to make way for and suppose another. In this case there is no such thing as two parts of a disjunction; when we are come to being in general, we are come to one single point, without a disjunction. Therefore God is, because there is no other way; God therefore is because there is nothing else to make a supposition of.[16]

The idealism, explicit or implicit, in the foregoing citations, and clearly and strongly stated in the youthful treatise "Of Being," appears in the treatise on *Original Sin*, posthumously published, and written towards the close of Edwards' life.[17] In it he maintains

. . . . that all dependent existence whatsoever is in a constant flux, ever passing and returning; renewed every moment, as the colors of bodies are every moment by the light that shines upon them; and all is constantly pro-

[15] *Ibid.*, 650, pp. 10, 11. The words *Thus* and *Otherwise* are underscored in the MS. copy.

[16] *Ibid.*, 880, pp. 22, 23.

[17] The Preface, by the author, is dated May 26, 1757. He died March 22, 1758.

ceeding from *God*, as light from the sun. *In Him we live and move and have our being.*[18]

Another indication of the importance to Edwards of the idealism affirmed in the paper "Of Being" is his extension of it to finite spirits. In the essay named he limits his reasoning to material things, and recognizes, in contrast, spirits as "properly substance." So in the paper "Of Atoms" he says: "Speaking most strictly, there is no proper substance but God himself. We speak at present with respect to *Bodies* only."[19]

Later, under date of February 12, 1725, he writes in his diary:

> The very thing I now want, to give me a clearer and more immediate view of the perfections and glory of God, is as clear a knowledge of the manner of God's exerting himself with respect to Spirits and Mind, as I have of his operations concerning Matter and Bodies.[20]

In the copies of *Observations* which I am using there is one which I suppose to have been composed, at the latest, not far from his settlement at Northampton February 15, 1727:

> 267. God's Existence. The mere exertion of a new thought is a certain proof of a God; for certainly there is something that immediately produces and upholds that thought. There is a new thing, and there is a necessity of a cause. It is not antecedent thoughts, for they are vanished and gone; they are past; and what is past is not. Do we say, It is the substance of the soul; if we mean that there is some substance besides that thought, that brings that thought forth; if it be God, I acknowledge it; but if there be meant something else that has no properties, it seems to me absurd. If the removal of all properties, such as extension, solidity, thought, etc., leaves nothing; it seems to me that no substance is anything besides them; for if there be anything besides, there might remain something when these are removed.[21]

This is an extension and form of idealism distinct from Berkleianism. It might easily pass on to mere phenomenalism

[18] *Works*, New York ed., Vol. II, p. 490. Edwards' thinking was early and powerfully affected by Sir Isaac Newton's *Optics*. See his papers, written when a youth, "Of Insects," *Andover Review*, Vol. XIII, p. 10; "Of the Rainbow," *Proc. Am. Antiq. Soc.*, New Series, Vol. X, pp. 239–41; "Of Being," *ibid.*, p. 244; *Works*, ed. DWIGHT, Vol. I, pp. 708, 716, 755, 756; II, p. 555, note [New York ed., II, pp. 89, 90, note].

[19] *Works*, ed. DWIGHT, Vol. I, p. 713.

[20] *Ibid.*, Vol. I, p. 105.

[21] MS. copy, 267, p. 6.

and skepticism, or else to an idealistic pantheism. But Edwards was neither a skeptic nor a pantheist. He is simply in this "Observation," according to his wont, reasoning a given thesis out. He is developing his theistic idealism of matter into a theistic idealism of finite mind. Such a use of a principle shows the importance it had for him.

To avoid leaving a wrong impression as to his conception of created spirits, I would call attention to the fact that in No. 383 =435, written perhaps from two to three years after the one just cited (267=319), Edwards, in order to sustain the position that the first principle of all things is "an intelligent willing agent" gives reasons for supposing that man's soul is "the image of that first principle." "It is only the soul of man," he remarks,

> that does as that supreme principle does; this is a principle of action, has a power of action in itself, as that first principle has. . . . . Man's soul determines things in themselves indifferent, as motion and rest, the direction of motion, etc., as the supreme cause does. Man's soul has an end in what it does, pursues some good that is the issue of its actions, as the first universal principle does. Man's soul makes, forms, preserves, disposes, and governs things within its sphere, as the first principle does the world. . . . . So that, if there be anything amongst all the beings that flow from this first principle of all things, that bears any sort of resemblance to it, or has anything of a shadow of likeness to it, spirits or minds bid abundantly the fairest for it.[22]

Elsewhere, and in various ways, Edwards recognizes man's likeness to God. "Many," he writes in an earlier Observation, No. 150 = 202, "have wrong conceptions of the difference between the nature of the deity and that of created spirits. The difference is no contrariety."[23]

We cannot explain away the apparent difference of representation by the supposition that when Edwards attributes to man distinct agency, personal causality, the selection of ends of action and their realization, he is accommodating himself to ordinary and unscientific modes of apprehension. He uses such forms of expression when he is reasoning carefully and with precision of statement.

The explanation lies in the peculiarity of his idealism. It

[22] *Ibid.*, 383, pp. 6, 7. [23] *Ibid.*, 150, p. 63.

did not, to his thought, empty the common ways of speaking of meaning and reality. He points this out in reference to the material universe. He says:

> Though we suppose that the existence of the whole material Universe is absolutely dependent on Idea, yet we may speak in the old way, and as properly, and truly as ever.[24]

The external world, ultimately, exists only mentally in God's idea, yet it is not a mere act or state of the divine consciousness; it is God operating *ad extra*, expressing himself in finite modes, forms, creations, according to a stable purpose and by an established constitution. In the same way the human soul is not a mere wave or bubble in the boundless ocean of being, or simply an element or momentum in the infinite life, but a divinely created being, capable of receiving, by divine communication, intelligence and inclination akin to the divine knowledge and holiness and blessedness. Only, Edwards would say, we may not think of it as a substance unrealized in its properties and capable of subsistence, even in conception or by way of abstraction, apart from and without its attributes. Its constitution, like that of atoms, is God working in the sphere of mind, as Edwards supposes God to work in the sphere of matter. We may use his definition of matter to set forth his conception of a soul:

> *That which truly is the Substance of all Souls [Bodies], is the infinitely exact, and precise, and perfectly stable idea, in God's mind, together with his stable Will, that the same shall gradually be communicated to us, and to other minds, according to certain fixed and exact established Methods and Laws:* or in somewhat different language, *the infinitely exact and precise Divine Idea, together with an answerable, perfectly exact, precise and stable Will, with respect to correspondent communications to Created Minds, and effects on their minds,*

only remembering that minds, as thus referred to, are images or reproductions *ad extra* of the creative spirit, so that their substance, in which all their properties inhere, is simply his idea and will thus expressed. Personal identity to Edwards, after he saw the insufficiency, as he did very early, of Locke's definition

[24] *Works*, ed. DWIGHT, I, p. 669.

of it as sameness of consciousness, seems to be a divine constitution, that is, God working according to a fixed plan, and realizing a fixed idea and purpose. Or, in terms of modern metaphysics, God is the *continuum* of all finite existence, material or spiritual. A soul, as to its substance, is God's exact and stable idea of it, together with his stable will that it shall be a spirit, in his image, having its subsistence by constant communication from him, according to fixed and established methods and laws.

"Man's reason and conscience," he writes, "seems to be a participation of the divine essence."[25] And again: "An inclination is nothing but God's influencing the soul according to a certain law of nature."[26] God comprehends the "entity of all his creatures, . . . . they are but communications from him: communications of being are not additions of being."[27]

We may obtain further light upon the importance to Edwards, and in his theology, of his early idealism, by observing various applications of it.

It drove from his mind a mechanical interpretation of nature. One of the corollaries to the essay on atoms, that follows "Of Being," reads thus: "Hence we learn that there is no such thing as *Mechanism;* if that word is intended to denote that whereby bodies act, each upon the other, purely and properly by themselves."[28]

Edwards' idealism is variously and intimately connected with his thought of God as triune. He began early to write on this subject, and from time to time through his life recurred to it. He fully realized its mysteriousness, but did not regard it as a blank to human reason. His speculations upon it, I may say in passing, deserve to be gathered together and suitably published. They would now be more impartially judged, and probably better appreciated, than at any time since they were written. In pro-

[25] *Ibid.*, 210, p. 108. [26] *Ibid.*, 301, pp. 489, 490.

[27] *Ibid.*, 697, p. 69. Edwards distinguishes spirit from matter in various ways. Matter is absolutely dependent for existence on mind. Mind is necessary to matter, not *vice versa.* "Perceiving Being only is properly Being." *Works*, ed. DWIGHT Vol. I, pp. 671, 679, 5.

[28] *Works*, ed. DWIGHT, I, p. 714.

fundity of thought, acuteness and subtility of reasoning, and spirituality of atmosphere, they rank with the best that has been said from Augustine to Dorner. Their underlying philosophy is that which first appears in his writings in the essay on Being. His Trinity is the biblical revelation, the Father, Son, and Spirit. It is, rationally and philosophically, "three, distinct, in God, each of which is the same," "God and the Idea of God, and the Love of God."[29] Each is substantial, each is God, "an infinitely perfect substance, even the essence of God."[30] This essence or substance is a "pure Act." There is nothing passive, nothing unrealized in the divine nature. Substance becomes, in Edwards' thought, life; being is perfect knowledge, perfect love. It is remarkable that a youth in college, not yet seventeen perhaps, who had been stirred and fascinated by John Locke, should have struck out for himself, against the tide of English philosophy, such an application of idealism to a doctrine then so remanded to obscurity or to the realm of a faith that, at least in this particular, renounced the aid of reason. "I think it is within the reach of naked reason," he writes, "to perceive certainly that there are three, distinct in God, each of which is the same, three that must be distinct; and that there are not, nor can be any more, distinct, really and truly distinct, but three.[31] Later he writes: "It the more confirms me in it that the perfect idea God has of himself is truly and perfectly God, that the existence of all corporeal things is only ideas.[32] Some thirty years or more later, while at Stockbridge, after his dismission from Northampton, he copied into his "Miscellanies" extracts from Chevalier Ramsay's *Philosophical Principles of Natural and Revealed Religion*,[33] which contain thoughts similar to those which he had elaborated and committed to paper not far from the time of his graduation, as in the following extract: "If God has an idea of himself there is really a Duplicity, because if there is no duplicity it will follow that Jehovah thinks of himself no more than a stone; if God loves himself and delights in himself, there is really a Triplicity;

[29] *Ibid.*, 308, p. 99.

[30] *Ibid.*, 94, p. 79.

[31] *Ibid.*, 94=146, p. 79.

[32] *Ibid.*, 179=231, p. 93.

[33] Published in 1748–9. [Copied by E. *ca.* 1751.]

three that cannot be confounded; each of which are [is] the Deity substantially."[34]

His christology shows not a few traces of his idealism. I have elsewhere published[35] some of his thoughts respecting the person of our Lord, its divinity, its humanity, its Trinitarian significance, its relation to creation and redemption, and man's knowledge and love of God and delight in him. He anticipated many of the best conceptions in later discussions—the affinity of the two natures as a presupposition of personal union, the genuineness, the activity and value of our Lord's humanity, his eternal mediation.

I will not, for the reason just intimated, cite passages on these topics. Their examination shows the constant influence of his early and spiritual philosophy. It will suffice for the present purpose to quote these words:

> From what insight I have into the nature of minds I am convinced that there is no guessing what kind of union and mixtion by consciousness, or otherwise, there may be between them; so that all difficulty is removed in believing what the Scripture declares about spiritual union of the persons of the Trinity, of the two natures of Christ, of Christ and the minds of saints.[36]

"Observations" not used in any edition of Edwards' works abundantly confirm that interpretation of his "Treatise on the End of God in creation" which makes it wholly antagonistic to an imputation of selfishness to God. They also connect the entire expression of God in creation with the ontological Trinity. God's manifestation of himself in and towards the creatures corresponds with the inward revelation through Fatherhood and Sonship and the procession of the Holy Spirit. Edwards' noblest utterances on this subject—and much is in his highest strain—is an amplification of the thought founded in his philosophy of nature and mind, that the Son is the perfect idea of God, and the world is a communication and image of the Son.

How closely his conceptions of spiritual holy life in man, of regeneration and sanctification, of eternal peace and blessedness,

[34] MS. copy, 94, p. 86.

[35] See *Observations concerning the Scripture Œconomy of the Trinity*, Appendix, pp. 72–89.

[36] MS. copy, 184, p. 93.

depend on his thought of the immediateness of the divine activity in the soul is familiar to every reader of his published writings. His unpublished *Observations* show their intimate connection, in some respects their identity, with his philosophy of being.

Most of all, I think, they relieve the impression his published writings sometimes make of a certain quantitative valuation of being which obscures, to say the least, the spirituality and ethical value of his theory of virtue.

Being, we see, was to Edwards no mere mathematical quantity or sum of magnitudes. "The Infiniteness of God," he says,

> consists in his perfect comprehension of all things, and the extendedness of operation equally to all places. . . . We ought to conceive of God as being Omnipotence, Perfect Knowledge, and perfect Love, . . . . and not as if he were a sort of unknown thing, that we call Substance, that is extended.[37]

Even his doctrine of the arbitrariness of God in his choice of the objects of his recovering grace becomes, from the point of view of his philosophy, a way of setting forth God's supreme personality and of exalting our conception of human personality. Arbitrariness means to Edwards that God has not tied himself down to particular methods and rules and proportions, revealed at certain stages and in special phases of his universe, but is ultimately determined by the laws and proportions of a perfect and absolute wisdom, and by the motive of a love which is at once the complete realization and only perfect expression, and indeed the very substance and essence, of his infinite being.

My purpose is accomplished if I have by the foregoing references to unpublished or neglected *Observations* called attention to the philosophical presuppositions of Edwards' theology. I have given but hints. The subject deserves a far more adequate treatment, which requires a command of all his philosophical and theological manuscripts.

I am disposed to believe that Edwards has a future in American theology which, in some respects, will be greater than his influence in his own generation or since. It will come by his being better understood,[38] by a more just and adequate apprecia-

[37] 194, p. 63.

[38] For such a better understanding there is need of a new edition of Edwards

tion of his deficiencies as well as of his excellencies, by an estimate of his thought, not so much as heretofore by his controversial treatises, and more than as yet has been possible through his ultimate conception of God, of His relation to the universe, of the immediateness of His presence and agency in nature and the human soul, in creation and its end, in history, in redemption, in His kingdom. The severity, the harshness, of some of his accents will be judged in the light of his intense appreciation of the divine holiness. His defective views of freedom, his failure to attain a just apprehension of personality, will appear in due connection with inherited and abstract logical methods and principles, and with conceptions derived from the philosophy of Locke which he himself rose above in his religious life and in his thought of God and of man as created in the image of God and for God. His spiritual philosophy, his sense of God, the light and radiance of his pure and lofty character, the penetrativeness of his insight into the unity of the *cosmos*, the depth of his thinking, will attract and enlighten and quicken. Better premises than those from which he at times argued with a tireless inexorableness will be found to be really his own, and he will be valued more for his reason than his reasonings. We shall not go back to him, nor yet go forward without him. In American theology he is the one peerless thinker whom no one can afford to neglect who would worthily cultivate the science of the highest, even the supreme, Being, Reason, and Life.

works, conformed to the standards of critical historical scholarship now accepted. In this opinion, formed in part by a study of some of the manuscripts, I am happy to be confirmed by the judgment of one of the ablest metaphysicians and most accomplished and best-known editors of philosophical writings in our time, who remarks, in a letter received a few months since: "I think we ought to have a critical edition of the works of Edwards by one competent philosophically and theologically—a work as yet unexecuted, but which I should rejoice to see done. . . ."

# ETHICS OF THE STATE.

By D. B. PURINTON,
Denison University.

ETHICAL law is universal. It pertains to every conscious, voluntary act of every free intelligence throughout the universe. Herbart has rightly contended that "the ethical appertains to self-active beings only." But every free intelligence is self-active and therefore ethically responsible.

Ethical law is immutable. It changes not to suit the convenience, ignorance, or caprice of its subjects. And yet its subjects may change. Indeed they must change. In a real and important sense Mr. Kidd is right when he says: "The moral law is the unchanging law of progress in human society." The law is immutable, but society, to which it pertains, being progressive, is of necessity mutable.

Ethical law is inexorable. Its demands cannot be avoided nor its penalties escaped. Lord Bacon's famous dictum that "ignorance of the cause deprives us of the effect" may be true in physics, but in ethics no amount of ignorance can ever rob righteousness of its reward or release iniquity from its penalty. A free intelligence may, indeed, cherish a certain conviction, indulge a certain feeling, perform a certain act, until to him it becomes habitual, automatic, morally indifferent. But the deed itself is not morally indifferent, and no number of repetitions can ever vacate its ethical quality. The law is simply inexorable, independent of human thought or deed.

Furthermore, ethical law applies to every possible combination of free intelligences. The popular aphorism "Corporations have no soul" is a mere ethical fiction. Every corporation is the aggregate soul of the men composing it. Corporate acts not infrequently discount the reputed ethical valuation of the individual souls concerned therein. But such discount is always in

the interest of truth. You can never make a dishonest corporation out of honest men.

The same principle applies to society, the community, the state. There is one immutable law that governs the individual, the corporation, the body politic. If two moral agents combine to execute a purpose which neither could accomplish alone, there is manifestly no power in such combination to free either the agents or their act from the responsibility of moral agency. And if such combination include a hundred, a thousand, or a million such agents, moral responsibility is neither shifted nor lessened thereby. Mere arithmetic cannot affect the moral quality of an act or a system of acts.

If these definitive statements be correct it is evident that there is such a thing as "ethics of the state."

The state may be briefly defined as "organized society exercising sovereignty over its members." Government is the agent of the state, whereby its will is announced, its sovereignty enforced. By "organized society" I do not mean a literal organic unit. Herbert Spencer is somewhat extreme on this point, contending that "the fundamental principles of organization are the same for individual organism as for social organism —being mutual dependence of parts." Professor Patten has rightly criticised this conception of society. In case of the individual the several parts depend upon the same vital force and the same will, which secures their interaction and reciprocal function, while in the case of society they depend simply upon similar environment, which is powerless to give such security. It is by disregarding this distinction that Mr. Spencer treats society as a literal organic unit, worships individualism, proposes land nationalization, and in the expressive words of a recent critic "elects to turn his back upon the rising sun and so remains where he was fifty years ago"—among exploded social problems.

Let it be distinctly understood, then, that when the state is spoken of as an organic unit it is not meant thereby to deprive its constituent members of their autonomy or their moral responsibility. With this understanding the definitions given

above may be taken as sufficiently accurate for the present purpose.

Viewing the state then as organized society, we must concede its dependence upon moral law. It is so dependent for its very existence. The individual may exist on principles of simple self-interest. But the social compact requires upon the part of all its members such constant sacrifice of individual interests to the general good that nothing short of moral principle will secure the needed sacrifice. Moreover, there is a certain ethical altruism without which the state can make no progress. The reasons are not far to seek. Intellectual progress is by the nature of the case exclusive, while the moral law is inclusive. Only a few citizens can respond to the appeals of science, but the many may respond to those of moral law. And then this intellectual minority by some curious law of heredity tends to diminish and run out. Take two young men of the same age, one with intellectual aspirations, the other without. The latter will marry at twenty-one years; the former will spend ten years in self-improvement and then marry at thirty-one. A recent writer has calculated that upon moderate estimates, from this difference alone, the progeny of the ignoramus will in three centuries become fifteen times as numerous as those of the literatus. Be this as it may, the relative sterility of the upper classes in all civilizations has become notorious. In India the high caste Brahmins have dwindled to a few thousands, while the lower castes are numbered by millions. Even in London the so-called upper and middle classes combined include but 16 per cent. of the population, while those in abject ignorance and poverty are more than twice as numerous. Manifestly we cannot depend entirely or even largely upon the intelligent few (Matthew Arnold to the contrary notwithstanding) for the regeneration of society and the perfection of the state. The state is to be improved mainly by improving the average citizen. And the average citizen is to be improved mainly by an appeal to ethical law, reinforced by spiritual truth and religious sentiment.

It is therefore of utmost importance to bear constantly in

mind the ethical aspects of society and the state. There is always danger lest that organic entity we call the state be regarded as an impersonal entity and its acts as devoid of moral significance. Our best citizens seem quite as prone as others to this error. Even preachers are not exempt from it. How seldom do we hear sermons on themes like these: "The moral value and responsibility of the state," "Its available improvement and possible perfection," "The rights and duties of government," "The religious obligations of citizenship," "The ethical responsibility of society for the social character of its members," and the like! It is manifest that such themes are of value to the citizen, the state, and the church, that they are recognized in the gospel, and that they ought to be recognized, occasionally at least, in the ministrations of the gospel.

Questions of state ethics may be loosely divided into two classes: duties of citizens to the state, and duties of the state to its citizens.

I. What are the duties of the citizen to his state?

1. He ought to love his state. This duty is fundamental and in a sense includes every other. Patriotism is a well-worn theme and yet one cannot easily define it. Janet makes it to include love of country, soil, kindred, laws, institutions, and I know not what beside. It has two principal forms, the martial or conservative and the civic or constructive.

(1) Martial patriotism is first in time but second in rank. Its function is to defend the state in times of danger. In the early history of all nations these times of danger have been frequent and trying. In such emergencies it is certainly a noble thing to risk one's own life for the life of his state. This spirit may degenerate, however, into the mere love of fighting and then it becomes brutal. The history of mediæval Europe is marred with much of this martial brutality. Mr. Ruskin's exhortation to British soldiers to follow their profession for the love of it is a thing of questionable propriety. It has a certain flavor of mediæval barbarity about it. And that was almost a ludicrous illustration of this tendency furnished by a British regiment which, in time of the late Franco-Prussian war, with true

martial zeal begged the privilege of fighting in that war, but when asked upon which side they desired to fight, replied that they had not considered that matter — the regimental officers could decide that. As civilization advances this form of martial patriotism recedes. I assign two reasons for it.

(*a*) It is not so much needed. In a state of barbarism, might makes right. In a state of perfect civilization, right makes might. Now, as nations advance from the former to the latter of these conditions, the tendency to oppression and tyranny subsides, and the fighting patriot disappears, or ought to disappear, from the land. The present spectacle in peaceful Europe of four millions of men retained in standing armies, whence the last vestige of active patriotism has fled, and where the countrymen of Cæsar, Napoleon, and Wellington have nothing left to do but grow lazy and immoral, while their women at home are bearing burdens of toil and hardship which the men ought to bear, is a pitiable travesty on civilization, a standing disgrace to humanity. If these great armies, now admittedly useless save as a menace to one another, were at once disbanded, the probability of individual invasion or of a general European war would be immensely diminished thereby. Advancing virtue is the best national guard. Sir John Lubbock rightly says: "Ideas are more powerful than bayonets."

(*b*) But again, this martial form of patriotism is receding before the advancing spirit of general philanthropy. As modern inventions annihilate space and bring even the remotest nations into the same circles of mutual acquaintance, commercial interest and friendship, the national horizon of the average citizen becomes immeasurably widened. He loves his own nation none the less, but he loves others all the more, and is increasingly averse to taking arms against them. He is still a citizen of his own state, but he is likewise a denizen of the world, a member of humanity, and his sympathies are now as broad as the race itself.

(2) Civic patriotism is of slower growth than the form just mentioned, but is superior in character and abiding in value. I have called it constructive patriotism, because its primary pur-

pose is, not to preserve the life of the state, but to improve the character of the state, to build it up in justice, virtue, and moral power. Men fight to preserve the state, not to improve it. If "revolutions never go backward," revolutionists seldom go forward. Progressive results are incidental, existing beforehand in the mind of Providence, no doubt, but not in the minds of those who fight. In 1861 if there was here and there a single soldier who fought for a great moral idea—the abolition of African slavery—there were ten soldiers at his side who were fighting merely to preserve the Union. Now that the Union is preserved, it is the mission of true patriotism to perform the greater work of up-building the state in righteousness and justice, increasing the efficiency of government, enacting and executing just laws, removing all manner of bribery and corruption, and securing to every citizen absolute equality of right, in fact as well as in form. For the exercise of this civic patriotism there will always be ample opportunity.

2. The second duty of the citizen is to obey the state. There are three possible cases:

(1) Where a law is believed to be wise and good. In this case exact and prompt obedience is the manifest duty of the citizen, no matter how burdensome it may be to himself personally.

(2) Where a law is believed to be unwise. In this case I still contend that the citizen is to obey. Of course, a law really unwise will ultimately work injury to the state, and ought to be repealed. But the individual citizen, not being gifted with infallibility, cannot certainly decide as to the unwisdom of a law. The only real test of a given law is to be found in strictly obeying it. And I ought to coöperate with my fellow-citizens in furnishing this needful test. If thereupon the law is found to work well, I must withdraw my objections, at whatever cost of personal or party pride. If it works ill, the chances are that my fellow-citizens, observing its evil tendencies, will join me in its destruction. But if not I must wait patiently and serenely till some further illumination shall come to the darkened minds of my countrymen.

(3) The third case is that of an iniquitous law. Ought the citizen to obey a law of the state which he believes to be morally wrong? The time-honored answer to this question is an affirmative. Under Roman jurisprudence, the citizen gave to the state his first allegiance. The universal worship of "divus imperator" meant a universal yielding of individual conscience to the state. Such political philosophers as Hobbes and Bentham have, in recent years, virtually insisted upon the same thing.

Now, this question involves a larger one, namely, Must a free moral intelligence always obey his own conscience? If he does, it will inevitably lead him astray. If he does not, he rejects his only possible moral guide, abdicates his manhood and becomes a thing instead of a man. My answer is, that he must obey conscience in every case. If, in a given instance, he is led astray thereby, then his guilt attaches to some previous defection from duty, and not to his present loyalty to conscience.

If this general principle of ethics be correct, then a negative answer must be returned to the question before us. The citizen must not obey a wicked law. In determining its moral character, he should seek all possible personal enlightenment, but the final decision must be his own. The state cannot keep his conscience for him. If he disobey the law, however, he should not seek to avoid its penalty. Let him stand up like a man, and take the full consequences of his disobedience. He is thus a law-abiding citizen, vindicating his own loyalty and condemning the law that he breaks.

3. A third duty of the citizen is to support the state. There are two kinds of support to be rendered, material and moral support. A state without money is like a sail without wind, an engine without steam. But the state has no resources of its own apart from those of its citizens. It exists simply for their benefit It performs certain indispensable services in their behalf, for which an equivalent should be cheerfully rendered, at least in so far as may be necessary for the support of the state. To evade a just tax is to rob the state of that material support which is due from every citizen.

But besides this there is a certain moral support due to the state. This may be rendered in two ways, negatively and positively. We are told not to speak evil of dignitaries. This is good religion and good politics as well. Would that the modern American might heed the admonition. Any course that tends to weaken the general respect for law and the agents of its execution is calamitous, if not indeed criminal. Mr. Debs has furnished the country a forcible illustration of this danger. But positively the citizen should give to the state and to its agents who stand for the majesty of law the moral support of his personal approval. I know a pastor in Ohio who recently lost his place for upholding righteous law against a mob. I glory in that pastor and blush for his church.

4. Another duty of the citizen is to coöperate with the state Every man ought to be an active politician. Manifestly there must be division of labor in politics as elsewhere, but what citizen has a right to shirk all political labor? Verily not one. It is easy enough to lift one's hands in holy horror and cry out against the wicked politicians. But citizens so doing should remember that by this very disgust they are at least modestly admitting their own superiority over those citizens who, in the aggregate, control the policy of the state. But if they are thus superior, then their own duty to the state is by so much the greater than that of those whom they criticise. When therefore they withdraw from all political action they are, in the expressive language of another, virtually "turning the country over to the devil," in so far as their own conduct can contribute to this direful result. They become disciples of Professor Huxley, who intimated that if there is to be no radical improvement in society he would "hail the advent of some kindly comet which would sweep the whole affair away." And yet, from his vantage ground of superior knowledge and character, he proffered no aid whereby such radical improvement might be wrought. The citizen may coöperate with the state:

(1) By voting. This duty is too obvious to need mention There is more implied in it than we often think. The mere casting of a ballot is a small matter, albeit many of our good citizens

forget to do even that. But the proper preparation for intelligent and effective voting is not so small a matter.

(2) By affiliating with a political party. Whatever may be truthfully said against partisan politics, it still remains that under any form of popular government the existence of at least two powerful political parties is an absolute necessity. There must be one party to furnish the office holders, and another to watch them—one to dictate governmental policy, and another to criticise it. This latter function is quite as needful as the former.

(3) A third method of coöperating with the state is by accepting office. Office seeking is by no means reprehensible And yet if office holding were universally regarded as a duty to be performed rather than as a reward to be sought it would be far better, both for the state and for the office holders themselves. Virginians have always viewed the matter somewhat in this light. At least they have made it a point of honor to accept any office, however low, to which their fellow citizens might call them. And it is a beautiful thing to see an ex-President of the United States acting as road overseer in his district, simply because he is called to this humble office and deems it his political duty thus to serve his fellow citizens.

(4) I mention one more method in which the citizen may coöperate with the state. It is by joining privately and unofficially with other citizens of the state. This I deem the most important method of all.

Other methods have their serious limitations and drawbacks When all possible precautions have been taken one must still often vote in the dark, if he votes at all. Primaries and political conventions have a perverse habit of going wrong. Office holding has its peculiar difficulties. In the first place, only a very few of the citizens can ever hold office. In the second place, many of the offices are financially not worth holding. In the third place, nomination for office is treated as a proper reward for party service, and he gets it, not who is best fitted for it, but who best pleases the party leaders. And, in the fourth place, that experience of petty office holding, in constant

expectancy of something better, which usually precedes political advancement tends to make a man subservient, to rob him of his independent manhood, and to render his whole happiness in life dependent upon securing an office, for which he is tempted to barter time, health, family, comfort, integrity, virtue, honor, all.

For such reasons it seems certain that the average citizen can best serve his state, not as an office holder or a political partisan with old scores to settle and old obligations to meet, but as an independent private citizen, with hand unfettered and tongue untied. Let such citizens associate themselves in the interest of some special cause that has merit in it. Let them gather and digest the facts pertinent thereto. Let them know definitely what they want and persist in demanding it, and eventually the politicians must yield. This is the history of political reform in this and other lands. The abolition of slavery after long years of agitation by private citizens, the civil-service reform law enacted after ten years of party rejection, the interstate commerce law, the ballot act and election laws adopted by Massachusetts and other states, the defeat of the Tweed ring and later of the Tammany ring in New York City, and the late political reforms in Chicago and elsewhere are familiar examples in the recent history of reform in this country.

Students of European history need not be reminded that political reforms there have never emanated from the throne. In this country it is equally true that politicians never inaugurate reforms. It is for the personal interest of office holders here, as of monarchs there, to maintain things as they are. It is not the man who is in that wants a change, but the man who is out. But the true patriot, whether in or out, will merge personal interests in the welfare of the state. The best citizen is he who recognizes most keenly and comprehensively his moral relations. The strongest bond that binds the citizen to his state is not social or political, but ethical.

II. Having briefly referred to the duties of citizens, I now come to the duties of the state itself. In order to consider them more intelligently, it is well to remind ourselves of the nature

and the rights of the state. Reverting to our definition, "A state is an organized society exercising sovereignty over its members," we note:

1. What is left out of this definition. Geography, language, race, and religion are left out. A state may defy natural boundaries, may speak many languages, may involve many races. Indeed, race lines are fading out everywhere. The German is no longer a pure Teuton, nor the Englishman an Anglo-Saxon, nor the Frenchman a Gaul. As for the American, he is rapidly becoming a cosmopolitan mixture of all bloods under the sun. Religion is likewise left out. Brahma, Gautama, Confucius, Odin, Osiris, Mohammed, the Pope, might once partition the earth and dictate state lines; they can do so no more. Some one has said of Solon that he "wrested the earth from religion and gave it to labor," evidently meaning that he began the secularization of the state — that long process which is now practically complete.

2. Note in the second place what is included in this definition. There must be society, organization, sovereignty. A lone man living in a hut on Treasure Island for seven years cannot constitute a state. Neither can unorganized savages, pirates, or gypsies constitute a state. Organized sovereignty is the essential characteristic of the state. Whenever a social compact exercises sovereignty over its members it thereupon becomes a state. Whenever it ceases so to do it thereupon ceases to be a state. Even the Spencerian philosophy, with all its ultra-individualism, believes in "the central ruling power' that protects the individual citizen.

I may now proceed to enumerate some of the duties peculiar to the state.

1. The first duty of the state is sovereignty. This is both a duty and a right, pertaining to all states alike, regardless of size, wealth, or power. And it means much.

(1) The state is sovereign over itself. By this is meant that there is no human authority back of the state whence its rights are derived, and no tribunal above the state to which its enemies may appeal. Ultimate sovereignty, of course, dwells in

God alone. But he seems to have entrusted to the state so much of it as pertains to the social order. And no human power can rightfully interfere therewith. Every act of the state is self-authorized, self-controlled, final. If mistakes occur they can be corrected only by the state itself.

(2) The state is sovereign over its own domain. And this includes all the land, the entire territory of the state. It all belongs originally to the state. Whether any or all of it shall be owned by individuals is a question to be determined by the state alone. If anyone doubts this statement, let him remember two things concerning it: (*a*) Every valid conveyance of land must be made with the approval of the state and duly recorded by its authority. (*b*) Under the principle of eminent domain, so called, the state may step in at any time and, without the consent of its owner, take possession of any land within its territory for public uses. You buy your land from your neighbor, but you take your title from the state. Moreover, you hold that title subject to the sovereign will of the state. This does not mean, of course, that rights of ownership once conceded by the state and acquired by the citizen can be violated without due compensation. Neither does it mean that they can ever be violated, save alone for the public need. I may have a right to give my son a wheel, or to refrain from giving. But having once given it on certain conditions I have no right to seize it from him in violation of those conditions. He has acquired property rights in that wheel which must be respected. This illustration must not be pushed too far. But it represents, in some sense, the actual condition of things in every civilized state on earth. Henry Georgeism, like Hegelian philosophy, might do for some ideal world somewhere, but it cannot apply to this actual world as it now is.

(3) The state is sovereign over its citizens. A man is born into society without his own consent, and cannot escape it. Aristotle said long ago: "The state exists by nature, and man is by nature a political animal." He may throw off his allegiance by removing from one state to another. But this is only to change masters. He has not escaped state sovereignty thereby.

Indeed, there is only one possible method of such escape. If he can find somewhere an unoccupied portion of the earth's surface, take personal possession thereof, and live the life of a hermit thereon, he then becomes his own sovereign. Such empty sovereignty is not worth having or mentioning. But otherwise the citizen is subject to the state from birth date to death date.

This sovereignty includes three things, the life, liberty, and property of the citizen. The state can innocently take the life of the citizen for cause. No other power can. This right the individual has yielded to organized society. He has therefore no right remaining, except in necessary self-defense, to take either his own life or that of another. The state can likewise take personal possession of the citizen for all purposes within the scope of the state's authority. Even the property of the citizen is subject to the state. I know we are apt to think otherwise. A man is supposed to be master of his own powers, and of the property he acquires by the legitimate use of those powers. And yet this is a grave mistake. You have a million dollars. You say this money is your own and you can do as you please with it. Try it and see. Put it into useful buildings on a college campus, and it is not likely that anyone will interfere with your property rights. But try it in another way. Put it into an immense powder mill or asafetida shop, just on the border of the same campus, and you will soon find whether the state has any authority over your property.

A just state will never exercise authority over the citizen or his possessions in any arbitrary or unjust way. Professor Huxley rightly contended that government should restrain such individuality as is inconsistent with society, while it encourages such as tends to social evolution.

2. The second duty of the state is to protect its citizens It is for the purpose of protection that the state exists. At least this is its chief purpose. But for this purpose, it need exercise no sovereignty either over itself or over its subjects. No man can protect himself or secure his own rights. Relentless forces of nature, savage beasts and more savage men, are con-

tinually resisting him and defeating his strongest efforts. He finds a universal struggle for existence, and that constant competition which Spencer has piquantly called "commercial cannibalism." He is subject to complicated conditions and forces over which he has, and can have, no control. Manifestly he needs a stronger arm than his own to hold these forces in proper adjustment, and to secure the free action of his own powers. Such a protecting arm it is the office of the state to furnish. This protection is threefold, that of person, of property, and of honor.

3. A third duty of the state is to secure the improvement of its citizens. This duty is necessarily somewhat indefinite. And yet the public welfare is to be sought by the state quite as much as the public safety. Mill says: "A government is to be judged by its tendency to improve the people." And it is evidently the duty of the state to adopt and maintain that form of government which is best adapted to improve the citizens. A careful distinction must be made here. The state can seek the improvement of its citizens as citizens only, and not at all as individual personalities. With their private personal character it can have nothing to do. Improvement therein must come incidentally if at all. In other words, the state has a perfect right to make me a good citizen if it can, but it has no right even to attempt to make me a good man. One thing the state can always do: It can teach the citizen the lesson of political altruism. It is perhaps asking too much to expect the average citizen to export himself from himself, and to think and act for the general good. Say what you will of human selfishness, most men act, and will continue to act, in their own personal interest. This is a legitimate force perhaps, but at all events a powerful one for the advancement of men. It needs, however, the constant action of a counter-tendency looking to the public good. This tendency the state ought to furnish. I quote again from Herbert Spencer who says: "From the dawn of life, egoism and altruism are increasingly dependent upon each other." The citizen and the state may supply these two elements respectively, from whose proper combination the constant progress of society is to come.

4. A fourth duty of the state is to respect the rights of its citizens. There are two classes of these rights, one which they have, hold, and exercise only in their combined capacity as a body politic, a brotherhood. Manifestly there are some things which may legitimately be done by society as a whole, and yet which no private citizen has any right to do. These things belong to the state and lie within the scope of its sovereignty. Life, liberty, and property, when forfeited by the citizen or when needed by the state, must be reckoned in this list. But there are other rights of the citizen which he has, holds, and exercises as an individual being, a private personality. These cannot be alienated by himself or accepted by the state. That is to say, the citizen has given much to the state, but he has not given his personality. You may take by force my property, my liberty, my life, but you must not touch the inner citadel of myself. That belongs to God and to me.

The state must neither transcend the limits of public right nor invade those of private right. Notice what this twofold inhibition means. In a general way it means that the state is capable of doing wrong. If it cannot do wrong, it is manifestly a mere machine and cannot do right. If it cannot abuse its rights, neither can it maintain them. The old doctrine that the king cannot err is decidedly uncomplimentary to the king. But more particularly this inhibition means that the state must exercise only its own rights, and these only in legitimate ways and for legitimate purposes. There are some things the state cannot do, some realms it must not enter. Henry George tells us, "It is not the business of government to make men virtuous, religious, or wise." So far as religion and virtue are concerned this statement is undoubtedly correct. That the state is to furnish the elements of wisdom, however, and the conditions of virtue, there can be no question. Social virtues must be encouraged and social vices repressed. With intrinsic personal virtue, the state, by the nature of the case, has nothing to do. This whole question of individual rights and state rights gives room for great differences of opinion. But there are certain basal truths which can scarcely be challenged. (1) The state is

ordained of God, and is therefore a divine institution. (2) It is so ordained for a specific purpose, namely, to determine and enforce the proper relations between man and man. (3) It is the duty of every citizen to give allegiance and obedience to the state within this its proper scope. (4) The state may rightfully do everything necessary to maintain the rightful relations among its citizens. (5) With the personal character, religious convictions, and spiritual life of the citizen the state has nothing whatever to do. (6) The state must recognize and enforce ethical law, but only that portion of it which concerns the social relations of men as inhabitants of the earth. (7) The state has a right to inquire what a man does, in so far as his deed affects the rights of other men, but has no right to inquire what a man is. (8) No man can be forced to be good, or punished for being bad. It is only as his goodness or badness affects the rights of others that it can even be called in question by the state. (9) The relations of every man to his own conscience, to God, to immortality, and to all spiritual truth cannot be yielded to the state, nor in any wise affected by the state. (10) If the state through its agent, the government, should invade any of these personal rights sacred to the private citizen, in so far as it does this it ceases to be a state and becomes a usurper whom it is both the privilege and the duty of every citizen to resist.

If these principles be correct they will go far toward settling certain vexed questions in political and social science. Some of these questions it may be proper to discuss. They are neither new nor startling, and yet honest citizens still differ concerning them. Conclusions reached herein will be stated with a degree of positiveness and a certain strength of conviction, and yet I trust not without due courtesy to opposing views, or constant hospitality to new light.

I. Should the state enact and enforce laws concerning the Sabbath? The leading facts relative to this question seem to be as follows: (1) The Sabbath is a religious institution, ordained by divine authority and regulated by divine law. Its proper observance is a question between God and the individual human conscience. (2) A rest day is a demonstrated physiological and

mental necessity. Neither man nor domestic animals can long endure the constant strain of laboring seven days in the week. (3) This religious institution called the Sabbath is besides a rest day, and coincides in frequency of recurrence with the physiological and mental requirements of man for periodic rest. (4) It therefore constitutes a convenient rest day, should any such day be adopted by the state.

From these facts certain conclusions may be safely drawn.

1. The state has no right to enforce any observance of the Sabbath whatever. A citizen may perform his full duty to his fellow citizens as such, and still not keep the Sabbath. His dereliction of duty is purely a religious one, for which the state has no right whatever to arraign him.

2. It is both the right and the duty of the state to enforce the observance of a rest day. That is, in so far as it pertains to the relations of man to man. Possibly the state may not force me to rest, but certainly it may force me to allow my employés to rest. Even their willingness to work for me seven days in the week does not affect the case. If I should induce a hundred men to commit suicide that would be a crime justly punishable by the state. And it matters not how slow the suicide may be. Evidently the state may close up my place of business periodically if necessary to secure for its citizens the enjoyment of a proper rest day.

3. There can certainly be nothing wrong in causing this rest day of the state to coincide with this Sabbath of the church. Furthermore, if the sanctions of the Sabbath make the observance of a coincident rest day easy and that of another day difficult if not impossible, it becomes the duty of the state to make these days coincident. Of course, it follows that if for any reason Wednesday, or Saturday, or any other day of the week should obtain universal religious sanction then that new day should be designated as the rest day of the state.

4. Sabbath laws, so called, can never be justified by reason of the religious character of the day. Any laws necessary for the regulation of a rest day, regardless of all religious requirement, are certainly proper. Any others are certainly improper.

Notice, we are not now considering the question of affording legal protection to religious assemblies. That may be right on any day of the week, and for other reasons—reasons equally applicable to innocent and useful assemblies for any purpose whatever.

To some it may not seem necessary in this day of the world to insist upon these plain principles. And yet it is necessary. Virtuous, law-abiding citizens of Kentucky, Tennessee, Maryland, Georgia, Illinois, and other states have recently suffered imprisonments and other pains and penalties at the hand of the state simply because they hoed corn or did some other harmless work on Sunday. I have no words of sufficient strength with which to characterize the atrocious iniquity of such proceedings. It may be unwise for a Sabbatarian to hoe corn on Sunday, but it is infinitely worse for a magistrate to punish him for it. I hope not to be misunderstood concerning this question of Sabbath laws. I certainly believe them to be wrong as relating to the religious day called the Sabbath. As pertaining to a day of rest merely they are right and good, and the name matters not much.

But the conscientious observance of the religious day itself I most heartily approve. The general introduction of the continental Sabbath into this country would be an unspeakable misfortune. I would write the sanctions of the day, however, not on the public statute books, but in the Christian conscience of each individual citizen. Any attempt to force men by law to keep the Sabbath is, in the words of Henry George concerning another matter, to "overstrain the functions of government, and thus weaken it as you do in the animal organism."

II. Should church property be taxed?

This old question is periodically renewed by some special event which serves to fix public attention upon it. The recent assessment of property belonging to Dr. Conwell's church in Philadelphia, and similar instances in New York and elsewhere have given the question something of current prominence.

Now concerning church and state it must be conceded that neither is the creature of the other. The church sanctions the

state by teaching its members to be subject to the powers that be, since they are ordained of God for the control of society. And the state works with the church in so far as its code of social morals is included within the moral code of the church. But beyond this their spheres of operation do not intersect. Each is ordained of God, but for a specific work not committed to the other.

From this principle it is argued that the church should do its own work, neither asking nor receiving aid from the state, and that the remission of taxes upon church property is really a contribution from the state toward the expenses of the church. Possibly so, but the contribution happens to be for state expenses instead of church expenses. Give a man a pure heart, a tender conscience, and an upright personal character and it is practically impossible for him to violate the laws of society. Personal purity never issues in social corruption. But this service the church is constantly rendering to the state. Now if the state sees fit to recognize the service and requite it to the extent of a few paltry tax receipts I see nothing wrong in this. Indeed, I am disposed to commend the wisdom of the expenditure, as compared with investments usually made in burly policemen who keep the peace by brute force. This principle must not be abused, however. Four errors are likely to be committed concerning it.

1. It may be supposed that the church is under some obligation to render service to the state. It is under no such obligation. It is not a police force. The church is under obligation to God, not to the state.

2. It may be supposed that taxes on church property should be remitted because the church is a religious institution. This is a mistake. Religion and morality are not synonymous terms. Unfortunately some religious systems are exceedingly defective in morals. If a certain religion (Mormonism, for instance) makes bad citizens it ought to be suppressed by the state.

3. A third error is to base exemption from taxation upon the fact that the church is a charitable institution. Now "sweet charity" is certainly a beautiful trait of the human

heart, a fragrant flower of Christian civilization. And yet, however beautiful and fragrant, it may be misdirected, its florescence excessive. Edward Denison was dwelling on this possibility when he exclaimed, "Charity is a frightful evil." One may not go so far. And yet I am of the opinion that a man who systematically, persistently, and incorrigibly banquets tramps should be punished for it. Certainly his taxes ought not to be remitted. And the same principle holds concerning charitable institutions. Churches, schools, asylums, hospitals, and the like may properly be exempt because they are unmistakably helping the state — doing what the state would otherwise have to do — but not simply because they are charitable institutions. It is always competent for the state to inquire as to the ultimate results upon good citizenship of the charity dispensed.

4. A fourth error is to hold that all church property must be exempt from taxation. A church may engage in secular pursuits. Any part of its property so used and not evidently rendering special service to the state should be put upon the tax duplicates. Delicate questions may arise in the application of this principle, but the principle itself is clear enough.

III. Should the Bible be read in schools supported by the state? This question involves the whole question of education as related to the state. Is the state responsible for the education of its citizens? I answer unhesitatingly in the affirmative. Considerations tending to establish this answer are briefly as follows: (1) Education is necessary to good citizenship. I have said that the chief purpose of the state is to protect its citizens. This means simply to keep every citizen from intruding upon the rights of every other citizen. But manifestly the first requisite to this result is, that every citizen be instructed as to his rights and their limitation. Without such instruction the work of regulation can never be successful. Political wisdom is not instinctive. (2) As civilization advances this work of protection diminishes, but the necessity for education never ceases. Indeed, the complications of advancing civilization serve only to increase it. Civilization marks a development of human powers, but likewise a multiplication of human wants. And this affects

the state quite as much as the citizen. The simple duties of a vassal to his lord can be understood without much education. Not so with the complicated duties of a sovereign American citizen to the complex government of which he forms a part. (3) It does not follow that the state must actually educate its citizens. All it need do is to see that in some way they are properly educated. If parents, public-minded citizens, corporations, or religious bodies are disposed to engage in this work, they may rightly do so. To the extent in which they do this they relieve the state of the duty of education. But no one can ever relieve the state of its obligation to oversee the work of education, by whomsoever carried on, and to secure to all its citizens at least so much instruction as may be needful for citizenship. If all else fail, the state must do the work itself. (4) All education is actually carried on in the name of the state. Every college and every university holds its property, carries on its work, and confers its scholastic honors in the name and by the authority of the state. If it should teach treasonable or other doctrine dangerous to the state its charter would be annulled and its right to instruct taken away.

Professor Hoffman and other recent writers have revived the doctrine of Plato and the Greeks that the parent even has no right to educate his own child. This view is extreme. The parent has a natural right to teach his child, which belongs to himself and not to the state. But if in exercising this right he teach things subversive of loyalty or public morals, then, and only then, the state can interfere. This does not mean, however, that defects in parental instruction may not be supplied by the state, and that by force if need be.

And now, to return to the original question, has the state a right to include in its scheme of education the reading of the Bible in its public schools? The answer naturally divides itself as follows:

1. It has no right to require the reading of the Bible. That is, it must not force the Bible upon its citizens contrary to their convictions of right. All such compulsion is evidently a violation of religious liberty. Just as much so as it would be to compel

citizens to listen statedly, against their will, to the reading of the Vedas, the Zend-Avesta, or the Book of Mormon.

2. It has a right to permit the reading of the Bible. This must be done if at all in such way as not to be tantamount to compulsion. Such time must be chosen for the reading as will make it possible for those to be absent who do not wish to hear. And the presence of persons conscientiously opposed to hearing should never be required.

3. The reason for this permission I find in the fact that the Bible is a text-book of morals. True it is likewise a religious book. But I am of the opinion that with the majority of men the strictest public morality cannot be maintained without the superior sanctions of religion. The Vedas and the Zend-Avesta in the East, the Eddas in Norseland, the Hermitic books in ancient Egypt, and the Prayers of Hurakan in Central America are among the non-Christian illustrations of this truth. Lecky has rightly said that "all religions governing mankind have done so by speaking to the heart." Simple knowledge of duty is not enough.

4. But when the Bible is read solely as a religious book, for spiritual instruction and devotion alone, the case is altogether different. I believe that no teacher employed and paid by the state has any right to take any part of the time for which he is so paid either to give religious instruction or to inculcate religious sentiment. He may hold distinctively religious exercises in his school, if objection is not made, if he acts as a private citizen and not as an agent of the state, if the exercise is strictly voluntary, and if the time thus occupied is not that prescribed by the state for the official instruction of its youth.

5. Suppose that for any reason the people of the United States should abandon the Christian standard of morals and adopt the code of Buddha, of Islam, or of Joseph Smith. Suppose, for instance, that Gibbon's learned opinions, Ingersoll's eloquent periods, Arnold's *Light of Asia*, or Max Müller's beautiful but doubtful translation of the Yajur Veda should revolutionize the public morals of this country and make Brahmins of us all. Then the Vedas ought to take the place now held by the

Bible as the text-book of the moral code. Then, if any religious book were read in the schools of the state that book should be the Veda. I have made this supposition in order to emphasize the remark that as things now are a Brahmin citizen of this Christian state should be accorded all the rights and privileges which under conditions just supposed I myself might ask as a lone representative of the Christian faith in a nation of Brahmins.

6. The principle of state control over education must not be misunderstood or perverted. Such control extends only so far as that education is concerned which is necessary for the citizen as such. The state may say that every child shall be educated to this extent. But it may not restrict education within these narrow limits of political requirement. Every child is an immortality as well as a prospective citizen. His spiritual personality is immeasurably more important than his citizenship. The one is superficial, involving but a limited earthly existence. The other is central, determining the illimitable expanses of the eternal life. That type of education which simply prepares for citizenship is therefore at best an incomplete thing. Indeed, it is fatally defective. The spiritual development of the child is the essential thing. All else is incidental.

Let no one complain, however, because state education leaves out this essential. The state must leave it out. Because it is so essential, so vital, it cannot be safely entrusted to the state. Physical force must not touch the soul. Violation of this principle has cost Christendom thousands of innocent lives and ages of retarded progress. Let it no longer be violated. This country stands for absolute religious liberty in the world, and can afford to abide by its principles, let who will object.

IV. Should the state make appropriations to denominational schools? This question has been seldom discussed in this country. Not many cases have arisen in which it has been brought to a practical issue. Doubtless many intelligent citizens have not thought far into it. Some have thought that it has no depths into which to look. And yet it is neither an empty question nor a dead issue. Within a few years past it has arrested

public attention as never before. The last Congress of the United States gave many hours to its discussion.

Before approaching the main question here involved, the relation of the state to the denominational schools in general must be briefly referred to. Conditions governing this relation are the following: (1) As a matter of fact these schools exist either by special charter from the state or under general law equivalent thereto. (2) The state does not attempt to manage the school thus chartered, to supervise its action, to exact reports, or in any way to secure the maintenance of its chartered rights and duties. Complete confidence is reposed in its promptness and political honor. (3) It is taken for granted that the school may do some things which the state may not do. Indeed, the *raison d'être* of the school is found in this fact. Notably, the school may teach certain religious doctrines in which its founders are specially interested and for which the state is not at all responsible. (4) It is expressly or tacitly understood that the school is neither to teach doctrines inimical to the state, nor to violate the stipulations of its charter. Upon these conditions the school takes its place as a legal entity in society, henceforth to be treated, both by the state and by individuals, very much as any citizen would be treated under similar circumstances. (5) It will be readily seen that such a school sustains two distinct relations, one to the state, the other to the religious denomination by which it is controlled. Now, since every relation involves a corresponding duty, and duties cannot conflict, it follows that obligations growing out of these distinct relations must be both distinct and self-consistent.

Applying these facts to the question before us, we notice:

1. The state has no right to make appropriations for the general support of such a school. If it does, the state thereupon becomes responsible for all that the school does. If you pay me for doing a certain deed, or bear my expenses in the doing of it, you are in the same position morally as though you did the deed yourself. *Qui facit per alium, facit per se.* Now, since the differential characteristic of a denominational school is its avowed attachment to certain religious beliefs and practices, and

since the state has no right to recognize or encourage any religious matter whatever, it is manifest that such portion of the work of the school as relates in any way to religion is entirely beyond the prerogative of the state. But any general appropriation is applicable to the entire work of the school. Hence some part of the state's money has been paid for teaching religion. This is a clear case of the misappropriation of public funds.

2. As to specific appropriations for stipulated uses, there may be a variety of cases. (1) The state may bargain for a legitimate service which the school may legitimately perform. For example, the instruction of an Indian youth in such things, and such only, as the state can properly require, provided the school were at liberty to give such instruction and such only, and upon special agreement to that effect, would be quite as legitimate as for the state to employ a private citizen for the same service. (2) There may be legitimate service which the school could not legitimately engage to do. For instance, if a given school is bound by relations to its denomination to give certain religious instruction to all its students, then such a school could not withhold this instruction from wards of the state. (3) Paradoxical as it may seem, a school might legitimately do illegitimate service. This would be the case if the government should employ a denominational school to teach the wards of the state, just as its other students are taught, without any restrictions whatever. Such a bargain the school might legitimately carry out, provided it had no convictions to the contrary. But the government has no right to make such a bargain. (4) In the absence of all restrictions or stipulations as to the subject-matter of instruction, it may safely be taken for granted that the bargain is illegitimate. One party to such a contract is certainly wrong; both are probably wrong.

Now, if these principles are applied and strictly enforced, there can be no sort of objection to the state's employing denominational schools to teach its Indian wards. But I hope not to be judged too severely when I express my decided conviction that in all such contracts the chances are far more than

ten to one against the honest application of these principles. Strictly conscientious schools are unwilling to take such contracts. All others are certainly disqualified.

V. I pass to another question involved in the ethics of the state. Should officers of state and witnesses at court be required to take an oath before entering upon their respective duties?

When President Cleveland said, "A public office is a public trust," he uttered no new truth. He simply put into attractive and portable form a very ancient doctrine. Plato held that officers of state have two duties, (1) to make the interest of the citizens their great aim; (2) to take care of the whole body of the republic. It has always seemed proper that officers, when about to assume such grave duties, should give some public assurances as to their convictions and purposes in the case. This expectation has assumed two forms, pledges before election, and oaths of office after election. The history of the civil oath is a long one. The oath itself is based upon the theory that a man who will not naturally tell the truth will become truthful by first calling God to witness what he is about to say, and imprecating eternal vengeance upon his soul in case he should falsify. Or, in case of an officer, that he will be made honest and faithful by means of such solemn preliminary exercises.

Concerning the oath and this theory of it the following may be said:

1. It is only the lowest type of man that can be influenced by such considerations. Any respectably intelligent man knows that all he says and does is in the presence of the Almighty, and under the constant scrutiny of his omniscient eye. He likewise knows that God will punish iniquity neither less nor more because the sinner asks him to. This, of course, in case the citizen testifying or officiating believes in God at all. But in case he does not believe in God the oath has no effect whatever, unless it be to disgust him.

2. The oath as usually administered, by a bad man or at best in a rapid, perfunctory, irreverent manner, has no moral significance whatever. Indeed, it is little short of a blasphemy.

3. In the case of an atheist who is conscientious—and there are some such—the oath becomes an iniquity. Either it requires him to assume a belief in God which he has not, and so to tell an untruth in the forlorn attempt to prove himself true and faithful, or else it debars him, on purely religious grounds, from certain rights of citizenship. Either of these results is both iniquitous and calamitous.

The repeated exclusion of Mr. Bradlaugh from the British parliament simply because he could not conscientiously recognize God in the customary oath of office is a standing reproach against Christian England, in this advanced age of enlightenment, toleration, and religious liberty. Whatever good purpose the civil oath may have served in the past, its day of usefulness is evidently done, and no Christian nation ought any longer to require it.

4. There is another matter closely associated with the civil oath which demands a passing notice. I refer to perjury and the penalties enacted for its punishment. The connection between perjury and the oath is inveterate, and yet it is neither essential nor vital. Indeed, it is merely incidental. The oath is religious in origin and character. Perjury laws are secular. The oath appeals to eternity and the sanctions of the higher life. Perjury laws appeal to time and the sanctions of the earthly life. The former appeal is closed against the state. The latter appeal is open to the state. Historically the two have been connected, as the term "perjury" suggests. But it need not have been so. If a man falsifies at court it is evidently proper to punish him for it. If an officer of state betrays the trust reposed in him as such it is right to impeach him, or to visit other pains and penalties upon him, for malfeasance of trust. No reasonable objection can be brought against existing penalties attached to the violation of an oath. The objection is, that they are attached to so unreasonable and foolish a thing as a civil oath. They are in bad company. In themselves they are just. But they ought to be exacted for the violation of truth or of official duty, not of a needless, meaningless oath. The sole purpose is to make a man tell the truth or do his duty. This

can be accomplished as well without an oath as with it. A pledge or affirmation, as allowed in the Constitution of the United States, and as now practiced in some of the courts, meets the case exactly. Its violation entails the same penalties. It proposes political punishment for political crime. This is just and right. Best of all, it avoids the awful inconsistency of imprecating divine vengeance on a frail, fallible mortal, in case he should come short in any respect of doing his whole duty. I trust the day is not far distant when the substitution now occasionally made will become universal, and when, among all Christian nations at least, the administration of a civil oath will be known only in history. The ends of justice and liberty will be thereby promoted, and the public morals advanced.

VI. Should blasphemy be punishable by law?

This is another of those questions involving the ethical functions of the state. Blasphemy has been variously defined. In its narrow sense it means profane swearing, the taking of God's name in vain. But it likewise includes all irreverence to God by asserting attributes contrary to his nature, by denying attributes essential to him, or by offering any reproach to his divine personality. In some Christian states the statutes against blasphemy include all malicious revilings of God, of the Christian religion, the Holy Scriptures, the established church, the virgin Mary, and the saints. In this country separation of church and state has largely reduced the content of the term "blasphemy" in its legal sense. And still many states of the Union have included much more than profanity in the crime of blasphemy as punishable by law. Recent attempts in certain states to restrain Mr. Ingersoll from lecturing within their borders, and to indict him for blasphemous utterances in his lectures, illustrate the supposed intent of the laws in such cases provided. A man need not swear profanely in order to be indictable for blasphemy.

Concerning this whole subject there are several undeniable statements to be made.

1. Blasphemy is a most inexcusable sin. Every man must either believe in God or not believe in him. If he does not

believe in God why should he be constantly swearing in his name? Such a practice is a piece of unmeaning folly, to say the least of it. But, to say more of it, if one knows the practice to be offensive to his fellow citizens, it then becomes a piece of ill breeding, an inexcusable effrontery. I never yet knew a man to swear from a sense of duty.

But to the one who does believe in God the sin of blasphemy is all the greater. It is simply unaccountable that a man who really believes in an infinite, all-wise, all-holy God should have any disposition either to think lightly of his being or to speak lightly of his name. It is hard for me to respect either the intelligence or the moral sense of a consciously blasphemous man.

2. My second statement is that the state has no right to punish sin. God alone can do that. There are certain sins which the state may punish, but not because they are sins. All sin is disloyalty to God and all disloyalty to God is sin. But some sins, in addition to this essential quality, are likewise incidentally injurious to men. These sins, within limits, the state may punish. But I repeat not because they are sinful, but solely because they are injurious to men. A man may be a horrible sinner against God and his fellow-men may never know it. But even if they do know it, if he takes pains to parade it before them and to glory in it, they have still no right to punish him for it. The relations of every soul to his Maker must be forever held inviolable by the hand of human law.

3. If these principles be correct it follows that the state has no right to punish blasphemy. If it can do this then it can likewise punish every other sin against God. Furthermore, the right to punish carries with it the duty to punish. And the state must act as the spiritual censor of every citizen. Religious liberty must be abolished and inquisitorial fires relighted. These conclusions may be unwelcome and somewhat startling, but they are the outcome of relentless logic and cannot be evaded. The only safe course for the state is to let the entire spiritual being of the citizen absolutely alone. If left free in this realm he may be good or he may be bad. God alone can judge him. But one

thing is certain. If not freely good he cannot be good at all. Forced goodness is not good, nor fiat virtue virtuous.

4. On the other hand, it cannot be maintained that all blasphemy must be exempt from punishment. In certain cases there may be elements connected with it which make it punishable. I mention two such possible cases. (1) What is known as vicious or malicious swearing. This form is symptomatic. It indicates something. It shows that its perpetrator is angry and in all probability is such a one as is about to break the peace. He can therefore be righteously apprehended for it, just as a citizen who threatens another can be bound over to keep the peace. Notice, however, that the basis of action in this case is found not in the actual relation of the prisoner's words to God, but in their prospective relation to man. Any other words indicating the same condition of mind might bring the same interference by the state. Manifestly, an injurer of society cannot be released from punishment simply because he is likewise a reviler of God. (2) The second case is that of habitual, profuse, indiscriminate, excessive profanity. This practice is offensive to good citizens and demoralizing to society. It is not punishable on this account, however. Good citizens are sometimes very unreasonably offended. Even truth and right may offend them. Forty years ago abolition agitators offended many such citizens, but they ought not to have been indicted for it. Neither can every tendency to demoralize society entail civil punishment. Almost every sin has some such tendency. Staying away from church, criticising the choir, or announcing a personal defect in the preacher will doubtless injure the moral fibre of some weak soul attendant thereupon. And yet no one would think such indiscretions indictable. If it be right to punish at all in the case now before us, I would base such punishment on the general right to abate a nuisance. Profanity in a religious assembly is certainly abatable as a nuisance. And I am not prepared to deny that the constant interlarding of conversation, otherwise reasonably intelligible, with expressions, senseless, distracting, and aggravating to citizens in general, may possibly be abatable as a nuisance. Certainly they are not punishable simply as blasphemy.

5. All laws against blasphemy as such are relicts of a bygone age, are wrong in themselves, are practically a dead letter, and should be removed from the statute books.

Much is constantly being said and written about the peculiarities of the present age as contrasted with former ages. But I believe that there is nothing more characteristic of it than its ability to look on both sides of a disputed question. This ability is a recent acquirement of the *genus homo*. Preceding ages have been invariably marked by prejudice. But prejudice is simply a one-sided view of things, a judging too soon, before the evidence is heard. The exercise of this new and growing ability has wrought great changes in the state and the church, as well as in individual thought and action. When Philip II, of Spain, reduced the army, destroyed the navy, and prostrated the resources of his imperial domain, in the vain attempt with his matchless Armada to extirpate heresy from Europe, it was simply because he took a one-sided view of his duty as a Christian emperor. No Christian emperor of this age would take such a view. When Catholics burned Protestants, Calvinists punished Arminians, Lutherans oppressed Calvinists, and Puritans banished Baptists, it was simply because they took a one-sided view of the duty of the church toward dissenters. No such view is now taken. So late as 1838 bishops of Durham and Norwich, having in an unguarded moment subscribed for a book written by a Unitarian, were required to make humble apology for their inexcusable indiscretion. It would read like the wildest romance if such a thing were required today. Now it seems to me that the existing statutes against blasphemy have grown out of a similar one-sided view of the duty of the state toward religion. Certainly the state ought to secure religion in the free exercise of all its rights. But it ought not therefore to punish the enemies of religion. Most assuredly it ought not to punish honest dissenters from prevailing phases of religious belief. For such dissent, through all the ages, has furnished the only avenue of religious progress. If a man should say a word against the worship of the Virgin, or against some one of the long catalogue of saints, I scarcely think there is a Christian state in all Europe

today that really believes he ought to be punished for it Neither do I think that the Christian people of this nation now really believe that Mr. Ingersoll ought to be incarcerated for speaking blasphemous words against the Bible and the God of the Bible. Now nothing is to be gained by retaining a law whose execution is neither possible nor proper.

We who believe in absolute religious liberty must have the courage to be consistent with our own convictions. Even if a man does most wantonly outrage all our most sacred feelings and beliefs, we must not turn inquisitors and persecute him for it. We have such abiding confidence in the inspired truth of God's Word and in the divine power of Jesus Christ over the human heart and life, that we ask no arm of state to avenge the friends or punish the enemies of the Cross. More than this We insist that the state be strictly neutral in all matters of religion, and that every law and act of government be consistent with such neutrality. This does not mean that we as Christians are neutral. Religious indifferentism in the church is quite as deplorable as religious intolerance in the state. That mawkish, invertebrate sentimentalism in religion which has no fixed convictions, which never thinks, which believes anything or nothing according to the latest theological or philosophical fad, without investigation or rational apprehension, is deserving of neither confidence nor respect. One-sided religious views should indeed be discarded. But men should not therefore sluggishly close their eyes and take no view at all.

The soldier with the strongest armor can calmly face the fiercest foe. So the Christian with the firmest hold on God and truth can safely challenge error in any of its forms. The state which is purest, wisest, strongest can give the greatest freedom to its citizens. So the church which is centered on the deepest truths of God can afford to be most tolerant of others. Polarity of doctrine gives fixity of purpose, solidarity of character, consistency of life. Unfortunately, of many a modern religionist it might be prophesied, as of one of old, "Unstable as water, thou shalt not excel."

It will be observed that questions hitherto presented are all

politico-religious questions. They refer, directly or remotely, to relations of church and state. But manifestly many other questions along other lines of thought must be included in any adequate presentation of our theme, Ethics of the State. It would be interesting to follow these lines, had not the discussion already become so extended as to forbid even a mention of them.

In concluding this paper it may be well to sum up briefly the results of our studies as hitherto pursued. We have found: (1) that ethical law is universal, including every voluntary act of every free intelligence, whether exerted singly or in combination with other free intelligences, and that therefore acts of state are ethical in character; (2) that the citizen owes duties to the state as an ethical entity, and that among these duties are the obligations to love, to obey, to support, and to coöperate with the state; (3) that the state likewise has duties to its citizens, among which are these: to maintain its own sovereignty, to protect and improve its citizens, and to respect their rights of personality; (4) that the state should not enforce Sabbath observance, that church property need not be taxed, that the Bible may be read as a religious book in schools of the state, but should not be forced upon unwilling ears, that general appropriations by the state should never be made to denominational schools, that the civil oath should be abolished, and that blasphemy as such should not be punishable by law.

These conclusions are believed to be correct beyond the possibility of successful contradiction. They are held firmly, yet always subject to revision upon the advent of new light concerning them. This is the proper attitude toward all secondary truth. Loyalty to what we have is perfectly consistent with hospitality to what we may hereafter receive. Conviction of truth is not intellectual opacity, nor is attachment to duty moral obscurity.

# RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

PHILOSOPHY OF THEISM; being the Gifford Lectures, delivered before the University of Edinburgh in 1895–6. By ALEXANDER CAMPBELL FRASER, LL.D. Second series. Edinburgh and London: W. Blackwood & Sons; New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. 304, 8vo. $2:

THE second volume of Professor Fraser's lectures is marked by the same maturity of thought, sobriety of statement, and perspicuity of style which we remarked upon in our review of the first. There the three theories of atheism, theism, and pantheism were set in contrast with one another as different solutions of the problem of the universe. The question was proposed, Which of these three is the most reasonable answer to be rendered to the fundamental question of our relation to the universe? Is man only a thing, or is he also a person? Do we stand in a moral relation to an Infinite Personality? It was contended that conscience enables us to answer this inquiry in the affirmative. We belong to a "morally principled universe" and so "may everywhere recognize and rest in God." This conclusion is not shaken by the fact of the existence of crude forms of religion, of fetichism and polytheism, any more than the calculus is overthrown by the circumstance that some tribes know nothing of distinction of number. The true interpretation of nature is the moral and theistic one; and in this position Kant was right. Even physical faith in natural order presupposes moral trust in the universal power. It is implied in the trustworthiness of experience. It is thus a necessary postulate. "Manifested power," Herbert Spencer's own phrase, cannot be unknown or unknowable power. His philosophy oscillates between universal nescience and non-moral power, Pyrrhonism and pantheism. "The eternal divine gospel that God is love may be taken as another expression for that perfect moral trustworthiness of the final principle of existence," which is the essential principle of theistic faith. The present volume carries out these propositions by an exposition of the relations of the theological problem to man. The titles of the chapters, viz., Causation Theistically Interpreted; Cosmical Adaptation and Divine Design:

Teleological, Divine Necessity: Ontological, and Philosophical, Faith indicate the course of the discussion in the first 120 pages. Then follow five chapters in which the doubts and queries suggested by the existence of evil, optimism and progress, miracle and its real nature, the mystery of death and the question of immortality, are handled with equal candor and ability. Objections and difficulties are fairly stated, and whatever weight can be justly conceded to them is conceded. The issue of the inquiries is the conclusion that faith in the supreme moral personality is not undermined by the fact of moral evil or by the fact of death, or by what is left of unfathomed mystery in the moral and providential administration of the world. To the pages (142–240) in which this luminous discussion is conducted we must refer the reader who would gain an adequate knowledge of its contents and a due impression of its soundness and value.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL. GEORGE P. FISHER.

ESQUISSE D'UNE PHILOSOPHIE DE LA RELIGION D'APRÈS LA PSYCHOLOGIE ET L'HISTOIRE. Par AUGUSTE SABATIER, Professeur de l'Université de Paris, Doyen de la Faculté de Théologie Protestante. Paris: Fischbacher, 1897. Pp. xvi + 415, 8vo. Fr. 7.50.

THIS is not by any means a great book, nevertheless it is a supremely interesting one. For the production of a work of the former class the times must be ripe, the age must coöperate with the author. A period of transition favors the appearance of a suggestive book, especially in so far as it induces a writer to reproduce semi-consciously the prevailing conflict of opinion or absence of clear constructive tendency.

Philosophy of religion is at present passing through that kind of change which commonly accompanies growth. This department of inquiry numbers today little more than sixty years. With the appearance of Hegel's Lectures, in 1832, it may be said to have finally dispossessed its ancestor, natural theology. For rather more than a generation thereafter Hegelian ideas and methods practically usurped the field; and one might say that the publication of Professor Otto Pfleiderer's classical work, in 1868, marked the beginning of the end of this epoch. Since then Hegelian principles have doubtless passed over into Britain, France, Italy, and the United States, and, in this new environment, have contrived to preserve their authority till within the last decade. But during this generation, which may be termed the

second epoch of philosophy of religion, a parallel movement has been in rapid progress. Facts of which Hegel knew nothing, information that his followers tend only too often to minimize or miss, have come to light. The labors of McLennan, Maine, and Robertson Smith, of Professor Max Müller, Mr. Tylor, Mr. Spencer, Mr. Andrew Lang, Mr. J. G. Frazer, and Mr. F. B. Jevons — to mention the names of British writers only — have intervened. The knowledge of ancient religions and civilizations has been vastly extended, like the information concerning primitive man and his customs; psychology has acquired a new importance; changed methods of investigation have wholly altered the outlook. As a result, an almost unanimous tendency to doubt the validity and usefulness of metaphysical formalism has gradually revealed itself. Thinkers begin to see that the entire field must be restudied without prejudice, and especially without the preconceptions incident to an *a priori* scheme which is brought to the facts and forced upon them willy-nilly. Further, it is becoming plainer and plainer that religion cannot be viewed as an intellectual phenomenon exclusively. Its roots extend, not only to the mind of man, but to his whole nature, drawing sustenance from volition and sentiment no less than from reason. In other words, a marked movement is traceable away from formal metaphysics and in the direction of psychological and historical investigation. Like all reactions, this one has run too far. For history and psychology have their necessary metaphysical implications, and these cannot be neglected.

Yet, in this very disparagement of metaphysics in the interest of history and psychology lie at once the hope for the future and the transition character of the contemporary attitude. Professor Sabatier's book is supremely interesting, because it indicates, better than any other work with which I am acquainted, the processes now in progress. Its limitations, like its value, center in its non-metaphysical nature, and in its effort to heighten the importance of psychology and history. Suggestion marks its every page; evidence of grasp is by no means so easily found.

The plan of the work obviously indicates what may be termed its sporadic character. After a preface, in which the incoherence of philosophy of religion under the metaphysical *régime* is emphasized and the need for sober history and psychology noted, Professor Sabatier proceeds to attack his problem along three main lines. His First Book treats of Religion, and is subdivided into four chapters — on the Psychological Origin of Religion; Religion and Revelation; Miracle

and Inspiration; and the Religious Development of Mankind. The Second Book is entitled Christianity, and the subject-matter falls into three chapters—Hebraism or the Origin of the Gospel; the Essence of Christianity; and the Principal Historical Forms of Christianity. The closing book, with the title Dogma, contains four chapters—What is Dogma? the Life of Dogmas and their Historical Evolution; the Science of Dogmas; and a Critical Theory of Religious Knowledge. It is a curious collocation of themes, and very well serves to show the somewhat chaotic conception of the author in regard to the precise aim of philosophy of religion. For this reason, too, the treatment possesses that flexibility and fluidity so admirably suited to the present situation.

Four lines of thought converge in the book—the theological, historical, psychological, and philosophical. The value of the work done upon each is very different. The theological positions are much the strongest. The chapters on Miracle and Inspiration, on Hebraism, on the Essence of Christianity, and all the sections on Dogma are excellent. They display competent knowledge, eminent fairness and scientific appreciation, and many of their suggestions are full of insight. The historical *Ueberblicke* are often most stimulating, and are invariably marked by great freshness. The consideration of the Religious Development of Mankind, of the Principal Historical Forms of Christianity, and of the Evolution of Christian Dogma in History, affords ample evidence of a certain happy valiancy that shakes one out of all ordinary ruts. The same praise cannot be conscientiously bestowed upon the psychological and philosophical portions. The psychological facts on which the argument is based are far too general. So much is this so that the method often recalls metaphysical *a priorism* against which the author protests. And redaction in the interest of a preconceived psychological scheme is just as objectionable as that set forth for the purpose of aggrandizing a metaphysical theory. The weakest part of the work is the purely philosophical portion;—the concluding chapter on the Nature of Religious Knowledge. Here Professor Sabatier makes most dangerous admissions, and employs arguments which are conspicuously double-edged. He appears to have been seriously affected by Ritschlianism, and this to such on extent that, if his contentions were true, they would entirely preclude the possibility of anything in the nature of *philosophy* of religion. Bookkeeping by double entry has no place in the accounting of human experience.

Throughout the book is written in that limpid style peculiar to the French; its objectivity forms its most attractive characteristic; it

is the style that puts the Germans to shame and makes English writers despair. Everyone interested in the subject ought to procure the volume, not expecting a systematic philosophy of religion, but a series of suggestions, enlivening in themselves, and raising several problems that have hitherto received too scanty attention. I am glad to notice that a second edition has already been called for. A full index would be a welcome addition.

R. M. WENLEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGION. By FRANK BYRON JEVONS, M.A., LITT.D. London: Methuen & Co., 1897. Pp. vii + 443; cloth. 10s. 6d.

THIS introduction to the history of religion deserves high commendation for its modesty, impartiality of tone, and suggestiveness. Though pretending to be little more than a compilation from authorities on anthropology, it really is — from the discriminating use of its material and the philosophical power of the author — an original and valuable contribution to the study of early religion, and therefore to the study of all religion. In studying any subject we must begin at the beginning. It bears, too, on those large problems, raised by biblical introduction, which are to be solved neither by the old dogmatism which rested on uncritical tradition nor by the new and sometimes sniffy dogmatism of modern literary criticism. Both of these dogmatisms have done good service in their time; but the time has come for something better. A patient and thorough investigation of all the facts is now demanded. That is being carried on, but much labor is still needed to complete the work. Clearly, too, no other method but the comparative can be used to ascertain wherein the things investigated — whether religions or anything else — resemble each other and wherein they differ. For though some who are rightly reluctant to appear to compromise the exclusive claims of Christianity are jealous of a method which to them implies that all religions are alike, they must on consideration admit that, just as comparative philology implies that languages differ from each other and comparative anatomy implies that animals differ in structure, so the use of the comparative method in the study of religions "is a standing disproof of the idea that all religions are alike." "The comparative method can only be used where there are differences in the things compared. Indeed, we may go further and say that it is

for the sake of ascertaining these differences that the method is brought into use." Thus, for example, it is a small thing for anyone to point out the resemblances which exist, on the one hand, between the cosmogony and the flood traditions found inscribed on the tablets of Nineveh and transliterated from older sources or found in the valley of the Nile, and those accounts, on the other hand, which we have in the book of Genesis concerning the creation of the world and the Noachian deluge. Surely, it is of much more consequence to insist on the great differences, and to seek for an adequate explanation of that spiritual elevation and the entire absence of crude mythological and polytheistic accessories in the biblical stories which make them still profitable reading for young and old, and for the man of science as well as for the man on the street. There are, however, people who become so fascinated with the resemblances on the surface that they jump to the conclusion that no difference worth speaking of exists between the Bible and Babylonian or Turanian or Hamitic tradition. There are others, again, so terrified because such a conclusion has been formed and announced to the world that they feel it their duty to deny the resemblance, and to denounce those who admit it as false brethren. The same spirit makes them cry, Can anything good come out of anthropology? as soon as they are informed that some anthropologists have assumed that all religion is merely developed fetichism or animism or something of the sort. Between the impatient unbeliever and the impatient believer the man of science and the man of faith walk together, hand in hand, enriching the world, and resting on the word, "He that believeth doth not make haste." Let us have the facts, all the facts, and, if possible, nothing but the facts, is today the cry of sensible men; and therefore it is that a book like Robertson Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, concerning which Dr. Jevons writes, "My obligations are too great for their expression to be confined in footnotes," is worth all the eloquent declamation of defenders of the faith in church courts, or all the "guesses" at the riddle of existence which the most accomplished man of letters can give us.

Totemism, that is, the belief which identified with the divine a species of animals or plants which was regarded as the ancestor of the tribe, is the earliest form of religion known to science. It may be added that the worship originally accorded to the whole species was after a time appropriated to one individual of the species. As to this faith, while no authority now accepts Mr. Spencer's theory that it originated in the worship of ancestors, it is admitted that "the nature of

religious belief in the pre-totemistic stage is entirely matter of conjecture." Dr. Jevons argues with much acuteness that pre-totemism must have been a "simple and amorphous monotheism." He takes issue squarely with those who maintain that as monotheism is the highest form of belief, it must have gradually developed from the lower forms of totemism and polytheism, through intermediate stages. Admitting every plea that seems to make for the ordinary evolutionary view, that the higher must have developed from the lower, he strongly insists that the highest must have been implicit in consciousness from the beginning, and also that evolution and progress are two very different things. Evolution is constant, but progress very rare. Indeed, "evolution may well be, from the religious point of view, one long process of degeneration." Progress is certainly as exceptional in religion as in other things, and where it takes place must be due to exceptional causes. "If evolution takes place, something must be evolved; and that something, as being continuously present in all the different stages, may be called the *continuum* of religion." He thus finds in the consciousness of primitive man that which only became fully explicit, millenniums after his appearance on earth. He puts this point again, near the end of his work, in the following striking passage:

"Once more, we must remember that the facts of consciousness were the same for early as for civilized man; but they were not as yet discriminated. They swam before man's untrained eye, and ran into one another. Even the fundamental division of objects into animate and inanimate had not been fixed. But even so, all was not irrational chaos for man. In the outer world of his experience the laws of nature, which are God's laws, worked with the same regularity then as now. In the world of his inner experience God was not far from him at any time. If he could not formulate the laws of nature, at least he had the key to their comprehension in the conviction, not expressed but acted on, that nature was uniform. If his spiritual vision was dim, his consciousness of God was at least so strong, to start with, that he has never since ceased seeking after him. The law of continuity holds of religion as of other things."

What more natural form of belief, in this primitive stage of existence, could there be than the conception of God as manifesting himself in some natural object! No wonder that totemism was world-wide. "The haunting sense of something incomprehensible, and therefore divine, has to be objectified in some form, and that form or totem becomes

the vehicle for the ideal union of the family or tribe." (*Christianity and Idealism*, by Professor John Watson.)

Most suggestive are the chapters on "Totemism and Survivals of Totemism," especially the argument that "totemism was the prime motor of all material progress." Progress would have been impossible without the domestication of animals and of plants, and success in either direction demanded labor and experimentation, for which the savage is naturally incapable. Only "in totemism have we a cause persistent, world-wide, and adequate to account for the facts." What we consider a form of religion so crude as to excite surprise and pity was thus indispensable to any material civilization! The lowest religion is clearly better than none.

The development of totemism into polytheism, through the offering of totem animals in sacrifice, marked another important stage in the history of humanity. When it was felt that the union of the human and divine was broken, some outward act was needed which would signify the reëstablishment of the connection. As the totem was supposed to share the common life of both parties and to be capable of exercising an influence on both, and as a blood covenant was the only means known for effecting union with anyone external to the tribe, the sacrifice of the totem and a common sacramental meal originated. The universality of the practice is the most conclusive testimony to the ineradicable craving of man's heart for union and communion with God, and to the consciousness that on such union alone can right relations with our fellows be based. Here is Dr. Jevons' language: "The whole human race for thousands of years has been educated to the conception that it was only through a divine sacrifice that perfect union with God was possible for man. At times the sacramental conception of sacrifice appeared to be about to degenerate entirely into the gift theory; but then, in the sixth century, B. C., the sacramental conception woke into new life, this time in the form of a search for a perfect sacrifice—a search which led Clement and Cyprian to try all the mysteries of Greece in vain. But of all the great religions of the world it is the Christian church alone which is so far heir of all the ages as to fulfill the dumb, dim expectation of mankind; in it alone the sacramental meal commemorates by ordinance of its founder the divine sacrifice which is a propitiation for the sins of all mankind."

His argument against the derivation of monotheism from polytheism is very decided, and will not be assented to by many who are ready to acknowledge that Jewish monotheism was due to a peculiar cause,

whether the cause be called special revelation, or greater power of spiritual insight on the part of the prophets of Israel, or the peculiar character and history of the "people of revelation." Admittedly, the development of religion in Israel was unique. There was no intermediate stage of polytheism. The teraphim or household gods of patriarchal times are evidences of primitive totemism, existing side by side with the higher revelation made to Abraham. Subsequently we find evidences of a worship of the great powers of nature side by side with the spiritual faith of Abraham and Moses. Syncretism, too, we find in Israel, but not polytheism. Faith in Jehovah, the God of Israel, developed into pure monotheism, and that into the perfect conception of God which Jesus revealed. But many who admit this unique development of religion in Israel hold just as firmly that the religion of Greece developed from the polytheism of Homer into the monotheism of its great poets and philosophers, a monotheism which at its best, in Plato, for instance, regarded God as simply transcendent, and which, therefore, was incomplete, but which none the less was spiritual monotheism. Dr. Jevons is a well-known classical scholar, and cannot have overlooked the case of Greece. Yet here are some of the sweeping assertions which he makes regarding the interrelations of monotheism and polytheism:

"Indeed, if we base ourselves on evolutionary principles we may safely say that, whatever be the genesis and history of monotheism, one thing is certain, namely, that it cannot have developed out of polytheism. Both species may be descended from a common ancestor, but not one from the other." (P. 387.)

"The monotheism of the Jews is a unique and solitary phenomenon in the history of religion. Nowhere else in the world has the development of religion culminated in monotheism." (P. 388.)

"The tendencies which have been supposed in polytheism to make for monotheism have always been purely pantheistic—speculative rather than practical, metaphysical rather than religious; and, as being metaphysical speculations, have always been confined to the cultured few, and have never even leavened the polytheism of the masses." (P. 389.)

"Pantheism is the philosophical complement of a pantheon; but the spirit which produced the monotheism of the Jews must have been something very different." (P. 396.)

All that need be said here on this interesting question is that those who maintain the opposite opinion, that monotheism did generally

develop and must have developed from polytheism, will have to reckon with Dr. Jevons' argument and facts. He attributes the development of the primitive amorphous monotheism, with its perfect forms in the religion of Israel, to the development of the consciousness of the divine personality, due to greater "attention," on the part of elect souls, to the real content of consciousness. What he says concerning the gradual realization of the content of consciousness and the extraordinary importance of the faculty of attention—though familiar to students of psychology—seems to me worthy of every consideration on the part of the ordinary reader.

G. M. GRANT.

HEILIGE SCHRIFT UND KRITIK. Ein Beitrag zur Lehre von der heiligen Schrift, insonderheit Alten Testamentes. Von D. WILHELM VOLCK, ordentlichem Professor an der Universität Dorpat. Erlangen und Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1897. Pp. x + 216, 8vo. M. 3.25.

THIS is a book of a kind of which one could wish we had more. The author believes profoundly both in the Scriptures and in criticism; and his object is to show that his faith is reasonable and well founded. He thinks himself justified in his faith, because he sees in the Scriptures the product of two factors, one the free divine activity, and the other the free human activity. As a product of the divine activity, the Scriptures are the authoritative standard of faith and life for the church; as a product of human activity, they are, like all literature, a proper subject for investigation and criticism. The treasure is heavenly; but the vessels are earthen.

The book is written by a Lutheran professor, who believes in a supernatural Christianity, which is the complement of a supernatural history, of which the Old Testament is the inspired and authoritative record. He also recognizes the place and value which the modern science of criticism must have in biblical and theological study, and writes in the scientific spirit. He believes that a lack of religion is not essential to the possession of the scientific spirit and the use of the scientific method, and that a man can be religious and scientific at the same time. His view is that the church should openly and gratefully recognize the profit which it has gained from the good work of its

opponents, and that it should constantly bear in mind the truth expressed in the saying, *et ab hoste consilium.*

The author accepts the principles and the methods of the higher criticism, but rejects many of the results reached by the Reuss-Graf school, especially as these are set forth by Wellhausen, because, as he claims, these are based upon a presupposition which is not an element of the science of criticism, and is indefensible and false. This presupposition is the absence of every supernatural element in the history of Israel, so that this history was only a process of natural evolution, and was, in all respects, of exactly the same character as the history of all other peoples. That our author, however, is not unwilling to accept results of criticism, not based upon the presupposition of the Reuss-Graf school, is shown in the statement he makes of his own views about the constitution and origin of the Hexateuch. In this statement JE, as already made by uniting J and E, is assigned to early times. Then PC was added to JE, before the Thora of D was made a part of the whole work. JE + PC + Joshua, with parts of D not included in the Thora, existed in a written form as one work in the time of Hosea, Amos, and Micah. Finally, the Thora of D (chaps. 5–28), found in the days of Josiah after being for some time unknown, was added to the whole collection after it had been worked over into its present form by the Deuteronomist. The hand of this Deuteronomist is also seen in all that body of history which begins with Genesis and ends with the book of Kings, and which did not receive its final redaction before the close of the exile.

The book is an enlargement of previous work by the author, which appeared in 1894 and 1895, in the form of contributions to the *Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift.* The object of the book is twofold. On the one hand, the author makes it his aim to show what has been the gain to Bible study and religion from the modern science of biblical criticism; and, on the other, he seeks to make it clear that there is room for all who believe in the supernatural character of the history of Israel, and the divine authority of Scripture in the Lutheran church, whatever number of the results of criticism they may accept or reject. The book is thus a warning against a return to the dogmatic theory of the seventeenth century in regard to inspiration.

The matter of the book is divided into three parts. The first part consists of a sketch of the history of the ideas about the Scriptures, and the method of their interpretation. The object in this part is to show that preconceived ideas about the Scriptures have largely deter-

mined the methods of interpreting them, and that the present attitude of the Reuss-Graf school towards the Old Testament is the natural result of a revolt from the presuppositions of the church in reference to the character of the Scriptures. The treatment of this last point is defective, and the author fails to carry out his purpose to a satisfactory result. In the second part, which is entitled "Discussion of Principal Questions," the author seeks to show that criticism has a place in biblical study. There must be criticism of the text, there must be criticism of the canon, and there surely may be criticism in regard to all the matters which belong under the head of Old Testament introduction. The rights of criticism, in the case of these latter matters, the author finds guaranteed in the character of the Scriptures rightly conceived, and in their nature as the product of a divine and a human factor. It is a mistake, in his view, to identify Scripture and revelation. Revelation is the incoming of God into history. Scripture is the authoritative record of the history which embodies revelation. Scripture is thus itself, in turn, a part of this history. In both the history and the Scriptures the human factor is not negative, but positive. Therefore, we are not justified in holding that the Scriptures must be free from all signs of human imperfection. We only need to determine the line within which these imperfections must lie. This is done when we see in Scripture that which it really is, the authoritative record of the history of salvation. The Scripture writers were elements in this history of salvation, under the influencc of the very spirit of God who was working in that history. To the work of criticism it is impossible to go without some prepossession. But the prepossession of the Christian interpreter has the better right. For his prepossession is the result of an experience in that life of salvation for which the history of which the Old Testament is the record prepared the way.

This second part of the book is its best and most convincing portion. It seems to the reviewer to present the ground on which those who know, by a blessed experience, the realities of a supernatural religious life for which they find in the Scriptures the source, the law, and the explanation, and yet believe in the advance of knowledge by study and research in the domain of theological as well as all other science.

In the third part of the book the author tries to show that the naturalistic view of Israelitish history presented by Wellhausen is not in harmony with the facts of the Old Testament records, when these are fairly treated. For this purpose the author seeks to prove (1) that

the monotheism of the decalogue, with its idea of a covenant, did not come into being with the political decline of Israel; (2) that the decalogue is Mosaic; (3) that the true idea of Jehovah is not a natural growth from the crude notions of the Mosaic time; (4) that the book of the Covenant is Mosaic; (5) that only one law of two tables (decalogue) has come down to us; (6) that the law of sacrifices, and the different kinds of sacrifices, go back to the legislation of Moses and his time; (7) that the idea of a central sanctuary must go back to the time of Moses; (8) that the tabernacle and the unity of worship were of Mosaic origin; (9) that a Levitical priesthood, and a distinction of priests and Levites, go back to the time of Moses; (10) that a written law, although not in the form of the present priests' code, goes back to the time of Moses; (11) that the great national feasts go back to the time of Moses; (12) that the Davidic psalms, Isaiah, Micah, Amos, Hosea, and Jeremiah, testify to the existence of a law of sacrifice and worship; (13) that HG and PC were in existence in the time of Ezekiel, and were used by him; (14) that PC is older than the exile. Whatever may be thought as to the conclusiveness of some of the argumentation of this part of the book, it certainly presents food for thought, and sets forth some considerations that must be reckoned with by those who reject the writer's conclusions. While Volck, in a general way, believes that the legislation of the Pentateuch is Mosaic, he does not think that the Pentateuch, as we now have it, was written by Moses. Rather, he gave principles and norms that were afterwards developed into the detailed laws of our present Pentateuch. If ever the defenders of the Wellhausen theory of the progress of the religious life and history of Israel are conclusively shown to be in error, some such method as that followed in this book by Volck, and only some such scientific method, will be adequate to the work.

In general, the book is well written, and the style clear, and not difficult for the American or English reader of German. It is only occasionally that the writer falls into needless obscurity. The one fault to be noticed is a lack of method. There are not infrequently digressions from the main line of thought, and, because of this and a general want of method, a lack of movement and unity. This fault, however, does not seriously mar the general and great value of the book.

S. BURNHAM.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

DIE MUSIKALISCHEN INSTRUMENTE IN DEN HEILIGEN SCHRIFTEN DES ALTEN TESTAMENTES. Von D. JOHANN WEISS, ö. o. Professor des alttestamentlichen Bibelstudiums an der k. k. Universität in Graz. Festschrift . . . . aus Anlass der Jahresfeier am 15. November 1895. Pp. 104, with 7 lithographic plates. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky, 1895. M. 7.

THE general subject of this monograph is sufficiently indicated by its title. The preface distinctly disclaims all intention to add to "the unfortunate attempts" to recover the lost tone-system and musical praxis of the Hebrews, and proposes simply "to present briefly the probable form and character of the musical instruments, especially in comparison with the corresponding remains of the oldest nations."

The book consists of three parts: first, a brief *résumé* of the passages in the Old Testament in which instruments are mentioned (pp. 5–15); then a systematic and extended discussion of each of them under the natural groups of stringed, wind, and percussive instruments (pp. 16–104); and, finally, a brief series of neatly engraved illustrations, selected from various authorities.

The opening section is curiously put together. The assumption seems almost to be that the Old Testament is one continuous, homogeneous, and equally significant piece of literature. The superficial readings of the several books are strung together in serial order without the slightest reference to differences of style, purpose, age, or technical quality. Chronicles, for example, is naturally drawn upon largely, but without critical differentiation from Kings as a source. There is no attempt at completeness beyond the historical books, the references in the Prophets and the Psalms being left for discussion in the next section. Two points may be cited as samples of the author's opinions about the musical praxis of the Temple. The ritual is affirmed (p. 14) not to have included any purely instrumental music, or any accompaniment for song except that executed on certain instruments "selected by David for sacred use," all others being "excluded as too noisy and as hindering the song." And the question whether women participated in the Temple music is dexterously negatived, though without wrestling long with 1 Chron. 25:6, Ezra 2:65, or Neh. 7:67 (notes, pp. 15 and 13). On the whole, one is tempted to pronounce this first section nearly valueless. It presents nothing new, and what it offers is invalidated at many points by an entire lack of historical perspective and occasionally also by prejudices apparently due to wholly modern conditions.

Far more important is the second or systematic section, though the opening pages have prepared us to expect little sense of historical proportion and sequence. Dr. Weiss has brought together a surprising mass of references from ancient authors and of modern opinions upon them, but they are usually presented without any special sensitiveness to the important differences that are to be imagined between periods as distinct, for instance, as the Homeric age and the time of Lucian, or between civilizations as remote as those of Babylon and of Rome. The difficulty of the reader's sifting and weighing this mass of material for himself is made exasperatingly great by the fact that the book has no index either of subjects or of passages cited,—an unpardonable defect.

Having recorded this general objection to the writer's method as a whole, it is only fair to say at once that the discussion of details is often acute and interesting. He begins by affirming that in general the accounts of instruments in the Old Testament are so meager that we must rely chiefly (1) on comparative data supplied by archæological finds in Syria, Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, and Arabia, or by literary references to the musical instruments of those countries; and (2) on the terms used in ancient versions of the Hebrew text, particularly in the Septuagint. As we go on, we find that Dr. Weiss has a rather extreme confidence in the value of patristic references as well. As to the process of instrumental evolution, so far as it is assumed, we note that he puts himself squarely on the side of those who regard percussive instruments as the oldest, to which wind and stringed instruments were later added—a general theory that is at least doubtful.

Space forbids our doing more than cite a few illustrations of his conclusions. The most elaborate treatment is given the national instruments, the kinnôr and the nêbel. That they were essentially different is clear; but that the Greek translators did not know how to indicate the difference, if, indeed, they always felt it, is admitted (p. 19). The kinnôr is held to have been the universal popular instrument for joyful expression, to have been of primitive origin (because mentioned in Genesis), etc.; while the nêbel, on the other hand, was an occasional adjunct, not for women or ordinary men, nor for secular merrymaking (p. 22). The conjecture is hazarded (p. 25) that the word "ạlmug" or "algum" was a popular perversion of "malayaja" (Malabar-wood). The word מְנִּים in Ps. 150:4 and 45:9 is supposed to be like our collective noun "strings." The conclusion about the kinnôr is that it was, not a harp, but a *cithara*, with a base, two arms, a cross-piece or

yoke, and strings of skin, which were played with or without a plectrum. The nêbel, on the contrary, on the strength especially of patristic tradition, is affirmed (p. 55) to have been a small harp, derived, not from Egypt, but from Assyria, though the contrary hypotheses of other investigators are duly recognized.

The typical wind instruments, the ḥâlîl, the qeren, the šôphâr, and ḥaçôçᵉrah, are each discussed at length, without reaching unusual conclusions. Attempts are made to handle the meager references to several other instruments, mainly stringed and wind, but, so far as I can see, without materially altering current suppositions. The difficult questions raised by the references to musical instruments in the book of Daniel are rather curiously avoided, except in passing references (as on p. 50), but each of the instruments is carefully discussed. One of the interesting conclusions here is that "symphonia" was a collective term for wind instruments (p. 87).

On the whole the book is valuable for its patient marshaling of materials and for its careful handling of many of the smaller points involved. But its perusal leaves the reader confirmed in his hopelessness about gaining positive information on many debatable matters until there has been some decided accession of new data from archæological researches. It is a convenience to have so much of the existing material brought together as Dr. Weiss has done, but it is curious how little advance he makes, for instance, on such a distinctively popular handbook as Stainer's *Music of the Bible*, to which, by the way, he makes no reference.

WALDO S. PRATT.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DAS BUCH HIOB ÜBERSETZT UND ERKLÄRT. Von D. KARL BUDDE, o. l'rofessor d. Theologie an der Universität zu Strassburg. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896. Pp. lvi + 256. M. 6.

THE *Handkommentar* on the Old Testament under the editorship of Professor Nowack is coming out with disappointing slowness, but every part is a contribution of solid value to biblical criticism. The last is certainly by no means the least. The greatest Hebrew poem is translated, expounded, and discussed in masterly fashion by one of the recognized heads of continental scholarship. Whatever may be thought of Professor Budde's opinions, the care and ability with which

he has handled his exceedingly difficult subject will be universally admitted.

The chief conclusions arrived at in the introduction, which is perhaps the most valuable part of the work, are the following: (1) The book as we have it proceeds from one author, but there are many short interpolations; and both the prologue and the epilogue are taken from a *Volksbuch* or popular setting of the Job tradition which was probably in the first instance of non-Israelitish origin. The genuineness of the Elihu speeches, which has been denied by most modern critics, is defended on internal grounds. The difference of their style when compared with that of the other parts of the book, which Professor Budde disputed in 1876, is now admitted, but it is ascribed to textual corruption, editorial revision, and, above all, interpolation. No notice seems to be taken of the old Jewish idea expressed in the testament of Job that Elihu was inspired by Satan, which shows that as early as the second or third Christian century these speeches were felt to be out of harmony with the rest of the book. (2) The purpose of the poem is regarded as quite other than that of the *Volksbuch*. Whilst the latter sought to prove the possibility of suffering, which is not a consequence of personal guilt, but a divinely arranged means of testing, the poet went far deeper. He had in some way come to know that there is such a thing as sin slumbering in the inmost recesses of the soul, unsuspected alike by the man himself and the people round him. Such sin must be realized and removed before there can be true blessedness. Hence mysterious trials like those of Job. It is not the testing of Job's character, but the purification of it from hidden spiritual pride which is endangering it, that is brought about by the divine wisdom through the instrumentality of Satan, who is of course quite ignorant of the purpose which he is used to further. (3) The date of the poem is put as late as 400 B. C., amongst other reasons on account of its universalism or cosmopolitism, and its alleged dependence on the Hexateuch. Twenty-three years ago Professor Budde preferred the period of the exile. (4) The Hebrew text is thoughtto have been moderately well preserved, but the text of the Septuagint is considered to possess very little critical value. Its smaller extent and its great freedom are ascribed to the following causes: (*a*) inability to understand difficult passages; (*b*) divergence of taste and opinion; (*c*) ignorance of the fundamental law of Hebrew poetry; (*d*) striving after Greek refinement; (*e*) fear of wearisome prolixity.

The text has been altered in many places, especially in the Elihu

speeches. The great passage in Job 19: 25–27, however, is but slightly changed. It runs as follows in Professor Budde's version:

> I know, however, that my Redeemer liveth,
> And at last shall he arise upon the dust,
> And behind my skin which is *so* tattered,
> And out of my flesh shall I see God:
> Whom I shall behold as favorable to myself,
> And mine eyes *shall* see, and not as a stranger—
> Although the reins languish in my body.

The *italics* mark the emendations. When compared with Professor Siegfried's treatment of the text in the Polychrome Bible our author's is wonderfully moderate. His view of the passage which has influenced no doubt his conception of the poet's purpose will assuredly be challenged by many. What Job so confidently expected he thinks was divine intervention here, not in another life. There is no reference to the hereafter in the passage. This conclusion depends in some measure on the translation of *achar* by "behind" instead of by "after." It is affirmed as a rule that this preposition has the latter meaning when used of an action, the former when used of an object. Yet other accomplished Hebraists (Davidson, Driver, Dillmann) seem to find no difficulty in interpreting the word here in the sense of "after." The last-mentioned critic explains "*behind*, that is, *after my skin*."

The book is unusually hard reading, but repays careful study. It does not say the last word about this mysterious part of the Hebrew canon, but offers valuable help towards a final solution.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

EXETER, ENGLAND.

DIE CHORGESÄNGE IM BUCHE DER PSALMEN—IHRE EXISTENZ UND IHRE FORM. Nachgewiesen von J. K. ZENNER, S. J. In zwei Theilen, mit einem Titelbilde. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder'sche Verlagshandlung; St. Louis: B. Herder, 17 South Broadway, 1896. Pp. vi, 92 + 72, 4to. $3.35.

THE handsome typographical dress of this work is decidedly prepossessing. Its plan proves to be logical and orderly, the disposition of matter thoroughly careful, and the style clear and direct. While the presentation is firm and confident, it is not over-dogmatic, or disfigured by a polemic tone. From the very start, therefore, the work commends itself to a most cordial examination.

The author's main thesis is that among the Psalms there are numerous *Chorgesänge*, which are poems precisely arranged for rendering by a choir made up of several sections or groups of singers that sing in rotation or alternation. The novelty lies in the belief of our author that he has discovered an exact plan of construction, which he claims to be able to indicate with precision in many examples. So sure is he of his theory that he even uses it as a help to text-criticism and reconstruction.

Without lingering upon the somewhat naïve account of how the theory grew up in his mind, we pass at once to the theory itself. Starting with Raffl upon the assumption that the true method of psalm study involves first of all a search for a general "lyric unity" in each poem, with which details are to be harmonized, our author plunges at once into the problem of strophaic structure in the Psalter. In his view the unit of structure is the "verse," which is normally a distich (sometimes a tristich), with usually about three words in each member. These verses, he affirms, are habitually united into strophes of somewhat various dimensions; but in any one poem, so far as it exhibits the plan which he specially considers, the strophes are disposed in one regular way. This typical strophe-plan is this: (*a*) an opening strophe of from three to nine verses; (*b*) an antistrophe of exactly the same length; (*c*) an "antiphonal strophe" (*Wechselstrophe*), in which choir answers choir (usually) in verse-by-verse antiphony, the total number of verses varying from three to twelve; (*d*) a concluding strophe of from three to eight verses, and (*e*) an antistrophe of exactly the same length. Sometimes, he thinks, this plan is extended or compounded by appending a second antiphonal strophe with a third strophe and antistrophe; and in two cases (Ps. 89 and Deut. 32) he finds a third antiphonal strophe, with a final strophe and antistrophe, making eleven distinct sections. In the shorter forms he would distribute the matter between two choirs, the one singing the opening and closing strophes, the other the two antistrophes, and both engaging in alternation in the antiphony in the middle. But in the longer examples he conjectures that probably six choirs are necessary, divided into two grand divisions. As a rule he thinks that the climax of lyric effect and interest is to be found in the antiphony in the midst of the poem.

The general analogy of this scheme with the well-recognized patterns of Greek dramatic poetry is apparent, and leads the author to query whether somehow the Greek may not be a derivative of the

Hebrew, though his theory is presented, not as suggested by any such external analogy, but as derived from an induction from the Psalms taken by themselves. His hypothesis took its rise in an attempt to disentangle the difficulties of Ps. 132. Here he claims to have discovered that originally the psalm was written in two columns, one for each of the two antiphonal choirs, but that the final transcription combined the two without regard to the intended order of the verses, so that the result is chaotic. His reconstruction may be tabulated thus:

| Strophe I. | Antistrophe I. |
|---|---|
| 2 . 3 . 4 . 5 | 11 . 12 (each 2 distichs) |
| Antiphonal Strophe. | |
| 6 | 13 |
| 7 | 14 |
| Strophe II. | Antistrophe II. |
| 8 . 9 . 10 . 1 | 15 . 16 . 17 . 18 |

The ingenuity of this is indubitable, particularly in balancing those expressions in the two strains of thought that are alike; but the difficulties involved (such as the transposition of vs. 1, the consequent need of tinkering vs. 2, the want of inevitable artistic relation, for example, at the joint proposed between vss. 1 and 15) make the illustration, taken alone, far from convincing to a mind not predisposed to the author's view. But the assumed success of this experiment appears to have powerfully influenced our author, so that he at once set about finding in how many cases he could work out, by hook or by crook, similar schemes for other psalms. In all he claims to have detected forty-six cases in which a strophaic structure essentially like the above, either simple or compound, can be made to harmonize with the sense, the existing vestiges of ancient dividing points, etc. The full list of his asserted *Chorgesänge* is as follows: 1–4 (the "first psalm" of Acts 13:33); 5; 6 + 13[1]; 7; 9 + 10; 18; 19 + 20 + 21; 22: 1–24; 25; 27; 30; 31; 33; 34; 38; 39; 40: 1–12; 44; 45; 46 + 47; 48; 50; 51; 65; 66; 69 + 70; 71; 72; 73; 74; 77; 80; 81; 83; 88; 89; 92; 94; 102; 103; 109; 114 + 115; 132; 140; 145; 148 + 149 + 150. Furthermore, he applies his hypothesis to Ex. 15: 1–18; Deut. 32: 1–43; Is. 1: 2–17; 1 Chron. 16: 8–36; Judith 16: 1–16 (Greek). Indications of a more or less mistaken transcription from a column-wise source he conjectures, not only in Ps. 132, but in Pss. 7, 45, 66, 69, and 88, so that in these cases he would rearrange the verses.

[1] *Plus*-marks are used to indicate that the author's analysis includes two or more psalms as taken together, *i. e.*, as belonging to a *single* original poem.

In order to make his thought perfectly clear in detail, he has printed the texts in full, typographically displayed most happily,[2] and accompanied by critical notes and explanations. In some cases he has reinforced his points by partial renderings into German.

It is manifestly impossible here to summarize the alleged results of this painstaking effort, much less to pass judgment upon them in detail. Perhaps, however, we should give a sample or two. Ps. 51 is divided as follows, assuming that the final verses are rightly placed:[3]

Strophe I. Antistrophe I.
1 . 2 . 3 4 . 5 . 6
Antiphonal Strophe.
7 . 8 - 9 . 10
11 . 13 - 13 . 14
Strophe II. Antistrophe II.
15 . 16 . 17 18 . 19 (3 distichs)

We doubt whether this suggestion will command much enthusiasm, though if our author chooses to believe in it, no one will seriously object. But such a reconstruction as he proposes for Ps. 66 is decidedly interesting:

Strophe I. Antistrophe I.
1 . 2 . 3 . 4 (3 distichs) 13 . 14 . 15 (tristich)
Antiphonal Strophe.
5 - 6 ab
6c 7a - 7 bc
Strophe II. Antistrophe II.
8 . 9 . 10 . 11 . 12 16 . 17 . 18 . 19 . 20
(Vss. 12 and 20 are tristichs)

Another reconstruction on the basis of an assumed column-wise source is this of Ps. 45:

Strophe I. Antistrophe I.
1 . 2 (3 distichs) 10 . 11 . 12
Antiphonal Strophe.
3 . 4 . 5 (2 distichs and a tristich)
(not certain how divided)
Strophe II. Antistrophe II.
6 . 7 . 8 . 9 (5 distichs) 13 . 14 . 15 . 16 . 17

a *dis*arrangement that we think will not commend itself to most minds.

Some skepticism may be pardoned about one or two of the author's

[2] Except that in some cases the verse numbers are slightly wrong or are omitted.

[3] The verse numbers in all these tables are those of the English version.

collocations of successive psalms, without denying the possibility that in our text original poems may be split into parts. Particularly unsatisfactory is his plan of "the first psalm":

| Strophe I. | Antistrophe I. |
|---|---|
| Ps. I. 1 . 2 . 3 . 4 . 5 . 6 | II. 1 . 2 . 3 . 4 . 5 . 6 . 7 . 8 . 9 |
| (each 9 distichs) | |

Antiphonal Strophe.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| II. 10 | - | 11 |
| 12 ab | - | 12 cd |
| III. 1 | - | 2 |
| 3 | - | 4 |
| 5 | - | 6 |

| Strophe II. | Antistrophe II. |
|---|---|
| III. 7 . 8 . IV. 1 . 2 | 3 . 4 . 5 . 6 . 7 . 8 |
| (each 6 distichs) | |

So far as good sense and "lyric unity" go, this is simply fantastic.

Now, without failing to grant that our author has here and there made suggestions that are more or less good, the number of cases in which his theory works with difficulty, if not with confusing effect, justifies us in challenging his view from two or three sides. For one thing, his effort to establish a single fixed plan, including an exact balance of parts, runs counter to the common supposition that Hebrew poetry, like much poetry of its class, was not rigidly bound by laws of metrical regularity. Again, even if considerable regularity appears, what certainty is there that the exact choral antiphony affirmed by our author is authentic? Why are we forced to imagine such a fixed method of proposition and response? And, furthermore, all sorts of historical queries raise their heads over the fact that the proposed analysis is made to apply only to about one-third of the Psalter, and is on the whole least successful with the stronger and more individual poems. So, then, we turn to see what *proof* he offers that his hypothesis is sound, and to consider what his historical attitude is.

We find, in the first place, that he has been much influenced by a passage in the writings of Cosmas Indicopleustes regarding the Temple music, which in a Vatican codex is accompanied by a striking pictorial representation of the Temple choir (this interesting picture is finely reproduced as a frontispiece for the book). Here the Davidic musical establishment is shown as composed of six χοροί, led respectively by Jeduthun, the sons of Korah (two groups), Ethan the Israelite, Asaph, and Moses, the man of God. Cosmas explains that there

were differences between the choirs in the instruments used, in the style of singing, and in the kind of passages assigned to each. He specially asserts that the διάψαλμα of the LXX is inserted to show where one choir is to succeed another. To this tradition, preserved by a sixth-century traveler, Zenner attaches great weight.

We find, in the second place, that our author has, therefore, placed great stress on the occurrence of "Selah" in the Psalter, contending that where it occurs there is a transition, not only of thought, but of rendering, and contending, also, that similar transitions are to be found where the mark has either been lost or was too obviously implied to need insertion. To illustrate his point here he refers to the irregular way in which the character ♯ was used in the *musica ficta* of the later Middle Ages. He accordingly makes an elaborate study of the occurrences of "Selah," and feels constrained often to make the text bend to conform to his theory.

We find, furthermore, that he proceeds on the assumption that the strophaic plan for which he contends was *original*, that is, belonged to the poems as arranged for use in the *first* Temple. The editing of the Psalter, as we have it, he places in the time of Ezra, by whom many of the older poems were broken up into convenient fragments, because the ancient choral forces no longer existed, and because in some cases the references to royal personages and conditions were no longer pertinent. This latter point explains, for instance, the separation of Ps. 19 from Pss. 20 and 21. Many changes of text resulted, he thinks, from the subsequent use of the Psalms in a more or less popular manner, including, also, the tacking on of refrains, etc., in some cases.

Several remarks upon these ideas at once suggest themselves. We may readily grant that the "Selah" does usually correspond with some shift in the poetic movement, even though we may be skeptical whether Cosmas gives us more than a monkish hypothesis of its original meaning. But we fail to find in his account or in our author's analyses what may be called *proof* of any such absolutely balanced antiphony of strophes or verses as is urged. That the Psalter poetry is made up of sections is clear, but that we are in position to affirm their regularity of length or succession is not yet apparent. In default of all contemporary accounts of the ancient musical and liturgical praxis in detail, we may be excused for hesitating to accept any hypothesis for which less than extensive or massive evidence can be adduced in the facts of the Psalter as a whole.

If it should prove, as has been suspected, that many of the Psalms,

as we have them, are compilations of matter of different periods and styles, even a successful analysis like that of our author would prove nothing more than something about the literary and liturgical notions of the period at which the compilation took place. Considering the character of the poems with which he has been more fortunate, we are inclined to think that he has proved little about the more ancient styles of composition and rendering, though he may have thrown some light upon the praxis of the Persian period or of some later time. Doubtless Canon Cheyne will find Zenner's work a contribution to his theory of a Maccabean origin for the Psalter collection. We suspect that this historical inference would be decidedly unexpected and unsatisfactory to our author.

On the whole, then, while we may commend the work before us as a most painstaking attempt to establish a hypothesis which probably has some foundation in fact, we conclude that it has much less importance or extensive application than the author fondly imagines.

WALDO S. PRATT.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

STUDIA BIBLICA ET ECCLESIASTICA. Essays chiefly in Biblical and Patristic Criticism. By Members of the University of Oxford. Vol. IV. Oxford: at the Clarendon Press, 1896. Pp. 324; cloth. 10s.

THIS fourth volume of Oxford essays contains a variety of excellent papers, attesting the breadth of interest of the theologians of that university, and illustrating especially the value of a thorough classical training for biblical and patristic studies.

1. Canon Hicks publishes a summer-school lecture on *St. Paul ana Hellenism*, in which he points out some distinctly Hellenistic, as opposed to Hebraistic, traits in St. Paul—in his language, his metaphors, his moral ideas, his mode of exposition, his method of travel (to larger cities and seaports), and even in the growth of his ideas on three great topics, viz., the universality of the gospel, the doctrine of the person of Christ, the universality and the unity of the catholic church. The essay is sketchy and brief, but full of acute remarks, suggestive points of view, and sound learning. It would be a most useful piece of reading for young students of Paul.

2. It was a happy thought to ask Professor Ramsay to restate in connected form the arguments on the Galatian question, as he does in

his essay on *The "Galatia" of St. Paul and the "Galatic Territory" of Acts.* He gathers here with considerable additions the material which he had previously published, and argues (1) that the "South-Galatian theory" was the early tradition, as attested by Asterius in 401; (2) that Ptolemy, Strabo, Pliny, Tacitus, and probably one inscription, show *Galatia* to have been the official name of the Roman province; (3) that the inhabitants would naturally have been called *Galatæ* by anyone "taking the Roman side in the social, educational, and political problems of the country," as other provincials of mixed race were called *Afri, Siculi, Aquitani;* and (4) that (as Mommsen shows) designations like Lycaonian, Pisidian, Phrygian, in direct address, were an insult from a Roman. The latter part of the article contains a valuable excursus on the meaning, in the first century, of *Asia*, which Ramsay holds was not then applied in the narrower sense as about equivalent to *Ionia;* and is chiefly occupied with a detailed discussion, following van Gelder, *Galatorum res in Græcia et Asia* (Amsterdam, 1888), of the Lycaonian Tetrarchy and the history of Galatia down to about 75 B. C. It is unfortunate that the limits set did not allow him to carry out his plan of giving the history for seventy-five years more, but for so excursive a writer limits are a necessity. The whole discussion bids fair to be permanently famous, and has certainly occasioned the eliciting of much information and brought about the instruction of the multitude in many unexpected ways.

3. Mr. F. C. Conybeare has translated the Armenian version of *Acta Pilati*, as found in two Paris MSS., in one case (α) into Greek, in the other (β) into Latin, and prints them one above the other on the same page. In his introduction he argues that (α) is the older text, (β) having been more corrected from the Greek by later hands. The version agrees on the whole with Tischendorf's form A of the Greek text, which seems from other considerations also, as Conybeare shows, to be more original than B. Conybeare's text, although it is a translation of a translation, is useful because Tischendorf's text is not a reprint of any one MS., but an eclectic text made without the means of proper textual criticism. The text of the new Berlin Corpus will be a great boon here, as in nearly every other part of the field which that great work will cover. Mr. Conybeare, by the way, thinks that an allusion to the "right-hand thief" (the penitent one) in Aristides, *De Latrone* (published at Venice in 1878), is the earliest reference to *Acta Pilati.* This would put at any rate chap. x back as far as A. D. 130–50.

4. Mr. F. W. Bussell discusses *The Purpose of the World-process and the Problem of Evil as explained in the Clementine and Lactantian writings in a system of Subordinate Dualism*, an essay on two related points in the history of dogma. No connection between pseudo-Clement and Lactantius other than a general resemblance of principles is hinted at.

5. Nearly half of the volume is occupied by an essay by Mr. E. W. Watson on *The Style and Language of St. Cyprian*, a thorough piece of work. Cyprian's style is marked by extreme rhetorical elaboration, which is here traced in detail with abundant illustration. Cyprian "disliked the style of the Latin Bible; he was also discontented with its vocabulary," especially with its many Greek and its Hebrew words. "There are few of the Greek terms of church use for which he has not essayed to find a Latin synonym." To Tertullian his style shows only contrast. The writer to whom he comes nearest is Apuleius, from whose attractive rhetoric the equally rhetorical treatise *Ad Donatum* was perhaps designed to draw Christian readers away. The style "had no doubt been learned by both on African soil. But how far it was peculiar to Africa is a more doubtful point. In its literary aspect it is closely akin to that of Ammianus and the Panegyrists; in its grammatical to that of Vitruvius." Cyprian is in no sense a writer of "ecclesiastical Latin," which did not exist until the monasteries were established. The latter half of Mr. Watson's essay is "a full account of the theological and ecclesiastical terms used by Cyprian," a valuable contribution, covering seventy-five pages, to the Latin lexicon, for which all who study Cyprian will be heartily grateful. Mr. Watson's work is doubtless only a first installment, and the hints that he here and there gives show that he has a broad historical interest in the subject to which he is devoting so many years.

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

DIVINITY SCHOOL OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

TEXTS AND STUDIES, Vol. V, No. 1. APOCRYPHA ANECDOTA II By M. R. JAMES, Lit. D. Cambridge: The University Press Pp. cii + 174. 7s. 6d.

THIS new series of unpublished apocrypha comprises six documents: (1) A fragment of the Acts of John; (2) a Greek Acts of Thomas, differing from those published by M. Bonnet; (3) the letter of Pilate to Herod and Herod's reply, both in Greek; (4) the letter

of Tiberius to Pilate; (5) a Greek apocalypse of Baruch; (6) the Testament of Job. Two of these writings, Nos. 4 and 6, have been printed before, but the text of the latter is now given from a Paris manuscript not used by Mai, the first editor. The only excuse alleged for reproducing No. 4 is the rarity of the works in which it appeared. The editor has added, for the sake of comparison, translations of the Ethiopic Conflict of St. Thomas, which corresponds, to a large extent, with the new Acts, of the Syriac versions of the letters of Pilate and Herod, and of the Slavonic apocalypse of Baruch.

By far the most interesting and important of the new *anecdota* is the fragment of the gnostic *Periodoi Joannou*, or "Acts of St. John," from a fourteenth-century manuscript at present at Vienna. With the exception of some passages quoted in the *Acts of the Second Council of Nice*, which have already been printed, the text is now given to the public for the first time. There can be little doubt that it dates from the latter half of the second century, as there is a probable reference to it in the writings of Clement of Alexandria. If so, it supplies an instructive early example of docetic teaching of a distinctly gnostic type. It belongs to the same class (if not the same age) as the fragment of the gospel according to Peter. The style is much more difficult, but on the whole more elevated. Some passages, indeed, approach sublimity. The use of the gospel of John by the author, which has been lately denied by Corssen in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, seems clearly proved by Dr. James. The text is accompanied by an English translation, and by critical notes which include suggestions from Professor Bonnet, who is bringing out an edition of the whole of the extant remains.

Next in interest is the Greek *Apocalypse of Baruch*, printed from a manuscript in the British Museum. It is very short, compared with the Syriac apocalypse, reëdited recently by Mr. Charles. It is clearly of Christian origin, at any rate in its present form, as it teaches that men obtain entrance into paradise through Jesus Christ the Immanuel (chap. 4). Its theme is the journey of Baruch, under the guidance of an angel, through five of the seven heavens, so that it corresponds in part to the *Celestial Physics* of the Ethiopic Enoch. It is thought to imply acquaintance with *The Rest of the Words of Baruch*, a Christian writing composed about 136 A. D. Dr. James assigns our apocalypse also to the second century. Short though it is, it is a storehouse of strange fancies and speculations. Note especially those about the diabolic origin of the vine in chap. 4, and about the

phœnix in chap. 6. Christian ministers are referred to as "priests" (chap. 16) and apparently as "spiritual fathers" (chap. 13).

The *Testament of Job*, which may also be Christian (although its Christian origin is far less distinct), has been hitherto overlooked by most; and so this reissue of it from another manuscript is not unwelcome, although it is clearly out of place among *anecdota*. It is conjecturally assigned to the second or third century.

The new *Acts of Thomas*, which are found in the same manuscript as Baruch, are late, but by no means without interest. They contain an *agraphon* not mentioned either by Resch or Ropes: "He who ransoms many souls shall be great in my kingdom" (chap. 6).

It goes without saying that the work is well edited. It makes no claim to thoroughness, but that cannot be expected in a volume of this kind. The texts are printed that others may interpret them. A few misprints have escaped correction in the extract from Professor Zahn's letter on pp. xxii and xxiii.

W. TAYLOR SMITH.

EXETER, ENGLAND.

A HISTORY OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE APOSTOLIC AGE. By ARTHUR CUSHMAN MCGIFFERT, PH.D., D.D., Professor of Church History in Union Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. The International Theological Library. Pp. xii + 681. $2.50 *net*.

IN HIS preface Professor McGiffert describes the apostolic age as the age of the New Testament. But by this he does not mean the period covered by the New Testament literature, which would extend from about 46 A. D., the date of the earliest document, to the middle of the second century, where 2 Peter is placed. He rather means the period during which the apostles, or any of them, were still active; and therefore the limit is the death of John, about 98 A. D. Within these limits the author has arranged his material in a simple and scientific manner. There are only six chapters. The first treats of the origin of Christianity under three heads: Judaism, John the Baptist, and Jesus; but the second is really part of the first, so we have here a compact presentation of what we may call the organism and its environment. Chap. 2 deals with primitive Jewish Christianity; chaps. 3 and 4 with the belief and work of Paul; chap. 5 with the church at large, and chap.

6 with the development of the chief churches of the empire, including remarks upon their unity and organization.

With a plan so broadly drawn, it has not always been easy for the author to introduce everything that is expected in a book of this kind; but this disadvantage is more than offset by the comprehensive view which one gains of the whole subject. If apparent unity has sometimes been secured by the purely mechanical device of avoiding the use of subsections and subtitles, the reader will gladly admit that there lies behind all that a real unity, due to the author's masterly grasp of the issues of the period, and by his power of lucid exposition. It may be thought by some that too much attention has been devoted to Paulinism, but for this very good justification may be found in the New Testament itself. The discussion of organization and of worship does not occupy many pages, but where shall we turn for extended information on these topics before the close of the first century? Professor McGiffert has clearly conceived his task, and has recognized the limitations under which it must be performed. The result is a book meritorious both for what it does and for what it leaves undone, a combination which unfortunately is rare. It should be added here that the design of the book has been carried out; it is "constructive and not destructive."

After rapidly sketching the development of the Messianic hope among the Jews, and describing the evidence afforded by the preaching of John the Baptist, that no religious reformation could succeed at that time without being based upon the popular belief in the approaching divine kingdom, the author passes to a consideration of the work of Jesus. From the outset we hear in his preaching a new note, that of personal fatherhood as the relation between God and man. The Jews had for some time regarded God as their Father in a national sense, but now the relation became individual. Using this truth as the corner-stone, Jesus built upon the popular Messianic expectation. That he was himself the Messiah appears to have first become clear to him at his baptism, a circumstance which is intelligible in the light of the prevailing conception that the Messiah would be a man chosen and equipped of God for his mission. The temptation was a critical attack of doubt as to the reality of his Messianic call, from which he emerged victorious. Jesus' historic significance is not that he stood in the line of the prophets, nor that he proclaimed the advent of the kingdom, nor that he lived a consecrated life and taught a pure morality; it is that he persuaded the few who adhered to him until the end that he

was indeed the promised Messiah, and that the kingdom was to find in him its founder and its head. The disciples regarded him simply in this light, and needed, in addition, neither his deity nor the perfection of his humanity as a foundation for the church. Though his death at first threatened to destroy what had been begun, it had precisely the opposite effect, for appearances of the risen Lord, of a character to convince his followers of their reality, gave them courage for the new beginning. The Messiah had come, but it was plain that the time for the establishment of the Messianic kingdom was not yet ripe; hence upon them devolved the task of preparation which Jesus had just laid down. The return of the disciples from Galilee to Jerusalem with this resolve was epoch-making, because at this point (not on the day of Pentecost) begins the history of the Christian church.

The disciples, personal friends of Christ, were now apostles, *i. e.*, primarily missionaries, the chosen messengers of his kingdom. It is true the book of Acts represents them as officials of the church, as an apostolic college, but this was the view at the time the book was written and in which its author shared; it was not the primitive conception. "The official character which has been ascribed to the apostles since the second century was the result of carrying back to them the official character of the bishops" (p. 97, n.). The question arises, What were these missionaries to preach? Their leader was dead, and if they would establish his Messianic claims they must overcome the prejudice caused by this event by proving that he was nevertheless the Messiah. Peter's speech on the day of Pentecost is the earliest Christian apology of which we know, and it breathes throughout the spirit of primitive Jewish Christianity. The point to which our author particularly draws attention is that this address shifts the emphasis "from the gospel itself to the evidence of its truth, from the message to the messenger" (p. 54). The change was inevitable, yet momentous for the future development of Christianity. In Peter's speech the argument turned upon the meaning of the charismatic phenomena of Pentecost, but it was not long before Christ's death became the crucial point, and this was interpreted in harmony with the conception of a suffering Messiah, which had made its way to a certain extent into the popular mind.

As for the life of these primitive Christian believers, it did not differ in any noticeable respect from that of their Jewish brethren. They kept the law, as Jesus himself had done; they baptized converts; so did Jesus; so did John; so had these same disciples before their Master's death. They did not baptize according to the formula of Matt.

28: 19, but simply in the name of Christ. But all the disciples were united by a common hope, a common faith, and a common purpose, and thus they formed one household. Every meal was a Lord's Supper, and to this simple commemorative act they attached at first no paschal significance whatever. The original circle was composed of Galileans, but citizens of Jerusalem and Hellenistic Jews were soon added to their number, though perhaps not so rapidly as the figures given in Acts 2 and 4 seem to indicate. The appointment of a special committee of seven to care for the poor among the Hellenists is, however, an indication of rapid growth. Dr. McGiffert takes occasion at this point to correct an earlier view, published in his edition of *Eusebius*, and now maintains that these "seven men" of Acts 6 were not presbyters, but temporary officers of the Jerusalem church, with no successors.

The first conflict with Judaism seems to have arisen from the simple charge that the disciples were disturbers of the peace. But when Stephen's death had given the signal for a general outbreak against the followers of Jesus, they at once began to be recognized as heretics, and were henceforth more and more marked off from their fellow-Jews. Dispersed, they formed little ἐκκλησίαι here and there, as the apostles and other preachers went from place to place with their message. With the conversion of Cornelius (not with that of the Ethiopian eunuch, who was doubtless a Jew) began the work among the Gentiles, in which the agent was Peter. There was nothing in the Cornelius incident, when reported to the church at Jerusalem, to suggest that the Jewish law was in danger, for the disciples failed to realize all that was involved, but the rapid rise of the Gentile Christian community at Antioch gave the situation a different aspect. Here the chief actor, although not the original founder, was the apostle Paul.

Professor McGiffert first examines Paul's doctrinal belief, maintaining that this underwent no substantial change from the beginning of his preaching to the end. His system was practically complete before he began his work, and its roots lie far back in his Jewish period. His apparently sudden conversion was in fact not without preparation. We can infer the progress of his thought at this crisis from his own writings more safely than from the three narratives in the Acts, although the most reliable of these (chap. 26) gives us important information about the external circumstances. Paul had always been a conscientious and earnest man, and, while still an ardent Jew, the dualism in his nature between will and desire had confronted him as an insoluble problem. The evil desire, he concluded, was inbred in the flesh, while

its opposite, viz., spirit, with its accompanying holiness, was unattainable. That he was already reduced to despair the words of Rom. 7:24 clearly indicate. But then came the vision of the risen Lord, a revelation of *spiritual being*, something whose very existence Paul had almost come to doubt. This spiritual Christ was, of necessity, a holy being, not an ordinary man, otherwise there was no place for him in Paul's thought, and appearing thus to Paul, not as one who rewards his servants with wages, but as one who is a Savior from sin, he supplied him with a new conception of the Messianic office. Christ enters into man's very being and unites him to himself, thought Paul. "Death with Christ unto the flesh and resurrection with him into a new life in the Spirit . . . . constitute the sum and substance of his Christianity." Faith is the attitude of receptivity toward Christ, or toward the Spirit, which is the same thing, and the result of faith is salvation, which becomes complete only after a prolonged struggle, when at last man is released from all contact with the flesh, which is in its very nature evil. Hence the fervent joy of Paul's outburst in Rom. 7:25. His idea of the believer's union with Christ involved release from the bondage of law, the Jewish law included, and when he realized the consequences of his position he boldly faced them, taking his stand as the Apostle of the Gentiles.

Professor McGiffert discusses with clearness the distinction which must be drawn between the Christianity of Paul and that of the church at large. Most of Paul's own converts, and, *a fortiori*, the converts of other apostles, were unable to grasp his deeply spiritual conception of the gospel as a vital union of the believer with Christ in the Spirit. They took Paul's teaching of freedom and interpreted it to mean freedom from the Jewish code alone; the Christian's law is new and higher, but it is law still. We find this legal conception of Christianity in Hebrews, James, Revelation, the pastoral epistles, Jude, 2 Peter, Clement of Rome, the Didache, Barnabas, Polycarp, and Justin Martyr. "Conformity to law was the ethical watchword of the age," within as well as without the pale of the church. The original gospel of the fatherhood of God is rarely met with in early Christian literature. A materialistic notion of Christ's future reign was widely prevalent, and to that reign believers looked forward. To have part in it was salvation, and salvation was conditioned upon faith, which meant "the assured conviction that what God has promised or threatened he will perform" (p. 458). Faith was thus an act of the intellect, it was knowledge, it was the opposite of doubt. The church at large thus

took the first step toward a later conception of faith as the assent to certain propositions, the *fides quæ creditur*. It must be remembered that this common Gentile Christianity, the prevailing type in the early church, is as distinct from Paulinism on the one hand as it is from Jewish Christianity on the other, and Dr. McGiffert has done a great service in thus insisting upon a recognition of its true character and in showing that it cannot historically be identified with the teaching of Paul as over against the Jewish type.

Paul's missionary activity and writings are discussed by Professor McGiffert at considerable length. He agrees with O. Holtzmann and with Harnack that the generally accepted chronology is five or six years too late. The following dates, taken from a convenient table at the end of the book, will show the most important features of the author's scheme:

Paul's conversion, 31 or 32 A. D.
His first visit to Jerusalem, 34 or 35 A. D.
Work in Syria and Cilicia, after 35 A. D.
Evangelization of Galatia (first journey), before 45 A. D.
Second visit to Jerusalem (apostolic council), 45 or 46 A. D.
Epistle to the Galatians, c. 46 A. D.
Evangelization of Macedonia and Achaia (second missionary journey), c. 46–49 A. D.
Epistles to the Thessalonians, c. 48 A. D.
Evangelization of Asia (third missionary journey), c. 49–52 A. D.
Trouble in the church at Corinth, epistles to the Corinthians, notes to Timothy and Titus, c. 51–52 A. D.
Last visit to Corinth, 52–53 A. D.
Epistle to the Romans, note to the Ephesians, 52–53 A. D.
Last visit to Jerusalem, arrest, 53 A. D.
Imprisonment in Cæsarea, 53–55 A. D.
Journey to Rome, 55–56 A. D.
Imprisonment in Rome, 56–58 A. D.
Epistles to Colossians, Philemon, Ephesians, and Philippians, note to Timothy, 56–58 A. D.
Death of Paul, 58 A. D.

Some such reconstruction of the chronology has been expected since the publication of Dr. McGiffert's brief article on the duration of Peter's activity in Rome, in the first number of this journal. Many of the difficulties which the new dates seem at first to present are satisfactorily met, provided one takes the author's view of the book of Acts, that it is a compilation from sources of unequal value and pervaded by the spirit

of a later age. On one of the most important points, the date of the accession of Festus, strong arguments are given for pushing it back to the year 55.

Of course, questions properly belonging to New Testament introduction demand attention in any book on the apostolic age, and the views of a scholar of Dr. McGiffert's standing are of great interest. A new theory of the position of Paul's epistle to the Galatians is here offered, viz.. that it is the earliest of his letters, dating from the year 46, very soon after the apostolic council. The epistle is skillfully interpreted in harmony with the peculiar conditions created by the council and by Peter's subsequent visit to Antioch. Thoughtful suggestions are also made regarding the time when the apostolic decree was adopted, a little later than the council. It was to bring this decree that emissaries then came from James to Antioch. In discussing the disagreement between Paul and Peter, Professor McGiffert is so anxious to do the latter full justice that he advances arguments in justification of his conduct which seem to the reviewer to lack force and cogency. On the other hand, the author's sensible opinion that the Galatian letter settled once for all the controversy with Paul's Judaizing enemies will commend itself to many scholars. In agreement with the best recent criticism Dr. McGiffert regards all the Pauline epistles except the pastorals as authentic, and even these are based upon genuine notes of Paul. A short letter to Timothy, written from Macedonia about 52 A. D., after Paul had left Ephesus for the last time, and a longer one written from Rome about 58, just before his execution, were worked over together to form our 2 Timothy. Our epistle to Titus is based upon a note written probably before Paul's last visit to Corinth, *i. e.*, about 52, asking Titus to spend the winter with him in Nicopolis, whither he must at that time have been planning to go. Varying judgments will be pronounced upon the author's theory that the redactor of 2 Timothy and Titus composed at a later date our 1 Timothy, on a very slender Pauline foundation, with a view to promoting his own original object, viz., the "healthy development of the church by the institution of safeguards and by the formulation of rules." The epistle to the Ephesians, while genuine, was not addressed to any particular church, but was a circular letter. Its doctrinal teaching, like that of Colossians, cannot be regarded as a valid argument against its authenticity. The last chapter of Romans does not belong to that epistle, but is a separate document, a note addressed to the Ephesian church, written from Corinth to introduce Phœbe. Sub-

stantially the same view is held by Weiss, Weizsäcker, Jülicher, and others.

The epistle to the Hebrews is anonymous. It is not from Barnabas' pen, as Professor McGiffert formerly maintained. The author may have been an Alexandrian Jew, possibly a former disciple of Philo, for the thought of the epistle is decidedly Philonic. It was designed for Gentile readers. Barnabas, however, is not to be deprived entirely of the honors of authorship, for Dr. McGiffert inclines to the opinion that our 1 Peter is from his pen, breathing, as it does, throughout the Pauline spirit. This document is here dated in the early part of Domitian's reign. But 2 Peter appears in a less favorable light. It is pseudonymous — the only such book in the New Testament — and dates from about the middle of the second century. As for the apostle Peter himself, he was certainly in Rome for a considerable time, though, of course, Jerome's tradition of a twenty-five years' episcopate cannot be maintained. The difficulty arising from Paul's silence being removed by the early date of Romans and of the epistles of the captivity, it seems reasonable to suppose that Peter spent five or six years in the capital, that period being none too long to account for his overshadowing influence as reflected in the tradition of the Roman church. Date and authorship of the epistle of James are unknown, but it must have been written before the end of the first century. Jude is later, belonging to the early part of the second, and its author cannot, therefore, have been the Lord's brother. The epistles of John are anonymous, and it is uncertain whether they are all from the same hand. First John was written by the author of the fourth gospel, which it resembles in the Pauline tone of its theology. The presbyter John was probably the author of the Apocalypse, which is based upon earlier apocalypses partly Jewish in their origin, and which dates in its present form from the latter part of the reign of Domitian. It is interesting to observe that books like Colossians, Ephesians, Hebrews, and 1 Peter, which others have usually regarded as doctrinal in their aim, Dr. McGiffert finds preponderatingly practical. So far as doctrine has been introduced, it is for the purpose of reënforcing the precepts laid down for the Christian life.

Mark is regarded as the earliest and most reliable of the synoptic gospels. It was written from Rome by John Mark about 75–80 A. D., and is largely based upon information received from Peter. Luke stands next, perhaps a decade later. Its author, a Gentile Christian, is unknown except as being also the compiler of the book of Acts. Besides the

gospel of Mark he used as a source the Logia, ascribed by Papias to the apostle Matthew (which statement, by the way, our author sees no valid reason to doubt). The compiler used the Logia with greater regard to their historical setting than did Matthew, whose sources were the same as Luke's. Matthew "is an argument, not merely a picture." It was composed with the design of establishing the Messiahship of Jesus, and is arranged on the topical plan. It appears to come from a Palestinian Jewish Christian of the second or third generation, but who the author was we do not know. As for the fourth gospel, Dr. McGiffert writes: "The time is past when the fourth gospel can be explained as a mere piece of religious fiction from the pen of a second-century writer; but on the other hand the time is not yet come, and possibly may never come, when it can be claimed to be either an absolutely exact picture of Jesus' character, or a really historical account of his ministry" (p. 612). Yet Dr. McGiffert accepts as accurate the statement of Irenæus that the apostle John spent the closing years af his life in Ephesus, and died there at a great age in the reign of Trajan. The fancied relation of this gospel to the teaching of Philo is pronounced to be misleading, for there is in reality nothing in common between the two beyond their employment of the same word *logos*. Their conceptions differ widely, The statement that there are many evidences of Pauline influence in the fourth gospel (pp. 487 f.) is not entirely consistent with what our author has said about the personal influence of Paul in Ephesus being very short-lived (p. 288).

The aim of the book of Acts is to exhibit Christianity "in its relation to the state in as harmless a light as possible" (p. 348). The compiler's sources were of very unequal value, some being of the first class (*e. g.*, the travel-document), others appearing to have less historical worth (*e. g.*, parts of chap. 15). Dr. McGiffert does not think Luke wrote the book, but it is unquestionably from the same hand as the third gospel, and dates not later than the reign of Domitian.

The remainder of the book must be passed over very rapidly. The author indicates clearly and dispassionately how much is known, or may be safely inferred, respecting the organization of the church at that early age. He maintains with Sohm that while in the New Testament the word ἐκκλησία is used in a specific as well as in a general sense, yet the church conceived as universal preceded the individual churches both logically and historically. Of course the later conception of a unity of organization is an altogether different thing. The unity of spirit in the primitive church was promoted by the itinerant

apostles and prophets, and by the interchange of written communications. The process by which this all-embracing spiritual unity of the first days of Christianity was superseded by a unity secured through exclusion is admirably indicated. The author is less clear than might be wished in distinguishing "prophets" from "teachers." He says of the former that they "were not simply the occasional recipients of a revelation; they were in possession of a permanent prophetic gift" (p. 652). But soon afterward he represents the latter as endowed with "a permanent gift which fitted them always to instruct and edify the church, while the prophet might receive his revelations only occasionally" (p. 655).

On the whole it may be truthfully said that the volume before us is the most notable contribution to a proper understanding of the apostolic age thus far made by any American scholar, and as such it will be certain to rank high in the valuable series in which it appears.

J. WINTHROP PLATNER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.

A CONCORDANCE OF THE GREEK TESTAMENT ACCORDING TO THE TEXTS OF WESTCOTT AND HORT, TISCHENDORF, AND THE ENGLISH REVISERS. Edited by W. F. MOULTON, M.A., D.D., editor of the English edition of the Winer's *Grammar of New Testament Greek*, and REV. A. S. GEDEN, M.A., Tutor in Biblical Literature, Exegesis, and Classics, Wesleyan College, Richmond, etc. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons. Pp. 1037, 4to. $7.

ALL New Testament scholars whose study has been of such a character as to require them to make much use of a concordance of the Greek text have felt for some years the urgent need of a work better adapted to their needs than anything that was in existence. Bruder, originally based almost as a matter of necessity on the now obsolete *textus receptus*, had in its latest editions professed indeed to exhibit the variations of the leading modern editors, but several circumstances combined to make the attempt far from successful. No attempt was made to exhibit any variations except those affecting the index word; thus the body of the quotation remained in the form of the *textus receptus*, a circumstance which greatly diminished the usefulness of the book for many purposes, especially for the study of constructions. Again, inasmuch as it was deemed necessary to retain the old stereo-

type plates, only such changes were shown on the page as could be introduced into the plates; for such as could not be thus shown awkward expedients had to be adopted. And finally, the number of positive blunders was large enough to make one always uncertain of his results till he had verified every passage by comparison of the text.

Other concordances, of course, there were, such as the Englishman's, Hudson, and Schmoller, but all of them based on the *textus receptus*, as well as severally open to other serious objections. The field was, therefore, an open one for the publication of a first-rate concordance of the Greek Testament on the basis of the modern critical texts. This important task was undertaken some years ago by Dr. Moulton and Mr. Geden, and has now been brought to completion in the volume before us. The plan of the work is in almost all respects admirable. The quarto page is divided into two columns, instead of three as in Bruder, thus permitting a somewhat longer quotation, usually long enough to secure grammatical completeness. The quotations are conformed to the Westcott and Hort text, but with an added statement of any variations of the text or margin of Tischendorf (8th ed.), or the English revision, which affect the form or the construction of the index word. To have done more in the matter of the text would have complicated the matter, probably without compensating advantage. Passages which are direct quotations from the Old Testament are immediately followed by the Hebrew of the original passage. The passages under the more important words are classified usually with reference to construction by a convenient system of index numerals. By means of * ** and † the words themselves are classified according to the period and range of their use. This is perhaps hardly within the strict scope of a concordance, but it occupies no space and adds a convenient feature.

Admirable as the book is, there are some respects in which we could have wished it were better. The paper is too soft, as one will find if he uses a pen on it. The appearance of the page is not as pleasant to the eye as is that of Bruder; this would not have been a serious objection if the book had thereby been made more easily usable, but the contrary seems to be the case. The omission of the passages, chapter and verse only being given, in the case of prepositions governing only one case, is a real defect, for which there seems to be no good reason. The adoption of the same method to so large an extent in the case of the article is also greatly to be regretted. In view of these features, and of the total omission of καί and δέ, which is, how-

ever, less serious, scholars will do well, while they establish the new work in the place of the discarded Bruder, still to give the latter a place on the top shelf for occasional reference. Despite these defects, however, some of which may possibly be remedied in later editions, the book is a long-desired boon, for which every student of the Greek Testament ought to be devoutly grateful, and of a copy of which he should possess himself at the earliest moment. By the way, in view of the statements of the preface, would it be any more than justice that this book should be commonly known as Geden's Concordance?

ERNEST D. BURTON.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LEHRBUCH DER NEUTESTAMENTLICHEN THEOLOGIE. Von HEINRICH JULIUS HOLTZMANN, Doctor und ordentlichem Professor der Theologie in Strassburg. Freiburg und Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1897. 2 vols. Pp. xvi + 503, xi + 532, 8vo. M. 20.

THIS important and comprehensive work is laid out on a truly scientific plan. After a full account of the literature and a critical sketch of the history of the "Disciplin," the writer, setting out from the point of view that the New Testament cannot be understood apart from the ideas of the Jewish canonical books and the later Judaism, its theology, angelology, demonology, and eschatology, gives a condensed review of this vast field. To the documents for the theology of the synagogue is accorded only a relative and secondary value on account of their later date. On the ground, however, that these writings record ancient traditions, the rule is laid down that when thoughts and expressions in the New Testament have a striking analogy to others in the Talmud and Midrash, these may be regarded as forms of the Jewish theology existing in New Testament times. The later apocryphal and apocalyptic literature of Judaism furnishes striking parallels to the New Testament ideas as to angels and demons, and in particular as to Satan, sin, and the fall of man (Luke 22:31; 2 Cor. 11:3, etc.). The occurrence of the same ideas in this literature and in that of the synagogue lends probative force to the latter. The Messianic doctrines of these writings throw light upon the cruder Messianism of the New Testament, especially that of its apocalyptic portions. Passages in 4 Ezra and Baruch may be compared with Matt. 24:7 and Mark 13:12. Deliverance from sin, however, through attachment in faith to the person of the Messiah, as taught by Paul, is foreign to Jewish thought. A

long section on the Alexandrian theology completes the extended discussion of the ideas of contemporary Judaism, occupying about one hundred pages, and brings us to the teaching of Jesus.

Of Jesus himself Dr. Holtzmann affirms that no real course of development can be proved. Certain conditions and impressions, however, which must have influenced him are recorded in his discourses — physical nature and environment, the spiritual atmosphere of the Old Testament, contemporary society, the Judaism of the synagogue and of the law, and John the Baptist. Reference is unnecessary to the many passages which show the influence upon the form of his teaching exerted by the climatic and social surroundings. A few will suffice (Matt. 6 : 26 ; 13 : 32 ; 15 : 26, 27 ; Mark 4 : 21; Luke 11 : 7; 14 : 7 ; 17 : 35 ; 20 : 46, 47 ; 21 : 1). His words show a reading acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures and also with the uncanonical literature of his people, from the latter of which he quotes in Luke 11 : 40. By Greek ideas he was as little influenced as by rabbinical theology, and from Essenian traits in Matthew it is not to be concluded that he belonged to that order. In the baptism of John Jesus "received the last of the incitements which are demonstrable before his public appearance," whatever significance may be attached to the facts that his ministry opened with John's call to repentance, and that like the latter he gathered disciples about him. We must not omit, however, to take into account his own religious genius, which enabled him to assume an attitude of superiority and refusal toward many ideas of his time; his faith in God, which was "not born of the storms of doubt;" his divine gift of love, and his mighty strength of will. "The religious genius lives rather from looking into himself than about himself." To those acquainted with the author's *Einleitung* it is necessary only to indicate briefly his position on the difficult problem of the sources of the teaching of Jesus. All that lies outside the three synoptics is regarded as of secondary importance. In the first rank are the logia of Matthew, the original Mark-writing, and "a still ever problematical separate source of the author *ad Theophilum*." "Our present gospels are books of devotion, and their relation to their historical contents is very complicated." Resch may take this crumb of comfort: "Despite all excesses, there remains a right kernel in the attempted proof of inner and outer canonical translation-variants."

In treating the difficult question of Jesus' relation to the law the author is inclined to exclude passages in Matt., chap. 5. He favors connecting 5 : 20–48 with 5 : 17, ascribing the latter verse, however, to

Matthew, in which case verse 18 "cannot be a genuine logion." All attempts to bring 5:18 into accord with 5:20–48 "issue in the desperate endeavor to make Jesus say the opposite of the unmistakable sense of his words." If Matt. 5:18 be retained and fairly interpreted only one possibility remains: "One must simply recognize the contradiction in Jesus' consciousness as the shadow which the religious genius cast and could not but cast." But since a strong Judaizing tendency is recognized in the first gospel, and Matt. 5:17 is ascribed to the evangelist, *καταλύειν τὸν νόμον* and *πληροῦν τ. ν.* being credited to the Pauline terminology, might not one hazard the conjecture that the true connection of the teaching of Jesus appears in joining 5:20 ff. with 5:16?

With regard to the idea of God as King and Father, Dr. Holtzmann holds with Dr. Weiss that Jesus stood upon Old Testament ground. Even the name "Father" is no discovery of his. God's fatherhood does not, however, rest upon the fact of creation. It is the "new family" (Mark 3:34, 35), the disciples, who are bidden to address God as Father. They are sons of God, since by anticipation they are members of his kingdom. They are "called" or "become" children of God who make peace, love their enemies, bless those who curse them, etc. (Matt. 5:9, 44, 45). The earlier idea of God is, however, enlarged and "furnished with a universalistic perspective." "God is Father of all who will become his children." This necessarily belongs with the thought of the kingdom of God.

The apparent antinomy in Jesus' representation of the kingdom of God as both present and to come, as destined to have an age-long development and yet a sudden, apocalyptic establishment, finds at our author's hands a historical solution from the point of view that Jesus had one conception of the kingdom in the time of his success and triumph and another when he was engaged in conflict and saw defeat at hand. This resolution of the antinomy, the opposing members of which are about equally well supported by exegesis, has in its favor an analogy with Jesus' conception of his Messiahship. For the Jesus of the synoptics as the Son of Man is conceived in relation to the future kingdom in accordance with the Daniel apocalypse. In the Son of Man of that book he sees prefigured his own Messiahship. If we put the apocalyptic portions of the synoptics to the credit of the evangelists, or with Arnold Meyer, Lietzmann, and others regard the term Son of Man as an Aramaic expression for Man, the facts remain that the title is applied to Jesus in exalted as well as in lowly functions, in pas-

sages which have no apocalyptic sense (Mark 8 : 31 ; 9 : 31, with reference to death and resurrection), and in general where he announces, extends, and represents the kingdom of God as one forgiving, healing, teaching, and suffering. Regarding the attempt to make it appear that Jesus made no claim to the Messiahship, Dr. Holtzmann remarks that "He who, taking his departure from the thought of the kingdom, knew himself to be its chosen organ, found, proceeding from the idea of God, the complementary counterpart to this idea in his own consciousness of Sonship ; and these two, the Son of Man and the Son of God, were united in his consciousness of Messiahship." He also finds it impossible to understand "under what other flag" than this of Messiahship "the life-ship of Jesus should sail."

The interpretation of the synoptic eschatology corresponds with that of the kingdom of God and Messianism. The former "has no other content than the prophesied triumph of the Messiah." Jesus foretold not only his death, but also his resurrection. But the record shows, in the scattering of the disciples, the embalming of the body, the stone before the tomb, and the astonishment at the open grave, that he had said nothing of rising within three days. If, moreover, he foretold his "personal restitution, and indeed probably just in the form of the resurrection," he must have had in view also the completion of his kingdom, and hence the prophecy included his triumphant return for this purpose. He told his disciples, or at least his judges, that they would see him sitting on the right hand of power and coming in the clouds of heaven (Mark 14 : 62). The immediate future, the existing generation, would witness this event. The kernel of this prophecy belongs to Jesus, and is not to be credited to the evangelists, to whatever degree the form and embellishment may be theirs. It is worthy of note here that Dr. Holtzmann abandons the position on this point defended in *Die synoptischen Evangelien*, 1863.

The sources of the Pauline theology do not include Second Thessalonians and the pastoral epistles, and admit as of only secondary importance Colossians and Ephesians. The materials of the Pauline doctrine relating to God and the world, revelation, inspiration of the Jewish Scriptures, Messiah, Satan, angels, demons, etc., came from the scholastic theology of the Jews. More than an "incidental" contribution was also furnished by Hellenism. In the Pauline anthropology "the outer man" includes σάρξ as the material and σῶμα as the form, and ψυχή is inseparably joined with the σάρξ as its life-energy which perishes with it ; while to "the inner man" belong νοῦς (the reason, thought,

and a will opposed to the animal man), and conscience (συνείδησις). The doctrines of sin, Christology, and salvation rest upon a distinct exclusion of σάρξ from the inner man. The author differs with Lüdemann, Wendt, Pfleiderer, and many other eminent scholars, in holding that Paul does not ascribe a πνεῦμα to man as an attribute belonging to him essentially and apart from his Christian renewal. Rather πνεῦμα = πνεῦμα θεῖον — a somewhat hazardous position, the exegetical support of which is not as strong as that drawn from the analogy of the apostle's thought. A Hellenistic dualism is found in the opposition of σάρξ and πνεῦμα, and it is maintained that Paul conceived of πνεῦμα as a "finer materiality," a "higher light-substance," of which the "spiritual body" was believed to be composed. The two factors of sin are the law, which was given that it might "abound," and the flesh, a power hostile to the Spirit and to God. Paul leaves the ground of the Jewish *Weltanschauung* and ethics, and stands opposed to our modern ideas in connecting sin inseparably with the substance of man's bodily organism in which it resides indissolubly as a "power" (Rom. 7:18). He knows nothing, however, of a matter evil in itself, so that his dualism is ethical rather than metaphysical. An unresolved difficulty appears in the relation of personal sinning to the primal sin, since in Rom. 5:12–19 a transference of the original sin to Adam's posterity appears to be taught, while in 7:14–23 and in 1 Cor. 15:45–47 sin is represented as having its ground in the nature of man, which Paul nowhere teaches to have undergone a change by reason of the first transgression. Dr. Holtzmann thinks that no reconciliation of these two teachings is adequate to resolve the antinomy implied in the entrance of death into the world through the first transgression (Rom. 5:12) and its inherence in the flesh, which in its nature partakes of corruption (φθορά). The death which is "the wages of sin" is not only that of the body, but also "destruction," annihilation, "exclusion from the sphere of existence."

The negative and pessimistic aspects of the doctrine of sin are relieved by the Christology, which presents an adequate Saviour in the preëxistent heavenly man who was "in the form of God," and through whom all things were made. The "was made" (ἐγένετο) in 1 Cor. 15:45, "the last Adam was made a quickening Spirit," is interpreted in the sense "became," that is, as representing a process completed in the resurrection, in consequence of which Christ was "declared to be the Son of God, with power" (Rom. 1:4). Raised from the dead, he assumed the spiritual form of being (σῶμα πνευματικόν) in which he had

previously existed. By "he was buried" (1 Cor. 15:4) is meant that with his flesh disappeared all that was national and legal in his Messiahship. The resurrection of his body would contradict not only 1 Cor. 15:37, 50, but the entire spirit of Paulinism, according to which "the grave signifies the death of the national-religious, the resurrection the sole validity of the universal, Messiah-ideal." The identity of the preëxistent with the postexistent Christ is maintained. To Paul Jesus was a human being, the ideal Man, in his preëxistent state, and the unity of his heavenly and earthly existence is indicated in the personal-official designation, "Jesus Christ," applied to him in both spheres. The end of the mission of Christ was the salvation of men by his death on the cross as a sacrifice for sin in accordance with the idea of the Jewish theology that the penalty of the sins of one might be borne by another. The reconciliation effected was not only that of man with God, but also that of God with man through the blood of Christ shed as a propitiation (Rom. 3:25). The resurrection of the believer to "newness of life" (Rom. 6:4) represents the ethical side of atonement, the mystic personal union with Christ. The atonement is effective only for those who believe. It is appropriated by faith, which is "an energy of the will manifesting itself in unreserved trust" (Rom. 4:19, 20). The righteousness which could not be attained under the law is a "gift" (Rom. 5:17) "on account of faith," which is reckoned as righteousness, so that "he who is not in himself righteous is regarded and declared by God to be so." The righteousness thus "imputed" in the *sensus forensis* is that of God (θεοῦ), which He may "declare," not as a Judge, who cannot pronounce a guilty man innocent, but as a King having a right to pardon. The author finds the ethical aspect of salvation in Rom. 5:17, according to which "man must constitute the battlefield of the sensuous desires of the flesh and of the will directed to God to the end that in general the human will may not finally come to a realization of its own contents." Predestination inheres in the Pauline ethics.

In discussing Paul's eschatology the author follows Pfleiderer in the opinion that the apostle simply reproduces the ideas of the primitive Jewish-Christian community, so far as the limited perspective is concerned—the day of the Lord coming "as a thief in the night" and the believers, including himself, living to see the end (1 Thess. 5:2, 14, 15, 17; 1 Cor. 1:7, 8; 11:26; 15:51). Christ comes forth from the heavens with a retinue of angels and the sound of a trumpet, the Christian dead are raised, and the believers who are alive are "changed."

A change in the apostle's eschatology is assumed to have taken place within the ten years between the first and the last of his authentic epistles, probably between First and Second Corinthians. In the latter he appears to believe in an immediate investment with the spiritual body at death. The author differs, however, with Schmiedel in assuming that Paul had in mind here only "an exceptional case" affecting "himself and some companions in spirit and destiny;" but he gives no other reason for the opinion than that otherwise we must assume "a complete transformation of the apostle's eschatology." The "spiritual" aspect of the eschatology is summed up in the remark that negatively it did away with the resurrection of the flesh, to which death indissolubly clings, and positively limited the resurrection to believers. An "interregnum" of Christ is assumed between his coming and "the end," an indefinite period (ἡμέρα χριστοῦ), during which further conquest may be won from Death in a third τάγμα (1 Cor. 15:23).

We can only glance at the extended treatment of the deutero-Pauline literature. The author's opinions on Colossians and Ephesians are well known to readers of his *Einleitung* and his *Kritik der Eph.- und Kol.-briefe.* The doctrinal contents common to the two epistles are discussed under several heads—Judaism, heathenism, and Christianity; faith and works; Christianity as theosophy; angelology; and the πλήρωμα. The ideas predominant in Colossians are Christological, and their difference from the Pauline Christology of the four great epistles is pointed out. The doctrines especially represented in Ephesians relate to predestination and the church. The pastoral epistles are regarded as showing their unauthenticity by a relatively meager equipment in general and their post-Pauline origin even more distinctly than Ephesians and Colossians by "a flattening of the Pauline thought according to the standard of the understanding of a later time." The points of view of these epistles are discussed under eighteen separate heads. Hebrews is shown to present important departures from Paulinism. As Paul knows nothing of Christ as "the Apostle and High Priest of our confession" (Heb. 3:1), so Hebrews nothing of the second Adam. The exaltation of Christ to the rank of a "God-being" exceeds the utmost reach of the Pauline Christology. In Paul the emphasis rests on the death and resurrection of Christ, while in Hebrews the latter is merely mentioned, and "the second act completing the atoning death is transferred to heaven." Instead of "justification" we have here "cleansing" and "sanctifying."

The catholic epistles, First and Second Peter, James, and Jude, are

regarded as standing "at the farthest remove from primitive Christianity and the questions which agitated it." Of all these First Peter is the most distinctively deutero-Pauline. But it contains nothing primitive-apostolic. "It is, however, perhaps, a document of primitive Christianity in the sense in which Paulinism itself belongs thereto." The preaching of Christ to the spirits in prison (3 : 19) is regarded as one of the "didactic specialties" of the epistle which are attached to Pauline premises, with reference to Eph. 4 : 8–10. The reference in 2 Peter 3 : 15, 16 to Paul's epistles which the unlearned and unstable wrest to their own destruction is intelligible only if by it the opposition of Paulinism to primitive-apostolic Christianity, so far as it was remembered by a later generation, was referred to a false interpretation of the apostle's letters and to their obscurities. The epistle of James furnishes little of doctrinal interest, and the discussion of it is concerned chiefly with the relation of its contents to Paulinism. In its field of view and means of expression it belongs to the Hellenistic literature from which it has largely drawn. Spitta's opinion that the epistle was written at an early date by a non-Christian writer is rejected, and it is regarded as one of the latest of the canonical books which could not have been written prior to Paul, since 2 : 14–26 is directed against his doctrine of faith. On this point the author says: "The efforts to obscure so manifest a situation, to show that both writers either mean the same thing or at least take no opposed standpoints, but agree in some higher unity, form a by no means pleasing or honorable chapter of Protestant biblical science." If the writer of James did not correctly apprehend the Pauline doctrine and missed it in his polemic, it does not follow from this "that he did not intend to hit it."

The Johannine theology is subjected to an analytical treatment of great extent and thoroughness. The scientific point of view requires that the fourth gospel be regarded primarily as "a didactic writing," to the leading ideas of which the Johannine epistles furnish certain amplifications. "The admission of some synoptic material and sayings does not alter the fact that in evident contrast with the historical portrait of Jesus his entire earthly work is referred to supersensible and eternal conditions." The discourses of Jesus are so constructed that "in contrast with the sententious catchwords of the synoptics they become connected monologues." "These two concessions are now generally made by apologists: that this history is somehow an ideal history and that these discourses must somehow be subjective

creations of the evangelist—in a word, that here we are farther than elsewhere from a photograph of the reality." The relation of the Johannine thought to that of Paul is elucidated in detail. "Paulinism in its impelling thought, freedom of faith from the law, and in its ultimate goal, salvation for all, forms a ferment of the Johannine theology." The author does not agree with B. Weiss that in John is to be found even a developed form of primitive-apostolic Christianity. To the conception of the Logos "an essentially Philonian stamp cannot be denied." "The idea of the Logos has its origin primarily in the need of a mediation of the abstract conception of God with the world." Preëxistence is ascribed to Christ (3:13; 6:62) apart from the prologue—"an idea wholly foreign to the synoptical Jesus." The synoptics are surpassed also in the ascription of omniscience and omnipotence to Jesus (4:16–18; 6:61, 64; 10:28–30; 13:19; 16:19; 17:2). The Johannine anthropology is regarded as based upon the dualism of σάρξ and πνεῦμα. The fourth gospel, however, recognizes no natural transition from the one sphere into the other, "although the whole primitive-Christian programme, the call to repentance by Jesus and the apostles, rests upon the presupposition of the possibility of such a transition." He who has passed from the one realm into the other has been "born from above" (3:3, 5), *i. e.*, has become the subject of a miracle. The Johannine formula for the synoptic μετάνοια is ἡ ἄνοθεν γέννησις or ἀναγέννησις. The atoning, propitiatory sacrifice of Christ in the Pauline sense has no representation in the fourth gospel. Rather "his saving work, according to the gnosticizing programme of the prologue, consists in his own self-revelation." Here, however, as in Hebrews, the Pauline theory of propitiation "lies in the background," and there are "presuppositions for a valuation of the death of Christ which approach and presuppose the Pauline." In like manner the Pauline doctrine of faith is emptied of its essential contents. In the eschatology the apocalyptic, synoptic, and Pauline features disappear, and "all blessedness consists in the permanent possession of the fellowship with Christ" (15:11, 15; 16:14, 15, 33).

We have not space to present a summary of the fruitful discussion under the head of "The Theological Problems of Primitive Christianity," which occupies 150 pages of the work, and which includes such topics as "The Beginnings of the Christology" and of "Dogmatizing on the Death of the Messiah," "Preëxistence," "Supernatural Birth," "Matthew, Mark, and Luke," with reference to their attitude toward the "problems," "the New Testament and the Catholic Church,"

"Gnosis," "Canon," and "Church." A review of such a work within admissible limits can do no more than present the leading positions of the author in a lucid summary. It has been the object of this notice to do this without presuming to enter upon detailed criticisms of the work of so accomplished a master as Dr. Holtzmann. The volumes will well repay a careful examination by students of New Testament theology. The work may fitly crown the long series of the author's labors upon the New Testament. Its comprehensive and sure grasp of the whole subject, its impartial consideration of the vast literature, its logical arrangement of the material, and its acute and masterful exegesis entitle it to a very high rank. It is no slight merit that the opinions of other scholars in the field which it covers are quoted, analyzed, and discussed. The views of the most distinguished of the author's opponents, and even of young writers among them, receive this consideration, and, while he is not more decided than we could wish him to be in the expression of his own conclusions, those who differ with him are treated with fine courtesy. These qualities combine to constitute a work of which it is not hazardous to prophesy that it will in the future rank as a classic in its department.

ORELLO CONE.

BOSTON, MASS.

DER ERSTE BRIEF AN DIE CORINTHER, neu bearbeitet von DR. C. F. GEORG HEINRICI, K. Pr. Consistorialrath und Professor der Theologie an der Universität Leipzig. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896. Pp. x + 530, 8vo. M. 7.

THIS third edition of Dr. Heinrici's redaction of Meyer's 1 Corinthians (the eighth edition in the Meyer series) well realizes the purpose of the publishers to preserve "the historical peculiarity of the old Meyer — the character of a repertory." A service is rendered to exegesis by this editing of the celebrated commentary by other hands, whereby account is taken of the conclusions of recent scholars, although the peril is not always escaped of disguising the great exegete in the new habiliments. The editor is well and favorably known by his commentary in two volumes on the Corinthian epistles (1880, 1887), in which the relation of primitive Christianity to Hellenism was especially considered. In the volume before us he claims to have furnished fresh evidences of the "Hellenistic woof" in the two epistles as well as of their relations to "rabbinical theologumena."

With respect to grammatical interpretation, it goes without saying that a work founded upon Meyer and written with due regard to his rare exegetical judgment cannot be obnoxious to much criticism. Blemishes appear, however, in some forced and far-fetched exegetical constructions sometimes made unhappily in the interest of a defense of the apostle. By maintaining that excommunication instead of a miraculous punishment is referred to in παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ (5:5) Dr. Heinrici thinks that he clears the apostle of the charge of excessive haste and passion. But this advantage is dearly purchased by giving to εἰς ὄλεθρον σαρκός the sense that the excommunicated man will find the salvation of his πνεῦμα at the parousia by means of the free scope accorded by Satan to his σάρξ! The author's contention that Paul's conception of the marriage relation can be shown to accord with that now prevalent in Protestant Christendom is hardly sustained in view of καλὸν ἀνθρώπῳ γυναικὸς μὴ ἅπτεσθαι (7:1), of ὡς καὶ ἐμαυτόν (7:7), and of ἐὰν μείνωσιν (7:8). In these passages "the present distress" (7:26) is not taken into account, and the assertion in 7:1 is controlled by διὰ τὰς πορνείας (7:2). Leaving on one side the question whether or no the apostle was influenced in his judgment regarding marriage by his doctrine of the "flesh," it is evident that his expectation of the impending end of the world must have led him to take a view of the institution less likely to be held by one whose historical perspective was not thus limited. In the interpretation of 7:8 Meyer understands τοῖς ἀγάμοις to denote the unmarrried in general. Heinrici's judgment that the reference is to "those of both sexes who have remained unmarried beyond the normal age" is without adequate support. The construction of the passage is loose, and the meaning obscure, but "unmarried men" are probably meant, if against Holsten καὶ ταῖς χήραις be retained.

In the interpretation of 11:3 Dr. Heinrici maintains that the subordination of Christ is not limited to his human nature, but denotes the "objective and necessary subordination of the Son to the Father." The idea, however, that when Paul says in this passage that "Christ is the head of the man," he means "and of the woman also," is plainly read into the text. The deliberate intention of the apostle in 7:3–16 to oppose what he regarded as a mischief-working "emancipation" of woman is evident in his entire argument. He reasons not alone from expediency and social customs, but also from the divine order of creation, according to which, as he understood it, "the head of the woman is the man," "the woman was made for the man," etc. It

suited the purpose of his argument to depend upon Gen. 2 : 18, 21–23, rather than upon Gen. 1 : 26 f. The weakness and inconsequence of some of his reasonings in this section are not, however, indicated by the author. Why should a man be covered because he is δόξα θεοῦ, and a woman covered because she is δόξα ἀνδρός? In the interpretation of διὰ τοὺς ἀγγέλους (11 : 10)—a fantastic reason assigned by Paul for the veiling of the women—the author again departs from Meyer to the prejudice of his hermeneutics.

In the extended commentary on chap. 15, occupying seventy pages, the Pauline doctrine of the resurrection is discussed with candor and with a due appreciation of its historical setting. The apostle's faith in the resurrection of the believers at the impending second coming of Christ rested on the to him indisputable fact of the resurrection of Jesus. Dr. Heinrici, in opposition to Meyer, concludes that Paul teaches that the believers who had died would alone be raised at the parousia, and that he knew nothing of a "resurrection to condemnation." To "perish" was the fate of the unbelievers. The inquiring student will, however, find some things wanting in this long discussion of chap. 15. The relation of Paul's account of the appearances of Jesus after his resurrection to the accounts of them in the gospels; the significance of the use of ὤφθη in his enumeration of the manifestations of Jesus and in his mention of his own vision on the road to Damascus; and the apparently different conceptions of the resurrection of believers in 1 Cor. 15 and 2 Cor. 5 : 1–6, concern difficulties which the readers of the commentary will regret not to find more fully discussed after the manner of the excursus on γλώσσαις λαλεῖν (12 : 10). The index of subjects and the list of Greek words text-critically discussed in the commentary will greatly facilitate the use of the work to the student.

ORELLO CONE.

BOSTON, MASS.

KRITISCH-EXEGETISCHER KOMMENTAR UEBER DAS NEUE TESTAMENT, begründet von HEINR. AUG. WILH. MEYER. Sechszehnte Abtheilung. 5. Auflage. DIE OFFENBARUNG JOHANNIS. Neu bearbeitet von Lic. Theol. WILHELM BOUSSET, a. o. Professor in Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1896. Pp. vi+527. M. 8.

THE exposition of John's Apocalypse in Meyer's *Critical Commentary on the New Testament* was prepared by Düsterdieck, and first

appeared in 1852. An English translation was made some years ago for the American edition of Meyer, and is on the whole probably the best commentary on the book of Revelation accessible to English readers. But the critical labors given in the last ten years to this most enigmatical book of the New Testament call for a thorough reconstruction of the work, and a new adjustment of the exegesis in the light of the most recent critical discussions. This labor has been accomplished in a very commendable way by Professor Bousset. The Introduction of 208 pages, nearly one-half of the volume, is a masterpiece of pains-taking scholarship. Meyer's ideal of making the commentary itself a repertory of all manner of exegetical opinions has been set aside, and as a compensation the author has furnished a detailed history of the exposition of the Apocalypse, which fills ninety pages of his introduction. Thirteen of these pages are occupied with a statement of the recent critical theories of the composition, which he subsequently classifies under three heads: (1) The theory of sources and of compilation (represented by Weyland, Spitta, Schmidt, Rauch); (2) the theory of revision and enlargement (Völter, Vischer, Erbes, and in part Pfleiderer); (3) the theory of fragments (Weizsäcker, Sabatier, Schön). Bousset inclines to this last-named theory, and thinks that its representatives are on the right track. He accepts no *Grundschrift* worked over at different times with gradual enlargements; no "sources" mechanically compiled and finally revised and edited by a Christian redactor; but an apocalyptic writer of great original genius, who nevertheless at many points appropriated older fragments and traditions, and worked them into his own plan. He speaks in high terms of Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* (1894), and thinks all future successful exposition of the Apocalypse must recognize the mythical and traditional elements which this class of biblical literature so naturally takes up into itself. There are numerous myths and symbols which travel from race to race, from religion to religion, and whose power of life is not extinguished with the century, the people or the religion in which they had their origin. John's Apocalypse has made an intelligent use of older conceptions and set its new stamp on old coins.

Thirty-seven pages of the introduction are given to the textual criticism of the Apocalypse, a grouping and discussion of the material, and a survey of the peculiarities of the language and style. Here we find a very full exhibit of the anomalies of grammatical form, the peculiar use of the article, the pronouns, verbs, and particles, and the exceptional words and word-forms. The commentary proper covers

pp. 209–527, is clear, comprehensive and critical, and by numerous abbreviations and page-references to the discussions of the ample introduction compresses a large amount of matter in a moderate space.

According to Bousset "the world-historical and church-historical interpretation" of the Revelation has no more a place in scientific circles or among the learned. "These methods still find their followers among expositors of second and third rank, with English commentators, and American tractwriters" (p. 141). A key to the historical situation and scope of the writer is to be found especially in chap. 13, where it appears that the book was directed against the Cæsar-cultus in the Roman Empire. The wounded head of 13:3 and the beast of 17:8, 11 are to be understood of Nero, and explained by means of the widespread popular superstition of Nero redivivus. That rumor about Nero seems to have taken on three forms: (1) that he was not dead, but had only concealed himself; (2) that he was concealed among the Parthians and would return in league with them; (3) that he was dead, but would come again from Hades. This last form of the superstition was not developed until about the close of the first century, but being traceable in this book shows that the time at which this Apocalypse as a whole originated could not have been at the earliest before the closing part of the reign of Domitian. For the broader shaping of the original expectation of Nero's return did not take place until at least a generation after the death of that monster of wickedness.

The ten horns of 13:1 are the first ten Cæsars, and the ten horns of 17:12 are so many Parthian princes who are expected to return with Nero, and support him with "their power and authority." The seven kings of 17:10 are seven Roman emperors, and the enumeration must begin with Augustus rather than Julius (Suetonius and the Sibylline oracles to the contrary notwithstanding), because, in the scheme of Bousset, Nero cannot possibly be the "one who now is." The seven heads in 13:1, however, have no significance. "They are simply taken over by the apocalyptist from the tradition," and "are unnecessary refinements" (p. 416). The composite image was formed by a combination of the four beasts in Dan. 7, and, in connection with the image of the great dragon of 12:3, has not improbably appropriated elements of the old Babylonian myth of a great seven-headed serpent. But one can hardly say with confidence whence the author of Rev. 12 borrowed his material, but it may be supposed that he was a Christian writer who took up an ancient sun-myth and adapted it to

the life of Jesus. So Weizsäcker, Sabatier, and Pfleiderer are probably correct in regarding chap. 12 as an independent fragment, which the author of the Apocalypse incorporated in his work as having for him a pragmatical significance.

These few but salient points may sufficiently serve to indicate the position and method of this new commentary. Taking the conspicuous place of one of the volumes of the famous Meyer series, it will command the general attention of New Testament scholars, and the respectful study of future contributors to the now new critical "problem of the Apocalypse." But one may well hesitate long before accepting the story of the superstitious expectation of Nero redivivus as the basis of so large a part of the prophecies of this book. Bousset declares his conviction that the apocalyptist truly received visions and heard voices from heaven (p. 169). He maintains that chaps. 1–3 could never have existed as a separate and independent section, "nor is it conceivable," he says, "that a writer so self-reliant and full of spirit should have been satisfied simply to insert these chapters in an apocalypse lying already finished before him" (p. 144). Is it not equally inconceivable that any Christian writer of such rank as the apocalyptist should have "combined a profound insight into the nature and the future of things with a bizarre fantastic popular superstition" (p. 159)?

The idea that the symbols of chap. 12 cannot in a single point be successfully explained by means of anything in the Old Testament, and that we are forced to go outside the religion of both the Old and New Testaments to find parallels and material for the strange world of thought which here presents itself (p. 405), may be safely challenged. That the woman, the dragon, and the man child are elements of an ancient sun-myth adapted by a Christian writer to the birth and ascension of Jesus, and then taken up by another Christian writer and worked into an apocalypse as early as the close of the first century, is a hypothesis not likely to obtain general favor. And why should the "man child" of chap. 12 be understood as an individual any more than the woman? If the woman is the personified Zion, or the idealized church, conceived after the imagery found in Isa. 66:7, 8, why may not the child be understood collectively? "The rest of her seed," referred to in vs. 17 are surely not to be explained as an individual, and it is not to be overlooked that, according to 2:26, 27, those who overcome receive "authority over the nations to rule them with a rod of iron." It is certainly conceivable that a gifted Jewish-

Christian might have combined the thought of the seed of the woman (Gen. 3:15, understood collectively) with the picture of a son of man at the throne of God, and Michael standing "for the children of thy people" (found in Dan. 7:13 and 12:1). To our thought such a view is much more probable than that the author of our Apocalypse knowingly constructed these symbols out of fragments of heathen mythology. Whatever mythological elements one may discover in the dragon of Rev. 12, the author of the Apocalypse need have known no more than he could have derived from such sources as the ideals suggested in Isa. 27:1; 51:9; Ezek. 29:3; 32:2, and the symbolic beasts depicted in the book of Daniel.

As for the ultimate solution of the problems of the Apocalypse, it may perhaps be said that Bousset's position points possibly in the right direction. Rejecting the theories of compilations and redactions, one may indeed recognize in the author of the Apocalypse a rare constructive genius, who truly received revelations of God. He freely appropriated whatever of current traditions and apocalyptic fragments served his purpose; but more than from all other sources he found in the Hebrew Scriptures his principal ideals. There is no conspicuous figure or symbol in the book but has its parallel or suggestion somewhere in the Old Testament. The last word in exposition of this wonderful prophecy has not yet been spoken, nor will any one contributor ever be credited with the final solution of its mysteries.

MILTON S. TERRY.

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE,
Evanston, Ill.

INTRODUCTION TO THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By H. O. WAKEMAN, M.A. 3d edition. London: Rivington, Percival & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897. Pp. xx + 505, cloth. $2.

THE author brings to his task an ecclesiastical theory which shapes and colors the entire narrative. In his selection of material, estimate of persons, and criticism of movements he is constantly the creature of the school to which he belongs—a school so completely owning his mind and pen that not a thought nor a line ever wanders. The desire to be an adequate and impartial historian is everywhere subordinated to the set purpose to serve the holy cause to which he has consecrated himself. This striking exhibition of the all-dominating influence of

an ecclesiastical notion gives the book its chief interest and value. One can here read the history of the Church of England through the spectacles of an intelligent and uncompromising high-church devotee.

With all his soul Mr. Wakeman believes in the Catholic church. Beginning in New Testament times, it has preserved its integrity through the centuries. It is a visible structure—a corporate body or corporation—whose entity or essence is found in the episcopate. Everything centers in and is dependent on the bishop. No bishop, no church. The line of bishops has come down in unbroken succession from the apostles. If by some accident the line had been broken all would have been ruined. These bishops are vitally important personages. They are the divinely instituted conduits of grace. Only through them is the priesthood maintained, and without the priesthood the sacraments are invalid. These priests can work marvelous changes in human souls through the use of bread, wine, and water. They can regenerate a baby or an adult by sprinkling a few drops of water on the forehead. A moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought by the sacrament. The operations of the Holy Ghost are tied to the outward ordinance, which is a channel of grace along which the blessings of adoption and renewal flow. We have here "the creation of a new heart, new affections, new desires, an actual birth from above, a gift coming down from God through baptism, through the operation of water and the Holy Spirit." If the subject of this "actual birth from above" willfully sins after baptism he forfeits and loses the life imparted, and can only regain it through the "sacrament of confession and absolution." God has empowered the priest to look into the case, and to relieve those who open their griefs to him. This priest-physician imposes the needful penance, and afterwards declares God's absolving sentence—thereby effacing the past. The one legitimate and sufficient remedy for the troubled conscience is the confessional. Upon this regenerating and absolving priest the people are still farther dependent through his mysterious and effective manipulating of bread and wine. The Lord's Supper is not a mere commemorative rite, nor a subjective presence of Christ in the soul of the worthy receiver, but "the bread and wine offered and consecrated in the liturgy or service of the holy eucharist are by consecration made to be truly and really the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ." "As to the manner in which the body and blood comes to be thus present in the sacrament," the Roman Catholic is foolish enough to speculate and philosophize, while the Anglo-Catholic neither

affirms nor denies, "except that it is in an ineffable and spiritual manner." Only a priest, however, can bring about this mysterious change, and only a priest can offer the eucharistic sacrifice, and upon the priest, therefore, are the people dependent for the benefits of the "altar."

Mr. Wakeman belongs to the dominant party in the Church of England — the party which believes in the holy Catholic church, the apostolic succession of the episcopate, baptismal regeneration, priestly absolution, the real presence of our Lord in the eucharist, the eucharistic sacrifice. "Lord Halifax, the president of the English Church Union, is able to say, without contradiction from the thirty-six thousand members of that society, that there is now no difference of sentiment or opinion between themselves and the Church of Rome." Cardinal Vaughan is able to say: "The sacramental power of orders, the real presence, the daily sacrifice, auricular confession, prayers and offices for the dead, belief in purgatory, the invocation of the blessed virgin and the saints, religious vows, and the institution of monks and nuns — the very doctrines stamped in the Thirty-nine Articles as fond fables and blasphemous deceits — all these are now openly taught from a thousand pulpits in the establishment, and as heartily embraced by as many crowded congregations." It is from the point of view of this party that Mr. Wakeman has written his history. One who wishes to see how English church history looks when seen by a thoroughgoing sacerdotalist and sacramentarian will find this treatise excellently suited to his purpose.

The British church, whose origin is shrouded in obscurity, though "poor and struggling," nevertheless "possessed bishops," and so "was a duly settled and regularly organized branch of the Catholic church." It was not through this church, however, that the English were destined to be Christianized, but rather through one who came from "distant Rome under the humble cowl of a monk." Augustine won the king of Kent, and numerous converts. "It was necessary that the growing church should have a bishop. Augustine accordingly applied to the Church of Gaul for episcopal orders." With the obtaining of these orders "the infant Church of England began to be. *Ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia.* By the consecration of Augustine Christianity in Kent had ceased to be merely a mission sent by Gregory, the bishop of Rome. It had become an integral and independent branch of the Catholic church." The pope sent the pall to Augustine, and directed him, "though he had no possible right to do so, to place the Celtic

church under his authority as archbishop." According to Wakeman the essence of the church consists in orders, *Ubi episcopus, ibi ecclesia*, but, according to Irenæus, *Ubi Spiritus, ibi ecclesia*. According to Wakeman, Augustine's consecration as bishop freed him from the authority of the Roman pontiff, but, according to Augustine himself, it only placed him under deeper obligations. If ever there was a man who, in his private life and in his official capacity, submitted absolutely to Rome and brought the converts he made and the church he organized into absolute obedience to the holy Roman see, that man was the first archbishop of Canterbury.

On the eve of the Council of Whitby, A. D. 664, Celtic Christianity prevailed over five-sixths of Christian Britain. Only one-sixth was Roman and papal. Whitby subordinated Celtic to Roman Christianity, and ultimately brought the entire island under the authority of the see of Peter. In this decision of Whitby Wakeman rejoices. "If the English church was to be a great national force it must be united and organized," and this could only be "by preferring Catholic tradition to local custom." "Roman tradition and papal authority were the forces which were to consecrate the barbarian world to the service of Christ, and the decision of Whitby meant that the Church of England had determined to take her part in that noble work."

Whitby gave the church "unity of observance," while "unity of administration" came through Theodore, whom the pope made archbishop of Canterbury in A. D. 668. He gave each "bishop a definite law to enforce and a definite area in which to enforce it." This Theodore got into trouble with Bishop Wilfrid, "who appealed straight to the pope, and left for Rome to urge his cause at the apostolic see.' "By appealing to the pope he did not in the least intend to maintain, as a matter of principle, the supremacy of the Roman pontiff over the domestic affairs of the Church of England." Still it cannot be forgotten that he returned from Rome "armed with a papal bull drawn up in due legal form directing his reinstatement in his old diocese," and that after many vicissitudes of fortune he secured his reinstatement.

"The Normans were impressed with the imposing character of the papal claims, and accepted them wholesale." "The Norman conquest of England greatly increased the power of the pope over the English church." "Foreign clergy, accustomed to accept the doctrine of papal supremacy without question, received all the higher posts."

After the Norman conquest and until the Reformation the Church of England had a hard time in maintaining her independence.

"Threatened by the tyranny of a strong and wicked king she called to her aid the power of a masterful and greedy pope. Ruined by papal exactions, abused by papal misgovernment, she turned in her need to implore the protection of a powerful and ambitious king." The fact to be remembered is that, though "ever shifting uneasily from one horn of the dilemma to the other," she succeeded in preserving her liberties intact. Neither king nor pope was able to wrest from her her independence, and through all those dark and troubled times the Church of England never lost her autonomy. She remained the Church of England still, though at times "sucked dry like an orange by king, and then by pope, and then by pope and king combined."

Through many trials she was able to maintain herself as "an integral and independent branch of the Catholic church" down to the dawn of the Protestant Reformation. Since that time new foes have arisen, which she has been able successfully to withstand Prior to the advent of Luther she was in peril from popery; since his advent from Protestantism. "A Protestant is one who holds religious opinions and principles in sympathy with those of the reformation movement of the sixteenth century, either in its Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinistic forms." A Catholic is one who holds "religious opinions and principles in sympathy with those which had been dominant in the church in previous centuries."

From Augustine to Henry VIII "the supremacy of the pope as essential to the existence of the church" was the doctrine under dispute. In the reign of Henry the true doctrine gained ascendency, that "the bishop of Rome hath not by Scripture any greater authority in England than any other foreign bishop." There is no truth whatever in the assertion that Henry abolished the papal church in England and established a new church, partly royal, partly Protestant. "There never was, in any true sense of the word, a papal church in England; but for nine hundred years there had been planted in England the Catholic church of Christ." It is a cause for shame and grief that "a break in the unity of Christendom resulted from the action taken by England and by Rome, which even now is among the greatest of hindrances to the effective presentation of the gospel both to the heathen and to the educated."

The Protestant revolt under Luther, Zwingli, and Calvin was a much more serious matter, and the Church of England has had a terrific struggle to maintain the Catholic faith against the doctrines and polity of these errorists. It was the continental reformers who

"invented the doctrine of the churches to supersede that of the Church." They even "overthrew the Church in their anger, and manufactured for themselves a new theology and a new organization." "Luther broke away from the Church and promulgated a new doctrine of the ministry." Zwingli, by his anti-sacramental doctrines, "struck at the very foundations of Catholic theology and eviscerated the sacraments of mystery and power." Calvin derived the beginning of Christian life from the special election of some by God instead of from the grace offered to all in baptism, repudiated the real presence of our Lord in the holy eucharist and substituted the congregation of the elect for the visible church of Christ." The Anabaptists were "religious enthusiasts who exaggerated the Lutheran doctrine of justification by faith only into a denial of the efficacy of the sacramental system and of all religious organization." It was against this revolt of Luther, Zwingli, Calvin and the rest against the faith and organization of the Catholic church that the Church of England had to contend. Many of her own children were corrupted by these errors, but over them she ultimately gained the victory.

In the reign of Henry VIII the break with Rome occurred. His redeeming trait was that, though he was a "suspicious and revengeful tyrant," he had "no sympathy whatever with Protestantism either in its German or Swiss form." Beyond his repudiation of the authority of the pope it was his policy to make a constitutional, doctrinal, and ceremonial reform of "proved abuses only"—the test being the faith and practice of the undivided church. His chief minister, Wolsey, though a "pluralist bishop and the father of an illegitimate family, was neither personally irreligious nor regardless of the need of ecclesiastical reform." "He was the last and the most splendid of the church reformers of the Middle Ages."

Cranmer was one of those men "against whom history would not have had one word to say had he never been taken from the seclusion of university life." Unfortunately an evil fortune suddenly raised him into public place. He was as wax in the hands of the stronger men by whom he was surrounded. "He claimed for bishops simply appointed by the crown the same powers as those consecrated by the church." "As long as Henry VIII lived his deference for the king saved him from going much further in the direction of Lutheranism than the advocacy and practice of clerical marriage and a leaning towards the doctrine of justification by faith only." A little later "a modified form of Calvinism" appeared to him as "the very

quintessence of truth." He grew at last to be a "Calvinist on the doctrine of the eucharist and a Lutheran on the doctrine of the ministry." It was through him that the "parish churches of England were reduced to the level of Calvinistic meeting-houses, and filled with the cold glare of clear glass and whitewash."

William Tyndale was in sympathy with Cranmer, and as far as he from being a good Catholic. He made a translation of the New Testament into English. "Not content with giving a Zwinglian bias to his translation, he prefixed to the parts as they issued from the press prefaces strongly attacking the Church and its system, and advocating the views of Zwingli."

Bishop Gardiner, on the other hand, was "a man of character and weight, deeply attached to Catholic theology and practice, a stanch and learned adherent of mediæval methods and principles, without any sympathy whatever for Protestantism." It was because he preached before King Edward "in defense of the doctrine of the real presence" that he was committed to prison.

Things went to the bad very rapidly under Edward VI. "An effort was made to construct a new theology for the Church of England and to alter her formularies in accordance with it."

The first prayer book, 1549, was a revision of service books then in use, and was designed to make the services "simple, congregational, scriptural, and primitive." "The book was instinct with the spirit of the Catholic church." The second prayer book, 1552, was a "revision in a Protestant direction." Cranmer, under the influence of Martyr and Bucer, and the "self-assertive aggressiveness of men like Hooper, Horne, Knox, and the gospelers," took the heart out of the first book. Especially is this true of the "office of holy communion." "This was the first formulary ever issued by the Church of England from the wording of which men might legitimately deduce the doctrine that the English church did not necessarily teach the real presence of our Lord in the eucharist." "It marks the extreme point to which the Church of England ever went in the direction of compromise with those who held Zwinglian or Calvinistic views." By the revision "room had been found within the pale of the English church for Cranmer and Hooper and Edward VI, as well as for Gardiner, Tunstall, and Elizabeth."

It was in this reign that Bishop Ridley "made an attack upon altars," and ordered them replaced in his diocese by "movable wooden tables." Then Edward's council followed Ridley's example and

issued orders to all the bishops to have all altars taken away. "This destruction of the altars was the first direct step taken by the government against the doctrine of the real presence of our Lord in the eucharist. It was an attack upon the central doctrine of the church. It cut at the very core of the spiritual life of the nation."

Edward VI was succeeded by Mary Tudor, and "Mary Tudor was the first Roman Catholic sovereign of England. She accepted to the full the universal headship of the pope." Her ecclesiastical advisers were in sore straits. Gardiner, Bonner, Tunstall, Heath, and the rest had always striven to maintain the Catholic faith. On the contrary, "Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, and Knox had done much to compromise the position of the Church of England by making an attack upon the historical creed of the church in two most important particulars—the doctrine of the eucharist and the doctrine of the ministry." Mary's ministers "preferred the presence of Philip of Spain to that of the German or Swiss reformer, and the papacy of Rome to that of Geneva."

Elizabeth "was strongly and intelligently attached to the doctrine and organization of the Catholic church. Lutheran and Calvinistic opinions had no attractions for her whatever." "The men on whom she had to rely for the government of the church" were so corrupted by these opinions that the queen found it impossible to restore the prayer book of 1549. Even the revision of 1552 was to them "tolerable only until something more thorough could be obtained." To the consummate ability of Elizabeth, therefore, must be attributed the preservation of the Church of England from complicity with that "travesty of Christianity" which goes under the name of Calvinism, for her bishops "were tainted with the Swiss opinions they had contracted on their travels in the days of Mary." She plainly enough saw that "it was impossible to combine a Calvinistic church theology, resting on the doctrine of election with the Catholic church theology, resting on the doctrine of baptismal regeneration." Elizabeth, therefore, by the aid of Whitgift and the Court of High Commission, undertook a "policy of repression" towards those who "mistook the teaching of Calvin for the teaching of Christ."

It is not needful to follow the fortunes of the Church of England through the reigns of the Stuarts and the Hanoverians. We know in advance what Wakeman will say about Charles I and the Long Parliament and Laud and Cromwell and the restoration and William III and the latitudinarians and Methodism and the evangelicals and the Oxford movement. At last in the "high-church revival of

the present century is seen the complete reaction against the Protestant movement of the sixteenth century . . . . the repudiation of the teaching and the systems of Zwingli, Luther, and Calvin." At last, just as the twentieth century is about to dawn, we have in high churchism "the restoration of the Church of England to the position which it held when Edward VI came to the throne." At last, after three hundred and fifty years of struggle and vibration in the ecclesiasticism, ceremonialism, and sacramentarianism of the advanced ritualists of the established church, "the balance is restored to the point which it had reached when foreign Protestantism began seriously to influence the English reformation."

Mr. Wakeman has written an exceedingly interesting book. In spite of its "Catholic" point of view, it is full of valuable information. The style is remarkably clear and elegant. It does not surprise us that it reached its third edition within three months after publication. Here is a book which high-church people can read with infinite delight, low-church people with gnashing of teeth, Protestants with incredulous smiles, and Romanists with curiosity and derision.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE AGE OF THE CRUSADES. By JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D., L.H.D. (Vol. VI of the Ten Epochs of Church History.) New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1896.

THE LATIN KINGDOM OF JERUSALEM. 1099 to 1291 A.D. By LIEUT.-COL. C. R. CONDER, LL.D., M.R., A.S., R.E. Published by the Committee of the Palestine Exploration Fund, London, 1897. (Imported by the New Amsterdam Book Co., New York.) Pp. viii + 443; cloth. $2.50.

L'ISLAM, IMPRESSIONS ET ÉTUDES. Par le COMTE HENRY DE CASTRIES. Paris: Armand Colin et Cie., 1896. Pp. 359, 18mo. Fr. 4.

DER GEISTESKAMPF DES CHRISTENTUMS GEGEN DEN ISLAM, BIS ZUR ZEIT DER KREUZZÜGE. Von ADOLF KELLER. Leipzig: Verlag der Akadem. Buchhandlung, 1896. Pp. 92. M. 2.

THE title of Dr. Ludlow's book may justify, to some extent, the introduction of much matter which seems foreign to the principal subject, but one cannot escape the conviction that many things are unnecessarily and improperly brought into connection with the crusades.

On the other hand, Dr. Ludlow has given his subject too narrow bounds, in dealing principally with the armies of the crusaders without giving us any adequate account of the states which they established, and of their variegated life in the East. The historical significance of the crusades he does not seem to have grasped. The "bibliography" presented is not satisfactory; the section devoted to "eyewitnesses" is especially deficient; at least four of those named were not eyewitnesses, while several who were indisputably eyewitnesses are omitted. Hagenmeyer's able commentaries are not mentioned. The book is evidently written without an accurate and comprehensive knowledge of the sources, and hence it is full of errors as to details. There is scarcely a page without a false statement. The author has a keen eye for the romantic, for the chivalrous, and for the religious, but little appreciation of the political and worldly sides of the crusades. For him Godfrey of Boulogne and Tancred are the greatest men of the first crusade; but it has long since been shown that Godfrey was only a pious knight, and Tancred a bold one, both without political understanding or ability to direct a great army. Boemund, the only able leader in the first crusade, receives short shrift. The folly of the crusaders caused nearly all the misfortunes which befell them, but the author follows the traditional western way of laying the blame on the Greek emperors. He does not understand the difficulties of the situation in which the eastern emperors found themselves placed by the crusades. Nor does he seem to comprehend the effects of the crusades on Europe, his utterances about which are most unsatisfactory and insufficient. He is not sufficiently critical, but makes concessions to the popular character of his book by weaving into his narrative, though often with a covert apology, many miraculous stories in which the crusading age believed.

Yet Dr. Ludlow has made a very readable book, and it is unfortunate that he should not have taken a broader and more independent view of the subject, and that he should not have made himself more familiar with the best and most important sources, as well as with the works of Hagenmeyer, Röhricht, Kugler, Riant, and others.

Colonel Conder's purpose differs from that of Dr. Ludlow in that he briefly describes the crusades and dwells especially on the history of the states in the East. The first three chapters of his work are disappointing in the extreme and give little promise of the good things to come in the later ones. While reading these first chapters one is tempted to throw the book aside as worthless, so full are they of errors.

In them the author attempts to give an account of the first crusade and of the establishment of the kingdom of Jerusalem, but he seems to be utterly ignorant of the good work of other historians in this field. He rehashes the story of Peter the Hermit, and makes him the author of the first crusade, although more than half a century ago von Sybel showed conclusively that the rôle which Peter played in the first crusade was far from glorious, and that the Pope, Urban II, was the real originator of the movement. And how Colonel Conder could have remained ignorant of the work of Hagenmeyer (*Peter der Eremite*, 1879) passes all comprehension. His too favorable estimate of Godfrey of Boulogne is based on the legendary conception of his character and work rather than on a knowledge of what he actually was and did. The high position which he assigns to Godfrey belongs of right to Boemund, who is strangely neglected by our author. These mistakes are due to the fact that Colonel Conder has followed the later and untrustworthy accounts of Albert of Aix, and William, archbishop of Tyre, without any regard to the critical work which has, in the last fifty years, been done on the period of the first crusade. These first chapters will remain a serious blot on a work which is otherwise both readable and instructive. For, in the remaining chapters of the book, the author has not only read the best sources, but he has also looked with independent eyes at the political development of the states which the crusaders established in the East, and, through his intimate acquaintance with the lands whose history he writes, he has brought to his narrative many of the qualities of an eyewitness. He is also the first writer to make use of the work of Herr Röhricht, the *Regesta Regni Hierosolymitani*, 1893, which offers a vast mine of material which has thus far not been utilized by historians.

The story of the later crusades is generally well told and is fairly accurate. Those chapters, however, are more satisfactory which deal with the life of the crusaders after they settled in the East, and of their native subjects, topics about which Colonel Conder, from his long residence in the East, is peculiarly well fitted to write. For the Templars and their peaceful policy towards the Mohammedans, at least in the thirteenth century, he has an appreciative word, and he clearly sees that the unyielding policy of the church, which forbade any peace or compromise with Mohammedans, was not only impossible, but also injurious, while "the policy of the empire, which was content to make peace with Islam and to regard Jerusalem as being what it really was—the Holy City of Christendom, which was valued only as a place of

pilgrimage, not as an earthly possession," was wise and practicable and, if it had been persisted in, might have prolonged the existence of the Christian states in the East. For the commerce, the travel, and their effect on the West, and for the interchange of ideas during the period of the crusades, Conder has a keen appreciation, and, in his "conclusion," pp. 414–28, he has given us a good characterization of the crusades, together with a careful estimate of their effects on Europe. He has evidently caught the spirit of the times, and of the movement, and of the peoples concerned in it. Two maps are added, one of them valuable because it shows the fiefs of the kingdom of Jerusalem about the year 1187.

M. de Castries, true to the title of his book, has given us in a series of chapters some interesting studies in Mohammedanism, interspersed with impressions which he has received during several years of persona. contact with Mohammedans. The impressions are those of an alert, sensitive mind, and the studies, while always sketchy, are full of close observation and discriminating interpretation. His first chapter deals with the old question of the sincerity of Mohammed, and, although it may seem like threshing old straw, he has done good service in bringing together the many little incidental things which make it impossible for us to believe that Mohammed was an impostor. In the face of the idolatry of the Christians as well as of the heathen, Mohammed certainly believed that there is but one God and that this God had called him to make known this truth to the world; he used questionable means to procure its acceptance, and he was sensual and revengeful; but a prophet is not impeccable, and "there are few who, believing that they have the truth, do not feel authorized to lie for it." It is to be hoped that the time will soon come when it will not be necessary to defend the sincerity of Mohammed. In an appendix to this chapter the author has collected a great many curious beliefs and legends about Mohammed which were in circulation in Europe during the Middle Age.

In dealing with the charge of intolerance made against Mohammedanism the author reminds us that there is far more intolerance in the Old Testament than in the Koran, and that for centuries Christians surpassed Mohammedans in cruelty to those of a different or dissenting faith. On the other hand, during much of the Mohammedan domination, the Mohammedan authorities not only did not disturb their Jewish and Christian subjects, but even refused to punish those fanatical Christians who, determined to secure the crown of martyrdom at all hazards, reviled Mohammed publicly and committed other excesses, only that

they might be seized and put to death. Nor was the religion of the conquerors always forced upon the conquered. Many peoples, among them Christians, accepted Mohammedanism because it seemed to them a better religion than the one they possessed. The Christianity of Egypt and Syria was in many respects inferior to Mohammedanism, and the defection of those countries is not at all strange.

While in no way defending polygamy, the author points out that certain vices, rampant in monogamous countries, are practically unkown among Mohammedans. Sensual pleasures are popularly supposed to be the chief attractions of the Mohammedan paradise, but M. de Castries quotes with great effect the passages of the Koran which dwell on the happiness which the faithful will derive from the presence of God. Both the Koran and its commentators agree that supreme happiness will consist in the Beatific Vision. The author shows that the Koran, like the Bible, may be quoted in favor of both foreordination and free will, while Mohammedan doctors are as deeply divided on these questions as are Christian theologians.

M. de Castries gives an interesting account of the expansion of Islam in Africa, and makes it apparent that central Africa is rapidly becoming a great stronghold of Mohammedanism. The last chapter is a frank discussion and free criticism of French policy toward the people of Algiers. The outlook, as the count sees it, is not altogether rosy, because the government is neither working in the best way nor pursuing the proper ends. Contact with Christianity has not been a blessing to the Mohammedans, who have taken the vices and not the virtues of Europe. The author has evidently observed carefully and widely, and has endeavored to interpret wisely what he has seen. Several appendices are added, containing interesting information on a variety of topics.

Herr Keller's learned and interesting pamphlet has grown, apparently, out of his interest in mission work, and is full of hopefulness for the near and complete success of Christian missions among Mohammedans, although he presents little on which to base such optimism, except the superiority of Christianity and the command of its founder to evangelize all peoples. In a few pages he sketches, in a masterly way, the relations between Christians and Moslems till the crusades, and especially the condition of Christians subject to Mohammedan rule.

Through the writings of John of Damascus (eighth century) the Greek church early became acquainted with the contents of the Koran and the traditional life of Mohammed, but, till the twelfth century, the West had no accurate knowledge of either Mohammed or his religion,

although the wildest and most fanciful stories about both were in circulation. The Western church undertook no mission work among Moslems and produced no refutations of Islam. In fact, writers in the West did not know whether to regard Islam as a heretical sect or a heathen religion. The crusades were begun in the hope of regaining possession of the holy places, and were in no sense missionary undertakings. Till the twelfth century the Occident thought of Moslems principally as a political power, not as the representatives of a new and hostile religion. The opposition between Mohammedans and Christians was far more political and commercial than religious. But Peter the Venerable (died 1126), by having the Koran translated into Latin, made it possible for the West to come to a good understanding and appreciation of Mohammedanism as a religion. Peter himself was an earnest student of Mohammedanism, and was the first to perceive its significance as a rival religion. His famous work against it was not polemical only, but was intended also as a loving invitation to all Moslems to embrace Christianity, and it is remarkable for the deep and true missionary spirit which pervades it.

The Franciscan Raymondus Lullus (died about 1315) was even more thoroughly a missionary than Peter. In 1276 he established a monastery on the island of Majorca, and with it a school in which various languages spoken by non-Christians were taught the monks, thus fitting them for foreign mission work. It was due chiefly to his efforts that the council of Vienne (1311–12) ordered professors of Arabic to be appointed in Oxford, Paris, Bologna, Rome, and Salamanca. Indeed the present *Congregatio de propaganda fide* is little more than the realization of his wise and far-reaching plan. Master of the scholastic arts of his day, he used them all to prove the truth of Christianity and the vanity of Mohammedanism. He believed that the Moslems could be won to Christianity by argument, but he often wrote and spoke with a natural and sincerely Christian enthusiasm and eloquence of heart which must have been far more effective than his arguments. To his literary efforts he added practical mission work, spending several years among Moslems as a missionary.

Peter and Lullus, as well as all other apologists who wrote against Islam, cover a wide range of topics. They attack the moral and religious character of Mohammed, his claims as a prophet, the character and contents of his revelation, and endeavor to make intelligible and reasonable to the Moslems the principal doctrines of the Christian church, such as the Trinity, the various Christological dogmas, the

divinity of Jesus, his eternal sonship, his incarnation; especially the sacraments required a deal of explanation and defense, because the Moslems had nothing in their religion which corresponded to them, and looked upon them as tricks of the clergy meant to deceive. The efforts of all these writers and missionaries, however able and interesting, were, so far as we know, unsuccessful and soon ceased, not to be renewed in any large way till the present century.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. OLIVER J. THATCHER.

KIRCHENGESCHICHTE DEUTSCHLANDS. Von D. ALBERT HAUCK, Professor in Leipzig. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. 3 vols.: 1887; 1891; 1896. Pp. viii+558; iv+758; viii+1042. M. 42.

THE first part or volume of this important work appeared in 1887, the second in 1890, the third in 1896. So far as completed, the history of the German church is carried forward to 1122.

We are not to suppose that the church history of Germany begins with the first entrance of Christianity into the territory of the present Germany—because the early cities on the Rhine and Mosel were Roman cities, and so the Christian communities of those cities were communities of Roman Christians. We may accordingly regard the baptism of Clovis in Rheims as the first German ecclesiastical event. The 25th of December, 496, is the first date in the church history of the Fatherland. From this date forward the lines of historical continuity are pretty evident until the consolidation of the German church between 911 and 1002.

The book begins with a general review of Christianity in the Rhinelands during the imperial times. It then takes up the Frankish church, noticing the different tribes—as the Alamanni, the Burgundians, and the Franks—and the influence of each. The relations of church and state, the moral and religious condition of Europe, the early growth and influence of monasticism, the progress of the conversion of Germany, receive due consideration.

In the third book we have a hundred and fifty pages devoted to the work of Anglo-Saxon missionaries in Germany and their relations to Rome. Of course Boniface is the center of interest here—and he is brought before us and discussed in a spirited, thorough, and satisfactory manner.

In the fourth book the Frankish church appears as an imperial

church. Charles the Great is the great figure of the period. The relations of the empire to the papacy are now becoming full of interest. There is great activity in theology and literature and church extension.

Then follows the dissolution of the imperial church. Interesting chapters are given on monasticism, the literary movement since the death of Charles the Great, missionary undertakings, and a summing up of results.

Thus the lines advance and converge, until at last they meet at some indefinite point between 911 and 1002. These dates inclose many subjects that live again in the treatment of Dr. Hauck. Among these are the relations of crown, episcopate, and dukedom; the activity of the German church in Bohemia and Poland, the renewal of relations with Italy and its reaction upon ecclesiastical conditions in the north. In literature and art during this period there was considerable activity. Monasticism has decayed, and there are many indications that the reformatory spirit is rising. By 1002 the ascendency of the empire in the church is complete, and the results in both church and empire are bad. But at last the spirits of reformation and ecclesiasticism find a strong expression in Gregory VII.

The third volume ends with an excellent chapter on the progress of the intellectual life. This is seen in architecture, sculpture, painting, schools, historical writings, theology, exegesis, Latin poems, German poems, and translations.

The book is to be recommended from almost every point of view. The author has a very large conception of his subject. Every important phase of development has been treated with the customary German thoroughness—without the customary German heaviness. The style is simple, lively, and direct. The German is peculiarly easy for the English reader, so that those whose knowledge of the language is moderate need not fear to take it up. It is to be hoped that Dr. Hauck may continue his work, and that someone may feel the obligation to put it into English form.

J. W. MONCRIEF.

EUROPE IN THE MIDDLE AGE. By OLIVER J. THATCHER, PH.D., and FERDINAND SCHWILL, PH.D. With maps and charts. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1896. Pp. xii + 681. $2.

THIS book attempts to cover the history of Europe, and of the Mohammedan countries from the fourth century to about 1500. It is

designed "for the use of the freshman and sophomore classes in the American college." It is adequately supplied with maps and chronological tables, ten of each. Such a volume was needed as a basis for lecture courses. A lecturer feels the need of some book to which he can refer students for a mass of details which ought not to be dictated. In presenting the necessary material this book is, I think, more successful than any previous volume in English. Although we have had some excellent works on this period, notably those by Professor Emerton, no one of them has been satisfactory in just this respect.

There are, however, serious faults in this volume. A text-book ought to be a guide to further study. In this respect the volume is almost useless. The authors say that they "have taken it for granted that the teachers who may use the book are acquainted with the best literature on the period, and will be able to direct the reading of their classes." They seem to have forgotten that in the average American college one man teaches all the history, and probably some other subject or subjects. That man is not likely to possess the necessary knowledge of mediæval history. Most teachers would agree with the authors that it would have been inadvisable "to add an extensive bibliography." But they should have given for each chapter a carefully selected and annotated list of the most useful works.

The choice of subjects has been wise for the most part, and some of the chapters are excellent. But there are two serious omissions: The history of the Roman Empire at Constantinople, and an account of the pre-Reformation movements. Each of these subjects is touched upon, but that is all. Probably the latter will be discussed in the volume on modern history. But there is no justification now for neglecting the debt we owe to the so-called Byzantine Empire. The division of the chapters by nations causes frequent repetitions. The first halves of pages 70 and 239 are practically identical, and the same is true of other parts of the book (*e. g.*, pp. 57 and 78, pp. 65–6 and 78). The spelling of proper names is influenced by German training, and is not always in conformity with good English usage, *e. g.*, Kaernthen, Clugny. Striking statements, which are not accurate, and which are sure to stick fast in the student's mind, are too common. On page 357 we are told that "large cities sprang up in all parts of the [Mohammedan] empire, many of them numbering a half million or more inhabitants." On page 26, "as a proof of the rapid increase [in population among the Germans] it is said that within sixty years the tribe of the Aduatici increased in numbers from six thousand to

fifty-nine thousand." It is true that this is said, but if the authors had read the source carefully they would have found good reason for not citing this statement without modification. In fact, a more careful dependence on sources would have saved them from many a slip.

It is to be hoped that the authors will soon have an opportunity to revise this work, and to make it the book which we need.

DANA CARLETON MUNRO.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.

MARTIN LUTHER IN KULTURGESCHICHTLICHER DARSTELLUNG. Von ARNOLD E. BERGER. Erster Teil. 1483–1525. Berlin: Ernst Hofmann & Co., 1895. Pp. xxiv + 506. M. 4.80.

EMERSON, in his *Lecture on the Times*, uses the following figure: "As the granite comes to the surface, and towers into the highest mountains, and, if we dig down, we find it below the superficial strata, so in all the details of our domestic or civil life is hidden the elemental reality, which ever and anon comes to the surface." Berger's *Luther* is an effort to dig down into the social and domestic life of the times of the Reformation and to connect Luther with this "elemental reality." An effort is made to weigh all questions with "a deep sociological and psychological insight." Each event is viewed in its double relationship, on the side of the individual and on the side of society. The working together of the personality of the reformer and the reflex action of the institutions and circumstances of the age are never forgotten. Our author objects to all previous lives of Luther on the ground that they have been written from a purely theological point of view. "The Protestant theologian," he says, "however sincerely he may endeavor to handle his material with the sole aim of setting forth its causal relationship in a purely historical manner, will never be able to escape the atmosphere of his religious education sufficiently to exclude entirely all apologetic and polemic points of view." The reason for this he finds in the fact that the interest of the theologian naturally hinges on the personality of the reformer and on a desire to maintain his "religious originality." Thus the tendency of all biographers of Luther has been to isolate the man as far as possible from the general culture of his times. But Berger contends that the greatness of a man is not comprehensible, unless we have some object by which he can be measured and over against which we can put him.

The real questions for the biographer are these: "What were the circumstances and problems of this man's age? How did he grapple with them? What solution had he? What lines did he mark out for future development?"

Now one can scarcely read a chapter of Berger's book without seeing that there is much truth in this contention. But yet it is open to certain objections. In the first place, Berger does not make entirely clear the reason why all Protestant theologians should desire to exalt the personality of Luther above the forces and ideas of which he was the representative or instrument. Was the Reformation any less justifiable or divine because it finds its roots in social conditions than it would be were it the work of one man? Despite Berger's seeming assumption that he has avoided the religious problem entirely, we cannot see that he has done so. Many of the ideas which Luther represented are still in open conflict with those which he opposed, and as long as this is the case a history that all sides shall pronounce to be absolutely without "Tendenz" seems to us to be an impossibility. This may be because we, too, look at the matter with theological eyes. But it seems to us that there is a certain legitimate criticism on the events of history and that a purely objective standpoint on a present-day problem is an extremely difficult position to maintain. It is like a man trying to perform a surgical operation upon himself. Then, too, if to measure a man it is necessary, as Berger says, to put him against some background, he must admit that a proper idea of perspective demands, just as much, a true estimation of the man as of his surroundings. The background must not be moved so far forward as to belittle or hide the man. It seems to us, therefore, that Berger might have avoided his strictures on theological biographers and have let his most excellent work stand on its own merits. He is not so much of a pioneer as he seems to think, for Kolde's biography of Luther professes to be an attempt "to explain Luther in his relation to the entire development of his people."

But in justice to Berger it must be said that he has carried on this attempt most successfully. The larger stream that bore Luther on its bosom he calls "lay-culture." He never loses sight of the relationship between Luther and certain social and economic problems. As early as the time of the crusades certain worldly and economic forces began to cross swords with the power of feudalism. More and more the money power, which tended to develop the individual, came to be regarded as the natural enemy of the church, which tried to suppress

the individual by means of its ascetic ideal. The discoveries and inventions of the fifteenth century naturally allied themselves with the forces fighting for individualism. The individual began to feel his power as an individual, and a desire arose in his heart to become the master of this world, to acquire its goods and enjoy its beauties. But of course such a conception was in direct opposition to the teaching of the church. Here Luther appears upon the scene. His doctrine of "Justification by Faith" makes the individual responsible to God alone. Under the shelter of this great thought the new movement finds, not only a religious sanction, but a new inspiration. The individual is now perfectly free to seek the good things of this world, knowing that he must give account of his stewardship to God and to Him alone. So the individualism bound up in "lay-culture" became united with the religious individualism that inside the church was making in the direction of a reformation. For such a union a man like Luther, whose sympathies were all with the people, was eminently fitted.

But Berger often makes a serious mistake in his book. In his desire to reveal Luther in the light of a "culture-hero," as well as a religious reformer (his book being one of a series of *Geisteshelden*), he is quite likely to put the religious problem into the background when it deserves stronger emphasis. For example, who will be satisfied with the treatment of the doctrine of "Justification by Faith" as a mere sanction and inspiration of economic ideals? Again, when he says that the mediæval religion "must be looked upon, in the principal matters, as the *negative* preparation for the reformation," by what right does he thus dispose of the religious problem as not dealing with "the principal matters?" Religious and social, sacred and secular, were bound up together, and there surely were more forces working in the Reformation than a struggle for social independence on the one side and an opposing hierarchy on the other. It is just as easy to maintain that the spread of religion among the common people and the freedom of thought which was manifesting itself in the church were the great cause of the social awakening of which Berger makes so much. The two problems cannot be kept entirely distinct.

But yet it cannot be denied that the side of the question which Berger emphasizes has long needed just such a book as this which he has written. There is certainly a tendency in all lives of Luther to neglect his relationship to the common culture of his day. Berger admits that yet much remains to be done. Perhaps in the second

volume of his work, which is yet to appear, we shall see further light thrown upon the problem, as well as some of the mistakes of the first volume avoided. At any rate, no future biographer of Luther can afford to neglect this book, written, as it is, with a thoroughly modern conception of history, and giving, as it does, the views which a historian of literature entertains of the great German reformer.

GEO. H. FERRIS.

TARRYTOWN, N. Y.

GESCHICHTE DER EVANGELISCHEN KIRCHE IN DEUTSCHLAND. Von R. ROCHOLL. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachfolger (Geo. Böhme), 1897. Pp. xii + 594, 8vo. M. 8.50.

THE writer is well known as an influential Lutheran churchman (he is *Kirchenrath* in Düsseldorf), as the author of a large work on the philosophy of history, and as a contributor to the new edition of the *Realencyklopaedie*. In the compass of a single volume he has attempted to give a sketch of Lutheranism in Germany from the beginning to the present time. There seems to be no other work that covers the same ground. The task would have been large enough if the author had contented himself with a discussion of great movements and characters; but he has evidently been ambitious to omit the mention of no important name, book, or fact, and the result is a not very readable epitome of Lutheran history. The necessity of extreme condensation has conduced to a terseness and nervousness of style uncommon among the Germans. Half-line sentences abound. The average length of sentences would probably not much exceed a line and a half. Many paragraphs consist of a line or less. Verbs are often omitted. The author's reputation as a philosophical historian is a sufficient guarantee that he would not present his condensed facts in a disconnected or illogical manner. On the contrary, the work is written pragmatically, and the aim has been to present Lutheranism in all its aspects as a segment of the great circle of Christian history. While a work of this kind might have been readily compiled from the multitudinous monographs that are available on the various epochs and aspects of Lutheranism, the author assures us that he has drawn his materials to a great extent directly from the sources, and that he has used some archival sources never before employed. The amount of pertinent quotation from the sources is really astonishing.

The work is divided into three books. The first treats of the Introduction (*Einführung*), the second of the Progress (*Ausführung*) (1600 onward), and the third of the Accomplishment (*Durchführung*) of the Reformation (1800 onward).

The history of the Lutheran Reformation has been studied so minutely of late years, and the results of recent research have been so fully published, that one could not expect to find much fresh material in a short history of this kind, however diligently the writer may have labored. The facts are well presented from a distinctively Lutheran point of view. There is no adequate recognition of the great mediæval evangelical movement that covered Europe with its influence long before Luther's time, and with whose principles Luther was thoroughly sympathetic during the early years of his reforming career. From the present work one would be able to form no just conception of the widespread and determined revolt against the state-church scheme that Luther felt himself forced by circumstances to adopt, but which was antagonistic to his own sentiments.

Even Zwinglianism receives less recognition than might have been expected even from so pronounced a Lutheran as Rocholl. The author is disposed to attribute the rise of the memorial view of the Supper among the Swiss to Carlstadt's influence. How far Zwingli was personally influenced by Carlstadt cannot be determined, but the readiness with which the Carlstadt-Zwinglian view was received throughout Switzerland, in France, Italy, etc., shows that this view was inherent in the humanistic mode of thought that prevailed in these regions, and that it needed only to be formulated in order to be generally adopted. The author does not sufficiently recognize the relationship of Luther's doctrine of the communication of idioms, of the ubiquity of Christ's humanity, and of the real presence in the Supper, with the old Alexandrian theology perpetuated in neo-Platonism and mysticism; nor the relationship of the Reformed view of the Supper and the Reformed denial of the communication of idioms and of the ubiquity of Christ's humanity with the old Antiochian modes of thought perpetuated to some extent in mediæval nominalism and in humanism. For Zwingli to have accepted Luther's view of the Supper would have involved a complete revolution in his Christology and his entire mode of thought.

The author's account of the Lutheran controversies is as luminous, perhaps, as could be expected in the space available, but falls far short of the requirements of an advanced student of doctrine-history. These controversies were unsurpassed in their bitterness and did much toward

destroying religious life in Germany. The author frankly admits that they were largely due to Luther's recklessness and inconsistency of statement, and to his utter lack of system. In fact, he asserts that Luther's greatness consists precisely in his lack of system (p. 62). He recognizes and seeks to apologize for Luther's almost unexampled coarseness. He glories in Luther's catholicity, and calls attention to the fact that Luther wished the ritual of the church to be such that a foreigner who could not understand the preaching would be compelled to say that a Lutheran church visited was "a right papal church, and that there was no difference or very little" (p. 73). Luther's willingness to adopt episcopacy is also referred to. The author regards Luther's complicity in the bigamous practice of Philip of Hesse as "the greatest blot on the Reformation history and on the life of Luther" (p. 67). Luther's ineffective striving against territorialism (as embodied in the maxim, *Cuius regio eius religio*) is repeatedly referred to. The author himself, somewhat in the spirit of English high-churchmen, regards the complete control of the church by the state as a misfortune and an anomaly.

The appropriateness of the designations of the second and third books is not very obvious. The second book includes the rise and growth of Lutheran scholasticism, of syncretism, of pietism, and of rationalism. Regarding the origin of Lutheran scholasticism the author, with some plausibility, takes issue with the Protestant Gervinus and the Catholic Werner, who agree in attributing it to the necessity felt by Protestant polemicists to combat the Jesuists with their own weapons. He maintains that it would have arisen apart from this circumstance from the very nature of the situation. This is probably true, but we cannot doubt the profound influence of Jesuitical theologizing on that of the German Lutherans. Syncretism, an irenical movement led by George Calixtus, which, in opposition to Lutheran orthodoxy, was disposed to assume a friendly attitude toward Calvinism and to recognize even in Roman Catholicism and in evangelical sects a modicum of good, represents an earnest effort to harmonize systems fundamentally antagonistic. It was the occasion of some of the most violent politico-ecclesiastial procedures of the latter half of the seventeenth century. Pietism the author regards as in part an outcome of syncretism, which loosened the bonds of Lutheran church organization and encouraged separatistic efforts. Little sympathy is shown for this "morbid phenomenon." The relation of pietism to old-evangelical thought and life, as this had been perpetuated among the sects of the Reformation and later times, is not sufficiently recognized. Even the chiliastic ele-

ment in pietism had its prototype in mediæval and Reformation parties. The reaction against dead formalism was sure to come sooner or later in some shape; but this does not excuse the neglect of effort to find a more remote source in the thought and life of the past.

The modern period, treated in Book III, includes the romanticism and rationalism that were in part a product of the French Revolution, the Union of 1817 with the mediating theology represented by Schleiermacher, Nitsch, Twesten, Julius Müller, Marheinicke, Dorner, etc., the recent Tübingen school, Ritschlianism, etc. The author looks with the utmost disfavor on the Union, which he ascribes to the efforts of an "erring, well-meaning king." He thinks that this effort to unite the Reformed and Lutheran churches might have been expected to result, as it did, in the formation of a third communion, side by side with the mutually antagonistic historical Protestant churches. He fully sympathizes with the polemical attitude assumed by the strict Lutherans toward this movement. He regards the loss of the evangelical (Lutheran) church in connection with the Union as similar to that of the Anglican church in the growth of non-conformity.

The author does not wholly ignore the influence of philosophy on the development of German theology; yet within the prescribed space an adequate exposition of this influence was clearly impracticable.

In conclusion it may be said that the work is a masterpiece of condensed exposition, and that it is almost encyclopædic in the range of its topics. Each book is subdivided into sections and chapters, and the matter is skillfully and logically arranged. The notes are gathered at the end of the volume. Good indexes render the work convenient for reference.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY.

THE PURITAN IN ENGLAND AND NEW ENGLAND. By EZRA HOYT BYINGTON, D.D. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1896. Pp. xl+406; cloth. $2.

THE printers have given the author's thought an attractive outward setting. The paper is thick, the type large, the margins wide, the pages inviting.

Out of review articles and papers read before historical societies have grown the eight chapters into which the book is divided. The original material has been so reconstructed and supplemented as, in its

present form, to give a connected history of our New England forefathers. "The Puritan in England" is treated in a single chapter, in which are rapidly sketched the beginnings of reform and the rise and growth of dissent under Henry, Edward, Mary, Elizabeth, James, and Charles; the persecutions of the Pilgrims, their stay in Leyden, and their voyage to Plymouth, the persecutions of the Puritans and their migration to Massachusetts Bay. The two colonies differed widely in their religious views, in their reasons for migrating, in their intellectual gifts and worldly standing, and in their social, political, and ecclesiastical ideals, and, consequently, in their influence in "molding the people of New England." The Puritans were more numerous, wealthy, learned, enterprising, powerful and intolerant. The Pilgrims were more gentle, lenient, and lovable, and more "merciful and just in the execution of their laws." While the Puritans have filled a larger place in the pages of history, men nowadays like better "those who came over in the Mayflower."

The early ministers were the chief agents in the development of the New England theocracy, and in chap. 3 we are told of their learning, piety, orthodoxy, pulpit ministrations, parochial work, and general, public, and private influence. Pity is it that men who had been the "special victims of Bishop Laud" could not rise above the spirit of religious persecution.

Full of interest is the family and social life of our New England forefathers — their love-making, marital relations, school system, amusements, dress, furniture, modes of traveling, "and all which made up their daily life."

And, again, full of interest are their theological opinions and religious life. They stood for a positive creed, and it was iron in their blood. "We shall fail to understand the Puritans unless we know what views they adopted in regard to religious truth. Duty to God was their highest rule. Religious motives had the largest place in their lives. They left their English homes behind them that they might be free to follow their religious convictions."

Of late there is a marked revival of interest in early New England history. No history is more instructive and uplifting. To readers familiar with the standard works Dr. Byington's book will serve as a refreshing review. Readers approaching the subject for the first time through this treatise will be inspired to continue their investigation.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SOME EARLY WRITINGS OF JONATHAN EDWARDS, A. D. 1714–1726. By EGBERT C. SMYTH. From *Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Annual Meeting, October 23, 1895*. Worcester, Mass.: Press of Charles Hamilton, 1896. Pp. 39.

JONATHAN EDWARDS has long been recognized as one of America's most original philosophical and theological thinkers. He early acquired the habit of systematic and independent thought. Just how early he composed his writings on "The Soul," "Of Insects," "The Mind," and "Notes on Science," is the question under consideration. Here are found the germinal principles of much of his later speculative reasoning. These documents, if written as early as is supposed, show a boy of almost unparalleled intellectual precocity.

The authority for the early origin of these documents has hitherto rested mainly on an opinion expressed by Dr. Dwight, Edwards' biographer, based principally upon the handwriting of the compositions. The correctness of this judgment has been prominently called in question, particularly by Professor Georges Lyon, who devotes nearly a chapter to Edwards in his *L'Idéalisme en Angleterre au XVIII^e siècle*, and by Professor Allen in his *Jonathan Edwards*, who is inclined to think that the notes on "The Mind" were written later than is generally supposed.

To afford a broader basis for judgment Dr. Smyth has carefully examined and reëdited a number of the original manuscripts of these early writings. By correcting the spelling and punctuation Dr. Dwight removed important indications of their age. The manuscript handwriting of a very early writing, as shown by the published facsimile, is neat and legible, but the capitalizing at the beginning of sentences, punctuation, and spelling are marvelously deficient. In this paper, in which young Edwards reasons logically and philosophically against the materiality of the soul, he misspells twenty-five words in twenty-three lines. He evidently had learned the use of good words by hearing rather than by writing. Professor Lyon doubts the originality of this paper; but Dr. Smyth thinks "it may well have been an original composition, and beyond reasonable question is of a date as early as Dr. Dwight supposed."

Most of Edwards' "Notes on Natural Science" have been referred to the years 1718–1720, and to the period of his tutorship, 1724–1726, and are regarded as original. Professor Lyon doubts the originality of Edwards' views of philosophic idealism, and thinks the notes on the mind were written later than Dr. Dwight supposes. He recognizes,

however, that only a "methodical comparison of the manuscripts" can determine this point.

Dr. Smyth has made a scholarly comparison of Edwards' pre-college writings with the first three articles in "Notes on Natural Science," and thinks the latter were written not later than his sixteenth year. A careful consideration of the spelling, punctuation, use of capital letters, construction of sentences, and other youthful characteristics of style, such as awkwardness, intensity, and positiveness in expression, and a comparison of manuscripts, furnish evidence as to the early beginning of articles on subjects in natural science and mental philosophy. The investigation enables Dr. Smyth to claim fairly that "Dr. Dwight's judgment of the time at which these papers were written is moderate and sound." And "if any change is to be made, it would apparently be in the direction of earlier rather than later dates."

A. R. E. WYANT.

MORGAN PARK, ILL.

HISTORY OF DOGMA. By DR. ADOLPH HARNACK. Translated from the third German edition by NEIL BUCHANAN. Vol. II. Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1897. Pp. viii+380, cloth. $2.50.

THE volume before us comprises Book II of Part 1 of Harnack's *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, with the exception of the final chapter. It is too much to have expected of an English publisher that this chap. 7 should be allowed a place in Vol. II of the translation. The German publishers are not so finicky about physical symmetry, though they do prize rational division and proportion. Did the omission of chap. 7 lead to the omission of the proper caption, "Book II, The Laying of the Foundation," from both the table of contents and the initial page of the text? If so, the English reader will indeed pay dearly for the missing chapter when it appears. Vol. I has "Book I, The Preparation" thrice repeated. Why should Vol. II go nameless?

It is unnecessary to comment at length on Dr. Harnack's theory of the rise of ecclesiastical dogma. His views have been more or less completely before the English public for almost a decade. No other living theologian has received so much attention in recent years as he. He has been criticised with vehemence, and even virulence; and he has been defended with spirit, and even spunk. No one as yet has seriously set about the task of answering him by putting forth a work of equal learning and comprehensiveness. It is clear, however, that Har-

nack's treatment of the subject is not going to pass as a finality. And perhaps no one is more convinced of this fact than the author himself. Modification of details has already begun, and this will lead to a readjustment, to a greater or less degree, of the system. Still, some things for which Harnack stands will never change. That the po itical, racial, social, moral, religious, intellectual, and philosophical environment of Christianity during the early centuries profoundly influenced the formulation of the doctrines and the development of the polity, cultus, discipline, and life of the church is a fact now beyond even captious criticism.

The sole question is as to amount and degree. Did the environment not only modify but pervert the Christianity of Christ and his first disciples? If so. in what respects. and to what degree? Harnack takes a pessimistic view of the subject. He maintains that the adoption of the Logos-Christology was the culmination of the Hellenizing influence and an essential perversion of primitive Christianity. But here the critics of early Christian history differ. It is needless to say that their differences rest largely on dogmatic presuppositions. Harnack has tried to free himself from such bias, but it is more and more clear that he has failed, as well as have his critics and defenders. Perhaps we shall all learn some day that it is impossible to do business without capital, and that the mind is no exception to the rule. However, Harnack has here again taught historians of the church a valuable lesson. He has fearlessly brushed aside the superstitions and false traditions which have beclouded the course of events in the early centuries, and sought to propound a theory that will fit the facts. But, like all pioneers, he became enamored with his theory, and overworked his main hypothesis. He assumed that the Christian faith was unequal to the contest, or, rather, he concludes that it was. "They that were against were more than they that were for." The battle was lost. Now, this is too great a tax upon the dogmatic presuppositions of most believers. And who, after all, is to decide the question? How much was really inherent and *implied* in the teachings of Christ and his apostles? Must not religious things be *thought out*, as well as philosophical things? And can you keep the results from ultimately blending? Few now question, however, that the Nicene amalgam was something of a debasement of the original coinage of the faith. But was it sufficient to make that faith counterfeit?

The substance of Harnack's views is contained in the two volumes of the translation which have now appeared, to which, however, chap.

7 must be added. That is to say, his temper and attitude and method of dealing with the subject are therein fully apparent. And no historian can afford to ignore Harnack's handling of this period of "origins." He has stated the problem with great clearness, and blazed the way to its solution. Indeed, his treatment is a distinct challenge to scholars of all schools, Catholic and Protestant alike. The ante-Nicene period is the battle ground for all parties. If Protestants are ever to justify themselves as against Roman Catholicism, they must do so before Nicæa. And *vice versa*. In a sense Harnack has thrown down the gauntlet to both branches of the church. As yet the Romanists have not taken his challenge very seriously, but the time is not far distant when they will be obliged to defend some things, at least, with new arguments. And orthodox Protestants cannot go on indifferently. Their castle has also been bombarded. But much work remains to be done before final answers can be given and *defended* to many vital questions in the Nicene period.

The translation, so far as it has been tested, seems to have been done with care and fidelity. At the rate the volumes have appeared up to date we cannot hope for the completion of the English edition for some five or six years.

EDWIN KNOX MITCHELL.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DER SOGENANNTE HISTORISGHE JESUS UND DER GESCHICHTLICHE BIBLISCHE CHRISTUS. Von MARTIN KÄHLER, Doctor und Professor der Theologie. Zweite, erweiterte und erläuterte Auflage. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Geo. Böhme), 1896. Pp. xii+206, 8vo. M. 3.25.

OF THE four great schools of theology in Germany, viz., the orthodox, the liberal, the mediating, and the Ritschlian, it is not easy to say to which one Kähler belongs. Some ten years ago he published a work entitled: *Die Wissenschaft der christlichen Lehre von dem evangelischen Grundartikel aus im Abrisse dargestellt.* The *Abriss* is 650 pages long, therefore *nicht gar zu knapp.* From this one may obtain a certain survey of his religious conceptions, which do not make his reputed affiliation with the "middlers" any too apparent. He has left behind him much that is, or was, cherished by that school. But he is neither an orthodox nor a liberal theologian. In a certain way he stands by himself. What more nearly connects him with the mediating

is a biblicism which yet in its formulæ moves as far as seems possible along the line of the doctrine of the church. Church-doctrine, with some reservation, is his guide through the Bible. But "church-doctrine" is not the fixed conception with him that it is for the orthodox. In so far as the mediating theology is rooted in pietism, Kähler belongs to this school, since his point of departure is pietism, and his method is influenced strongly by Schleiermacher. Kähler's pietism is, like that of Beck, of so exceptional a character that it is coupled with equal systematic interest in theology. To Kähler all dogmatics is somewhat of a *confession*. To him our whole evangelical confession is only the echo of the confession of the apostles, which may be followed in some way through all times in the history of the church, and *fully* perceived and understood again in the Reformation. And it is peculiar to Kähler —here is the point—to understand the Bible itself, especially the New Testament, as "confession," the confession, namely, that one has experienced Jesus Christ in redemption. If dogmatics has to exhibit only those thoughts which belong, not to knowledge, but to the Christian *faith;* if, therefore, it has to speak of Jesus, not as he is *in himself, i. e.*, not historically, not metaphysically, but only as he is *for us*, it follows that he is to be treated from the outset only as "Savior." And since what Jesus is for us is always a confession, the correct thought is that the entire "gospel" has been preached only because the apostles desired to confess that they had found in Jesus the Savior of the world. In the above work, first published in 1892, Kähler more minutely expounds this feature of his theology, and still more distinctly in the new edition of 1896. In difficult, but stimulating, German he sets forth his thesis: Not merely the fourth, but all the gospels are *preachings about Christ*, rather than *historical* narratives. In the gospels as well as in the epistles we have the confessional Christ. And it is a vain undertaking to fetch forth from *behind* the apostolic witness of Christ, *by historical means*, the real Jesus Christ as he was and lived, and to desire to make the latter foundation of faith—vain, because *historical* [*historischen*, not *geschichtlichen* (the former means objective and, therefore, trustworthy; the latter confessional and subjective)] sources of sufficient reliability are wanting, and because in the attempt to delineate the genuine historical Jesus Christ the imagination of the investigator constantly supplements the results of historical investigation. The historical-science Christ is not the historical Christ, and the historical Christ is not the confessional Christ, *i. e.*, not the Christ of faith, not the preached Christ. To be sure, in his judgment the

gospels are not so *tendenziös* but that the historical-science Jesus may be in some degree known. Yet the Christ of the gospels is a *Characterbild*, not a *Lebensbild*. The Christ concealed behind the apostolic proclamation is forever inaccessible to science, and science is of little or no aid to faith.

The point of view of Kähler is instructive. It suggests the painful but necessary question, Who is Christ? "The Christ of today," or the Christ of the schools, or the Christ of the church, or the biblical-confessional Christ, or the historical-science Christ? And in which one of these do we have the fundamental revelation of God? Or shall we push the question further and say, with Feuerbach, that the great discovery of this generation is that "man made God in his own image," and that "an honest God is the noblest work of man"? One thing is clear: If the historical-science Jesus is not in the main identical with the biblical or confessional Christ, we do not know who Christ is, and, by consequence, who God is, or what the basis of faith is. The problem is not so new, after all, for did not Strauss smite the church with terror as he urged that the ground of faith was subjectivism and illusionism? But the rock upon which he broke abides: there must be lodged in the Jesus of history a content adequate to account for the Jesus of confession. Indeed, it is the old problem which led philosophy to despair, but in a new application: To what extent, absolutely, partly, or not at all, does the knowing mind make the object known? Eliminate the contribution the mind makes, and the remainder is the thing-in-itself. So, similarly, subtract from Jesus what faith, love, devotion, *i. e.*, "confession," supply, and the remainder will be the *real* Jesus-in-himself, whom biblical science wishes to see. Did Jesus make the disciples, or did the disciples make Jesus? It must be granted, I think, that, precisely as a psychological necessity, the biblical Jesus is confessionally colored. But the mind that, upon the basis of sense perception, cannot entertain the conviction that the outside world is unreal will not be able to rest in the belief that the richest and noblest character of which it has become aware, likewise through experience, is a mere constriction of thought, or faith, or fancy, to which no reality corresponds. It must also be granted that the distilling work of historical inquiry is not first to give to faith its enduring foundation. To be sure, a wider limit to the justifiable tasks of investigation into the life of Jesus is to be drawn than Kähler has done; and the worth of such investigation for faith itself is to be valued more highly than he has done: it can help faith, remove hindrances out of

the way, enrich faith, since it gives the picture—immediately certain to faith—of Jesus Christ, still more distinctly, more vividly, more exactly; and, especially, it can compel faith to abandon false foundations. But to Kähler's view that faith cannot find its *foundation* in a historical Jesus first elaborated and guaranteed through historical inquiry, I agree. Else what becomes of faith, in the meantime? And how long must it wait for results universally accredited by the investigators?

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DOGMATIQUE CHRÉTIENNE. Par JULES BOVON, Docteur en Théologie, Professeur à la Faculté de Théologie de l'Église Évangélique Libre du Canton de Vaud. Lausanne: Georges Bridel & Cie., Éditeurs. In two volumes, 1895 and 1896. Pp. 549 and 584. Fr. 22.

THIS treatise, which is the second part of a comprehensive *Study upon the Work of Redemption*, of which the first part is an elaborate biblical theology,[1] is a thorough piece of work according to the standards of German scholarship. Indeed, though written in French, it may be styled in a large degree a German book, for it refers constantly to German writers, and discusses at length at the proper points the theories of the great German leaders, such as Schleiermacher, Rothe, Julius Müller, Ritschl, etc., while not neglecting the Reformers, or contemporary French and English theologians. But whatever Professor Bovon may have drawn from other sources, his masters have been the Germans.

Nor is it difficult to locate our author among the schools of German thought. While he differs from Ritschl upon many a point, and preserves his relative independence of him by frequent criticisms, still, upon the whole, the method of this work is Ritschlian, and the results,

[1] *Théologie du Nouveau Testament*, consisting of two volumes of respectively 549 and 604 pp.; Fr. 22. The first volume, entitled *La Vie et l'enseignement de Jésus*, contains what is in effect an introduction to the gospels, in respect to which the writer maintains a position of moderate conservatism; a treatment, in the large rather than in detail, of the life of Jesus, and a discussion of the teaching of Jesus. The second volume is entitled *L'Enseignement des Apôtres*, which he discusses under the heads: (1) "Le Judéo-Christianisme"; (2) "Le Paulinisme," to which is attached by way of appendix "Le Paulinisme du second degré ou la doctrine de l'épître aux Hébreux;" (3) "Les Épîtres Catholiques," (4) "L'Apocalypse," and (5) "La Théologie Johannique."

particularly at the main points, such as the Christology, are substantially Ritschlian. Whatever, then, any thinker may judge of the correctness or the value of Ritschl's theology, the same judgment he will have to pass in the main upon this work.

The plan of the work is in some respects new, and is adapted to the analytic and inductive method of arriving at dogmatic statements. The first book treats of the "principles," man considered as a personality, religion, and God; the second of sin; the third of grace; the fourth of eternity. Under this general scheme, which is not altogether unique, it is the constant purpose of the author to bring in every theological topic exactly where it is required in the development, that is to say, exactly where it has been prepared for by the previous work, and where it has become a necessity for the development of the following points. In this arrangement he has shown great skill, and deserves the credit of having done much to facilitate the labors of others who shall hereafter seek to erect a dogmatic structure which shall be really progressive, "*aus einem Guss*," and inductive. Thus, for example, when God is discussed among the "principles" of the system, it is his existence, his attributes in a more general sense, and his works of creation and providence which occupy the attention. The justice of God, and hence the full idea of his holiness, is not discussed till the topic of sin is reached. In the same way, the doctrine of the Scriptures is postponed till the third book, where it enters, first under the head of the preparation of salvation, revelation, and then, still later, after the work of Christ has been developed, under the head of the diffusion of the knowledge of salvation. Christology, which must embrace a treatment of the work of Christ, comes after the discussion of sin, which is the occasion of that work. And the doctrine of the Trinity comes after the discussion of the application and appropriation of salvation, and thus after the discussion of the Holy Spirit, which has been conducted in connection with the development of the Spirit's work. The author thus always proceeds from the nearest to the more remote, from the known to the unknown, and from phenomena to their basis in reality. If he fails sometimes to get all the phenomena and thinks he is explaining them when he is not fully doing so, the fault lies in the application of the method rather than in the method itself.

Returning from this general survey, we may now look at details. The "introduction" discusses first the idea of dogma and dogmatics; and the leading thought of the author is here brought forward that the Christian life comes first, and then the knowledge of the truth, and

then the dogma, as the formulated expression of apprehended truth. Under the head of "method" the theory of the infallibility of the Scriptures is discussed. The style of treatment, illustrated by this topic, is one characteristic of the book, and leads incidentally to one of its prime excellencies. The question as to infallibility is raised by the idea of a "biblical" dogmatics, which has only to take the Scriptures as they are for its basis. This is the plan of Beck, and, having mentioned Beck's name, Bovon goes on to sketch his theory, with its principal sustaining arguments, and then to subject the whole to a sharp critique. This custom he follows throughout the work, so that upon every important point various views may be found, and critical discussion, which is always acute and sometimes profound. Beck's view of the Bible is what we are accustomed in America to call that of verbal inspiration. Bovon acknowledges that a "biblical dogmatics," such as Beck has in mind, can only be founded upon an infallible Bible, but he denies that we have in fact any such Bible. Besides fallibility in the sciences, the Bible exhibits fallibility elsewhere. Its authors make no claim for a special inspiration for their writings which is not applicable to their oral instructions and to their conduct. And they have actually erred, even in matters of doctrine. A single error, like the expectation of the near advent of the Lord, is enough to destroy Beck's theory. Hence Bovon, in accordance with his leading idea, teaches that knowledge of the truth is through the life, and that over and above the indwelling and sanctifying Spirit there is no inspiration for the writing of the Bible. Hence he calls his own system, not "biblical," but "Christian" dogmatics, because it makes Christ its central principle and develops doctrine from this as the origin. "The gospel is a historical fact, which we have not the right to change or alter; the testimony of the first witnesses of Jesus Christ remains, in this respect, the test of that which is conformed or contrary to the thought of the Master. Only, this apostolic doctrine is not a series of theological propositions placed in juxtaposition. It forms above all a living organism, because it is grouped about a living personality."

Doctrine thus springing from life, the starting point of the system is to be found in some fact of experiential knowledge. The fact of conversion, which "the believer knows," is this fact. The method of development from this fact is an experimental method. First, the facts must be determined, and when these in all their diversity are examined, then from them must be gained the general truths and the knowledge of reality, which exists for us only as it manifests itself in facts. Bovon

thus alines himself with Schleiermacher and Ritschl as a dogmatician of experience; and this suggests a reference to these theologians, and a criticism of Ritschl at some length. He praises his independence of metaphysics, and is yet inclined to accuse him of having, after all, imposed upon Christianity a philosophy foreign to its spirit. While he acknowledges, as further excellencies of this theologian, that he constantly insists upon making the Christian religion to agree with the historical work of its founder, and makes, therefore, the apostolic writings the sole norm of evangelical truth (in which points Bovon entirely follows Ritschl), he criticises him as having been too much influenced by the recoil from contemporary dogmaticians, and as having produced a kind of rationalistic moralism, in which he has weakened the idea of sin, diminished the fact of the new birth, changed the doctrine of the Holy Spirit, and, in his antagonism against mysticism, removed from his system elements of spirituality which he needs. Ritschlianism is "a systematic and continuous reduction of Christianity to insipidity." "What Ritschlianism needs is not scientific improvement, but the right point of departure, the religious conception, the knowledge of those two facts without which no one can ever comprehend the entire redemptive work, viz., the awful power of sin which enchains us, and the depth of the moral transformation which the Scriptures call the new birth." Frank of Erlangen comes in also for a somewhat careful criticism, which discovers his "logical incoherence."

The first book of the treatise proper begins with the study of the personality of man. It is conducted, as most of such studies are in the sequel, by means of a historical review, so that a great deal of matter strictly belonging only to a history of doctrine is incorporated in the work. The usual positions which are to be expected of a nineteenth century dogmatician are taken upon the constitution and faculties of the soul, upon trichotomy, etc. Curiously, no clear-cut doctrine of the freedom of the will is to be found. Such as it is, the doctrine is developed in connection with the new birth. This is introduced as the characteristic thing in Christianity, after considerable discussion of the nature of religion. "At the root of this radical transformation is the sacrifice by which the Ego abdicates in order to surrender itself to the Savior. . . . The Infinite appears to us under the aspect of a distinct personality whom we know ourselves free to resist. From the contact of God and man results, at the instant when the shock is produced, a double phenomenon. In the first case, the Ego effaces itself. Conscious of its weakness, it submits, it gives itself up. Under the second

influence, on the contrary, the Ego affirms itself. Strong in its moral dignity, it declares in the face of the universe that it is free and responsible for its actions." Here is the antinomy of dependence and liberty, the like of which are to be found at other points of the system. From this point Bovon is led to a discussion of the general topic of the religious consciousness of dependence, which carries him into criticisms of Schleiermacher and Kant. The latter philosopher he employs to establish his own doctrine of liberty. But this is later weakened, when the subject of sin comes up for treatment, and we are left in such fog as this, that "we are so far slaves as not to be able to save ourselves; but so far free as to appropriate the grace which God offers us," which, logically, is rank determinism.

We may now pass rapidly over a number of points. The "proofs" of the existence of God Bovon finds defective and unable to convince an unbeliever, and hence of no apologetic value at all. The sole real proof is that of personal experience. The proofs serve only to make more precise the knowledge of God which we thus obtain. This is far from the position of Ritschl, whom Bovon claims in his own support, for Ritschl said, not that the proofs give us nothing, but that they cannot give us the full idea of God, who is essentially the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. Bovon will run great risk of seeing his treatment of the subject charged with undue subjectivism. We pass over the whole prolonged discussion upon sin, remarking only that it is a good, strong, affirmative doctrine. We must, however, glance a little more at length at the positive doctrine of the Scriptures which he sets forth, and then at his Christology. After these, the doctrine of regeneration, the church, and the future state may be dismissed with the remark that the eschatology is feeble, the final fate of the wicked being considered a mystery "entirely insoluble."

As to the Scriptures, then, Bovon teaches that they depend upon divine revelation. "If human existence had not been troubled by sin, revelation would be one and the same with natural development, each moral victory gained carrying with it a corresponding progress in the knowledge of God; there would, therefore, be no occasion of speaking of a special divine revelation." There is, however, revelation; yet this is not the mere communication of truths which man could not learn of himself. "The vice of this theory is its intellectualism. To suppose that divine revelation is a communication of true ideas is to suppose that sin consists in the formation of false notions." Revelation is rather a purification and strengthening of the consciousness of God in man.

It is made, first of all, in Jesus Christ, and Christ "reveals to us first of all the moral qualities of God, to which his metaphysical attributes are always subordinated." Hence revelation may be essentially defined as "the supernatural manifestation, of God, rendering himself evident to man in spite of sin, to effect the salvation of the world." In discussing at a later point the doctrine of inspiration, Bovon repeats the positions on inspiration reported above. The true value of the Bible is that it is "the authentic document of revelation." As such it makes a part of the revelation itself. Hence we infer that God has not left to hazard the formation of this book, but has exerted upon its writers an influence to which the name of inspiration has been given. What was the exact result of inspiration? Did it suppress the play of the faculties of the writers? Bovon's reply is, No. The inspiration of the Bible is religious, that is, bears exclusively upon the verities ot the faith. There are also degrees of inspiration, according to the directness or the remoteness with which any matter affects our knowledge of the revelation given in Christ. In a word, for "plenary and uniform inspiration" Bovon "substitutes religious and unequal."

The discussion of Christology begins with a historical review, and with a critique of modern theories, including the kenotic. Bovon proposes to avoid the fault of the ancient Christology which subjected itself to the yoke of a philosophy essentially pagan and foreign to the spirit of the gospel. He begins with the evangelical history, proceeding from the unity of the living person of Jesus Christ. At first view he appears like one of us, and, in fact, like us he "learns obedience by the things which he suffers." But he is perfectly obedient, and this calls for an explanation, this immunity from the common lot of men. Accepting the evangelical account of the miraculous conception, we have an explanation, and readily assign to him the title of "Son" in a unique sense. But we have another fact to explain, the incomparable greatness of his personality, a personality absolutely authoritative in the religious sphere. We are assisted somewhat by the phrase "the second Adam," and we are to conceive him as realizing in a unique sense the goal and destiny of man.

Now, it is just because he is thus man that he is adapted to display the perfections of God, for men are "of the race of God." Believers are sons of God, when they do his will, and in this fact is the key to the explanation of the sonship of Christ. But is not this to confound the divinity of the Son with his perfect holiness? Christians are also holy. In what, then, would consist the proper divinity of Jesus? To

say that God becomes incarnate in Jesus Christ is to say that the essence of God appears in humanity. That essence is his love and holiness. It is, therefore, to affirm that God objectifies his perfection in an authoritative human life. Now, the love and the holiness of God are not communicated according to the laws of the transmission of physical forces, but like spiritual forces, in the possession of which we progress by the free action of the will. God being a person in consequence of his religious qualities and not of his ontological attributes, this revelation of his perfect life in Jesus is a personal manifestation, the definite and supreme expression of our knowledge of God our Savior. Is, then, Christ Son of God only by his obedience?

Before answering this question, Bovon interjects a premise out of his theory of knowledge. One must not put the moral conception in antagonism to the metaphysical, and say that other men are the sons of God in a moral sense, Christ in an ontological. It is repugnant to the spirit of the gospel to separate between *act* and *being*, since the idea of *life* embraces them both. We are, therefore, to turn aside from this distinction and try to understand the matter by different methods.

Christ is the mediator. The distinction which exists between us and the Savior is that his perfection shows itself to be creative, while ours is derivative. Whatever success we attain in the struggle against evil in the world we owe to Christ, who alone gives us the knowledge of the Father and leads us to God. When he enters into the sanctuary of his own consciousness, he finds there the eternally active perfections of the Omnipotent. Act and Being are united in Life. God-Man by nature, Christ becomes this also by voluntary consecration. In him God descends into the man, as the man elevates himself towards God.

We have thus the complete idea of Bovon, but he makes it a little clearer by his discussion of the preëxistence of Christ, which he conducts in connection with the text, Before Abraham was, I am. In the first place, the preëxistence is not an ideal preëxistence, such as Beyschlag, and the Ritschlians in general, teach. The "I" who is before Abraham is the Christ himself, the Messiah born of a woman, who lived upon the earth, and who pronounced these words. The present tense "I Am" shows, however, that the Lord is not contemplating successive periods, but a state which dominates times and change. And, of course, the idea of a preëxistent humanity is not for a moment to be entertained. What is the explanation? Theology may, perhaps, lift a corner of the veil which will ever hang over this mystery in the following manner: We have to do here with the prob-

lem of psychological history, not with ontology. The question is, What judgment did Christ form of himself? He had the consciousness, alone of all upon earth, of realizing in himself the creative life of the Eternal. When he directed his view upon himself and sounded the depths of his own being, his gaze pierced the veil which arrests us. Behind the net which entangles us he discovered God himself, the sovereign personality whose holiness he manifests among men. In one word, his consciousness, passing beyond time and its phenomena, leaps into eternity. In the sublime hours when Christ discerned his origin, behind the terrestrial "I" he saw only the Father, he identified himself with the immutable God, he knew himself to be eternal in his creative life, in the divine power which flowed forth from him; and since the biblical intuition, which is that of the popular language, expresses eternity by anteriority or preëxistence, Jesus knew himself as personally preëxistent.

We pause in our review of this remarkable work. Its tendencies and its worth will be evident to everyone acquainted with theology. It represents among the Swiss what its closely related contemporary in Germany, Ritschlianism, represents, the fear of "ontology," the disposition to accept the New Testament Scriptures as a record of facts, which facts are to be interpreted in the light of modern ideas, and to refuse to the explanation of those facts found in the New Testament, and to most, if not all, of the supernatural portion of New Testament and church theology, all validity. No one can read the work without learning much; but we regard this fundamental defect of method, this fear which resembles a superstition, as a fatal blemish in the book, and the cause of what is, after all, a failure in the attempt to reproduce a "Christian" theology.

FRANK HUGH FOSTER.

OAKLAND, CAL.

CHRISTIAN ETHICS. Eight lectures preached before the University of Oxford in the year 1895, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, M.A. By T. B. STRONG, M.A., Student of Christ Church. London: Longmans; New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1896. Pp. xxviii+380, 8vo. 12s.

AN APOLOGETIC vindication of Christian ethics today must have reference to two main lines of attack. Positivism maintains that Christian morality does not stand for love for love's sake, duty for

duty's sake, but values these rather as means toward an unworthy ulterior end, often of an eschatological character. Moreover, evolutionary ethics, without religious presuppositions, rests on a surer basis than Christian ethics. To meet this attack it is required to show that religion and morality cannot be separated without the destruction of both. The other main line upon which the criticism of Christian morality is moving has to do with the relation, not between religion and morality, but between theology and morality, certainly between Christianity and morality. Does the Christian type of life depend upon the Christian doctrines? It is maintained that the separation of the Christian life from the deposit of Christian truth is to the advantage of the former. "The Christian morality may be retained, and even purified, while the Christian doctrines are discarded as *Aberglaube*, only hindering at the present stage of the world's development the general acceptance of the moral teaching." Passing by with slight reference the positivistic morality which confronts the Christian system, Mr. Strong directs the whole force of his polemic against the latter criticism. Granting a strong conviction that in some sense the facts of Christian history are to be effective in Christian life, he seeks to disclose a marked failure to keep the two together. The burden of his lectures is to show the closeness of this union, that dissolution here between doctrine and life would mean relapse upon paganism. The author's own summary of his thought is briefly as follows: "That the Christian theory of moral life is not merely a new formulation of the old experience, nor is it merely a restatement of the old truths with certain new virtues added [referring to the so-called 'theological virtues,' I judge]; but it is a view of life based upon a radically different experience of facts. The reconciliation of the finite and infinite —of man and God—which the incarnation achieved, was, at most, a dream of the most enlightened Greek philosophers, and a hope to the most enlightened Jews. When it happened, man was admitted, in proportion to the certainty of his faith in it, into a clear and decisive knowledge of the spiritual divine order. The appearance of the Word of God in human flesh did not indeed explain itself fully in philosophical language, but it declared finally the fact that man's nature, however frail and limited it may be, is the scene of a spiritual history, and is explicable only in spiritual terms." The author endeavors to show that the Christian ethic is the detailed presentation of this fact, in relation to the end of life and human nature, the theory of virtue, the idea of evil, and the general order of the universe as a whole. But to

make plain how vital and indissoluble is the connection of the Christian doctrine of incarnation with the Christian view of life, is the serious task to which the lecturer has devoted his strength. In working out his thought he begins with the note of disappointment and weariness which sounds in the writings of the ancient world. The Greek ideals failed as guides to life. The Jews reached a similar result from a different cause. Though not perplexed by philosophic questions like those of the Greeks, the Jewish mind, being under law, failed to achieve its ideal owing to the condition of the human will. Then the Sermon on the Mount comes with a new authority and offers a new hope of moral perfection, but, like Greek and Jewish conception, is still a law commanding from without. The Jew, regarding human nature as fallen, was saved from consequent despair by the hope of a deliverer. His estimate here leading thus to negative results, the author turns in a positive way to Christ and the apostles, and inquires how far Christianity succceds where previous efforts had failed. "In the gospels we find a totally different atmosphere to that of ethical philosophy. The gospels are historic—even the discourses rise out of the history. They aim at describing a life—which is at the same time a moral ideal." The historic character of this ideal is not its finally distinctive character. This is to be found in the relation of Jesus Christ to the Father, which also explains the difference between the moral tone of the gospels and, for instance, that of the Psalms. Even this only describes Christ's personal life, without explaining how his example is to be made good for others. But the last discourses show that a new order is to date from his life and work, and we are thus referred to the history of the church. As union with the Father explains Christ's action, so the apostles proclaim Jesus as Lord—basing their statement on their personal experience of him, and especially on the resurrection. These doctrines are brought to bear on the conditions of human life. They completely change the position of man; they do not justify sin; they make it possible to avoid it. "The first form in which men became conscious of the new life was in direct experience, which, at first, seemed likely to lead to antinomianism. The apostles condemn this tendency, and are led by circumstances to deal with various ethical problems." Their treatment of such questions is mostly incidental, but certain predominant ideas come into view, notably, Faith, Hope, and Love—terms ambiguous, especially πίστις, and all unfamiliar in the technical language of philosophy. The burden of the author's message is seen in the following: They get

their primary meaning from their relation to the facts on which the creed rests, concentrating in themselves the attitude of man toward the new truth.

Proceeding to consider the effect of Christianity upon those moral ideas which were already prevalent, especially the cardinal virtues with their harmonious adjustment of conflicting interests involving a certain amount of individual self-sacrifice for the welfare of the whole, the lecturer contrasts with these the Christian ideal, showing that the contrast between the two moral ideals rests upon a deep inward difference—the difference in the estimate of human personality. Every human life is, as such, of infinite value. This explains both the truceless war with the world and the principle of universal love—the desire that all men should be saved. The last part of the book is given to the discussion of the growth of moral theory in the church, holding that it did more than combine Judaism and Hellenism. There was an added element besides these which was Christian. "To adjust the view of personal right and wrong to the predominantly civic conceptions of Greek ethics was a serious problem for the church. In the course of its history the church took up and molded the social idea with its four virtues in relation to the new spiritual environment, and the virtues appear as modes of the love which is the life of the new society."

The volume is timely, and of real merit. It will be, indeed has already been, welcomed and honored as a masterly exposition and defense of conservative ethics and theology. Not the least valuable part is the number of detailed notes of a technical character which could not be well fitted into the eloquent lectures.

Our main criticism upon the work is twofold: First, it attributes too great ethical importance to the historic formulation, to the creedal character of theological truth, overlooking the fact that in the progress of thought the truth may be cast into new form, not only without detriment to, but to the advantage of, Christian morality; and, secondly, a confusion in one or two pivotal chapters of the historically operative force with its theological interpretation and justification. What was it that told upon the vast mass of early converts? It was the passionate devotion to a person, called out by a belief in His infinite self-sacrificing love. This, and not the theological explanation of this, was the source of that ethical life, purer and loftier than the pagan. Assent to the theological propositions of the trinitarian essence of Christ, and of two natures in the unity of one personality, does not of neces-

sity involve redemptive experience or moral transformation. To be sure, the consciousness of the church passed from the primary force to a theological theory concerning that force—a theory which reacted helpfully indeed upon the consciousness; but it cannot be shown that the church began with such a theory. The distinctively Christian forces making for righteousness are often operative even today apart from that theological theory which the author would treat of as their necessary condition. That force is indeed a proper and necessary object of theological thought, but theology did not make that force effective in character, but showed that it was the ultimate reason for the new life which came into the world.

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE NEW APOLOGETIC, five Lectures on True and False Methods of Meeting Modern Philosophical and Critical Attacks upon the Christian Religion. By MILTON S. TERRY, D.D., LL.D., Professor in Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings, 1897. Pp. 199.

TO POINT out the lines along which present-day apologetics must move is the object of this little book. The author, after a historical review of attacks and apologies, shows in three successive chapters how, in his judgment, the skeptical attacks of philosophy, of criticism, and of rival religions are to be met. This threefold division compels the author to place the attacks of natural science under the head of philosophy—which is using the term philosophy in a very loose sense. We notice, also, the term monism is scarcely employed with absolute accuracy and consistency; and its three divisions—idealistic, materialistic, and pantheistic—are not exclusive, since the last may also be materialistic or idealistic. A closing chapter deals with the positive apology, where the apologist takes the aggressive and boldly urges the claims of Christianity. This chapter is in need of an organific principle, and, lacking this, makes the impression of being loosely drawn. There are some statements in the book that are not as clear as they should be. If (p. 77) the implication is that the design-argument is now of no value, we dissent from it. The following statement is liable to be misunderstood:

> These facts suggest that the highest and most powerful religions originate in special revelations of God to an individual, who thereby becomes the

incarnation of a divine ideal. To some extent every such ideal is God manifest in flesh (p. 125).

The assertion is apparently made (p. 125) that there is no ground for the distinction of natural and revealed religion. This is misleading; for, properly understood, there is a clear-cut distinction between them.

Our author's treatment of miracles is obscure. He seems to be afraid to assert their essentially supernatural nature. If he means merely to adopt the position of Bushnell, he should have stated it more plainly. Besides this, he unfortunately minimizes their evidential value.

Dr. Terry, however, has written a book worthy of high praise in many respects. He has no sympathy with that subjectivism which regards Christianity merely as a kind of mystical life. He holds uncompromisingly the position that Christianity is a system of objective truths that must be vindicated. His statement of these truths (p. 45) is comprehensive and well-put. In the argument against pantheism he properly distinguishes between it and the doctrine of divine immanence that we all ought to hold. The position as to evolution and its compatibility with theism and Christianity is the one held by most apologists today. The author shows very wisely that it is not a matter of life and death to apologetics to defend the absolute inerrancy of the Scriptures. That the apologist must be prompt to recognize the good there may be in other religions is well brought out. The fact that Jesus Christ himself is the great and crowning apology of Christianity is rightly emphasized. Dr. Terry is a writer of irenic spirit and judicial poise. His style is, as a rule, perspicuous and popular.

BENJAMIN LEWIS HOBSON.

MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE AMBASSADOR OF CHRIST. By JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS, Archbishop of Baltimore. Baltimore, New York, London: John Murphy & Co., 1896.

THIS is a book of over four hundred pages, and contains thirty-one chapters. It has also an interesting preface, and a good index. It is an extended pastoral address to the priests of the Roman Catholic church in the United States. The author writes as though the priests were immediately before him. He directly addresses them. In scores

of passages he uses the second person. He discusses the divine call to the priesthood, the education of priests, their manifold duties to themselves, to their superiors, to the laity in the church, and to the unbelieving world without the pale of the church. He seems to overlook nothing in character or conduct. Among the topics on which he expatiates are obedience to teachers, truth and sincerity, self-respect, charity, politeness, chastity, and humility.

He insists that priests should be men of learning; that throughout all their lives they should be diligent students, and that their chief study should be the Bible. He contends that the foremost duty of the priest is to preach and explain the Scriptures to the people, and that if he neglects to do this the people will spiritually famish. He must also care for the children with tender solicitude. They should be catechised and instructed in the Sunday school, but he says nothing to indicate that the children in the Sunday school should be instructed in the Bible. Apparently they are to be given by lay teachers another dose of catechism. Parochial schools he regards as a necessity, since all religious instruction is excluded from the public schools; but he warmly commends teaching in the parochial schools all those facts in our national history which will kindle and keep alive in the hearts of the children and youth the fires of patriotism. He points out with great particularity the means and methods of propagating Roman Catholicism, emphatically commends congregational singing, and urges upon the priesthood the faithful performance of all pastoral duties.

He writes in a liberal spirit. He speaks of Protestants as our "separated brethren." He eulogizes religious liberty. He utters no bitter words against anybody. Again and again he gives expression to glowing patriotic sentiment. He quotes freely from both Protestant and Roman Catholic authors. If the word pastors or elders should displace the word priests, considerable portions of this book would be a timely treatise for our Protestant ministry.

To be sure, we find in the volume the frank, decisive utterance of Roman Catholic doctrine. The archbishop believes in sacramentarianism and transubstantiation with all his heart. In his view the priest "offers the spotless Lamb in God's holy temple." "He holds in his hands, and partakes of, the same flesh that was born of the Virgin Mary." "The lips . . . . that are daily purpled with the blood of the Lamb should never be defiled by indecorous language." The priest "becomes the spiritual father of his flock, whom he has brought forth to a new life in the regenerating waters of baptism." He has the power

of "pardoning sin in the tribunal of penance." All this we believe to be unscriptural, and delusive, destructive error. But our author is a Roman Catholic from conviction. Such utterances are, therefore, to be expected from him. Still, from his point of view, he has written, not a great, but a good and useful book, and we are glad to place it on our shelves among the books written by Protestants on pastoral theology, grateful that these silent, peaceful volumes agree in so many vital points.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE CURE OF SOULS. Lyman Beecher's Lectures on Preaching, at Yale University, 1896. By JOHN WATSON, M.A., D.D. New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1896. $1.50.

A FAR cry it is from the day when preachers denounced the novel to the day when Ian MacLaren crosses the ocean to instruct the American students in the art of preaching! Among all the preachers who have visited Yale to extend the ever-lengthening chain of "Lectures on Preaching" none has had a warmer reception or produced a more delightful book than Dr. Watson. *The Cure of Souls* is a fine blending of sound Scotch sense with prophetic fervor, and is lighted up on every page by flashes of quaint humor, which vividly remind us of *Drumtochty* and *His Mother's Sermon*. These lectures make no pretense of greatness. They are simple, masculine, pithy, and extremely suggestive. They show us the interior of the workshop of a master workman—although he vigorously protests that "there is some difference in principle between the construction of a table and a sermon." The first lecture on "The Genesis of a Sermon" is of value to every literary worker, and its analysis of mental production into Selection, Separation, Illumination, Meditation, and Elaboration will repay study. Then follow chapters which in a charmingly informal way lead us in and out through all the public and private life of the modern prophet. While the general positions are hardly novel, the sudden sallies, glimpses, side-lights make the book fairly fascinating. The genuine sincerity and somewhat archaic expression remind us of Baxter and George Herbert; while the discussions on "artistic repletion," "sane mysticism," on "weaning an idea from its relatives," on "sermons by machinery," etc., show a mind distinctly and alertly modern. The whole book exhibits the

manliness of spirit and deftness of touch which we have learned to expect in the author.

W. H. P. FAUNCE.

NEW YORK CITY.

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. Ten Lectures, delivered in the Union Theological Seminary, New York, in the Autumn of 1896. By CHARLES CUTHBERT HALL, D.D.; ALEXANDER V. G. ALLEN, D.D.; EGBERT C. SMYTH, D.D.; CHARLES C. TIFFANY, D.D.; HENRY EYSTER JACOBS, D.D., LL.D.; WILLIAM RUPP, D.D.; WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON, D.D.; ALLAN POLLOK, D.D.; GEORGE DANA BOARDMAN, D.D., LL.D.; THOMAS S. HASTINGS, D.D., LL.D. New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1897. Pp. viii+348; cloth.

WE HAVE in these ten lectures a comprehensive and able discussion of Christian worship. The first lecture deals with the principles of Christian worship, the ninth discusses the worship of non-liturgical churches, while the last sets forth the ideal of Christian worship. The remaining seven treat the subject historically. In clear outline the essential facts concerning primitive Christian liturgies are presented. The Greek and Roman liturgies, together with those of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, are unfolded. The evolution of the *Book of Common Prayer*, the service of the Church of England, is attractively traced; this is followed by a lecture which sets forth the growth and merits of Presbyterian forms of worship, as embodied in the *Book of the Common Order*.

Appended to several of these lectures are very valuable bibliographies. Any investigator of the subject of liturgies, and of public worship, will not only find invaluable aid in these discussions themselves, but by these bibliographies will be put on track of the best literature pertaining to the whole field of investigation.

The study of such literature is liberalizing and healthful. In worship all Christians, however diverse their creeds, are one. When on their knees before God they all alike humbly confess their sin, and adore Him through whose matchless grace they are forgiven and saved. In praise and prayer differences vanish, and all hearts are blended in blissful unity. The theology of the head may separate believers, but that of the heart unites them. We owe a debt of gratitude to the theological school that has evoked and sent out these lectures. It is

another increment of force added to the irenic movement of the present day.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CHRISTIAN LIFE IN GERMANY. By E. F. WILLIAMS, D.D., western editor of *The Congregationalist*. Chicago: Revell Co. Pp. 320. $1.50.

NOT a few authors have essayed to interpret German life. Among these may be mentioned Wilhelm Baur, Loring Brace, Gostwick, Hart, Julian Hawthorne, Hedge, Heine, Howitt, Hundeshagen, Lichtenberger, Madame de Staël, Matheson, Mackay, Marshall, Müller, Schmidt, Stroehlin, the unknown author of *Religious Thought in Germany*, Schaff, and Wiggers. None, however, quite touched Dr. Williams' distinctive province. He has sketched the salient features of the peculiar complex known as Christian life in the German church and government and in German society.

There was need of a book to touch the various points of the circle of which the works of the writers named above formed arcs. There was room for one, preferably not a German, who should present the practical activities of German Christianity. English-speaking Christians have generally assumed a Philistine attitude of superiority to their German brethren. Hence Dr. Williams has given us a work complemental, not supplementary, to those of his forerunners; not theoretical, but invaluably practical.

Without attempting to describe Christless Germany, to emphasize the effect of critical study on the Faith, or to say much about the relations between church and state, but assuming that allowance will be made for the difficulties under which German Protestantism labors and for the sad fact that it must render final report and ultimate appeal, not unto Christ, but to Cæsar, Dr. Williams observed personally and studied the worker's own report. He intended to state the condition of the Protestant communions, describe their spiritual standing, and supply the latest data for judgment as to their future. He first describes some of the methods for training the German to service, the description involving a statement of the manner in which the autocratic, bellicose temper of the ruling classes affects the activity of Christianity. Missions are then enlisted to indicate the spiritual status of the Lutheran and Presbyterian (or Reformed) communions, by showing their Chris-

tian endeavor for heathen at home and abroad. Third comes a specific presentation of the forces in home-missions and of their training. Finally the new Germany of 1860–95 is sketched in its moral and social environments, and with particular regard to their bearing upon the outlook.

Dr. Williams views Germany through German spectacles, but with American eyes. His standpoint is that of sympathetic justice, teachable tolerance, and uncensorious vision. He demonstrates that German Christianity cannot be judged by Anglo-American standards. Many misapprehensions are removed. There are dark and dangerous clouds in the German sky, but it is a clearing sky. A keen sense of relative values appears in the proportion allowed the industrial, intellectual, and social environments of Teutonic Christianity. The historic instinct is strong, and richly accentuates the development of several great religious facts and influential spiritual forces. The cyclopedic scope of the book makes it encyclopedic in the best sense. The author leaves the reader to draw his own conclusions. He is not a judge, summing up the evidence, but an impartial witness, offering testimony. He leads us to marvel at the myriad activities of the inner or home-missions, which anticipated and rendered superfluous the Salvation Army. Such knowledge must make for fellowship between American and German Protestants. Accordingly the book does not merely make a positive contribution to our literature relating to Germany, though in its field it will long remain the first authority; it will in a fashion of its own serve as a missionary. What Bryce accomplished for the American commonwealth Dr. Williams achieves for Christian life in Germany.

FREDERIC PERRY NOBLE.

CHICAGO.

THE TRANSFIGURING OF THE CROSS; OR, THE TRIAL AND TRIUMPH OF THE SON OF MAN. By THEOPHILUS P. SAWIN, D.D., Minister of the First Church of Troy. Troy, N. Y.: Brewster & Packard, 1896.

WE HAVE in this volume nine sermons purporting to be an exposition of the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of the fourth gospel. While these discourses are thoughtful and in style generally forceful, they lack the essential elements of genuine sermons. They are rather a series of essays. Only in three or four brief passages do we find any

direct address. Some of these discourses have not even the faintest suggestion that they were delivered to an audience. Moreover, the author uses many words which might be suitable for the essay, but are quite out of place in popular discourses; such as "tergiversations," "laissez faire," "non ens," "determinism," "posits," "antinomy." We also meet in these discourses compound adjectives, which vitiate the style of either the essay or the sermon; for example, "cat's-paw intention," "out-of-date publication," "go-as-you-please philosophies."

From a careful perusal of these discourses, the conclusion is forced upon us that the author's chief aim is to discredit certain theological doctrines. Among the doctrines on which he animadverts stands foremost the vicarious suffering of Christ. "Any theory," he says, "that makes him bear substitutionary penalties either makes him a sinner, or makes God unjust." Still, before he closes his discussion he is constrained to declare that "the fact of vicarious suffering is as old as human affection," and that we must approve it, or else go back "on the deepest of our moral intuitions." Moreover, he affirms that not only on the cross, but throughout the life of our Lord, "the vicarious element is always present." How suffering which is approved by our deepest moral intuitions, and was an ever present element in the life of our Lord, can make Christ a sinner or God unjust is a mystery.

But in the earlier discourses of the volume, having set aside the doctrine that Christ suffered in our stead, he feels that in some way he must account for the intense agony of Christ in Gethsemane. And this is his solution of the problem. Christ's agony, which was so overwhelming that he sweat great drops of blood, was caused, our author assures us, by the attitude of his countrymen toward him and by the additional fact that he must leave his disciples "before his perfect work was done with them." He says, "There," in the garden, "Jesus breaks completely down, and gives way to the anguish which filled his soul, as he thinks of his work which is done and yet not done, and which cannot be done without him."

To represent Christ as "exceeding sorrowful even unto death," agonizing on his face in prayer, and sweating blood because his countrymen had rejected him, and he must leave his work for his disciples incomplete, in our view makes Christ a very unmanly man, makes him in true manhood far less than hosts of his followers have been.

But our author seems to ignore the plainest statements of our Lord. Jesus did not grieve because his work for his disciples was "not done;" he said on his cross, "It is finished." He did not sorrow because what

remained to be done could not "be done without him." He taught that it could not be done if he did not go away; that it was expedient, best for his disciples, that he should depart from them. He said, "If I go not away the Comforter will not come unto you; but if I go, I will send him unto you." "When he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all the truth." It is clear that our author has not pointed out the cause of Christ's exquisite anguish in the garden. The cause that he attempts to discredit, that Jesus suffered in our stead for our sin, is apparently the only adequate explanation.

Our author also whitewashes Judas. He thinks that when Judas hung himself "his last words might have been, 'I didn't mean to do it.'" But Matthew says that Judas deliberately made a bargain with the chief priests to deliver Christ to them; and the moneyed proposition came from Judas himself, "What are ye willing to give me, and I will deliver him unto you?" And John calls Judas a thief, and justifies his accusation. It looks as though Judas meant to do it, and meant to do it for *money*.

We notice in these sermons some glaring misquotations of Scripture. "Not a sparrow falls to the ground without your Father's notice;" but Christ said, "And not one of them shall fall on the ground without your Father." He quotes Jesus as saying it is "expedient for him to go away;" but Jesus said, "It is expedient for you that I go away." He says John the Baptist "expects that Jesus will be even more violent than himself," and then to sustain this misrepresentation of John he makes a garbled quotation of John's words, "I baptize with water, but he shall baptize you with fire," omitting before the last two words, "with the Holy Spirit and." The omission thrusts a sense upon the passage which evidently was never in John's mind.

Our author represents the preaching of John the Baptist as all severity and wrath, and that of Christ as all love. Neither representation can be justified from the New Testament. He says that Christ's blood does not cleanse us from sin. But John says, "The blood of Jesus his Son cleanseth us from all sin." Either John or Dr. Sawin is mistaken.

We believe with the author that the sacrifice of Christ was not made to appease God's anger; nevertheless, Christ speaks of it as a necessity. In his conversation with Nicodemus, early in his ministry, he said, "So *must* the Son of man be lifted up." After his resurrection he said, "Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things?"—was it not necessary for him thus to suffer? At the institution of the Supper he said,

"This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many unto remission of sins." Peter, who made the first great confession of Jesus' Messiahship, and on account of that confession received the blessing of his Lord, says in his first epistle that Christ "bare our sins in his own body on the tree." Did he not understand the significance of Christ's death? John, who looked so profoundly into the heart of Christ, says, "He is the propitiation for our sins." Paul, who claims to speak what he received from his divine Lord, says, "Him," Christ, "who knew no sin, he made to be sin on our behalf." The death of Christ, the sinless one, was then a necessity. His blood was shed to effect the remission of sins. It wrought something in the mind of God. Christ "is the propitiation for our sins." He who so loved us that he gave his sinless son to die for us had no anger that needed to be appeased; but there may have been a demand of justice which had to be met by somebody, and Christ voluntarily, out of love to us, may have met it on our behalf. Peter says, "Christ also suffered for sins once, the righteous for the unrighteous, that he might bring us to God." Our author asks, Why did God the Father demand the suffering and death of Christ? and answers, "There is a mystery here which we are unable to penetrate." So say we all. Like the "angels," we "desire to look into" these things, but the line of our vision cannot reach the depths of this divine mystery. Unable fully to comprehend, we here bow down and worship him who "died for our sins according to the Scriptures."

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

*The Knowledge of Life; being a Contribution to the Study of Religions.* By H. J. Harald. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons; London: Archibald, Constable & Co., 1896, pp. viii + 333, 12mo.) There are few more unsatisfactory tasks than reading and estimating a book attempting to deal with a great and vital subject prepared by a writer who is quite unfitted for his work, though evidently in earnest. Such an attempt has been made by the writer of this book. His heart is right, but his head is hopelessly wrong. With no knowledge of history of philosophy, with a psychology all awry, with no literary skill, with a bitter despite of the church, and yet with a love for humanity and a desire to benefit mankind, he proposes to supply a new religion, the essential characteristics of which he describes, and whose beneficent

results he enumerates. This religion is the religion of science. The god of this religion is the spirit which animates an individual, prompting him to all that is high and noble, and warning him against that which is low and degrading. It is the result of evolution through one's ancestors. It is oneself, and yet above oneself. The right is that which makes us evolve upward, the wrong is that which hinders evolution. The good is that which produces happiness, evil is that which produces misery. Both good and evil are, to be sure, social, as well as individual. To help society evolve is good, because at the same time you yourself evolve. Immortality consists in the leaving behind you a good influence which will help future evolution. True prayer is addressed to the god within oneself. Such are some of the remarkable religious positions of Mr. Harald. He closes with a creed which reads as follows: "I believe in the God that is within me dictating to me what is right; that this power descended to me from and through my ancestors, who thus live again in me; that I must use this to the best advantage, and hand it on pure and strong to my descendants in whom I shall live again. I believe that the highest aim of man is perfect happiness, and that this will be obtained by conquering environment. I believe that all bad actions will recoil upon me, and lower me in the scale of evolution, removing me from my wished-for end. Finally, I believe that a life in harmony with this creed will lead me to the highest attainable end: perfection: the state of being God."

Evidently the author is a young man whom the years will teach wisdom, or an old man who has begun too late.— G. S. GOODSPEED.

*Die Grundbegriffe christlicher Weltanschauung.* Eine philosophische Studie von Dr. med. Sigismund Kröger, Sen. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf., Geo. Böhme, 1896, pp. 120, M. 1.75.) The author writes—so he says—"to attempt a mediation of the understanding for those who have not recognized the rational in the Christian religion and on that account are hostile in their attitude thereto." From theoretical considerations we become certain of no object in such a way as we do through actual experience. Therefore God must be experienced. Experience mediates in all regions of true knowledge. Christianity is in the first place life, not doctrine. It can be understood only by him who experiences it. A Christian is one who has entered into the most intimate fellowship of life and love with Christ. A compact and suggestive book, but better in religion than philosophy.— GEORGE B. FOSTER.

*The Sacred City of the Ethiopians; being a Record of Travel and Research in Abyssinia in 1893.* By J. Theodore Bent. New edition. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1896, pp. xvi + 309, 8vo, cloth, with illustrations and a map.) The recent death of Mr. Bent lends a melancholy interest to a new edition of this attractive account of his travels and researches in Abyssinia in 1893. In spite of manifold dangers he penetrated to Axum, the ancient seat of the Ethiopian-Arabic kingdom, and obtained copies of numerous inscriptions there, as well as photographs of the ruins and other remains. These are of special value because they illustrate the Arabic influence upon Ethiopian culture and furnish materials for the knowledge of the ancient and great Axumite kingdom. These copies of inscriptions were placed in the hands of Professor D. H. Müller, of Vienna, and an appendix of fifty pages from his pen contains an admirable philological discussion. This new edition, which appeared about the time of the contest between Italy and Abyssinia and derived special interest therefrom, seems to have no additions of importance.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

*Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament zusammengestellt von* Dr. Georg Jacob, Privatdocenten an der Universität Halle. (Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1897, pp. 25, 8vo, M. 1.) This is Heft IV of *Studien in arabischen Dichtern* by Dr. Jacob, and contains some parallels to the Old Testament from old Arabic writers. To many parallels, which writers before him have quoted, he merely alludes. But as many of these works are not in the hands of everyone, the writer could have made his *Heft* more useful by quoting these parallels. But since this has not been the case, we thank the author for what he has given us.—B. PICK.

*The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch.* By Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D. New edition, revised and enlarged. (New York: Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1897, pp. xii + 288, cloth, $2.50.) When this book first appeared it was recognized as a masterly production. Written in a clear style and full of the largest learning, it easily took a foremost place in discussions of the subject. The only criticism which one could pass upon it was that it was hardly full enough in some of its discussions. Several editions have been demanded since it was first published, and now it appears again in a new and thorougly revised edition, with fuller statements on many points. We congratulate the author upon

his soundness of judgment and his clearness of statement, as well as upon the admirable temper which the book has preserved. May the demand for it constantly increase, and it continue to be a means for the dissemination of broader and truer views of the literary character of the Hexateuch.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

*Die Therapeuten und die Philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben.* Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums. Von Paul Wendland. (Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1896. Besonderer Abdruck aus dem zweiundzwanzigsten Supplementband der *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie*, pp. 695–771.) Eusebius of Cæsarea, *Hist. eccl.*, II, 16, 17, cites this tract of Philo to prove the existence of Christian monastic orders in the first century. H. Grätz, 1856 ff., disputed the Philonic origin of the tract, and in 1879 P. E. Lucius, *Die Therapeuten*, rejected the book as a Christian forgery by an author living shortly before Eusebius and intending to bolster up monastic institutions. Lucius' followers were many and influential (Harnack, Schürer, Hilgenfeld, Siegfried in part, J. Drummond, Hatch, W. Robertson Smith, etc.). Against Lucius wrote L. Massebieau (Paris, 1889), Conybeare (Oxford, 1895), and Wendland. Conybeare's book is important chiefly for the restoration of the text, on the basis of the Armenian and Latin versions, and for his excursus on the authorship. Every contribution to our knowledge of Philo from the pen of the joint-author of the new critical edition of Philo's works is welcome to students of Hellenistic literature. Whatever our view as to date and authorship of the *περὶ βίου θεωρητικοῦ*, high praise is due to Wendland's small but valuable brochure. The author begins (1) by speaking of the direct and indirect transmission of the text—of which there exist several Greek manuscripts, all younger than the Armenian version (before 450 A. D.), and a Latin translation (of about 400 A. D.), both older than the archetype of our extant Greek MSS., and in many cases better; he then (2) discusses its place among the genuine writings of Philo and contemporary Jewish literature, tracing its date back to at least the time of Origen, and its use by Clement of Alexandria, thereby disproving the theory of its origin in the third or fourth century and assigning it to the first century. Here is a weak point in Wendland's strong arguments. The reverse might just as well be the case; no decisive arguments can be adduced here in favor of the early date of the tract. (See also Siegfried, *Protest. Kirchenzeitg.*, 1896, No. 42); (3) specially worthy of attention—the author's chapter on

language and style, internal evidence from the language, as compared with Philo's genuine works, especially the Apology and the ὑποθετικά, that are good Philonic; coincidences are adduced that are organic; morphology, syntax, and here especially the syntax of the prepositions, always of some peculiar character in an individual author, conform to all that we know of Philo's language and style; (4) the Philonic description of the Therapeutai, whom Wendland proves to have been a Jewish sect, a society of Jewish scribes, upheld by Philo as the true ascetic philosophers in contradistinction to the contention of Chaeremon the Stoic (Porphyr., *De abst.*, IV, 6, 7). Here also Siegfried, *loc. cit.*, agrees with Wendland. (5) Explanation of the origin of the Therapeutai, and (6) refutation of the theory of Lucius and others that they were Christians. Wendland's results as to the real character of the Therapeutai are, of course, rather negative; he cannot arrive at any definite conclusion owing to the meager sources of information. What Wendland has proved to his own satisfaction and that of many of his readers are these two points: (*a*) Philo, the author of the tract, and (*b*) the Therapeutai a Jewish sect. Pp. 769–70 contain "Nachträge" directed mainly against E. Schürer, to which the latter replied in *Theolog. Litztg.*, 1896, No. 12, cols. 313–16.—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

*Legends of the Virgin and Christ, with Special Reference to Literature and Art.* By H. A. Guerber. (New York: Dod, Mead & Co., 1896, pp. xx + 277, 12mo.) A very complete collection of the almost infinite variety of apocryphal tales connecting themselves with the birth, boyhood, and death of Christ is made in this book. These are interesting, not merely on account of the fact that art and literature have made use of them, but also because they illustrate the universal tendencies of religion wherever found to glorify and magnify the lives of religious founders. Suggestive hints are afforded, also, in the narratives of this book toward an understanding of the origin and popularity of the worship of the Virgin. Clear illustration is given of the power of popular religious legends to dominate the life and to influence the thought of the church. Logic is nothing, poetry and pathos are everything. Protestantism may perhaps find a useful lesson on the power o reigious investigation lurking amidst these odd apocryphal legends; and the religious poet and dreamer may well say, "Let me make the legends of a religion, and I care not who constructs its theology." Some admirable photo-engravings lend attractiveness to this useful little volume.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

*The Problem of Jesus.* By George Dana Boardman. Revised and enlarged. (Philadelphia: Am. Baptist Publication Soc., 1897, pp. 62, cloth, 50c.) This is a new edition of a book which first appeared in 1891. "The problem of Jesus is twofold. First: a philosophical problem — How will you account for him? Secondly: a practical problem — What will you do with him?" The vocabulary of the author compels a use of the dictionary and of reflective powers. The analysis of character is subtle and suggestive. The classification of the men who have been influenced by Jesus would furnish topics of biographical and historical studies for a lifetime. Every page is suggestive, and the argument is clear, strong, and cumulative. — C. R. HENDERSON.

*Philologica Sacra.* Bemerkungen über die Urgestalt der Evangelien und der Apostelgeschichte, von Eberhard Nestle. (Berlin: Verlag von Reuther & Reichard, 1896, pp. 59, 8vo, M. 1.60.) Nestle, more than any other living student of the Old and the New Testament, is the scientific successor of the late Paul de Lagarde, the like of whom the world has seldom seen. Like Lagarde, Nestle has worked along the lines of Old and New Testament criticism and literature as well as in the field of Septuagint research and Semitic philology. Like Lagarde he emphasizes the importance of textual criticism, and this work is one of the many fruits of his labors in those directions. The main portion of the treatise is an answer to a polemic on p. 174 of Arnold Meyer's *Jesu Muttersprache.*[1] Meyer's objections and attacks are answered in a most conclusive manner. We assent heartily to the three general propositions touching the treatment of Nestle's subject (pp. 3 ff.), viz.: (1) the question at issue is that of a common Semitic, Hebrew, or Aramaic original of the synoptic texts, not of one alone; (2) differences in the synoptic texts among themselves are to be explained either as variants of the translators or as results of the individual liberty of the narrator; (3) an intimate knowledge of the languages of Biblical Greek, Hebrew, Aramaic, and cognate dialects is a prerequisite to work along these lines, as also a knowledge of the manner observed by ancient translators. He sums up on p. 43: "We know of Aquila's translation of the Old Testament that there was a double recension, a *secundam editionem quam Hebraei κατ ακριβειαν vocant*, as Jerome assures us. Why should not the same have been the case with a New Testament writing? It is not my task properly to discuss the origin of the gospel narrative and its sources.

[1] For a review of this book see AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, Vol. I, pp. 188–90.

By mere chance I approached the subject. But now that I do so, I believe to have found the way by which a more correct understanding of the gospel history can be obtained than has hitherto been done." Pp. 45–54 contain miscellaneous remarks, mostly of textual character, on passages from the gospels and Acts, followed by "Nachträgliches statt eines Vorwortes," pp. 55–9. The "two-document" hypothesis does not bother Nestle, who shows also in this pamphlet his immense linguistic attainments and acumen. He applies his theory of a Hebrew original of the New Testament history — maintained for the gospel of Matthew throughout the entire ancient church — also to Mark, and to parts of Luke and the beginning of the Acts of the Apostles. In general, he maintains that we must separate from the original Semitic nucleus the original Greek additions of the recensions. Of special interest are the author's observations on τέλειος (Matt. 5 : 48) = οἰκτίρμων (Luke 6 : 36), both going back to the √שלם (also see Nestle in *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1896, 737–9); on Bethphage and Dalmanūtha; on ἔθνος = חֶבֶר, and ἐθνικός = חֶבֶר (pp. 28, 36, 57); and on the influence exercised by popular etymology on proper names (p. 20). The whole book is a new proof of the author's learning, and betrays from cover to cover the all-pervading spirit of de Lagarde. Additions to the *Philologica Sacra* have been published by the author in Hilgenfeld's *Zeitschrift f. wiss. Theol.*, 40, 148–9.[2]—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

*Die Entstehung des Neuen Testamentes.* Von Gustav Krüger, Professor of Theology at Giessen. Zweiter, unveränderter Abdruck. (Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896, pp. 27, M. 0.60.) This essay deals with the origin, not of the New Testament books, but of the New Testament, that is, with the rise of the New Testament canon. It is a most admirably clear and informing piece of work, maintaining the view that down to 150 A. D., while the Christian church reverenced the Lord Jesus and his apostles as the highest authority for its faith, and in consequence also the writings which either told their history or came

[2] On Semitic originals of some New Testament passages see, *e. g.*, the series of short articles in the London *Academy*, 1896, June 27, p. 530; July 4, p. 11; September 5 (Badham), p. 160; 12 (Herz and Cheyne), p. 184; 26 (Nestle), p. 224; October 3, p. 245; 10, p. 265. Also Nestle's articles in *Expos. Times*, October 1896, pp. 42–3 (Matt. 5 : 42 = Luke 6 : 30; Matt. 5 : 47 = Luke 6 : 34); December, pp. 138–9 (Semitic Assonances); January 1897, pp. 190–1; February, p. 237; pp. 239–40 (Luke 16 : 25); August, p. 521 (Matt. 2 : 9), etc.; *Mittheil. u. Nachr. d. deutsch. Paläst.-Vereins.*, 1896, pp. 54–5 (Matt, 3 : 12; Luke 3 : 17); also Marshall, *Expos. Times*, November 1896, pp. 90–1; Selbie, *ibid.*, November, p. 75.

from them, yet it had not found occasion to make a definite collection of their writings or been led to recognize them individually as Scripture. This latter process, according to this view, was the work of the "Catholic church," both this and the New Testament canon being in fact the product of the same cause. Of course, in the brief space of twenty-six pages no details can be given and no proof of these positions, but as a clear and broad statement of the matter from this point of view the essay can hardly be excelled.—ERNEST DEWITT BURTON.

*Ueber die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelien.* Von D. Paul Ewald, ord. Professor der Theologie in Erlangen. [Sonderabdruck aus der *Neuen kirchlichen Zeitschrift.*] (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf., Geo. Böhme, 1897, pp. iii+25, M. 0.75.) This address treats, not of the inspiration of the Scriptures, but of the trustworthiness of the gospels. The doctrine of inspiration would be of value only in case the origination, preservation, and interpretation of the Scriptures were all inspired. But this hypothesis is rendered impossible by errors due to imperfect preservation and by manifold contradiction of interpretation — if so be that God is errorless and self-consistent. This aside then, the purpose of the author is to indicate in broad outlines the way to take in order to certify to ourselves ever anew the trustworthiness of the evangelists and of their narratives, against ever-recurring objections. It is a plain, common-sense argument based on internal evidence.— GEORGE B. FOSTER.

*The Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark, and its Relations to the other Synoptists;* being the Ellerton Essay for 1896. By J. C. Du Buisson, B.A., Late Demy of Magdalen College. (Oxford: The Clarendon Press. Pamphlet. Pp. 72, 1s. 6d.) This is a brief but valuable introduction to the second gospel, dealing mainly with the question of its sources and its relation to the other gospels. The argument is confessedly based in considerable part on the essay of F. H. Woods published in the first volume of the *Studia Biblica.* The writer advocates the theory of an original Mark, differing, however, only on minor points from our present gospel. These differences consist almost entirely in additions and slight modifications by a later editor, not at all in the omission of matter now found in Matthew and Luke, but absent from the present Mark. The last twelve pages contain a brief but discriminating discussion of the purpose and characteristics of the gospel.—ERNEST DEWITT BURTON.

*Acta Apostolorum, sive Lucæ ad Theophilum liber alter*, secundam formam quæ videtur Romanam. Edidit Fridericus Blass. (Lipsiæ in ædibus B. G. Teubneri, 1896, pp. xxxii+96, paper, 12mo, M. 2.) It is probably as it should be that our standard editions and translations of the New Testament present the so-called eastern text of the book of Acts. At the same time, the western or Roman text, with its numerous, sometimes important, variant readings and additions, deserves more consideration than it has commonly received. Dr. Blass here contributes an instrument of no little value to this end. He has attempted to work out this western or Roman text, basing it upon the Greek text of Codex Bezæ (D) with its parallel Latin version, and presenting the readings from other Greek and Latin manuscripts, from Syriac, Coptic, and Latin versions, and from Greek and Latin fathers. The text is printed continuously, with the variants in footnotes, and the peculiarities of the western text are presented to the eye by the means of spaced type (which indicates readings supported by Greek manuscripts), or perpendicular type (which indicates readings with only Latin or Syriac support). The critical apparatus is, therefore, supplied for the reconstruction and estimate of the western text, and Dr. Blass' work will be appreciated and used. In the preface he has taken occasion to restate his hypothesis of the two Lucan recensions, set forth in his *Acta Apostolorum* (1895), and to defend it against the adverse criticism of many scholars, German and English. A careful consideration is also given to the authorities for the text.—C. W. VOTAW.

*The Ante-Nicene Fathers.* Translations of the Writings of the Fathers down to A. D. 325. Original supplement to the American edition. Edited by Allan Menzies, D.D. Vol. IX. (New York: Christian Literature Company, 1896, $4.) Every scrap of new information on this period is eagerly sought. This volume is sure to have a most favorable reception, because it supplements important deficiencies. For instance: "A portion of a gospel has been recovered which was read in the latter part of the second century in certain Christian churches, and purports to be the work of the apostle Peter." . . . . "The epistles of Clement have recovered their concluding portions," and there are "portions of two of the most important commentaries of Origen. . . ."

"The circumstances of these various discoveries, and also of others of a similar nature, are stated in the introduction prefixed by the writers in this volume to the various pieces, and it will be seen that scholars of many lands have taken part in them." The Diatesseron of Tatian

is here for the first time translated from Arabic into English.—J. W. MONCRIEF.

*Die Ambrosianischen Tituli.* Eine litterarhistorisch-archäologische Studie von Sebastian Merkle. Mit einer Ausgabe der Tituli als Anhang. Sonderabdruck aus der *Römischen Quartalschrift*, X, 185–222. (Rom, 1896; Freiburg i. B.: Herder'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung; St. Louis: B. Herder; pp. 42, $0.22 *net.*) Franz Juret published in 1589, in Vol. VIII of *Bibliotheca Patrum* (edited by M. de la Bigne, Paris), twenty-one distichs that are supposed to have been titles by Ambrosius written originally under paintings in the church at Milan. Without giving his own source, Juret introduced them: "incipiunt disticha sancti Ambrosii de diversis rebus quae in basilica Ambrosiana scripta sunt." Almost all recent editors of Ambrosius and critics of early Christian literary monuments have denied their genuineness, with the exception of de Rossi, *Inscript. Christ.*, Vol. II, 1, p. 160, whom Merkle follows. Our author argues that Ambrosius has always been known as the author of some metrical inscriptions, graven in stone, etc., and thus preserved longer. There are good reasons, also, in favor of the genuineness of these twenty-one distichs, *tituli*, as the work of Ambrosius. External witnesses are these: (1) Juret's introductory words, which, however, cannot be proved to have rested on older sources; (2) traces, though very faint, of early, lost collections and sayings; (3) a line from these distichs preserved in two codices of the ninth century; (4) a remark by Gennadius, *De vir. ill.*, 13; (5) their imitation in Prudentius' *Dittochaeum*, whose genuineness, though doubted by many, our author is about to show conclusively. The distichs themselves show great probability of Ambrosian authorship. Type and symbolism show nothing that militates against their being the work of Ambrosius; in style and languge they agree with other acknowledged writings of the bishop, as Biraghi has shown. The writer of these tituli does not yet know the Vulgate, which would be impossible in post-Ambrosian times. Neither can the iconographic objections, raised by many, be upheld. The description given by the tituli refers to pictures which could easily have existed at that time. (This, however, is denied by many important critics.) The author finally traces the original order of the whole cycle, according to which he prints the text of the twenty-one tituli, which to students of Ambrose must be a welcome addition; together with the critical apparatus to these, from Biraghi's edition, which, however, is so vague and

indefinite in its language as to be anything but convincing. In general we must say that the author has not proved to our satisfaction that this cycle of distichs was known in the fourth century, their very nature pointing rather to the sixth. The author deserves our thanks for bringing this question up again for discussion; he himself cannot and will not claim to have uttered the last deciding word in this matter. —W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

*The Boniface.* By the Rev. J. Gregory Smith, M.A., Hon. LL.D., Edinburgh. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; New York: E. & J. B. Young & Co., 1896, 106 pp., 1s. 6d.) This little book is one of *The Fathers for English Readers.* It is made up chiefly from the correspondence of Boniface and from the *Vita Bonifacii* by Willibald, a companion of Boniface. The work is well done. Many interesting and central facts about the great missionary are brought out. An introduction gives some of the leading features of the state of Europe at this time. Then follow accounts of his early life, his "missionary skirmishes," his more serious and permanent work in Thuringia and Franconia. Boniface worked largely under the direction of Rome. While he was a man of independence, convictions, and persistency, he always sought advice in cases of peculiar difficulty. It is interesting to see that the church even at the opening of the eighth century is far advanced in corruption, and that this sincere man of action kindly but firmly rebukes these departures from faith and righteouness. The selections from his letters at the close of the volume throw light on the character of the man, and the reader will wish there had been many more of them. A good map is a great desideratum.— J. W. MONCRIEF.

*An Introduction to Theology: Its Principles, its Branches, its Results, and its Literature.* By Alfred Cave, A.B., D.D., Principal and Professor of Theology of Hackney College, London. Second edition, largely rewritten. (Edinbugh: T. & T. Clark; New York: imported by Chas. Scribner's Sons, pp. xiii + 610, $4.50.) This revised edition of Dr. Cave's most useful work, though, as the author says, largely rewritten, differs rather in detail than in essential characteristics from the former edition. Aside from the revision of the lists of books, the most notable changes are as follows: The section "What is Religion?" has been rewritten, the matter on pp. 47–57 being largely new. Pp. 77–9 and 87–9 show revision and enlargement. Pp. 123–

45, devotional books, and books on theology in general, and pp. 327–40, on biblical archæology, are almost entirely new matter. On the other hand, the section entitled "Outline of Natural Theology," contained in the old edition, pp. 144–8, has been omitted from the treatment of that subject. The work is characterized by a broad and just conception of the field and sources of theology, and its lists of literature on the various themes, though of course not complete, are judiciously made up. Alike for its exposition of the relations of the different departments of theological science to one another and for its bibliographical information, it is a most useful handbook for all students of theology.—ERNEST DEWITT BURTON.

*An Ethical Movement. A Volume of Lectures.* By W. L. Sheldon, Lecturer of the Ethical Society of St. Louis. (New York and London: The Macmillan Co., 1896, pp. xvi, 349, $1.75.) This book reveals the workings of an earnest, grave, and essentially conservative mind One feels that its author has made no changes from the accepted religious tradition lightly or light-heartedly. Though his emphasis is on ethics, which he believes to be possible without religious faith, he is throughout reverent toward religion; he speaks of the "sublime sacraments of the church," and his ultimate aim appears to be by throwing the stress on moral issues to be able "to restore the right hold for religion." Sometimes, indeed, ethics is made into a sort of religion of itself, and, in one place, he even says that it will be the "one surviving standpoint for the future religion and the future church;" but it is possible that this is an exaggeration — he confesses that to give ethics its true place in religion once more it "may be even necessary to give to this aspect an exaggerated degree of interest." Ordinarily, however, he uses "religion" in its commonly accepted sense — and the student of religious psychology and philosophy proper will find food for reflection in such chapters as "Being Religious — What it Means," and "How People of Many Minds Can Use the Word 'God.'" The author's treatment of marriage, government, property, and social ideals is cautious and conservative — some will say at points ultra-conservative; as to marriage he says, "I take my stand with the Roman Catholic church." A characteristic chapter is "The Difficulty for the Idealist in Taking Sides on Questions of the Day." Everywhere one feels the stress of a strong nature, conscientiously weighing its duty, hesitating to act in any new way till fully assured, but capable of powerful action when conviction is reached. Mr. Sheldon modestly speaks of his as only a

"personal statement," but his colleagues in what is called the "Ethical movement" will none the less welcome it, and be proud of this addition to their by no means extensive literature.—WILLIAM M. SALTER.

*Christianity and Property.* By Albert E. Waffle. (Philadelphia: Am. Baptist Publication Soc., 1897, pp. 106, cloth, 50c.) Twelve pages are given to quotations of passages in the New Testament relating to property. There is no attempt to give the Old-Testament view of wealth. The notions of Tolstoi are subjected to analysis, although that eccentric writer is not mentioned by name. The criticism of communistic interpretations of the teachings of Jesus is clear and convincing. Several practical problems of Christian duty are discussed in a sensible way under the heads acquisition, consecration, and distribution.—C. R. HENDERSON.

*The China Mission Handbook.* First Issue. Prepared by a committee. (Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, 1896, pp. 436, 2 parts.) This is a most interesting and useful book, not merely to students of missions, but also to students of religion. It opens with a series of brief articles upon such subjects as Confucianism, by Dr. Faber; Buddhism, by Drs. Richard, Edkins, and others; on Taoism, by Drs. Faber and Martin; Mohammedanism, the Secret Sects of China, etc. Some of these are, indeed, compilations from previous writings by the authors, but in these cases they are from books which are hardly accessible to western scholars. An exception must be made in the case of the extract from Dr. Washburn's article on Mohammedanism in the Parliament of Religions report. The second part of the book consists of a series of reports from the various missionary societies doing work in China. Several maps of districts in China, on which the mission stations are marked, conclude the volume. It is to be hoped that the publication of such a handbook will become a regular yearly affair.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

*The Conservative Principle in Our Literature.* By William R. Williams, D.D. (Philadelphia: Am. Baptist Publication Soc., 1897, pp. 91; paper, 25c.; cloth, 50c.) Filial piety has reproduced a paper, first published fifty years ago, from the graceful pen of one of the most distinguished writers of the Baptist denomination. The definition of literature includes "the whole literary intercourse of the people, whether that intercourse be oral or written." The author discusses

certain destructive tendencies in American life: the mechanical and utilitarian spirit, passion, lawlessness, false liberalism, superstition. The remedy is not to be found in legislation, education, philosophy, nor in general knowledge. "The cross of Christ is the only conservative principle of our literature." It protects life against the evil tendencies which are the peril of our society, and for it no substitute can be found. By the cross of Christ he means Christian truth and conduct. The style is chaste, transparent, strong, a fitting dress for the serious, tender, and persuasive teaching.—C. R. HENDERSON.

# CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

WHEN THE "HIGHER CRITICISM" HAS DONE ITS WORK. By THOMAS DAVIDSON; *International Journal of Ethics*, July 1897.

THE thinking portion of the world is rapidly assuming a new attitude toward Christianity and its basal documents.

Various sciences have disproved the validity of biblical statements.

Historical research is disproving the Bible's historicity, while ethical reflection is proving that its moral sanctions are far from the highest, and that they have been long outgrown.

But the church in general is indifferent to these results. To this attitude the science of higher criticism is about to put an end. Its results are to be sown broadcast by clergymen in good standing. What will be the result?

I. Higher criticism is the application of ordinary canons and methods of literary and historical criticism to the books of the Bible.

II. Work so far has been done mainly in the Old Testament. The result, in a word, is that Hebrew history and thought, instead of being a series of supernatural miracles and revelations, have become an intelligible process of natural evolution.

Among the particular results of the higher criticism may be mentioned the following:

1 The law is the result of the teaching of the prophets.

(2) Mosaic law dates from the captivity. Deuteronomy from Josiah's reformation.

(3) What little is known of the Hebrews previous to Samuel is mostly tendentious legend.

counts of the creation, fall, etc., are myths, mostly of Babylonian origin.

(5) Hebraic history was recast during and after the captivity, to give divine authority to certain theories and institutions; and thereby robbed of historicity.

rophecy is choice poetry elaborately prepared.

(7) Prophecy always has reference to current events, and its foretold blessings are always confined to this present world.

(8) The Messiah is unknown to the Old Testament, "Messiah" being applied to various anointed ones.

These examples might be multiplied indefinitely. *Ergo*, it is no longer possible to consider the Jews as, in any special sense, a chosen people and the depositories of special revelation, or to maintain that the prophets prophesied of Christ.

As for the New Testament, the impression prevails that when the higher criticism has done its worst for it, Christianity's fundamental beliefs will remain intact. The futility of this belief is evident to anyone who knows how completely Jesus' Messianic and divine claims are based upon the former.

III. The higher criticism has yet to do for the New Testament what it has done for the Old, and to present its final results in the "Polychrome Bible."

Among the results already accomplished are the following:

(1) The New Testament is a compilation, gradually formed through the second, third, and fourth centuries.

(2) We have no account of Jesus' doings from an eyewitness, the gospels being written after 70 A. D.

(3) Generally speaking, the books of the New Testament were not written by the men whose names they bear.

(4) The Jews had several conceptions of the Messiah, chief being the preëxilic and the apocalyptic ones.

(5) Jesus combined these two with a third—the "Servant of the Yahveh" idea—and carried out his own conception of the Messiah in his life and death.

(6) While Palestinian Jews looked for a Messiah, the "Dispersion" expected a personified "Word." In John's gospel Jesus is identified with a Hellenized form of this.

(7) The historic Jesus made no claim to deity and refused to work miracles.

(8) Christianity's rise and spread can be satisfactorily explained by the ordinary agencies which make human history.

IV. The higher criticism will thus eliminate the miraculous from history and discredit, as superstition, whatever pretends to be a divine revelation, not explicable by its laws.

It will thus hasten the final triumph of pure science, and then we shall cease assuming that we have any privileged information regarding the nature or ulterior purpose of the supernatural author of the universe. The God of "revealed" theology is only an unconscious induc-

tion from an exceedingly crude, narrow, and unsystematized experience. Instead of regretting the obsolescence of this God, every rational being will rejoice to find him replaced by a God who, being the very principle of explanation of all that is known, must be the most scrutable and intelligible of beings, no matter whether he prove impersonal, super-personal, personal, or multipersonal.

V. So the purified faith of the future will take its stand on science, —science of nature and of that for which nature is, viz., spirit.

Surely it is not so sad to be in the position of Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, and other truth-seekers, who fearlessly sought to penetrate the riddle of existence and to lead worthy lives—lives that shame those of most believers in revelation. Between them and us lie two thousand years of rich human experience. And it is only a distrust, fostered by sycophantic supernaturalism, of "mere human reason" as a guide to life, that keeps us from reaching a far deeper insight into the truths that give life its meaning than any that revelation ever offered.

It is beyond doubt that existence is moral to the core, that every spirit is infinite, eternal, and, therefore, also free, free to work out an eternally increasing blessedness for itself and others. What more can we ask for?

The purified creed has many other advantages.

(1) It can retain, in ennobled form, all that was valuable in the old creed.

(2) It can be taught in our schools, as a basis for ethical life, which demands virtue as the one eternally desirable thing in the universe.

(3) It will demand, for its intelligent acceptance, the exercise of our highest intellectual faculties, which have become either atrophied or corrupted through supernaturalism.

(4) It will form an ethical and religious foundation upon which all men can meet.

(5) It will blot out the cruel line between religious and "merely moral" life, and make duty the one universal, religious rite.

(6) It will be capable of endless development.

These advantages, while depriving us of the privilege of being lazy, thoughtless, and superstitious, suggest an outlook which should make us welcome the results of the higher criticism with the utmost confidence as the conditions of a new era.

The article does not aim to be original, but to reflect the results of the higher criticism. Since, however, it summarizes the conclusions of only the most radical critics, it is one-sided and unfair. Who denies Messianic prefiguration in the Old

Testament? Who adheres to the former position of some students that the date of the authorship of the gospels and epistles is to be placed in the third and fourth, or even second century? Written ostensibly in the interest of science and religion, the article does not satisfy the rational thought of the former, but wounds the feelings of the latter, while its philosophic affiliation is with nothing more respectable than absurd naturalism.

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

ÜBER DEN QUELLENWERT DER SYNOPTISCHEN EVANGELIEN. Von LIC. E. G. STEUDE; *Der Beweis des Glaubens*, 1897, Heft 3, 4, 5, pp. 89–101, 138–64, 189–206.

RECENT discussions concerning the credibility of the synoptic gospels have yielded three important results: (1) that the time of their composition cannot decide upon their value as historical sources; (2) that their narratives are not in a strict sense historical accounts; (3) that the words and sayings of Jesus are in this respect superior to the historical narratives.

It is very possible that factors such as Holtzmann emphasizes—for instance, among others, that the prophetic and inspired persons in the early Christian communities transferred to Jesus the Old Testament Messianic ideal, and ascribed to him, unwarrantably, deeds greater than the most eminent of the Old Testament worthies were supposed to have performed—may have been operative in the oral and written traditions to which our gospels go back. It is the work of the critic to ascertain if and in how far this has actually occurred. To this end the words and discourses of Jesus claim first attention, since the gospels are not primarily histories, but compositions intended to awaken and to strengthen faith. But our gospels, nevertheless, contain historical matter which invites credence. Hence the question arises, Shall we or shall we not accept all that they relate of the *deeds* of Jesus and of his *miracles*, and just as they relate them? Previous investigation does not enable us to reply confidently in the affirmative, though excluding the possibility of positive denial. To reach a more definite conclusion such a new starting point is needed as is afforded by those sayings of Jesus which present-day criticism pronounces best attested.

These are, in the first place, found in our present Matthew and Luke, who preserve, though in a somewhat different form, that collection of λόγια originally compiled by the apostle Matthew. In addition to these sections, common to Matthew and Luke, we have others common to these with Mark, who has not used the λόγια; who also preserves in his

gospel that tradition of which the basis was Peter's preaching. Finally there appears throughout the discourses of the synoptic gospels a nucleus of an entirely individual character, whose genuineness is indisputable. From these assured results of criticism it must *first* be determined with what the discourses of Jesus furnish us concerning his own conception of his person and work, viz., his *self-consciousness;* and, *second*, what these same sections set forth concerning his *deeds* and *miracles*.

1. An examination is made of fourteen sections, not as comprising all those sayings of Jesus which are genuine, but as representative utterances, covering the greater part of his ministry.[1] These are Matt. 9: 15–17; Mark 2: 27–28; Matt. 5: 21–48; Luke 11: 31, 32; Luke 10: 23, 24; Matt 10: 15; Mark 9: 37; Matt. 9: 2; Matt. 12: 22–32; Matt. 11: 7–11; Mark 12: 35–37; Luke 10: 21–24; Matt. 26: 26–29; Matt. 26: 64. Thus *seven* sections are common to all three gospels, *five* common to the first and third, *one* is peculiar to Matthew, and *one* to Mark. Where the accounts differ in particulars or arrangement, a consideration of the general trend of the gospel, of the connection into which the sayings are brought, and a comparison of their wording, restore to us somewhat exactly their original form.

This done, it appears that Jesus had a most exalted idea of his own person and work. Thus he places his preaching on a level higher than that of Jonah—his wisdom than that of Solomon. He represents himself to be a perfect interpreter of the law, even as a new law-giver, and claims for himself the right of Sabbath legislation against the strict letter of the law. He possesses authority (ἐξουσία) to forgive sins; claims that to himself as Messiah the promises of Psalm 110 refer; pronounces his disciples happy in being privileged to hear what the prophets desired to hear, but heard not, and threatens with fearful doom that city which will not receive the preaching of his messengers. These and other expressions of his Messianic consciousness (*cf.* the significance of the words in connection with the institution of the Last Supper, and his answer before the Sanhedrin, as to his continued existence), that he is in complete and exclusive possession of the truth and knowledge of God, are in that utterance of Jesus (Matt. 11: 25–30 and

[1] See the parallel passages in *A Harmony of the Gospels*, by Stevens and Burton. The references given above are those which the writer has seemed to regard as in form or connection most closely approximating to the original sources. "The arrangement of the 'oracles' from Matthew's original collection is more original in Luke, the wording more original in our Matthew."

Luke 10 : 21–24) merged into one majestic expression, than which there is nothing loftier in the synoptic gospels, which is like an "aërolite from the Johannean heaven."

2. It remains to be seen what these best-attested sayings of Jesus set forth in particular concerning his miracles. *Four* instances are considered, which stand in such intimate relation to the speeches in which they are found that they must be regarded as integral parts of them (Matt. 9 : 1–8; Matt. 12 : 22–32, and parallels), or as inexplicable, unless they gave rise to the speeches (Matt. 11 : 20–24; 11 : 4, 5, and parallels). As a result it appears: (1) that Jesus performed cures not only upon minds diseased, but those sick in body, and not only on those whose bodily disease was psychically conditioned, nor in few instances, but in great numbers; (2) that Jesus had a clear and complete consciousness that he was able to do and that he did extraordinary deeds; (3) and that he conceived these deeds to be an essential part of his Messianic office, and to be miracles in an absolute sense. That theory, therefore, which explains miracles in accordance with known laws of nature, and makes Jesus, surprised at his first success, regard them, in self-deception, as deeds which he as the Messiah was divinely empowered to perform, is impossible. For, in the two instances most fully attested (Matt. 9 : 1–8; 12 : 22–32), (*a*) faith as a spirit-exciting and body-controlling influence was absent; (*b*) Jesus was always confident and certain in his action; (*c*) the results were immediate; (*d*) physical means were not necessary, in the cases mentioned not employed; (*e*) the variety and number of instances (*cf.* Matt. 11 : 4, 5; Luke 7 : 22) exclude the possibility of assigning them to that class of nervous or imaginary disorders, curable by psychical or magnetic treatment. Finally, if Jesus were in this self-deceived, it is impossible to say in what he was not. Since his self-consciousness as to his miracles is a fact, his entire Messianic consciousness must therewith stand or fall.

Since from the above-named starting point this sure result has been attained, the further task of the historian is along this path, in consideration of the other words and acts of Jesus recorded in the gospels and epistles, to arrive at an assured answer to the question, Is and in how far is the "Christ of Faith" also the "Jesus of History"?

While in some instances the method and application of the criticism are somewhat overrefined or strained, and do not command immediate acceptance, this article yields results of permanent value. It is a strong presentation of the facts which make it impossible to accept that which, in respect to the discourses of our Lord, criticism pronounces genuine, and to reject those miracles without which the speeches

hang in air and become inexplicable. By showing that Jesus considered his miracles as an essential part of his work, bound up in the unity of his consciousness, the writer has made it impossible to reject the miracles without seriously inpairing, if not destroying, the value of Jesus' testimony to his own being and work.

HENRY TODD DEWOLFE

FOXBORO, MASS.

LA NOTION BIBLIQUE DE LA DESCENTE DU CHRIST AUX ENFERS. Par C. BRUSTON; *Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie*, January 1897, pp. 57–78; March 1897, pp. 169–82. (Since reissued separately, with the addition of a discussion of 1 Tim. 3:16, under the title, "La Descente du Christ aux enfers." Paris: Fischbacher. 1897.)

THE amplified form of the Apostles' Creed says that Jesus descended into hell. In the teaching of Jesus there is not the slightest basis for this view. The word in John 20:17 plainly refers only to the time *since* the resurrection. The thought of Acts 2:27 is that the soul of Jesus did not come into the possession of sheol. Had the poet wished to say that God would not leave his soul *in* sheol, he would have said בִּשְׁאוֹל, and not לִשְׁאוֹל.

In spite of the clear word of Jesus, the belief early spread in the church that his soul descended into hades in the moment of death, and that in the interval before his resurrection he conquered the powers of hell, preached the gospel to the dead, and delivered the Old Testament saints out of the subterranean regions. Biblical basis for these views are Eph. 4:8 and 1 Pet. 3:19. These passages differ in two points from the view of the early church.

(1) According to ecclesiastical authors and the Apostles' Creed this descent was *before* the resurrection of Jesus; according to Paul and Peter it was *after* the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus.

(2) According to the majority of the fathers the descent of Jesus had as its object the deliverance of the righteous of the old covenant from hades; according to Paul its object was to conquer the powers of darkness, and according to Peter it was to announce the gospel to the spirits most guilty and most severely punished.

In Eph. 4:8–10 the word πρῶτον, which is added to κατέβη, is the work of some copyist who sought to conform the text to the current belief. The passage speaks of what is done by the exalted Christ. The descent into hell is spiritual, like his descent to his church.

One is tempted to compare Col. 2:15 with the passage in Eph., but this cannot be done, for the *principalities* here thought of are not infernal, but human. They are the princes of this world (1 Cor. 2:6–8).

The thought of Peter (1 Pet. 3:14–22) agrees essentially with that of Paul. Peter makes special mention of the most culpable, but his καὶ τοῖς implies general preaching. The *spirits in prison* are not men, but rebellious angels (see Gen. 6:1–4; Enoch 6—16). Their guilt was greater than that of any men, because they were celestial and immortal spirits. The *patience* of God and the *small number* of the saved are mentioned to set in plainer light the disobedience of the angels. This interpretation of vss. 18–20 accords with the preceding exhortation.

The thought of Paul and Peter agrees with the essential principles of Christianity. It is natural to think that, after toiling for the salvation of men on the earth, Jesus has continued his work, not only in the visible world, but also in the invisible. Could he who came to seek and to save the lost leave without witness the millions who died before he came and those who in subsequent times have died without knowledge of him? It is permitted to think that this preaching to the spirits has not been in vain, especially since a word of Jesus justifies us in believing that all sins except that against the Holy Spirit may be forgiven in the world to come.

The article of descent into hell ought to be suppressed by the Reformed churches, not as being inexact in itself, but as being badly placed in the symbol, and consequently giving rise to various false ideas.

In the second part of this discussion, a synopsis of which is not given for lack of space, the author speaks of the substitution of the ecclesiastical idea of the descent into hell for the apostolic idea, and of the successive deformations of Christian eschatology. He regards the ecclesiastical doctrine of preaching to the dead as a logical consequence of the idea of the resurrection of the flesh, and he holds that this doctrine came into the church in a reaction against gnosticism. The fact that the preaching was put between the death and resurrection of Jesus is thought to be due to Matt. 27:52–53. The deformations of Christian eschatology are traced to Jewish notions and to the reaction against docetism.

This article of M. Bruston is one of great interest and value. It shows the utter untenableness of the view that Jesus descended into hell or into hades between his death and his resurrection. It argues with force, if not conclusively, for a spiritual activity of the exalted Christ in the entire invisible world.

GEORGE H. GILBERT.

CHICAGO THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DER ENTWICKELUNGSGEDANKE IN DER EVANGELISCHEN THEOLOGIE BIS SCHLEIERMACHER. Von FRIEDRICH SCHIELE; *Zeitschrift für Theologie und Kirche*, VII, Heft 2.

THE term "development" was first used by Nicolaus de Cusa in the sense of explication or evolution. Leibnitz, in his doctrine of monads, used it of the unfolding of the soul's essence, and since this consists of ideas, development with him means enlightenment. Lessing, in his *Education of the Human Race*, made the successive steps of revelation the process by which the self-developing understanding arrives at clearness of ideas. Semler, the father of the enlightenment theology, applied Leibnitz' idea of gradual development to the Christian revelation. Scripture statements, being locally and temporally conditioned, can be no register of all religious knowledge for all time, but only a beginning. Like the early Christian apologists, he disregarded the historical elements of Christianity; dogmas based upon them might be of value for the "public" (*öffentlichen*) religion of the masses, but these and the dogmas which flow from speculative-mystical thought are foreign to the "private" (*eigenen*) religion of the educated and enlightened, which is founded on the rational teachings of a natural theology.

Abraham Teller attempted a broad and connected application of Leibnitz' idea to religion. Of this, he said, there are three grades of development: first, the Christianity of faith, resting on the authority of a teacher and employing history, figures, and parables; second, the Christianity of reason, which passes from facts to principles, from reliance on another's system to the erection of one's own; third, the religion of the perfect, springing out of truth immediately perceived. Men commence with the first and end with the third, not in every case passing through the second.

The Enlightenment, like the Hellenistic Gnosis, failed to inquire what "faith" means, and neutralized it by "knowledge." Akin to deism of the better type, it yet made no attempt to get back to nature by rejecting the supposed accretions of history, for the "religion of the perfect" issued out of a historical process.

Both education and development were comprehended in Krug's "perfectibility," which he defined to be "that quality of revealed religion by virtue of which it contains the principle (*i. e.*, the determinate possibility) of a constant development and progress." Christianity needs perfecting, not only subjectively by appropriation, but objectively by doctrinal transformation and correction; yet without

removing its foundation in God, freedom, and immortality. But this "principle" is only formal, and makes out nothing as to the *content* of Christianity.

Kant shattered the theoretical structure of the Enlightenment, but with it acknowledged the primacy of reason in the practical sphere. Religion is to be freed from all empirical grounds and externalities, and a religion of reason is to take their place. Revelation is the free unfolding of inherent divine qualities from a self-developing germ in man (*cf.* E. Caird's "germinative principle"); but he does not state *what this religion of reason is*, nor define the *aim* of the development. Christ is indeed to Kant the "personified idea of the good principle," but *how?*

Important among Kantians is Ammon, because his treatment of religion was historical. But with him the development of Christianity to a world-religion is a development only in the form and mode of teaching, not an evolution of the religion itself in its inner essence. Rohr, the rationalist, said Jesus aimed at a universal religion; therefore its universal system of religious truth must have its final ground in universal human reason. That is, the religion of Jesus = rationalism, and has no connection with a doctrine of his person.

Rationalism lacked the feeling for history, and, accordingly, it viewed Christianity one-sidedly as doctrine. The so-called development was rather an *e*velopment of Christianity out of supposed wrappings. It was regress, not progress. But when the new speculative philosophy and theology of the nineteenth century began to apply the notion of development to the various speculative dogmas, the historical sense was awakened. Herder saw that a religion of pure reason (or natural theology) has not been from the first everywhere the same. Revelation is not given to men as a ready-made idea; but it is the feeling for the invisible in the visible, for the one in the many; it is the universal spirit adjusted to the real in nature and history. Schelling, in his philosophy of identity, viewed spirit as invisible nature and nature as visible spirit. The self-revelation is a historical process. Christianity is "the eternal idea," "the ideal spirit," ever disrobing itself of its old forms of manifestation and clothing itself anew. This "ideal principle" is of the very essence of Christianity, and not a mere capacity for becoming, like Krug's "perfectibility." The rationalists sought to return to the doctrine of Jesus; Schelling advocated the progressive evolution of religion. Hegel described the essence of religion as the exaltation of the finite nature-bound spirit to its freedom

in God, and sought to find in every religion a moment in the development of the *idea* of religion, but in a purely logical way.

The error common to both speculative and rationalistic thought was the assumption that Christianity is essentially doctrine, revelation a communication or aquisition of knowledges, and its content objective theoretical *Weltanschauung* rather than subjective spiritual life-determination. This error was overcome *practically* by the Reformers and *theoretically* by Schleiermacher. With him religion has an independent basis as a distinct inner quality of the human spirit — namely, feeling (*Gemüth, Gefühl*), and it is, therefore, not interchangeable with doctrine or morality. The essence of Christianity is not to be found in a faith in facts of history, nor in a principle of reason dialectically disclosed, but in *the absolutety archetypal person of Jesus Christ* — not his empirical appearing, but *the peculiar determinateness of his God-consciousness.* This is the eternal infinite principle of Christianity, which exists perfectly in Christ, but did not come to perfect manifestation in his empirical life.

A very concise, clear summary, written from the Ritschlian point of view.

GEORGE CROSS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE WAHRE BEDEUTUNG DER GLAUBENSRECHTFERTIGUNG. Von DR. ZITZLAFF, Superintendent in Fehrbellin; *Studien und Kritiken*, 1897, pp. 489–577.

THE Catholic church holds that in connection with justification there is a change in the believer's character; and that this change is effected by the believer himself, under the influence of divine grace. Justification and sanctification are simultaneous and identical, and both alike depend upon human coöperation.

The Evangelical Lutheran church holds that justification is an act of pure grace on God's part, for the sake of the righteousness of Christ, and without the coöperation of men.

In their zeal to guard against the error of the Catholics in making faith meritorious, some of the theologians of the church, following the Formula of Concord, were led to declare that justification is a forensic act, a declaration of pardon merely, a matter of God's judgment simply, not affecting in any way the believer's character. *Quæ actio, cum sit extra hominem non potest hominem intrinsece mutare* (Hollaz).

This position is untenable, is contrary to the idea of faith, and to the doctrines of the reformers and of the Scriptures.

1. It is untenable. It cannot be defended against the objection that the righteousness imputed would then only be putative, not real righteousness, and that it implies that God pronounces a man righteous when he is really unrighteous.

2. It is contrary to the idea of faith. *Fides*, according to the symbols of the Evangelical church, is not simply *notitia*, or *notitia* with *assensus*, but before all *fiducia*. Luther calls it the living trust upon the grace of God. Melanchthon says of it: *Quia fides affert spiritum sanctum et parit novam vitam in cordibus, necesse est, quod pariat spirituales in cordibus* (*Apol. Confess.*, III, 4). Faith is never thought of except as involving a change in man, a renewal of one's innermost being.

3. The forensic theory is contrary to the doctrines of the reformers. (*a*) It is contrary to the views of Luther. In his sermon "The Freedom of the Christian" he speaks of faith as making righteous, as completely changing a man within, uniting him to Christ as bride to bridegroom. With Luther "justification and sanctification were not two separate experiences, but two events united in one." See his *Sermon on Good Works*, *The Larger Catechism*, and *The Smalcald Articles*. (*b*) It is contrary to the views of Melanchthon. According to him justification is equivalent to a sinner's pardon and acceptance with God. Faith and sanctification are joined together in indissoluble unity. As Eichhorn says of him, "that God could look at a thing different from what it is never came into his mind." (*c*) The views of the reformers, as gathered from Luther's *Larger Catechism*, *The Augsburg Confession*, *The Apology*, and *The Articles of Smalcald*, may thus be summarized: God in the gospel offers grace and mercy. He who believes the gospel is just with God. This belief involves the acknowledgment of being sinful, of being subject to wrath, and of deserving God's judgments; it involves the belief that Jesus made an atonement for sin, that he fulfilled the law, freed men from its curse, and so reconciled God. (*d*) But he who thus believes cannot be an unconverted man. He has already become a new man, converted, turned his face, not his back, towards God. His heart has an entirely new direction. That faith is not the condition of the new life, but is itself the new life, seems to *me* to be beyond doubt. It is not the condition of our acceptance, it is our acceptance; not the means to the cure, but the cure. And justification is only declaring what is. God declares a man

δίκαιος, when he is δίκαιος, not righteous in a juridical sense, that is, absolutely correct, but in the sense of being acceptable to him.

4. The forensic theory is contrary to the Scriptures; in particular to the epistle to the Romans. The theme of this epistle is the righteousness of God, brought to light in the gospel as a power of God unto salvation to everyone that believeth. δικαιοσύνη γὰρ θεοῦ (1:17) means the righteousness of God's being. The disclosure of this is the main and weightiest part of this epistle, and is ever kept in the foreground. This righteousness was revealed in part in God's wrath against sin. It is now disclosed in all its fullness in Christ. It is inclusive of grace and mercy. While still condemning sin, God can now pardon and save the sinner and still be righteous. To believe this is to acknowledge God's righteousness, and God cannot but declare those who believe to be righteous, since they answer to all that the disclosure of his righteousness designed. εἰς ἔνδειξιν τῆς δικαιοσύνης αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ εἰς τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν δίκαιον (3:26). Every believer in this righteousness experiences it as a power unto salvation. This is most clearly brought out in chap. 8. "The law of the spirit of life hath made me free from the law of sin and death" (8:2). This law of the spirit is the spirit of God, which lives in every believer and gives his life a new direction and power. What the law could not do the revelation of the righteousness of God could. It brings with it a spirit which every believer receives, a spirit which is the beginning of a new life.

This being so, δικαιοῦν cannot signify a mere forensic act. There must be of necessity a change of being on the part of the δικαιωθείς. This is exactly what appears in believers. Through this change they become indeed δίκαιοι, and are not merely declared so juridically.

The question whether δικαιοῦν means to make righteous or to pronounce righteous does not affect my position. Neither does the expression λογίζεσθαι εἰς δικαιοσύνην (4:3, 5, 9). For the faith reckoned for righteousness *is* righteousness for God.

The various legal expressions of the epistle are easily accounted for on the ground that it was written against the adherents of the Jewish legal righteousness.

Even according to the common conception of the epistle, the position that δικαιοῦν is simply declarative is untenable. It is incompatible with the strong emphasis which the epistle throughout lays on faith (1:16, 17; 3:22, 25, 26, 28; 4:3, 5, 17–22, 25; 5:1, etc.). Justification is too closely united to faith to make it such an external affair as

the forensic theory requires. Various particular passages against the forensic theory are: 5 : 17, where the justified are said to receive the gift of righteousness; 5 : 19, which says that by the gift of one many shall be constituted *κατασταθήσονται* — righteous; 6 : 2–13, where the believer's life is compared to a dying and rising with Christ, and as being alive unto God through Jesus Christ. See also 6 : 15, 16; 7 : 1 *seq.*, and 8 : 5; 14 : 15.

This is an able article. That the author succeeds in showing that the forensic theory, as he defines it, is untenable and contrary to the teachings of Melanchthon, Luther, and Paul admits, it seems to us, of no doubt whatever. But it should be observed that he deals with the most extreme type of that theory.

The author's own view is very attractive, and is, we are inclined to believe, not far removed from that of the apostle Paul. Two things, however, must be said about it: (*a*) His conception of justification is truer than his definition of faith. He emphasizes too much the intellectual side of faith, the relation of man to the gospel, and does not lay sufficient stress on its volitional side, the attitude of the soul toward Christ and God. (*b*) It is to be observed that in the writer's own view justification is still forensic, not efficient; declaratory, not causative. And this it must be, if we are to retain the New Testament view. The correction for the view which the author is opposing is not in denying that justification is a forensic act, but in denying that its declaration is contrary to fact. The author would have done better to have recognized this, and not to have defined forensic in so narrow and exclusive a manner.

Some of the incidental positions of the author are also open to criticism. He asserts that those who make faith a condition of justification make it a merit. But is this so? It is no merit in me that I breathe God's free air in order to live, though it is the indispensable condition of my maintaining physical life. The subject of the epistle to the Romans is not, as he asserts, the righteousness of God brought to light as a power unto salvation, but righteousness attained through faith. Nor is the righteousness of God the power unto salvation; the gospel is that power. His definition of the divine righteousness is not exact, either. God's righteousness, as Paul uses the term, does not include his grace and mercy. Grace and mercy are attributes of God's being, coördinate with righteousnesss.

G. D. HEUVER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

**June--September.**

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

## GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA AND METHODOLOGY.

BERG, FRDR. Desideria theologica. Nachgelassene Schrift. Leipzig, Grübel & Sommerlatte, in Komm.; 40 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

BERNOULLI, C. ALBR. Die wissenschaftl. u. die kirchliche Methode in der Theologie. Ein encyclopäd. Versuch. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr; xv + 229 pp., 8vo. M. 3.20.

CAINE, HALL. The Christian. New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1897; v + 540 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.50.

DRUMMOND, H. A Life for a Life, and other addresses; with a tribute by D. L. Moody. New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1897; iv + 75 pp., 16mo. Cloth, $0.25.

GLAGE, MAX. Moderne Theologie. Vortrag. Hamburg, Gebr. Lüdeking, 1897; 20 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

KÄHLER, MART. Der lebendige Gott. Fragen und Antworten von Herz zu Herz. 2. Aufl. Leipzig, A. Deichert Nachf., 1897; 72 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

LORIMER, GEO. C. The Transcendent Value of Theological Studies. *Christ. Quart.*, July, 289–320.

RAMSAY, W. M. Impressions of Turkey during Twelve Years' Wanderings. New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1897; xvi + 296 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $1.75.

*Theologischer Jahresbericht*, hrsg. von H. HOLTZMANN u. G. KRÜGER. 16. Band, enthaltend die Literatur des Jahres 1896. Zweite Abteilung: Historische Theologie, bearbeitet von Lüdemann, Krüger, Ficker, Lösche, Hegler, Kohlschmidt und Furrer; M. 7. Dritte Abteilung: Systematische Theologie, bearbeitet von Mayer, Troeltsch, Sulze und Dreyer; M. 4. Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1897; pp. 157–476 and 477–631. Complete, M. 20.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

BARTH, PAUL. Die Philosophie der Geschichte als Sociologie. 1. Teil: Die Einleitung u. kritische Übersicht. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1897; xvi + 396 pp., 8vo. M. 8.

Berner Studien zur Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte. Hrsg. v. LUDW. STEIN. V.–VIII. Bd. Bern, Steiger & Co.; 8vo. à M. 1.25.

V. ORTIZ GEO. Die Weltanschauung Calderons. 67 pp.

VI. MARINPOLSKY, L. Zur Geschichte des Entwicklungsbegriffs. viii + 120 pp.

VII. RUBIN, S. Die Erkenntnistheorie Maimons in ihrem Verhaltnis zu Cartesius, Leibnitz, Hume und Kant. 57 pp.

VIII. BAUER, W. Der ältere Pythagoreismus. viii + 232 pp.

DARTIGUE-PEYROU, JEAN. Quæ sit apud Senecam consolationum disciplina, vis ratioque. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 2.50.

——— Marc-Aurèle dans ses rapports avec le christianisme. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 5.

DONNER, J. O. E. Lord Byron's Weltanschauung. [Aus: "Acta soc. scientiarum fennicae," Helsingfors.] Leipzig, Voss' Sortiment, 1897; 135 pp., 4to. M. 4.

EUCKEN, RUD. Religionsphilosophische Bewegungen innerhalb des französischen Katholicismus. *Beilage zur Allgem. Zeitg.*, München, No. 139.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Religious Thought in the Victorian Era. *Christ. Lit.*, July, 220–30.

GEHRING, JOHS. Die Religionsphilosophie J. E. von Bergers. Diss. Leipzig, J. Naumann's Sort. in Komm., 1897; 93 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

HOYER, R. Die Heilslehre. Der Abschluss sokratischer Philosophie u. die wissenschaftl. Grundlage späterer Religionssysteme. Bonn, F. Cohen, 1897; 191 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

MAERKEL, PAUL. Herbart und der Religions-Unterricht an höheren Lehranstalten. Programm. Berlin, R. Gaertner, 1897; 28 pp., 4to. M. 1.

PFISTER, OSKAR. Die Genesis der Religionsphilosophie A. E. Biedermanns, untersucht nach Seiten ihres psychologischen Ausbaus. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus der Schweiz*, 1897, 178–96.

WENLEY, R. M. The Movement of Religious Thought in Scotland, 1843–96. *New World*, Sept., 467–85.

WILLMANN, OTTO. Geschichte des Idealismus (in 3 Bdn.). 3. Bd.: Der Idealismus der Neuzeit. Braunschweig, Vieweg & Sohn, 1897; vi + 961 pp. M. 13; bd., M. 15.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. The Threefold Message of the Gospel. *Outlook*, July 24, 36–9.

BRUCE, ALEXANDER B. The Providential Order of the World. Being the Gifford Lectures, 1896–7. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 8vo. $2.

CHARBONNEL, V. Superstitieux et mystifiés. *Rev. chrét.*, July, 1–18.

CROOKER, J. H. The Atheism in Religions. *New World*, Sept., 519–31.

ERHARDT, FRZ. Die Wechselwirkung zwischen Leib u. Seele. Eine Theorie des psycho-phys. Parallelismus. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland, 1897; v + 163 pp., 8vo. M. 3.60.

HÖFLER, A. Die metaphysischen Theorien v. den Beziehungen zwischen Leib und Seele. Einige Fragen an die Monisten. Wien u. Prag, F. Tempsky; Leipzig, G. Freitag, 1897; 24 pp., 8vo.

HYDE, HENRY DE WITT. Practical Idealism. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897.

LOW, G. J. The Church and Modern Thought. *Queen's Quart.*, July, 1–10.

LUM, DYER D. The Basis of Morals. A posthumous paper of an anarchist philosopher. *Monist*, July, 554–71.

MÜLLER, JOS. Die Philosophie des Schönen in Natur und Kunst. Mainz, F. Kirchheim, 1897; iii + 271 pp., 8vo. M. 5; bd., M. 6.50.

REHMKE, JOH. Fundamental Conceptions of Consciousness. *Philos. Rev.*, Sept.

ROURE, L. Mysticisme. *Études*, July 20, 240–6.

ROYCE, JOSIAH. The Conception of God. A philosophical discussion by J. Royce, Joseph Le Conte, and George H. Howison. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897.

SAMTLEBEN, G. Metaphysisch-psychologischer Wahrscheinlichkeitsbeweis für Gottes Dasein und Wesen. *Bew. des Glaub.*, June, 248–55.

SCHNEIDER, HUGO. Durch Wissen zum Glauben. Eine Laien-Philosophie. Leipzig, H. Haacke, 1897; xii + 236 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50.

STEIN, LUDW. Die sociale Frage im Lichte der Philosophie. Vorlesungen über Socialphilosophie und ihre Geschichte. Stuttgart, F. Enke, 1897; xx + 791 pp. M. 16.

THIEMANN, K. Schopenhauer, ein Zeuge biblisch-evangelischer Wahrheit. Stuttgart, Belser, 1897; 36 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.
= Zeitfragen des christlichen Volkslebens, hrsg. von E. Frhr. v. UNGERN-STERNBERG u. TH. WAHL. 164. Heft.

Ueber den christlichen Glauben. Antwort eines Laien aus der Landeskirchl. Vereinigung auf die Angriffe eines Laien. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 32 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

Was ist der Mensch? Was ist sein Ziel? Von ***. Berlin, A. Deubner, 1897; 38 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

Wer ist Gott? Gedanken f. Denkende. Von *?* Leipzig, H. R. Thom, 1897; viii + 44 pp. M. 1.20.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

ELY, RICHARD T. Religion as a Social Force. *Christ. Quart.*, July, 321–8.

ETTER, ERNST. Gebet, Gebetserhörung und moderne Weltanschauung. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus der Schweiz*, 1897, 160–78.

GLÜER, H. Der Evolutionsgedanke in seinem Verhältnis zur Naturwissenschaft u. zum Wunderglauben des Christentums. *Bew. des Glaub.*, Aug., 293–310.

LANE, A. C. Religion among Men of Science. *Outlook*, July 31, 795–7.

Testamenti, veteris, prophetarum interpretatio istro-croatica, saeculi XVI. Ed. V. Jagič. Wien, A. Holzhausen; Berlin, Weidmann, 1897; vii + 316 pp., 8vo. M. 10.

Tymns, T. V., E. Medley, Alfred Cave, and others. The Ancient Faiths in Modern Light: a series of essays, by various clergymen. New York, imported by C. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 416 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $4.50.

## THE OLD TESTAMENT.

### GENERAL.

Behrends, A. J. F. The Old Testament under Fire. New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1897; 246 pp., 8vo. $1.

Giesebrecht, F. Die Berufsbegabung der alttestamentlichen Propheten. Gottingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897. M. 4.40.

Kautzsch, Emil. Abriss der Geschichte des alttestamentl. Schrifttums, nebst Zeittafeln zur Geschichte der Israeliten und anderen Beigaben zur Erklärung des Alten Testaments. [Aus den "Beilagen" zu der vom Verfasser hrsg. Uebersetzung des Alten Testamentes.] Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; vi + 220 pp., 8vo. Bd., M. 5.

Margival, Henri. Richard Simon et la critique biblique au xvii^e siècle. 4^e art.: La publication de *l'histoire critique du vieux testament*. *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. relig.*, II., 223–48.

Meyer, Ed. Julius Wellhausen und meine Schrift: Die Entstehung des Judenthums. Eine Erwiderung. Halle, M. Niemeyer, 1897; 26 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

Also see *Expos. Times*, June, 415–16.

### GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

Bliss, F. J. Thirteenth Report on the Excavations at Jerusalem. Palest. Expl. Fund, *Quart. Stat.*, July, 173–81.

Brünnow, R. Inschriften aus dem Ostjordanlande. *Mitth. u. Nachr. d. deutch. Paläst.-Ver.*, 1897, 38–41.

Cheyne, T. K. Professor Hommel on Arphaxad. *Expos. Times*, July, 474.

——— Hebrew Mythological Terms. *Ibid.*, Aug., 525.

Cléophas et Lagrange. La mosaïque géographique de Mâdaba. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 165–84.

Clermont-Ganneau, Ch. The Mâdeba Mosaic. Palest. Expl. Fund, *Quart. Stat.*, July, 213–25.
Note on the same by Sir Charles Wilson, *ibid.*, 239.

Conder, C. R. Date of the Siloam Text. Palest. Expl. Fund. *Quart. Stat.*, July, 204–8.

Couret, La prise de Jérusalem pars les Perses en 614. Trois documents nouveaux. Orléans, Herluison, 1897; 48 pp., 8vo.

Diener, C. Die Katastrophe von Sodom und Gomorrha im Lichte geologischer Forschung. *Mitth. d. Geog. Gesellsch. in Wien*, XL., Nos. 1–2.

Ford, R. C. The High Priest's Diadem. *Expos. Times.*, Aug., 526–7.

Gatt, G. Die Hügel von Jerusalem. Neue Erklärung der Beschreibung Jerusalems bei Josephus, *Bell. Jud.*, V. 4, 1 und 2. Mit 1 Plane. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; vii + 66 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

Germer-Durand. L'Age de pierre en Palestine. *Rev. bibl.*, July, 439–49.

Hommel, Fritz. 1) Belial and other Mythological Terms. 2) Havilah. 3) Nĕbhêlah. *Expos. Times*, July, 472–4.

Kraus, Sam. Marinus, a Jewish Philosopher of Antiquity (465 B. C.). *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, April, 518–20.

Lagrange, Fr. M.-J. Notre exploration de Pétra. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 208–230.

——— Jérusalem d'après la mosaïque de Madaba. *Rev. bibl.*, July, 450–8.

Mackie, G. M. Who was Potiphar? (Gen. 39: 1.) *Expos. Times*, June, 430

Monroe, James. Joseph as a Statesman. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 484–500.

Rampillou. La Terre Sainte. Souvenirs et impressions d'un pèlerin. Tours, Mame, 1897; viii + 143 pp., 12mo.

Rhétoré, Fr. J. La Prise de Jérusalem par les Perses. *Rev. bibl.*, July, 458–63.

Riess, R. von. Wandkarte von Palästina. Maassstab 1:314,000. Freiburg i. B., Herder. M. 9.

Sachsse, R. Beiträge zur Kenntniss der Mineralien, Gesteine und Gewässer Palästinas. *Zeitschr. des Deutsch. Palästina-Vereins*, XX., 1–34.

SCHICK, C., und I. BENZINGER. Namenliste und Erläuterungen zu Baurath Dr. C. Schicks Karte der weiteren Umgebung von Jerusalem. *Ibid.*, XIX., 145–220.

SCHICK, CONRAD. The (so-called) Tombs of the Kings at Jerusalem. Palest. Expl. Fund, *Quart. Stat.*, July, 182–8.

SCHUMACHER, G. Notes from Jedûr. *Ibid.*, July, 190–5.

SÉJOURNÉ, PAUL.-M. Les fouilles à Jérusalem. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 299–306.
Escarpe et murs de la ville. — escaliers. — Piscine de Siloé. — Découverte d'une église.

SELBIE, J. A. Who was Potiphar? *Expos. Times*, July, 474–5.

SPENCE, R. M. Nĕbhêlah. *Ibid.*, June, 428; July, 526.

WATSON, C. M. The Length of the Jewish Cubit. Palest. Expl. Fund, *Quart. Stat.*, July, 201–4.

WRIGHT, TH. F. The Tabernacle Roof. *Ibid.*, July, 225–6.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT.

BEECHER, WILLIS J. Notes on Hebrew Words in the Old Testament. I. "Torah" in the Book of Job. II. "Torah" in the Book of Proverbs. *Hom. Rev.*, June, 541–4.

BENNETT, W. H. A Selection of Passages of Unpointed Hebrew, from Genesis, Isaiah, and the Psalms. Cambridge Univ. Press, 1897. New York, The Macmillan Co., iv + 36 pp. $0.35 *net.*

CHEYNE, T. K. The Origin and Meaning of "Belial." *Expos. Times*, June, 423–4.

——— The Text of Job. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, July, 573–80.

DÖRWALD, PAUL. Die Formenbildungsgesetze des Hebräischen. Ein Hilfsbuch f. Lehrer des Hebräischen an Gymnasien. Berlin, Mayer & Müller, 1897; vii + 123 pp., 8vo. M. 2.40.

NESTLE, EBERH. The Transliteration of Hebrew. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 525.

SIEGFRIED, C. Stellenfehler in Mandelkern's Veteris Testamenti concordantiae hebr. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 465–7.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

DÖRING, JOHS. Wellhausens Theorien zur Geschichte Israels in kritischer Beleuchtung. Vortrag. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; 48 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

HOEDEMAKER, PH. J. Der mosaische Ursprung der Gesetze in den Büchern Exodus, Leviticus und Numeri. Vorlesungen über die moderne Schriftkritik des Alten Testaments. Deutsch von A. F. Schulte-Bunert. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; xv + 368 pp., 8vo. M. 6; bd., M. 7.

HOMMEL, FR. The Ancient Hebrew Tradition as illustrated by the Monuments. A protest against the modern school of O. T. criticism. From the German, by Edmund McClure and Leonard Crosslé. New York, E. J. B. Young & Co., 1897; xvi + 350 pp., 12mo; cloth.

LAGRANGE, M.-J. L'Innocence et le péché (Gen. 2:4—3, 24). *Rev. bibl.*, July, 341–79.

LEATHES, STANLEY. The Claims of the Old Testament. (Princeton Lectures.) New York, Ch. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 73 pp., 8vo. $1 *net.*

MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. Hommel's Ancient Hebrew Tradition. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 499–501.

MCCURDY, J. F. Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries. The Creation Story — its Origin. *Hom. Rev.*, July, 24–6; Aug., 121–4.

RUPPRECHT, ED. Kann eine mangelhafte Beseitigung der sogen. Postmosaica die Anerkennung der Pentateuchabfassung durch Moses hindern? *Bew. des Glaub.*, Aug., 310–19.

TOWNSEND, LUTHER TRACY. The Story of Jonah in the Light of Higher Criticism. New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1897; 120 pp., 8vo. $0.50.

WHATHAM, ARTHUR E. Cain's Wife. *Expos. Times*, July, 476.

ZIEMER, E. Abrahamus patriarcha an fuerit re vera. Diss. Erlangen, 1897; 108 pp., 8vo.

THEOLOGY.

BOEHMER, T. Das Reich Gottes in den Psalmen. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 620–52.

BORCHERT. Die Wunder der Propheten. *Bew. des Glaub.*, May, 177–89; June, 236–48.

CONDAMIN, ALBERT. Le Texte de Jérémie 31:22, est-il méssianique? *Rev. bibl.*, July, 396–404.

MURPHY, W. La religion primitive d'Israel, d'après une livre récent. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 239–54.

The book in question is the German translation of James Robertson's "The Ancient Religion of Israel," etc.

VOS, G. Some Doctrinal Features of the Earlier Prophecies of Isaiah. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 444–63.

WINTERBOTHAM, R. The Good Shepherd of Zechariah xi. *Expositor*, Aug., 127–39.

THE LAW.

BARTLETT, S. C. Novel Bible History. Deut. 14:21, etc. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 383–6. Also *ibid.*, July, 572–6.

CHEYNE, T. K. Rival Restorations of Num. 24:23, 24. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 520,

FISKE, AMOS K. The Myths of Israel. The ancient Book of Genesis, with Analysis and Explanation of its composition. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; xii + 355 pp., 12mo; cloth. $1.50.

HALÉVY, J. La prétendue absence de la tribu de Siméon dans la bénédiction du Moïse (Deutéronome, xxxiii). *Jour. Asiat.*, March–April, 329–31.

JONES, J. C. Primeval Revelation. Studies in Genesis i.–viii. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1897; 8vo. 6s.

KEERL, K. Die Bildung des ersten Menschen aus Staub und Erde. *Neue Kirchl. Zeitschr.*, viii, 482–519.

KLOSTERMANN. Beiträge zur Entstehungsgeschichte des Pentateuch. Schluss. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 353–83.

MCCURDY, J. F. Light on Scriptural Texts from Recent Discoveries: The Story of the Creation. *Hom. Rev.*, June, 502–5.

MORTON, H. The Cosmogony of Genesis and its Reconcilers. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 264–92.

NESTLE, EBERH. The Division of the Ten Commandments in the Greek and Hebrew Bibles. *Expos. Times*, June, 426–7.

ROBERT, CHARLES. À propos des fils de dieu et des filles de l'homme dans la bible. *Rev. bibl.*, April, 264–71.

SAYCE, A. H. An Archæological Commentary on Genesis. Gen., chaps. 14 and 15. *Expos. Times*, July, 461–5.

ZÖCKLER, O. 1. Die Mosaität des Pentateuch; 2. Die Chronologie des Exodus. *Bew. des Glaub.*, May, 215–16.

THE PROPHETS.

BÖHMER, JULIUS Wer ist Gog von Magog? Ein Beitrag zur Auslegung des Buches Ezechiel. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 321–55.

KENNEDY, JAMES. Isaiah 7:25. *Expos. Times*, July, 477–9.

LANG, MARSHALL B. Isaiah 1:18 and Ephesians 4:25–29. A comparison. *Expos. Times*, June, 405–6.

MOULTON. RICH. G. Daniel and the Minor Prophets. Edited with Introduction and Notes. (Modern Readers' Bible.) New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897. $0.50.

PIDGE, JOHN B. GOUGH. The Prophetical Books of the Old Testament. Philadelphia, Am. Bapt. Publ. Soc., 1897; 128 pp., 16mo. $0.50.

TOUZARD, M. De la conservation du texte hébreu; étude sur Isaïe, chaps. 36–39, suite. *Rev. biblique*, 1897, 185–206.

ZÖLLNER, W. Amos und Hosea. Handreichung zur Vertiefung christlicher Erkenntnis. 1., Heft 2. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897. M. 1.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BEARDSLEE, J. W. The Imprecatory Psalms. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July 490–505.

BRUSTON, C. Études sur Daniel et l'apocalypse. Montauban, Granié; Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 39 pp., 8vo.

CHEYNE, T. K. On 2 Chron. 14:9; Job 1:15; Prov. 27:22. *Expos. Times*, June, 431–2.

——— Prov. 27:22. *Ibid.*, July, 480.

——— The Book of Job and its Latest Commentator. *Expositor*, June, 401–16; July, 22–36.

Hand-Commentar, Kurzer, zum Alten Testament, in Verbindung mit J. Benzinger, B. Bertholet, K. Budde, B. Duhm, H. Holzinger, G. Wildeboer, hrsg. v. Prof. D. Karl Marti (in 20 parts). Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr; 8vo.

Part XV: WILDEBOER, G. Die Sprüche erklärt. xxiv + 95 pp. Subscription price, M. 1.90; single price, M. 2.50; bd., M. 3.50.

Part XVI: DUHM, BERNH. Das Buch Hiob erklärt. xv + 212 pp. Subscription price, M. 3.60; single price, M. 4.80; bd., M. 5.80.

HERBST, F. Der Hüter Israels schläft noch schlummert nicht. Betrachtungen über das Buch Esther. Barmen, Wupperthaler Traktat-Gesellschaft, 1897; iii + 119 pp., 8vo. Bd. M. 1.80.

HOMMEL, FR. Havilah in Job 11:17? *Expos. Times*, June, 431.

MACKIE, G. M. The Pestle and the Mortar (Ps. 12:6; Prov. 27:21, 22). *Expos. Times*, Aug., 521–2.

MACMILLAN, HUGH. Throwing a Stone at an Idol. Prov. 26:8. *Ibid.*, June, 399–400.

MÜLLER, D. H. Hiob, Kap. 14. *Wien. Zeitschr. f. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, XI., 57–62.

NESTLE, EBERH. Job. 1:17. *Expos. Times*, June, 432.

PARISOT, DOM. J. Les Psaumes de la captivité. Le Psaume 106. *Rev. bibl.*, July, 432–9.

ROYCE, JOSIAH. The Problem of Job. *New World*, June, 261–82.

ROY, H. Die Volksgemeinde u. die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter. Programm. Gnadau, Unitäts-Buchh. in Komm., 1897; 8vo. M. 1.50.

The Psalms in History. *Quart. Rev.*, April, 305–31.

VAHLDIECK, F. Beiträge zum Verständnis des Buches Koheleth mit besonderer Berücksichtigung des Unsterblichkeitsproblems. Leipzig, 1897; 47 pp., 8vo.

APOCRYPHA AND SEPTUAGINT.

BACHER, W. The Hebrew Text of Ecclesiasticus. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, July, 543–63.

BLUDAU, A. Die alexandrinische Uebersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältniss zum massoretischen Text. [Biblische Studien, hrsg. von A. Bardenhewer. II. Band, 2. und 3. Heft.] Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; xii + 218 pp., 8vo. M. 4.50.

BROISE, R.-M. DE LA. Juifs et Romains. Commentaire historique d'un chapître des Macchabées. (1 Macc., chap. 8.) *Études*, June 20, 807–24.

CHARLES, R. H. The Assumption of Moses. London, A. & C. Black, 1897; 8vo. 7s. 6d.

GRAY, G. BUCHANAN. A Note on the Text and Interpretation of Ecclus. 41:19. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, July, 567–72.

HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques: Étude sur la partie du texte hébreu de l'ecclésiastique, récemment découverte (suite et fin). *Rev. sém.*, July, 193–255.

LÉVI, ISRAËL. La Sagesse de Jésus, fils de Sirach. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV, 294–6.

MÜLLER, D. H. Glossen zum Ecclesiasticus. *Wien. Zeitschr. f. Kunde d. Morgenl.*, XI., 103–5.

SCHECHTER, S., and NEUBAUER, A. The Word תחלים in Ecclus. 44:17, and Professor Smend's Emendations. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, July, 563–7.

TOUZARD, J. L'Original hébreu de l'ecclésiastique. I. *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 271–82.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

LEO. FRDR. Die plautinischen Cantica und die hellenistische Lyrik. 115 pp. M. 7.50.
Abhandlungen der kgl. Gesellsch. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Philolog.-hist. Classe. Neue Folge. Bd. 1, No. 7. Berlin, Weidmann.

SCHLATTER, A. Einige Ergebnisse aus Niese's Ausgabe des Josephus. *Zeitschr. d. deutsch. Pal.-Ver.*, XIX., 221–32

WEISS, HUGO. Judas Makkabaeus. Ein Lebensbild aus den letzten grossen Tagen des israel. Volkes. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; viii + 122 pp., 8vo. M. 2.

## THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

ABBOTT, EDWIN A. A Fragment on the Ephesian Gospel. *New World*, June, 218–42.

ADAMS, JOHN QUINCY. The Jews and Early Christianity. *Expos. Times*, July, 477.

BATIFFOL, PIERRE. Les Origines du nouveau testament d'après un livre récent (A. Harnack, Chronologie der altchristl. Litteratur). *Rev. bibl.*, July, 423–32.

EDGAR, R. M. Tradition that there was a "Galilee" in the Mount of Olives. *Expositor*, Aug., 119–27.

FARRIS, ROB. P. Mariolatry. *Presb. Quart.*, July, 296–307.

GODET, F. Introduction au Nouveau Testament. Introduction particulière: II. Les Évangiles et les Actes des Apôtres. 1re partie: Les trois premiers évangiles. 1re livraison. Paris, Librairie Fischbacher. Fr. 2.
(To be completed in 5 parts at fr. 2.)

GOLDSCHMID, LÉOPOLD. Les Impôts et droits de douane en Judée sous les Romains. *Rev. des ét. juiv.*, 1897, XXXIV, 192–217.

HALL, THEOPHILUS D. Introduction to the Study of the Greek Testament: comprising a connected narrative of our Lord's life, from the synoptic Gospels in the original Greek. With concise grammar, notes, etc. London, John Murray, 1897; 8vo. 3s. 6d.

MATHESON, GEORGE. Relation of Christianity to Pain (Rev. 21:4.) *Expositor*, Aug., 102–10.

MUIRHEAD, L. A, The Times of Christ. Bible-Class Handbook Series. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark; London, Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co., Ltd.; New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1897. $0.45.

WEISS, BERNHARD. Lehrbuch der Einleitung in das Neue Testament. 3. Aufl. Berlin, Besser, 1897; xiv + 617 pp. M. 11; bd., M. 12.50.

WELLS, JAMES. Grace. A New Testament study. *Expos. Times*, June, 401–2.

WESTCOTT, BROOKE FOSS. Some Lessons of the Revised Version of the New Testament. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1897. 5s.

ZAHN, THEODOR. Einleitung in das Neue Testament. Bd. I. Leipzig, Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh., Nachf. (Geo. Böhme), 1897; viii + 489 pp. M. 9.50.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT.

FISHER, F. H. On some Readings of "Codex Bezæ" in Acts. *Expos. Times*, Aug. 523–4.

JACQUIER, E. Critique textuelle et éditions du nouveau testament. *L'Univ. cath.*, XXV., May, 73–92.

MOULTON, W. F., and A. S. GEDEN. A Concordance to the Greek Testament, according to the texts of Westcott & Hort, Tischendorf, and the English revisers. Edinburgh, T. & T. Clark, 1897; 1040 pp., 4to. 26s. *net.*

NESTLE, EB. Einführung in das griech. Neue Testament. Mit 8 Handschriften-Taf. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; 129 pp., 8vo. M. 2.80; bd., M. 3.40.

——— Some Trifling Corrections to Westcott and Hort's "Greek Testament." *Expos. Times*, July, 479.

——— The Text of Matt. 2:9. *Ibid.*, Aug., 521.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

ANDERSON, S. H. Histoire de Jésus-Christ, dans les paroles mêmes de ses contemporains, Matthieu, Marc, Luc et ean. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 32mo. Fr. 0.75.

BODDY, ALEX. A. Christ in the Holy Land. London, S. P. C. K., 1897.

BOURLIER, J. Les Paroles de Jésus à Cana. *Rev. bibl.*, July, 405–22.

CAMERON, A. B. From the Garden to the Cross. A study of our Lord's passion. London, Isbister & Co., 1897; 8vo. 5s.

CHAPUIS, P. La sainteté de Jésus de Nazareth. Ses caractères et ses conditions. Premier article. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, No. 4, 297–321.

ESCOT, C. Attitude du Sanhédrin à l'égard de Jésus-Christ. Thèse. Lyon, Paquet, 1897; 115, 8vo.

FARRAR, F. W. How Best to Present the Life of Christ from the Pulpit. *Hom. Rev.*, June, 483–9.

FÜRER, C. E. Jesus auf dem Höhepunkt seiner irdischen Wirksamkeit in Israel. *Bew. des Glaub.*, June, 217–36.

GRASSMANN, R. Das Leben Jesu. Stettin R. Grassmann, 1897; vi + 104 pp., 8vo M. 0.60

HÖFER, C. Wie ist die Forderung eines "pragmatischen Lebens Jesu" zu beurteilen, bezw. praktisch zu gestalten? *Padagog. Studien*, XVIII., 2.

JAEGER, J. Ist Christus ein Suggestionstherapeut gewesen? *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, viii, 454–81.

KEEN, W. W. Further Studies on the Bloody Sweat of Our Lord. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 469–83.

MACKAIL, J. W. The Sayings of the Lord Jesus Christ. Collected and arranged. London and New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. 2s. 6d.

PARKER, JOHN. The Saviour in the Light of the First Century. Edinburgh, T. G. Hitt, 1897.

REDPATH, HENRY A. Professor Albert Réville's "Jésus de Nazareth." *Expositor*, Aug., 90–102.

TRABAUD, H. A propos de la langue de Jésus. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, No. 4, 369–74.

WHATHAM, ARTHUR E. Christ's Nature. *Expos. Times*, July, 476–7.

WHITON, JAMES M. Jesus the Ideal Man. *New World*, June, 242–61.

WOHLENBERG, G. Jesu Auferstehung von den Toten. Vortrag. Schwerin, Bahn, 1897; 31 pp. M. 0.60.

WOODWORTH, R. B. The Public Language of Our Lord. *Presb. Quart.*, July, 325–56.

APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

BACCHUS, F. Twenty-five Years of Peter. *Dublin Rev.*, April, 386–96.

BARING-GOULD. A Study of St. Paul: his character and opinions. With 2 maps. London, Isbister & Co., 1897; 498 pp., 8vo. 10s. 6d.

BARNS, TH. The Baptism of John: its Place in New Testament History. *Expositor*, Aug., 139–53.

BROISE, DE LA. Les dernières années de la sainte vierge. *Études*, Aug. 5, 289–304.

CONE, ORELLO. The Paul of the Acts and the Paul of the Epistles. *New World*, June, 332–52.

HOYLE, ARTHUR. Paul and Jesus. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 487–92.

LATHAM, H. Pastor Pastorum: or, The schooling of the apostles by our Lord. Cambridge, Deighton, Bell & Co.; London, G. Bell & Sons, 1897; 8vo. 6s. 6d.

NINCK, JOH. Simon Petrus, der Fischer aus Galiläa u. Apostel Jesu Christi. Ein Lebensbild fürs Leben. Mit mehr als 100 Textbildern u. Illustr. Dresden, Exped. d. Deutschen Kinderfreundes 1897; viii + 112 pp., 4to. Bd., M. 6.

RAMSAY, W. M. A Study of St. Paul by Mr. Baring Gould. *Expositor*, July, 49–65.

——— St. Paul's Shipwreck. *Ibid.*, Aug., 154–7.

St. Paul, was he Married? *Expositor*, June, 436–42.

STEINMETZ, R. Die zweite römische Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus. Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. (Geo. Böhme), 1897.

STURM, W. Der Apostel Paulus und die evangel. Überlieferung. I. 1. Programm. Berlin, Gärtner, 1897; 23 pp. M. 1.

THEOLOGY.

ALTHAUS, P. Die Heilsbedeutung der Taufe im Neuen Testamente. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1897; xii + 321 pp. M. 4.50; bd., 5.40.

AVELING, F. W. Who was Jesus Christ? and other questions. 1897; 8vo. Cloth, 6s.

BALGARNIE, R. Could Jesus Err? *Expos. Times*, July, 475.

BRIGGS, C. A. The Wisdom of Jesus the Messiah. I., II., III. *Expos. Times*, June, 393–8; July, 452–5; Aug., 492–6.

CLARK, JOHN A. Could Jesus Err? *Ibid.*, Aug., 524.

GOETZ, HERMANN. Der theologische u. anthropologische Heilsuniversalismus bei Johannes in seiner exeget. Begründung. Diss. Greifswald, 1897; 52 pp., 8vo.

GRAFTON, C. The Church of the New Testament. Milwaukee, Wis., The Young Churchman Co., 1897. (Fond du Lac Tracts, No. 1). $0.05.

HOLTZMANN, H. J. Lehrbuch der neutestamentl. Theologie. 2 Bde. Freiburg i. B., Mohr, 1897; xvi + 503, xi + 532 pp., 8vo. M. 20.

HULBERT, C. B. The Theology of the Sermon on the Mount. *Hom. Rev.*, Aug., 163–6.

IHLEN, C. Den paulinske fremstilling af forsoningen. Bibelsk-theol. afhandl., belønnet med H. K. H. Kronpr. guldmedalje. Christiania, 1897; v + 225 pp., 8vo. Kr. 4.80.

KLOPPER, A. Das gegenwärtige und zukünftige Gottesreich in der Lehre Jesu bei den Synoptikern. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 355–411.

KUTTER, HERM. Das Hohepriestertum Jesu Christi nach dem Hebräerbrief. II. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus d. Schweiz*, 1897, 114–28.

MATHESON, GEO. The Place of the Cross in the World. Rev. 13:8. *Expositor*, June, 416–24.

ROGGE, CHR. Der irdische Besitz im Neuen Testament. Seine Beurteilung und Wertschätzung durch Christus und die Apostel. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; iii + 120 pp. M. 1.80.

ROURE, J. Le Problème de la foi chez M. Paul Janet. *Études*, June 5, 601–23.

——— La Philosophie et la théologie dans leurs relations d'après M. Paul Janet. *Ibid.*, July 5, 5–26.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, PAUL. Der Teufels- und Dämonenglaube Jesu. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, IV, 289–330.

WHITELAW, THOM. Could Jesus Err? III. *Expos. Times*, June, 411–13; July, 467–8.

WREDE, W. Über Aufgabe und Methode der neutestamentlichen Theologie. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897. M. 1.80.

ZEHNPFUND, R. Das Gesetz in den paulinischen Briefen. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 384–429.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

CONYBEARE, F. C. Christian Demonology. IV. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, July, 581–603.

DEWART, E. N. The Tübingen School of Criticism. *Hom. Rev.*, Aug., 114–19.

ERMONI, V. Le noyau primitif des évangiles synoptiques. Suite et fin. III., *Rev. bibl.*, 1897, 254–64.

HÜMPEL, E. De errore christologico in epistolis Joannis impugnato eiusque auctore. Quaestio hist.-crit. Diss. Erlangen, 1897; 78 pp.; 8vo.

LOISY, ALFRED. Le prologue du quatrième évangile. 3e art. *Rev. d'hist. et de litt. relig.*, II., 249–67.

MANEN, W. C. Jacobus geen Christen? *Theol. Tijdschr.*, July, 398–428.

MAYOR, J. B. Authenticity of the Epistle of St. James defended against Harnack and Spitta. *Expositor*, July, 3–14.

PRAT, F. L'Évangile et la critique. *Études*, July 5, 55–75.

STAERK, W. Die alttestamentlichen Citate bei den Schriftstellern des Neuen Testamentes. II. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, XL., 1897, 211–67.

STEUDE, E. G. Ueber den Quellenwert der synoptischen Evangelien. II. and III. *Bew. d. Glaub.*, April, 138–64; May, 189–206.

VEIT, K. Die synoptischen Parallelen und ein alter Versuch ihrer Enträtselung mit neuer Begründung. 2 Teile. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897. M. 7.

WALFORD, F. F. The Sign of the Prophet Jonas. *Expositor*, July, 36–48.

WELLS, JAMES. Grace. A New Testament Study. 2. The Idea of Grace. 3. The Doctrine of Grace. *Expos. Times*, July, 456–8; Aug., 512–14.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

BELSER, J. Beiträge zur Erklärung der Apostelgeschichte. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897. M. 3.50.

——— Das Lukas-Evangelium nach den neuesten Forschungen. *Theol. Quartalschr.*, 298–345.

BURY, R. G. St. John 8:25. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 522.

CONYBEARE, F. C. Two Notes on the Text of the Gospels from Old Sources. *Expos. Times*, June, 427–9.
I. The birth in the cave, Matt. 2:9.
II. "Call thou me not good," Mark 10:18.

Great Text Commentary. The Great Texts of St. John's Gospel. St. John 12:24. *Expos. Times*, June, 403–4; John 12:32; 14:2. *Ibid.*, July, 468–70; Aug., 496–9.

HILGENFELD, A. Prolegomena zum Lucas-Evangelium. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 411–32.

——— Altchristliche Prolegomena zu den Evangelien. *Ibid.*, 432–44.

LAKE, K. Notes on *Didache* 1, 2; and Acts 15:20, 29. *Class. Rev.*, April.

LINDER, G. Gesetz der Stoffteilung im Johannes-Evangelium. *Ibid.*, 444–54.

MOFFATT, JAMES. Mark 1:8. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 522–3.

PERDREAU. Les saints évangiles. Mesnil, Firmin-Didot et Cie.; Paris, Lecoffre, 1897; 4 vols. in 18mo.

PITZER, A. W. A Divine Manual for all Christian Workers: the Acts of the Apostles. *Presb. Quart.*, July, 357–64.

RAMSAY, WM. The Census of Quirinius III. *Expositor*, June, 425–35.

RENDALL, FR. The Acts of the Apostles in Greek and English. With notes. London and New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; 8vo. 9s.

ROBERTSON, G. S. On the Interpretation of John 8:25. *Expos. Times*, June, 424–6.

SIEDERSLEBEN, P. Erklärung von Ev. Johannis, 4:43–44. Dessau, P. Baumann; 9 pp., 8vo. M. 0.20.

SÖDERBLOM, NATH. Le sens des commandements de Jésus dans le discours sur la montagne. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, No. 3, 247–64.

SWETE, H. B. St. Mark in the New Testament. *Expositor*, Aug., 81–9.

THOMSON, P. Note on John 1:9. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 527–8.

WARREN, W. St. Matt. 10:28 and St. Luke 12:5. *Ibid.*, June, 450–1.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

BROWN, DAVID. Romans 3:25, 26. *Expositor*, Aug., 158–60.

DALE, R. W. A Voluntary Humility. Col. 2:18. *Expositor*, June, 464–70.

FREUND, GEO. Die Früchte des Geistes. Populäre Abhandlungen über St. Paulus' Galaterbrief. C. 5. vs. 22, 23. Münster, Alphonsus-Buchh., 1897; 266 pp., 8vo. M. 1.70.

GRASS, K. KONRAD. Kurze Auslegung des ersten Johannesbriefes. *Mitth. u. Nachr. f. d. evang. Kirche in Russl.*, Bd. 53.

GREGORY, D. S. The Second and Third Groups of Pauline Epistles. *Hom. Rev.*, July and August.

JACOBUS, M. W. The Recent Controversy in the Harmony of Galatians and Acts. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 506–28.

KEAN, W. Stoicheiolatry. Gal. 4:1–10. *Expos. Times*, Aug., 514–16; also see, *ibid.*, pp. 484–5.

LANGER, PFR. Die Apocalypse oder die Offenbarung des hl. Apostels Johannes in Form e. Paraphrase erläutert. Trier, Paulinus-Druckerei, 1897; 147 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

LOCK, WALTER. 1 Corinthians 8:1–9; a Suggestion. *Expositor*, July, 65–74.

MOULE, H. C. G. The Epistle to the Philippians. (The Cambridge Greek Testament for schools and colleges.) Cambridge, The University Press, 1897. 2s. 6d.

——— Philippian Studies. London, Hodder & Stoughton, 1897. 5s.

WEIDNER, R. F. Annotations on the General Epistles of James, Peter, John and Jude. The Lutheran Commentary. New York, The Christian Literature Co., 1897; 378 pp., 8vo. $1.50.

## EARLY CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

Anecdota Maredsolana seu monumenta ecclesiastica antiquitatis ex MSS. codicibus nunc primum edita aut denuo illustrata. Opera et studia Presbyt. D. Germani Morin, O.S.B. Vol. VII., pars 2. Oxford, J. Parker & Co.; 4to Maredsoli.

III., 2. HIERONYMI, SANCTI, presbyteri tractatus sive homiliæ in Psalmos, in Marci evangelium aliaque vera argumenta. Partem nunc detexit adulteris mercibus exemit, auctori vindicavit, adiectisque commentariis criticis primus ed. M.; viii + 423 pp. 10s.

BACON B. W. Are the "New Sayings of Christ authentic"? *Outlook*, July 31, 785–9.

CLEMEN, C. Nochmals der Märtyrertod des Petrus in der Ascensio Jesaiae. *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.*, 455–65.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, editum consilio et impensis academiae litterarum caesareae Vindobonensae. Vol. XXVII., fasc. ii. Wien u. Prag, F. Tempsky; Leipzig, G. Freytag, 1897; 8vo.

XXVII., 2. Lactanti, L. Caeli Firmiani, opera omnia, accedunt carmina ejus quae feruntur e L. Caecilii, qui inscriptus est de mortibus persecutorum liber vulgo Lactantio tributus. Recensuerunt Sam. Brandt et Georg. Laubmann, indices confecit SAM. BRANDT. xxxvi + 169–568 pp. M. 6.40.

COTTON, JAS. S. Greek Papyri from Egypt. *Biblia*, Sept., 153–9.

DARTIGNE-PEYRON, J. Marc-Aurèle dans ses rapports avec le christianisme. Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 8vo. Fr. 5.

German Scholars on the New *Logia*. *Independent*, Sept., 9, 17 (à propos of the contributions of Harnack, Clemen, Nestle and Blass).

HARNACK, ADF. Über die "Ordinationes" im Papstbuch. [Aus: Sitzungsber. d. k. pr. Akad. d. Wiss.] Berlin, G. Reimer in Komm., 1897; 18 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

——— Die jüngst entdeckten Sprüche Jesu. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 36 pp., 8vo. M. 0.80.

JACQUIER, E. Les Sentences de Jésus récemment découverts. *L'Univ. cathol.*, Aug. 15, 562–72.

KRÜGER'S History of Early Christian Literature. Transl. by the Rev. C. R. GILLETT. New York, the Macmillan Co., 1897; 407 pp., 8vo. $2.

KUNZE, JOH. Ein neues Symbol aus Ägypten und seine Bedeutung für die Geschichte des altkirchlichen Taufbekenntnisses. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 543–68.

LEWIS, AGNES B. Last Gleanings from the Sinai Palimpsest. *Expositor*, Aug., 111–19.

MCGIFFERT, A. C. The New-Found Collection of Logia. *Independent*, Aug. 26, pp. 8–9.

PORTER, H. A Greek Inscription from near Nazareth. Palest. Expl. Fund, *Quart. Stat.*, July, 188–9.

REDPATH, HENRY A. The So-Called Logia, and their Relation to the Canonical Scriptures. *Expositor*, Sept., 224–30.

Sayings of our Lord. Discovered and edited, with Translation and Commentary, by BERNHARD P. GRENFELL, M.A., and ARTHUR S. HUNT, M.A. London and New York, Henry Frowde; 20 pp.; paper. $0.12.

SORTAÈS, G. La plus ancienne représentation du sacrifice eucharistique: Fractio panis. *Études*, June 5, 688–95.

SWETE, H. B. The Oxyrhynchus Fragment. *Expos. Times*, Sept., 544–51.

——— Provisional Restoration of the Sayings of the Lord. *Ibid.*, 568.

Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, hrsg. von O. v. Gebhardt u. Adf. Harnack. Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs' Verlag, 1897; 8vo.

XV., 2. KLETTE, E. THDR. Der Process u. die Acta S. Apollonii. iv + 136 pp. M. 4.50.

XV., 3. BRUCKNER, ALB. Julian v. Eclanum, sein Leben und seine Lehre. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Pelagianismus.—HARNACK, ADF. Ueber den dritten Johannesbrief. iii + viii + 180 + 27 pp. M. 7.

Texte und Untersuchungen. Archiv f. die von der Kirchenväter-Commission der kgl. preuss. Akademie der Wiss. unternommene Ausgabe der ältesten christl. Schriftsteller, hrsg. von O. v. Gebhardt u. Adf. Harnack. Neue Folge, I. Bd. (=XVI. d. ganzen Reihe). Leipzig, J. C. Hinrichs' Verlag, 1897; 8vo.

I., 3. KOSTERMANN, E. Die Ueberlieferung der Jeremiahomilien des Origenes. iii + v + 116 pp. M. 3.50.

I., 4. ACHELIS, HANS. Hippolytstudien. vi + 233 pp. M. 7.50.

THAYER, J. HENRY. The New "Sayings of Christ." *Independent*, Aug. 12, 16; also see *ibid.*, Aug. 19.

## HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

### GENERAL.

BOMPIANI, SOPHIA V. A Short History of the Italian Waldenses, who have inhabited the valleys of the Cottian Alps from ancient times to the present. New York, A. S. Barnes & Co., 1897; viii + 175 pp., 12mo. $1.

GOETZ, LEOP. KARL. Zur Union der romfreien katholischen Kirchen des Abend- u. Morgenlandes. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 247–301.

HARNACK, A. Le Rôle social de l'église à travers les siècles. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, No. 3, 264–78; No. 4, 322–42.

HUCK, CHRYSOST. Dogmenhistorischer Beitrag zur Geschichte der Waldenser. Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1897; vii + 88 pp. M. 2.

MAERE, R. Les récentes controverses sur l'apostolicité des églises de Gaules. *Muséon et Rev. de relig.*, XVI., 372–93.

MIEHAUD, E. Résultats de l'ancien catholicisme. *Int. theol. Zeitschr.*, 506–21.

Rocholl's Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland, kritisch beleuchtet von THEOPHILOS. Hannover, Wolff & Hohorst Nachf.; 51 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

TEHÉRAZ, MINAS. L'Église arménienne, son histoire, ses croyances. *Muséon et Rev. des relig.*, 232–42; 324–30.

### THE EARLY PERIOD.

ALLARD, PAUL. Le Christianisme et l'Empire Romain, de Néron à Théodose. Paris, Lecoffre. Fr. 3.50.

BOURGEOIS, L. EM. Les Martyrs de Rome d'après l'histoire et l'archéologie chrétiennes. Tome I.: Les Martyrs des voies Nomentane et Tiburtine. Paris, Lamulle et Poisson, 1897. Fr. 7.50.

NESTLE, EB. Die Statuten der Schule von Nisibis aus den Jahren 496 und 590. Nach dem von I. Guidi herausgegebenen syrischen Text übersetzt. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 211–29.

*Quartalschrift, römische, für christliche Altertumskunde und für Kirchengeschichte.* 6. u. 7. Suppl.-Heft. Rom; Freiburg i. B., Herder in Komm., 1897; 8vo.

6. WEHOFER, THOM. Die Apologie Justins, des Philosophen und Märtyrers, in literar. Beziehung zum erstenmal untersucht. Eine Vorstudie zur Kirchen- u. Philosophiegeschichte des II. Jahrh. xv + 141 pp. M. 4.
7. WIELAND, FRZ. Die genetische Entwicklung des sogenannten Ordines Minores in den 3 ersten Jahrhunderten. xi + 179 pp. M. 4.

SCHULTZ, FERD. Die altesten Zeugnisse über das Christenthum bei den römischen Schriftstellern. Gymnas. Programm, Charlottenburg, 1897; 32 pp.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

ALDINGER. Die Bischofswahlen in Verdun in den Jahren 1245–1256. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 183–201.

Analecta hymnica medii aevi. Hersg. v. Clem. Blume u. Guido M. Dreves. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland; 8vo.

XXVI. Historiae rhythmicae. Liturgische Reimofficien des Mittelalters. 6. Folge. Aus Handschriften und Wiegendrucken, hersg. v. GUIDO M. DREVES, S. J. 292 pp. M. 9.

CHRZASZCZ, JOH. Der hl. Adalbert, Bischof und Märtyrer. Breslau, G. P. Aderholz, 1897; 47 pp., 8vo. M. 0.60.

Corpus scriptorum historiae Byzantinae. Editio emendatior et copiosior, consilio B. G. Niebuhrii, C. F., instituta, auctoritate academiae litterarum regiae borussicae continuata.

Vol. L. Ioannis Zonarae epitomae historiarum libri xviii. Ex recensione Maur. Pinderi. Tom. III., libri xiii + xviii, ed. THDR. BÜTTNER-WOBST. Bonn, E. Weber, 1897; xxi + 933 pp. M. 24.

DOIZÉ, J. Bulletin d'histoire ecclésiastique du moyen âge. *Études*, July 5, 117–35.

DOMEIER, VICT. Die Päbste als Richter über d. deutschen Könige von der Mitte des 11. bis zum Ausgang des 13. Jahrh. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des päbstlichen Einflusses in Deutschland. Breslau, W. Koebner; iv + 115 pp. M. 3.60.

= Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- u. Rechtsgeschichte, hrsg. von Prof. Dr. OTTO GIERKE. 53. Heft.

FREDERICQ, P. De secten der Geeselaars en der Dansers in de Nederlanden tijdens de 14de eeuw. 1897; 62 pp. and 1 table, 4to. Reprint.

FREYSTEDT, ALBERT. Studien zu Gottschalks Leben und Lehre. II. Die Zeit der Propaganda. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 161–82.

MM. Die Geissler in den Niederlanden im Jahre 1349. *Beilage zur Allgem. Zeitung*, München, 1897, No. 152.

MAILHET, CL. Les Fêtes religieuses du moyen âge. *Rev. chrét.*, June, 425–39.

MEYER VON KNONAU, G. Zur Beurteilung des historischen Wertes der Streitschriften aus der Zeit des Investiturstreites. *Theol. Zeitschr. aus d. Schweiz* 1897, 129–39.

NERVO, DE. Isabella the Catholic, Queen of Spain, her life, reign, and times, 1451–1504; from the French by Temple West. New York, imported by C Scribner's Sons, 1897; 348 pp., 8vo. $5.

Repertorium Germanicum. Regesten aus den päpstl. Archiven zur Geschichte des deutschen Reiches u. seiner Territorien im XIV. u. XV. Jahrh. durch das k. preuss. histor. Institut in Rom. Pontificat Eugens IV., 1431–47. Bd. I. Unter Mitwirkung v. Johs. Haller, Jos Kaufmann u. Jean Lulvès, bearb. von ROBERT ARNOLD. Berlin, A. Bath; lxxix + 677 pp., 8vo. M. 26.

*Studien, Historische.* Veröffentlicht von DR. E. EBERING. v.–ix. Heft. Berlin, E. Ebering; 8vo.

V. SCHIFF, OTTO. Studien zur Geschichte Papst Nikolaus' IV. v + 84 pp. M. 2.40.
VI. KARST, AUG. Geschichte Manfred's vom Tode Friedrichs II. bis zu seiner Krönung (1250–58). xiv + 184 pp. M. 4.
VII. RÖSSLER, OSK. Kaiserin Mathilde, Mutter Heinrichs von Anjou, u. das Zeitalter der Anarchie in England. xiii + 443 pp. M. 8.
VIII. SCHEFFER-BOICHORST, PAUL. Zur Gesch. des 12. u. 13. Jahrhdts. Diplomatische Forschungen. xi + 419 pp. M. 10.
IX. WINKLER FRDR. Castruccio Castracani, Herzog von Lucca. 140 pp. M. 3.60

VAN DYKE, PAUL. The Age of the Renascence; an outline sketch of the history of the papacy from the return from Avignon to the sack of Rome (1377–1527). With an introduction by Henry van Dyke. New York, The Christian Lit. Co.; xxii + 397 pp., 12mo.

= Vol. VII. of Ten Epochs of Church History, edited by John Fulton, D.D., LL.D.

WEISS, ANT. Aeneas Sylvius Piccolomini als Papst Pius II., sein Leben u. Einfluss auf die literarische Cultur Deutschlands. Rectoratsrede. Mit 149 bisher ungedruckten Briefen aus dem Autogr.-Codex No. 3389 der k. k. Wiener Hof-Bibliothek, sowie ein Anhang. Graz, U. Moser; iv + 297 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

ALBRECHT, O. Studien zu Luthers Schrift "An die Ratsherren aller Städte deutschen Lands, dass sie christliche Schulen aufrichten und halten sollen. 1524." *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 687–777.

——— Eine handschriftliche Notiz Melanchthons aus dem Jahre 1559. *Ibid.*, 797–801.

BERGER, SAMUEL. Melanchthons Vorlesungen über Weltgeschichte. *Ibid.*, 781–90.

BRATKE, P. Ein humanistischer Scherz von Melanchthon. *Ibid.*, 812–14.

CARO, J. Anekdotisches zu Melanchthon. *Ibid.*, 801–11.

CLEMEN, OTTO. Miscellen zur Reformationsgeschichte. *Ibid.*, 815–23.

CONRAD, GUST. Die Reformationsordnung für die Gemeinden Hessens von 1526 nach Inhalt u. Quellen. Diss. Halle, 1897; 61 pp.

DEWITT, JOHN, Philip Melanchthon: Scholar and Reformer. *Presb. Quart.*, July, 273–95.

DRÄSEKE, JOH. Gennadios Scholarios. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 652–71.

EHWALD, B. Philippus Melanchthon als Gelehrter, Lehrer, Schulmann und Genosse Luthers. Rede. Gotha, F. A. Perthes, 1897; 22 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

FRIEDENSBURG, W. Beiträge zum Briefwechsel der katholischen Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter. Aus italienischen Archiven und Bibliotheken (Fortsetzung). *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 233–97.

KAWERAN, G. Melanchthon neben Luther. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 668–86.

KNAAKE, K. Melanchthons Dictionarium. *Ibid.*, 791–7.

KÖSTLIN, JULIUS. Luthers Grabstätte in Wittenberg. *Ibid.*, 824–6.

LADEUZE, P. La Conversion de Luther *Muséon et Rev. de relig.*, 278–81.

LOOFS, FR. Melanchthon als Humanist und Reformator. *Stud. u. Krit.*, 1897, 641–67.

PORTER, D. G. Arminius and the Dutch Calvinists. *Christ. Quart.*, July, 351–76.

RUMP, JOH. Melanchthons Psychologie (seine Schrift *De anima*) in ihrer Abhängigkeit von Aristoteles u. Galenos dargestellt. Kiel, E. Marquardsen 1897; viii + 188 pp., 8vo. M. 3.50.

*Studien, Leipziger*, aus dem Gebiet der Geschichte. Hrsg. v. G. Buchholz, K. Lamprecht, E. Marks, G. Seeliger Bd. 4, Heft. 2. Leipzig, Duncker & Humblot, 1897; 8vo.

OPPERMANN, OTTO. Das sächsische Amt Wittenberg im Anfang des 16. Jahrh., dargestellt auf Grund eines Buches vom Jahre 1513. vii + 120 pp. M. 2.80.

SZLÁVIK, MATHIAS. Zur Geschichte des Anabaptismus in Ungarn. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII., 202–10.

WALTHER. Brief Leonhard Käsers und Martin Luthers. *Ibid.*, XVIII., 230–2.

WILKENS, C. A. Spanish Protestants in the Sixteenth Century; compiled from the German of C. A. Wilkens by Rachel Challice, with introduction by Lord Plunkett. New York, imported by C. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 192 pp., 12mo. $1.50.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

BEAUNE, HENRI. Les Mémoires de M. de Séguret, secrétaire de la cassette et premier commis des petits appartements de Louis XVI. *L'Univ. cath.*, Nos. 6 and 7, 180–98, 345–65.

BRUCHMÜLLER, W. Die Folgen der Reformation u. des 30-jährigen Krieges für die ländliche Verfassung u. die Lage des Bauernstandes im östl. Deutschland, besonders in Brandenburg und Pommern. Crossen a. O., R. Zeidler; iv + 37 pp. M. 1.

BÜTTGENBACH, FRZ. Armand-Jean de Rancé, Reformator der Cistercienser von la Trappe und erster Abt der Trappisten. Aachen, J. Schweitzer in Komm., 1897; 118 pp., mit 2 Ansichten u. Bildniss, 8vo. M. 2.

DRYERRE, J. M. Heroes and Heroines of the Scottish Covenanters. New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1897; 160 pp., 12mo. $0.75.

Geschichtsblätter des deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins. VI. Zehnt, 8. Heft. Magdeburg, Heinrichshofen's Sort.,8vo.

8. DENKINGER, HENRI: Die französisch-reformirte Colonie zu Friedrichsdorf. 22 pp. Mit einer Ansicht. M. 0.50.

GRABINSKI, JOSEPH. Les Prêtres romains et le premier empire (suite et fin). *L'Univ. cath.*, No. 7, 366–409.

HOFFMANN, FRZ. Caspar Schwenckfeld's Leben und Lehren. Progr., 1. Tl. Berlin, R. Gaertner, 1897; 29 pp., 4to. M. 1.

LEHR, H. Les Soldats huguenots dans les armées de Louis XV. *Rev. chrét.*, June, 412–24.

MEHLER, T. B. Der sel. Petrus Canisius, ein Apostel Deutschlands. Zum 300-jährigen Gedächtnisse seines Todes nach den besten Quellen bearbeitet. Berlin, Germania, 1897; 120 pp., 16mo. M. 0.20.

= 116 u. 117 of Katholische Flugschriften, zur Wehr u. Lehr.

NAZELLE, L. J. Isaac Casaubon. Sa vie et son temps (1559–1614). Paris, Fischbacher, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 3.50.

PALMIÉ, FREDR. Der Pietismus u. A. H. Francke. Gütersloh, C. Bertelsmann, 1897; 48 pp. M. 0.60.

Handreichung zur Vertiefung christlicher Erkenntnis, hrsg. v. Jul. Möller u. W. Zöllner.

PAPE, PAUL. Bibliographie der kirchengeschichtlichen Litteratur. Vom 1. October 1895 bis 1. Januar 1897. 2. Hälfte. Neuzeit. *Zeitschr. f. Kirchengesch.*, XVIII.

SABATIER, A. Port-Royal et le protestantisme. *Rev. chrét.*, Aug., 81–95.

SCHLEICHL, FRZ. Glaubensflüchtige aus Deutschland seit dem Jahre 1500 und die Duldung im 16. Jahrhdt. Zwei culturgesch. Aufsätze. Linz, E. Mareis; 34 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

TACHELLA, E. Les Anciens Pauliciens et les modernes Bulgares catholiques de la Philippopolitaine. *Muséon et Rev. des relig.*, 209–23.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

ABBOTT, H. V. The Master of Balliol. *Outlook*, Aug. 7, 840–5.

CHADWICK, J. W. Benjamin Jowett. *New World*, Sept., 401–20.

COMBE, ERNEST. Alexandre Vinet interprète du Nouveau Testament. *Rev. de théol et de philos.*, No. 3, 201–40.

Festschrift zur 300-jährigen Jubelfeier der niederländischen-reformirten Gemeinde zu Hanau. Von ARTH. WESSEL. Hanau, G. M. Alberti, 1897; 51 pp., 4to. M. 3.

FLEISSER, FR. Staat u. Bishofswahl im. Bist. Basel. Geschichte des diplomat. Verhandlungen mit der romischen Kurie im 19. Jahrh. u. Darstellung des geltenden Rechtes. Leipzig, H. Hessel, 1897; x + 288 pp., 8vo. M. 12.

FOSTER, FRANK H. Albrecht Ritschl *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 369–86.

NESSLER, CARL. Festschrift zur 300 jährigen Jubelfeier der wallonischen Gemeinde zu Hanau. Im Auftrage des grossen Consistoriums verf. Mit 25 Lichtdr.-Tafeln, 2 Autotypien und 2 Zinkätzungen. Hanau, G. M. Alberts, 1897; viii + 123 pp., 4to. M. 8.

SALMOND, S. D. F. Professor A. B. Davidson, D.D., LL.D. *Expos. Times*, July, 441–5; Sept., 536–42.

SCHAFF, DAVID L. The Life of Philip Schaff. New York, Chas. Scribner's Sons, 1897; 8vo.

SCHROEDER, CHARLES. En souvenir d'Alexandre de Vinet. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, No. 3, 241–6.

SIMMONS, H. M. Henry Drummond and his Books. *New World*, Sept., 485–99.

## SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

KIRKUS, W. The Terminology of the New Theology. *New World*, Sept., 432–50.

KREYHER, JOH. Über Inspiration als Thatsache des Seelenlebens. *Bew. des Glaub.*, July, 269–88.

LACHERET, E. De la nature de la révélation. *Rev. chrét.*, July, 19–36; Aug.,

LEJEUNE. Manuel de théologie mystique. Paris, Poussielgue, 1897; 12mo. Fr. 2.50.

PLATZHOFF, E. L'Église et la théologie. *Rev. de théol. et de philos.*, No. 4, 342–60.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

BOUDINHON, A. Sur l'histoire de la pénitence à propos d'un ouvrage récent (H. C. Lea, A History of Auricular Confession, etc.). *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, July-Aug., 306-45.

BRUCE, D. Une récente controverse entre théologiens allemands sur l'origine de la Sainte-Cène. *Rev. de l'hist. relig.*, XXXV., 205-15.

ECKE, GUST. Die theologische Schule Albrecht Ritschl's und die evangelische Kirche der Gegenwart. In 2 Bänden. 1. Band: Die theologische Schule Albrecht Ritschl's. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard, 1897; xii + 318 pp. M. 5.

GOTTSCHICK, J. *Propter Christum.* Ein Beitrag zur Versöhnungslehre Luther's. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, IV., 352-84.

KOCH, A. Irrgänge u. Wahrheitsmomente der Theologie Ritschl's. Vortrag. Oldenburg, Eschen & Fasting, 1897; 62 pp., 8vo. M. 0.75.

KÖSTLIN, JULIUS. The Theology of Luther in its Historical Development and Inner Harmony. Translated from the second German edition by Rev. Charles E. Hay, A.M. 2 vols. Philadelphia, The Lutheran Publication Society, 1897. $4.50.

SCHEIBE, MAX. Calvin's Prädestinationslehre. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung der Eigenart seiner Theologie und Religiösität. Diss. Halle a. d. Saale, 1897; 85 pp.

STANGE, CARL. Zur Theologie des Musaeus. 1. Heft. Halle, M. Niemeyer, 1897; 49 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

UNDRITZ, O. Die Entwickelung des Schriftprincips bei Luther in den Anfangsjahren der Reformation. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 568-91; 593-620.

VOLLERT, WILH. Die Lehre Gregors von Nyssa vom Guten und Bösen und von der schliesslichen Überwindung des Bösen. Leipzig, A. Deichert Nachf., 1897; iv + 158 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

APOLOGETICS.

BACHELET, X.-M. LE. De l'apologétique "traditionelle" et de l'apologétique "moderne." *Études*, July 20, 145-75; Aug. 5, 369-86; 20, 457-79.

BECKER, FRZ. Lehrbuch der katholischen Religion f. höhere Schulen. Freiburg i. B., Herder; vii + 55 pp., 8vo. M. 0.70.

DOGMATICS.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. The Trinity of the Spirit. *Outlook*, July 3, 535-8.

——— The Basis of Belief. *Ibid.*, Sept., 4, 77-80.

CARROLL, B. H. The Bible Doctrine of Repentance. Lectures delivered before the Bible School of Baylor University; with an introduction by T. T. Eaton, D.D. Louisville, Ky., Baptist Book Concern, 1897; 132 pp., 8vo. $0.25.

CLEMEN, CARL. Die christl. Lehre von der Sünde. Eine Untersuchung zur systemat. Theologie. I. Tl.: Die bibl. Lehre. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; vi + 272 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

HÄRING, TH. Gehort die Auferstehung zum Glaubensgrund? *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, IV., 331-51.
Amica exegesis zu Professor D. M. Reischle's "Der Streit über die Begründung des Glaubens auf den geschichtlichen Jesus Christus," *ibid.*, 1897, No. 3, 171 ff.

MACNEIL, J. E. "Even so, Come," or, the Second Coming of Our Lord. New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1897; 80 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $0.50.

SULZBERGER, CYRUS L. The Unity of God. *Jew. Quart. Rev.*, July, 723.

TOURNEBIZE, F. Le Dogme de l'expiation. *Études*, June 20, 743-56.

ZÖCKLER, O. Zur Würdigung des römischen Mirakelglaubens unserer Zeit. *Bew. des Glaub.*, July, 257-69.

ETHICS.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. The Test of Character. *Outlook*, Aug. 14, 939-43.

BELL, F. W. B. VAN. Zedekunde, III. and IV. *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 349-98; 465-518.

BOVON, JULES. Morale chrétienne. Tome I. Lausanne et Paris, Fischbacher; 8vo. Fr. 8.
Étude sur l'œuvre de la Rédemption. III.: Les Conséquences pratiques.

Ethik, eine neue, von IGNORAMUS. Berlin, Mayer & Müller; 22 pp. M. 0.60.

HOFFMANN, A. Ethik. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; iv + 120 pp. M. 2.50; bd., M. 3.50.

KRARUP, F. C. Grundriss der christlichen Ethik. Autorisierte Uebertragung aus dem Dänischen von M. phil. Carl Küchler. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; viii + 226 pp. M. 3; bd., M. 4.

MAUSBACH, JOS. Christentum und Weltmoral. Zwei Vorträge über das Verhältnis der christl. Moral zur antiken Ethik und zur weltl. Cultur. Münster, Aschendorff, 1897; 61 pp., 8vo. M. 1.

SCHILLER, F. C. S. The Ethical Significance of the Idea of Immortality. *New World*, Sept., 420–32.

SCHULTZ, HERM. Grundriss der evangelischen Ethik. Zum Gebrauche bei akadem. Vorlesungen. 2. Aufl. Göttingen, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht; iv + 140 pp., 8vo. M. 2.40; bd., M. 3.

VALENTINE, M. Theoretical Ethics. Chicago, Scott, Foresman & Co., 1897; 232 pp., 16mo. Cloth, $1.25.

X. J. H. Fichte's Systeem der Ethik, fragmentarisch voorgesteld in brieven aan Dr. A. J. Th. Jonker. III. *Theol. Studiën*, 1897, 255–82.

## PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS.

### GENERAL.

BALLARD, ADDISON. Christianity, a Return to Judaism. *Independent*, Sept. 16, 3–4.

BREWER, D. J. The Pew to the Pulpit: Suggestions to the ministry from the viewpoint of the layman. New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1897; 76 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $0.25.

CANABAZÈS, H. DE. Les Voyantes et le clergé. Paris, Chamuel. Fr. 0.50.

ESCOTT, T. H. S. Phases, Forces, and Pitfalls, Social and Personal, of the National Faith. *New Cent. Rev.*, Sept., 243–52.

HARDELAND, AUG. Geschichte der speciellen Seelsorge in der vorreformatorischen Kirche u. der Kirche der Reformatoren. 1. Hälfte. Berlin, Reuther & Reichard; vii + 234 pp. M. 5.

KIRCHBERG, C. De voti natura, obligatione, honestate commentatio theologica. Münster, Aschendorff, 1897; 222 pp., 8vo. M. 3.60.

LEMME, FR. Wegweiser in den evangelischen Gottesdienst. Ein Handbuch für Lehrer u. Geistliche. Mit 12 Abbildgn. 3 Tle. Breslau, F. Hirt; 8vo., in one vol. M. 1.25; bd., M. 1.75.

1. Kurze Geschichte des christlichen (evangelischen) Gottesdienstes. 64 pp., with 12 fig. M. 0.60.
2. Evangelische Gottesdienstkunde oder zusammenhängende Darstellung des gottesdienstlichen Lebens der evangelischen Kirche. 48 pp. M. 0.50.
3. Schulgemässe Behandlung des gottesdienstlichen Lebens der evangelischen Kirche. Leitfaden f. den Schul- u. Konfirmationsunterricht. 31 pp. M. 0.30.

SCHRENK, E. Wie soll ich zum hl. Abendmahl gehen? Wie steht es mit deinem Beten? Kassel, E. Röttger, 1897; 14 pp., 8vo. M. 0.15.

WITTE, LEOP. Aus Kirche und Kunst. Leipzig, Buchh. des evang. Bundes von C. Braun, 1897; viii + 470 pp., 8vo. M. 6.

### HOMILETICS AND CATECHETICS.

BASSERMANN, H. Der Katechismus für die evangelisch-protestantische Kirche im Grossherzogtum Baden. 3 Hefte. Freiburg i. B., J. C. B. Mohr, 1897. M. 3.

CASPARI. Die katechetische Behandlung einiger Hauptpunkte des zweiten Artikels durch die Anhänger der neueren Theologie. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 435–54.

ERNST, AUG., U. ADAM, JOH. Katechetische Geschichte des Elsasses bis zur Revolution. Strassburg, F. Bull, 1897; xi + 351 pp., 8vo. M. 5.

HÄCKER, WALT. Zum biblischen Religionsunterricht des Pfarrers in der Volksschule. Stuttgart, W. Kohlhammer, 1897; iii + 72 pp., 8vo. M. 0.40.

HEMMER, H. Manning et Newman et la question de l'éducation des catholiques à Oxford. *Rev. d'hist. et de lit. relig.*, July–Aug., 345–80.

SATTIG, FRITZ. Zur Behandlung des Alten Testaments auf der Mittelstufe des Gymnasiums. Gymnas.-Programm, Bunzlau, 1897; 29 pp.

SCOTT, J. Larger Catechism of the Doctrines, History, and Polity of the Methodist Protestant Church. Pittsburg, Pa., Methodist Protest. Board of Pub., 1897; 287 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.25.

### CHURCH POLITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

BRAUN, C. *Distinguo.* Mängel u. Übelstände im heutigen Katholizismus nach Professor Dr. Schell in Würzburg und dessen Vorschläge zu ihrer Heilung. Ein Wort zur Verständigung. Mainz, F. Kirchheim; 88 pp., 8vo. M. 1.20.

CHADWICK, W. E. Notes from Dr. Hort's "The Christian Ecclesia." *Expos. Times*, July, 470–2.

CHAVANNES, C. G. Qu'est-ce qu'une église? Paris, Fischbacher, 1897.

*Christ* oder *Antichrist*. Bd. III.: Wittenberg und Rom. Berlin, Germania, 1897; 8vo.
III. Der Protestantismus der Gegenwart; geschildert von einem Protestanten (Prof. Dr. Krogh-Tonning). Aus dem Norwegischen von P. P. 80 pp. M. 1.

DELFOUR, L'Abbé. Catholicisme et progrès. *L'Univ. cathol.*, Aug. 15, 519–42.

FALLOT, T. Qu'est-ce qu'une église? Un chapitre de christianisme pratique. 2e édition. Paris, Fischbacher; 12mo. Fr. 1.

FORSYTH, P. T. The Charter of the Church. Lectures on the Spiritual Principle of Nonconformity. London, Alexander & Shepheard, 21 & 22 Furneval Street, E.C.; 8vo. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

HODGE, J. ASPINWALL. The Ruling Elder at Work. New York, A. D. F. Randolph Co., 1897; vii + 216 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $0.75.

KING, H. MELVILLE. The Baptism of Roger Williams: a review of the Rev. Dr. W. H. Whitsitt's inference; with introduction by Jesse B. Thomas, D.D. Providence, R. I., Preston & Rounds Co., 1897; xii + 145 pp., 12mo. $1 *net*.

MALTZEW, ALEXIOS v. Ritus der Vereinigung mit der orthodoxen Kirche. Deutsch u. Slawisch. Berlin, K. Siegismund, 1897; 97 pp., 8vo. M. 1.50.

MIRBT, CARL. Die Religionsfreiheit in Preussen unter den Hohenzollern. Rede. Marburg, N. G. Elwert's Verlag; 21 pp., 8vo. M. 0.50.

REED, R. C. Pope Leo XIII. on the Validity of Anglican Orders. *Presb. Quart.*, July, 308–24.

ROSS, E. A. The Educational Function of the Church. *Outlook*, Aug. 28, 1036–40.

SINCLAIR, B. D. The Crowning Sin of the Age. The Perversion of Marriage. Boston, H. L. Hastings, 1897; 94 pp. Paper, $0.25.

SPECTATOR. Kirchenpolitische Briefe. XXI., XXII., XXIII., XXIV., XXV. Beilage zur *Allgem. Zeitg.*, München, 1897, Nos. 48, 73, 97, 122, 143.

TOURNEBIZE, F. La Réponse des archevêques anglicans à la lettre de Léon XIII. sur les ordinations anglicanes. *Études*, Aug. 5, 304–19; Aug. 20, 487–511.

### LITURGIES AND HYMNOLOGY.

Beiträge, hymnologische. Quellen u. Forschungen zur Geschichte der latein. Hymnendichtung. Im Anschluss an ihre Analecta, hersg. v. CLEM. BLUME u. GUIDO M. DREVES. Bd. I. Leipzig, O. R. Reisland; 8vo.
1. GODESCALCUS LINTPURGENSIS. Gottschalk, Mönch v. Limburg an der Hardt und Probst von Aachen, ein Prosator des XI. Jahrhdts. Fünf ungedruckte Opuscula, m. hist. Einleitung u. e. Anhang v. Sequenzen; hrsg. v. G. M. DREVES. 219 pp. M. 7.

BENSON, L. F. The Liturgical Position of the Presbyterian Church in the United States of America. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 418–44.

HORDER, W. G. The Theology of Our Hymns. *Outlook*, Sept. 11, 119–21.

MAY, J. Die Behandlung des Kirchenliedes im kathol. Religionsunterricht. Gymnas.-Programm, Bentheim, 1897; 22 pp.

### SERMONIC LITERATURE.

KELBER, KARL. Ein Kirchenjahr in Katechismuspredigten. München, Ackermann; viii + 337 pp., 8vo. M. 3.20.

KENNARD, J. SPENCER. The Personal Factor in Preaching. *Hom. Rev.*, Aug., 110–14.

MACGREGOR, G. H. C. A Holy Life and how to Live it. New York and Chicago, Fleming H. Revell Co., 1897; 124 pp., 16mo. Cloth, $0.50.

RADE, M. Zu Christus hin. Religiöse Geleitworte. Freiburg i. B. u. Leipzig, J. C. B. Mohr, 1897; 8vo. M. 2.

RICKER, G. S. Patchwork Preaching. *Outlook*, Sept. 4, 37–9.

SAMPLE, R. F. Efficient Preaching. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 279–96.

SAVAGE, M. J. Religion for To-Day. Boston, G. H. Ellis, 1897; v + 250 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.

TRUXAL, A. E. Sermonizing. *Ref. Church Rev.*, March, 201–7.

### MISSIONS.

DENNIS, JA. SHEPARD. Christian Missions and Social Progress: A sociological study of foreign missions. In 2 vols. New York and Chicago, Flemming H. Revell Co. Vol. I., x + 467 pp., 8vo. Cloth, $2.50.

DREW, P. Die Anschauungen reformatorischer Theologen über die Heidenmission. *Zeitschr. f. prakt. Theol.*, 3, 193–213.

EAGLETON, D. F. W. L. Marshall: a missionary pioneer of the Southwest. *Presb. Quart.*, July, 365–75.

FABER, ERNST. Dr. Martins Charakteristik der chinesischen Zustände. *Zeitschr. f. Miss. u. Relig.-Wiss.*, 1897, 129–42.

Für Feste und Freunde der Inneren Mission. 1.–5. Heft (each 16 pp. with illustrations). Berlin, Buchhandlung des Ostdeutschen Jünglingsbundes. Each M. 0.30.

1. HENNIG, MART. Johann Heinrich Wichern, der Herold der Innern Mission.— 2. PETRAN, ERNST. Theodor Fliedner, der Diakonissenvater.— 3. OSTERTAG. Die Anstalten des Pastors D. v. Bodelschwingh.— 4. BOIT. Aug. Hermann Franke, ein Vater der Waisen.— 5. MÜLLER, KARL. Elisabeth Fry, der Engel der Gefangenen.

GENÄHR. Aus dem religiösen Leben des Chinesen. *Evang. Missionen*, May.

GRÜNBERG, PAUL. Die Evangelisationsvorträge des Predigers Elias Schrenk. *Zeitschr. f. Theol. u. Kirche*, VII., 265–88.

HALLER, J. Das Leben im Basler Missionshaus. Basel, Missionsbuchh.; 44 pp. and 2 illustrations. M. 0.15.

HEWES, F. W. The Measure of Missionary Spirit. *Outlook*, July 3, 586–93.

MARTIN, CHALMERS. Apostolic and Modern Missions. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 228–50.

MARTIN, CHALMERS. Apostolic and Modern Missions. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, July, 464–89.

MONOD, WILFRED. Les Nouveaux actes des apôtres, ou les merveilles des missions modernes. *Rev chrét.*, May, 334–42.

A review mainly of Arthur Pierson's book.

MONTGOMERY, H. H. The Sight of Melanesia. A record of thirty-five years' mission work in the South Seas. London, S. P. C. L., 1897.

MEYER, F. Deaconesses and Their Calling. From 2d German ed. by Emma A. Endlich. Milwaukee, Wis., G. Brumder; 58 pp., 12mo. $0.35.

MUNZINGER, K. Das Geistesleben des Japaners und die christliche Mission. *Zeitschr. f. Missionsk.*, etc., XII., 65–79.

MUTCH, W. J. Adaptation in Missionary Methods. *New World*, June, 324–31.

SCHÄFER, THDR. Die innere Mission auf der Kanzel. Ein homilet. Hilfsbuch. München, C. H. Beck, 1897; viii + 385 pp., 8vo. M. 5; bd., M. 6.

TSCHACKERT, PAUL. Die Mission, Vereinssache oder Aufgabe der Kirche. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, 521–42.

### SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIALISM.

B., F. A. La Femme et sa vocation. *Rev. chrét.*, March, 188–212.

BEMIS, E. W. Sociological Notes. *Bib. Sac.*, July, 580–5.

BENZR, G. Die christliche Bruderliebe. Ein Vortrag. Basel, Jaeger & Kober, 1897; 23 pp. M. 0.25.

BRAASCH, HEINR. Martin Luthers Stellung zum Sozialismus. vii + 180 pp. M. 3.

Beiträge zum Kampf um die Weltanschauung. 2. u. 3. Heft. Braunschweig, C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1897; 8vo.

HENDERSON, C. R. The Social Spirit in America. (Chautauqua Reading Circle Literature.) Meadville, Pa., Flood & Vincent, 1897; iii + 350 pp., 12mo. $1.

SCHILLER, JUL. Christenthum und Socialismus. Beilage zur *Allgem. Zeitung*, München, 1897, No. 105.

### SOCIOLOGY: PROBLEMS.

BODE, W. Die ländliche Spar- u. Darlehnskasse als Stück der inneren Mission. Hannover, Wolff & Hohirst Nachf.; 13 pp. M. 0.25.

BRENTANO, LUJO. Die Stellung der Studenten zu den sozial-politischen Aufgaben der Zeit. Vortrag. München, C. H. Beck. M. 0.40.

CALDWELL, W. The Housing Question and Social Reform. *Bib Sac.*, April, 366–73.

COMBS, GEO. H. The Socialism of George Eliot. *Christ. Quart.*, April, 209–23.

COULON, H. Jésus et la femme (étude). Annecy, Abry; Paris, Ollendorff, 1896; 82 pp., 16mo.

EHRMANN, K. M. Wie war's? und was wird werden? Ein Glaubensbekenntniss, nebst einigen sozialpolitischen u. staatsrechtl. Forderungen. 2. Aufl. Regensburg, W. Wunderling, 1897; 134 pp., 8vo. M. 1.60.

ELY, DEAN OF. A Creed for Christian Socialists. London, William Reeves, 1897; 8vo. 2s.

FERGUSON, F. L. Some Decadent Tendencies in City Life. *Presb. Quart.*, April, 201–17.

FISHER, D. W. Socialism in Italy. *Presb. and Ref. Rev.*, April, 198–209.

HOLBROOK, Z. S. Christianity and Social Problems. *Bib. Sac.*, April, 348–65.

NASH, HENRY S. Genesis of the Social Conscience. The establishment of Christianity in Europe in relation to the social question. New York, The Macmillan Co., 1897; viii + 309 pp., 12mo. Cloth, $1.50.

SEEBERG, R. Die Kirche und die soziale Frage. Leipzig, A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. (G. Böhme), 1897. M. 0.75.

STOECKER. Gesammelte Schriften. Christlich-sozial (Reden u. Aufsätze, 2. Aufl.), u. Wach auf, evangelisches Volk! Neue bill. Lfgs.-Ausg. 15–24. (Schluss-)Lfg. Berlin, Buchh. der Berliner Stadtmission, 1897; pp. 195–624, 8vo. à M. 0.30.

STUBBS, CHARLES. A Creed for Christian Socialists, with expositions. London, W. Reives; 114 pp., 8vo. 2s.

WACH. De honding van den Evangeliedienaar tegenover de politieke en christelijk-sociale beweging in onzen tijd. *Stemmen uit de Luth. Kerk in Nederland*, III., 2.

WOHLENBERG, G. Jesus Sirach und die soziale Frage. *Neue kirchl. Zeitschr.*, VIII., 329–48.

# INDEX.

## I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS.


ABBOTT, LYMAN, The Need of a New Theology - - - - - 460–464
Agnosticism, Theological - - - - - - - - - - - 1
Agrapha, The So-called - - - - - - - - - - - 758
*Alexandria and the New Testament*, James Stevenson Riggs - - - 927–949
Amos 1 : 3–2 : 5, Suggestions concerning the Original Text and Structure of 141
ANDERSON, GALUSHA, Review of: Mortimer, The Seven Last Words of Our Most Holy Redeemer - - - - - - - - - - 529
Noble, The Divine Life in Man and Other Sermons - - - - 532
Mason, Principles of Ecclesiastical Union, and Shields and others, Lectures on Church Unity - - - - - - - - - - 840
Noble, Discourses on the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians - - - 844
Gibbons, Cardinal, The Ambassador of Christ - - - - - 1096
Christian Worship - - - - - - - - - - - 1097
Sawin, The Transfiguring of the Cross - - - - - - - - 1099
Synopsis of Briggs, The One Flock of Christ - - - - - - - 267
*Apologetics in the Eighteenth Century*, A. M. Fairbairn - - - - - 298–311
ARNOLT, W. MUSS-, Bibliography - 271–288; 555–576; 858–882; 1130–1150
Review of: Wendland, Die Therapeuten und die Philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben - - - - - - - - - - - 1105
Nestle, Philologica Sacra - - - - - - - - - - - 1107
Merkle, Die Ambrosianischen Tituli - - - - - - - - - 1111
Authorship of Old Testament Documents, Style as an Element in Determining the - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 312
BARROWS, JOHN HENRY, Is Christianity Fitted to Become the World-Religion? 404–423
*Bernhard Weiss and the New Testament*, Caspar René Gregory - - - - 16–37
*Bibliography*, W. Muss-Arnolt - - 271–288, 555–576, 858–882, 1130–1150
BLACKBURN, F. A., Review of Gurteen, Epic of the Fall of Man - - - 186
Book Reviews. See Index II*A*, Recent Theological Literature.
BRADLEY, CH. F., Review of Dale, Epistle of James and Other Discourses - 811
Synopsis of Abbott, The Raising of the Dead in the Synoptic Gospels - 248
BRIGGS, CHARLES A., The Scope of Theology and its Place in the University - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 38–70
BROWN, CHARLES RUFUS, Review of Karl Marti, Kurzgefasste Grammatik der biblisch-aramäischen Sprache - - - - - - - - - 803
BRUCE, ALEXANDER BALMAIN, Theological Agnosticism - - - - - 1–15
Review of Dunlop's Religious Certainty - - - - - - - - 165
BUCKLEY, EDMUND, Review of Martin, A Cycle of Cathay - - - - 474
BUHL, FRANTS, Some Observations on the Social Institutions of the Israelites - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 728–740
BURNHAM, S., Review of Volck, Heilige Schrift und Kritik - - - 1007
BURRAGE, H. L., Synopsis of Warfield's Archæology of the Mode of Baptism - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 256

BURTON, ERNEST D., Review of: Moulton and Geden, Concordance to the Greek Testament - - - - - - - - - - - - 103
Krüger, Entstehung des Neuen Testamentes - - - - - - 110
du Buisson, Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 110
Cave, an Introduction to Theology - - - - - - - - - 111
Calvin and Servetus - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 45
Canon of Scripture, Suggestions for a Preface to the History of - - - 7
Chinese, Speculative Philosophy of the - - - - - - - - - 28
Christianity Fitted to Become the World-Religion? - - - - - - 40
Colossians, The Epistle to the - - - - - - - - - - - 37
*Conception of the Future Life in Homer*, Arthur Fairbanks - - - - 741–75
CONE, ORELLO, Review of: Sabatier, L'Apôtre Paul - - - - - - 49
Holtzmann's Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie - - - 103
Heinrici-Meyer, Der erste Brief an die Corinther - - - - - 104
CONYBEARE, FRED. C., Protevangelium Iacobi. From an Armenian Manuscript in the Library of the Mechitarists in Venice - - - - - 424–44
The Growth of the Pᵉshiṭṭâ Version of the New Testament. Illustrated from the Old Armenian and Georgian Versions - - - - - 883–91
Corinthians, The Epistles to the - - - - - - - - - - 35
COULTER, JOHN MERLE, Review of Andrew D. White's History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom - - - - - - 23
CRANDALL, LATHAN A., Review of Hort, Village Sermons - - - - 84
Critical Notes - - - - - - - - - - 137–158, 443–464, 758–78
CROSS, GEORGE, Review of Duke of Argyll, Philosophy of Belief - - 79
Synopsis of Schiele, Der Entwickelungsgedanke in der evangelischen Theologie bis Schleiermacher - - - - - - - - - - 112
Current Periodical Literature, see Index II*B*.
CURTIS, EDWARD LEWIS, Review of: G. F. Moore, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges - - - - - - - - - - - 17
A. Bertholet, Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden 49
CURTISS, SAMUEL IVES, Style as an Element in Determining the Authorship of Old Testament Documents - - - - - - - - - - 312–32
DAVIDS, T. W. R., Review of Minayeff's Recherches sur le Bouddhisme - 16
DENIO, FRANCIS B., Review of Dillmann's Handbuch der alttestamentlichen Theologie - - - - - - - - - - - - - 48
Development of Theology in the University - - - - - - - - 5
DEWOLFE, HENRY TODD, Synopsis of Steude, Über den Quellenwert der synoptischen Evangelien - - - - - - - - - - - 111
*δικαιοσύνη*, Forensic Meaning of - - - - - - - - - - 44
Document: Protevangelium Iacobi - - - - - - - - - - 424–44
DRUMMOND, JAMES, The Fourth Gospel and the Quartodecimans - - 601–65
Ecclesiasticus, The Hebrew - - - - - - - - - - - 77
Edwards', Jonathan, Idealism - - - - - - - - - - - 95
Eighteenth Century Apologetics - - - - - - - - - - 29
Ephesians, The Epistle to the - - - - - - - - - - - 37
*Ethics of the State*, D. B. Purinton - - - - - - - - - 965–99
Evolution, Moral, of the Old Testament - - - - - - - - 65
Exchange of *θεός* and *κύριος* in New Testament - - - - - - - 3
FAIRBAIRN, A. M., Apologetics in the Eighteenth Century - - - - 298–31

FAIRBANKS, ARTHUR, The Conception of the Future Life in Homer - - 741–757
Review of Wobbermin, Religionsgeschichtliche Studien - - - - 465
*Fall and Its Consequences, according to Genesis, Chapter 3*, H. G. Mitchell - 913–926
*Fatherhood of God*, Chas. M. Mead - - - - - - - - - 577–600
FAUNCE, W. H. P., Review of: "Sermon Preparations" - - - - 245
Henry van Dyke, the Gospel for an Age of Doubt - - - - 522
Hillis, A Man's Value to Society - - - - - - - - 532
Watson, The Care of Souls - - - - - - - - - 1095
FENN, W. W., Review of Dahle's Life after Death - - - - - 519
FERRIS, GEO. H., Review of Berger's Martin Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1068
FISHER, GEO. P., Review of Fraser's Philosophy of Theism - - - 159, 998
Forensic Meaning of δικαιοσύνη - - - - - - - - - 443
FOSTER, FRANK HUGH, History of the Original Puritan Theology of New England, 1620-1720 - - - - - - - - - - - 700–727
Review of Bovon, Dogmatique Chrétienne - - - - - - - 1082
FOSTER, GEO. B., Review of: Schurman, Agnosticism and Religion - 224
Wotschke, Fichte und Erigena - - - - - - - - - 243
Kähler, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus - - - - - - - - - - - - 1079
Strong, Christian Ethics - - - - - - - - - - 1089
Kröger, Die Grundbegriffe christlicher Weltanschauung - - - 1103
Ewald, Über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelien - - - - 1109
Synopsis of Davidson, When the "Higher Criticism" has Done its Work 1116
*Fourth Gospel and the Quartodecimans*, James Drummond - - - - 601–657
FRENCH, F. C., Review of Kübel, Christliche Ethik - - - - 837
Future Life in Homer - - - - - - - - - - - 741
Galatians, The Epistle to the - - - - - - - - - - 344
Genesis, chapter 3 - - - - - - - - - - - - 913
Genuineness of the Pauline Epistles, Present Status of the Inquiry concerinng the - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 328
GIBSON, MARGARET C., Review of Maclean's Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac - - - - - - - - - - - 168
GILBERT, GEO. H., The Scope of Paul's Doctrine of Grace - - - 692–699
Review of Plummer's Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke 813
Synopsis of: Teichmann's Die Taufe bei Paulus - - - - - 251
Bruston's La Notion biblique de la descente du Christ aux enfers - 1122
God, Fatherhood of - - - - - - - - - - - 577
GOODSPEED, GEO. S., Review of: Harold, The Knowledge of Life - - 1102
Bent, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians - - - - - - 1104
Briggs, The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch - - - - 1104
Guerber, Legends of the Virgin and Christ - - - - - 1106
China Mission Handbook, first issue - - - - - - - - 1114
GOTTHEIL, RICHARD, Review of Bedjan Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum - 820
GOULD, E. P., St. Paul's use of δικαιοῦν - - - - - - - - 149–158
Review of Burgon and Miller, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels - 192
Grace, The Scope of Paul's Doctrine of - - - - - - - - 692
GREGORY, CASPAR RENÉ, Bernhard Weiss and the New Testament - - 16–37
Review of Julius Baumann, Die Grundfrage der Religion • • • 787

GRANT, GEO. M., Review of: T. W. Rhys Davids, Buddhism - - - 163
Jevons, Introduction to the History of Religion - - - - - - 1002
GRIFFIS, WM. ELLIOT, Review of Cust, The Gospel Message - - - 245
*Growth of the P<sup>e</sup>shiṭṭâ Version of the New Testament*, Illustrated from the Old Armenian and Georgian Versions, Fred. C. Conybeare - - - 883–912
*Habakkuk 3: 10, 11, 15*, William Hayes Ward - - - - - 137–141
HARPER, WILLIAM R., Suggestions concerning the Original Text and Structure of Amos 1: 3–2: 5 - - - - - - - - - - - 141–45
Review of Geo. Adam Smith, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol. I - 477
HARRIS, J. RENDEL, Review of: Hill's Dissertation upon the Gospel Commentary of S. Ephraem the Syrian - - - - - - - - 196
Holzhey, Der neuentdeckte Codex Syrus Sinaiticus untersucht, and Bonus, Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti, etc. - - - - - 496
*Hebrew Ecclesiasticus*, Hope W. Hogg - - - - - - - - - 777–786
HENDERSON, C. R., Review of: C. Liebich, Obdachlos; G. Stäbler, Bilder aus dem Menschenleben im Lichte des göttlichen Wortes; and Morrison, Juvenile Offenders - - - - - - - - - - - 533
Boardman, The Problem of Jesus - - - - - - - - - - 1107
Waffle, Christianity and Prophecy - - - - - - - - - 1114
Williams, Conservative Principle in Our Literature - - - - 1114
HEUVER, G. D., Synopsis of Zitzlaff, Die wahre Bedeutung der Glaubensrechtfertigung - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1124
*History of the Original Puritan Theology of New England, 620–1720*, Frank Hugh Foster - - - - - - - - - - - - - 700–727
HOBSON, B. L., Review of M. S. Terry, The New Apologetic - - - 1093
HOGG, HOPE W., The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus - - - - - - - 777–786
Homer, Future Life in - - - - - - - - - - - - - 741
Hort, F. J. A., Life and Letters of - - - - - - - - - - 95
HOVEY, ALVAH, Review of J. Morris, A New Natural Theology - - 228
HULBERT, ERI B., Review of: Sinclair, Leaders of Thought in the English Church - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 219
Liebermann, Über die "Leges Edwardi Confessoris" - - - - 828
Wakeman, Introduction to the History of the Church of England - 1051
Byington, Puritan in England and New England - - - - 1074
Synopsis of Haverfield, Early British Christianity - - - - - 540
Iacobi Protevangelium - - - - - - - - - - - - - 424
Idealism of Jonathan Edwards - - - - - - - - - - - 950
*Is Christianity Fitted to Become the World-Religion?* John Henry Barrows - 404–423
Israelites, Some Observations on the Social Institutions of the - - - 728
JACKSON, JNO. L., Review of Chapman, Kadesh-Barnea; or, The Power of a Surrendered Life - - - - - - - - - - - - 846
JASTROW, MORRIS, JR., Review of Zimmern, Vater, Sohn und Fürsprecher 468
JOHNSON, FRANKLIN, Review of: Geo. P. Fisher, History of Christian Doctrine - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 240
Gothein, Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation - - - 500
Besser, Die Apostelgeschichte St. Lucä - - - - - - - 532
Synopsis of: Clemen, Die Himmelfahrt des Jesaja, ein ältestes Zeugnis für das römische Martyrium des Petrus - - - - - - - 290
Bardenhewer, Ungedruckte Excerpte aus einer Schrift des Patriarchen Eulogius über Trinität und Incarnation - - - - - - - 263
Fairchild, The Religious Life: Its Nature and Claims - - - - 553

*Jonathan Edwards' Idealism*, with special reference to the Essay "Of Being" and to the writings not in his collected works, Egbert C. Smyth - 950–964
JONES, JENKIN LLOYD, Synopsis of Simon, The Mission of Judaism, and Montefiore, Unitarianism and Judaism in Their Relations to Each Other - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 854
KOHLER, K., Review of H. Clay Trumbull, The Threshold Covenant - 798
LADD, GEO. TRUMBULL, Review of Rethoré's Science des Religions du Passé et de l'Avenir, du Judaïsme et du Christianisme - - - - - 161
Language of the New Testament - - - - - - - - - - 931
*Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort*, W. Sanday - - - - - - - 95–117
LITTLE, CHAS. J., Review of Atkinson, Beginnings of the Wesleyan Movement in America - - - - - - - - - - - 244
MARGOLIS, MAX L., Review of: Gerber, Die hebräischen Verba Denominativa - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 476
Barnstein, Targum of Onkelos to Genesis - - - - - - - 491
MARSHALL, J. T., Review of Meyer's Jesu Muttersprache - - - - - 188
MARTIN, WILLIAM A. P., The Speculative Philosophy of the Chinese - - 289–297
Review of J. L. de Lannesan, La Morale des Philosophes Chinois - - 796
MCCURDY, JAMES FREDERICK, The Moral Evolution of the Old Testament - 658–691
Review of Eduard Meyer, Die Entstehung des Judenthums - - - 107
MCGIFFERT, ARTHUR C., Peter's Sojourn in Rome - - - - - - 145–149
MEAD, CHARLES M., The Fatherhood of God - - - - - - - 557–600
MEAD, GEORGE H., Review of Class, Untersuchungen zur Phaenomenonologie 789
MENZIES, ALLAN, The Natural History of Sacred Books: Some Suggestions for a Preface to the History of the Canon of Scripture - - - 71–94
MERRILL, SELAH, Review of Blankenhorn, Entstehung und Geschichte des Todten Meeres - - - - - - - - - - - - - 174
MITCHELL, EDWIN KNOX, Review of Harnack's History of Dogma, Vol. II - 1077
MITCHELL, H. G., The Fall and Its Consequences, according to Genesis, Chapter 3 - - - - - - - - - - - - - 913–926
MITCHELL, S. C., A Stricture on Schaff's Account of Servetus - - - 450–459
MONCRIEF, J. W., Review of: Vincent, The Age of Hildebrand - - - 218
Innes, John Knox - - - - - - - - - - - - 223
Villari, Girolamo Savonarola - - - - - - - - - 245
Locke's Age of the Great Western Schism - - - - - - - 499
Lea, History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church 829
Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands - - - - - - - 1065
Menzies, The Ante-Nicene Fathers - - - - - - - - 1110
Smith's The Boniface - - - - - - - - - - - 1112
Synopsis of Portalié, La Crise du Protestantisme Français - - - 538
MOORE, GEORGE F., Review of Schechter, Studies in Judaism - - - 183
*Moral Evolution of the Old Testament*, James F. McCurdy - - - - 658–691
MOXOM, PHILIP S., Synopsis of Royce, Browning's Theism - - - 247
MUNRO, DANA CARLETON, Review of Thatcher-Schwill, Europe in the Middle Age - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1066
*Natural History of Sacred Books*, Allan Menzies - - - - - - - 71–94
*Need of a New Theology*, Lyman Abbott - - - - - - - - 460
New England, Original Puritan Theology of - - - - - - - 700
New Testament, Alexandria and - - - - - - - - - 927
Bernhard Weiss and - - - - - - - - - - - 16

New Testament, Growth of the Pᵉshiṭṭâ Version of the - - - - - 883
Language of the - - - - - - - - - - - - - 931
Thought of the - - - - - - - - - - - - - 936
New Theology, Need of - - - - - - - - - - - 460
NEWMAN, ALBERT HENRY, Review of: Burn, The Athanasian Creed and Its Commentaries - - - - - - - - - - - 216
Rocholl's Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland - - 1071
NOBLE, FR. P., Review of Williams, Christian Life in Germany - - 1098
*Observations, Some, on the Social Institutions of the Israelites*, Frants Buhl - 728–74
"Of Being," Jonathan Edwards' - - - - - - - - - 95
Old Testament Documents, Authorship of - - - - - - - - 31
Moral Evolution of the - - - - - - - - - - - 65
PARKER, A. K., Synopsis of Kellog, the Baptism of Polygamists in non-Christian Lands - - - - - - - - - - - 55
Pastoral Epistles, The - - - - - - - - - - - 39
Paul's Doctrine of Grace, Scope of - - - - - - - - - 69
*Paul's Use of δικαιοῦν*, E. P. Gould - - - - - - - - - 149–15
Pauline Epistles, Present Status of the Inquiry concerning the Genuineness of the - - - - - - - - - - - - - 32
PEPPER, GEO. D. B., Review of Kügelgen, Immanuel Kants Auffassung von der Bibel und seine Auslegung derselben - - - - - - 83
Periodical Literature, Current, see Index II*B*.
Pᵉschiṭṭâ, Version of the New Testament, Growth of the - - - - - 88
*Peter's Sojourn in Rome*, Arthur C. McGiffert - - - - - - - 145–14
Philippians, The Epistle to the - - - - - - - - - - - 38
PICK, B., Review of Jacob, Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament - 110
PLATNER, J. W., Review of McGiffert, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age - - - - - - - - - - - - - 102
PRATT, WALDO S., Review of: Brightman, Liturgies, Eastern and Western, I. 52
Weiss, Die musikalischen Instrumente in den heiligen Schriften des Alten Testamentes - - - - - - - - - - - 101
Zeuner, Die Chorgesänge im Buche der Psalmen - - - - - - 101
*Present Status of the Inquiry concerning the Genuineness of the Pauline Epistles*, Bernhard Weiss - - - - - - - - - - - 328–4
PRICE, Ira M., Review of: Johnson, Quotations of the New Testament from the Old - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1
Lorimer, Messages of Today to the Men of Tomorrow - - - - 8
*Protevangelium Iacobi*, From an Armenian Manuscript in the Library of the Mechitarists in Venice, edited by Fred. C. Conybeare - - - 443–4
Psalm 77: 17–20 - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1
PURINTON, D. B., Ethics of the State - - - - - - - - - 965–9
Puritan Theology of New England - - - - - - - - - 7
PURVES, GEO. T., Review of E. P. Gould's Commentary on The Gospel according to St. Mark - - - - - - - - - - 2
Quartodecimans, The Fourth Gospel and the - - - - - - - 6
READ, E. A., Synopsis of Beach, The Reconstruction of Theology - - 5
*Recent Tendencies in Theological Thought*, Augustus H. Strong - - - 118–1
Recent Theological Literature, see Index II*A*.
RHEES, RUSH., Review of Watson, the Mind of the Master - - - - 2
RIGGS, JAMES STEVENSON, Alexandria and the New Testament - - - 927–9

Romans, The Epistle to the - - - - - - - - - - - - 363
ROPES, C. J. H., Review of Wuttig, Das johanneische Evangelium - - 493
ROPES, JAMES HARDY, The So-called Agrapha - - - - - - - 758–777
Review of Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, Vol. IV - - - - - 1021
Sacred Books, Natural History of - - - - - - - - - 71
SALTER, WILLIAM M., Review of Sheldon, An Ethical Movement - - 1113
SANDAY, W., The Life and Letters of F. J. A. Hort - - - - - 95–117
Schaff's Account of Servetus, Stricture on - - - - - - - - 450
SCHMIDT, A., Synopsis of Dräseke, Dionysische Bedenken - - - 541
SCHMIDT, NATH., Review of Steuernagel, Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 486
SCHODDE, GEO. H., Synopsis of Kaftan, Das Verhältniss des evangelischen Glaubens zur Logoslehre - - - - - - - - - - - 545
SCHWILL, FERD., Review of Landwehr, Die Kirchenpolitik Friedrich Wilhelms, des Grossen Kurfürsten - - - - - - - - - - 502
*Scope of Paul's Doctrine of Grace*, George H. Gilbert - - - - - 692–699
*Scope of Theology and its Place in the University*, Charles A. Briggs - - 38–70
SCOTT, H. M. Synopsis of: Lobstein, Zur Rechtfertigung der Kindertaufe - 255
Büchler, The Sources of Josephus for the History of Syria - - - 848
Servetus, Stricture on Schaff's Account of - - - - - - - - 450
SMALL, ALBION W., Review of Leslie Stephen, Social Rights and Duties - 842
SMITH, GEORGE ADAM, Review of Buhl's Geographie des Alten Palästina - 169
SMITH, HENRY PRESERVED, Review of: J. Frederic Berg, Influence of the Septuagint upon the Peshitta Psalter - - - - - - - - 804
E. Nestle, Septuaginta-Studien, II - - - - - - - - - 806
SMITH, W. TAYLOR, Review of: Budde, Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1013
Text and Studies, Vol. V, No. 1, Apocrypha Anecdota, M. R. James - 1023
SMYTH, EGBERT C., Jonathan Edwards' Realism, with special reference to the essay "Of Being" and to the writings not in his collected works - 950–964
SOARES, THEO. G., Synopsis of Barnes, The Midrashic Element in Chronicles 535
*So-Called Agrapha, The*, James Hardy Ropes - - - - - - - 758–777
Social Institutions of the Israelites, Some Observations on - - - - 728
*Speculative Philosophy of the Chinese*, William A. P. Martin - - - - 289–297
State, Ethics of the - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 965
STEVENS, WILLIAM ARNOLD, On the Forensic Meaning of δικαιοσύνη - - 443–450
STRATTON, A. W., Review of Oldenberg, Ancient India - - - - - 530
*Stricture on Schaff's Account of Servetus*, S. C. Mitchell - - - - 450–459
STRONG, AUGUSTUS H., Recent Tendencies in Theological Thought - - 118–136
Review of Geo. Harris' Moral Evolution - - - - - - - - 503
STUCKENBERG, J. H. W., Review of Gladstone, Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler - - - - - - - - - - - 832
*Style as an Element in Determining the Authorship of Old Testament Documents*, Samuel Ives Curtiss - - - - - - - - - - 312–327
*Suggestions concerning the Original Text and Structure of Amos 1:3—2:5*, William R. Harper - - - - - - - - - - - 141–145
Suggestions for a Preface to the History of the Canon of Scripture - - 71
Synopses, see Index II*B*, Current Periodical Literature.
TERRY, MILTON S. Review of: Briggs, The Messiah of the Gospels, and, The Messiah of the Apostles - - - - - - - - - - - 209

Bousset-Meyer, Die Offenbarung Johannis - - - - - - - 1047
Synopsis of Schmidt, Zur Lehre von der Person Christi - - - 850
THATCHER, O. J., Review of: Ludlow, The Age of the Crusades; Conder, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem; de Castries, L'Islam; and Keller, Der Geisteskampf des Christentums gegen den Islam, bis zur Zeit der Kreuzzüge - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1059
*Theological Agnosticism*, Alexander Balmain Bruce - - - - - - 1–15
Theological Thought, Recent Tendencies in - - - - - - - 118
Literature, Recent, see Index II.
Theology, Development of, in the University - - - - - - - 50
θεός and κύριος in New Testament - - - - - - - - - 33
Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Epistles to the - - - - - - - - 331
THOMAS, W. I., Review of Crépieux-Jamin, L'Écriture et le caractère - - 531
Thought of the New Testament - - - - - - - - - 936
University Studies' Relations to Theology - - - - - - - - 40
VOTAW, CLYDE W., Review of Blass, Acta Apostolorum - - - - - 1110
Synopsis of Erbes, das Todesjahr Agrippa's, II - - - - - - 258
WARD, WILLIAM HAYES, Habakkuk 3:10, 11, 15 - - - - - - 137–141
WEISS, BERNHARD, The Present Status of the Inquiry concerning the Genuineness of the Pauline Epistles - - - - - - - - 328–403
Weiss, Bernhard, and the New Testament - - - - - - - - 16
WENLEY, R. M., Review of Sabatier, Esquisse d'une philosophie de la religion - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 698
WERGELAND, M., Review of Eckenstein, Woman under Monasticism - - 826
WILKINSON, J. H., Review of Spitta, Die urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls - - - - - - - - 508
WILSON, R. D., Review of Gibson, Apocrypha Sinaitica - - - - - 531
World-Religion? Is Christianity Fitted to Become the - - - - - - 404
WYANT, A. R. E., Review of Smyth, Early Writings of Jonathan Edwards - 1076
ZENOS, A. C., Review of Bestmann, Entwicklungsgeschichte des Reiches Gottes - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 181
Synopsis of: Dole's Christocentric Theology - - - - - - - 265
Strauss u. Torney's Christi Gottheit und Präexistenz - - - - 54

## II*A*. RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

*Argyll, Duke of*, The Philosophy of Belief - - - - - - - - 792
*Atkinson*, Beginnings of the Wesleyan Movement in America - - - - 244
*Barnstein, H.*, Targum of Onkelos, to Genesis - - - - - - - 491
*Baumann, Julius*, Die Grundfrage der Religion - - - - - - - 787
*Bedjan, P.*, (Ed)., Acta Martyrum et Sanctorum - - - - - - - 820
*Bent*, The Sacred City of the Ethiopians - - - - - - - - 1104
*Berg, J. Frederick*, The Influence of the Septuagint upon the Peshitta Psalter 804
*Berger*, Martin Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung - - - - 1068
*Bertholet, A.*, Stellung der Israeliten und der Juden zu den Fremden - - 490
*Besser, W. F.*, Die Apostelgeschichte St. Lucä - - - - - - - 532
*Bestmann*, Entwicklungsgeschichte des Reiches Gottes unter dem alten und neuen Bunde - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 181

*Blanckenhorn*, Entstehung und Geschichte des Todten Meeres - - - 174
*Blass*, Acta Apostolorum, sive Lucæ ad Theophilum liber alter - - - 1110
*Boardman*, The Problem of Jesus - - - - - - - - - - 1107
*Bonus, A.*, Collatio Codicis Lewisiani rescripti Evangeliorum Sacrorum Syriacorum cum Codice Curetoniano - - - - - - - - - - 496
*Bousset-Meyer*, Die Offenbarung Johannis - - - - - - - - 1047
*Bovon*, Dogmatique Chrétienne - - - - - - - - - - 1082
*Briggs, C. A.*, The Messiah of the Gospels; and, The Messiah of the Apostles 209
The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch - - - - - - - - 1104
*Brightman, F. E.*, Liturgies, Eastern and Western, Vol. I - - - - - 526
*Budde*, Das Buch Hiob übersetzt und erklärt - - - - - - - - 1013
*Buhl*, Geographie des alten Palästina - - - - - - - - - 169
*Buisson, du*, The Origin and Peculiar Characteristics of the Gospel of St. Mark - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1109
*Burgon and Miller*, Traditional Text of the Holy Gospels - - - - 192
*Burn*, The Athanasian Creed and its Early Commentaries - - - - - 216
*Byington*, The Puritan in England and New England - - - - - 1074
*Castries, de*, L'Islam, Impressions et Études - - - - - - - - 1059
*Cave*, An Introduction to Theology - - - - - - - - - 1112
*Chapman, J. W.*, Kadesh-Barnea; or, The Power of a Surrendered Life - 846
China Mission Handbook. First Issue - - - - - - - - - 1114
*Class, G.*, Untersuchungen zur Phaenomenologie und Ontologie des menschlichen Geistes - - - - - - - - - - - - - 789
*Conder*, The Latin Kingdom of Jerusalem - - - - - - - - 1059
*Crepieux-Jamin, J.*, L'Écriture et le caractère - - - - - - - 531
*Cust, R. N.*, The Gospel Message - - - - - - - - - 524
*Dahle, Lars N.*, Life After Death - - - - - - - - - - 519
*Dale, R. W.*, The Epistle of James and Other Discourses - - - - 811
*Davids, T. W. Rhys*, Buddhism: Its History and Literature - - - - 163
*Dillmann, August*, Alttestamentliche Theologie - - - - - - - 482
*Dunlop*, Religious Certainty - - - - - - - - - - 165
*Eckenstein, Lina*, Woman under Monasticism - - - - - - - 826
*Ewald*, Über die Glaubwürdigkeit der Evangelien - - - - - - 1109
*Fisher, George P.*, History of Christian Doctrine - - - - - - 240
*Fraser, A. C.*, Philosophy of Theism - - - - - - - - 159, 998
*Gerber, W. J.*, Die hebräischen Verba Denominativa - - - - - 476
*Gibbons*, The Ambassador of Christ - - - - - - - - - 1094
*Gibson, Margaret D.*, Apocrypha Sinaitica - - - - - - - - 531
*Gladstone, W. E.*, Studies Subsidiary to the Works of Bishop Butler - - 832
The Works of Joseph Butler, Bishop of Durham - - - - - - 298
*Gothein, Eb.*, Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation - - - - 500
*Gould, E. P.*, Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Gospel according to St. Mark - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 200
*Guerber*, Legends of the Virgin and Christ - - - - - - - - 1106
*Gurteen*, Epic of the Fall of Man - - - - - - - - - - 186
*Hall, C. C., and others*, Christian Worship - - - - - - - - 1096
*Harald*, The Knowledge of Life; being a Contribution to the Study of Religions - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1102
*Harnack*, History of Dogma. Translated from the third German edition by Neil Buchanan. Vol. II - - - - - - - - - - 1077
*Harris, George*, Moral Evolution - - - - - - - - - - 503
*Hauck*, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands - - - - - - - - - 1065
*Heinrici-Meyer*, Der erste Brief an die Corinther - - - - - - - 1045
*Hill, J. H.*, Dissertation upon the Gospel Commentaries of S. Ephraem the Syrian - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 196
*Hillis, N. D.*, A Man's Value to Society - - - - - - - - 532
*Holtzmann*, Lehrbuch der neutestamentlichen Theologie - - - - 1036
*Holzhey, C.*, Der neuentdeckte Codex Syrus Sinaiticus untersucht - - 496
*Hort, A. F.*, Life and Letters of Fenton John Anthony Hort - - - - 95

*Hort, F. J. A.*, Village Sermons - - - - - - - - - - - - 846
*Innes*, John Knox - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 223
*Jacob*, Altarabische Parallelen zum Alten Testament zusammengestellt - - 1104
*James*, Texts and Studies, Vol. V, No. 1. Apocrypha Anecdota II - - - 1023
*Jevons*, Introduction to the History of Religion - - - - - - - 1002
*Johnson, F.*, The Quotations of the New Testament from the Old - - - 190
*Kähler*, Der sogenannte historische Jesus und der geschichtliche biblische Christus - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1979
*Keller*, Der Geisteskampf des Christentums gegen den Islam - - - - - 1059
*Kröger*, Die Grundbegriffe christlicher Weltanschauung - - - - - 1103
*Krüger*, Die Entstehung des Neuen Testamentes - - - - - - - 1108
*Kübel, Robert*, Christliche Ethik - - - - - - - - - - - 837
*Kügelgen, C. W. von*, Immanuel Kants Auffassung von der Bibel und seine Auslegung derselben - - - - - - - - - - - - - 834
*Landwehr, H.*, Die Kirchenpolitik Friedrich Wilhelms, des Grossen Kurfürsten 502
*Lannesan, J. L. de*, La Morale des Philosophes Chinois - - - - - 796
*Lea, Henry Charles*, A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 829
*Liebermann, F.*, Ueber die "Leges Edwardi Confessoris" - - - - - 828
*Liebich, C.*, Obdachlos - - - - - - - - - - - - 533
*Locke, Clinton*, The Age of the Great Western Schism - - - - - 999
*Lorimer, Geo. C.*, Messages of Today to the Men of Tomorrow - - - 846
*Ludlow*, The Age of the Crusades - - - - - - - - - - 1059
*Maclean*, A Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac - - - - 168
*Marti, Karl*, Kurzgefasste Grammatik der biblisch-aramäischen Sprache - 803
*Martin, W. A. P.*, A Cycle of Cathay - - - - - - - - - 474
*Mason, Arthur James*, The Principles of Ecclesiastical Unity - - - 840
*McGiffert*, A History of Christianity in the Apostolic Age - - - - 1025
*Menzies*, The Ante-Nicene Fathers - - - - - - - - - 1110
*Merkle*, Die Ambrosianischen Tituli - - - - - - - - - 1111
*Meyer, Eduard*, Die Entstehung des Judenthums - - - - - - - 807
*Meyer, Arnold*, Jesu Muttersprache - - - - - - - - - 188
*Minayeff, I. P.*, Recherches sur le Bouddhisme - - - - - - - 166
*Moore, G. F.*, Critical and Exegetical Commentary on Judges - - - - 176
*Morris, J.*, A New Natural Theology - - - - - - - - - 228
*Morrison, W. D.*, Juvenile Offenders - - - - - - - - - 533
*Mortimer, A. G.*, The Seven Last Words of our Most Holy Redeemer - - 529
*Moulton*, A Concordance of the Greek Testament according to the Texts of Westcott and Hort, Tischendorf, and the English Revisers - - - 1034
*Nestle, Eberhard*, Septuagintastudien, II - - - - - - - - 806
Philologica Sacra - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1107
*Noble, Frederick A.*, Discourses on the Epistle of Paul to the Philippians - 844
The Divine Life in Man and Other Sermons - - - - - - - 532
*Oldenberg, H.*, Ancient India - - - - - - - - - - 530
*Plummer, Alfred*, A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel according to St. Luke - - - - - - - - - - - - 813
*Réthoré, F.*, Science des Religions du Passé et de l'Avenir, du Judaïsme et du Christianisme - - - - - - - - - - - - 161
*Rocholl*, Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland - - - - 1071
*Sabatier, A.*, Esquisse d'une Philosophie de la Religion d'après la Psychologie et l'Histoire - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1000
L'Apôtre Paul - - - - - - - - - - - - - 498
*Sawin*, The Transfiguring of the Cross; or, the Trial and Triumph of the Son of Man - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1099
*Schechter*, Studies in Judaism - - - - - - - - - - - 183
*Schurman*, Agnosticism and Religion - - - - - - - - - 224
Sermon Preparation - - - - - - - - - - - - 245
*Sheldon*, An Ethical Movement - - - - - - - - - - 1113
*Shields, Charles W., and others*, Lectures on Church Unity - - - - 840

*Sinclair*, Leaders of Thought in the English Church - - - - - - 219
*Smith, George Adam*, The Book of the Twelve Prophets, Vol. I - - - 477
*Smith, J. Gregory*, The Boniface - - - - - - - - - 1112
*Smyth*, Some Early Writings of Jonathan Edwards, A.D. 1714–1726 - - 1076
*Spitta, Fried.*, Die urchristlichen Traditionen über Ursprung und Sinn des Abendmahls - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 508
*Stäbler, G.*, Bilder aus dem Menschenleben im Lichte des göttlichen Wortes - 533
*Stephen, Leslie*, Social Rights and Duties - - - - - - - - 842
*Steuernagel, C.*, Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes - - - - 486
*Strong*, Christian Ethics - - - - - - - - - - - - 1089
Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica, Vol. IV - - - - - - - - - 1021
*Terry*, The New Apologetic - - - - - - - - - - - 1093
*Thatcher and Schwill*, Europe in the Middle Age - - - - - - - 1066
*Trumbull, H. Clay*, The Threshold Covenant - - - - - - - - 798
*Van Dyke, Henry*, The Gospel for an Age of Doubt - - - - - - 522
*Villari*, Girolamo Savonarola - - - - - - - - - - - 245
*Vincent, M. R.*, The Age of Hildebrand - - - - - - - - 218
*Volck*, Heilige Schrift und Kritik - - - - - - - - - - 1007
*Waffle*, Christianity and Property - - - - - - - - - - 1114
*Watson, John*, The Mind of the Master - - - - - - - - - 245, 577
The Cure of Souls - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1095
*Wakeman*, The History of the Church of England - - - - - - 1051
*White, Andrew D.*, History of the Warfare of Science with Theology in Christendom - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 237
*Weiss*, Die musikalischen Instrumente in den heiligen Schriften des Alten Testamentes - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1011
*Wendland*, Die Therapeuten und die Philonische Schrift vom beschaulichen Leben - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1105
*Williams*, Christian Life in Germany - - - - - - - - - 1098
The Conservative Principle in Our Literature - - - - - - - 1114
*Wobbermin, G.*, Religionsgeschichtliche Studien - - - - - - - 456
*Wotschke*, Fichte und Erigena - - - - - - - - - - 243
*Wuttig, O.*, Das johanneische Evangelium - - - - - - - - 493
*Zimmern, H.*, Vater, Sohn und Fürsprecher - - - - - - - - 468
*Zenner*, Die Chorgesänge im Buche der Psalmen — ihre Existenz und ihre Form - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 1015

## II*B*. CURRENT PERIODICAL LITERATURE.

*Abbott*, The Raising of the Dead in the Synoptic Gospels - - - - - 248
*Barnenhewer*, Ungedruckte Excerpte aus einer Schrift des Patriarchen Eulogius über Trinität und Incarnation - - - - - - - - - 263
*Barnes*, The Midrashic Element in Chronicles - - - - - - - 535
*Beach*, The Reconstruction of Theology - - - - - - - - - 548
*Belser*, Der Tag des letzten Abendmahls und des Todes Jesu - - - - 536
*Briggs*, The One Flock of Christ - - - - - - - - - - 267
*Bruston*, La Notion biblique de la descente du Christ aux enfers, - - - 1112
*Büchler, Adolf*, The Sources of Josephus for the History of Syria - - - 848
*Clemen*, Die Himmelfahrt des Jesaja, ein ältestes Zeugnis für das römische Martyrium des Petrus - - - - - - - - - - - - 260
*Davidson*, When the "Higher Criticism" has Done its Work, - - - - 1116
*Dole*, Christocentric Theology - - - - - - - - - - 265
*Dräseke*, Dionysische Bedenken - - - - - - - - - - 541
*Erbes*, Das Todesjahr Agrippa's II - - - - - - - - - - 258
*Fairchild*, The Religious Life: its Nature and Claims - - - - - 553
*Haverfield*, Early British Christianity - - - - - - - - - 540

*Kaftan*, Das Verhältniss des evangelischen Glaubens zur Logoslehre - - 545
*Kellogg*, The Baptism of Polygamists in Non-Christian Lands - - - 551
*Lobstein*, Zur Rechtfertigung der Kindertaufe - - - - - - - - 253
*Montefiore, C. G.*, Unitarianism and Judaism in Their Relations to Each Other - 854
*Portalié*, La Crise du Protestantisme Français - - - - - - - 538
*Royce*, Browning's Theism - - - - - - - - - - - - 247
*Schiele*, Der Entwickelungsgedanke in der evangelischen Theologie bis Schleiermacher - - - - - - - - - - - - 1124
*Schmidt, Herm.*, Zur Lehre von der Person Christi - - - - - - - 850
*Simon, Oswald J.*, The Mission of Judaism - - - - - - - - 854
*Steude*, Über den Quellenwert der synoptischen Evangelien - - - - 1119
*Strauss u. Torney, V.*, Christi Gottheit und Präexistenz - - - - - 543
*Teichmann*, Die Taufe bei Paulus - - - - - - - - - - 251
*Warfield, B. B.*, Archæology of the Mode of Baptism - - - - - 256
*Zitzlaff, von*, Die wahre Bedeutung der Glaubensrechtfertigung, - - - 1126