E1097

THE

AMERICAN JOURNAL

OF

THEOLOGY

EDITED BY
THE DIVINITY FACULTY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

VOLUME III
1899

CHICAGO
The University of Chicago Press
1899

PRINTED AT
The University of Chicago Press
CHICAGO

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

JANUARY.

PAGE

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTMAS. Fred. C. Conybeare. - - - - - - 1–21

THE RITSCHLIAN DOCTRINE OF THEORETICAL AND RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE. Hugh R. Mackintosh. - - - - - - - - - - 22–44

SHALL THE THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM BE MODIFIED, AND HOW? William R. Harper. - - - - - - - - - - - - - 45–66

FULFILMENT OF PREDICTION IN ISAIAH, CHAPS. 40–48. Owen H. Gates. - 67–83

THE HASTINGS BIBLE DICTIONARY. - - - - - - - - - 84–98

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES: *The Transcendental Element in the Consciousness of Christ*, Walter F. Adeney. — *Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle*, I, Marvin R. Vincent. — *The Newberry Gospels*, Edgar Johnson Goodspeed. - - - - - - - - - - 99–137

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - - 138–224

SUPPLEMENT: *Theological and Semitic Literature*, 1899, No. 1. W. Muss-Arnolt.

APRIL.

RELIGIONLESS MORALITY. Otto Pfleiderer. - - - - - - - 225–250

THE IMPORT OF THE CHRONICLES AS A PIECE OF RELIGIO-HISTORICAL LITERATURE. Theodore G. Soares. - - - - - - - - - 251–274

RELATIVE AUTHORITY OF THE GOSPELS. Eml. V. Gerhart. - - - 275–294

RECONSTRUCTION IN THEOLOGY. Henry Churchill King. - - - - 295–323

MODIFICATIONS IN THE THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM. George Harris, Augustus H. Strong, Charles W. Eliot, Charles Cuthbert Hall, Charles J. Little. 324–343

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - - 344–431

BOOKS RECEIVED. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 432

SUPPLEMENT: *Theological and Semitic Literature*, 1899, No. 2. W. Muss-Arnolt.

JULY.

HAS THE GOSPEL OF THE REFORMATION BECOME ANTIQUATED? Friedrich Loofs. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 433–472

PERSONALITY FROM THE MONISTIC POINT OF VIEW. George F. Genung. - 473–498

PAGE

THE SO-CALLED "EBED-YAHWEH SONGS," AND THE MEANING OF THE TERM "SERVANT OF YAHWEH" IN ISAIAH, CHAPS. 40–55. Karl Budde. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 499–540

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES: *The Double Text of Tobit:* Contribution toward a Critical Inquiry, J. Rendel Harris. — *The Edict of Tolerance of Louis XVI. (1787) and its American Promoters*, Gaston Bonet-Maury. — *The Essay "Contra Novatianum,"* Caspar René Gregory. — *Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle*, II, Marvin R. Vincent. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 541–577

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - - 578–640

SUPPLEMENT: *Theological and Semitic Literature*, 1899, No. 3. W. Muss-Arnolt.

OCTOBER.

THE PROPER USE OF SCIENCE BY THE PULPIT. John Merle Coulter. - - 641–653

ETHICAL POSTULATES IN THEOLOGY. W. Rupp. - - - - - - 654–678

THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. John F. Hurst. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 679–694

RESCH'S LOGIA. James Hardy Ropes and Charles C. Torrey. - - - 695–703

DOCUMENT: *A Hitherto Unpublished Treatise against the Italian Manicheans*, Fred. C. Conybeare. - - - - - - - - - - 704–728

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES: *The Martyrdom of St. John*, F. P. Badham. — *The Bearing of the Composition of the Psalter on the Date of the Forty-fourth Psalm*, George A. Barton. - - - - - - - 729–746

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE. - - - - - - - - 747–863

BOOKS RECEIVED. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 864

INDEX. - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 865–884

SUPPLEMENT: *Theological and Semitic Literature*, 1899, No. 4. W. Muss-Arnolt.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume III JANUARY, 1899 Number 1

THE HISTORY OF CHRISTMAS.

By F. C. CONYBEARE,
Oxford, England.

CHRISTMAS day, on December 25, is one of the latest of the feasts commemorative of Jesus Christ instituted by the church, for it only began to be observed toward the end of the fourth century. John Chrysostom[1] has left us a homily preached at Antioch which helps us to fix the exact date at which it was first kept in that important Christian center. His name for the feast is: The birth of Christ *after the flesh*. "It is not yet ten years," he says, "since this day became manifest and known to us." And a little below he remarks: "This day is everywhere a matter for discussion; for some accuse it of being a new feast and new-fangled, and of having been introduced but now; while others contend that it is old and original, because the prophets long ago foretold about his birth; and they argue that long ago it was revealed and held in repute by the inhabitants of regions extending from Gades to Thrace."

Thus we know that the Christmas, or feast of the birth of Christ, was observed in Antioch, the oldest Christian center outside Jerusalem, not earlier than 376 A. D.; that ten years later it was far from being unanimously accepted by Christians. Indeed, if we bear in mind that Chrysostom was an advocate of the new feast, we can infer from his language that eastern

[1] MIGNE, *Patrologia Græca*, XLIX, p. 351.

Christendom was extremely opposed to it. He also implies that it was celebrated in the western half of the world bordering the Mediterranean before it gained a footing in the eastern half.

An Armenian writer of the eleventh century[2] records — we know not on what authority — that it was first observed in imperial circles in Constantinople A. D. 373, having been invented much earlier by Artemon the heretic in Rome. In Egypt it was still repudiated in the fifth century, for Cassian, a Latin Father, in his *Collat.*, X, 2, tells us that: In Egypt the custom is retained from ancient tradition of celebrating in a single festival on the one day of Epiphany both the Lord's baptism and his nativity after the flesh, instead of keeping them separately on two distinct days, "as is done in the western provinces" of the empire. In Armenia to this day the two feasts of the baptism and of the fleshly birth are kept together on the day of Epiphany, *i. e.*, January 6.

In Rome, the date at which the festival of December 25 was instituted is difficult to ascertain. Ambrose of Milan, however, in his third book "About Virgins," chap. 1, reminds his sister Marcellina that she took the veil of a nun from Pope Liberius on the birthday of the Savior, and adds the remark: "On what day could you better do so than on that upon which the virgin was vouchsafed her offspring?" It is evident, therefore, that the birth from the virgin was celebrated in Rome as early as the year 366, in the September of which this pope died. It is usually assumed that the feast in question was kept on December 25, but that is not certain, for Ambrose says nothing on the point. If it was really invented by Artemon, as the Armenians have always declared, it must go back to the third century in the West, and that would explain Chrysostom's statement.

In our own islands we have an interesting record that the Christian feast of Christmas coincided in date with an earlier pagan festival. For the venerable Bede tells us in his work *De Temporum Ratione*, cap. 13, that "the Anglian peoples began the year on December 25, on the day on which we now celebrate the birth of the Lord; and they then called the very

[2] Paul of Taron against Theopistos.

night, which is now sacrosanct to us, by the vernacular name of *modranecht*, that is, the night of mothers, by reason, we suspect, of the ceremonies which they conducted on it, watching throughout its length."

For a similar reason the Germans still call Christmas the *Weihnacht*. The old Scandinavian word "yule" signifies the feast of the solstice or turn of the sun, for on December 25 the shortest day is past, and the day begins to wax again.

In Italy also, and in Latin countries generally, the new Christmas of the end of the fourth century coincided with an older pagan festival. The Saturnalia, when the slave was for once as good as his master, lasted from December 17–24, to be followed on December 25 by the Brumalia or Breuima, the feast of the shortest day, the first of the new sun, the last of the old, as Ovid says:

Bruma noui prima est, ueterisque nouissima solis.

This was followed by the Sigillaria, so called because on it parents gave dolls to their children. The new year proper began with the first of January, on which *strenæ*, the French *étrennes*, were given by friends and relations to one another, by way of good omen, *boni ominis causa*.

Christian writers of the fifth century make it clear by their protests against the pagan merriment with which the last week of the old year and the first days of the new were still marked, that the new feast of Christmas had been put on December 25 in order to hallow in the Christian way a day round which more than round any other the associations of the older religion centered. There was an obvious propriety, also, in putting the birthday of the Sun of righteousness on the old birthday of the sun. The Christians of the farther East round about Edessa, who rejected the new Christmas, accused their co-religionists of Rome of idolatry and sun-worship, because they chose December 25 for their new festival; and it is likely enough that the old sun-worship lived on as an integral element in the new cult. The Persian Christians, who followed Mani's revelation from about 275 A. D. onward, openly identified Christ with the sun in heaven; and the Christian bishops of Rome, always more

ready than others to assimilate pagan practices and popular beliefs, may have deemed it good policy to take over one which they could not hope to eliminate. The eastward position in prayer, which is assuredly very ancient, must originally have been adopted out of respect to the rising sun. The Palestinian Essenes, although they were stern monotheists and as Jews averse to the worship of created things, nevertheless turned in their prayers to the rising sun, and, according to Josephus, besought him to rise with litanies drawn from a remote past.

Note that Chrysostom and Cassian speak of the new feast as that of the birth *after* or *according to the flesh*. Was there, then, an older feast which celebrated the birth of Jesus according to the spirit? There was, and this was no other than the feast of the baptism, known to us today as the feast of the Epiphany. As to the original significance of this feast there can be no doubt. Nicetas says that "its principle and cause is the baptism of Christ." Gregory, the wonder-worker, writing in the third century, calls it the day of the holy theophany, and in his homily for it speaks only of the baptism of the Lord as being commemorated on it. Hippolytus, at the beginning of the same century, calls the festival by the same title, and in his homily for it equally refers to the baptism only.[3]

Gregory of Nazianzen in his fortieth homily calls it the day of lights, *ἡμέρα τῶν φωτῶν*, and records, what we also know from other sources, that it was a favorite day for the baptism or illumination of neophytes. Those who were so baptized upon it were "illuminated along with Christ," *Χριστῷ συμφωτισθῆναι*. The earliest record we have of the festival of the baptism of Jesus is in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.*, I, p. 140, ed. Sylb.), who mentions that the sect of Basilides observed it and kept a vigil on the night preceding it, with readings from the Scriptures. Some of them, he adds, kept the feast on the 15th, others on the 11th of Tybi, which answers to January 6. This notice

[3] Jerome, in his *Commentary on Ezechiel*, I, chap. 1, states that the feast of the carnal birth did not properly belong to January 6: "Epiphaniorum dies hucusque venerabilis est: non ut quidam putant, natalis in carne. Tunc enim absconditus est et non apparuit; quod huic tempori congruit, quando dictum est: Hic est filius meus dilectus, in quo mihi complacui."

implies that the followers of Basilides invented the festival. If so, the other churches must have rapidly adopted the feast from them; for a hundred years later it was kept in all the eastern churches. In the West it is said to have been introduced much later; and Ammianus Marcellinus is the first to mention its existence in Gaul. He states that the emperor Julian kept the feast there in the year 360 A. D. However, it is probable that our ignorance of it at a far earlier date in the West is only due to want of records. The Latin writers of the late fourth century and of the fifth also had a reason for being reticent about the feast, supposing, as is probable, that it existed much earlier. It was commemorative of the Lord's rebirth, and as such was become heretical. Later on it acquired a new orthodox content as commemorating the visit of the magi and the manifestation of the infant Jesus to the Gentiles. The homilies of pseudo-Maximus, which I quote below, indicate that in the north of Italy it existed at a much earlier date, and was called the *natalis dies*, because on it Jesus was reborn (*renatus*). The Armenians, who, as I have said, still keep Christmas, or the carnal birth of Jesus, along with his baptism, on January 6, preserve in the controversial literature in which they defended their conservatism against the attacks of the Greeks numerous citations from early Christian writers, which prove, if genuine, that their way of keeping the double feast on one and the same day, January 6, was early and widespread. They cite Polycarp of the first half of the second century, Melito, *Ad Eutropium*, in the second, Hippolytus and Cyprian of the first half of the third. Their appeal was always to Luke's gospel, which declares that Jesus was beginning his thirtieth year when he came before John for baptism; this proves—such was their argument—that he was baptized on his thirtieth birthday Hence it is proper to celebrate his baptism and his birth on one and the same day.

It is certain, therefore, that prior to the year 373 A. D., when the modern Christmas was introduced at Antioch and Constantinople, the earthly or carnal birth of Jesus was already feasted; but only along with the baptism, and not on a separate day by

itself. We have seen, however, that the original significance of the feast of the Epiphany was baptismal. How, then, shall we explain the fact that, in the fourth century, before the birth from the virgin was allotted a day of its own, the 6th of January was regarded as at once the birth and baptismal day of Jesus? Why should the idea of the birth have been so closely bound up in believers' minds with that of baptism that their first idea was to celebrate both things together? The use of Jerusalem in the first half of the fourth century is a remarkable example of this association. A letter is preserved by John of Nice (in Combefis., *Hist. Monothel.*) said to have been addressed by Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, to Julius,[4] who was pope of Rome A. D. 337–52. In this Cyril complains of the difficulty experienced at Jerusalem by the faithful in keeping both festivals on the one day. The birth, he says, had to be celebrated in the cave of the nativity at Bethlehem and the baptism on the banks of the Jordan. Now, Bethlehem is seven miles south, the Jordan some eighteen east, of Jerusalem. How, he asks, are the faithful to go through the ceremonies of reading prayer and praise at Bethlehem, and on the same day hurry off to the Jordan in time to get through the celebration there of the Lord's baptism? He entreats the pope to examine the books brought by the Jews in the age of Titus from Jerusalem to Rome, in order to ascertain from them the real date of the birth. It is then related that the pope read in Josephus that Zacharias' vision in the temple took place at the feast of Tabernacles, and, calculating from that as a fixed point, inferred that the virgin bore her son on December 25. This, therefore, was the true date for Christmas.

The church of Jerusalem, however, was too conservative to adopt a new date, and in the year 549, if we may believe Cosmas Indicopleustes, the old date, January 6, was still observed and defended on the ground that St. Luke's narrative of the baptism implied it to be the true one. Whether the letter of Cyril be genuine or not, it implies that at Jerusalem the feast of the baptism was that which originally pertained to the day, and that it

[4] To Sylvester, according to the oldest Armenian text in Paris, *Fonds Arm.*, 45, 45, f. 35.

was celebrated by the believers on the banks of the Jordan, where John baptized Jesus. The feast at Bethlehem was an embarrassing addition to the older one. It was clearly a new feast.

Now, the reason which led the believers of the fourth century to tack on to the baptism the feast of the birth from the virgin is not far to seek. They did so because the baptism of Jesus Christ was already regarded as his birthday, only as his spiritual birthday. Hence it is that Nicetas and Chrysostom are careful to speak of the new Christmas on December 25 as the celebration of the birth of Jesus *according to the flesh.* They were conscious that the baptism was his birth according to the spirit. From that time on it was not unusual for the Greek Fathers to say that the divine word Christ had undergone as many as three births, to-wit, the birth from the virgin mother, the birth in the Jordan when he was baptized, and the birth of the resurrection.

Nor is it in Greek and Armenian sources alone that we meet with the double feast in its older form. There are two Latin homilies variously attributed to Maximus of Turin in the fifth century or to Ambrose of Milan in the fourth. In these it is declared that Epiphany was, anyhow, the birthday of the Lord Jesus, whether because he was born of the virgin on that day, or was reborn in baptism (*sive hodie natus est ex virgine sive renatus in baptismo*).

He was born unto men on that day, these homilies declare, and thirty years later, on the same day, he was reborn unto the sacraments (*renatus est sacramentis*). On both grounds, says the writer, the feast is his natal feast (*festivitas natalis*). It is his nativity both of flesh and spirit (*nativitas et carnis et spiritus*). As thirty years before he had been brought forth through the virgin (*per virginem editus*), so on the same day he was now regenerated through the mystery (*per mysterium regeneratus*), was even sanctified (*sanctificatus*). As he was then born after his humanity (*secundum hominem nascitur*), so now he is generated according to a mystery (*secundum mysterium gignitur*).

These homilies attest, moreover, that the lection for the Epiphany was the gospel, not of the earthly birth, but of the

baptism, in these words: "The gospel writing, *as we have just heard it read*, relates that the Lord came to the Jordan for the sake of baptism, and that he wished himself to be consecrated in that river by the heavenly mysteries." In remote Armenia, where the Epiphany was always kept as the birthday, the same lection was in use at least as late as the eighth century. The catholicos John bears witness to the fact about 720 A. D. An examination of the most ancient lectionaries would probably indicate that the early Epiphany retained its primitive character as the festival of the baptism, even long after the commemoration of the carnal birth from the virgin was associated therewith. As late as the twelfth century, even, orthodox Armenian Fathers still defended their Christmas on January 6, on the ground that that was the day on which Christ had been reborn in the waters.

Now, in the fourth century, to which, no doubt, these two north Italian homilies belong, it was already heretical in the great Christian centers of Rome, Antioch, and Constantinople to use such phrases as we find in them: to say, namely, that Jesus was reborn, was regenerated, was sanctified in the Jordan, to speak of the nativity of his spirit. Accordingly the writer, if it be not some editor of these homilies, apologizes for his lapse into language which was already heretical, no matter how archaic, and he introduces an imaginary objector, as follows: "Perhaps someone will say, 'If he (Jesus) is holy, why did he wish to be baptized?' Hear then: Christ is baptized, not in order that he may be sanctified by the waters, but that he may himself sanctify the waters."

And here we find ourselves in the presence of what is by far the greatest revolution of Christian opinion which has ever occurred, greater far than the Reformation of the sixteenth century. It was accomplished in different places in different ages, in Rome as early as about 199, in Antioch about 260, in the Balcan peninsula about 340; in outlying parts of Christendom, like Spain and Armenia, as late as the eighth to tenth century In some remote circles of believers in Poland, Russia, Armenia, and the upper Tigris it has never been accomplished at all.

This revolution concerned the way in which Christians regarded the nature of Jesus Christ; it was a change in their Christology.

There is no doubt that the baptism of Jesus had for the four evangelists a unique significance, or they would not have narrated it in so circumstantial a manner. Jesus approaches the Baptist, the heavens open as he comes up out of the Jordan, and the Holy Spirit, in the form of a dove, alights upon him. At the same time the *Bath Kol*, or voice from heaven, salutes him in the language of the psalm as the beloved Son, in whom God is well pleased. There are variations in the narratives of the four evangelists and of the earliest extra-canonical witnesses, which claim here our momentary attention. Matthew and Mark relate the opening of the heavens and the dove-like descent of the Spirit as a personal vision of Jesus himself, and almost exclude the view that others saw it. Their narrative is clearly the most original, and we recognize in the incident the ecstasy of one who was not foreign to the theosophic imagery of Alexandria which recurs so often in the pages of Philo, and according to which the divine Spirit, or the Logos, was symbolically called by the name of, and likened to, the wild dove which roams over the desert tracts unfrequented by man. In Luke the vision is materialized, and the Holy Spirit is stated to have descended in *bodily* form as a dove. In the fourth gospel the vision gains the maximum of material externalization, and the Baptist "bears witness, saying: 'I beheld the Spirit descend . . . .'" Its descent, palpable to his eyes, is even represented as the sign which he was to watch for, in order to the recognition of him who was to baptize with the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, the fourth gospel preserves a trait in the narrative which has vanished from all but the oldest texts of Matthew and Luke, namely, that the Holy Spirit abode on, or rested on, Jesus, stayed with him permanently. The form of gospel which the Ebionite or Jewish Christians used related, according to Epiphanius (*Hær.*, 30, 13), that the Holy Spirit appeared in the form of a dove, descending and *entering* into Jesus. This form also related that the *Bath Kol* not only acclaimed him as the well-beloved Son, but added the words, "This day have I begotten

thee;" and the oldest witnesses attest the same reading in Luke 3:2.

The unique significance, in the apostolic age, of the Lord's baptism is also shown in the fact that Mark's gospel, the most archaic of the synoptics, begins with the baptism; so does John's, except for the prelude, in which he sets forth the nature of the Spirit, or Word, or Reason, of God, which, entering and abiding in Jesus at his baptism, so became flesh and tabernacled among us. Matthew and Luke alone pay any attention to the earthly birth of Jesus and to the incidents of his life antecedent to his baptism. In Acts 10:37, Peter's summary of the work of Jesus Christ also begins with the baptism preached by John, and implies that it was through that baptism that God anointed him (ἔχρισεν αὐτὸν, vs. 38, made him a Christ) with the Holy Spirit and power. Luke, also, in his gospel is careful to tell us how, after his baptism, Jesus "was full of the Spirit, and, returning from the Jordan, was led by the Spirit in the wilderness during forty days;" how, after the temptation, "he returned in the power of the Spirit unto Galilee;" and how he then returned to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, and, opening the book of Isaiah, read aloud in the local synagogue those marvelous verses, which were that day, for the first time, fulfilled: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, Because he anointed me to preach good tidings to the poor: He hath sent me to proclaim release to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind. . . ."

If, then, we discard artificial interpretations, the significance of John's baptism, both for Jesus and for those who believed in him, becomes clear. The Spirit of God then entered into him, anointed him spiritually, so that he was the Lord's anointed, or the Christ. God begat him in that hour, so that he was thenceforth born from above, regenerate, the chosen Son of God. He was then filled with the Spirit; the Spirit was *upon* him, filled him with power, possessed him, sent him forth on his ministry.

And the fourth gospel makes it clear that Jesus, the God-inspired man, was conceived as passing on to others the Spirit which in its fulness had rested on him. To as many as received him, to them gave he the right to become children of God like

himself; when they believe on his name, that is, in his power and prerogative as the Christ. And these believers are, like the Christ, born (or begotten), not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. We see, then, that Jesus Christ communicates to all the faithful the same divine sonship, the same spiritual birth, vouchsafed to him. All who would see the kingdom of God must like himself be born from above (not afresh). And this birth from above is in baptism. "Except a man be born of water and the Spirit, he cannot enter the kingdom of God." Jesus, therefore, does not stand alone, nor is he the only one chosen to be son of God; all who will can become sons of God and be spiritually anointed as was he Paul insists on this point when he declares that God foreknows *all* whom, according to his purpose, he has called and foreordained to be conformed to the image of his Son (Rom. 8:29). Jesus is but "the first-born among many brethren." And this is the faith which underlies Gregory's phrase, used of those who were baptized at the feast commemorative of the Lord's baptism: "They are illuminated along with him."

The church has always held, even long after the growing abuse of the rite made it a mockery, that baptism brings spiritual regeneration, the birth in the individual of a new inner man or spirit. It was regarded as a crisis in which, after a catechumenate or period of discipline, the individual, by a conscious effort of will and also by the grace of the Spirit, which freely enters the temple prepared, emerges from nature into the highest moral order, which the New Testament calls the kingdom of God. "The faithful," as the first epistle of Peter (1:23) says, "have been begotten again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, through the word of God which liveth and abideth in them." In other words, it is the eternal reason, which, entering at this crucial moment of repentance and faith, not so much displaces the natural soul as touches it to finer issues and raises it to a higher power. In Pauline phrase, the man who was merely ψυχικὸς, psychic, becomes πνευματικὸς, pneumatic, the temple and home of a spirit, which, crying "Abba, father," in his heart adopts him and makes him a son of God. So much stress did the early

church lay on this aspect of baptism that until a catechumen was baptized and received the Spirit he might not even use the Lord's prayer[5] and address God in heaven as "our Father;" and this prohibition was still enforced among the Armenian Christians of the tenth and eleventh, and among the Albigeois of the twelfth and thirteenth, centuries. Among the latter the *traditio precis*, or bestowal by the church of the Lord's prayer on a believer, was the prelude to the *consolamentum*, or spiritual baptism, in which he received the gift of the Holy Ghost.

There was also another aspect of the new soul which at baptism the Holy Spirit or Word of God engendered in the repentant and faithful. Being eternal and divine, it was naturally immortal and could not die. Hence the Christian was said at baptism to have risen again with Christ into immortal life. Nor is evidence wanting to show that this baptismal soul was regarded as having an incorruptible spiritual body, capable of being seen in apparitions to the purified eye of believers. We must not forget, also, that, in the age of the New Testament and for centuries after, the idea of spirit as a purely self-conscious immaterial activity did not exist in men's minds. A spirit, even the Holy Spirit of God, had a body of attenuated matter; and, like the wind which, unseen itself, stirs the material world and sets it in movement, it was capable of material action and reaction, especially on other spirits. In the *Shepherd* of Hermas the Holy Spirit is exhibited as waging upon the grosser and crasser evil spirits an almost physical warfare inside the body of the believer. I know that it is not popular at the present day, when philosophic idealism has schooled our minds, to dwell on the limitations which, after all, beset the conceptions of a Luke, a Paul, a Clement, perhaps even of Jesus. Yet we shall never grasp the inner meaning of the greatest renaissance of the human spirit until we frankly admit those limitations.

I said that the church has always adhered to the idea of spiritual regeneration in baptism, although by baptizing babies

[5] *Cf.* CASSIAN, *Coll.*, ix, 18: "Uniuersitatis deum ac dominum patrem esse uoce propria confitentes, de conditione seruili in adoptionem filiorum nos profitemur adscitos."

it has long ago stultified itself and abandoned the essence of baptism. Indeed, the significance of the baptism of Jesus, as it presented itself to St. Paul and the evangelists, was soon lost sight of by the orthodox churches, and instead of the "first-born among the brethren," we have set before us God incarnate from the virgin mother. Mary becomes the mother of God, the miraculous birth is exalted into the chief feast of the church; and the spiritual birth of baptism, through which the man Jesus, born of woman in the natural way, became, by the inspiration of God, the divine Son and Christ, is driven into the background The human significance of the gospel record thus fades away, and Jesus becomes God masquerading from the first moment of his conception in human flesh. And why? In order to deceive the devil, who, mistaking God for man, enters on the unequal conflict and is ignominiously defeated. Such is the travesty of early Christian conceptions, which we already meet with in so famous a teacher as Origen. In the third century it was already heretical to speak of Jesus as having been reborn, as regenerated spiritually, as sanctified in his baptism. The entire episode was explained away as an act of condescension on the part of God disguised as man. It was already of faith to declare that he was the divine Son, the Christ, the vehicle of the Holy Spirit, before he came to John in the Jordan.

Nevertheless, eloquent attestations of the juster and more primitive view remain to us—all too rare, alas—in the writings of the early Fathers. Thus Clement of Alexandria in his *Pædagogus* (I, 6) writes as follows: "At the very moment of his being baptized a voice from heaven resounded unto the Lord in witness that he was the loved one: 'Thou art my beloved Son, this day have I begotten thee.' Let us ask then of the wiseacres of today this question: The Christ having on this day been reborn, is he not now at last perfect, or, what is most absurd, is he still deficient in aught? If he be the latter, then he needs to learn something that he has not learned before. But it is not so. He is God and it is impossible that he should learn anything afresh. For no one can be greater than the Word, still less teacher of the only teacher."

The purport of the above is that the man Jesus became, in virtue of his baptismal regeneration, the divine Logos, who is perfect in wisdom above all other teachers. Clement continues: "Surely then they will admit that the Logos was born of the Father, perfect from perfect, and was regenerated perfect according to the foreshadowing of God's providence. But if he was perfect before, why was the perfect baptized? They answer that he needed to fulfil the profession of humanity. Very good. I admit it. Consequently, in the moment of his being baptized by John, he becomes perfect. That is clear. Did he then learn nothing additional from John? No. Then was he made perfect by the font alone, and hallowed by the descent of the Spirit? Yes."

In the above Clement attests the true meaning of the Lord's baptism. By the descent of the Spirit on him, Jesus became the perfectly wise teacher and was born again perfect. Then Clement insists that baptism has the same import for believers as for Jesus and for Jesus as for them, in these words: "And the very same thing happens also in regard to us, whose exemplar the Lord became: In being baptized we are illumined; in being illumined we are made sons (*i. e.*, adopted); in being made sons we are perfected; in being perfected we win emancipation from death. 'I,' saith he, 'have spoken, ye are gods, and sons of the Most High, all of you.'"

It is melancholy to reflect how soon evangelical language like the above became heretical in the great centers of the religion. In the last years of the eighth century it still survived in remote Spain, where Elipandus of Toledo was condemned for using the phrase: "Et ille Christus, et nos Christi. Et ille adoptiuus et nos adoptiui," *i. e.*, "Jesus was Christ, and we are Christs. He was the adoptive son of God, and so are we." Elipandus even speaks of Jesus as *deum inter deos;* he became God, and so do we. But elsewhere the early faith had long been anathematized, at Rome in the person of Theodotus before 200 A. D., at Antioch in the person of Paul of Samosata in 206 A. D.

Yet, as in Clement, so in isolated Latin writers, accounted

catholic, of the fourth century, it still survived. Thus, in Hilary, *De Trinit.*, viii, 25 (Tom. ii, p. 230*d*, of ed. Maffei, Verona, 1730), we have the following: "After the nativity of his accomplished baptism (*post consummati baptismi natiuitatem*) there was heard this declaration also of his belonging (to God), since a voice bore witness from heaven: 'Thou art my son. This day have I begotten thee.'" And at i, 48*a*, of the same writer we have a more explicit passage: "For he who was born man of the virgin, was he already then son of God? Nay, he that is son of man, is he as such son of God? Rather say that he was born again through baptism, and so became son of God. . . . . Indeed it is written, when he had come up out of the water: 'Thou art my son, I have this day begotten thee;' but according to the engendering of a man who is being reborn, he then also himself was reborn and became perfect son of God, and as he was already son of man, so he was in baptism made son of God."

Such passages as these of Clement and Hilary enable us to appreciate the cardinal importance attached in the earliest age to the feast of the baptism. It commemorated the transformation of the natural man Jesus into the adopted Son of God, into the Christ. It was natural, then, for Christians to choose this day to be baptized upon; but even this practice, because of the color it lent to the older Christology, was dropped in the fourth century, and only lingered on in remote Spain as late as the sixth. We also learn from them why the early Christians, especially in the Roman catacombs, loved to represent Christ in their symbolic pictures as a big fish, and themselves as little ones. It was the popular belief that fish are born in the water. So Jesus was born the Son of God in the Jordan. It was a mere happy accident that the letters of ἰχθύς are the initials of ἰησοῦς χριστὸς θεοῦ υἱὸς σωτήρ. This was a later conceit discovered when the original meaning of the symbol began to be obscured by the innovating theologians of Rome about 200 A. D. Tertullian preserves to us its genuine significance, when he almost heads his treatise on baptism with the words: "nos pisciculi secundum

nostrum Iesum Christum in aqua nascimur," "We little fishes are, after the example of Jesus Christ our Fish, born in the water." In the Christian art of the East down to quite late times, in pictures of the baptism of Jesus, the little fishes are represented swimming round about his feet under the waters of the Jordan. The symbol could not possibly have had one meaning as applied to Jesus Christ and another as applied to believers. It is noticeable that this symbolism vanishes about 300 A. D. along with the triumph of that newer Christology according to which Jesus was God from his mother's womb and filled from the first with the Holy Spirit. Concurrently with that triumph also arose the custom of baptizing infants, all incapable of that act of spiritual rebirth which was so supremely important to the first generations of Christians. Of this custom we have no trace before the third century, for the two passages of Irenæus (2, 33, 2) and Clement of Alexandria to which Wall and other defenders of the practice appeal have been simply misunderstood by them. Tertullian is the first to hint at the baptism, not indeed of infants, but of boys and girls; and he only mentions it in order to reprehend it. He has in view children of an age to be able to ask for the boon, but objects to their inexperience. What reason have those who are still at an age of innocence to be in a hurry for the remission of their sins? "Quid festiuat innocens ætas ad remissionem peccatorum?" Let them wait, he continues, till they are married, or otherwise disciplined. Such a passage proves — and it is well to notice the fact in passing — that the idea of marriage being a sacrament was unknown to Christians in those early ages; and naturally so, since no sacraments can precede baptism, and marriage usually did precede it. The scattered sects which throughout the Middle Ages, and even to the present day, have adhered to the primitive form of baptism have steadily refused to regard marriage as a sacrament. They have also kept up another early trait in the rite, namely, that the catechumen should, after repentance of sin and confession of faith, himself *ask* for baptism from the church as a favor to be conferred on him. For the first three centuries ministers and missionaries did not go

about the dwellings of the poor hunting for new-born infants to carry off and baptize. The one condition of the rite was that those who sought it should be old enough and instructed enough to grasp the serious nature of the regeneration they sought, the *pondus baptismi*, as Tertullian calls it. Even as late as the eighth century, as Boniface's letters show, importance still attached, even in catholic circles, to the catechumen's *asking* for baptism.

We hear much discussion nowadays of the validity of orders English, Latin, and oriental. The unbiased student of church history cannot but wonder that it has never occurred to any of these controversialists to ask whether they are not, after all, contending for a shadow; whether, in short, they have, any of them, real orders in the primitive sense in which alone they care to claim possession of them. The various sects of the Middle Ages which, knowing themselves simply as Christians, retained baptism in its primitive form and significance, steadily refused to recognize as valid the infant baptism of the great orthodox or persecuting churches; and they were certainly in the right, so far as doctrine and tradition count for anything. Needless to say, these great churches, having long ago lost genuine baptism, can have no further sacraments, no priesthood, and, strictly speaking, no Christianity. If they would reënter the pale of Christianity, they must repair, not to Rome or Constantinople, but to some of the obscure circles of Christians, mostly in the East, who have never lost the true continuity of the baptismal sacrament. These are the Paulicians of Armenia, the Bogomil sect round Moscow whose members call themselves Christs, the adult baptists among the Syrians of the upper Tigris valley, and perhaps, though not so certainly, the Popelikans, the Mennonites, and the great Baptist communities of Europe.

This condemnation of the great and so-called orthodox churches may seem harsh and pedantic, but there is no escape from it, if we place ourselves on the same ground on which they profess to stand. Continuity of baptism was more important in the first centuries of the church than continuity of orders; so important, indeed, that even the baptism of heretics was recognized as valid. If store was set by the unbroken succession of bishops,

it was only because one function of the bishop was to watch over the integrity of the initiatory rite of the religion. How badly the bishops of the great churches did their duty, how little, indeed, after the third century they even understood it, is seen in the unchecked growth, from about 300 A. D. onward, of the abuse of the baptismal rite, resulting before long in its entire forfeiture.

One more characteristic may be noticed of those Christians who have retained the primitive baptism. It is this. The idea of the personal inspiration of those who have received the baptism of the Spirit has ever been for them more of a reality than for those churches which lost sight of the real import of the baptism of Jesus, and before long lapsed into Mariolatry, and the cult of the *theotokos*. They have always believed that the fully initiated Christian is a temple in which the Holy Spirit, Christ, nay, God himself, dwells. For St. Paul himself, faith in Christ meant possession by the same Spirit which, descending and abiding on the man Jesus, made him Christ.[6] In the *charismata* of the early church, in the prophetic gift, in the gift of healing, of tongues, of discerning of spirits, in those who were powers, δυνάμεις—mediums, as a latter-day spiritualist would call them—the immanent Spirit revealed itself. "It is not I that speak," says Paul, "but Christ that dwelleth in me." So Ignatius of Antioch was called the bearer of God, "*theophoros*," because he was, as a later writer describes him, the home of the Lord, οἰκητήριον τοῦ κυρίου. Montanus and his prophetesses in Phrygia retained this idea of the immanent Spirit speaking and acting through them in the second half of the second century, when in the great church the written book of the New Testament was beginning to draw to itself a monopoly of the inspiration which till then had belonged to living believers. The formation and establishment of the New Testament canon implied the decay and disappearance of the Christian prophets; of the pneumatics, as Tertullian calls them. Yet, in conservative and remote corners of Christendom the belief in pneumatic

[6] For St. Paul, however, the προκοπή, or evolution of the man Jesus into the Christ and divine Son, was only completely manifested in the resurrection and ascent into heaven.

gifts survived, and the faithful were not merely Christians, but Christs. Among the Paulicians, from the eighth century till now, this Christhood of the elect continues. So it does among the Ebionite Syrians of the upper Tigris. Mr. Wallace Budge among the mountains north of Mosul was shown the house where a Christ had been born and the stream in which he had been baptized. The same thing goes on among the Bogomiles of modern Russia who know themselves as *the Christs*. The German word *Christ*, for Christian, points back to an age when the Christianity of northern Europe was of the same stamp.

In such circles of believers the man who is a Christ and has Christ in him is regularly adored by his fellow-believers, even when they are also Christs. Thus we read in Adamnan's life of St. Columba how the monks used to prostrate themselves before the saint, "adoring the Christ in him." The same adoration was customary among the Albigenses, and is noticed hundreds of times in the records of the inquisition of Toulouse in the early fourteenth century. It also prevails among modern Bogomiles round Moscow and among the Armenian Paulicians, whose book, *The Key of Truth*, I have recently edited. Tertullian records the same thing of his fellow-Christians at Carthage in the second century, and in Photius, and other writers of the ninth and tenth centuries, the charge of anthropolatry is, in this connection, constantly brought against the Paulicians of those ages.

In conclusion let me sum up, as portrayed in the above, the characteristics of this early form of Christianity, adding a few minor touches:

1. The incarnation was the taking possession of the man Jesus by the Holy Spirit at his baptism in the Jordan.

2. This, the prime event in Jesus' life, since he was therein reborn as Christ and Son of God, was commemorated in the Epiphany festival on January 6.

3. The same rebirth or regeneration belongs to all who, after repentance and profession of faith in his name or in God, are baptized into his church.

4. For Christians of this type it was immaterial whether Jesus was born in the natural manner or not. Accordingly some

of the Judæo-Christians or Ebionites believed one thing, some the other.

5. Christ was symbolized as a fish, because he was born in the waters of the Jordan.

6. When this original significance of the baptism began to be lost sight of, this symbol disappears from the monuments. Jesus comes to be regarded as having been Christ and God from his mother's womb, and the belief in the miraculous birth becomes all-important. The mother of Jesus becomes the mother of God, *theotokos*.

7. With the spread of this later view of the incarnation we must associate the invention of the modern Christmas on December 25. At the same time the old Epiphany feast loses its significance as the commemoration of the spiritual birth of Jesus Christ, and becomes the feast of the magi and their visit to Bethlehem. In an earlier age so little was known for certain about the time and place of Jesus' birth that the docetic Christians who were, as early as 100 A. D., the half of Christianity believed that he had never been born at all.

8. The forty days' fast called Lent originally followed directly upon the feast of the baptism; and naturally so, since it commemorated the forty days passed by the Lord in the wilderness. This is attested by Isaac Catholicos in his summary of Paulician doctrine (in Combefisius' *Hist. Monothelitarum*) and by Cosmas Indicopleustes. According to the former source, this custom lasted for 120 years in the church. When Epiphany lost its original significance and the Jewish paschal feast was, with the suppression of the quartodecumani, transformed into the Christian Easter, Lent was moved forward, so that the fast terminated with Easter eve.

9. After the example of Jesus, Christians of the primitive cast I have described were baptized in their thirtieth year. Paul of Samosata prescribed this age (see Mai, *Bibl. Patr.*, Tom. IX = Migne, *Patr. Gr.*, Vol. 72, col. 524). The Paulicians described by Isaac Catholicos followed the same rule, which is also insisted on by *The Key of Truth*. The Baptist Syrians north of Mosul still follow this rule.

10. Those who took this view of the baptism of Jesus have, everywhere and always, believed in the ability of believers to become Christs, in the sense of Paul of Samosata's saying, "Et ille Christus et nos Christi," and have adored believers who had attained to such a spiritual grade.

11. The creeds must once have mentioned the baptism of the Lord, and I suspect that in the Apostles' Creed there originally stood the following clauses: "And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born in the Jordan through baptism, suffered," etc. It is not without significance that the Albigensian form of creed retained such a mention of the baptism, and that the Armenian baptismal creed does so likewise.

For the benefit of students interested in the history of Christmas, a few important works of recent date may be added here: Paul Cassel: *Weihnachten-Ursprung, Bräuche und Aberglauben.* Berlin, 1861.—Chambers: *Book of Days.* Edinburgh, 1864.—Marbach: *Die heilige Weihnachtsfeier.* Frankfurt, 1865.—Florian Riess: "Das Geburtsjahr Christi." Ergänzungshefte der *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, 1880, Nos. 11 and 12.—Hermann Usener: *Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchungen.* Erster Theil: "Das Weihnachtsfest." Bonn, Max Cohen & Sohn, 1889 (reviewed by Adolf Harnack in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1889, cols. 199–212; and by Holtzmann *et. al.* in *Theologischer Jahresbericht*, Vol. IX, pp. 95, 108, 135, 163).—Paul de Lagarde: "Altes und Neues über das Weihnachtsfest." *Mittheilungen*, Vol. IV, pp. 241–323, Göttingen, 1891. Lagarde mentions here many writers on the history of Christmas, reviews Usener's contribution, and advances our knowledge of the subject considerably beyond Usener's. In the same volume, pp. 211–40, Lagarde reprints two forgotten articles on the history of Christmas by Paul Ernst Jablonski.—S. Bäumer: "Das Fest der Geburt des Herrn in der altchristlichen Liturgie." *Katholik*, Vol. LXX, 1890, pp. 1–20.—Karl Müller, *Kirchengeschichte*, Vol. I, p. 205.—H. Thurston: "Christmas and the Christian Calendar. I," *American Ecclesiastical Review*, December, 1898.

(To be continued.)

THE RITSCHLIAN DOCTRINE OF THEORETICAL AND RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE.

By HUGH R. MACKINTOSH,
Tayport, Scotland.

THE present article endeavors to review the most important presuppositions of a philosophical kind upon which the theological edifice known as Ritschlianism has been raised. No one can deny that the school of Ritschl is at once the most interesting and the most conspicuous feature of the theological landscape at the present moment, and that the contributions which its members have made to the religious thought of our time are fitted to enrich in a singular degree the intellectual heritage of Christian thinkers. It is all the more essential that the metaphysical assumptions which have to bear the weight of a superstructure so imposing should be carefully and critically analyzed. A fragmentary sketch of such an analysis and criticism will be found in the pages which follow, where we shall be occupied, not so much with the Ritschlian theology in itself, as with the philosophical avenue which conducts us to it.

The exposition of the Ritschlian theory possesses one paradoxical aspect which must always have provoked remark. Everyone is aware that the general thesis maintained by Ritschl and his followers is the entire independence of reason which faith enjoys, the right of religious belief to cast off the chill and confining influences of philosophy. They adopt the plan, therefore, of persuading philosophy to abdicate at the bidding of her own fundamental principles. And so it comes about that there are no books in the world in which more technical metaphysics are to be found than those which the most prominent Ritschlians have written. Herrmann's *Die Religion* is a kind of modernized *Critique of Pure Reason.* If the truth really be as they say, one is forced to conclude that only a trained metaphysician has any right to believe it. Philosophy must be

brought in somewhere and somehow: if not as a factor in the scientific expression of faith, at least as a medicinal preparative for those who wish to be able to give a reason for the faith that is in them.

It need hardly be said that the Ritschlian scheme of thought is opposed to the general trend of the history of dogmatic system-building. The practice of most theologians of repute, when embarking on their enterprises in divinity, has been to justify the existence of systematic theology by an appeal to considerations of a more or less philosophical kind. The demand for rational unity without which intelligence cannot be conceived, the inconsequence of any abrupt cessation of reflective synthesis, the necessity for thought of some criterion which will distinguish the true elements of religious experience from the false—such things as these are peremptory. And, *prima facie*, the theologians are right. For in dealing with its subject-matter, theology claims to possess no special organ of knowledge by an appeal to which inconvenient questions may be evaded. It works with the ordinary instruments of reflection. No doubt valuable results can be expected only from those who sympathize with the aspirations of faith; but the same may be said, *mutatis mutandis*, of æsthetics or morals.

Now, religious experience has a cognitive side. The judgments of faith claim to be true of a reality, of a system of things, existing quite independently of our interest in it. And to conceive this world of divine and spiritual being at all, we require conceptions which are metaphysical if they are anything. How else can we describe such notions as self-consciousness, or end, or cause? A theologian may repudiate the meaning assigned to terms like these by a dominant philosophy, but the modifications he may propose leave them as metaphysical as ever. Both theology and philosophy, again, are bound to discuss such questions as the possibility of miracle, or the theoretical efficacy of proofs for the existence of God. And while the argument in each case may take a different route, there is no difference of kind between the principles they apply, the criteria they seek to conform to, or the notion of truth which obtains in each depart-

ment. Christian theology has refused, and refused rightly, to submit to the tyranny of any particular system of metaphysics, or to use those terms exclusively which might be licensed by the philosophy of the day. But it has done so from no aversion to the *method* of philosophy, which it accepts as its own, but from the condition that the system in question has done violence to certain elements in faith by forcing them into logical formulas too narrow for their content.

Ritschlian thinkers, however, absolutely decline to acquiesce in the relations which have hitherto subsisted between dogmatic theology and metaphysics. They believe that, if we define the limits of the two with accuracy, they may live together in the same mind, on a basis of peaceful neutrality. The old opposition of faith and knowledge is a true one, and needs to be applied inflexibly all along the line. It is even possible to pronounce two contradictory judgments on the nature of reality, according to the rôle we elect to fill; for in Herrmann's unequivocal words, "the difficulty of the religious problem is not one whit lessened or increased whether the dogmatic metaphysics which the Christian follows is built on materialistic or idealistic lines."[1] Religious knowledge as such is entirely independent of theoretical cognition. The starting-point of the former is *sui generis*. And, while Ritschl wavered considerably, in his different editions, on the point whether we ought to seek ultimately to unite the conclusions of reason and faith, Herrmann has no scruples on the matter, and denounces any such attempt as a treachery to religion. The limits of cognition must be fixed once for all; beyond them lies the province of faith. No question of faith must ever be taken for trial to the court of reason; the verdicts of reason have no authority in the realm of faith. It is this attempt to disarm the criticism of philosophy by changing the *venue* that forms the characteristic mark of Ritschl's theology.

The first part of our author's theory, therefore, is of a negative character, since, to make room for belief, knowledge must first of all be abolished. The second part easily surpasses the

[1] *Die Metaphysik in der Theologie*, pp. 16, 17.

first in interest and importance, containing as it does his reasoned and explicit opinions on the subject of *value-judgments* as the proper instrument of theological knowledge. While there are adumbrations of a similar theory of the fundamental significance of the conception of *worth* in theology to be found in the works of Kant, Schleiermacher, and others, yet to Ritschl and Herrmann is due the prominence which the conception has attained in modern thought. Now, as it is through judgments of value that faith escapes into the region of the supersensuous and divine, as we have Ritschl's plain declaration that "it is the task of theology to guard the peculiarity of the thought of God —that it ought to be expressed in judgments of value only,"[2] it is obviously our interest to study the second part of his theory with great care. The first half of his apologetics is a semi-Kantian theory of knowledge of no particular merit or originality; the other half, containing his exposition of the value-judgment, is intended to revolutionize theology. Besides, while writers like Herrmann and Kaftan diverge widely from Ritschl, in their method of demonstrating the impotence of knowledge to deal with matters of faith, they join hands with him in declaring that the idea of worth is our only guide to the spiritual world. After a very brief account of Ritschl's theory of knowledge, therefore, we shall turn more especially to his theory of faith, and in the course of our discussion of this latter point we shall be able to embrace the most important thinkers of the school in a single view.

In a well-known passage of his *Theologie und Metaphysik*,[3] Ritschl vehemently denies that he has any wish to exclude metaphysics entirely from theology. The theologian, he considers, cannot, as a scientific thinker, dispense with a theory of knowledge which may furnish him with the formal conceptions or categories necessary for the work of rationalizing experience. The highest category of metaphysics, however, is that of *thing* or substance; and this carries with it the fatal consequence that, from the metaphysical point of view, we can ascribe to spirit no

[2] *Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung*, 3te Auflage, III, p. 214.

[3] *T. u. M.*, 2te Auflage, p. 48.

superiority over nature. They are both substances, and, so far, stand upon one level. The introduction of philosophy into theology has had the result—to take the most grievous example—that the word God has been understood as equivalent to the unity of the world-substance, and thus a relic of the Aristotelian metaphysics has been substituted for the far deeper meaning attached by Christianity to the divine. This unhappy consequence could not, in the circumstances, be avoided, for metaphysics have no room for the conception of conscious personality, and must, from the very nature of the case, be blind to the *worth* of spiritual life.

Now, in charging metaphysic with indifference to the distinction in value between spirit and nature, Ritschl appears to me to be guided, or rather misguided, by the resolve to identify it completely with the theory of knowledge. It is perfectly true that epistemology as such has nothing to do with questions of the value of an object for the self: for its purposes an object is simply an object known, not an object appreciated. But if we refuse to identify these two philosophical disciplines, as Ritschl persists in doing, it remains possible for us to hold that metaphysic, as the last word on our experience as a whole, is bound to include all the distinctions on which that experience rests, and among them the distinction of value or worth. Otherwise we should be forced to adopt the strange conclusion that the ultimate philosophy must remain entirely silent on the subject of our moral and æsthetic beliefs.

One or two of the more salient features of the Ritschlian theory of knowledge may be briefly noticed. After a rapid summary and criticism of the epistemological views of Plato and Kant, Ritschl professes his agreement with the positions arrived at by Lotze. The value of this confession of epistemological faith, however, depends on the meaning it receives when expanded. It is possible, I think, to discover two widely separate lines of thought in his subsequent exposition. The one is guided by a method essentially psychological, and leads to a purely subjective idealism; the other, betraying itself at intervals, is suggestive of a naïve and uncritical realism. The study of

Ritschl's writings, indeed, leaves on the reader's mind the impression that he had not clarified his theory of knowledge sufficiently; for he habitually uses language which must be interpreted in a subjectivistic sense, but which he sets aside without compunction when the need for realistic expression becomes urgent.

Let me illustrate what I have called Ritschl's psychological method, first, by his explanation of the way in which we come to believe in the *unity* of a thing. We call an object a *single* object, he tells us, simply because, amid the changing perceptions we have of it, we are conscious of the unity of the self.[4] The impulse which prompts us to apply the category of unity to a group of phenomena comes from the subjective side. We are not to suppose that the phenomena themselves force us to conceive them as forming an individual thing. Now, it is clear that Ritschl has here fixed his attention solely on the contents of consciousness. He does not recognize the fact that ideas inform us of what is happening beyond the limits of our single mind, whether we attend to it or not. His explanation, too, is not explanatory. For the self is always one, and always knows itself as one, however its perceptions may change, but we do not regard every group of phenomena we perceive as an individual. We must wait for some cue to be given us from without, for some quality of the sensational elements which calls for the category of oneness. Knowledge is not spun from the inside of the mind; it is subject to the constraint of fact. But Ritschl systematically ignores this transsubjective reference which ideas always carry with them, and will not permit the circumstance that ideas are symbols of reality to interfere with his theory of perception. It is one aspect of his attempt to empty the external world into the human mind.

Again, when we turn to his account of the conception of *cause*, we are met by another instance of his method of confining knowledge to the intraconscious standpoint, and manufacturing cognition out of elements purely subjective. He regards it as a mistake of the popular view of things to differentiate

[4] *T. u. M.*, p. 38.

between cause and effect, or to interpose any interval of time between them, for, to use his own words, "when we think effects rightly, we think the cause in the effect." The particular case of causation in which Ritschl is specially interested is that of religious experience, where God is the cause of the effects in us. The effects, such as love, contrition, etc., are modifications of our consciousness, and the result of applying the above formula to them is to yield the conclusion, "we know God *only* in his effects upon us."[5] Unless we confine our apprehension of God in this way to our own ideas, he considers that we have no guarantee of religious certainty. He claims, indeed, that his theological method is a revival of Schleiermacher's analysis of the individual religious consciousness. But, surely, to forbid us to move beyond the intrasubjective domain is to convert knowledge into introspection, and to divest religious faith of all its objective meaning. The religious consciousness, when unsophisticated by theories of its own nature, infallibly regards the Divine Spirit as the cause of the experiences of piety—a cause, too, which is other than its effects and independent of them. It knows God, not as Ritschl would say, *in* his effects alone, but *through* them. Religious minds do not first examine certain phenomena of their inner life, and conclude from a study of them to the nature of God, any more than in conversation with a friend our attention lingers first upon the vocal sounds he utters. We go, of course, directly to the thoughts which his words signify, and in the same way the religious impulse is to look away beyond itself and know the divine object immediately. Our knowledge of the spiritual world comes to us necessarily *through* our immediate experience, but we cannot convert this straightway into a preliminary investigation of our subjective states. If God is to be found solely in certain effects in us, we must ascribe to him a merely intramental existence, for these effects as such are nothing but conditions of our consciousness. And if we adopt Ritschl's reading of the matter, we can see clearly enough how Feuerbach could define religion as our worship of our own being. If it is merely a vulgar error to place the cause at an

[5] *T. u. M.*, p. 49.

earlier point of time than the effect — that is, in more general terms, to make the effect significant of something other than itself — the limits of the individual mind can never be transcended. Carry Ritschl's ruling principle out to its logical issue, and we find that man, condemned to self-observation alone, becomes and remains the center of religion; the whole universe of piety revolves about the particular self. Bender has only extended the Ritschlian method when he affirms: "Not God but man is the central element in faith; man is the sun round which circles the world of religious thought."[6] But we escape from conclusions so paradoxical when we recollect the simple truth that religious experience, like every other, carries with it a theory of its own origin. It refers us beyond itself, to the source of those impulses which have translated themselves into the ideas and feelings of piety. We can see already, from the point we have reached, how natural it will be for Ritschl, in harmony with his idealistic view of knowledge, to resolve religious cognition into judgments which express, not objective existences, but the values which the ideas of them have for the believing mind.

Let us take one more example of the procedure I have styled psychological, this time our author's doctrine of the self. Here, too, he is faithful to the tendency we have noticed above, to resolve the object of discussion into elements which can be phenomenalized — elements, that is to say, which actually present themselves as part of the stream of consciousness. His first step is to assign supreme importance to the active aspect of the ego; indeed, it would hardly be too much to say that for Ritschl the notions of self and will are identical. Other functions of the ego are construed as auxiliary to will, inasmuch as they furnish materials for its realization. But when we seek an answer to the question, "What, then, does he mean by will?" we are forced to conclude that, when rigorously interpreted, he tends to decompose it into its phenomenal manifestations. Will becomes for him simply a compendious name for the series of voluntary acts. "We know nothing," he declares roundly, "of an in-itself of the soul, of a self-inclosed life of spirit behind or beyond its

[6] *Das Wesen der Religion*, pp. 71, 78.

functions."[7] He ascribes reality, that is, only to what can be apprehended by self-observation, and since the noumenal self, as the subject of knowledge, cannot be made the object of direct intuition, its existence is denied. The ego falls asunder into its particular active experiences. But the functions of the self are many: in what sense can Ritschl call it a unity? It can be one, surely, for the eye of a spectator alone, or as the purely formal unity of consciousness, the needle-eye of experience through which all threads must pass. The constituents of conscious life all cross one another at this point, but they flow on in ceaseless change, and if there exists no permanent self as their ground and their guide, the spring of moral action and the continuity of character are gone. Here again we must reject a method which fails to conduct us to real existence, and leaves us in the shadow-land of floating ideas. Unless the mind is in immediate contact with reality somewhere, unless we are right in construing trans-subjectively the cognitive elements of consciousness, whether they refer to the self or the not-self, there is nothing for it but to resign ourselves to the tender mercies of Hume.

Ritschl turns, at last, from the introductory task of negative criticism, and sets out to replace the current conceptions of theology by others more agreeable to his subjectivistic theory of knowledge. We have seen how persistently he holds the mind to the intraconscious point of view; how he rejects, when he is most logical, every kind of realistic interpretation of ideas. We cannot know things as they are apart from actual perception; the scholastic distinction between things-in-themselves and their action upon us is antiquated and mistaken; we know a good deal about predicates, effects, and perceptions, but we must ask no questions about subjects, or causes, or things perceived. His task now is to throw religious knowledge into a form which harmonizes with these presuppositions, to prove that faith does not really concern itself about the independently real existence of its objects, but looks only to the value for the self of this or that reality, when drawn down to the subjective level. In matters of faith Ritschl advises us to exercise prudence, and not stir beyond

[7] *R. u. V.*, III, p. 21.

what we immediately experience. Herrmann only throws the same opinion into a striking aphorism when he declares: "For religion the real is not that which can be explained, but that which can be experienced."[8]

How, then, does Ritschl actually define religion, and what does he take to be its idea and its end? "The distinction of worth," he tells us in an important passage, "is of no significance for the metaphysical theory of the universe, while the religious view of the world depends on the fact that man distinguishes himself in worth in some measure from the phenomena which surround him."[9] Religion thus rests primarily upon a certain relation between man and the world. Faith steps in to solve the contradiction between the claims of spirit and the relentlessness of nature. In man's helpless plight religion intervenes, revealing to him the existence of transcendent spiritual powers through whose aid he is enabled to cope with the pressure of the natural world.

I think that Ritschl habitually does himself injustice when he attempts to elucidate the fundamental idea of religion. He appears to me to understate the opinions which he actually held on this subject, and which come to the surface instinctively in many parts of his writings devoted to other themes. One would hardly gather, indeed, from the official passages which deal with the topic, that his views of the ideal nature of religious faith were so high and spiritual as we know them to have been. For the outcome of these passages is simply that religion is a product of the struggle for existence; to use his own words, "religion is the spiritual instrument which man possesses to free himself from the natural conditions of his life."[10] Such a theory is not so much false as altogether inadequate. It is based upon an examination of religious phenomena which belong to the lower rather than the highest stages of human development. It interprets faith in the light rather of its beginning than of its end. Not only so, but since religion arises to solve a contradiction—between man and nature—and depends for its very life upon

[8] *Die Religion*, p. 114.

[9] *T. u. M.*, p. 9.

[10] *R. u. V.*, III, p. 174 (edition 1874).

this opposition, the reconciliation of the opposing terms would sound the death knell of faith. In the limiting case of a perfect harmony between the spirit of man and its natural environment the need for devotion would have disappeared. If the idea of God is nothing more than a *Hilfsbegriff*, as Ritschl's theory implies, then union with God is not something without which man is essentially inadequate to his idea, but a mere necessity of his present unfortunate situation. The revolutionary inferences which follow thus unavoidably from his premises have been drawn with merciless fidelity by Bender, Ritschl's most extreme and most superficial disciple. And yet, if any such account of the fundamental motive and impulse of religion be true, the highest reaches of devout and reverent feeling are an insoluble mystery. At the supreme level attained in the Psalms, or in the epistles of St. Paul, communion with God is passionately sought for its own sake alone, and the religious consciousness repels ardently the insinuation that in turning to God in prayer and fellowship the soul is animated by any ulterior motive or desire, even that of moral improvement. But if the *form* of religious experience be conceived with Ritschl as essentially determined by the two factors, nature and man, the yearning for God must wear to the last the aspect of a means to a further end.

And now we have reached the stage at which it becomes necessary to examine with care the function and significance which Ritschl ascribes to value-judgments, as the only legitimate instrument and expression of religious knowledge. It is this half of his theory which has had a history in the formation and rapid development of the school known by his name.

The all-important question, then, is this: How does religious differ from theoretical cognition? The difference, in Ritschl's view, is not to be found in the *object*,[11] for both kinds of knowledge deal with the world, and both, though from divergent motives, seek to comprehend the world as a whole. The distinction lies rather in the sphere of the *subject*. In what characteristic of the self does the root of the difference lie? In this, that the self may appropriate the sensations or ideas which

[11] *R. u. V.*, III, pp. 195 ff.

arise in consciousness in one of two ways. "On the one hand, *in the feeling of pleasure or pain they are determined according to their value for the self.* . . . . In the feeling of pleasure or pain the ego affirms for itself whether a sensation which affects the self-feeling serves to heighten or depress it," that is, it passes a value-judgment upon it. "On the other hand, the sensation is referred through the idea (of it) to its cause," *i. e.*, a theoretical judgment is pronounced upon it. These two functions of the ego always act simultaneously, though in their combination one or the other may predominate at different times. Ritschl proceeds to discriminate between those value-judgments which are merely *concomitant* and those which are *independent.* The former turn out to be nothing more than that running commentary of pleasurable interest which accompanies the exercise of the cognitive faculty; we cannot come to know without, at least in some degree, desiring to know. The latter class are most important for our purpose, for to them belong the judgments of faith. Ritschl expresses himself most concisely on this point when he says: "Religious knowledge manifests itself in independent value-judgments which have to do with the attitude of man to the world and call forth feelings of pleasure and pain in which man either enjoys the dominion over the world which divine aid has vouchsafed him, or experiences with pain the lack of God's aid to that end." And thus he comes finally to declare that "knowledge of God is demonstrably religious knowledge only when God is conceived in the relation of assuring to believers that position in the world which overbalances its hindrances. . . . . To be sure, it is maintained that we must know the being of God in order that we may affirm his value for us: on the contrary, *we know the being of God only within his value for us.*"[12]

If we now go back to a passage which was quoted above, we shall be able to understand better what it implies. "Sensations (or ideas) are determined according to their value for the self in the feeling of pleasure and pain." A value-judgment, if we take these words strictly, is really a report upon the pleasure or pain which a certain idea excites in the mind; it is not so far a

[12] *R. u. V.*, III, p. 202; *cf.* pp. 376 and 558.

proposition about an independently real object of knowledge. It moves and has its being wholly within the subjective domain, and simply affirms the worth of an idea for us, according as it heightens or lowers the self-feeling. That is to say, *feeling is the value-norm*, and an idea should logically stand higher or lower in the scale of worth as it excites in us more or less pleasure. In such a judgment we may assert, indeed, the value, the transcendent value, of the idea of God, but so far we can say nothing whatever of God as he exists apart from our idea of him. But if the worth, and consequently the religious truth, even of the conception of the divine depends on its capacity to stimulate our pleasurable consciousness, where are we to find a criterion which will secure that the highest of all ideas shall not be the prey of individual caprice? Kaftan evidently feels that every assurance must be offered that the judgments of faith repose upon some other foundation than the arbitrary decision of the single mind, and that they represent objective matters of fact. His repeated protestations on the subject suggest a fear lest the argumentations of Ritschl might seem to imperil the objective validity of theological propositions, and the anxiety of a convinced disciple to remove apprehensions on so vital a point.

I do not think that those who have discussed the foundations of the Ritschlian theology have bestowed sufficient attention on the fact that feeling (as pleasure or pain) is erected by Ritschl into the criterion of religious value-judgments. No doubt, if we argue solely from his general allusions to the conditions and significance of morality, we should expect him to reason thus: The good is, as such, supremely valuable. If man is seriously to will what is good, and to believe in the possibilty of its realization, he must have faith in God. What ought to be can and must be, and to bring it into being there must exist a moral Ruler of the world. But his definite theory on the subject, as we have just seen, is something very different. Feeling is the norm which determines the value of an idea for us. Nor does it seem possible to interpret his language in the sense that feeling is merely a *thermometer*, so to speak, but not strictly a measure, of worth; his words are too unambiguous for that.

And thus Scheibe, in his sympathetic exposition of Ritschl's system, does him no injustice when he sums up the gist of it in these words: "Religious knowledge is given by value-judgments upon that which God is for us, *i. e., by the feelings of pleasure which we connect with the thought of God.*"[13] But if feeling is to be made the norm of the judgments of faith in this thoroughgoing fashion, the most capricious and unworthy conceptions of God can claim as much truth as the purest and most ideal, and theology becomes infected throughout with the individual subjectivity of Hedonism.

If feeling is the standard of value-judgments, it becomes clearer than ever that religion must center round man. "Religious cognition consists of judgments of worth which have to do with the attitude of man to the world." Feeling must be sheltered from disturbance, and maintained at a positive level; and since human powers are inadequate to such a task, the aid of heaven must be invoked. But may it not be said that the difficulties from which men thus seek to be rescued are, above all, difficulties of a *moral* kind? True, but we must recollect that, for Ritschl, moral judgments are a subdivision of independent value-judgments, and thus in their turn dependent on the feeling of pleasure and pain. He is absolutely debarred from the appeal to moral convictions of a distinctly categorical character which rest not on feeling, but on conscience. This way of escape lies open to Herrmann, but Ritschl cannot resort to it except at a sacrifice of self-consistency.

For our present purpose it will be sufficient to indicate in a word the positions relative to Ritschl taken up by Herrmann and Kaftan, his most distinguished followers. The family characteristic which attaches to each of these kindred systems of thought is that religion is brought by each into a fundamental and exclusive dependence upon judgments of worth. It is of very little importance whether we say, with Kaftan and Herrmann, that faith-propositions *rest on*, or, with Ritschl, that they *consist in*, judgments of worth. The distinction is purely formal: in every case the thesis set up and defended is that our apprehension of

[13] *Die Bedeutung der Werturteile für das religiöse Erkennen*, p. 11.

those ideas which most concern us as religious men rests exclusively on the feeling of value. Of course, a great deal more is meant by this than the truth that religious knowledge deals with objects which are of supreme value for humanity. These writers go much farther. They contend that faith affirms the existence of what is supremely valuable, exclusively on the ground of its being so. Reason finds the ground of knowledge in the constraint of objective fact, and the ultimate ideal of truth in the conception of an articulated system of experience. Faith finds the ground, and the only valid ground, of belief in the transcendent worth of its object.

But at this point Herrmann diverges from Ritschl and Kaftan. The two latter theologians conceive the personality, which has to be maintained against the world, whose claim upon life and happiness has to be satisfied, as constituted ultimately by feeling. For them the spring and source of religious thought and action is the impulse to preserve intact the feeling of self. Herrmann, on the other hand, as an out-and-out Kantian, conceives the personality which is to overcome the world as determined essentially by the moral law. Indeed, he does not hesitate to say: "The content of the moral law *is* personality."[14] The indispensable characteristic of a personal life is subjection to the categorical imperative, and the fundamental postulate of all religious faith is that there must be a God, if a refractory world is not to overwhelm and annihilate the moral aspirations of man. Plainly enough these two views are as wide as the poles asunder in their fundamental features. In the one case religion rests upon belief in a power which makes for happiness and brings to nought the opposing force of natural conditions; in the other religion depends on faith in a power on whose gracious coöperation man can depend in his struggle to realize the moral ideal.

One is haunted, when reading the writings of the Ritschlians, by the feeling that they have failed as yet to make out the objectivity of the norm or standard by which judgments of value are to be criticised. If religious ideas and sentiments make their appeal to feeling alone, who shall decide when feelings

[14] *Die Religion*, p. 240.

disagree? *De gustibus non disputandum:* each man's capacity for feeling becomes the measure of the supersensuous world. In the domain of morals, at any rate, we cannot rest satisfied with so subjectively determined a criterion of conduct. There we instinctively regard the norm of ideal action as independent of the fortuitous susceptibility of the individual mind. We approve of an action because the ideal standard has in some degree been satisfied; we do not conclude from the fact of our approval to the satisfaction of the norm. The standard which we bring to the examination of the person or action concerned attaches itself to an objective quality of the given fact. And we cannot escape from this consideration by saying, with Kaftan, that a value-judgment expresses merely a relation which we as living beings occupy to the represented object,[15] for this is to open the doors of practical philosophy to the weary paralogisms of the doctrine of the relativity of knowledge.

But if the norm be objective, it cannot be defined in terms of feeling alone, as is done by Ritschl and Kaftan. It is doubtless true that we cannot be susceptible of the worth of an object without in some degree being suffused with pleasurable consciousness. Yet, on the other hand, we are well aware—and upon such a point a man's own consciousness is the last court of appeal—that the excellence and dignity we ascribe to an ideal of any kind are in no way dependent upon the amount of pleasure it may yield us, either at a particular moment or throughout the whole of life. If Scheibe, consequently, is right in saying that "religious knowledge is given by the feelings of pleasure and pain which we connect with the idea of God," it is clear how wavering and inconstant must be our apprehension of the divine. But there is little use of pursuing this line of criticism farther. What we have in this theory is obviously the old Hedonistic doctrine once more. Religious eudæmonism has risen into life again in the systems of Ritschl and Kaftan, disguised on this occasion under the new rubric of value-judgments, but its inadequacy to interpret the moral and religious experience of man is as patent as ever. We must answer, as has been

[15] *Das Wesen der christlichen Religion*, p. 42.

answered before, that a pleasant state of consciousness cannot be at once identified with the judgment that an object has positive value, nor pain with the judgment that the object has negative worth. There are passages in Herrmann where he seems inclined to follow the same route, and he does place at the center of all things the self-feeling (*Selbstgefühl*) to the satisfaction of which both religion and morality minister as means.[16] But these are negligible infidelities to his real Kantianism, and to his true and vigorously enforced contention that the value-standard we apply to the judgments of faith must be based upon the absolute *a priori* character of the moral law, and that nothing can be permitted to rank as religious knowledge which does not serve to perfect moral personality.

Another great difficulty which outsiders have found in the Ritschlian system, and which forms the burden of complaint in most of the critical writing directed against it, is the lack of anything like proof that value-judgments really transcend the limits of subjective persuasion. If we make explicit the syllogism which lies at the basis of Ritschlianism, it runs somewhat as follows: What is of (supreme) religious value is real. God is of (supreme) religious value, *ergo* God exists. The argument depends for its very existence upon the previous conclusion that intellectual experience has utterly failed to bring us within sight of the divine. Faith must cast off the last shred of connection with knowledge; Herrmann, indeed, takes great pains to make it clear beyond all possibility of doubt that faith is concerned with a reality absolutely dissevered from the real which is given in knowledge, and that to attempt to unite the two is nothing short of sacrilege. "For Christianity," he says, "there is no identical ground of morality and nature."[17] Faith thus *contradicts* knowledge, instead of going on before it as an advance guard, to occupy tracts of being as yet incompletely subdued by the labors of rational insight. The theory of knowledge has walled up the self in ontological seclusion, and if it is ever to escape to the sphere of supersensible reality, it can only be by a *tour de force*. We are to conclude from a desire which we find within us to the

[16] *Die Religion*, p. 146.

[17] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

reality of its corresponding object—a desire in support of which we have not a single reason to offer. Our heart must remain satisfied with an ideal which we cannot know to be real.

The precarious nature of such a theory of religious cognition appears to be dimly adumbrated even in the expositions of Ritschlian writers themselves. They seem to be unable to rid their minds of the suspicion that, after all, value-judgments are not sufficient *per se* to apprehend the objects of religious faith, and that, while thrown out at these objects with all possible purity of aspiration, they prove somehow unable to break loose from the world of mere desire. This sentiment of insecurity seems to me to find clear enough expression in the function they assign to *revelation*, which they regard as having reached the world exclusively in the person of Christ. Some tangible, objective ground of belief could not be dispensed with, if faith was not to hang helplessly between heaven and earth. And thus we find Herrmann announcing, toward the close of his argument, that historical revelation supplies us with the necessary grounds for the objective validity of our faith, that "the reality of what is believed is for us also independent of the subjective experiences of believers, inasmuch as it rests securely upon the person of Jesus, and the relation of that person to the needs of the ethical spirit of man."[18] Ritschl similarly maintains that the subjective judgments of feeling are warranted true and no illusions, only through the historical person of Christ and the testimony of the church.[19] And to the same general effect Kaftan remarks that "whether a religion really rests upon revelation is identical with the question whether or not it is true."[20]

Here again the query cannot be evaded: How do we know that any given personality *is* a revelation? If there are true revelations, presumably there are "revelations" that are false. The only consistent answer possible on Ritschlian presuppositions — one of which is that the reference to spiritual being can be extracted only from a value-judgment — must be that we base our certainty that Jesus has truly revealed God exclusively on

[18] *Die Religion*, p. 399.

[19] *R. u. V.*, III, pp. 6, 184 ff., and *T. u. M.*, p. 16.

[20] *Das Wesen*, p. 197.

a judgment of worth. Jesus is to be appraised as the revealer of God, because what he brings to us is religiously valuable. But this is to argue in a very obvious circle. Revelation cannot communicate objectivity to the value-judgments of faith in general, if a value-judgment is the source of its own cogency. If our only outlook to the transcendent is through the judgment of worth, all that a "revelation" can possibly effect is a modification of the meaning we ascribe to the words "religiously valuable." If value-judgments, in short, are true because of the worth of the objects they describe, no revelation is required to demonstrate their objective validity, for *ex hypothesi* that is certain already. If they are not, a revelation which draws all its persuasiveness from value-judgments is incapable of establishing their objectivity.

Thus we arrive at the same conclusion as before, that so long as feeling is the supreme court of appeal, religious belief is condemned to imprisonment in the dungeon of subjectivity. Feeling can offer us nothing but particular sensations of pleasure or pain; we must look to *thought* for the self, and for objects, and for the value which the one finds in the others. The categories of value must be shown to be categories of reason in the richest and most comprehensive sense of that word. Otherwise theology is left where Schleiermacher left it—internally, elaborated by a master hand with marvelous felicity, but bereft of a genuinely scientific foundation. Or if we take the line which Herrmann has chosen and argue for the truth of faith on the ground that it renders morality possible, we are likely to disagree with him, not so much for what he affirms as for what he denies. For, not to dwell upon the fact that he can offer us no *known* object to which we may attach our ideally ethical judgments of faith, he ignores all the other links which bind the sentiment of moral obligation to the thought of God. Obligation is not a mere feeling; it comes to us laden with transcendent relations; in a very true sense it comes to us "trailing clouds of glory, from God who is its home." Nor do we project the source of it out into the vast inane, planting the being whom we call God vaguely in the ocean of characterless existence. Our thought reaches

land again in the belief that the origin and fountain of moral inspiration is likewise the source and support of the causal and teleological order disclosed to us by knowledge. Further, we do not identify these two conceptions—the source of moral consciousness and the ground of nature—simply because we believe that they *must* be identified, if moral life is to be possible. It is a matter of history that man has been able to achieve a moral advance, and to find in nature progressively the vehicle and serviceable instrument of his ethical ideals. The conclusion, then, that the ground of nature and of spiritual life is one is neither an unjustifiable assumption nor a hazardous conjecture. It is, if you will, an expression of faith, but of that faith which is an essential element in knowledge.

It is impossible to acquiesce in the arrangement which Ritschlian writers attempt to bring about between faith and reason, by the amiable expedient of shutting up each in a water-tight compartment of the mind. Can anyone who wishes to keep his intellectual conscience stainless adopt, for instance, the desperate conclusions of Herrmann on the subject of miracle?[21] When two explanations of a single event evidently collide, mankind has agreed to believe that only one is true. Herrmann will reject neither. "One of the most remarkable of Father Newman's Oxford sermons," says Mr. Bagehot, "explains how science teaches that the earth goes round the sun, and how Scripture teaches that the sun goes round the earth; and it ends by advising the discreet believer to accept *both*." Similarly, Herrmann cannot see how any Christian can resign the belief that Jesus rose from the dead, but *qua* scientist he finds the belief absolutely untenable. So that, in this particular instance, faith, expressed in a value-judgment, has actually power to create an objective "truth" out of nothing—nay, out of less than nothing, for Herrmann grants unreservedly the finality of scientific objections to the resurrection. But mental bookkeeping by double entry is bound to collapse with a clearer vision of the unity of truth. On this point von Hartmann's words are singularly apposite: "In this controversy between heart and under-

[21] *Die Religion*, pp. 382 ff.

standing only two views are possible. Either the understanding is right, and then the protest of the heart is the result of dispositions of feeling which survive from earlier periods of culture; in this case, too, their complete removal and destruction by means of the dissolvent lye of the understanding is only a question of time. Or the heart is right; then it *is* right only because with the unconscious reason of instinct it has grasped a higher form of truth than the understanding with its discursive reflection; then, too, the heart will *show* itself to be in the right, and finally see its ideals recognized even by the understanding as truth."

The first remark which suggests itself when we regard the Ritschlian movement as a whole is that it bears very evident tokens of having come into existence amid circumstances of intellectual storm and stress. The extraordinary progress of natural science by which this century has been distinguished; the consequent tendency of many minds to consider the conceptions of science as not only self-explanatory, but explanatory of everything else; the general disposition to recognize the reality of that alone which could in some way or other be made accessible to the immediate testimony of the senses—these things could not fail to affect current theological methods. To this must be added the fact that an irresistible reaction had set in against Hegelian intellectualism, that a tendency and a resolution had arisen to disbelieve in the virtue of dialectical incantations to charm away the antinomies of fact, and that it had begun to be felt that in Hegel's hands religion had become too much a matter of speculative thought, too little one of feeling and emotion. Faith had been made an affair of the school rather than of the universal heart. Both these influences have left their mark deep upon the Ritschlian system. One might almost say that it was thought out by a sincere believer in the truth of religion, with his back to the wall and his face to the advancing forces of materialistic science. And its elaboration was accompanied by an everpresent sense, and, as it seems to me, a disabling and a skeptical sense, of the incompetency of reason to apprehend the divine reality which lies behind the veil of phenomena.

We have seen that Ritschlianism lays great weight upon a certain conception of *faith* as an attitude of mind entirely independent of reason, and capable of producing certainty in the believing consciousness, though upon other grounds than those of knowledge. How come these thinkers to assign to faith such plenipotentiary powers, and to constitute it in everything but in name a mode of apprehension? Whence comes this tendency ot trust the heart against the head, to assert that faith is unaffected by negative arguments which are intellectually irrefutable?

This tendency appears to be simply an exaggeration of an indubitable truth. It *is* the fact that no amount of evidence can avail to induce that self-surrender to an infinite object in which religion may be said to consist. The greatest perspicacity of moral perception is powerless to restrain a man who is bent on doing wrong. In both cases you have to allow for an act of freedom. It is a question of the heart, and so Paul could say, "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness," and could speak of the "faith that worketh by love." This, then, is a characteristic peculiar to faith, but it is not by itself alone equivalent to faith. The older theologians used to divide faith into *notitia*, *assensus*, *fiducia*, and it is in the disposition of the heart and will noted above that *fiducia* consists. But the Ritschlian position comes finally to this, that *fiducia* is made to do the work of *notitia* as well as its own; while in reality it denotes the trustful apprehension of an object recognized in *notitia* as real. Into faith then enters, not only faith as surrender of the heart, but also the *faith of cognition*, that divining insight of knowledge which seizes, as it were prophetically, upon supersensible objects and relations. *Notitia* may exist without *fiducia*, for a man may defy God; but *fiducia* without *notitia* is blind.

The natural consequence of adherence to the Ritschlian point of view is a violent antipathy to dogma. Yet we may be sure that on this negative swing of the pendulum the positive will follow. The rights of reason to fulfil her function even within the domain of sacred truth cannot be permanently suppressed. The conviction is bound to assert itself that religion makes appeal to the whole nature of man, not

to feeling or to will alone, or to anything but the undivided personality. Movements of negation, such as Ritschlianism, do not obliterate the progress of the past; the tide moves on, though single waves recede. In this case the scholasticism of post-Reformation systems has forced a natural reaction. The artificial infinity of detail to be found in orthodox text-books, and the pretended minuteness of spiritual diagnosis, finally offended practical minds and made simplicity attractive.

Though professedly independent of philosophy, Ritschlianism really rests upon a certain theory of human knowledge. If Kantianism is mistaken, Herrmann's system of theology falls like a house of cards. Yet we should gravely err if we decided that nothing can be learned from a man of such pure and elevated faith, and of so singularly impressive an intensity of religious conviction. This whole movement, its antecedents and its program, have many things to teach the Christian church. And chiefly this, I think, that religion is not theology. It is not apart from theology, or, indeed, quite devoid of theology in any mind; but the two are not the same. One may profess a system of enviable impeccability, abounding in faultless deductions, and impregnable in controversy, yet never have caught a glimpse of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. If particular theological dogmas obscure *that* from us, if we cannot read the gospels with open, docile hearts while they remain in our minds, we ought to get rid of them without delay and without remorse. But we ought also to take care that neither sloth, nor impatience, nor despair dissuades us from replacing them with doctrines that are better.

SHALL THE THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM BE MODIFIED, AND HOW?

By W. R. HARPER,
The University of Chicago.

MANY intelligent laymen in the churches have the feeling that the training provided for the students in the theological seminary does not meet the requirement of modern times. These men base their judgment upon what they see in connection with the work of the minister who has been trained in the seminary. Nor is this disaffection restricted to the laity. Ministers who, after receiving this training, have entered upon the work of the ministry, and who ought, therefore, to be competent judges, are frequently those who speak most strongly against the adequacy and the adaptation of the present methods in the seminary. So prevalent is this feeling that students for the ministry often ask the question, "Is there not some way of making preparation other than through the seminary?" And not a few men are securing this preparation by taking graduate courses in the universities; while, on the other hand, some prefer to adopt the so-called short-course plan.

The condition of the churches, both rural and urban, is not upon the whole encouraging. Ministers of the better class are not satisfied to accept the rural churches; and yet these same ministers are not strong enough, or sufficiently prepared, to meet the demands of many of the city churches. The rivalry of denominations has led to the multiplication of churches, and in turn church abandonment in some sections of the country is being substituted for church building. It is not the purpose of this paper to consider the occasion of this condition of things in the churches. At the same time it is probably true that, whatever may be the occasion, the ministry is in some measure responsible, for we are compelled to believe that, with better organization and more efficient administration, this condition of

things would not exist. But now, if the ministers are in any measure responsible, the theological seminary in which they receive their training must bear the brunt of the reproach, for, surely, the ministers are very largely what the theological seminary makes them. Their ideals, their equipment, and their spirit are the product of the seminary.

The model in accordance with which the modern theological seminaries have been organized had its origin a century or more ago; but while the environment of the seminary has utterly changed in this century, the seminary itself has remained practically at a standstill. To say the least, there are to be found in its organization and curriculum many survivals from the oldest times. These survivals are out of harmony with the whole situation as it exists today. These elements, therefore, do not suit the present situation. It is not enough merely to say that they occasion a waste of time and energy. In fact, they do distinct injury to everything with which they come into close relationship, and, what is of greater importance, they take the time and attention which something stronger and better ought to occupy.

Assuming, without further argument, that the curriculum of the seminary should be modified, there would seem to be two general principles in accordance with which such modifications should be made, and these may be considered before presenting a recommendation of specific changes.

Modifications of the curriculum should accord with the assured results of modern psychology and pedagogy, as well as with the demands which have been made apparent by our common experience, so far as this experience relates to the student and the preparation for his work. If this principle were adopted, certain ends would be held in mind:

1. An effort would be made so to adjust the work of the seminary as to render it attractive to the best men. Much has been said about the small number of men in our college classes who enter the ministry. Much more might be said as to the quality of these men, when compared with the men who enter the other professions and occupations. This difficulty, of course, cannot

be charged wholly to the character of the instruction offered in the seminary, since it stands connected also with the profession itself. But actual observation shows that the curriculum of the seminary has something to do with the matter, since many of the better men seem to think that a satisfactory preparation may be secured in some other way.

2. The curriculum must be of such a character as to give the training which is best adapted to the individual taste and capacity of the student. The field of theological study is a broad one. No man can cover all or even a large portion of it. The interest of some men will be aroused more easily in one line of work than in another. Some phases of the work required are very distasteful to many men. To spend time on such work is for these men distinctly wasteful. It is, moreover, injurious to the student. Theological students are supposed to be men of maturity. Beyond a general and comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures, it is not necessary that all should have the same training. It is important, indeed, that men should be trained along different lines. What is helpful to one man may be injurious to another. In a field characterized by such variety advantage may well be taken of the opportunity which is thus offered.

3. An effort should be made to give the student that particular training which will enable him to grow stronger and stronger in future years. It is an unfortunate fact that a large proportion of men who enter the ministry begin to lose intellectual strength from the moment they leave the seminary. In some cases this probably could not be prevented in any way, but in many cases it is due to the wrong training which the student received while in the seminary. In other words, the seminary is not a place in which men are to learn certain views, or to receive and adopt certain opinions. It is rather a place in which men shall be taught to think. It is unfair that the student, who spends his time and money for a specific thing, should receive in return, not what will prove to be a proper equipment, but instead something, the real nature of which years of pastoral experience may be required to show. In planning the work of the seminary, it should be kept in mind that the student is beginning a work that will continue

many years. Every hour of the curriculum should be arranged with the sole purpose of furnishing that training which will render him more efficient as the years go by. With such training, men will not be compelled to leave the pulpit at the age of forty-five or fifty. They will be stronger at sixty than at thirty-five Is this the case today?

4. That training is demanded which, upon the whole, will best adapt the individual to his environment. This makes necessary a study of the individual and likewise a study of the environment. It is more important that the instructor should study his student, and it is equally important that the student should study his environment. Failure in most cases is simply inability to adjust one's self to his environment. Education should have for its first aim the establishment of such an adjustment.

But this suggests the second principle in accordance with which such modifications must be made. Modifications of the curriculum should be of such a nature as to meet the demands suggested by the character of the field in which the student is to work—the demands, in other words, which in general concern the present state of society in the midst of which the student finds himself. Here, again, certain conclusions immediately follow:

1. The training of the theological student should be adjusted to the modern democratic situation. Real democracy is not a century old. The atmosphere of the present day is essentially different from the atmosphere of our grandfathers. Even fifty years ago men did not dream of the development which was to come, nor of the results which were to follow the introduction of self-government by the people. The curriculum of the theological seminary, however, has not been modified to meet this new situation. While Christianity is democratic through and through, the church, to a large extent, has antagonized the democratic spirit. The masses are out of sympathy with the church, because they confound the church and Christianity, ascribing to the latter the aristocratic attitude of the former. If the theological student is to do his work in a democratic atmosphere, he must be filled with the democratic spirit and must learn to employ demo-

cratic methods. This is not the spirit, and these are not the methods, of the ordinary theological seminary. And unless this spirit is permitted to control the work and methods of the seminary, the minister will find the opportunities for his work reduced in number and in character.

2. Changes should be made which will bring the work of the theological student into touch with the modern spirit of science. The great majority of students who enter the theological seminary have but a slight knowledge of science, if they have any. They have come in large measure from the smaller denominational colleges, few of which have any equipment adapted to teaching science. Here, indeed, a real difficulty presents itself. If a prospective theological student is sent to a state institution, or to one of the larger universities in which he would learn directly and definitely this scientific spirit, he is in danger of being drawn away from his purpose to preach. If, on the other hand, he goes to a small denominational college, he fails to secure any adequate preparation in science or psychology. It is true, moreover, that theological students in general are devoid of the scientific sense. They have little or no sympathy with scientific work. They utterly lack that point of view which will enable them to bring themselves into relationship with that greatest factor in modern civilization, popularly called science. The man who has not had training in science cannot speak effectively on any subject, least of all the subject of religion, to men who have had such training. We should be surprised, not at the small number of scientists who maintain their church connections, but rather at the comparatively large number who retain such connection in spite of the pulpit ministrations to which they are compelled to listen.

3. Some adjustment must be found by which the curriculum will meet the demands that are made by the present peculiar social conditions. Reference has already been made to the inability of the ordinary preacher to make an impression on the lower classes. The evidence would seem to be quite conclusive that he is equally unable to influence the higher classes. The country is full of men who have become wealthy. The number of wealthy men

increases every decade. It is democracy itself that has made possible this large number of wealthy men. The most interesting problem, perhaps, that confronts the future democracy is the question: How will she adjust herself to men of wealth, or them to her? Meanwhile, what is the attitude of the church toward this growing class of influential men? How shall men be prepared who shall be able to work out this difficult problem? For it is the problem of the church as well as the problem of democracy. Something is being done in sociological lines to train men to exercise influence among the working classes. Nothing has yet been proposed to provide a training which will enable the ministry to do successful work among the richer classes.

Before making specific recommendations of modification, I may be permitted to offer certain general criticisms upon the present curriculum. For the sake of convenience, these may be divided into groups.

The first group will include criticisms relating to points of a more or less external character:

1. The present scope of the theological curriculum includes practical preparation for only one kind of Christian work; namely, preaching. A hundred years ago this was sufficient, but in these modern times a great change has come. Many phases of the religious work of our times are conducted by those who are not preachers. Lay workers in different lines are numerous, and the church must assume the responsibility for the special preparation of these men and women, as well as for that of preachers. If one were to calculate the number of those whose lives are given to Christian work of one kind and another, in which they find the means of their subsistence, the number would, perhaps, exceed that of the preachers. Only here and there is preparation made for the training of these workers, and this preparation is in many cases of a distinctly inferior character. Why should not the curriculum of the theological seminary be broadened sufficiently to include this larger and modern work?

2. There seems to be good evidence for the statement that the present training of the theological seminary too frequently cultivates on the part of the students a narrow and exclusive

spirit. It could not be otherwise in the case of institutions located in country towns, and isolated from the various activities of human life. In so far as the seminary follows the policy of the mediæval monastery, in so far does it cultivate a narrow and exclusive spirit. In so far as the seminary accepts students who have not already received a broad education in letters and science, it cultivates such a spirit; and in so far as its own curriculum includes only theological subjects, it cultivates this spirit. The great majority of American seminaries are located in out-of-the-way places, and are not in touch with modern life. It is almost impossible that the average student educated in these institutions should have a broad and generous spirit. There are some men, of course, who, in their very nature, transcend all limits imposed by narrowness in education, but these are the exception, and are comparatively few.

3. The arrangements of many seminaries not only encourage, but compel, the student to preach constantly during the first years of his theological course. In the seminaries of some denominations preaching is not allowed in the first year. This should be the regulation in every seminary. The contention is made that such preaching is practice of the most valuable character in the work which is to be the life-work of the student. The truth is that in most cases student-preaching in the first and second years of the theological course is an evil. To this evil may be traced the bad habits which many preachers exhibit in their later ministry. The student who does the work of the class-room during the week is not in fit condition to preach regularly on the Sabbath. Every sermon preached in these circumstances injures him. The habit of slovenliness is inevitably acquired, and when once acquired this habit may not be corrected by the limited instruction given him in the later years of his course. The urgency which drives young men into the pulpit is a weapon of the evil one to counteract, so far as possible, the good which would otherwise be accomplished. The seminary, instead of encouraging or compelling this student-preaching, should forbid it; and, except incidentally, students should preach only when provision has been made for careful

and severe criticism of the manner and method of preaching adopted.

4. The usual practice in theological seminaries of providing free tuition and rooms, and of furnishing financial aid indiscriminately to all who may apply for the same, is greatly to be deprecated. This practice, like many others of the church, is a survival of mediævalism, and is not consistent with the spirit of our modern democracy. In answer to this proposition one may not present the analogy, so often cited, of the military schools and naval academies of the government. These are not parallel. It is true that men of the highest type have been produced in connection with the system in vogue, but they were produced in spite of the system, not because of it. In general, the beneficiary system, as it is administered, degrades the student. This is the testimony of hundreds and thousands who have worked under it. It places the theological student upon a distinctly lower plane than that occupied by the law or medical student. It cultivates in the very beginning of his life a principle which in too many cases is applied throughout life. Nothing is more noticeable, or more despicable, than the utter lack of independence exhibited by a great proportion of the ministerial class. In other words, this system encourages and cherishes a habit of life which soon becomes permanent. This habit, while possibly consistent with the methods of life one hundred years and more ago, does not fit into the modern conceptions of life as they have been worked out in the spirit of democracy.

The second group of criticisms will include those which relate to special subjects of study of the curriculum.

1. Reference has already been made to the lack of a sufficient amount of laboratory work in science in the training of the ordinary theological student; but how, it is asked, may this lack be supplied? The theological seminary is not responsible for it. This work is college work, and should be completed before the student enters the seminary. There is truth in this statement, but it must not be forgotten that the colleges in which the majority of students preparing for the ministry are trained devote their attention almost exclusively to the humanities, and

are, for the most part, lacking in adequate equipment for the teaching of science. The larger institutions, in which science is taught with satisfactory methods, do not send any considerable proportion of their graduates into the ministry. The question is, therefore, one which must be considered from the point of view of the theological curriculum. A specific amount of laboratory work in science is in our day as necessary for the prospective theological student as a knowledge of Greek, and if the college does not furnish the student this equipment, the seminary must take the necessary steps to provide it. We may not forget that in many theological seminaries of England and Scotland, which are, perhaps, more like theological colleges, chairs of science are established. It was such a chair that Henry Drummond occupied in the Free Church College in Glasgow. The greatest enemy with which Christianity is called to contend is the materialism which has grown up in these days of modern science. No man is fitted to represent Christianity in this contest who has not for himself mastered the methods and the spirit of modern scientific workers.

2. The student is almost as deficient in a right understanding of modern psychology as in that of science. The instruction in psychology provided in the smaller institutions from which candidates for the ministry come in largest numbers is of the same character as the instruction provided in science. The work, for the most part, is that which was being done fifty years ago. What may be called modern psychology is as yet largely unknown.

This statement applies likewise to the principles of pedagogy, a subject which, in its recent application, is of vital interest to the minister. Child study is as directly connected with the work of the minister as with that of the teacher, for it is in the transition age, from twelve to eighteen, that the work of the church must be done.

3. There has been much talk about the study of the English Bible in the theological seminary. A compilation of the facts, however, shows that a comparatively small amount of work in the English Bible is being undertaken. The old-fashioned habit

of Bible study in the home has largely been given up. The amount of real knowledge of the Bible gained in the Sunday school, even in a long course of years, is practically nothing. The college student is so occupied with other work, and the provision for Bible study within his reach is so inadequate, in most cases, that he finishes his course without any definite advance in this department. The theological seminaries are sending men into the ministry who have no proper knowledge of the growth and development of biblical thought, and who even lack familiarity with the most common material of the biblical books. The time of the student is devoted either to the more mechanical work of learning a new language, or the peculiarities of a new dialect, or to the so-called exhaustive exegesis of a few chapters. Of the great movements of national life, of the contemporaneous history, of the social development, of the gradual growth of religious thought, he remains largely ignorant. Here, most of all, the curriculum needs modification.

4. About one-fifth of the time of the average theological student is devoted to the study of the Hebrew language. This study is compulsory, and the great majority of the students would otherwise omit it. After the freedom ordinarily given in the later years of college work, the compulsory language work is in most cases distasteful. Only work enough is done by the student to enable him to receive credit for the course. The time thus spent proves to be wasteful and injurious. It would be far better, in the case of some students at least, that this time should be given to the study of the English Bible. Only one or two institutions in the country have had the courage to make Hebrew an elective. The requirement of Hebrew has worked incalculable injury to the morale of many students. The study of the Hebrew language should be made elective. The result of this modification would be twofold. Those men who have reached a mature age, and are by nature really unfitted to master the details of a new language, might devote their time to something which would bring them greater advantage. But besides this, those who elect the study of Hebrew would approach the subject from another point of view. It would be a voluntary study, and their attitude

of mind would be entirely different. Still further, an obligation will rest upon the instructor in Hebrew to make the subject as interesting as it may be made, in order to attract students to its study. As the matter stands today, the Hebrew instructor need not disturb himself, for the students are compelled to attend his classes. He does not, therefore, have the incentive to throw into the subject that vitality and energy which are needed to make it interesting and profitable. No greater farce may be found in any field of educational work than that which is involved in the teaching and study of the Hebrew language in many theological seminaries. It may be suggested that to make Hebrew an elective is to lower the standard of theological education. Those who know the facts connected with the study of Hebrew by theological students will not make this claim. It is certainly desirable that every man who preaches from the sacred Scriptures should be able to read them in the original, but this is only one of many desirable things on the part of the preacher. If he may not attain all of these, some must be omitted.

5. A most fertile field for occupation in the training of the ministerial student is that of English literature. It may fairly be questioned whether a mastery, so far as possible, of this field may not be reckoned as second in importance only to the mastery of the sacred Scriptures. The great writers have expressed in tangible form the common feelings of the soul of humanity, and this expression always meets direct response when again brought into touch with the soul from which it originally proceeded. Surely the student preparing for the ministry does not understand the unlimited power of this mighty weapon, or he would train himself to make use of it more frequently and with greater skill. In this particular, as in that of science, and in that of psychology and pedagogy, the ordinary college is confessedly weak, while, in fact, it would hardly be going too far to assert that every minister should be a specialist in English literature. Much of the technique of a theological education could be put aside to advantage, if the time thus gained could be occupied by work in English literature.

6. If the theological student lacks living familiarity with

the great works of literature, he is even weaker, in general, in his ability to express himself in strong and forcible English. It is notorious that our college education in the past has been unsuccessful in its effort, where, indeed, effort has been made, to teach students the use of English. Even the common principles of expression are unknown to many of those who present themselves for admission to the seminary. In these last years a few institutions, realizing that this, after all, is the greatest result to be sought in education, have given diligent attention to this matter, but it will be many years before the results accomplished in the average college will be noticeable. Meanwhile it will devolve upon the seminary to make ample provision for training men in English expression. From the first day, theme work, as it is called, should be carried on, and, if necessary, much of the distinctly theological part of seminary work should be omitted, in order that the student may have an opportunity to make himself skilful in the use of the English language. The department of homiletics cannot be expected to do this work, for it really lies outside the particular field of that department. A special chair for instruction in the English language should be a part of the curriculum of every well-organized theological seminary.

In the third group we may include suggestions which bear upon the general scope of the seminary. This has been alluded to above. These suggestions might all be covered in a plea for a curriculum which would encourage specialism in the ministry, as opposed to the present curriculum, which requires the same work of every man.

1. Some men are intended by nature to preach. They may be scholarly, but they can never become scholars. They may possess a social temperament, but the work of the pastorate is not natural to them. They have, however, the ability to impress an audience with a truth which has taken possession of their own heart. Such men should be encouraged to preach rather than to do the kind of work which nature never intended they should do. A special training should be arranged for them which would enable them to become strong preachers. This training would,

of course, be in large measure the usual curriculum, but some subjects of the usual curriculum should be omitted, and other subjects substituted, in order that the student in this particular case might be enabled to cultivate the talent with which he has been endowed.

2. Other men, however, who exhibit a different attitude of mind, and possess a different temperament, should be advised to select their subjects for study in a line which would train them specially for pastoral work, or general Christian work. The churches will some time learn that one man, whatever may be his ability, cannot meet all the demands of modern times. Then, perhaps, they will readjust their organization in such a way as to make it possible for two or three men of different kinds of ability to be associated together in the same field. Only one minister in a thousand may be equally strong in the pulpit and in the pastoral work, and the effort of that man to do both results not infrequently in practical suicide. Many churches are today losing ground because they have placed in the pulpit a pastor who cannot preach. Other churches are losing ground because they have a preacher in the pulpit who cannot or will not do the necessary pastoral work. This pastoral training should be something very different from the training needed for the preacher.

3. Many men enter the theological seminary with the purpose of preaching who find, after a period of study, that God intended them for teachers rather than preachers. These desire to consecrate themselves to the work of the church. The calling of the Christian teacher, whatever may be the subject taught, is hardly less responsible, and hardly less important, than that of the preacher. Provision should be made in the seminary by which such men, while grounded in the teachings of Christianity, shall find it possible also to devote themselves to some special field of study, for the sake of the church. It would be a great advantage to all our institutions of higher learning if a larger number of the men engaged in teaching were controlled in life and thought by the spirit of consecration to the church. There was a time when only ministers were appointed to professorships

in colleges. The time has come when, outside of the theological seminary, the minister is hardly eligible for the professor's chair. The highest ideal will be realized when men whose lives have been consecrated to the service of the Master shall, as a part of that service, prepare themselves to teach in the various subjects which form the curriculum of the college and the university. Meanwhile chairs of biblical literature are multiplying in the colleges, and opportunities to do really strong work in connection with Bible classes are rapidly increasing. It is no longer an entirely anomalous thing for a Bible teacher to receive compensation for his services.

4. In these modern days the administration of church affairs has come to assume great importance. Men who are interested in affairs should be encouraged to enter upon a service for the church. To this end men of an administrative turn of mind, who, for one reason or another, find their way to the seminary, should be encouraged to give a fair proportion of their time to courses of instruction arranged especially with administration as the end in mind. The concerns of the church are increasing in number and in magnitude. These must be cared for by men specially trained for the work. The difficulty with which executive positions are filled in college and church work is due to the fact that no special provision has yet been made for the preparation of those who might wish to undertake such work. Twenty-five years ago it was never suggested that a man should prepare himself to be a professor in college. Today the graduate courses in various universities are organized for those who publicly announce their purpose to do professorial work in college lines. Twenty years from now young men will announce from the beginning their purpose to prepare themselves for college and university presidencies and for the secretaryships of our great missionary societies, and will undertake long years of training especially adapted for such work.

5. The musical work of modern church life is becoming more and more emphasized. The men who conduct this work should be men who have had a theological training. This training might have included also a special training in church music.

Men who have a gift for musical work should be encouraged to make special preparation which would fit them for this class of service, and the seminary should require such training as an important part of its work.

6. The idea of the medical missionary is an idea which should be applied to home work as well as to foreign work. Many a Christian man could do more service for the church by acquiring medical knowledge and making use of it than by giving his time to the study of Hebrew. It is, of course, true that the theological seminary cannot easily offer special work in medicine, but it would be easy, by coöperation with a neighboring medical school, to arrange a curriculum in such a manner that a student whose interest is especially strong in this direction might secure the necessary part of the theological education, and in connection with it the medical training.

To put the whole matter in a single proposition: The day has come for a broadening of the meaning of the word minister, and for the cultivation of specialism in the ministry, as well as in medicine, in law, and in teaching. In the village and small town a single man can do all the work in the Christian ministry, as well as in medicine and in law. There is evidently no room here for the specialist in any field. But in the small cities, as well as in the large cities, the time has come when specialism in the ministry is as necessary as specialism in any other profession. The ministry stands today in this respect where law and medicine stood twenty-five years ago. The conservatism of the churches explains this holding back, and the fact that the profession of the ministry has not developed, as other professions have developed, under the influence of the democratic sentiment, explains why the stronger and brighter men who come from our churches ignore the ministry, and choose another profession.

The fourth group of suggestions will have to do with methods of instruction employed in the seminary.

1. The elective system should characterize the theological curriculum as it now characterizes that of other departments of education. Not more than one-third to one-half of the curriculum should be common to all students. To divide the time of

the theological student equally between four or five or six departments is, from the pedagogical point of view, absurd. The elective system is necessary, first of all, in order to give the student an opportunity to pursue those studies in which he is most interested. The theological field is very wide, including linguistic and philological work; historical and sociological work; philosophical and pedagogical work; rhetorical and literary work. No man can have the same degree of interest in all these fields of study. In one or another he can excel; opportunity should therefore be given him to select that in which he can do his best work. But further, the elective system is necessary in order that the student may be able, in some special subject, to do a sufficient amount of work to enable him to cultivate the student habit. We are accustomed to speak of the loss, on the part of ministers, of the student habit. In most instances we should rather speak of the lack of such a habit, for in these cases the habit was never gained. The present theological curriculum compels superficiality. When under obligation to do a given amount of work, in a given number of departments, the student is not permitted to gain that deeper knowledge of any subject which will enable him to become a student of this subject in the truest sense. It is for this reason that so many men cease to be even superficial students when they leave the seminary.

2. The general distribution of departments in the seminary is, for the most part, artificial. The students work in these departments without a realization of the fact that they are artificial. In other words, they fail to correlate their work. They are surprised to learn that the problems which confront them in church history or in systematic theology are, after all, the same problems which they were called upon to consider in the field of the Old Testament. Modern experience shows that the best work is accomplished when single problems are taken up by the student and followed, wherever they may lead, into this or that department. A curriculum should be so arranged that the great and fundamental subjects (for example, the atonement, the incarnation, the future life) might be taken up historically and systematically, a period being given to the idea as it is

presented in the old religions, another period to the consideration of the same subject in the Old Testament, another in the New Testament, another in the progress of ecclesiastical history, and still another to its systematic formulation from the point of view of modern philosophy. To put this suggestion in another form, the time has come for the comparative method to be introduced into theological work, as well as into the many other fields of thought in which it has already found a place.

3. The so-called seminar method should be more widely adopted. It is difficult to define this method. The central element in it, however, is to encourage the student to enter upon a personal investigation of certain subjects for himself. The lecture method is, for the most part, unsatisfactory. This is even more true of the text-book method. In special cases, to be sure, these methods must still be employed, but the exclusive use of either or both will fail to give the student the training of which he will stand most in need when as an independent student he is compelled to face the problems of his work. There are few subjects in the theological curriculum which do not lend themselves to this method. The results obtained must be more valuable than those which come in any other way, because they have been reached by the student himself. When there exists a curriculum that requires so much ground to be covered in every subject within a specified time, the seminar method is clearly impracticable. For this reason, if for no other, election should be introduced.

4. The environment of the theological seminary includes much material which would serve the same purpose for the theological student as is served by the hospital to the medical student, or by the law courts to the law student For lack of a better phrase, we might suggest "theological clinics." This material is not limited to the work of visiting the slums, but includes also the study of the work of particular preachers, in the pulpit and in church work, the study of educational methods, the study of church organization, as illustrated on every side. This clinical or laboratory method is already a feature of the work of seminaries in large cities. The fact is, the theological

seminary in any other place than in the large city is as much handicapped in many features of its work as the hospital would be in the same situation. But even in the larger cities this part of the work has scarcely been touched. The field is boundless, and while, on the one hand, there is danger of throwing away valuable time in fruitless search for information and experience, under wise guidance this danger may be reduced to a minimum. Without its clinics a medical school would be a school for the study of certain facts of science; it would not be a training school for physicians. Without its clinics the theological school is a school for the study of language and history and philosophy, and is not a place for the training of preachers or Christian workers.

5. The theological curriculum should include a certain time set apart for work in a church under the direction of a pastor, the pastor during this period serving as the instructor of the student. The time spent should be long enough to give the student a real experience of practical church work. It should not be less than three months, or one-ninth of the whole time given to the preparation. In no other way may actual experience be gained so easily, and in this way the inevitable mistakes of the first years of the pastorate would be largely avoided. This would be a revival of the old-fashioned method employed before the organization of the theological seminary. This old-fashioned method had some advantages over modern methods, and deserves to be reinstated, at least during a portion of the period of preparation. Just as every law student should spend a portion of his time in a law office, and every medical student in a hospital, so the student for the ministry should spend a portion of his time in actual touch with real church work, under the guidance of the leader. It is true that ministers might not be willing to accept this responsibility in addition to their regular work, but it may be suggested that arrangements could be made by which the minister should receive compensation, of more than one kind, in return for this service granted the seminary.

6. Reference has been made more than once to the means by which the student should come into direct contact with prac-

tical life. For this reason it has been suggested that the best place for the location of the seminary is in the city. Essential as this is, it remains true that the student whose life-work is to be that of spreading Christianity needs, as his Master before him needed, opportunity for seasons of prayer and meditation. These seasons, moreover, should be sometimes long continued, extending, it may be, over days, and possibly weeks. The curriculum of work intended to prepare a man to preach the gospel of Jesus Christ should include provision for retirement from the world of groups of men, selected with great care, under the leadership of a congenial personality; a retirement during which effort should be made to separate the mind and soul from contact with the outer world and to bring them into closest touch with God himself. It is not enough to say that one should always be in a prayerful mood. It is not enough to say that God is in the world, and that contact with the world is therefore contact with God. We are human, and therefore weak, and we need at times to take advantage of impulses and circumstances which will cultivate within us the calm, peaceful spirit of meditation, the strong and urgent spirit of longing for a higher inspiration, the exalting and ennobling spirit which comes from communion with God. A season of such life, away from the cares and distractions of ordinary living, in which glimpses, perhaps, may be gained of a higher spiritual life, would seem to be an important element in the training of him who is to guide others into that higher life.

Even at the risk of repetition, I desire to present by way of summary a few specific recommendations for the improvement of the theological curriculum. These suggestions are intended to embody in the main the points indicated above. It is recommended:

1. That an opportunity be given to those who may so desire to spend four years in the seminary instead of three, and that the stronger men be encouraged to take the longer period. It is understood, of course, that the work is arranged for students who have taken a college degree. It would scarcely be wise to require four years' preparation of all men.

2. That the work of the first year be prescribed and be carried on in common by all students, whatever may be their special predilection. This work should include:

a) A general course covering the field of Old Testament history, literature, and theology; a general course covering the field of New Testament history, literature, and theology; a course giving in outline a survey of the field of ecclesiastical history, and a course giving in outline the ground to be covered in systematic theology. These courses should be introductory or general in their character, and, if restricted to three or four hours a week, may be presented fairly well in a year of thirty-six weeks. In the conduct of this course the lecture method and text-book method should prevail. There would be no place in this work for the seminar method.

b) One or two lectures a week throughout the year in sociology, the aim and purpose of which should be to present to the student as forcibly as possible the more important characteristics of the special environment in which he is to take a place.

c) Regular theme work for the cultivation of proper expression. This work, while under the direction of a specially appointed instructor, should be conducted in close connection with the general courses of instruction indicated above. A certain number of brief papers should be prepared by the student during the year, each of which should be thoroughly criticised from the point of view of the English as well as that of the contents.

3. That immediately upon finishing the general courses in Old Testament, New Testament, church history, and systematic theology, the student be expected to make choice of certain fields of work and of special subjects in these fields, and that after this choice has been made the details be worked out under the direction of the professor in whose department he shall undertake to do his particular work. It is understood that, as soon as the prescribed curriculum is abandoned, the student will need the special counsel of an adviser.

4. That at this point the students be allowed to group themselves according to the work which they propose to do. In this

way there will come to be a group of those who perhaps are planning to preach or teach; another group of those who desire to become pastors, administrators, or general workers; a third group for musical workers; and a fourth, if necessary, for medical workers.

5. That in each case the student be expected to select a particular department in which he shall do his principal work. This will be one of the six departments ordinarily organized in connection with a divinity school; namely, Old Testament, New Testament, church history, systematic theology, sociology, homiletics. It will be to his advantage also to select a second department in which he shall do secondary work.

6. That the study of Hebrew be required of those only who make the Old or New Testament the principal subject, and that a knowledge of Greek be required of those only who are to be preachers or teachers.

7. That every student who is preparing to teach or preach be encouraged to give a liberal portion of his time to work in natural science, psychology, and English literature, unless in his college course he has made such progress in these subjects as would warrant his omission of them at this stage of his work.

8. That in the group made up of those who are to be pastors, administrators, and general workers, the English Bible be made the principal subject, and that the secondary subjects be psychology, pedagogy, and sociology. Of these, neither Hebrew nor Greek should be required.

9. That for musical and medical workers courses be laid out along lines of special adaptation, an effort being made to correlate the work of the seminary with that of some special institutions in which music and medicine are the sole subjects of study.

10. That to as large an extent as possible the work of the student be directed to the study and investigation of great problems.

11. That "clinics" be organized in connection with various departments of the seminary; for example, in Sunday-school work, with the biblical and pedagogical departments; in visita-

tion work, with the sociological department; in preaching and church administration, with the department of homiletics.

12. That a certain number of weeks be set aside in the course of each student during which he shall work under the direction of a pastor in active service, the results of this work to be formulated by the student, criticised by the pastor, and reported to the faculty of the seminary.

13. That arrangements be provided whereby students in small groups, with an instructor of their own choice, may be enabled to retire from the active work of the institution, and live together in quiet and solitude for special seasons.

14. That, in so far as possible, the theological curriculum be organized in connection with a university, in order that the facilities afforded by the university may be at the service of the student, and his individualism thereby be given opportunity to develop; and in order, further, that there may be gained the greater breadth which is secured by mingling with men who have other points of view. To this same end intermigration between theological seminaries of the same denomination and of different denominations should be encouraged.

15. That in all cases tuition fees be charged, and that all money to be used for the aid of students be distributed in the form of scholarships on the plan adopted in colleges and universities, in return for which the student shall render actual service of one kind or another to the seminary.

16. That, inasmuch as each seminary cannot make provision for all the specialties in Christian work, an agreement be reached among seminaries located in a given district in accordance with which the students of all the institutions in that district who wish to work in a given specialty be advised to go to the seminary in which this specialty may be cultivated.

17. That the scope of the theological seminary be broadened, and if necessary the name be changed in order that it may include instruction for Christian workers of all classes.

FULFILMENT OF PREDICTION IN ISAIAH, CHAPS. 40–48.

By OWEN H. GATES,
Oberlin, O.

THE career of Cyrus, prophesied and now brought to pass by Jehovah, is one of the known facts upon which the prophet bases his appeal to Israel to trust Jehovah for the future.

In the effort to justify this position, it is important to consider at the outset the prophet's audience and theme. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God." These opening words are justifiable on the ground of their fitness to arrest the attention. They are, however, more than a point of departure; they are a true text. The prophet has a message of comfort from Jehovah for Israel. By far the greater part of the nine chapters is formally, as also really, addressed to Israel; but there are a few paragraphs that are addressed in form to others, and the question naturally arises whether the section lacks unity in this respect. Does the prophet change his audience and, of course, to some extent his theme?

The first passage to be examined is 41:1–7. These verses are not addressed formally to Israel, and vs. 1 does expressly address the islands and peoples. We believe, however, that Israel is the prophet's real audience. It is noticeable that, after the first verse, foreign nations are not addressed, but, on the other hand, in vss. 5 ff. they are mentioned in the third person, precisely as in chap. 40. The dissimilarity between 41:5 ff. and 41:1, and the similarity between 41:5 ff. (and especially vs. 7) and 40:19, 20, are commonly taken as proof that 41:7 has by mistake been transferred to the present context from its original place in connection with 40:20. The formal dissimilarity being admitted, the first effort should be to discover a real continuity of thought which may justify the sequence. The suggestion of

identity of audience in chaps. 40 and 41 goes far toward a satisfactory explanation.

It is further to be noticed that the passage conveys to the reader the impression that Israel also is in the assembly which the prophet calls; whether as advocates for Jehovah, as the nations are for their gods, or as witnesses, as 43:9, 10, or as judges, it may be difficult to determine. Indeed, this very indeterminateness is evidence that the judgment scene was intended by the prophet, and was understood by the reader, to be merely a figure of speech for the more emphatic presentation of the theme to Israel. If it be remarked that the figure should be continued at least to the extent of summoning Israel also to the judgment scene, the reply is easy that, if chap. 41 is allowed to have any connection with chap. 40, Israel is already present in audience before Jehovah, and the cohortative "let us come near" may include Israel with Jehovah as one party, as it does the nations for the opposite party.

Again, the prophet is fairly chargeable with poor logic, if he is actually addressing the nations. Duhm says of vs. 4: "We can detect in these sentences the impression made upon Deutero-Isaiah by the events of history, especially the wondrous teleogy of the Jahvist, and by the representations of an Isaiah and a Jeremiah of Jahve's unlimited direction of the history of the nations. For if he had not regarded the history and its philosophy, as he had it before him, as correct and universally acknowledged, he could not with such remarkable ingenuousness have treated as an argument that which must needs have been proven to the heathen. In fact, the peoples on the coasts of the Mediterranean who are summoned to the contest would much more readily have believed the proposition that Cyrus was called of Jahve than this other used in its support, viz., that they themselves were created and superintended by him. Auch Dtjes. berührt den Boden nicht mit seinen Füssen." The criticism is well founded, if it is not permitted to look beyond these few verses to discover the prophet's real thought. As an argument directed to idolatrous nations, the verses 1–7 are doubtless defective. No one who really believed

in his idols would be led thereby to discard them or to accept Jehovah's claims; but the defects disappear if we are permitted to consider the "ground" upon which the prophet would fain get his feet to be, not the conviction and conversion of foreigners to Jehovah worship, but the comforting of Israelites who are already Jehovah worshipers, and the strengthening of their faith in their God (*cf.* 51 : 12–16).

A second passage very similar, so far as it concerns the persons addressed, is 41 : 21–29. It is similarly treated by Duhm, who holds it up to ridicule, himself personating, it would seem, the heathen of whom he says: "He would easily refute the prophet, if not laugh at him, for maintaining that there were no predictions outside of the religion of Israel; and that the Persian was called of the God of the little people that he had scarcely heard of, etc." It would also be in order to remark that the test, in order to carry weight, must be accepted and entered upon by the heathen, a condition which is not met in the passage. The argument, however, is not for the heathen, or for anyone likely to challenge the foundations of faith in Jehovah. It is for Israel, already fully convinced of the control exercised by their God in the affairs of the universe, and accustomed to regard prediction as a test of divine inspiration. If the prophet "receives the kingdom of God as a child" (Duhm), it is because he would proclaim it to children and must speak so as to be understood by them. His purpose is not now to tear down a false faith and substitute the true, but to strengthen a weak faith and make it of vital force in the conduct of the Israelites.

Vss. 8–20 of this chapter are commonly regarded as a digression, and such they are both as to purpose and as to audience, if vss. 1–7 and vss. 21–29 are addressed to the heathen. The inconsequence disappears if we may regard the whole chapter to be equally directed to the comforting of Israel, the different sections differing only in literary form. The relation between vss. 1–7 and vss. 8–20 is the same as that between the two clauses of Ps. 91 : 7. "A thousand shall fall at thy side, and ten thousand at thy right hand, but it shall not come nigh thee." The prophet's assurance that Jehovah has

raised up Cyrus and is directing his career has led him to picture graphically the havoc which he has wrought in the world. He thereby magnifies the salvation which Jehovah has prepared for his people. But will not the confusion engulf the little nation with the rest? The fear is but natural, and it is fully met by vss. 8–20, in which the author directs attention to Israel's consciousness of its election and to Jehovah's protection thereby assured.

In the few verses, 43:9–12, there is an allusion to foreign nations which may properly be taken as of import similar to those in chap. 41. As there, the scene is in court; witnesses are present; an issue is to be decided. Here, however, the nations are indirectly summoned; the third person is used of them throughout, the second person being Israel. Israel is Jehovah's witness, to testify to his acts in the course of the nation's history by which he is proven to be God. But who are the judges? "That *ye* may know and believe me and understand that I am he." Witnesses and judges alike are Israel. Those to be convinced are the same who are to furnish the evidence. The scene resolves itself, then, into a dramatic appeal of the prophet to Israel's own consciousness of Jehovah's acts. Upon this recollection, which rises in the mind like so much testimony, he bases his assurance that "none can deliver out of the hand" of Jehovah; that he will work out irresistibly his gracious plans for salvation. Duhm would change the person of "that ye may know" to the third, because it must be the heathen who are to be convinced. This would introduce the same lack of sequence and unity of subject as is involved in the common view of chap. 41, and makes the prophet say precisely what Duhm has twice ridiculed him for saying in the earlier chapter. The gain by the change is a more natural course of thought within the limits of the four verses. The present reading furnishes a sequence, which, if not entirely logical, is at least psychologically possible and easily understood. This being the case, no change is called for, and the change suggested is not inspired by a keen appreciation of the prophet's course of thought.

A third passage in which non-Israelites are addressed is

45:1–7. Here Cyrus is the recipient of a message from Jehovah, who promises him unlimited prosperity in order that he may know that he has called him; for he has called him, and that for Israel's sake. He will support him, that the universality of his own power may be recognized in every quarter of the heavens. The section is a welcome expansion of the doctrine of election; welcome, that is, to the modern student of the Old Testament who now and then finds Old Testament apologetic a little irksome, but not welcome, as appears from 45:9–13, to the average Israelite of that day. The prophet must needs rebuke his people for their slowness in accepting their release from Cyrus' hand. The election of Cyrus, of which they were disposed to complain, was about to accomplish, and accomplish gloriously, the very things that their hearts were set upon, and of which their boldest conception perhaps was a reluctant release granted for a price and a reward to those able to purchase it, a release to be secured by no favor from an alien, but self-bought.

The insertion of the message to Cyrus in the prophetic writing was, of course, in order that it might have its natural effect upon Israel. Was it written for any other purpose? Did the prophet write it for Cyrus, or deliver it to him? We venture a negative answer; not only its introduction here, but the form of expression as well, and the whole notion of a message to Cyrus, are a device to get before Israel in dramatic and impressive form the fact of Jehovah's control and direction of Cyrus' career. This view leaves untouched as irrelevant the question of the actual relation of Jehovah to Cyrus, and the further question of the extent to which Cyrus recognized the part he was playing in the history of Israel. However specific Jehovah's direction, and however complete the response, it is not necessary to suppose that this particular prediction was the channel of communication between Jehovah and Cyrus. This interpretation is supported by several considerations. Vs. 4, "For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel my chosen, I have called thee by thy name, etc," would be of questionable value in an address actually made to Cyrus. The motive suggested would not naturally win the

heathen warrior to the service involved. The following verses (5 and 6) supply an ideal that might well inspire a conqueror, viz., the bringing of the whole world under the sway of one God, and he one who claimed, and for whom, when once his cult was world-wide, the claim could be successfully made, that he was the creator of the universe. In the grandeur of this prospect the, to him, mean origin of the God would be lost sight of. But the notion that the inspiration and ultimate purpose of the vast scheme were the resultant benefit to Israel would, if the human nature of Cyrus were to have any part in the case, come into the picture as a disturbing feature, counteracting the whole effect. In fact, by the introduction of vs. 4 the passage falls short of a consistent expansion of Judaism to a universal religion, for that verse is the expression of Jewish narrowness and exclusiveness. It is the antithesis of the old Abrahamic promise, "In thee shall all the families of the earth be blessed." If the prophet's audience is really Israel, the unnaturalness vanishes. True, the contradiction remains, but it is the easy contradiction of one whose aim is comfort and not logic. Even Christian consolation is often a strange mixture of benevolent and selfish considerations.

The quoted message beginning with the second verse is preceded by an introductory verse in which the clause, "Thus saith Jehovah to his anointed, to Cyrus," is followed by a series of clauses descriptive of Cyrus. These expressions introduce to the reader more fully the person to be addressed, in order to his better understanding of the message as it follows. Now, it is noticeable that these introductory phrases do not differ in content from the assurances given to Cyrus himself within the message. They are statements of Jehovah's support of him, of which the message assures Cyrus, and are not even confined to existing conditions, but expressly include his purposes for the future. The change to direct discourse is marked solely by the use of the second person: "To open the doors before *him*, and the gates shall not be shut; I will go before *thee* and make the rugged places plain." This failure to mark the point at which the quotation begins by some decided change of sentiment is

unimportant in case the address to Cyrus is a mere literary form, but is inexcusable otherwise.

What is true of the relation between 1 and 2 ff. is true also of the relation of the whole address to its context. The point of view is the same, the presuppositions are the same, there are no differences to correspond with the heathen and the Israelitish hearer.

The prophecy in chap. 47, directed against Babylon, is of the familiar type of prophetic denunciations of nations that have ill-treated God's people. These all may doubtless be taken, not as directly sent to the denounced tribe, but as of the nature of an "open letter," a rehearsal before the usual audience of the righteous judgment against the foe. In this particular case Jehovah is called "our redeemer" in a context which identifies the speaker as Jehovah. This lapse is natural only to the extent that Israel is prominent in the writer's thought.

From this review of the passages not formally addressed to Israel it would appear that the prophet is really addressing his own people throughout the section.

What was the message that the author brought to Israel? It was, of course, a message of comfort; and the particular comfort offered was without doubt release from the Babylonian captivity. This is the only event which will satisfy all the assurances of the section. Israel's service period is accomplished, her iniquity is pardoned, her God is coming, and that over a prepared highway, to rule his kingdom, to lead his flock and gently shepherd them. Such are the terms of the preface. The picture further presented is of Israel helped and upheld, her enemies confounded, herself become a threshing instrument, her thirst and hunger satisfied; Jehovah aroused to her help as a giant, gasping like a woman in travail; Israel redeemed, ransomed with a great price, and to be gathered from every point of the compass; Babylon to be brought low, Jerusalem to be inhabited, Cyrus to perform the service of Jehovah, Bel and Nebo helpless, salvation and glory to come to Zion, Israel bidden to flee from Babylon and from the Chaldeans. Surely the end of

the exile is meant, whether the writer be living in the exile or in the time of Isaiah.

Now, the prediction of a release is available for comfort just in the measure of the certainty of the fulfilment of the prediction. We accordingly find the prophet emphasizing the certainty of the future promised, by drawing attention to the character and past acts of Jehovah who makes the promises. First in order is, of course, the identification of the promising god with Jehovah. This is furnished abundantly by the oft-repeated formula, "I am Jehovah." There is frequent reference to Jehovah's creative work, and to his providential maintenance of his creation. Allusion is made to the election of Israel, to the founding of the nation, and to the various steps in its history up to the present. There is also abundant generalization from these facts, with statement of the general truths of Jehovah's relation to righteousness and evil in the world. The constant repetition of these sentiments with scant variety of phraseology constitutes the most obvious feature of these chapters. These thoughts are, however, far from being the prophet's goal. They are not inserted for their own sake, as the special message of Jehovah to his people through his prophet. Emphatic as they are, they but impart their emphasis to the main contention of the writer, viz., that it is this same omnipotent and righteous Jehovah who pledges his name and glory to the release from exile. That this is their value to the prophet is evident from a study of the section.

This use of the material is possible only on condition that the reader is familiar with the facts stated. Admitting as a major premise that a being who is omnipotent can predict and bring to pass, they must also know and concede that Jehovah has shown himself omnipotent before the conclusion will follow that this new promise of Jehovah's will be fulfilled. Studying the passages in question, we find that the argument of the prophecy follows this scheme. The prophet in no case attempts to prove that Jehovah created the world, that he marshals the stars; he simply states a fact known by every Israelite. There is nothing in the claim that Jehovah created the heavens and the earth which would compel assent to it. A heathen disposed to

dispute it would not be influenced by it in the least. It is forcible only as a reminder of an accepted tenet of Israelitish faith, from which article of faith the prophet desires to argue to a greater trust in Jehovah's promises. Back of this statement and others similar he does not go; he adduces no proof, for he expects no dissent at this point. His repeated inquiry is: "Have ye not known? Have ye not heard? Hath it not been told you from the beginning?"

One other evidence that Jehovah's promises will be fulfilled has been reserved for separate notice. We refer to his power already proven by predictions and their fulfilment. As above, the reasoning here is not to prove the supremacy of Jehovah. Only those who are already convinced of this would be inspired by the argument to confidence in Jehovah's predictions for the future. Moreover, in order to be available in an argument, the predictions themselves must be accepted as genuine and unique, and this condition confines the argument to Israelites who had their national literature at hand, who were students of their own history, who accepted the current prophetic view of history, and who, finally, were familiar with the teachings of their prophets.

The argument from prediction is found in six chapters. The first is the trial scene in 41:21–29, to which allusion has already been made. Assuming an Israelitish audience, and their unquestioned acceptance of the proposed test as conclusive, then the anticipated failure of the idols to cite past predictions and to make present predictions will, of course, show them powerless.

Chap. 42 begins with an inspiring description of the Servant and of the work that he or Israel (or he, *i. e.*, Israel) will with Jehovah's assistance be able to accomplish. Then occur the words (vss. 8, 9): "I am Jehovah, that is my name, and my glory will I not give to another, neither my praise unto graven images. Behold the former things are come to pass, and new things do I declare: before they spring forth I tell you of them." What is the glory of which Jehovah is jealous? Is it not to be interpreted by the words following? If prediction has in the

preceding chapter been a test of divinity, then it certainly may be guarded zealously by Jehovah as a divine prerogative. After the false gods failed to predict or to show any other kind of activity, Jehovah uttered a glorious prediction. He glories in this sovereign activity, involving as it does conscious power to fulfil.

In 43:9 the assembled nations are challenged to declare such things as Jehovah has just declared; to cite past events predicted by them as coming events are just now predicted by Jehovah; to bring witnesses to establish the truth of their claims as they shall hear the questions at issue. These things, which cannot be proven for the idols, are verifiable for Jehovah by his witnesses, Israel, when once, through the appeals of the prophet, their blind eyes are opened and their deaf ears unstopped.

The argument in 44:6 ff. is clearly of this class, whatever be the exact reading of the original text, or the particular antiquity mentioned. The last five verses of the chapter are instructive. The prophet introduces a quotation of a message from Jehovah. The Revised Version fails to reproduce a difference of construction in the several clauses, which cannot be accidental. The subject is "I," with its appositive "Jehovah": there follows a series of participles, with no finite verbs to constitute the predicate. It is in some or all of these participles that the predicate of the sentence must be found. Now, as far as 26*a* they are used without the article, while from that point on the article introduces them. The last clause, introduced by ולאמר, may be left out of account, as it certainly cannot of itself form the predicate. The natural explanation of the different uses of the article is that the first group of participles, without the article, belongs in the subject, while the later group, with the article, constitutes the predicate. The thought of the several clauses varies with the construction. Those which we assign to the subject rehearse, as we should expect, past and known acts of Jehovah, or state equally well-known and believed general truths concerning him. The clauses assigned to the predicate are confined to promises made for the future. The sentence then runs, in

effect, thus: "I, Jehovah, who make the universe and overthrow the wisdom of men counted wise, am the one who now says to Jerusalem, 'Be inhabited.'" The trust of the people in Jehovah for the fulfilment of his promises for Jerusalem is based on their recollection of his past dealings. Prominent among these recollections is that of his bringing the counsel of diviners to nought.

In 45:21 Jehovah again claims to be the one "who hath showed this from ancient time," that "hath declared it of old." It is this God who now swears, by himself, by an oath that is irrevocable, that every knee shall bow to him and every tongue shall swear.

The same connection of the future with past predictions appears in 46:8–13. Jehovah characterizes himself as one who declares the end from the beginning; in this there is no one like him. He bids Israel but remember the past and they will be persuaded. Turning then to the future, he bids them hearken to his promise of an approaching righteousness, a salvation that shall not tarry.

The last passage is chap. 48, in which occurs the fullest statement of the argument from prediction. Jehovah has a message from a certain class identified and described as follows: They belong to the house of Jacob, are called by the name of Israel, are come forth out of the waters (?) of Judah, swear by the name of Jehovah, and make mention of the God of Israel, but not in truth and righteousness. They claim citizenship in the holy city, they stay themselves upon Israel's God, they are notoriously obstinate, stiff-necked, brazen-faced, inclined to idolatry, ready to attribute Jehovah's doings to their idols. They assume withal to know everything. To these men the message comes that things which are now accomplished facts had been predicted of Jehovah. Their accomplishment, on the other hand, was sudden and unexpected. The prediction was made in the presence of these same persons because of their obstinacy and brazen-facedness, in order that they should not attribute the acts to their idols. The predictions secured the general acknowledgment that the design was original with

Jehovah; the suddenness and unexpectedness of the accomplishment precluded interference with the execution of Jehovah's plans. It is exactly these two points which are guarded by modern patent laws. From the past he turns to the present. "I have showed thee new things from this time, even hidden things which thou hast not known." There can be no doubt about this, for they were not even created heretofore. The teaching of the chapter seems to be that prediction of a future event can be regarded as a divine function only provided the fulfilment is brought about by the power that predicts. At least some predictions and fulfilments are designed to be evidence of the divinity of Jehovah. As evidence, only those predicted events have value which are so outside the operation of other powers that they must be conceded to be wrought by the being who predicted them.

We have thus far seen that in the chapters under discussion the prophet uses the creative and providential acts of Jehovah, and especially his fulfilled predictions, as evidence to Israel of his supremacy, upon which in turn depends the certainty of the release which he promises. He employs these arguments upon Israel, who are already persuaded of the facts adduced, and trained by their religious leaders to recognize the conclusiveness of the proof. His object is not to convert the heathen, but to strengthen and purify Israel's faith. This being his purpose, it is clear that his use of *known* facts is not accidental, or a matter of indifference, but is an essential element in his argument. His purpose would not be served by an allusion in the course of his reasoning to anything not a matter of common knowledge, or at least easily verifiable. If, for example, to take an extreme case, there were no stars in the heavens, it would be vain for the prophet to exhort, "Lift up your eyes on high and see who hath created these," and then proceed to say, "The same Jehovah who created them is now predicting your release." Or if now and then a star was missing from the sky, would it be an assurance for the future that the same Jehovah who attempts to marshal the stars by number is undertaking the overthrow of Israel's enemies? Such a reference would be worse than useless.

It would not simply be a waste of words, but would also imply that Jehovah was lacking in power or constancy just to the extent that stars were lacking from the heavens. "Ye are my witnesses," Jehovah is represented as saying. They could witness only what was known to them, and should not be called to witness more, on pain of working injury to the cause of Jehovah.

The discussion thus far has not depended upon our critical position as to the date of second Isaiah. It has, indeed, been assumed that Cyrus is referred to, but that is the common belief of all schools. It certainly need not, in itself, stagger any belief in inspiration, for this may be defined in such a way as to include detailed prediction of events and persons as one of its results. The question would then turn on the probability of such a prediction in any given case. It has also been assumed that release from the Babylonian exile is the comfort which it is the prophet's mission to proclaim; but this in turn may be admitted without in consequence yielding the Isaianic authorship. An assumed situation just before the release will by very definition account for all allusions to events then past or present. While we hold that it is extremely improbable that prediction of release from Babylon would in the age of Isaiah take the form of chaps. 40 ff.. and improbable also that the extended persistent and consistent assumption of a historical situation in the exile, exhibited in those chapters, would be adopted by a prophet, especially by an Isaiah so clearly shown by his undisputed writings and by history to be intensely practical in his prophetic activity, we yet pass over these considerations to state the argument for an exilic date from the fulfilment of prophecy and especially from the allusions to Cyrus.

Referring to the summary of the prophet's argument given above, it should be noted that Cyrus is one of the facts known to all concerned, which predicted and brought to pass by Jehovah prove his to be a universal power, and inspire confidence in the promises of a release now made. This will be evident from a brief review of the passages involved, some of which have already been examined in another connection.

The first, and an obvious, reference to Cyrus is in 41:1–7. As

has been seen, the prophet has been deriving comfort for his people from the creative activity of Jehovah, in which they believed, from the control exercised by him over the universe, in which they believed, and from the vanity of heathen gods, a thing that needed no intellectual proof to them; and now in 41, in the imagined audience of the peoples and Israel, and in the real presence of Israel, with the avowed purpose of bringing the whole question of Jehovah's supremacy to a final and practical decision, the prophet asks the question, "Who hath raised up one from the East?" and the description of the hero follows. In form this is not predictive, and the context forbids it to be such. It is one of the known facts upon which the argument for trust in Jehovah is based.

The context in 41:21 ff. is equally convincing. Jehovah challenges the idols to predict what shall happen and to show the nature and results of things that have happened. There is silence. A final and absurdly simple test, viz., that they do good or evil, elicits no response, and the inevitable verdict issues. But what of Jehovah? He has applied no test to the idols which he is unable to stand when applied to himself. He has raised up the eastern hero. Here is an event which is a fair object of prediction. "Who declared it from the beginning that we may know, etc.?" The answer demanded by the context is that Jehovah, and he alone, has predicted him. The sentence actually following runs: "To Zion behold a first and to Jerusalem a bringer of good tidings אֲחֹנִי." If this be taken as referring to a past prediction, as is possible, the question finds a direct answer. If, as is more natural from the form of the sentence, it be made to refer to the future, the question lacks formal answer, although the context leaves no doubt as to what it must be. Assuming its reference to the future, it forms a logical continuation and termination of the demand of vss. 22, 23, that one who claims to be a god should be able to show the future. From the passage it appears not only that Cyrus was known to the readers, but also that he had been predicted, and the prediction as well as its fulfilment was a matter of common knowledge.

Cyrus is next heard of in 44:24 ff. It is Jehovah, the one who performs the deeds and shows the constancy and wisdom so familiar to Israel, who now says that Jerusalem and the cities of Judah shall be rebuilt, and that Cyrus is his servant to perform all his pleasure. The power, the wisdom, the inclination of Jehovah are certainly sufficient for the accomplishment of his purposes, as regards Jerusalem and Judah, through Cyrus. Cyrus is just as much a recognized fact as Jerusalem and the Judean cities. There is nothing uncertain about the existence of any of them. That which does engage the attention and test the faith of Israel is, with reference to Jerusalem, the prediction that it should be inhabited, and, with reference to Cyrus, that this foreigner and heathen should be used of Jehovah as his servant. This interpretation of the section is especially attractive if we may see in vss. 26–28 an allusion to recent predictions which had awakened unlimited interest, but had been in some quarters received with a pardonable skepticism. But even if such be not the reference, and the predictions of vss. 26–28 be now for the first time published, the prophet would still have abundant reason to introduce them by the sentiments of the preceding verses.

With reference to the forty-fifth chapter, it is difficult to see how the objections which are answered in vss. 9–13 to the agent employed of Jehovah to save his people should have been raised, even hypothetically, upon the basis of the meager data concerning him furnished by these references. If the man has already arisen, and his career already begun and become the talk of the community, then the chapter becomes most natural.

Chap. 46 contains a reference to Cyrus under the title, "ravenous bird." Bel and Nebo are unable to save themselves, much less succor their worshipers. Not so Jehovah; from the first he has carried his people, and he will carry them to the end. Let Israel bear this in mind; it is sure, for they have but to recall God's past predictions and fulfilments in order to remember how constant has been the execution of his counsel. "Calling a ravenous bird from the east, and the man of my counsel from a far country." This also is a fact which they should remember. Let them do this, and they will concede

the credibility of the promises of salvation made in vss. 3–7 and renewed in vs. 13.

From some of these passages the conclusion is irresistible, and with the rest it is in entire accord, that the career of Cyrus, already initiated, is used by the prophet as one evidence of God's sovereignty. It should be unnecessary to remark that the hypothesis of an exilic date for second Isaiah does not, in the least, modify any passage that clearly refers to the future. It is only those which, in form, are present or past in reference that are affected. The allusions to Cyrus, reviewed above, are not predictive; in the argument of the section they have the value of historical facts.

One question, however, remains. Can they constitute a part of an *assumed* historical situation? The question involves, of course, not the effect of the composition upon Israel at the end of the exile, but the relation of the message, if it existed, to the Israel of Isaiah's age, and onward down to the time when the assumed becomes the real situation. The general objection obtains here that an address or a document based upon, and predictions growing out of, a condition which is not yet actual lose force and meaning in the interval, because the audience does not understand them. Those passages are not to be classed here in which the speaker, having carried his audience along with him to a future point, points to a still more remote future. For example: "I will gather all nations against Jerusalem to battle, and the city shall be taken; then shall Jehovah go forth and fight against those nations and destroy them." In such predictions there is an unbroken connection, link by link, with the hearers present. Destroy the first link, and the mind of the hearer does not run out along the chain to comprehend the subject presented, and the future fails to exercise any influence upon his actions or character.

A second objection, however, forces itself upon us in this particular instance. The peculiar use made of Cyrus' name and career (in part) is such that it is incredible that Isaiah should have thus expressed himself. It is not a mere question of speaking in an unknown tongue, however improbable that may

be in Isaiah's case. Listening to 40: 1–11, Isaiah's hearers would say: "We do not understand you." If they claimed to understand, it would be a misunderstanding. As he proceeds to vss. 12–31, they would answer: "We accept your proof of the sovereignty of Jehovah, for we know your evidence is true." But when the dramatic chap. 42 is reached, the positive agreement and the passive lack of comprehension must give place to active denial. "Who hath raised up one? No one; no such person as you describe has been raised up by Jehovah or anyone else." And the argument that rests upon the acceptance of the statement not only loses all force, but speedily becomes, in naturally skeptical soil, an argument against, rather than for, the supremacy of Jehovah. Unless inspiration radically altered for the worse the prophet's logical faculties, and, moreover, operated on hearer and reader in a way the like of which does not continue, we cannot suppose Isaiah to have penned the allusions and constructed the arguments we have been reviewing.

THE HASTINGS BIBLE DICTIONARY.[1]

IT is the editor's obvious intention that in the criticism of the Hebrew text, as in other things, the Dictionary shall represent the actual state of learning. The attainment of this end is very difficult. Many articles are necessarily committed to specialists in other departments, whose acquaintance with Old Testament criticism and exegesis is limited, and whose attitude toward the Massoretic text is not the same as that of the editor. The great inequality which results could be removed only by a more thorough editorial revision than seems to have been attempted. Thus in many of the geographical articles material variations in the tradition of the name are unrecorded, and conjectures which, either from their intrinsic probability or their extensive currency, we should expect to find in a work on this scale are ignored. Thus, under Acco it is not noted that the name is read not only in Judg. 1:31, but by codd. of the LXX in Josh. 19:30, and by many scholars after Reland's conjecture in Mic. 1:10. Similarly — to take examples almost at random — under Adam (city) 1 Kings 7:46 should be mentioned; as several scholars independently have seen, "the clay ground" between Succoth and Zarethan but slightly disguises the name of the city. Under Arumah (Judg. 9:41) no reference is made to vs. 31; under Edom no mention of Judg. 1:36 (the boundary of the Edomites, LXX); under Amalekites none of Judg. 1:16 (association of the Kenites with A., Greek codd.), while the corrupt text of Judg. 5:14 and 12:15 is used without a word of caution for most precarious historical construction. Similar omissions are many, and they seriously impair the value of the Dictionary; for where else should the pertinent results of generations of patient labor on the Old Testament be brought together and put to use, if not in such a work? As an instance of entire confusion about the nature of the critical problem, the article on Bay Tree may be cited. It is but just to add that many of the articles are entirely satisfactory in this respect.

[1] *A Dictionary of the Bible.* Dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents (including the Biblical Theology). Edited by J. HASTINGS, assisted by J. A. SELBIE. Vol. I, *A–Feasts.* Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. 864. Cloth, $6; half morocco, $8, per volume. (To be completed in four volumes.)

The article on the Armenian Versions (Conybeare) is disappointingly meager. The question what type of LXX text is represented by the Armenian is not touched, except as the author expresses his opinion that the translators and revisers used codices with marginal apparatus ("hexaplar"). That on the Egyptian Versions (Forbes Robinson) is much more satisfactory, though more complete for the New Testament than for the Old; on the short text of Job in Sahidic MSS., *e. g.*, reference is made only to Ciasca, Hatch, and Burkitt.

I regret to see Aaron's name twice, on p. 2, written אַהֲרוֹן, as in three editions of Smith's *Dictionary;* MT. knows only an אַהֲרֹן. In conclusion, it is not, perhaps, out of place to express the earnest wish that the etymologies of Aramaic proper names in the New Testament may be subjected to revision by a Semitic scholar; such blunders as that Bartimæus is derived by some from "Arab. *aṣamm*, blind" (!) ought not to be perpetuated. For a future correction of this article I add a reference to *Koheleth rabba* ראה חיים.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

ANDOVER, MASS.

The Hexateuch is well illustrated under the titles: Abraham, by H. E. Ryle; Deuteronomy, also by Ryle; Exodus and the Journey to Canaan, by J. Rendel Harris and A. T. Chapman; and The Book of Exodus, by G. Harford-Battersby. These articles are all written from the point of view of modern critical scholarship. The documentary composition of the Hexateuch is assumed, and the familiar symbols, J, E, P, and D, are constantly used. The references to Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* are numerous, and the positions of that work are constantly reflected. The aim of the writers throughout has been to give facts rather than theories, to be constructive rather than destructive, and thus to preserve and emphasize, as far as possible, the historical element of the Hexateuch, while freely allowing, also, the ideal or legendary element. There is a sober conservatism in their treatment, and yet an unflinching recognition of the demands of scientific scholarship. — The article on Abraham (pp. 13*a*–17*b*) is very comprehensive. It contains a sketch of Abraham's life according to the biblical narrative as a whole, and separate outlines according to J, E, and P; notices of the chief difficulties arising from the narrative, *i. e.*, the home of Abraham's people, the narrative in Gen., chap. 14, the promises to Abraham eight times repeated, and the sacrifice of Isaac; and accounts of Abraham in the history of Israel, in Old Testament theology, in

New Testament theology, in Jewish tradition; and finally the name "Abraham" is discussed. While a uniform literal historicity for the narrative cannot be accepted, the writer finds in Abraham the great leader of a racial movement, and one who left his mark upon his fellow-tribesmen, not only by his superior gifts, but by the distinctive features of his religious life. The religion of Israel dates from Abraham, and not from Moses. The narrative of Abraham, however, is strongly colored by the teachings of the prophets. — In the article on Deuteronomy (pp. 596*b*–603*b*) the material of Driver's *Old Testament Introduction* and *Commentary on Deuteronomy* is freely used, and an admirable scientific account of the book is given under the topics, name, contents, unity, language and style, and date and authorship. — In the article Exodus and the Journey to Canaan (pp. 802*b*–806*a*, with a map) it is held that exploration and discovery, while furnishing biblical illustration, have not wholly confirmed the biblical account of the exodus. A newly discovered inscription shows that, at the time of the exodus, Israelites were already in Palestine, and hence the migration then was partial and not national. The biblical stations, however, present a conventional itinerary and are, therefore, susceptible of identification and verification, apart from the history in which they are imbedded. In giving the route from Kadesh to the Jordan, the writers depart quite a little from the ordinary hypothesis, and their results will probably call for discussion. They favor the compassing of Edom on its west and north borders, instead of, as is usual, its east border. — The article on The Book of Exodus (pp. 806*b*–11*b*) treats the book in three parts: 1—13:16; 13:17—18:27; chaps. 19–40. Special attention is paid to the critical analysis, and the parallels and contrasts between the narratives of J, E, and P in a very clear manner are given. The writer is especially suggestive in a concluding survey, where he gives the leading ideas and shows the religious value of Exodus.

EDWARD L. CURTIS.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

In view of the multitude of difficult questions involved and the limitations of space, Francis Brown has treated the Books of Chronicles with a thoroughness which is as surprising as it is admirable. Three of the nine pages devoted to the article contain detailed lists of the chief linguistic peculiarities of the chronicler and of the parallels to his narrative. If the general Bible student is appalled by the mass of technical data, he at least has the assurance that the conclu-

sions which are deduced from them, and which are plainly and fairly presented, rest on broad and sure foundations.

The first half of the third century B. C. is accepted as the probable date at which the work was composed. The extreme freedom with which the chronicler reads the ideas and institutions of his own into earlier periods is clearly illustrated. Whether or not his narrative adds any new historical facts to those presented by Samuel and Kings is left an open question, to which no absolute answer can be given. The chief value of his work is the indirect light which his writings shed upon his own time. Although his pictures of the earlier history of his race were far from exact, it would be most unjust to call the chronicler a falsifier. He shows himself, on the contrary, a man of great sincerity and moral earnestness. His habits and convictions, the result of inheritance and of training, determined his mode of writing history.

Unfortunately, in the article on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah, by L. W. Batten, many questions, fundamental to the right interpretation and use of these historical sources, have been ignored. Respecting their critical analysis there has been, until within the last two or three years, practical agreement among scholars. These current conclusions are concisely and well presented; but, as the editor states in a note, the present article was in type before the recent works of Kosters, Van Hoonacker, and Torrey appeared, which contest many of the positions which it takes for granted. Ezra-Nehemiah has suddenly become a storm center for discussion and study. It is being asked in all earnestness whether or not there was a general return in 536 B. C., whether Ezra preceded or followed Nehemiah, and whether Ezra actually lived or is merely the creation of the chronicler. The answers to these questions depend primarily upon the analysis and reconstruction of the books under consideration. While some of the conclusions presented by Professor Batten will stand, others certainly must be fundamentally modified.

CHARLES FOSTER KENT.

BROWN UNIVERSITY.

The articles which deal directly with the Psalter are few. Under most of the heads where one hopes to find something one is disappointed by being told, "See Psalms." The little that one does find, however, is good and up to date. — F. H. Woods, in the article Acrostic, enumerates and describes the alphabetic psalms, and points

out the significance of this form in the determination of the primitive text and of the age of these poems. It is hard to understand why he should pronounce Ps. 25 "comparatively early," or why he should doubt that Nahum, chap. 1, was originally an acrostic.—J. A. Selbie, in the article Asaph, takes the view that Asaph was the eponym of a guild of singers that before the exile furnished the music of the temple. After the exile this guild came to be regarded as Levitical, and in P (Ex. 6:24) Abi-Asaph is made one of the sons of Korah. The title "to Asaph," in Pss. 50 and 73–83, means only that these psalms once belonged to the hymn-book of the Asaphite choir.—H. A. White, in the article David, holds that the titles assigning seventy-three of the psalms to David are untrustworthy. David was a poet, and may have composed some religious songs, but his low moral character and crude religious ideas make it difficult to think of him as the author of some of the most spiritual products of the Old Testament religion. The list of psalms which Ewald assigns to David, White regards as too large, but he does not state which he thinks are genuinely Davidic.—In lack of direct discussions, I have been curious to see how far other articles of a more general character on criticism and biblical theology would take account of the Psalter. I have been surprised to find that they almost entirely ignore it. The article Amen, by J. Massie, fails to treat of its usage. The article Atonement, by J. O. F. Murray, neglects the subjective side of this doctrine as exhibited in the Psalms. A. Stewart, in the article Bible, gives an elaborate discussion of the pentateuchal criticism, but on the Psalter remarks merely: "The Psalms belong probably to most of these periods, including even the Maccabæan (168–165), but chiefly to the latter ones." Which psalms, however, belong to which period he does not even suggest. The same lack characterizes the articles on Congregation, Conscience, Conversion, Covenant, Doubt, Eschatology, and Faith. A notable exception is the article on Ethics, by T. B. Strong, which gives a really thorough study of the teaching of the Psalter.

All this shows merely how few men have reached independent conclusions in regard to the criticism of the Psalms. Authors are afraid to use the Psalms for historical or for biblical-theological purposes, because they have no positive opinion where to place them chronologically. Psalter criticism must be carried farther before this rich fund of religious thought can be utilized properly. The subjective guesses of critics at the age of Psalms on the basis of biblical-theological theories are worthless. What we need is a thoroughgoing philological and

historical investigation that shall enable us to arrange the Psalms in their true chronological sequence. To the supply of this need the new *Bible Dictionary* seems likely to contribute little.

LEWIS B. PATON.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

The volume contains eight articles relating to the prophets and the prophetic books. These are Ahijah and Azariah, by Newport J. D. White; Elijah and Elisha, by James Strachan; Amos, by John Taylor; Daniel and Book of Daniel, by Edward L. Curtis; and Ezekiel, by John Skinner. The articles on Amos and Ezekiel relate both to the prophet and his book.

In the four first articles the biblical account is closely followed. Elijah and Elisha are treated as historical characters, and the story of their lives is taken to be true history. Even the reality of their miracles is allowed. Critical evidence is, indeed, cited on some points, but the reader is left to draw his own conclusions in regard to what is proved by it. — In the articles on Daniel and his book, by Professor Curtis, the modern critical views have a larger place. It is held to be doubtful whether the prophet can be considered to be a historical character. The book is considered to be a unity, and is assigned to the Maccabæan period, but is, nevertheless, deemed to be worthy of a place in the sacred canon. The interpretation of the book is ably discussed. — Professor Skinner's article on Ezekiel gives an excellent account of the life and work of the prophet, but claims that it is doubtful how much history the book contains, since it is so difficult to separate between that which was real and that which was simply imagined by the prophet, in the accounts contained in the work. Chaps. 40–48 are the most important element of the book, containing a picture of the kingdom of God in its final state. The prophet's relation to the Pentateuch legislation is not discussed, but it is admitted that he seems to occupy a position between D and P.

On the whole, the work of the articles is scholarly and well done.

SYLVESTER BURNHAM.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

The liberal proportion of space in this dictionary to be given to Assyriology, as evidenced in this volume, justifies its publication, if nothing else does. For the contribution of this new science to the

knowledge of the Old Testament is simply indispensable to any proper understanding of Old Testament chronology, history, and literature. One might almost say that too liberal treatment has been accorded, when it is seen that the articles on Assyria and Babylonia fill respectively twenty-eight and thirty-three columns, while those on the Bible and the Apocrypha are limited respectively to twenty-eight and twenty-six columns. The larger part of this Assyriological material is furnished by scholars who may be said to champion the conservative side in Old Testament criticism. Sayce and Hommel are the chief contributors, and their work, while it is characterized by undoubted scholarship and fulness of knowledge, is also injured by bold assertions on topics which are still in dispute, and reiterations of positions which have been often called in question. — Other contributors are O. C. Whitehouse, who writes too much under the influence of Schrader's *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament*, of which he is the translator; Ira M. Price, whose informing article on the Accadians is marred by the addition of the only editorial note of contradiction in the volume — which seems to us to be in poor taste and of doubtful judgment; H. E. Ryle, who writes on topics connected with the early chapters of Genesis with admirable balance and caution of statement; and Theophilus G. Pinches, the well-known scholar of the British Museum. — Many articles beside those concerned directly with Assyriology employ its results for illustration and argument. The most satisfactory examples of such are those on the Fall and Cosmogony. In some cases the correcting and informing service which might have been performed by Assyriology is wanting. Among such articles may be mentioned those on Crete, Cross, and Damascus. It is evident that the editor has not cared to correct manifest disagreements and contradictions between writers on this subject, except in the unfortunate instance alluded to above. This may be a wise policy, though in a popular Bible dictionary it is questionable. It certainly illustrates the important fact that the last word of Assyriology upon many of these questions has not yet been spoken. The most patent example is seen in the chronological schemes, and in special chronological data furnished by the several writers. Bible students who have access only to this book will have some difficulty in forming a consistent Old Testament chronology from the differing conclusions offered with equal confidence in the various articles.

G. S. GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

It is rarely that one finds a monograph so completely answering all requirements as the article on Egypt by Mr. Crum. The student who desires a compact survey of the civilization of the Nile valley will find it here, as it is not to be found anywhere else. This is saying a good deal for a history so complicated in its sources, and in which there are still so many problems unsolved.— In the account of the physical characteristics there is a lack of clearness which the word *cañon* would have dispelled, for Egypt is a vast cañon with its bottom covered with loam by the Nile inundations. Again, in the Old Empire it is not the case that the "nomes" were the basis of the judicial administration. But space will not permit the discussion of special questions. — The land of Kush is treated by Margoliouth. It is unfortunate that so good an Arabist should have been assigned a subject which he could hardly be expected to treat satisfactorily. He is fortunate in escaping as many mistakes as he has, but it is a pity that the reader should not be given the latest developments. The recent progress in the study of the language of Kush at Berlin is not even mentioned! — The Art and Archæology, by Petrie, of course exhibit the proverbial acuteness of that archæologist; still it is plain that he is not on as familiar ground as the Nile valley. Indeed, it would seem that an account of Hebrew art which unquestioningly puts the tabernacle at the beginning of the national career needs some modification in the light of historico-literary criticism. Illustration would be a great help to these articles, and one looks in vain for a bibliography. — The article on the high priest's breast plate, by Kennedy, does not refer to the remarkably similar insignia worn by the Egyptian high priest. — G. E. Post writes on the Cedar. He entirely ignores the Egyptian material, and thinks the denudation of Lebanon began in David and Solomon's time (!), although coffins of cedar from Lebanon are common in Egypt in the eleventh dynasty, far back in the third millennium B. C. — The article on Exodus, by Rendel Harris and A. T. Chapman, although the Egyptian material in it is taken at second hand, shows such judicious selection and use of sources that it is a trustworthy and useful guide. — In the article on Famine, by Wilson, no reference is made to the significant monumental material of which there is not a little. — Forbes Robinson has furnished an article on the Coptic Versions, which is a model of thoroughness. It is the best presentation of the subject in English.

The Arabic orthography in the articles touching Egypt is in need of editorial revision, and the omission of all the sources of the illus-

trations given is a decided lack. To add the source of an illustration is fully as obligatory and just as useful as to add that of a quotation or borrowed fact.

J. H. BREASTED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The group of articles bearing upon the Apocrypha and Apocalyptic Literature, in so far as it is represented in the first volume, furnishes admirable illustrations of method and learning. It may be that there is an inclination to overestimate the influence of apocalyptic literature upon Christianity, but no one can read that literature without being convinced as to the truth of the general positions taken by the authors of these papers. — Professor Charles' distinction made between prophecy and apocalypse seems to be important and sound, although his statement that the Messianic hope is the genuinely Jewish element in the apocalypse may mean too much or too little. His two papers upon the Book of Enoch are admirable statements of the author's position. It is also worth noticing that, as we should suppose, the relation of apocalyptic to Pharisaism is properly emphasized. — The article of Porter upon the Apocrypha is an admirably critical presentation of the facts, and we shall look for his special introductions with interest. — Those upon the two books of Esdras, by Thackery, are good examples of what such introductions should be.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

The perplexing problem of the chronology of the New Testament is well presented and discussed by C. H. Turner. The chronology of the life of Christ, in Turner's hands, comes out as follows: The birth in 7–6 B. C.; the age of Jesus at the baptism thirty years more or less; the baptism in 26 (27) A. D.; the duration of the ministry between two and three years; the crucifixion in 29 A. D. It is admitted by him that these several points, taken singly, are weak, but he says they "become, when woven together, the strong and stable support of a consistent chronology." For the material of the problem, and for a thorough consideration of it, the article is highly praiseworthy; and the conclusion reached is in some respects satisfactory. But it seems still uncertain what the length of the public ministry was, and whether there is sufficient reason to regard 29 rather than 30 as the year of Jesus' death. Turner's presentation simply shows how insoluble the

problem is. Several uncertainties do not make a certainty, no matter how tightly they may be "woven together." There are other hypotheses of the dates which are just as "strong and stable" as the one he advocates. It is impossible for scholars to agree whether the public ministry was one, two, or three years long; and we are scarcely any nearer agreement now than before. The data are capable of different explanations and combinations.

The chronology of the apostolic age is arranged by Turner as follows: The conversion of Paul in 35 or 36 A. D.; his first visit to Jerusalem in 38 A. D.; the death of Herod in 44 A. D.; Paul's second visit to Jerusalem in 46 (45) A. D.; the first missionary journey in 47–48 A. D.; the council of Jerusalem in 49 A. D.; the second missionary journey in 49–52 A. D.; the third missionary journey in 52–55 A. D.; the date of Festus' arrival in Judea "seems to be established" as 58 A. D.; and the termination of Paul's first imprisonment in 61 A. D. The discussion is not carried beyond this point. This is ground which has been freshly traversed by many scholars in the past few years. Turner has followed the discussion, but has ultimately gone a way of his own. It may be a necessity, at any rate it is unfortunate, to have one more chronological scheme added to the already long list. Nor does the scheme here proposed command assent. It may be as good as others, it is not obviously better. Undoubtedly there are ways in which an earlier scheme of dates than the current one would relieve difficulties in the apostolic age. And the readiness of scholars to change from traditional positions, where the reasons are good, has been recently demonstrated in the adoption of the South-Galatian hypothesis by many American and English scholars. At the same time, there does not seem to be at present any general tendency to move in the direction of the newly advocated chronologies.

It must then be said that, although this article is the best brief treatment of the subject thus far published, and while it ably presents the data at hand, and arrives at some conclusions (presented with unexpected confidence), yet it cannot be considered as settling the time problems of the life of Christ and the apostolic age. This is not because the writer has failed in his effort, but because a conclusive determination of the New Testament chronology is at present impossible.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

In the article on the Acts of the Apostles, by A. C. Headlam, the solution of Westcott and Hort as to text is held to be more probable than that of Blass. Luke is the author, although there is no decisive evidence for Lukan authorship earlier than Irenæus. The Acts is the "sole remaining work which deals with the beginnings of church history." It is an artistic whole. Christianity is depicted as a polity or society whose external growth interests the author more than the internal history. Rome is represented as on the whole favorable, Judaism as unfavorable, to Christianity, but there is no hint of an apologetic intention in the narration. The situation of the early community differs from that in which the author lived (Acts was written most probably after 70), and the description is not likely the result of the historical imagination of the writer. The speeches, though they are written in the author's style and may have some details due to him, are nevertheless quite authentic. There appears to be a difference in style between the earlier and later chapters, but the author of the "we" sections is the author of the Acts. He was personally acquainted with eyewitnesses throughout and may very probably have had one or more written documents. Theories as to sources have been made "by a number of scholars, mostly of inferior rank, who do not seem to have attained any success" (Sorof, Feine, Spitta, Van Manen, Clemen, Jüngst are cited), and the method even of B. Weiss and Hilgenfeld is, for the most part, absolutely arbitrary. The article is clear, cautious, conservative, but confessedly controversial. It is not so much a balanced statement of the whole truth as a case for the defendant. Hence its meagerness spite its excellence. The article has one great defect. Inasmuch as it presupposes no differences, theological or historical, between Acts and its sources, it should have treated the section on "Sources" less summarily, not to say cavalierly.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. J. E. FRAME.

The two articles on the Corinthian Epistles are by A. Robertson, who struggles with an embarrassing mass of material. Space might have been saved for more important matter by omitting the elaborate analysis of the first epistle, which occupies three columns. Principal Robertson fails to bring out the incompleteness of the historical connection with the Acts. He places the date of the epistle in 57, as against Ramsay and Clemen. He maintains a distinct Christ-party, on which he asserts that 2 Cor. 10 : 7 "lets in a flood of light." This we cannot see. The connection of the Christ-party (supposing that there

was any distinct party of that name) with the Judaizers of 2 Corinthians is little better than a speculation. He slurs over baptism for the dead. He holds that 11 : 27, 29 involves Paul's belief that the body of Christ is eaten. While justly characterizing the epistle as reflecting the corporate life of the church, he does not lay stress on the corporate union of believers with Christ as its very keynote, and on the breaking of this union as the essence of all the abuses which it assails. The statement that expediency is the keynote of the ethics of the epistle is open to criticism, as is the assertion that these two letters are "the most pastoral of the epistles." There is no mention of Paul's views of marriage as affected by the expectation of the parousia. The delivering unto Satan is evaded. The remarks on the indications of church organization furnished by the epistle are sound. He holds that the words of institution of the Lord's Supper are inserted from Luke. On the literature he does full justice to Schmiedel, but notes Stanley's *Corinthians* as among the best modern works (!). He refers to Ellicott's English Commentary with high praise, but does not mention his excellent commentary on the Greek text, and barely notices Heinrici's Meyer (1896), which belongs in the very front rank. The article on the second epistle is mainly devoted to the complicated historical "situation." Rightly, as we think, he holds that 2 : 5–11 cannot be referred to the offender of 1 Cor. 5 : 1. *Not* rightly, in our judgment, he denies the second, intermediate visit. He decides, though hesitatingly, against the separation of chaps. 10–13 from the remainder of the epistle. This, however, is still an open question.

The article on Colossians, by J. O. F. Murray, is brief and calls for no special remark. He is not decisive in stating his opinion as to the Pauline authorship, though we infer that he regards the epistle as Paul's. He fixes the composition of the three Asiatic epistles at Rome. He says nothing of the peculiar vocabulary of the epistle, and holds with Dr. Hort as to the unsatisfactory state of the text. He is not satisfactory on the nature of the Colossian heresy.

Walter Lock's article on Ephesians is a capital piece of work, and by far the best of the four. He holds the Pauline authorship and the composition at Rome, dismisses Holtzmann's theory as fanciful, and follows Hort and Lightfoot in identifying the letter with that mentioned in Col. 4 : 16. In his summary of the important doctrinal points he does not allude to the peculiar emphasis of the epistle on the Holy Spirit.

MARVIN R. VINCENT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

In this volume the book of Revelation is not directly treated, but there are several articles bearing indirectly on the subject. Charles, who has done such excellent work on the apocalypses of Enoch and Baruch, gives us in the article on Apocalyptic Literature an excellent statement of the origin of this branch of Jewish literature, and accurately distinguishes it from prophecy. Most of what he says of the nature and purpose of the apocalypse would apply as well to the New Testament book of Revelation as to any other apocalypse. Whatever may be thought of the theory, now held by many scholars, that parts of Revelation are of Jewish origin, no one will deny that it had its birth among Jewish Christians. Charles' statement that an apocalypse "presented a Semitic philosophy of history" is, therefore, as apt a description of Revelation as of any other. One is surprised, however, that Charles, in giving a list of the "chief apocalyptic writings which will be treated in this dictionary," omits both Daniel and Revelation. Perhaps it seemed to him too much like putting canonical books into the same sack with uncanonical, but it is a pity, in such a matter, to sacrifice completeness of statement. It is difficult to see how the truth could have hurt anyone.

Of particular subjects in Revelation there are one or two points which deserve notice. In his admirable article on Alpha and Omega Charles concludes that it is a "Greek rendering of a corresponding Hebrew expression." This is not out of harmony with the view of Briggs, that this phrase originally occurred only in the apocalypse of the Trumpets, which was written in Hebrew.

Gwatkin, under the head of Angels of the Seven Churches, presents the arguments for and against the supposition that they were bishops. His conclusion that they are "best regarded as personifications of their churches" is in harmony with the opinion of Lightfoot, Thayer, and others, and is, no doubt, correct.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.

The Dictionary professes to include the biblical theology, but of biblical theology, in the accepted sense of the term, there is little trace. That department deals with the teachings of individual books, or authors, whereas the only theological articles in the Dictionary are on certain theological terms or subjects in the Old Testament or the New Testament as collections. The article on Atonement, *e. g.*, treats the teaching of the New Testament in regard to this matter as a whole.

This is a defect, not only of title, but of subject-matter, since, as a matter of fact, there is not one, but several ideas of atonement in the New Testament.

However, we can gather some material to show the general character of the Dictionary in this department. Since biblical theology professes to give the teaching of the different authors, it has to discuss questions of authorship. What has this dictionary to say about these, and especially as they affect the progress and development of theological thought in the New Testament?

One noticeable fact about English biblical scholarship is that it has come to accept the main facts established by criticism in the Old Testament, but accepts it as a settled policy that none of the critical incursions into the domain of the New Testament are to be received. It is evident that this *Bible Dictionary* is to be constructed on this plan. The articles on Exodus, Deuteronomy, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Esther, Ecclesiastes, Daniel, are frankly critical, while those on Acts, Ephesians, Colossians, are equally uncritical.

There are three articles in this first volume which deal with disputed books in the New Testament canon. Of these, the one on Acts is not entirely satisfactory. The Lukan authorship may be taken for granted, but it is not a matter of prime importance. The verisimilitude of the discourses in the first nine chapters is rightly accepted, and is a matter of vital importance. It is the only representation in the New Testament of the early teaching of the Twelve. But the more essential matter of the relation of Paul to the Twelve is fatally marred by the omission of important facts. Acts 21 : 17 quotes James as saying that there are myriads of believers among the Jews, and they are all zealots of the law. On the contrary, it is the fundamental assumption of the traditionalist that the Judaizing party was only a small fraction of the church at Jerusalem. Again, Gal. 2 : 11–13 represents Peter as deserting his liberal attitude with the coming of certain from James. But what reason could Peter have had for this, if these emissaries represented only a miserable faction and not the church as a whole, or even if they represented the church, but not the Twelve or James? And yet, here is an elaborate treatise on this matter which entirely ignores these prime facts.

The articles on Colossians and Ephesians are obscured by like myopia.

Turning to articles dealing directly with topics of biblical theology, we find that on Christology marked by serious obscuring of essential

facts. The fact ignored throughout this article, never once mentioned, is that the title Son of God is a Messianic title, which the Jews never understood as involving divine nature, but only the representative position of kings, prophets, and others, as standing for God, acting for him in their relations to other men. The article acknowledges that there is growth in the conception of the person of our Lord, but insists that the constant element is this divinity of origin and nature. Whereas, any true and adequate statement would have to include this historical origin of the title. Then, while the influence of Gentile thought in this evolution is admitted, the nature of this relation is not stated, and the short paragraph given to it is summed up with the statement that "contemporary Greek or oriental thought does little or nothing to elucidate the teaching of the New Testament about the Son of God." But why not give us the facts about the Logos doctrine in St. John, Colossians, and Hebrews, and let us judge for ourselves about their importance?

On the other hand, the articles on Eschatology, Angels, Ascension, Baptism for the Dead, Bible, Demon, Election, are fair examples of the historical method which is at the basis of biblical theology. Those on the Atonement and Faith are good examples of the systematic, as distinguished from the biblical, treatment of theological subjects. It would seem as if the latter were the only treatment of theological subjects proper to a biblical dictionary.

E. P. GOULD.

ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH,
New York, N. Y.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

THE TRANSCENDENTAL ELEMENT IN THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF CHRIST.

THE application of historical criticism to the teaching of Jesus Christ, regarded by itself, seems like an attack on the originality of his ideas. Inquiries into the antecedents of those ideas, as they appear in the gospels, point to contributions from preceding Jewish thought — sayings of the rabbis, especially of the school of Hillel, apocalyptic writings, perhaps practices of the Essenes, as some suppose. And meanwhile a new and daring development of the *kenosis* doctrine goes out to meet this historical criticism, cheerfully surrendering whatever it may claim.

But when so much is conceded that it is difficult to find room for any appreciable amount of originality, the ease with which the triumph of historical continuity has been attained begins to rouse uncomfortable suspicions as to the validity of the process. For after the logic of the situation has demonstrated that, viewed from the standpoint of its antecedents, Christianity would seem to be lacking in any considerable degree of originality, the patent facts of history rise up and confront it with the startling reminder that nevertheless Christianity has succeeded in turning the course of the world's life into new channels by a revolution of thought so stupendous as to be rightly named "a new creation."

This apparent contradiction is not to be resolved by merely pointing to the dynamic element of Christianity as its one distinguishing characteristic. It is true that Jesus Christ realized what his predecessors only dreamed, and that the greatest wonder of his work is its vitality rather than its novelty. Even in this direction we seem to be led on toward the transcendental, since there was nothing in apocryphal or rabbinical teaching to quicken its own seeds. That Jesus accomplished what others only thought is one indication that he drew on resources that were beyond their grasp.

Still, it may well be doubted whether this is enough to account for the facts. The form as well as the force of Christianity, the truth of

it as well as its power, come on the world as new in their wholeness, whatever they may seem to be in detail. The discovery of the quarry from which the stones of a building have been hewn is no explanation of the genius of the architect who planned it.

Thus we are driven back to a fresh examination of our data to discover how it is that, while so much in the teaching of Jesus may be traced to traditional or literary analogies, that teaching still commands the world's attention as something entirely unique. Assuredly we shall not recover the precious ore of divine originality by simply collecting the residuum when all that strikes us as of a local or temporary nature has been strained off. To follow such a process as this is to imitate the precarious device of the natural theologian, who, having retreated from one point after another under the relentless pressure of the advancing army of science, with its demonstration of uniformity in nature, has intrenched himself in a last fortress on the ground of the mystery of life, the plain consequence staring him in the face that, if ever vital forces are resolved into equivalent molecular movements and the reverse process is attained in the production of life from some transformation of known physical forces, forthwith theology must disappear from his universe. As with nature, so with Christ, we cannot be content to hold just one final citadel of the transcendental. We must go back over the whole course of the retreat to see it everywhere if we are to see it anywhere. If, then, the transcendental is not to be found in a mere residuum of unexplained ideas, where is it to be sought? Clearly not in phrase or sentence, not as this or that oracular statement which we can still preserve in literary isolation uncontaminated by contact with prior or contemporary thought. It must be sought in atmosphere, in perspective, in proportion, in spirit.

For example, we have a clear note of independence in the Sermon on the Mount, where Jesus sharply contrasts his own teaching on such subjects as murder, adultery, oaths, not only with that of the scribes, but also with that of the Pentateuch. It is possible to see antecedents of much that our Lord here teaches in various parts of the Old Testament—revenge forbidden in Proverbs (25: 21, 22), etc. And it may be surmised that the strong thinking of a mind of lofty moral tone could move to the positions here indicated in its own energy, without having recourse to any transcendental knowledge or impulse. Similarly in regard to his daring teaching and practice in the matter of the Sabbath, Jesus is able to appeal to the example of David and the language of Hosea (Matt. 12: 3, 7). A keen perception of analogy and a rigor-

ous drawing of inferences may be thought to suffice for the conclusions at which he arrived.

And yet, when we cease to take his ethics in detail, when we stand back from the picture and perceive it in its entirety, so that the proportions of the whole are apparent and the spirit that breathes through it is felt, we discover here no mere eclectic system, patched together out of even the very best elements of earlier thought, but an idea of life wholly in advance of Old Testament writings as well as rabbinical teaching, to which we are compelled to give the distinctive title "Christian ethics."

The question, then, is, How was this advance brought about?

Wendt is decidedly opposed to the supposition that Jesus drew either on the teaching of the Pharisees or on that of the Essenes. His definite conviction is that our Lord went back to Scripture, ignoring or contradicting subsequent accretions. But this is no final explanation. First, we want to know how it was that he alone of all men came to do this; second, why the result of his doing so was such a new reading of the Old Testament as ushers in the New. Clearly at least we must allow that Jesus took up a new attitude toward the Scriptures; one closer to that of the prophets than to that of the legalists; one that drew especially near to Jeremiah perhaps, still one that was new, in its newness making a break with the old, not alone in the law, but in Judaism generally.

But now we may approach the subject from another side. With Wendt the central point of the consciousness of Jesus and the key to all his specific thought and teaching are to be found in his perfectly unique perception of God as his Father. Beyschlag ventures to carry the analysis a step farther back, suggesting that, as Jesus realizes in his own person the beatitude of the pure in heart, it results that through his unique purity he sees God as no other man can see him. This of course must be allowed, though we may demur at the notion that it accounts for everything.

In the first place, the unique purity of Jesus itself calls for explanation. Then, if purity is not the bare negation of defilement, if it has also a positive character as absolute goodness, as the holiness without which no man can see God, for this to be raised to perfection is for a divine attribute to appear; in other words, it is for Jesus to be evincing his own divinity. We come, then, to the position that it is through his divine sonship that Jesus knows the Father. Shall we call this a transcendental consciousness? As regards the phenom-

enal, yes; for it is neither a sense perception nor a purely logical inference from sense perceptions in the plane of the understanding. It need not be thought of, however, as a revelation borne in upon the soul of Jesus *ab extra*, coming from what might be regarded as an external world of the eternal. If Jesus is of the eternal, and the eternal is in him, it would seem to follow that his own personal thinking will be in the sphere which to us is the transcendental. We need not, therefore, assert that our Lord followed other methods of thinking than those that come within the limits of human consciousness. His manner of dealing with the data of consciousness would be, one might say, just that which is natural to mankind. Otherwise, the completeness of his humanity is marred, or we fall into some form of *Docetism*. Neither need we fall back on a Nestorian division, a double stream of consciousness. Let us admit that while on earth he reasons as a man can naturally reason. Still it remains that his unique experience in contact with his Father must have afforded him data for his thinking which we do not possess, just as the data of consciousness in the saint differ from those of the abandoned sensualist, though the scale of difference must be infinitely greater in the experience of our Lord, because the purity of Christ is infinitely more holy than the sanctity of the most spotless saint.

Account for it as we may, or leaving it an unexplained mystery, we cannot be blind to the fact that Jesus comes to us with a new vision of God in his soul and a new revelation of God in his life and teaching. This is not altogether new in words; that may be granted ungrudgingly, and yet the great fact will remain unshaken. The spirituality of God, the goodness of God, the fatherhood of God are all to be found in the earlier revelation—the spirituality in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, as surely as in the words of Jesus at Jacob's well, the goodness of God as emphatically in Psalms 23, 91, and 103, and many another passage of the old Scriptures, as in the twelfth chapter of Luke. The fatherhood of God, as it touches Israel, emerges more than once in the Old Testament, and indeed it appears in pagan literature. Homer's Zeus is the "father of gods and men," who in Latin becomes Jupiter, his fatherhood declared in his very name. Yet, on the lips of Jesus and in his life spirituality and goodness and fatherhood mean vastly more than in the sayings of prophets and poets of the past.

Marcion was only exaggerating a truth to which the Catholic churchmen against whom he protested were strangely blind, when he

daringly affirmed that Jesus had revealed a hitherto unknown God. The total impression of Christ's revelation of God is a new revelation. Especially may we say that the centrality of the fatherhood in the being of God, with the new depth of meaning now to be seen in it and the far-reaching consequences flowing from it and dominating all religious thought and life, was unknown till Jesus made it known. This is his fundamental contribution to the revelation of truth. It cannot be traced to Rabbinism, to Judaism, to Old Testament prophecy, to the Law. Springing from his own perceptions, born of his own conscious relationship with God, neither phenomenal nor illative, it is the supremely transcendental element in the thought of Jesus, as that thought is communicated to us by means of the gospels. But if we concede this point, we cannot stay here. Other elements in the thought and teaching of Jesus are of similar character, and are so because they are dominated by this central idea of God.

Thus the ideas of Jesus Christ concerning himself appear to be of the same nature. That he was early conscious of divine sonship, Luke's narrative of his visit to Jerusalem in his thirteenth year plainly indicates. We cannot say, however, that this consciousness implied to him from the first the assurance that he was the Messiah. We have no data for affirming that thus early it meant all that we attach to the idea of his divine sonship. It may not have been at all self-conscious; it may have been wholly concerned with God as his Father, not at all with himself as the Son. Nor can we definitely affirm that the full perception of sonship was first realized at the baptism. Still it is significant that Mark, our earliest authority, represents the revelation as then made solely to Jesus, and therefore, we may presume, as of real significance to him. Next it is to be observed that, whether first attained with this revelation or possessed earlier, the assurance of his Messiahship is henceforth clear to him; for the whole significance of temptation which in all three synoptic accounts follows sharply on the baptism turns on the mission of the Messiah, and how it might most readily be carried out. Here, once for all, Jesus rejects the part of the popular Messiah, choosing for himself a wholly different course.

The fact that the career of the popular Messiah presented itself to him in the light of a temptation is a clear proof that the course he felt constrained to follow lay before him as a duty, *i.e.*, that it was not chosen for reasons of policy as the best means to attain certain settled ends, but accepted under the obligation of truth and right. He must have seen from the first that Messianic deliverance and apocalyptic

happiness, redemption and the advent of the golden age could not be attained by force, or display, or any worldly methods—methods which to his pure soul meant the worship of Satan—that they could only come by means of the perception of truth and the life of holy obedience to the will of God—that life which is so well expressed by the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, in his citation from the fortieth psalm: "Lo, I come to do Thy will, O my God." He must also have seen that these blessings themselves were of a totally different nature from those of the Jewish millennial pictures of material delights.

But this was a new conception of the Messiahship. Righteousness, indeed, is associated with the Messianic victory in the "Psalms of Solomon;" but no Jew before Jesus conceived the idea of such a Messiah as Jesus was. We cannot set down this new turn in the Messianic idea to the force of circumstances—to such facts as the irresistible power of Rome which precluded any rational hope of success in an insurrection; the humble circumstances of Jesus, who as a provincial mechanic could not hope to win the honors of princely rank; or the specific gifts he enjoyed as prophet and teacher, pointing to the exercise of didactic rather than political functions. All three of these facts may have contributed to aid in the development of his Messianic idea. But they could not have shaped it from the first; because a Jew prejudiced by the popular notion must either have ignored the facts while fanatically clinging to his conviction of the Messiahship, in the spirit of a *zealot*, or have abandoned the dream of Messiahship in face of their remorseless opposition to the attainment of it in the way universally expected.

There must have been something in the consciousness of Jesus himself to determine him to pursue his original course as the Messiah. May not this be traced back to his consciousness of God? Such an idea of God as he possessed was inconsistent with the popular Messiahship; or at all events could not be satisfied with the crude materialism that accompanied it. If there is a transcendental element in our Lord's consciousness of God, that must be taken into account in his conception of his own mission.

To the consciousness of Jesus, it would seem, the working out of his ideas concerning his vocation must have preceded his elaboration of the conception of the kingdom of God—the temptation in the wilderness occurring before the preaching in Galilee, and that early preaching only repeating John's prior announcement of the near advent of the kingdom, all exposition of its nature being reserved for

a later stage of his mission. Nevertheless, in the order of his public teaching the exposition of the nature and laws of the kingdom comes before any declaration of his Messiahship. This was the text and theme of most of his teaching.

Here again we are struck with the originality of Jesus, though not always in form and phrase. It is possible to discover Old Testament antecedents to most of the specific characteristics of the kingdom of God, as this is expounded by our Lord. In particular Jeremiah's prophecy of the new covenant (Jer. 31 : 31) comes near to the very heart of our Lord's teaching. And yet it must be said that the total picture of the kingdom of God which Jesus draws is unique, new to the world, wholly his own. Its inwardness, its spirituality, its humaneness, its ethical purity, its mingled graciousness and elevation are all of a new order, born into the world with the teaching of its founder.

Then, if we go a step farther back it becomes apparent that this novel conception of the kingdom stands in the most intimate relations with our Lord's own perception of the nature and character of God. Since it is the kingdom of *God*, as God is so it must be; our idea of the kingdom must vary directly with our idea of God. If, then, the vision of God is transcendental, the idea of the kingdom of God rests on transcendental grounds.

The case is somewhat different with those parts of our Lord's teaching which appear to lie outside the range of his immediate experience on earth, even that profound interior experience which is represented by the vision of God attained in perfect purity of heart, or the perception of divine fatherhood responsive to the relation of sonship. Jesus speaks of more or less remote facts—his own death and resurrection, his second advent and reign in glory, the judgment of the nations, Gehenna, the life eternal. How far may we regard his words on these subjects as representative of a transcendental consciousness?

Our Lord's final rejection at the hands of the authorities was darkly foreshadowed by the treatment he received earlier from scribes and delegates of the Sanhedrin. Knowing them and seeing clearly what course he must pursue unflinchingly to the end, he must have perceived what that end could not but be. Probably Holman Hunt is right with the posture he gives to Jesus in his picture, "The Shadow of Death," one that precludes Jesus himself from seeing the shadow as of a crucified man that he is casting on the walls of Joseph's workshop when he stands there with outstretched hands. There is no reason to suppose

that the shadow lay across his path from the first, though the temptation may well have suggested a tragic ending to a course which deliberately defied the "prince of this world." Before long, however, the clouds gathered darkly enough to presage the approaching storm. But what of the resurrection? No calculation of human affairs could point to that miracle. We cannot deny that Jesus had a sure prevision of it. May we admit the supposition that his vision of the fatherhood of God, his consciousness of his own nature, and his firm conviction of his mission must have assured him that God would not permit his Holy One to see corruption?

Concerning his return in glory Jesus uses most positive language. In form this agrees with, and may be said to be derived from, current apocalyptic literature. So far, then, it does not point to transcendental elements of consciousness. But there are two additions: (1) his personal connection with the apocalyptic ideas; (2) the near approach of the end. The one might be regarded as an inference from his Messiahship, the other as a deduction from his perception that the Jewish state was ripe for judgment. And yet the language is singularly definite and exact; and much of it was remarkably verified in the tragic events of the year 70 A. D.

Lastly, as regards the future after death, Jesus adds nothing to current conception of its form. Concerning Gehenna he uses conventional language — he adds no new revelation, he betrays no consciousness of a transcendental nature. Touching this subject the accent lies on the ethical part of his teaching — as to *who* are in danger of Gehenna, a Dives negligent of Lazarus, a degenerate Pharisee. Here we see it is just the transcendental character of his ethics that comes in.

Concerning future blessedness he is most positive, though singularly sparing of descriptive imagery. He scarcely lifts the veil to make known the condition of the blessed dead, but he is quite certain that they live again and that they are blessed. On this subject he partly indorses current ideas. Is he then merely repeating them? It seems reasonable to say that his singularly clear and positive tone on a subject about which men speculate timorously points to sources of assurance beyond the reach of mankind. But at all events we may conclude that his vision of God and his reception of the divine fatherhood would here contribute to the conviction that such a God could not be a God of the dead, that to such a Father all his children must live.

If there is any truth and reasonableness in these considerations, they lead to the conclusion that there was a truly transcendental ele-

ment in our Lord's consciousness on earth; but that this may not have been immediate in all relations, but centering in and radiating out from his consciousness of God.

WALTER F. ADENEY.

LONDON, ENGLAND.

SOME ASPECTS OF PAUL'S THEOLOGY IN THE PHILIPPIAN EPISTLE.

I.

THE Philippian letter, as is well known, is not of a distinctively doctrinal character. It is a familiar epistle, called out by the generous gift of the Philippian church to Paul, in which to his acknowledgment of their bounty the apostle adds such practical counsels as his acquaintance with their circumstances suggests. It is informal and irregular in structure, so much so as to have provoked the challenge of its integrity. It passes rapidly and abruptly from one topic to another, and, like the second Corinthian letter, is characterized throughout by strong emotion.

Nevertheless, it holds a good deal of theology in solution. It deals with doctrinal points, not in the way of exposition, like the letter to the Romans, but in the way of allusion to principles and facts which are assumed to be familiar to the readers and accepted by them. Such hints as are furnished by the Thessalonian and Philippian epistles indicate that the type of Christianity in the Macedonian churches was exceptionally fine and robust. In Macedonia the apostle's teaching was little disturbed by foreign elements. There are, indeed, evidences of the unsettled conditions of a new spiritual life — the gradual rooting of new principles and the tendency to partisanship; and Paul's exhortations are addressed to the common inclinations which develop under such conditions — boasting, self-love, ambition, and petty jealousy; but of conflicts between opposing tendencies of thought and faith there is no evidence, either as respects Jewish or heathen inclinations. The national traits of the Macedonians were revealed in their Christian life. Without the intellectual vivacity and subtlety which, in other places, opened the way for the inroads of speculative gnosis; without the restlessness of the Hellenic mind which found vent in the discussion of Christian problems — that active, practical, buoyant character which made the power of Greece felt throughout the world, the courage, tenacity, and power of endurance developed a type of Chris-

tianity, simple in faith, generous in impulse, open-handed, fruitful in good works, and steadfast under persecution.

In the present paper I desire to offer some observations upon the Pauline theology as it appears in two passages of this letter: the celebrated christological passage in the second chapter, and that portion of the third chapter in which the apostle sets forth the nature of the righteousness of faith.

Much of the difficulty which attaches to the former passage is due to its interpreters rather than to the passage itself, and arises from the assumption that in these verses Paul was attempting to formulate a statement of the character and conditions of Christ's existence before and during his incarnation. Such a view is utterly inconsistent with the familiar tone of the letter and with the practical intent of the passage, the principal object of which is to enforce the duty of humility. As the supreme illustration of this virtue, Paul adduces the example of Jesus Christ in his voluntary renunciation of his pre-incarnate majesty and his voluntary identification with our humanity. The points of the illustration are thrown out in rapid succession and without elaboration, and are all brought to bear upon the exhortation: "Look not everyone at his own things, but everyone also on the things of others." Paul does, indeed, rise here above the level of epistolary colloquialism, but the impulse to the higher flight is emotional and not philosophic.

Bishop Lightfoot does not escape this error in his well-known excursus on the synonyms σχῆμα and μορφή (*Commentary on Philippians*, 12th ed., p. 127). Before the philosophical period the predominant sense of μορφή was "shape" or "figure," a sense which is retained to some extent in philosophical usage, and which occurs in both Plato and Aristotle. These two philosophers, however, employed the term with a wider range of meaning, applying it to immaterial facts; and it is from Aristotle's usage especially that Lightfoot draws the meaning of "specific character" which he attributes to Paul's use of the word here. It may be granted that Aristotle employs it in this sense; but a far more thorough discussion of Aristotle's usage than is furnished by the excursus would be necessary in order to make good that position, if it can be made good. There are three things to be said: (1) that Aristotle, as already remarked, uses the word also in the earlier, objective sense; (2) that his more subjective conception of μορφή is not uniform throughout, being more purely intellectual in his *Logic* than in his *Physics;* (3) that even in his most subtle and immaterial concep-

tion of "form" the abstract is habitually brought into concrete realization. His doctrine is familiar to all students, that sensible objects consist of matter and form; matter being simply the potentiality of becoming, while form makes this potentiality actual, so that matter is not intelligible without form, though the form is not necessarily external or material.

I find it impossible to believe that Paul's use of μορφή was derived from Aristotle, or was intended by him to denote "specific character," in the sense asserted by Lightfoot. The starting-point of his conception lay, in my judgment, nearer to the anthropomorphic than to the metaphysical; not necessarily that he definitely conceived God as invested with human form, but that he conceived the essential personality of God as externalizing itself and expressing itself in some mode apprehensible to pure spiritual intelligences, if not to the human mind. But it seems likely, in any case, that Paul's mind touched the conception of "the form of God" very slightly and incidentally, and only on its outskirts, since the application of the word μορφή to God was mainly a reflection of its application to "a bond servant." Christ's humiliation was the dominant idea in Paul's mind, and the μορφή of a bond servant, therefore, came first in the order of thought. The idea of some embodiment of the divine personality was not altogether absent from his mind; but it is quite possible that it did not assume conscious definition, and was chiefly a rhetorical antithesis to

Nevertheless, it is apparent that Paul uses the word with a recognition of its peculiar relation to the essential and permanent nature of that which is expressed or manifested; so that it is purposely chosen instead of σχῆμα, which signifies merely the outward and transient configuration without regard to that which is behind it. In illustrating this distinction, Lightfoot, in one or two instances, seems to me to have refined too much, as in his illustration from Mark 16:12, and his explanation of μόρφωσις, Rom. 2:20, as signifying an *aiming* after or *affecting* the real μορφή of knowledge and truth. This will hardly hold.

I assume that in vs. 6 Paul refers to the pre-incarnate condition of our Lord, and in vss. 7, 8 to his incarnate state. With this seems to go necessarily the continuity of Jesus' divine consciousness in his human condition, that is, that he did not forget or lose sight of his original equality with God. This might easily open the whole vexed question of the kenosis, which I should have no room to discuss here, even if I were so disposed. The fact that Jesus retained the consciousness of

his original divine prerogative seems to me to be as clearly indicated as any christological fact in the New Testament.

That it is distinctly asserted in the fourth gospel is admitted. Such passages as John 8 : 58; 13 : 3; 17 : 5, 24, not to speak of the prologue, are unquestionable. He comes from the Father with a special commission. His union with the Father is clearly to be distinguished from that which any good man may have with God. In virtue of this union he possesses peculiar powers. Even the tremendous prerogative of judging the world is claimed by him, to the end that men should honor him as they honor the Father. He does not make many or full disclosures of the unseen world, but what he does say is said with a tone of special authority and as by one who is speaking of his native home.

But such indications are by no means confined to the fourth gospel. They are found in abundance in the synoptic gospels. He is *the* Son of God whom no one knows save the Father, and who only, with those to whom he chooses to manifest him, knows the Father. Even the title "the Son of Man" implies his peculiar and representative relation to humanity, and that he bears the nature of man in an exceptional way. He is the fulfiller of the law and the prophets, the founder of the kingdom of God, its supreme legislator and head. He offers rest to the world, and the offer is based on the delivery of all things to him by the Father. He forgives sins with divine authority. He assumes authority over Satan and the demons. Men must confess him, and the awards of the final judgment are to be regulated by their relation to him. He is to come to judge the world, sitting upon the clouds, upon the throne of glory, at the right hand of power. Under all these utterances lies the distinct consciousness of a unique relation to God. That any being should say such things and prefer such claims without this consciousness is incredible, except upon the supposition that he was either the greatest of dupes or the greatest of impostors.

The same consciousness, unbroken by his entrance into the human state, is clearly implied in the epistle to the Hebrews. Nowhere is his condition of humiliation more distinctly stated, and nowhere is his preëxistent condition of divine majesty and equality with God more emphatically asserted. In the state of humiliation he is carrying out the restoration of the divine archetype conceived before the ages in the mind of God. Is it credible that the consciousness of these two states should be severed? Is it credible that the writer should conceive him in the work of his priesthood and sacrifice and purging away of sins as

not reverting to his own original share in the very design which he had come to earth in order to carry out, as having lost or sunk for the time all sense of the ages when, as the very image of God's substance, he was working toward this very consummation and bearing onward all things by the word of his power?

But, it is said, this is not recognized by Paul. Not in the same way as in the gospels, for we have almost no utterances of Christ in the Pauline epistles; but it is none the less clearly implied. In this passage Christ is described as renouncing his pre-incarnate majesty by a voluntary, self-conscious act. Shall we believe that in that act Christ temporarily annihilated all consciousness of that which he renounced; that there was a breach of continuity in the mind which gave rise to the incarnation; that a mighty impulse of free and self-conscious love constrained the eternal Son to descend into humanity, and in the descent that love lost itself for years? (Bruce, *Humiliation of Christ*, p. 227.) Is it likely that Paul, on this point, held a view so utterly at variance with that of the gospels? On this point the words of Weizsäcker are worth citing: "He had a personal existence before his human birth, and his earlier life was divine and absolutely opposed to the dependent life of man upon earth. Christ becomes man by a personal act. The heavenly descent of 'the man from heaven' is equivalent to the thought that he was 'in the form of God;' and Paul can, therefore, say without hesitation that it was Jesus the Christ who first existed in the divine form and then humbled himself. Had he not given his doctrine of Christ this backward extension, the human life of Christ would have become for him a sort of impersonal event, and Jesus a mere instrument. His doctrine of the preëxistence accordingly enables him to look upon Christ's work as a personal act, and to preserve the bond between him and humanity."

On the same line is 2 Cor. 8 : 9. Christ was rich, but voluntarily became poor that he might enrich men through his poverty. Are we to suppose that Paul regarded Christ in his state of poverty as oblivious of the riches out of which he came with the express purpose of making men sharers in them? Or take Col. 1 : 19, and the context. Here, too, the work of redemption through Christ's blood is put in direct connection with his pre-incarnate glory. His original divine dignity is emphasized in order to throw into stronger relief his value and power as a human redeemer. He stands between the eternal glory and the abject human condition as a mediator and reconciler. "For it pleased the Father that in him should all the fulness dwell; and having made

peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself; by him, I say, whether they be things in earth or things in heaven." Throw out of this passage the idea of the continuity of consciousness, and it becomes practically pointless. A reconciler must have an eye on both sides. A mediator must have a hand on both parties. It is simply incredible that Paul should have conceived Christ as carrying on the work of reconciling God and man, things in heaven and things on earth, in a state of utter obliviousness or suspended consciousness of the fact that he was from the beginning the image of the invisible God, with all the divine fulness dwelling in him.

To the same effect are Paul's words in 1 Corinthians, chap. 15, concerning Christ as the agent in man's resurrection. The whole argument for our resurrection rests upon the fact that Christ as the *Lord from heaven* became partaker of death and rose from the dead. The pre-incarnate condition cannot be divorced from the work in the flesh. Did Paul assume such a divorce in Christ's thought?

And all these acquire the more force when we have once freed ourselves from the tendency to regard Christ's eternal glory and his humiliation as distinct. They stood in unbroken connection in Christ's consciqusness because of their organic connection in fact. The two are parts of one whole. The humiliation is a phase of the glory. The outraying of the divine glory in Christ does not cease when he becomes man. Love, devotion, sacrifice, suffering for others are divine and eternal in their nature. They are outgoings and ongoings of the eternal quality of God. Hence the writer to the Hebrews is careful to say that "*it became*" even the God by whom and for the sake of whom all things are, to carry out his eternal plan of salvation through a suffering Savior (Heb. 2 : 10). Incarnation and humiliation were not a break in the history of humanity, nor in the eternal activity of God in Christ. The "Lamb was slain from the foundation of the world." Christ's humiliation, so far from obscuring his glory, was a new and unique revelation of it. It showed how the divine in man could be evolved out of that to which no thought of the divine attached—sorrow, suffering, poverty, ignominy, and death; and in its result the final achievement of redemption will identify itself with the original ideal of creation, and the divine glory will once more be reflected from the whole universe of God.

Passing now from this, we are met by the question whether ἐν μορφῇ θεοῦ ὑπάρχων and τὸ εἶναι ἴσα θεῷ signify the same thing. "No,"

it is said. Equality with God did not inhere in Christ's pre-incarnate being. He received it first at his exaltation and as a reward for his perfect obedience. Thus Dorner (*Christl. Glaubenslehre*, Vol. II, pp. 286 f.) says: "His manhood is raised to a full share in the divine majesty as a reward of its maintaining true obedience. He could not have been exalted if he had not exhibited a faultless development in a true existence and obedience."

Along with this view goes an assumed antithesis between Christ and Adam. Dorner says: "While the first Adam grasped at equality with God, the second obtained exaltation to the divine majesty; since not only would he not assume the divine dignity, but, though himself elevated in dignity, humbled himself, and became obedient even unto death." The parallel is developed by Ernesti (*Stud. u. Krit.*, 1848, Hft. 4): "Adam would be God; Christ renounced his god-likeness. Adam suffered death as a doom; Christ voluntarily. Adam incurred the divine curse; Christ won the approval of God, and the reward of exaltation to equality with God."

The same view is held by Dr. Briggs. He says: "It was, indeed, involved in his existing in the form of God that he should be equal in rank with God. From that point of view it might be said that he would not grasp after his own rank, to which he was entitled as the Son of God; but it is probable that the apostle had in mind the antithesis between the first and the second Adam which is so characteristic of his theology. He is thinking of the sinful grasping of the first Adam after equality with God under the instigation of the serpent. As the second Adam he will not grasp after equality with God, even though it be his birthright. He will receive it from the hands of God as a gift of love, after he has *earned* it by obedience, just as the first Adam ought to have done" (*Messiah of the Apostles*, p. 180. Similarly Beyschlag, *Neutestamentliche Theologie*, 2. Aufl., Bd. II, p. 88).

Setting aside for the moment the question of the two Adams, I fail to see the consistency of Dr. Briggs' first statement—that equality in rank with God was involved in Christ's existence in the form of God—with his last statement, that equality with God was something which Christ *earned* by his obedience. This inconsistency is not reconciled by the antithesis of the two Adams. At any rate, these statements can mean only that the status of the pre-incarnate Christ was inferior to his status after his incarnation; that the being whom Paul describes as existing in the form of God was something less than the being whom God highly exalted. This is clearly put by Beyschlag: "The subject

of this passage is not Son of God, as in the so-called Athanasian symbol, but one sharply distinguished from God. The μορφὴ θεοῦ in which he preëxisted is not a μορφὴ τοῦ θεοῦ, and the ἴσα θεῷ εἶναι is not an ἴσα τῷ θεῷ εἶναι. There remains between him and the one God, who is the Father, so decided a difference that the incomparable glory which Christ won through his self-emptying and obedience unto death does not belong to him as his eternal, natural possession, but is given to him by God's free grace, and must redound only to the honor of the Father. Hence ἑαυτὸν ἐκένωσεν cannot signify a laying aside of his divine being, but only the laying aside of his mode of manifestation" (*Neutestamentliche Theologie*, II, p. 86).

It is difficult to see how such words can be reconciled with passages like Col. 1:15–17, in which, to the doctrine of the form of God in the Philippian letter, we have added the doctrine that the preëxistent Son of God was the mediator between God and the creature in creation, in providence, and in redemption. Add to this John 1:1, 2; 5:21; 6:4, 18, and especially Heb. 1:2, 3. In this last passage we have a more technical and formal statement after the manner of the Alexandrian school, and according to this statement the preëxistent Christ was the very impress of God's substance.

Beyschlag, as Philo (*De Somn.*, I, 39, 41), insists on the distinction between ὁ θεός and θεός, claiming that this distinction is observed in John 1:1. But in that passage θεός, predicated of the Logos, is used attributively and with a notion of kind, and is thus necessarily anarthrous. It excludes identity of person, but emphasizes identity of essence and nature. Accordingly, what John says is that the Logos was with God, and that with no lower nature than God himself. Philo, on the contrary, claims that the anarthrous θεός describes the Logos as of subordinate nature — δεύτερος θεός.

Dorner cites Rom. 1:4 to show that Christ was constituted the Son of God *with power* only after his resurrection. "Therefore, before this, he was not the Son of God with power, though he was already the Son" (*Chr. Glaubensl.*, II, p. 284). But this inference rests on a misinterpretation. Ἐν δυνάμει does not belong with υἱοῦ θεοῦ, but is adverbial, and qualifies ὁρισθέντος. Paul's statement is that Christ was designated as Son of God in a powerful, impressive, efficient manner by his resurrection from the dead as a work of divine power. Compare 2 Cor. 13:4; Eph. 1:19.

Moreover, I am unable to see how equality with God can be conferred or superinduced. Equality with God can belong only to essence.

As to the antithesis of the two Adams, it seems forced, at best; but *is* there any antithesis? According to the narrative in Genesis, chap. 3, Satan declared that the eating of the fruit would confer a knowledge which would make the eaters as gods, knowing good and evil; and the woman saw that the tree was to be desired to make one wise. Nothing is said of a desire to be equal with God in the absolute sense. The temptation and the desire turned upon forbidden knowledge. The words "as gods" are defined and limited by the words "knowing good and evil;" and Scripture nowhere asserts or hints that Adam desired equality with God. Moreover, if Adam had proved obedient, his reward would not have been equality with God.

Yet something was obtained by Christ, as the result of his incarnation and of his perfect obedience therein, which he did not possess before his incarnation, and which he could not have possessed without it. Equality with God was his birthright; but his Messianic lordship was something which could accrue to him only through his incarnation and its attendant humiliation; and it was this, and not equality with God, which he received in his exaltation. The διὸ of vs. 9 is not to be taken as if God bestowed exaltation as a reward for perfect obedience, but rather, as Meyer correctly says, "as the accession of the corresponding consequence." The sequence is logical rather than ethical. Out of the human life, death, and resurrection of Christ comes a type of sovereignty which could pertain to him only through his triumph over human sin (Heb. 1 : 3); through his identification with men as their brother. Messianic lordship is a matter of function, not of inherent power and majesty. The phrase "seated at the right hand of God" is Messianic, and expresses Christ's Messianic triumph; but not to the detriment of any essential dignity possessed before his incarnation. But the incarnation places him, in a new sense, in actual, kingly relation to the collective life of the universe. There cannot be the bowing of every knee and the confession of every tongue so long as Christ merely remains being in the form of God — until he has made purification of sins, redeemed creation, and been manifested to earth, heaven, and hades as the Savior of men, and Lord because Savior.

Thus new elements enter into the life and sovereignty of the exalted Christ. He exists no less as Son of God, but now also as son of man, which he could be only through being born of woman and made in the likeness of men. The divine glory shines through the bodily form which he carried into heaven with him, yet "in him dwelleth all the

fulness of the godhead bodily-wise" (Col. 2 : 9). He is what he was not, and could not be, before his incarnation — the Great High Priest. Having begun the high-priestly work in his death and sacrifice, he now carries it on in the heavenly places by his work of intervention (ἐντυγχάνειν, Heb. 7 : 25) in the lives of those who believe on him. He is the minister of the resurrection-life to his redeemed, ever bringing to bear on them, through the Spirit, the divine forces which cause them to "walk in the newness of life." Thus lordship won by conquest in incarnation is distinguished from inherent lordship. This is the lordship which Jesus preferred to that which was inherent in him as the equal of God.

And in this fact lies the answer to the much-discussed question: What is the name which God gave him at his exaltation? As the lordship is Messianic, as the Messianic lordship comes only through the human experience and victory, the name will unite the human experience and the Messianic dominion: "Jesus," the human name; "Christ," the Messianic name. Not "Lord," for lordship was his inherent prerogative before incarnation. Not "Jesus" alone, for that represents only the human experience of humiliation; but JESUS CHRIST — Christ the Messiah only as he was "Jesus." Accordingly, "Lord," in vs. 11, is defined by Jesus Christ.

MARVIN R. VINCENT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York, N. Y.

THE NEWBERRY GOSPELS.

WHEN Professor Caspar René Gregory was lecturing at the University of Chicago in 1895, he directed my attention to a Greek manuscript of the gospels, in the Newberry Library of Chicago, and suggested that it be collated. The results of the work undertaken upon this suggestion are here presented.

The manuscript is a parchment codex, of 211 leaves, carefully written in a graceful minuscule. It has generally been assigned, on palæographical grounds, to the twelfth century.[1] The parchment is

[1] The hand of the manuscript bears a closer resemblance to that of a thirteenth-century gospels in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Paris, than to any other with which I have been able to compare it. This manuscript, Gregory's 293, Bib. Nat. Grec 117, a facsimile of which has been published by OMONT, *Fac-similés des manuscrits grecs datés de la Bibliothèque Nationale du IX^e au XIV^e siècle*, Paris, 1891, pl. LVI, is dated 1262 A. D.

generally soft and fine, the ink brown with age. The leaves are arranged in twenty-six full quires, properly made, with a twenty-seventh of three leaves, and measure 13 by 8.6^{cm}; but the fact that some quire numbers and marginal corrections are partly cut off shows that there has been an appreciable loss from the lower and outer margins. The fifth leaf of the eighth quire, containing the chapter list for Mark, is a coarser bit of parchment, which has been glued in place; but the writing on it seems to be in the same hand as the body of the manuscript. The writing is in single columns, unbroken by paragraphs, with twenty-seven lines to the page. The pages are lined in the usual way, the writing depending from the line. Quire numbers are written at the lower right-hand corner of the first recto of each quire. The margins contain the usual Eusebian numbers, the sections in gold, the canons in red. The upper and lower margins contain the chapter titles, in gold, and the lesson titles, in red. There are frequent abbreviations, no capitals save in the margin, the usual accents and breathings, and a copious punctuation. The marginal capitals are in gold. After interrogative sentences the colon frequently takes the place of the interrogation point, especially when the presence of an interrogative pronoun makes the interrogative character of the sentence unmistakable. Properispomena followed by dissyllabic enclitics are usually treated like paroxytones. In the marginal capitals an occasional error of omission or substitution has been made, as will appear from the readings given below, *e. g.*, Matt. 15:14; 19:1; Luke 17:34; 24:22. Corrections are frequent, although not a few cases of itacism and homoioteleuton have escaped the correctors. With the possible exception of a very doubtful case in Mark 12:1, iota subscript is never written, nor does iota adscript occur. Old Testament quotations are indicated by angular marks $\gtrless$ in the left-hand margin. A striking feature in the manuscript is the representation of each evangelist at the beginning of his gospel, in a painted miniature, most carefully executed on a gold background. The evangelist is shown seated before his desk, each picture, with its decorative ΠΤ-shaped border, occupying rather more than half a page. Other decorations are few and simple, being confined for the most part to the subscriptions and chapter-title lists.

An examination of the contents of the manuscript shows a quantity of accompanying matter. With the first quire begins the gospel of Matthew, the preliminary matter which was doubtless, as is usual, on a prefatory quire, having disappeared. The first gospel is complete

in 357 sections, sixty-eight chapters, the number of στίχοι being indicated in round numbers as 2,600. Professor Rendel Harris has pointed out that the mass of gospel manuscripts containing stichometrical indications give the στίχοι in round numbers, Matthew 2,600, Mark 1,600, Luke 2,800, John 2,300; and, to anticipate, those are the numbers given in the present manuscript. There follow, in twenty-seven lines, the subscription drawn from Cosmas Indicopleustes, and noted by Scrivener in the tenth or eleventh century gospels, Lambeth 1178; a brief summary of the first gospel, in thirteen lines; and a statement as to the origin and history of it, in twelve. The material prefatory to Mark then begins. A preface to Mark in twenty-five lines is followed by the list of chapter titles for Mark, forty-eight in all. The scribe here left a little space, in order to begin the gospel itself on a fresh page; and this space has been filled by a crude hand, much later, with five verses on Mark. A peculiarity of this addition is the omission of the initial letters of all the lines save the second, the intention evidently being to add these as capitals, and space being actually reserved for this purpose. In the *Journal of Biblical Literature* (The Andover Press), 1890–91, p. 33, Professor J. Rendel Harris has printed a subscription of four lines which he found in a British Museum manuscript, Cod. Add. 892, and with which ll. 1–4 of this subscription are identical. The subscription in the Newberry gospels, so carelessly written as to be almost illegible, runs as follows, the omitted initials being supplied:

Ὅ]σσα περὶ χρῖστοῖο, θεηγόρος ἔθνεα πέτρος
κυρήσσων ἐδίδασκεν ἀπὸ στομάτων ἐριτίμων
Ἔ]νθάδε μάρκος ἄγειρε καὶ ἐν σελίδεσσῖν ἔθηκε
Τ]οὕνεκα καὶ μερόπεσσιν εὐάγγελος ἄλλος ἐδείχθη
Ἔ]ργον ἀριπρεπὲς ἐκ μεγάλου πέτρου μνηθείς

The transposition of the first and second vowels of κηρύσσων does not appear in the subscription as found by Professor Harris. In response to an inquiry, Professor Harris has very kindly sent me a copy of the subscription as he found it in another manuscript, Cod. Mon. 518 (Ev. 83). Here, too, there are but four lines, and these agree with the first four of our subscription, save that the Munich codex has ἐδίδαξεν for ἐδίδασκεν. A similar subscription of four hexameters accompanies Matthew's gospel in both these manuscripts. These facts suggest that the fifth line in our codex is an accretion, and this suggestion is confirmed by the form in which our five lines appear in a fourth manu-

script, the Haskell gospels, a large codex of about the year 1500, purchased in 1895 by the University of Chicago. In collating this recently, I observed the four-line subscriptions after Matthew and Mark; but after the Mark subscription is an elaborate pause, and then the following sentence written twice:

ἔργον ἀριπρεπὲς ἐκ μεγάλου πέτρου
μυηθεὶς, μάρκος ἔτευξε τόδε πνεύματος
ἐν σοφίῃ

Clearly we have in our five lines a combination of these two subscriptions; and our scribe has neglected to add, not only his initial capitals, but also the last six words of his copy. Perhaps he stopped in disgust when he found his sixth line was no hexameter. The value of all this is only to show that some time in its history the Newberry gospels came in contact with a manuscript having such a double subscription to Mark as that preserved in the Haskell gospels.

The gospel of Mark, with the longer conclusion, of course, appears complete in 239 sections, the 234th beginning at 16:9. After a statement in five lines as to the origin of the gospel of Mark, another group of verses is encountered. Unlike the hexameters just given, these are in the same graceful hand with the rest of the manuscript. They are entitled ἐπίγραμμα εἰς τὸν ἅγιον μάρκον, and read thus:

πέτρου μυηθεὶς τοῖς ἀπορρήτοις λόγοις
τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ κένωσιν εἰς βρωτῶν φύσιν
ἐν ᾗ τὸ διπλοῦν ὢν θεάνθροπος φέρει
ταύτην καθεξῆς συντίθησι πανσόφως
ὁ δευτερεύων μάρκος ἐν θεογράφοις (?)
παῦλον γὰρ ἔσχες τεχνικὸν παιδοτρίβην

The material dealing with the third gospel is introduced by a preface to that gospel, in twenty-five lines. The list of chapter titles for Luke, eighty-three in all, follows. Then appears the gospel of Luke, complete, in 342 sections. Luke is followed by a short introduction of four lines to the gospel of John; the list of chapter titles for John, eighteen in all, is next given; and, after a second introduction of thirty-six lines, the fourth gospel appears, complete, in 232 sections. With this the manuscript seems to have closed, for the dated subscription, unfortunately undecipherable, scrawled across the foot of this last page, is certainly not by the scribe of the manuscript, and is probably due to a very much later hand. A coarse fly-leaf, added perhaps still later, is

covered with characters illegible even under the glass. The whole manuscript is now protected by a handsome red morocco binding, done by F. Bedford, London, not later than 1868.

Of the source and history of the manuscript little can be said. It is briefly described in Quaritch's *Catalogue* of 1868,[2] where it is numbered 9630. It was bought soon after by Mr. Henry Probasco, of Cincinnati, and in the catalogue of his collection[3] substantially the same description of the little codex is presented. The book came into the possession of the Newberry Library, with much more of Mr. Probasco's collection, on December 1, 1890, and is now in the museum of the library. In working there on the manuscript the writer has been put under many obligations to the librarians for their courtesy and helpfulness. Since its removal to Chicago, the manuscript has been collated by Mr. Edward A. Guy, his collation, which has not been published, being designed, he informs me, to form a part of a larger work, on which he has long been engaged. A brief notice of the manuscript, from the hand of Mr. C. E. Woodruff, of the University of Chicago, appears in the last edition (1896) of Dr. E. C. Mitchell's *Critical Handbook of the Greek New Testament* (New York), p. 244; while a somewhat longer account, with a facsimile, may be found in the *Biblical World*, Vol. X, 1898, p. 277 and frontispiece.

The collation that follows is made with the Received Text as represented by the Lloyd and Sanday reprint (Oxford, 1889) of Mill's edition, as being substantially identical with the edition of Stephanus, published in 1550. In the collation differences in the matters of accent, breathing, and punctuation are generally not noticed. Thus the writing of the negative οὐ before a rough breathing with an apostrophe, οὐχ', as though for οὐχί, and the occurrences of ἐπ' ἄν for ἐπάν, ὅτ' ἄν for ὅταν, μὴ δέ for μηδέ, ἆρα γέ for ἄραγε, διὰ τί for διατί, οὐκ ἔτι for οὐκέτι, ὡς ἀννᾶ for ὡσαννά, δι' ὅτι for διότι, and similar substitutions, are not indicated. The abbreviations are the usual ones, the number at the right hand above being employed to show which of several occurrences of a word in a verse is meant. The letters "tr" before a phrase mean "transpose so as to read," the phrase that follows giving the order of the manuscript.

[2] *A General Catalogue of Books, arranged in Classes*, offered for sale by BERNARD QUARITCH, London, 1868. No. 9630, p. 657.

[3] HENRY PROBASCO'S *Catalogue of Books, Manuscripts, and Works of Art*, Cincinnati, 1873. P. 378.

Matthew 1:4—ἀμιναδάμ | ἀμιναδὰμ 6 βαλέα *pro* βασιλέα | σολομῶνα *pro* Σολομῶντα 14 ἀχίμ | ἀχὶμ.

2:1—δὲ | ἰησοῦ + χριστοῦ 5 οὕτως *pro* οὕτω 11 εἶδον *pro* εὗρον 16—καὶ ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς ὁρίοις αὐτῆς.

3:1—δὲ 5—ἡ[1] 6 ἰορδάνη + ποταμῶ 8 καρπὸν ἄξιον *pro* καρποὺς ἀξίους 12 καθαριεῖ *pro* διακαθαριεῖ | —αὐτοῦ *post* σῖτον | ἀποθήκην + αὐτοῦ 15 οὕτως.

4:4 ἐν *pro* ἐπὶ 10 ὕπαγε + ὀπίσω μου 15 ζαβαλὼν 18—ὁ Ἰησοῦς 20 δίκτυα + αὐτῶν 23 μαλακείαν *corr; prim man* μαλακίαν?

5:5—τὴν 6 μαμάριοι *pro* μακάριοι 12 πολλὺς *pro* πολὺς | οὕτως 13 ἐκβληθῆναι *pro* βληθῆναι 16 οὕτως 18—ἂν[1] 19 οὕτως | τοῦ θεοῦ *pro* τῶν οὐρανῶν *bis* 20 περισσεύση *corr; prim man* περισεύση | tr ὑμῶν ἡ δικαιοσύνη | πλείων *pro* πλεῖον | 21 ἐρρήθη 22—αὐτοῦ[2] 25 τῶ *pro* τῇ | ἀντίδικός + σου 26 κοδράτην 27 ἐρρήθη 28 ἐμβλέπων *pro* βλέπων | αὐτὴν *pro* αὐτῆς 29 εἰς + τὴν 30 εἰς + τὴν 31 ἐρρήθη | βιβλίον ἀποστασίου *pro* ἀποστάσιον 32 πᾶς ὁ ἀπολύων *pro* ὃς ἂν ἀπολύσῃ 33 ἐρρήθη 38 ἐρρήθη 42 τῶ θέλοντι *pro* τὸν θέλοντα 43 ἐρρήθη 44 τοῖς μισοῦσιν *pro* τοὺς μισοῦντας | —καὶ *ante* προσεύχεσθε 46 ποιοῦσι *corr; prim man* ποιοῦσιν 47 φίλους *pro* ἀδελφοὺς | τὸ αὐτὸ *pro* οὕτω 48 ὡς *pro* ὥσπερ | ἐστιν *pro* ἐστι.

6:5 γωνίαις *corr; prim man* γονίαις 7 προσευχόμενος *pro* Προσευχόμενοι | βαττολογήσης *pro* βαττολογήσητε 8 ὑμῶν + ὁ οὐράνιος 15 ὑμῶν + ὁ οὐράνιος 24—τὸν[2] | + τοῦ *ante* ἑνὸς | μαμωνᾶ *pro* μαμμωνᾷ 26 τούτων *pro* αὐτῶν 27 προσθῆναι 31 περιβαλλώμεθα.

7:1 κρίνετε[1] *corr* 2 μετριθήσεται 10 + ἢ *ante* καὶ 11 οὐράνιος *pro* ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς 12—ὑμῖν | —οὕτω | οὕτως *pro* οὗτος 14 τί *pro* ὅτι 17 οὕτως 18 δύναται *corr* 22 tr καὶ . . . . ἐποιήσαμεν, καὶ . . . . ἐξεβάλομεν 23 ἔγνω *pro* ἔγνων 27 προσέρρηξαν *pro* προσέκοψαν | μεγάλη + σφόδρα.

8:2 προσελθὼν *pro* ἐλθὼν | προσεκύνει *corr; prim man* προσεκύνη | 3 + ἀπ' *ante* αὐτοῦ[2] 4 ἀλλ' *pro* ἀλλὰ 5 αὐτῶ *pro* τῷ Ἰησοῦ 8 λόγω *pro* λόγον 11 ἀνακληθήσονται *pro* ἀνακλιθήσονται *corr; prim man* -τι? 13 ἑκατοντάρχη | —καὶ[2] | ἐκείνη + καὶ ὑποστρέψας ὁ ἑκατόνταρχος εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ὥρα, εὗρε τὸν παῖδα αὐτοῦ ὑγιαίνοντα 20 ἀλόπεκες 22—καὶ 28 ἐλθόντος αὐτοῦ *pro* ἐλθόντι αὐτῷ | μνημάτων *pro* μνημείων 32 καὶ *pro* Οἱ δὲ | —τῶν χοίρων[2] 33 κατὰ *pro* καὶ τὰ.

9:1—τὸ 4 εἰδὼς *pro* ἰδὼν 5—γάρ | εὐκοπώτερον *corr; prim man* -οτερον 12 ὑγιαίνοντες *pro* ἰσχύοντες 13 ἀλλὰ *pro* ἀλλ' 17 ἀμφότεροι *pro* ἀμφότερα 18 εἰσελθὼν *pro* ἐλθὼν[2] | τῷ ἰησοῦ *pro* αὐτῷ | κύριε *pro* Ὅτι 19 ἠκολούθει *pro* ἠκολούθησεν 32 κωφὸν *corr; prim man* κοφὸν 33—Ὅτι 36 ὄχλους + ὁ ἰησοῦς | ἐσκυλμένοι *pro* ἐκλελυμένοι | —καὶ ἐρριμμένοι | ὡς *pro* ὡσεὶ.

10:1 + κατὰ *ante* πνευμάτων | μαλακείαν *corr pro* μαλακίαν *prim man* 2 δώδε *pro* δώδεκα 4 + ὁ *ante* Ἰσκαριώτης 8—νεκροὺς ἐγείρετε 10 τοῦ μισθοῦ *pro* τῆς τροφῆς 12 αὐτὴν + λέγοντες εἰρήνη τῷ οἴκῳ τούτῳ 13—μὲν . . . . ἐὰν 15 γομόρρας *pro* Γομόρρων 18—δὲ 19 λαλήσετε *corr* 23 ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ταύτης *pro* ἐν τῇ πόλει ταύτῃ | ἑτέραν *pro* ἄλλην | —γὰρ 24 διδάσκαλον + αὐτοῦ 25 ἀπεκάλεσαν *pro* ἐκάλεσαν | οἰκειακοὺς *pro* οἰκιακοὺς 27 πρὸς *pro* εἰς 28 φοβεῖσθε *pro* φοβηθῆτε | ἀποκτενόντων *pro* ἀποκτεινόντων 33 ἀρνήσηταί *corr* | tr κἀγὼ αὐτὸν 36 οἰκειακοί.

11:1 συνετέλεσεν *pro* ἐτέλεσεν 2 δεσμωτηρίῳ *corr; prim man* δεσμοτηρίῳ 16 παιδίοις | tr καθημένοις ἐν ἀγοραῖς 21 βηθσαϊδά *pro* Βηθσαϊδὰν 23—τοῦ | ἀνυψωθεῖσα *pro* ὑψωθεῖσα 27 ὃ *pro* ᾧ.

12:2 ἰδόντες + αὐτοὺς 5 ἀναίτιοί *corr* 6 μεῖζόν *pro* μείζων 8—καὶ 10 ἦν + ἐκεῖ 11 πέσῃ *pro* ἐμπέσῃ 13 ἀποκατεστάθη + ἡ χεὶρ αὐτοῦ 15 ἐθεράπευσε πάντας—αὐτοὺς 18 ηὐδόκησεν *pro* εὐδόκησεν 21—ἔθνη 22 κωφὸν *corr; prim man* κοφὸν? 25 ἑαυτὴν *pro* ἑαυτῆς *bis* 26—τὸν | —οὖν 28—ἐγὼ 29 διαρπάση *pro* διαρπάσει 32 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν[2] | τῷ νῦν *pro* τούτῳ τῷ 34—ἀγαθὰ 35—τῆς καρδίας | —τὰ 37 κατακριθήσῃ *pro* καταδικασθήσῃ 42 σολομῶνος *pro* Σολομῶντος *bis* 44 ἐλθὼν *pro* ἐλθὸν | σχολάζοντα + καὶ 45 αὐτοῦ *pro* ἑαυτοῦ[2] | —καὶ[4] 48 ἢ *pro* καὶ.

13:3 σπείρων *corr* | τοῦ σπεῖραι τὸν σπόρον αὐτοῦ *pro* τοῦ σπείρειν 4 σπείρειν *corr* | ὃ *pro* ἃ | —ἦλθε | —καὶ[3] | αὐτό *pro* αὐτά 5 καὶ ἄλλο *pro* ἄλλα δὲ 12 ἂν ἔχῃ *corr pro* ἔχει[1] 14—ἐπ' | συνῆτε + καὶ οὐ μὴ συνῆτε 15 ἐκκάμυσαν *pro* ἐκάμμυσαν | ὀφθαλμοῖς + αὐτῶν | ἰάσομαι *pro* ἰάσωμαι 16 ἀκούουσι *pro* ἀκούει 18 ἡμεῖς *pro* Ὑμεῖς 26—καὶ[2] 27—σῷ | —τὰ 33 ἔκρυψεν *pro* ἐνέκρυψεν 34 οὐδὲν *pro* οὐκ 36 παραβολὴν + ταύτην 39 θερισταὶ + οἱ 40 καίεται *pro* κατακαίεται 42 κλαυθμὸς *corr; prim man* κλαθμὸς 44—πάντα 45 ἅλιν *car* Π | —ἀνθρώπῳ 50 ὀδόντων *corr?* 52 τῇ βασιλεία *pro* εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν 55 τέκτωνος *pro* τέκτονος 57 οἰκεία *pro* οἰκίᾳ.

14 : 7 ὠμολόγησε *pro* ὡμολόγησεν | tr δοῦναι αὐτῇ 14 αὐτοῖς *pro* αὐτοὺς 19 ἐκέλευσε *pro* κελεύσας | ἀνακλιθῆναι *corr; prim man* ἀνακληθῆναι | τοῦ χόρτου *pro* τοὺς χόρτους 22—αὐτοῦ 25 τετάρτη *corr* | —ὁ Ἰησοῦς 28 tr ἐλθεῖν πρός σε 35 προσήνεγκα *pro* προσήνεγκαν 36 ἵνα + κἂν | ἐσώθησαν *pro* διεσώθησαν.

15 : 3—καὶ 4—σου 5 ὃς + δ' | ὠφεληθεῖς *pro* ὠφεληθῇς | τιμήση *corr* 14 tr τυφλοὶ εἰσιν ὁδηγοὶ τυφλῶν | υφλὸς *car* τ | —δὲ | ἐμπεσοῦνται *pro* πεσοῦνται 22 ἠδοὺ *pro* ἰδοὺ 25 προσεκύνησεν *pro* προσεκύνει 29 μετβὰς *pro* μεταβὰς 31 + καὶ *ante* χωλοὺς 32 φάγουσι *pro* φάγωσι 39 ἀνέβη *pro* ἐνέβη.

16 : 2 εὐδεία 3 πρωΐας *pro* πρωΐ | δύνασθε + γνῶναι 8 εἶπε —αὐτοῖς 9 οὔτε *pro* οὐδὲ 17 + ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 18 οἰκοδωμήσω *pro* οἰκοδομήσω | κατισχύσοσιν *pro* κατισχύσουσιν 20—Ἰησοῦς 21—καὶ ἀρχιερέων 24 ἀκολουθείτω *corr* 28 δόξη τοῦ πατρὸς *pro* βασιλείᾳ.

17 : 2 ἱμάτιαὐτοῦ *pro* ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ 3 μωυσῆς *pro* Μωσῆς 4 μωσεῖ *pro* Μωσῇ | tr ἠλία μίαν 5 ἔτι + δὲ 9 ἐκ *pro* ἀπὸ | —ὁ Ἰησοῦς 12 ἀλλὰ *pro* ἀλλ' 14—αὐτῶν 19 ἐκβαλλεῖν *pro* ἐκβαλεῖν 20 κόκκον *corr; prim man* κόκον 22—δὲ 24 δίδραγμα *pro* δίδραχμα *bis* 27—αὐτοῖς.

18 : 2 αὐτῶ *pro* αὐτὸ 4—ὅστις . . . . οὐρανῶν 5 tr ἓν παιδίον τοιοῦτον 6 κρεμμασθῆ *pro* κρεμασθῇ 7—ἐστιν 8 αὐτὸν *pro* αὐτὰ | βληθῆναι *corr* 9—ὁ | βληθῆναι *corr* 11 σῶσαι *corr* 12 γένη *pro* γένηταί | ἐνενηκοταεννέα *pro* ἐννενηκονταεννέα 13 ἐνενηκονταεννέα *pro* ἐννενηκονταεννέα | πλανωμένοις *corr pro* πεπλανημένοις ; *prim man* πλανομένοις 14 ἓν *pro* εἷς 15 ἁμάρτη *pro* ἁμαρτήσῃ 16 σταθήσεται *pro* σταθῇ 18 ἂν *pro* ἐὰν *bis* 19—ὅτι 26 δοῦλος + ἐκεῖνος 28 εἴ τι *pro* ὅ τι 29—πάντα 30 ἀλλὰ *corr; prim man* ἀλλ' | ἀποδῶ + πᾶι 31 ἑαυτῶν *pro* αὐτῶν.

19 : 1 τέλεσεν *car* ἐ 5 κολληθήσεται *pro* προσκολληθήσεται 8 οὕτως 9—εἰ 12 οὕτως | —τῶν[1] 14—καὶ | κωλύετε *corr; prim man* κολύετε | ἐλθὲν *pro* ἐλθεῖν 16 τίς *pro* εἷς 19 μητέρα + σου 20 tr ταῦτα πάντα 24 εἰσελθεῖν *pro* διελθεῖν 25—αὐτοῦ 26 — ἐστι[2] 28 παλινγενεσία *pro* παλιγγενεσίᾳ 29 ὅστις *pro* ὃς | οἰκίαν *pro* οἰκίας | ἑκατονταπλασίονα *corr; prim man* -ωνα.

20 : 3—τὴν | εὗρεν *pro* εἶδεν 4 καὶ ἐκεῖνος *pro* κἀκείνοις 5 περὶ + τὴν | ἐνάτην *pro* ἐννάτην 7—Ὅτι 10 πλεῖον *pro* πλείονα 15 ὡς *pro* ὃ 21 εὐωνύμων + σου 22 ἢ *pro* καὶ 26 ἔσται *pro* ἔστω 27 ἔσται *pro* ἔστω

28 ὥσπερ + καὶ 29 ἠκολούθησαν *pro* ἠκολούθησεν 30 + ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς tr παράγει ὁ ἰησοῦς 31 — Ὁ δὲ ὄχλος . . . . Δαβίδ 33 ὑμῶν *pro* ἡμῶν.

21 : 1 βηθσφαγὴ *pro* Βηθφαγῆ | ἐλαιῶν *corr; prim man* ἐλιῶν? 3 ἀποστέλλει *pro* ἀποστελεῖ 8 τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτῶν *pro* ἑαυτῶν τὰ ἱμάτια | — ἄλλοι δὲ . . . . ὁδῷ 12 — τοῦ Θεοῦ 14 tr χωλοὶ καὶ τυφλοὶ 18 ἐπὶ *pro* εἰς | ἐπείνασε *corr* 25 — πόθεν | tr ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ἦν | ἐν *pro* παρ' | οὖν *suppl corr* 26 ἅπαντες *pro* πάντες 27 tr ὑμῖν λέγω 28 ἄνθρωπός + τις | tr δύο τέκνα | — μου 30 ἑτέρῳ *pro* δευτέρῳ 32 πιστεῦ *pro* πιστεῦσαι 36 αὐτοὺς *pro* αὐτοῖς 40 ὅτε *pro* ὅταν | ποιήσει *corr; prim man* ποιήση.

22 : 4 ἡτοίμασται *pro* ἡτοίμασα 7 καὶ ἀκούσας *pro* Ἀκούσας δὲ | βασιλεὺς + ἐκεῖνος 9 πορευθέντες *pro* πορεύεσθε | ἐὰν *pro* ἂν 11 μὴ *pro* οὐκ 13 tr χεῖρας καὶ πόδας | βάλετε *pro* ἐκβάλετε 15 ἔλαβον + κατ' αὐτοῦ 16 μέλλει *pro* μέλει 21 τότε + οὖν | ἀπόδοτε — οὖν 23 — οἱ 24 ἐξαναστήσει 30 ἐν[2] + τῷ 32 — Θεὸς[5] 37 ἔφη *pro* εἶπεν | — τῇ[1] 39 αὕτη *pro* αὐτῇ 40 κρέμμανται 45 tr κύριον αὐτὸν καλεῖ 46 ἠδύνατο.

23 : 3 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν 4 τῷ *corr; prim man* το? 10 ὅτι *pro* εἷς γὰρ | — ὁ *ante* καθηγητὴς | tr καθηγητὴς ὑμῶν ἐστὶν 11 μείζων *corr; prim man* μεῖζον : 3 — δὲ 15 ποιεῖται *pro* ποιεῖτε 17 μείζων *corr; prim man* μειζον 18 ἂν *pro* ἐὰν 23 ταῦτα + δὲ 25 ἀδικίας *pro* ἀκρασίας 28 οὕτως | ἔσωθεν *corr; prim man* ἔσοθεν 34 ἀποστελῶ *pro* ἀποστέλλω 36 + ὅτι *ante* ἥξει | tr πάντα ταῦτα 37 ἀποκτένουσα *pro* ἀποκτείνουσα.

24 : 2 tr ταῦτα πάντα | μὴ[2] *corr* 5 τῷ *corr; prim man* τὸ? 6 μελήσετε *pro* Μελλήσετε 7 λοιμοὶ *corr; prim man* λιμοὶ 14 — τοῦτο 15 ἑστὼς *pro* ἑστὸς 17 + καὶ *ante* ὁ | τὰ *pro* τι 18 + εἰς τὰ *ante* ὀπίσω 20 — ἐν 24 — γὰρ 32 φύλλα *corr; prim man* φύλα 33 οὕτως | tr ταῦτα πάντα 35 παρέλθωσιν 45 θεραπείας *corr; prim man* θεραπίας 49 συνδούλους + αὐτοῦ | ἐσθίη *corr pro* ἐσθίειν; *prim man* ἐσθίει | πίνη *corr pro* πίνειν; *prim man* πίνει.

25 : 2 αἱ *suppl corr* 3 αὐτῶν *pro* ἑαυτῶν[1] 8 αἱ[2] *suppl corr* | ὑμῶν *pro* ἡμῶν 9 οὐ μὴ *pro* οὐκ | tr ὑμῖν καὶ ἡμῖν 14 ἄνθρωπός + τις 21 — αὐτῷ 28 — οὖν 29 δοκεῖ ἔχειν *pro* ἔχει 30 ἐκβάλετε *pro* ἐκβάλλετε | + ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει· ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω 36 ἤμην *corr* 37 εἴδομεν *corr* 38 συνηγάγομεν *corr* 43 — ξένος . . . . συνηγάγετε με 44 — αὐτῷ.

26:1—πάντας 4 tr δόλω κρατήσωσι 6—ἐν Βηθανίᾳ 8 ἀπώλεια *corr; prim man* ἀπόλεια 9 δοθῆναι *corr; prim man* δοθῆνι? 11 tr τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε 17 ἑτοιμάσομέν *pro* ἑτοιμάσωμέν 18 ἐστι 19 καθὼς *pro* ὡς 22 λοιπούμενοι *pro* λυπούμενοι | ἤρξατο *pro* ἤρξαντο | —αὐτῷ 26—τὸν | εὐχαριστήσας *pro* εὐλογήσας 28—γάρ 29 γενήματος *pro* γεννήματος 33 + δὲ *post* ἐγὼ 35 ἀπαρνήσωμαι *pro* ἀπαρνήσομαι | + δὲ *post* Ὁμοίως 36 μαθηταῖς + αὐτοῦ | ἂν *pro* οὗ 38 αὐτοῖς + ὁ ἰησοῦς 42 προσηύξατο + ὁ ἰησοῦς 43 tr πάλιν, εὑρίσκει αὐτοὺς 45—αὐτοῦ 48 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν 52 ἀποθανοῦνται *pro* ἀπολοῦνται 54 οὕτως 59 tr θανατώσωσιν αὐτόν· 60—καὶ πολλῶν . . . εὗρον 71—αὐτὸν[2] | + ἐκεῖ *ante* Καὶ οὗτος 73 tr δὲ μικρὸν 74 καταθεματίζειν.

27:3—τοῖς[2] 6 κορβονᾶν *pro* κορβανᾶν 11—αὐτῷ 12—τῶν[2] 15 εἰώθει *corr* | tr δέσμιον τῶ ὄχλω 16 βαραβᾶν *pro* Βαραββᾶν 17 θέλετε + τῶν δύο 22 λέγουσι—αὐτῷ 23—λέγοντες 26 φραγελώσας *pro* φραγελλώσας 29 αὐτὸν *pro* αὐτῷ 31 ἐνέπαιξαν *corr* | —αὐτὸν[3] 32 ἐξερχόδενοι *pro* Ἐξερχόμενοι 33 ὅ *pro* ὃς 35—ἵνα . . . . κλῆρον.' 41 πρεσβυτέρων + καὶ φαρισαίων 42 + ἐπ' *ante* αὐτῷ 43—νῦν 44 αὐτόν *pro* αὐτῷ[2] 45 ἐνάτης *pro* ἐννάτης 46 ἐνάτην *pro* ἐννάτην | λιμὰ *pro* λαμὰ 55—ἀπὸ[1] 63 tr ὁ πλάνος ἐκεῖνος.

28:2 θύρας + τοῦ μνημείου 5 tr ζητεῖτε τὸν ἐσταυρωμένον 6—γὰρ 19—οὖν.

Mark 1:5—ἡ 8—ἐν[1] 13 τεσσαράκοντα + καὶ νύκτας τεσσαράκοντα | —οἱ 16 τοῦ σίμωνος *pro* αὐτοῦ 19 δίκτυα + αὐτῶν 21 ἐλθὼν *pro* εἰσελθὼν 22—αὐτοὺς 27 ἑαυτοὺς *pro* αὐτοὺς 30 + τοῦ *ante* Σίμωνος 34 ἐθεράπευσεν | + τὸν χριστὸν εἶναι 36 κατεδίωξεν *pro* κατεδίωξαν 37 tr σε ζητοῦσι 38 καὶ ἐκεῖ *pro* κἀκεῖ | ἐλήλυθα *pro* ἐξελήλυθα 45 πάντοθεν *pro* πανταχόθεν.

2:1 tr εἰσῆλθε πάλιν 3 αὐτὸν + τινὲς 4 ἦν + ὁ ἰησοῦς 5 ἀφέωνται *corr; prim man* ἀφέωντι? 7—οὕτω 9 σου *pro* σοι 10 tr ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἀφιέναι 14 παράγων + ὁ ἰησοῦς | λευΐ *pro* Λευΐν 16 ἰδόντες δὲ αὐτὸν οἱ γραμματεῖς καὶ οἱ φαρισαῖοι *pro* καὶ οἱ γραμματεῖς . . . . αὐτὸν 18 νηστεύουσιν *pro* -σι 19 δύνανται *corr; prim man* δύναντι? 21—καὶ[1] 22 ἀλλ' *pro* ἀλλὰ 23—ἐν 26—τοῦ[2].

3:1 ἐξηραμένην *pro* ἐξηραμμένην 2—εἰ τοῖς σάββασι θεραπεύσει αὐτὸν 3 ἐξηραμένην *pro* ἐξηραμμένην | ἔγειραι *corr* 5—ἡ[2] 7 ἠκολούθησεν *pro* ἠκολούθησαν 7, 8 tr ἰδουμαίας . . . . ἱεροσολύμων . . . .

ἰουδαίας 10 *ἄψωνται corr; prim man ἅψονται* 11 *προσέπιπτον pro προσέπιπτεν* | *ἔκραζον pro ἔκραζε* 12 tr *φανερὸν αὐτὸν* | *ποιήσωσιν* + *ὅτι ἤδεισαν τὸν χριστὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι* 14 + *τοὺς ante δώδεκα* | *post αὐτοῦ* + *οὓς καὶ ἀποστόλους ὠνόμασε* 17—*τοῦ*[2] 20 *μὴ δὲ pro μήτε* 27—*οὐ* | tr *οὐδεὶς δύναται* | *ἁρπάσαι pro διαρπάσαι* | *διαρπάση pro διαρπάσει* 28 *ἂν* + *καὶ* 32 tr *περὶ αὐτὸν ὄχλος* 33 *καὶ pro ἡ.*

4:1 tr *ὄχλος πολὺς πρὸς αὐτὸν* 2—*αὐτοῖς* 4—*τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* 7 *ἄλλο corr; prim man ἄλλος* | *ἔδωκεν* 8 *ἐν pro ἓν ter* 9—*αὐτοῖς* 11 *δέδοται corr; prim man δέδοτι?* 15 *ἀκούσωσιν* + *αὐτοῦ* 18—*οὗτοί εἰσιν*[2] 19 *αἱ*[2] *suppl corr* 20 *ἐν pro ἓν ter* 21 *τεθῇ pro ἐπιτεθῇ* 22—*τι* 28 *καρπὸν φέρει pro καρποφορεῖ* 30 *ὁμοιώσομεν pro ὁμοιώσωμεν* 31 *κόκκον pro κόκκῳ* | *μικρότερος* + *μέν* | tr *ἐστι πάντων τῶν σπερμάτων* 33—*πολλαῖς* 36 *πλοῖα pro πλοιάρια* 38 *μέλλει pro μέλει* 40 *οὕτως* 41 *οἱ ἄνεμοι pro ὁ ἄνεμος.*

5:3 *μνήμασι pro μνημείοις* | tr *δῆσαι αὐτὸν* 4 *ἴσχυσε pro ἴσχυε* 5 tr *μνήμασι . . . . ὄρεσιν* 6—*ἀπὸ* 7 *λέγει pro εἶπε* 10—*πολλὰ* | tr *ἀποστείλῃ αὐτοὺς* 11 *τῷ ὄρει pro τὰ ὄρη* | —*μεγάλη* 12 *παρεκάλουν pro παρεκάλεσαν* 14 *ἀπήγγειλαν* | + *καὶ ante εἰς*[1] 15 *ἐσχηκότα corr; prim man ἐσχικότα* 18 *ἐμβαίνοντος* | tr *μετ' αὐτῶν ἦ* 19 *καὶ pro ὁ δὲ Ἰησοῦς* | *πεποίηκε pro ἐποίησε* 23 *αὐτῶ pro αὐτῇ* 24 *ἀπῆλθεν* | *ἠκολούθει corr* 26 *αὐτῆς pro ἑαυτῆς* 34 *ὁ δὲ* + *ἰησοῦς* | *μάστιγγός pro μάστιγός* 38 + *καὶ ante κλαίοντας* 40 *πάντας pro ἅπαντας* 41 *ἔγειρε pro ἔγειραι.*

6:2 *ἵνα pro ὅτι* | *γίνωνται pro γίνονται* 11 *ἐὰν pro ἂν* | *καὶ pro ἦ*[1] 15—*ἦ* 17—*γὰρ* | —*τῇ* 20—*καὶ ἅγιον* 27 *σπεκουλάτορα pro σπεκουλάτωρα* 28—*ὁ δὲ . . . . αὐτοῦ* 29—*τῷ* 31 *εὐκαίρουν pro ηὐκαίρουν* 32 *ἀπῆλθεν pro ἀπῆλθον* 33—*οἱ ὄχλοι* | *αὐτοὺς pro αὐτὸν*[1] | —*καὶ συνῆλθον πρὸς αὐτόν* 34 tr *ὁ ἰησοῦς εἶδε* 35 *λέγουσιν* + *αὐτῶ* 37 tr *δηναρίων διακοσίων* 39 *ἐν pro ἐπὶ* | *χλωρῶ corr; prim man χλορῶ* 44—*ὡσεὶ* 45 *ἀπολύσει pro ἀπολύσῃ* 51 tr *ἐξίσταντο ἐν ἑαυτοῖς* 52 tr *αὐτῶν ἡ καρδία* 53 *γεννησαρέτ pro Γενησαρὲτ* 56 *ἐὰν pro ἂν bis.*

7:2 *ἄρτον pro ἄρτους* | *ἐμέμψαντο* + *αὐτούς* 3 *ἰδαῖοι pro Ἰουδαῖοι* 4 *χαλκείων pro χαλκίων* 5 *ἔπειτα corr* | —*τὸν* 6 tr *ἡσαΐας προεφήτευσε* 8 tr *πολλὰ παρόμοια τοιαῦτα* 18 *οὕτως* 19 *κοιλίαν corr; prim man κολίαν* 22 *ὑπερηφανία corr* 24—*τὴν* | *ἠθέλησε pro ἤθελε* 25 tr *περὶ αὐτοῦ γυνὴ* 26 *συροφοινίκῖσσα pro Συροφοίνισσα* |

ἐκβάλη *pro* ἐκβάλλῃ 28—Ἡ δὲ ἀπεκρίθη | παιδίων *corr; prim man* πιδίων 32 μογγιλάλον *pro* μογιλάλον 33 ἐπιλαβόμενος αὐτοῦ *pro* ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν.

8 : 1—ὁ Ἰησοῦς | —αὐτοῦ 2—ἤδη 3—καὶ | νῆστις *corr pro* νήστεις; *prim man* νῆστεις 7 παραθεῖναι *corr; prim man* -θῆναι 10 tr ἐμβὰς εὐθέως 13—τὸ[1] 14 ἄρτους + οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 17—Καὶ | γνοὺς + δὲ | —ὑμῶν 18 οὐδὲ *pro* καὶ οὐ 21 λέγει *pro* ἔλεγεν 24 λέγει *pro* ἔλεγε | —ὅτι *et* ὁρῶ 25 ἀνέβλεψε *pro* ἐνέβλεψε 26 ὕπαγε εἰς τὸν οἶκον σου· καὶ ἐὰν εἰς τὴν κώμην εἰσέλθῃς, μηδὲν *pro* Μηδὲ . . . .· μηδὲ 30 αὐτῶ *pro* αὐτοῖς | + ὁ ἰησοῦς *ante* ἵνα 31 + τῶν *ante* ἀρχιερέων | + τῶν *ante* γραμματέων 35 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν[1] | ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν *pro* ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ[2] | 38 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν.

9 : 4 μωϋσῆ *pro* Μωσεῖ 5 tr τρεῖς σκηνάς | μωσῆ *pro* Μωσεῖ 6 λαλήσει *pro* λαλήσῃ 7—λέγουσα 8 tr οὐδένα εἶδον οὐκέτι 12 λέγει *pro* εἶπεν | ἀποκαθιστάνει *pro* ἀποκαθιστᾷ 13 ὅτι—καὶ 19 φέρετε μοι αὐτὸν ὧδε *pro* φέρετε . . . . με 20 ἰδὸν *corr pro* ἰδὼν *prim man* 25 + ὁ *ante* ὄχλος 28 ὅτι + διατί | ἐκβαλλεῖν *pro* ἐκβαλεῖν 32 ἐρωτῆσαι *pro* ἐπερωτῆσαι 38—δὲ 39 κολύετε *pro* κωλύετε 40 ἡμῶν *pro* ὑμῶν[2] 41—τῷ 42 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν | μικρῶν + τούτων | μυλικὸς *corr; prim man* μιλικὸς 43 σκανδαλίση *pro* σκανδαλίζῃ 44 ὁ σκώληξ *corr* 45 tr σοι ἐστὶν 47 ἐστὶν *pro* ἐστι 49—καὶ . . . . ἁλισθήσεται 50 αὐτὸς *pro* αὐτὸ | ἀρτύσεται *pro* ἀρτύσετε.

10 : 1 εἰώθει *corr; prim man* εἰώθη 2—οἱ 5 ἔγραψε—ὑμῖν 6 ἐποίσεν *pro* ἐποίησεν 8 tr σὰρξ μία 10 τούτου *pro* τοῦ αὐτοῦ 14—καὶ[2] 16 εὐλόγει *pro* ηὐλόγει 19—μὴ ἀποστερήσῃς 21—τοῖς | οὐρανοῖς *pro* οὐρανῷ 24—τοῖς[2] 25—τῆς[1] *et*[2] 27—τῷ[1] 28—Καὶ[1] | ἤρξατο + δὲ 30 ἀδελφὰς + καὶ πατέρα | μητέρα *pro* μητέρας 31—οι 33—καὶ τοῖς γραμματεῦσι 34 αὐτῶ[1] *corr* 35 ποιήσεις *pro* ποιήσῃς 41 τῶν δύο αδελφῶν *pro* Ἰακώβου καὶ Ἰωάννου 43 οὕτως | tr μέγας γενέσθαι | tr ὑμῶν διάκονος 44 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν 46 + ὁ *ante* υἱὸς 51—ἀποκριθεὶς | ῥαβουνὶ *pro* Ῥαββονὶ 52 ἠκολούθει *corr; prim man* ἠκολούθη.

11 : 1 βηθσφαγὴ *pro* Βηθφαγὴ 3 ἀποστὲλλει *pro* ἀποστελεῖ 4—τὸν 5 ἑστώτων *pro* ἑστηκότων 8 στιβάδας *pro* στοιβάδας 13 + ἀπὸ *ante* μακρόθεν 18 ἀπολέσωσιν *pro* ἀπολέσουσιν | ἐξεπλήσετο *pro* ἐξεπλήσσετο 21 ἀναμνησθεὶς *corr; prim man* -σθῆς? | ἐξήραται *pro* ἐξήρανται 22 + ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 23 ὄρει *corr; prim man* ὄρε 24 αἰτῆσθε

pro αἰτεῖσθε 25 στήκητε(?) *corr* 28—τὴν ἐξουσίαν ταύτην | δέδωκεν *pro* ἔδωκεν 29 tr κἀγὼ ὑμᾶς 32—ἀλλ' | —ὄντως.

12:5 ἀποκτένοντες *pro* ἀποκτείνοντες 6—Ὅτι 7 ἀποκτείνωμεν *corr; prim man* ἀποκτένομεν 14 μέλλει *pro* μέλει 19—ὅτι 20 ἦσαν +παρ' ἡμῖν 21 οὗτος *pro* αὐτὸς | ὡσαύτος *pro* ὡσαύτως 25—οἱ 26 τοῦ *pro* τῆς 27 ὁ θεὸς+θεὸς | —Θεὸς *ante* ζώντων 28 ἰδὼν *pro* εἰδὼς | πάντων *pro* πασῶν 29 πάντων ἐντολὴ *pro* πασῶν τῶν ἐντολῶν 30 πρώτη +πάντων 32—Θεὸς 33—καὶ τὸ ἀγαπᾶν . . . . ἰσχύος 35 tr δᾰδέστι 36—τῷ[1] *et*[2] | λέγει *pro* Εἶπεν 37 καλεῖ *pro* λέγει 39 πρωτοκαθεδρίαις *pro* πρωτοκαθεδρίας 41 ἔβαλον *pro* ἔβαλλον 43 ἔβαλε *pro* βέβληκε 44 περισσεύματος αὐτῶν *pro* περισσεύοντος αὐτοῖς.

13:4 tr ταῦτα πάντα 5 tr ἤρξατο λέγειν αὐτοῖς 8 ταῦτα δὲ πάντα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων *pro* ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα 11 μεριμνᾶτε *pro* προμεριμνᾶτε | λαλήσετε *pro* λαλήσητε | μελετᾶτε *corr* | tr ὑμεῖς ἐστὲ 14 ἑστῶς *pro* ἑστὸς 16 ἐπιτρεψάτω *pro* ἐπιστρεψάτω 19 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ἐκείναις *pro* αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι | θλίψεις, οἵαι οὐ γεγόνασιν οὐδέποτε τοιαῦται *pro* θλῖψις, οἵα οὐ γέγονε τοιαύτη 20 ἡμέρας[1] +ἐκείνας 23 ἅπαντα *pro* πάντα 26 tr καὶ δόξης πολλῆς 27—καὶ[1] | +τοῦ *ante* οὐρανοῦ 29 οὕτως 30 tr ταῦτα πάντα 31 παρελεύσεται *pro* παρελεύσονται | παλέλθωσιν *pro* παρέλθωσι 32—τῆς[2] 34 tr τὴν ἐξουσίαν αὐτοῦ.

14:3—τῇ 5 τοῦτο+τὸ μῦρον 6 ἐν ἐμοί *pro* εἰς ἐμέ 8 ἔσχεν *pro* εἶχεν 9 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν 10—ὁ[2] 11 ἀργύρια *pro* ἀργύριον | tr αὐτὸν εὐκαίρως 13 ὑπαντήσει *pro* ἀπαντήσει 14 ἂν *pro* ἐὰν 15 ἀνώγεων *corr pro* ἀνώγεον; *prim man* ἀνώγειον? 18—καὶ ἐσθιόντων 19 ἐγώ[1]+εἰμι 20—ἐκ 22 εὐχαριστήσας *pro* εὐλογήσας 25 γενήματος *pro* γεννήματος 27—ἐν ἐμοὶ 29 σκανδαλισθήσονται+ἐν σοὶ 30 ὅτι+σὺ 31 ὁ δὲ+πέτρος | ἀπαρνήσωμε *pro* ἀπαρνήσομαι | ὡσαύτως *corr; prim man* ὡσαυτος 32 προσεύξομαι *pro* προσεύξωμαι 33—τὸν[2] 35 προσελθὼν *pro* προελθὼν 36 ἀλλ' εἴ τι *pro* ἀλλὰ τί 37 ἴσχυσας +κἂν 38 πειρασμόν *corr; prim man* πηρασμόν? 41 ἀπέχει+τὸ τέλος 43—ἔτι | παραγίνεται *corr; prim man* παραγίνετι | —τῶν[3] *et*[4] 44 σύσημον *pro* σύσσημον | ἐὰν *pro* ἂν 45 λέγει+αὐτῷ 50 αὐτὸν +οἱ μαθηταὶ 51 ἠκολούθησεν *pro* ἠκολούθει 52 καταλιπὼν *corr; prim man* -λιπὸν 60—τὸ 62 tr ἐκ δεξιῶν καθήμενον 65 προφήτευσον +ἡμῖν χριστὲ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παίσας σε 66—κάτω 67 ναζαρηνοῦ *corr*

man rec 68 οὔτε *pro* οὐδὲ 71 ὀμνύναι *pro* ὀμνύειν 72 τὸ ῥῆμα ὃ *pro* τοῦ ῥήματος οὗ.

15:12—πάλιν 15 παρέδωκεν | φραγελώσας *pro* φραγελλώσας 19 tr τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ 23 ἔλαβεν 24 διαμερίζονται *pro* διεμέριζον 29—αὐτὸν 31—δὲ | —πρὸς ἀλλήλους 32 πιστεύσωμεν + αὐτῶ 33 ἑνάτης *pro* ἐννάτης 34 ἑνάτη *pro* ἐννάτῃ | λιμὰ *pro* λαμμᾶ 36 δραμὼν *corr; prim man* δραμὸν 39 οὕτως 41—αἱ 42 πρὸς σάββατον *pro* προσάββατον.

16:1—τοῦ² 6 ζητεῖτε *corr; prim man* ζητῆτε | ἐσταυρωμένων *pro* ἐσταυρωμένον 8—ταχὺ 10 ἐκείνη + δὲ 18 βλάψη *pro* βλάψει.

Luke 1:1—ἐν 2 παρέδωσαν *pro* παρέδοσαν 8 ἐναντίον *pro* ἔναντι 15—τοῦ 21 τῶ² *corr; prim man* το 24 ἑαυτῆ *pro* ἑαυτὴν 25 οὕτως 27 οἴκου + καὶ πατριᾶς 29 ἡ *pro* εἴη 30 tr αὐτῆ ὁ ἄγγελος | —τῷ 31 καλέσεις *corr; prim man* καλέσης 36 γήρει *pro* γήρᾳ 41 βρέφος + ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει 42 ἀνεβόησε *pro* ἀνεφώνησε 44 *post* ἐσκίρτησε tr τὸ βρέφος ἐν ἀγαλλιάσει 59 τῇ ἡμέρα τῇ ὀγδόῃ 62 αὐτό *pro* αὐτόν 64—καὶ ἡ γλῶσσα αὐτοῦ | εὐλογῶν *corr; prim man* εὐλογον 74 ἀφόβως *corr; prim man* ἀφόβος.

2:12 ἡμῖν *pro* ὑμῖν | —τῇ 13 tr ἐγένετο ἐξαίφνης 15—δὴ | ἕως + εἰς 19 συμβάλλουσα *corr; prim man* συμβαλουσα 20 ὑπέστρεψαν *pro* ἐπέστρεψαν 21 συνετελέσθησαν *pro* ἐπλήσθησαν | + αἱ *ante* ἡμέραι | αὐτὸν *pro* τὸ παιδίον | συλληφθῆναι *pro* συλληφθῆναι 26 + τοῦ *ante* μὴ 28 αὐτὸν *pro* αὐτὸ 36 προφῆτις *corr; prim man* προφήτης | tr μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἔτη 37—ἀπὸ 41 ὅ τε ἰωσὴφ καὶ ἡ μαριὰμ *pro* οἱ γονεῖς αὐτοῦ 42 ἀνέβησαν *pro* ἀναβάντων αὐτῶν 43 + ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 44—ἐν³ 45 ἐπιζητοῦντες *pro* ζητοῦντες 48 tr εἶπεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ.

3:1 *prim man*—τῆς ἰουδαίας καὶ τετραρχοῦντος; *suppl man rec* 2 ἐπὶ ἀρχιερέως | —τοῦ 4 λόγων *corr; prim man* λόγου 5 φάραξ *pro* φάραγξ 11 ποιείτω *corr; prim man* ποιήτω 13 εἶπεν 14 εἶπε *corr; prim man* εἶπεν 16 tr ὑμᾶς βαπτίζω 20 κατέκλεισε *corr; prim man* κατέκλησε? | —τῇ 24 ματθάν *pro* Ματθὰτ 25 ναγγέ *corr pro* Ναγγαὶ; *prim man* ναγγαί? 27 ἰωννάν *pro* Ἰωαννᾶ 29 ἰωρίμ *pro* Ἰωρεὶμ 33 ἀμιναδάμ *pro* Ἀμιναδὰβ | + τοῦ ἰωαράμ *ante* τοῦ ἐσρὼμ 34 θάρρα *pro* Θάρα | σερούχ *pro* Σαροὺχ 37 ἐνών *pro* Ἐνὼχ | ἰάρδ *pro* Ἰαρὲδ.

4:1 tr πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου; πλήρης *suppl corr* 4 tr πρὸς

αὐτὸν ὁ ἰησοῦς | καὶ εἶπε *pro* λέγων | —ὁ *ante* ἄνθρωπος 6 εἶπε | πρὸς αὐτὸν *pro* αὐτῷ 7 πᾶσα *pro* πάντα 8 tr ὁ ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶ | —γὰρ 9—ὁ 12 tr ὁ ἰησοῦς εἶπεν αὐτῶ | γέγραπται *pro* Ὅτι εἴρηται 13 ἅπαντα *pro* πάντα 16 ἐν τῇ συναγωγῇ *pro* εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν 18 εἵνεκεν *pro* ἕνεκεν | εὐαγγελίσασθαι *pro* εὐαγγελίζεσθαι 19 + καὶ ἡμέραν ἀνταποδόσεως 20 πάντων + τῶν 22—τῆς χάριτος 24 ἀμὴν ἀμὴν 25—δὲ 26 ἄρεπτα *pro* Σάρεπτα 28 ἀκούσαντες *pro* ἀκούοντες 29—τῆς² 35—τὸ² 36—ἐν 40 ἐπιτιθεὶς 42 ἐπεζήτουν.

5:6 tr πλῆθος ἰχθύων 7 ἐλθόντος *pro* ἐλθόντας | ἀμφότεροι *pro* ἀμφότερα 8—τοῦ 14 ἀλλ' 17 διδάσκων *corr; prim man* διδάσκον? | —Γαλιλαίας καὶ 19 πῶς *pro* διὰ ποίας 21 εἷς *pro* μόνος 23—σοι | tr σου αἱ ἁμαρτίαι 26—καὶ ἔκστασις . . . . τὸν Θεὸν 27 λέγει *pro* εἶπεν 29—ὁ 30 + τῶν *ante* τελωνῶν 34 εἶπεν 35—καὶ | + καὶ *ante* τότε 36—καὶ¹ | —ἐπίβλημα².

6:1 ἔτιλλον *corr; prim man* ἔτιλον 7—αὐτὸν | κατηγορεῖν *pro* κατηγορίαν 9 ἀποκτεῖναι *pro* ἀπολέσαι 10 εἶπεν αὐτῶ *pro* εἶπε τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ | ἐξέτεινε *pro* ἐποίησεν οὕτω 12 ὄρος + ὁ ἰησοῦς 18 ἀπὸ *pro* ὑπὸ 20 πτωχοὶ + τῶ πνεύματι 23 χάρητε *pro* χαίρετε | καὶ *pro* κατὰ 24 ὑμῖν *corr; prim man* ἡμῖν? 26—ὑμῖν 27 ἀλλὰ *pro* Ἀλλ' 28 ὑμᾶς *pro* ὑμῖν | —καὶ | εὔχεσθε *pro* προσεύχεσθε 34—οἱ 35 δανείζετε *corr; prim man* δανίζετε | —τοῦ 38 δοθήσεται *corr; prim man* -τε or -τι 39 ἐμπεσοῦνται *pro* πεσοῦνται 49 ἐστι.

7:2 ἔμελλε *pro* ἤμελλε 4 λέγοντες + αὐτῶ 6 tr μου ὑπὸ τὴν στέγην 7 ἀλλ' *pro* ἀλλὰ 9—αὐτῷ | + ὅτι *ante* οὐδὲ 10 εὗρον *man rec; prim man* εὑρο 11 καὶ ἱκανὸς ὄχλος πολύς *pro* ἱκανοὶ καὶ ὄχλος πολύς 12 αὐτὴ *pro* αὕτη | —ἦν 13 αὐτὴν *pro* αὐτῇ¹ 15 ἀνεκάθισεν *man rec; prim man* ἀνεκάθησεν? 16 πάντας *pro* ἅπαντας 17—τῇ² 18 ἰωάννην *pro* Ἰωάννῃ 20 tr οἱ ἄνδρες πρὸς αὐτὸν 21—τὸ 27 οὗτος + γὰρ | ἀποστελῶ *man rec pro* ἀποστέλλω *prim man?* 28—προφήτης 31—εἶπε δὲ ὁ κύριος 32—τοῖς 33 ἐλήλυθεν 34 tr φίλος τελωνῶν 35—πάντων 36 τὸν οἶκον *pro* τὴν οἰκίαν 42 ἀποδοῦνναι *pro* ἀποδοῦναι | —αὐτὸν 45 εἰσῆλθεν 46 ἤλειψας *corr; prim man* ἤληψας? | tr τοὺς πόδας μου 49 tr ἐστιν οὗτος.

8:11 ἔστιν *pro* Ἔστι 18 ἐὰν *pro* ἂν² | —μὴ 22 ἐγένετο δὲ *pro* Καὶ ἐγένετο 23—ἀφύπνωσε· καὶ 24 γαλήνη + μεγάλη 25 tr πρὸς ἀλλήλους λέγοντες | τοῖς ὕδασι *pro* τῷ ὕδατι | αὐτοῦ *pro* αὐτῷ 26 ἀντιπέρα *pro* ἀντιπέραν 27 δαιμόνιον *pro* δαιμόνια 29 παρήγγειλε

pro Παρήγγελλε | *συνηρπάκει corr; prim man* συνηρπάκη? 30 *τίς pro* Τί 31 *παρεκάλουν pro παρεκάλει* 32 *ἀγγέλη pro ἀγέλη* 34 *γεγονὸς pro γεγενημένον* | *—ἀπελθόντες* 35 *σωφρονοῦντα corr; prim man σοφρονοῦντα* 36—*καὶ* 37 *συνείχοντο corr; prim man συνήχοντο* 39 *πόλιν* + *ἐκείνην* | *θεός pro* Ἰησοῦς 43 *γυνή* + *τις* | *ἰατροῖς pro εἰς ἰατροὺς* 45 *σὺν αὐτῷ pro μετ' αὐτοῦ* 48 *ὁ δὲ* + *ἰησοῦς* 51 *ἐλθὼν pro* Εἰσελθὼν | *οὐδένα* + *σὺν αὐτῷ* | tr *ἰωάννην καὶ ἰάκωβον* 52 *κλέετε*(?) *pro κλαίετε* | *ἀπέθανε* + *τὸ κοράσιον* 54 tr *πάντας ἔξω* 55 *ἐπέτρεψε pro ἐπέστρεψε* | *διέταξε* | tr *δοθῆναι αὐτῇ.*

9:1 *ἀποστόλους pro μαθητὰς—αὐτοῦ* 5 *ἐὰν pro ἂν* | *αὐτοῖς pro ἐπ' αὐτούς* 9—*ὁ* 13 tr *ἰχθύες δύο* | *ἀγοράσομεν pro ἀγοράσωμεν* 15 *οὕτως* 20—*ὁ* | *εἶπεν* + *αὐτῷ* 23 *δὲ* + *καὶ* | *—καθ' ἡμέραν* 27 *ἑστώτων pro ἑστηκότων* | *γεύσωνται corr pro γεύσονται prim man* 28—*τὸν* 33 tr *μίαν μωσεῖ* 38 *ἐπίβλεψαι pro ἐπίβλεψον* 40 *ἐκβάλωσιν pro ἐκβάλλωσιν* 41 tr *τὸν υἱόν σου ὧδε* 45 *αὐτοῦ corr? pro αὐτό prim man?* 48 tr *τὸ παιδίον τοῦτο* | *ὑμῶν*(?) *pro ὑμῖν* 49—*τὰ* 50 *ὑμῶν pro ἡμῶν bis* 51—*καὶ* | tr *ἐστήριξε τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ* | *—τοῦ*? 52 *πόλιν pro κώμην* 54 *εἴπομεν pro εἴπωμεν* 56—Καὶ *ἐπορεύθησαν εἰς ἑτέραν κώμην* 57 *ἐὰν pro ἂν* 58 *κλίνει pro κλίνῃ* 59 *πρὸς* + *τὸν* | tr *πρῶτον ἀπελθόντι* 62 tr *ὁ ἰησοῦς πρὸς αὐτόν.*

10:1 *ἐνέδειξεν pro ἀνέδειξεν* 2 *ἐκβάλῃ pro ἐκβάλλῃ* 3 *πρόβατα pro ἄρνας* 6—*μὲν* 8—*δ'* | *ἐσθίετε* + *καὶ πίνετε* 12—*δὲ* 13 *χοραζίν pro* Χωραζὶν 15—*τοῦ* 20—*μᾶλλον* 22 tr *μοι παρεδόθη* 28 *σώζῃ pro ζήσῃ* 29 *εἶπεν* 30—*τυγχάνοντα* 32 *ἀντιπαρῆλθε* 34 *ἔλαιον corr; prim man ἔλιον*? 36 tr *πλησίον δοκεῖ σοι* 40 *μέλλει pro μέλει.*

11:1 *τῶ corr; prim man* το 2 *προσεύχησθε corr* 6—*μου* 7 *θύρα* + *μου* 8 *ὅσον pro ὅσων* 11 *ἢ pro εἰ* 13 tr *δόματα ἀγαθὰ* 15 *post δαιμόνια* + *ὁ δὲ ἀποκριθεὶς εἶπε πῶς δύναται σατανᾶς σατανᾶν ἐκβάλλειν* 19 *ἐκβάλουσι corr pro ἐκβάλλουσι prim man* | tr *αὐτοὶ κριταὶ ὑμῶν* 22 *ἐπεποίθει corr; prim man -θη*? 26 *ἐλθόντα pro εἰσελθόντα* 29 *ἐπιζητεῖ corr; prim man ἐπιζητῆ* 30—*ἔσται* 31 *σολομῶνος pro* Σολομῶντος *bis* 32 *νινευΐταις pro* Νινευΐ | *μετενόησεν pro μετενόησαν* 33 *κρυπτὴν corr pro κρυπτὸν; prim man κρύπτειν* | *ἢ pro* οὐδὲ 34 *φωτινὸν ἔσται pro φωτεινόν ἐστιν* | *—ᾗ*[2] 40 *ἐποίησε corr; prim man -σεν* 44—*οἱ*[2] 49 *προφήτας* + *καὶ διδασκάλους* 54—*καὶ.*

12:4 *ἀποκτενόντων pro ἀποκτεινόντων* 8 *ὁμολογήσει corr pro ὁμολογήσῃ; prim man -σῃ* 15 *φυλάσεσθε pro φυλάσσεσθε* | *αὐτῶ pro*

αὐτοῦ[1] 16 tr πρὸς αὐτοὺς παραβολὴν 20 ἄφρον *pro* Ἄφρων 21 πλουτῶν + ταῦτα λέγων ἐφώνει ὁ ἔχων ὦτα ἀκούειν ἀκουέτω 22 ἐνδύσεσθε *pro* ἐνδύσησθε 23 ἡ + γὰρ | πλείων *pro* πλεῖόν 28 tr σήμερον ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ 29 πίετε *pro* πίητε 33 ἀνέκλειπον *pro* ἀνέκλειπτον 38 οὕτως 47 αὐτοῦ *pro* ἑαυτοῦ 48 ζητιθήσεται *pro* ζητηθήσεται | ἀπαιτήσουσιν *pro* αἰτήσουσιν 52—ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν 53 ἐπὶ *pro* ἐφ' 54 οὕτως 58 βάλη *pro* βάλλῃ 59 τὸν *pro* τὸ.

13 : 4 αὐτοὶ *pro* οὗτοι 6 tr ζητῶν καρπον 8 οὗ *pro* ὅτου | κόπρια *pro* κοπρίαν 9 ἐκκόψης *pro* ἐκκόψεις 15 ὑποκριταί *pro* Ὑποκριτὰ 19 κόκω *pro* κόκκῳ | + ὁ *ante* ἄνθρωπος 20 εἶπεν 21 ἔκρυψεν *pro* ἐνέκρυψεν 29—ἀπὸ[2] | ἀνακληθήσονται *pro* ἀνακλιθήσονται 34 ἀποκτένουσα *pro* ἀποκτείνουσα | νοσίαν *pro* νοσσιὰν 35—ἀμὴν | tr λέγω δὲ.

14 : 3—Εἰ 4 ἀπέλυσεν 5 υἱὸς *pro* ὄνος 8 κατακλιθῆς *corr; prim man* -κληθῆς? 10 ἀνάπεσον *corr; prim man* ἀνάπεσε 15 ἄριστον *pro* ἄρτον 16 μέγαν *man rec pro* μέγα *prim man* 21 ἀναπήρους *man rec; prim man* ἀπήρους | tr τυφλοὺς καὶ χωλοὺς 24 + πολλοὶ γάρ εἰσι κλητοί· ὀλίγοι δὲ ἐκλεκτοί 26 αὐτοῦ *pro* ἑαυτοῦ[1] | tr εἶναι μαθητής 27 tr εἶναι μου 28 + ὁ *ante* θέλων 30 οἰκοδομὴν *pro* οἰκοδομεῖν 32 tr πόρρω αὐτοῦ.

15 : 2 διεγγόγυζον *pro* διεγόγγυζον 4 ἐνενηκονταεννέα *pro* ἐννενηκονταεννέα | ἕως + οὗ 6 συγκαλεῖται *pro* συγκαλεῖ | tr αὐτοῖς λέγων 7 οὕτως | ἐνενηκονταεννέα *pro* ἐννενηκονταεννέα 10 οὕτως 13 διεσκόρπισε *corr; prim man* -σεν 17 ἄρτων *corr; prim man* ἄρτον 24 ἀπολωλὼς *corr; prim man* -λὸς 26—αὐτοῦ 30 ἔθυσας *pro* ἔθυσας 32 ἀπολωλὼς *corr; prim man* -λὸς.

16 : 1—καὶ[1] 5 ἑαυτοῦ *man rec; prim man* αὐτοῦ 9 ἐκλίπητε *corr; prim man* ἐκλείπητε 15—ἐστιν 22—τοῦ 26 ἔνθεν *pro* ἐντεῦθεν | ἡμᾶς *pro* ὑμᾶς | ὑμᾶς *pro* ἡμᾶς 31 πορευθῇ *pro* ἀναστῇ.

17 : 4—ἐπὶ σὲ 6 ἔχετε *pro* εἴχετε 7 ἀνάπεσον *corr pro* ἀνάπεσαι 9—αὐτῷ 10 οὕτως | ἡμεῖς *pro* ὑμεῖς | tr ἐσμὲν ἀχρεῖοι | ὀφείλομεν *pro* ὠφείλομεν 12—καὶ | εἰσερχομένου + δὲ 18 ἀλογενὴς *pro* ἀλλογενὴς 23—ἢ 24 εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν *pro* εἰς τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν | —καὶ 26—τοῦ[1] | —καὶ[2] 27 ἤσθιον + καὶ 30 τὰ αὐτὰ *pro* ταῦτα 33 ἀπολέση *pro* ἀπολέσει 34 νῇ *pro* τῇ | —ὁ[1].

18 : 1 προσεύχεσθαι + αὐτοὺς 4 ἤθελεν *pro* ἠθέλησεν 5 χήρα *pro* χήραν | ὑποπιάζη *pro* ὑπωπιάζῃ 7 ποιήση *pro* ποιήσει 9—καὶ[1]

14 ἢ + γὰρ | —ὁ δὲ . . . . ὑψωθήσεται 15—δὲ² 28—ὁ 33—τῇ² | tr τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρα | ἐγερθήσεται *pro* ἀναστήσεται 35 δὲ *suppl rubr* 37 ναζοραῖος *pro* Ναζωραῖος.

19:4 συκομορραίαν *pro* συκομωραίαν 7 πάντες *pro* ἅπαντες 8 μοι *pro* μου | ἐσυκοφάντισα 11—αὐτῶν 15 ἀπελθεῖν *pro* ἐπανελθεῖν | —καὶ² 16 μνᾶς *pro* μνᾶ 17 tr ἀγαθὲ εὖ 18 μνᾶς *pro* μνᾶ | ἐποίεισε 20 ἴδε *pro* ἰδοὺ | μνᾶς *pro* μνᾶ 21—ἔθηκας . . . . οὐκ 23—τὴν 27 κατασφάξατε + ὧδε 29 βηθσφαγὴ *pro* Βηθφαγὴ 37 ἐλαιῶν *corr; prim man* ἐλιῶν 38—ὁ ἐρχόμενος 45 ἑαυτῶ *pro* αὐτῷ 48—τὸ | ποιήσουσιν *pro* ποιήσωσιν | ἐξεκρέμματο *pro* ἐξεκρέματο.

20:1 ἱερεῖς *pro* ἀρχιερεῖς 5—οὖν 8—αὐτοῖς 9—τις 27—αὐτὸν 28 μωυσῆς *pro* Μωσῆς 31 + καὶ *ante* οὐ 33 ἔσται *pro* γίνεται 35—ἐκείνου | τῶν *pro* τῆς ἐκ | ἐκγαμίζονται *pro* ἐκγαμίσκονται 38 ἔστιν *pro* ἔστι.

21:2 tr τινα καὶ 6 λίθον *pro* λίθῳ 8 ἤγγικεν 14—εἰς 15 ἢ *pro* οὐδὲ 16 tr καὶ φίλων καὶ ἀδελφῶν | —καὶ συγγενῶν 22 πλησθῆναι *pro* πληρωθῆναι 24 ὑπὸ + τῶν 30 προβάλλωσιν *pro* προβάλωσιν 34 βαρηθῶσιν *pro* βαρυνθῶσιν | αἰφνιδίως *pro* αἰφνίδιος 36—ταῦτα.

22:3 καλούμενον *pro* ἐπικαλούμενον 4—τοῖς² 5 συνεχάρησαν *pro* ἐχάρησαν 7—ἡ 8—καὶ¹ 12 ἀνώγεων *pro* ἀνώγεον | ἐστρωμμένον *pro* ἐστρωμένον 18 γενήματος *pro* γεννήματος 19 ἡμῶν *pro* ὑμῶν 20 ἡμων *pro* ὑμῶν 26 μεῖς : *car* ὑ 28 ἔσται *pro* ἐστε 29 με *pro* μοι 30 καθίσεσθε *pro* καθίσησθε 32 ἐκλίπῃ *pro* ἐκλείπῃ 34 φωνήσῃ *pro* φωνήσει 35 οὐθενός *pro* Οὐδενός 36 βαλλάντιον *pro* βαλάντιον | —καὶ¹ | πωλήσει *pro* πωλησάτω | ἀγοράσει *pro* ἀγορασάτω 38 ἐστιν *pro* ἐστι 39—καὶ² 45—αὐτοῦ 47 αὐτοὶς *pro* αὐτῶν | αὐτόν + τοῦτο γὰρ σημεῖον δεδώκει αὐτοῖς· ὃν ἂν φιλήσω αὐτός εστιν 50—τις 52 πρὸς *pro* ἐπ' 53 tr ἐστὶν ὑμῶν 54—αὐτὸν² 60—ὁ² 63—αὐτῷ 66—τε 68—καὶ.

23:1 ἤγαγον *pro* ἤγαγεν 2 ἔθνος + ἡμῶν 6 ἠρώτησεν *pro* ἐπηρώτησεν 14 διαστρέφοντα *pro* ἀποστρέφοντα 18—τὸν 19 εἰς + τὴν 26—τοῦ¹ 29 μασθοὶ *pro* μαστοὶ 34 ἔβαλλον *pro* ἔβαλον 39 κρεμμασθέντων *corr pro* κρεμασθέντων *prim man* 42—ὅταν ἔλθῃς 44 ἐνάτης *pro* ἐννάτης 51—καὶ² | tr καὶ αὐτὸς προσεδέχετο 54—καὶ² 55—καὶ¹.

24:1 βαθέως *pro* βαθέος 4 tr ἄνδρες δύο 5 ἐμφόβον *pro* ἐμφόβων 12 θαυμάζον *pro* θαυμάζων 18—ἐν *ante* Ἱερουσαλὴμ | —ἐν αὐτῇ

21 *συμπᾶσι pro σὺν πᾶσι* 22 *μᾶς : car ἡ* 24 *οὕτως* 46 *οὕτως pro οὕτω.*

John 1:20—*ὡμολόγησε corr; prim man -σεν* 21—Καὶ λέγει . . . . *προφήτης εἶ συ;* 28 *βηθανία pro* Βηθαβαρᾶ 33 *μοι pro με* 40—δὲ 42 *μεσίαν pro* Μεσσίαν | *ἐστιν* | —ὁ 44 *αὐτῷ* + ὁ *ἰησοῦς* 46 + *τὸν ante* Ἰησοῦν 49—ὁ.

2:9 *ἠτληκότες pro ἠντληκότες* 14 *πωλοῦντας corr; prim man πυλοῦντας* 15 *κολυβιστῶν pro κολλυβιστῶν* 17 *καταφάγεταί pro κατέφαγέ* 19—ὁ 22—*αὐτοῖς post ἔλεγε* 23 + *τοῖς ante* Ἱεροσολύμοις.

3:5—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 6—*τὸ γεγεννημένον ἐκ τῆς σαρκὸς σάρξ ἐστι· καὶ* 10—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 11—*λαλοῦμεν* 12 *πιστεύσητε pro πιστεύσετε* 15 *ἔχει pro ἔχῃ* 16 *οὕτως* | *ἔχει pro ἔχῃ* 20 *ἐλεχθῆ pro ἐλεγχθῇ* 20, 21 *ἵνα μὴ . . . . τὸ φῶς bis; sec ras* 23 *σαλὴμ pro* Σαλεὶμ 25 *ἰουδαίου pro* Ἰουδαίων 36 + *τὴν ante ζωὴν*[2].

4:3 *ἀπῆλθεν—πάλιν* 13—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 18—*ἄνδρας* 20 tr *τῷ ὄρει τούτῳ* 21—*ὅτε* 25 *μεσίας pro* Μεσσίας 30—*οὖν* 31 *μαθηταὶ* + *αὐτοῦ* 35 *τετράμηνός pro τετράμηνον* 37—*ἐν γὰρ . . . . θηρίζων* 46 tr *πάλιν ὁ ἰησοῦς* 47 *ἔμελλε pro ἤμελλε* 53 *ὥρα* + *ἰάθη.*

5:4 *ἐταράσσετο pro ἐτάρασσε* | *ἐγένετο pro ἐγίνετο* 5—*τις* | *τριάκοντα* + *καὶ* 7 *βάλη pro βάλλῃ* 10 *ἰδαῖοι pro* Ἰουδαῖοι 18 *ἰδαῖοι pro* Ἰουδαῖοι 19—*ἂν* 21 *οὕτως* 27, 28—*ὅτι υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστί. μὴ θαυμάζετε τοῦτο* 31 *ἐὰν* + *γὰρ* 35 *ἀγαλλιαθῆναι pro ἀγαλλιασθῆναι* 38—*αὐτοῦ* 39 + *οὐ ante δοκεῖτε* 46 *μωσεῖ pro* Μωσῇ 47 *πιστεύετε pro πιστεύσετε.*

6:5—ὁ Ἰησοῦς 12 *ἐπλήσθησαν pro ἐνεπλήσθησαν* 15 *ἀνεχώρησεν—πάλιν* 19 *γενόμενον pro γινόμενον* 24—*καὶ*[1] 28 *ποιῶμεν pro ποιοῦμεν* 29—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 32 *ἔδωκεν pro δέδωκεν* 38—*τὸ ἐμὸν ἀλλὰ τὸ θέλημα* 45—*τοῦ ante θεοῦ* | *ἀκούων pro ἀκούσας* 52 *ἰδαῖοι pro* Ἰουδαῖοι 54 + *ἐν ante τῇ* 58 *ζήσει pro ζήσεται* 64 *ἤδη pro* Ἤιδει 66 *μεθ' αὐτοῦ* 70—ὁ Ἰησοῦς 71 *ἔμελλεν pro ἤμελλεν.*

7:7—*ἐγὼ* 8—*ἐγὼ οὔπω . . . ταύτην* 10—*ὡς*[2] 16 *ἀπεκρίθη* + *οὖν* 22 *οὐχ' ὅτι* + *περὶ τοῦ* 27 *ἔρχηται corr* 29—δὲ 30 *ἐληλύθει corr; prim man -θη?* 32 tr *ὑπηρέτας οἱ φαρισαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἀρχιερεῖς* 33—*αὐτοῖς* 36—*οὗτος* | *εἶπεν* 39 *ἤμελλον pro ἔμελλον* | —ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 41—δὲ 42—*τοῦ* 46—*οὕτως* 47 *πεπλάνησθε corr* 51 *κρίνει corr; prim man κρίνῃ?*

8:1 *ἐλαιῶν corr* 2 *πάλιν* + *βαθέος* 3 *ἐπὶ pro ἐν* 4 *ταύτην*

εὕρομεν ἐπαυτοφὸρω μοιχευομένην *pro* αὕτη . . . . μοιχευομένη 5 νόμῳ + ἡμῶν | —ἡμῖν | λιθάζειν *pro* λιθοβολεῖσθαι | δὲ *pro* οὖν | λέγεις + περὶ αὐτῆς 6 κατηγορίαν κατ' *pro* κατηγορεῖν | ἔχωσι *corr* 7 ἀναβλέψας *pro* ἀνακύψας | —τὸν | tr βαλέτω ἐπ' αὐτήν 9—καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι | tr ὁ ἰησοῦς μόνος | οὖσα *pro* ἑστῶσα 10 εἶδεν αὐτὴν καὶ εἶπε *pro* καὶ μηδένα . . . . αὐτῇ | γῦναι *pro* Ἡ γυνὴ | —ἐκεῖνοι . . . . σου 11 + ἀπὸ τοῦ νῦν *ante* μηκέτι 12 tr αὐτοῖς ὁ ἰησοῦς | περιπατήση *pro* περιπατήσει 14 + ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς | ἀληθής *corr* | —δὲ *post* ὑμεῖς 19—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 20 ἐληλύθει *corr; prim man* -θη? 22 δύνασθε *corr; prim man* -σθαι? 26 ἐστιν 29 tr πάντοτε ποιῶ 36 ἐλευθερώσει *pro* ἐλευθερώσῃ | ἔσεσθε *corr; prim man* -σθαι 42—οὖν 44 ἐκ[1] + τοῦ 46—τίς . . . . μοι; 48 λέγωμεν *pro* λέγομεν | σαμαρείτης *corr; prim man* -τις? 52 tr θανάτου οὐ μὴ γεύσηται 54 ἡμῶν *pro* ὑμῶν 55—ἐγὼ δὲ οἶδα αὐτόν.

9:1 παράγων + ὁ ἰησοῦς 3—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 4 δύναται *corr* 8 πρότερον *corr; prim man* πρώ-? 9 ἄλλοι[2]—δὲ + ἔλεγον 10 ἠνεώχθησαν *pro* ἀνεῴχθησάν 15—καὶ[1] | ἐπέθηκε tr μου ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς 16—τοῦ 20 ἀπεκρίθησαν + δὲ 21 ἑαυτοῦ *pro* αὐτοῦ 24—οὖν 27 θέλετε *corr* | tr μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ 28—οὖν 31 ἁμαρτωλῶν *corr; prim man* ἁμαρτωλὸν 36 + καὶ *ante* τίς.

10:4 ἐκβάλλη *pro* ἐκβάλῃ 5 ἀκολουθήσωσι 8—πρὸ ἐμοῦ 13 φεύγει *corr* | μέλλει *pro* μέλει 22 *man prim* γένετο; ἐ *suppl rubr* | —τοῖς 23—τοῦ | σολομῶνος *pro* Σολομῶντος 25 εἶπον + οὖν 30 πατήρ + μου 40 ἀπῆλθεν.

11:1 βηθανείας *pro* Βηθανίας 3 ἀδελφαὶ + αὐτοῦ | φιλεῖς *corr* 7 μαθηταῖς + αὐτοῦ 9—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς | —τούτου | 12 κεκοίμηται *corr* 15 ἀλλὰ *pro* ἀλλ' 18 βηθανία *corr; prim man* βιθ-? 19 ἐληλύθεισαν *corr; prim man* -θεσαν 20—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 21—ἡ *ante* Μάρθα 32 tr αὐτοῦ εἰς τοὺς πόδας 34 τεθήκατε *pro* τεθείκατε 38—οὖν 41 τεθνηκὼς *corr* 46 ὅσα *pro* ἃ 47 ποιήσομεν *pro* ποιοῦμεν 48 οὕτως 54—ἐκεῖθεν.

12:2 ἀνακειμένων σὺν *pro* συνανακειμένων 4—ἐκ 6 ἔμελλεν *pro* ἔμελεν 12—ὁ *bis* 13—ὁ *ante* βασιλεὺς 16 πρῶτον *corr; prim man* πρότερον? 18—καὶ 26 ἀκολουθείτω *corr; prim man* ἀκολουθήτω 28 πάτερ + ἅγιε 30—ὁ 33 ἔμελλεν *pro* ἤμελλεν 34—Ὅτι[2] 41 ὅτι *pro* ὅτε 42 ἀρχόντων *corr* 49 δέδωκε *pro* ἔδωκε 50 tr ἐγὼ λαλῶ | οὕτως.

13:6 νίπτης *pro* νίπτεις 12 τῶν μαθητῶν *pro* αὐτῶν 13 tr ὁ

κύριος καὶ ὁ διδάσκαλος 15 ποιεῖτε *pro* ποιῆτε 18 ἐγὼ + γὰρ 25 ἐκεῖνος + οὕτως 29 εἶχεν—ὁ 35 γνώσονται *corr* 36 ὅπου + ἐγὼ | με *pro* μοι[1] 37—ὁ | σε *pro* σοι + νῦν.

14:1 ταρασέσθω *pro* ταρασσέσθω 3 ἑτοιμάσαι *pro* καὶ ἑτοιμάσω 7 *man prim*—ἐγνώκειτέ . . . μου; *suppl marg* 10 ἐστιν 13 αἰτήσητε *corr; prim man* -τεν? 14 αἰτήσητε *corr; prim man* -τει? 23—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 24 τὸν λόγον *pro* τοὺς λόγους 27 ταρασέσθω *pro* ταρασσέσθω 30—τούτου 31 οὕτως.

15:5 εἰμὶ *corr* 6 + τὸ *ante* πῦρ 7 αἰτήσασθε *pro* αἰτήσεσθε 8 γενήσεσθε *corr; prim man* -σθαι 14—ἐγὼ 15 tr λέγω ὑμᾶς | ὅσα *pro* ἃ 16 μείνη *pro* μένῃ | δώῃ *pro* δῷ 19 ἐφίλη *pro* ἐφίλει 26 μαρτυρήσει *corr; prim man* -ση.

16:3 ποιήσουσιν—ὑμῖν 4 μνημονεύετε *pro* μνημονεύητε | ἤμην *corr; prim man* ἤμιν? 7 γὰρ + ἐγὼ 15 λαμβάνει *pro* λήψεται 16 ὅτι—ἐγὼ 23—ὅτι 27 ἡμᾶς *pro* ὑμᾶς 33 ἔχητε *corr.*

17:2 δώσει *pro* δώσῃ 8 ὅτι *corr; prim man* ὅτῃ? 11 ὃ *pro* οὓς 12 εἰμὶ *pro* εἰ μὴ | ἀπολείας *pro* ἀπωλείας 15 τηρήσεις *pro* τηρήσῃς 20 πιστευόντων *pro* πιστευσόντων 23 γινώσκει *pro* γινώσκῃ 24 δέδωκας *pro* ἔδωκας.

18:1 εἰσῆλθον *pro* εἰσῆλθεν 2 ἤδει δὲ *corr* 8—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 14 ἀποθανεῖν *pro* ἀπολέσθαι 15 ἠκολούθει *corr; prim man* ἠκολούθη 20—τῇ *ante* συναγωγῇ | πάντες *pro* πάντοτε | ἰουδαῖοι *corr; prim man* ἰδαῖοι 21 ἐρώτησον *pro* ἐπερώτησον 23 δέρεις *corr* 25 ἠρνήσατο + οὖν 28 ἄγουσι—οὖν 29 πιλάτος + ἔξω 31 δὲ *pro* οὖν[2] 32 ἔμελλεν *pro* ἤμελλεν 33 tr πᾶλιν εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον 34 ἀπεκρίθη—αὐτῷ | ἀπὸ σεαυτοῦ *pro* Ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ | —σὺ 35 εἰμί *corr* 36—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς | tr ἡ βασιλεία ἡ ἐμὴ ἦν 39 tr ἀπολύσω ὑμῖν *bis.*

19:6+αὐτόν *post* σταύρωσον[2] 7 tr υἱὸν θεοῦ ἑαυτὸν 11—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 12 ἐκραύγαζον *pro* ἔκραζον | ἑαυτὸν *pro* αὐτὸν 13 τούτων τῶν λόγων *pro* τοῦτον τὸν λόγον | τῶν *corr; prim man* τὸν | γαβαθά *pro* Γαββαθᾶ 14 ἦν *pro* δὲ[2] 16 ἤγαγον *pro* ἀπήγαγον + ἐπιθέντες αὐτῷ τὸν σταυρὸν αὐτοῦ 17 βαστάζοντες *corr pro* βαστάζων; *prim man* βαστάζωντες | ἐξῆλθον *pro* ἐξῆλθεν | τόπον *pro* τὸν[2] 20 tr ὁ τόπος τῆς πόλεως 23 ὅτε *corr* | ἄραφος *pro* ἄρραφος 24 σχίσωμεν *corr; prim man* σχίσομεν? 25 κλοπᾶ *pro* Κλωπᾶ 28 ἰδὼν *pro* εἰδὼς | πληρωθῇ *pro* τελειωθῇ 31—ἡ 34 εὐθέως *pro* εὐθὺς 35 tr ἐστιν αὐτοῦ

36 + ἀπ' *ante* αὐτοῦ 38 μετὰ—δὲ | καὶ κρυμμένος *pro* κεκρυμμένος 40 + ἐν *ante* ὀθονίοις.

20:1—ἔτι 4 προέλαβε *pro* προέδραμε 8 εἰσῆλθεν *pro* εἰσῆλθε 13 *post* μου + ἐκ τοῦ μνημείου 14—Καὶ[1] | —ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς 15 tr ἔθηκας αὐτὸν 16 ῥαβουνὶ *pro* Ῥαββουνί 18 ἀπαγγελουσα *pro* ἀπαγγέλλουσα 19—οὖν 21—ὁ Ἰησοῦς 23 κεκράτηντε *pro* κεκράτηνται 26 ἔρχεται + οὖν 28—Καὶ[1] | —ὁ[1] 29 εἶπε δὲ *pro* Λέγει | —Θωμᾶ | 30 ἐνώπιον *corr; prim man* ἐώπιον 31—ὁ *ante* Ἰησοῦς.

21:3 ἐνέβησαν *pro* ἀνέβησαν 4 ἐπὶ *pro* εἰς 5—οὖν 6 λέγει *pro* Ὁ δὲ εἶπεν 13—οὖν 15 τοῦτων *corr; prim man* τοῦτον 17 τὸ[1] *corr* 19 εἶπεν *pro* εἶπε 20 εἶπεν *pro* εἶπε 25 γράφητε *pro* γράφηται.

EDGAR JOHNSON GOODSPEED.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

LA CRÉATION ET LA PROVIDENCE DEVANT LA SCIENCE MODERNE. Par EUGÈNE MAILLET, Docteur ès lettres, ancien professeur de philosophie au lycée Louis-le-Grand. (Mémoire couronné par l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques.) Paris: Librairie Hachette et C^ie^, 1897. Pp. xii + 463. Fr. 7.50.

THE subject treated by Professor Maillet in this volume has engaged the attention of able metaphysicians and theologians for a long time, and is not likely to lose its interest while there are thoughtful men under the sun. The writer was a professor of philosophy, and his treatment of the subject chosen furnishes abundant evidence of familiarity with both ancient and modern philosophy. It also proves his acquaintance with the principal facts established by modern science and supposed to have a bearing on creation and providence. He is classed with eclectic philosophers, and his purpose in the present work was to effect a reconciliation between faith and science. The volume has been given to the public by his friends after his death, but without making use of a book of notes which he had accumulated since his work was crowned by the Academy in 1891. Whether these notes suggest any modification of his views in respect to creation and providence is not stated, but we are told that they were not left in a condition to be used by anyone except their author.

The style of the volume is good, though there are sentences, perhaps few in number, less perspicuous than is common with the best French writers. Ordinarily the language is perfectly lucid and characterized by a sober dignity befitting the subject. *Part first* treats of the present state of questions pertaining to theodicy, and in a succession of chapters describes the actual situation of theodicy in presence of theology and science respectively, and in particular the present state of theodicy on the question of the religious sentiment, on the questions of nature and of the existence of God, on the problem of creation, on the problem of providence, and on the question of the good and the evil of life. *Part second* surveys in a rapid way the principal systems of theodicy; the two dialectics, that of theism and that of pantheism;

providence in Greek religion and Greek philosophy, in some purely theistic doctrines, in pantheism; creation and providence in Christian metaphysics. *Part third* treats of consciousness as the basis of a possible view of the relations of God and the world; inductions from consciousness, both theological and metaphysical; providence in nature, in history, and in religion.

Professor Maillet's theory of the harmony between creation and providence and modern science is most clearly defined in the last part of his work. He understands consciousness to be the activity of the essential being. It embraces all personal action, indeed all selfhood. It covers the whole psychological life, and, in virtue of the finality concealed in it, is the moving principle of all its action. "That which is only true in a representative form in the development of human consciousness becomes true in an absolute manner in the evolution of the divine consciousness. (For God to think is to posit real being.) Yet the evolution of the divine consciousness is not chronological, it is simply logical. And as the 'first moment' of consciousness in man contains an image of creation, the 'first moment' of consciousness in God contains the reality of creation." Again, "God is not a being, infinite, perfect, supremely wise, supremely good, and, still more, *a person;* he is *a person* whose action contains and produces, in an order purely logical and under the character of eternity, the infinitude, the perfection, the plenitude of goodness, of righteousness, and of all his other attributes. From this point of view, and from no other, can Strauss be refuted."

Maillet holds that there is a "soul of truth" in the doctrine that we can see the Absolute in matter or in nature. For the Absolute in producing matter made it, in a certain sense, after his own image; for he deposited in it the ideal possibility of all things. It may be defined as a *negative residue* of the Absolute. That it is not continuous has been shown experimentally by Tyndall and rationally by Janet. It may be defined, not as force, but as *resistance*, that is, persistence in being once received, or as *inertia*, that is, persistence in movement once imparted. On the other hand, nature may be defined as *force;* for it has, so to speak, deposited in its forms, its laws, its continuity of being and of action, the connection of its phenomena, and its infinite tendency to progress, the force of the Absolute. It is not God, but in it and through it the thought and will of God are realized. After a discussion of the nature of space and time, Maillet summarizes his conclusions in these words: "The first moment of the divine consciousness

creates space, by creating the absolute dissemination of pure matter; the second moment of the same consciousness creates time, by giving the first impulse to nature's movement, by creating the necessity of a universal flight of things toward the good, or life and progress. As to God, he subsists outside of space and of time, in his own immutable eternity, centered in himself. 'All comes from him, all abides in him, all returns to him,' but without any mingling, as pantheism wrongly believes, with the impassible unity of the divine substance."

Under the head of providence in nature the author says: "We do not believe that the determinism of nature ought to be considered strictly rigid or purely mechanical. Nature has its free hand. This does not mean that it is disorderly or that the law of causality sometimes fails. It means that the law by which nature binds a consequent to an antecedent phenomenon is a law that has made itself under the influence of the idea which dominates it, the end which directs it. In this law there is the life of nature, and with this life the spontaneity, the suppleness, the plasticity which are characteristic of life in all its forms. This is what a contemporary philosopher has expressed by a remarkable formula when he speaks of *the contingency of the laws of nature*. We believe that nature is in a process of evolution and progress, and that for this reason its laws are in movement."

In history there are two forces at work: on the one hand, divine action, working after the law of final causes; and, on the other, human action, the concurrence of free wills working according to the law of efficient causes. As Vico teaches, in *The New Science*, "God does not substitute his own rational volitions for the capricious volitions of men; but, through the profound laws which he has established, he acts upon their volitions to make them enter into the current of his designs, and bends them, as efficient causes, to the realization of a system of finalities." In other words, God does not directly create our thoughts and acts; he moves upon our souls by way of influence, not of constraint. Human freedom is never violated, yet by a sort of divine persuasion men are led to accomplish his purpose. "One will perhaps object that, if the action of providence upon human affairs is reduced to this influence of *persuasion* which is wholly inner, wholly moral, human volitions, being free, would all resist the same and the moving principle of the moral world thus be totally suppressed. But this is a gratuitous hypothesis, resting on the chimera of a liberty absolutely indifferent."

These citations and statements suggest the theory of divine provi-

dence advocated by Professor Maillet. It leaves small place for miracles, though it does not expressly deny the possibility of them. While, therefore, his theory, elaborated so fully and connected at so many points with religious speculation in the past, explains satisfactorily the general course of events as dependent upon both divine and human action, it does not cope with all the difficulties which present themselves to the mind of a believer in Christ. Religion is thought to be the product of divine condescension and of human aspiration, having reached its highest form in Christianity; but just how the person and work of Jesus Christ are interpreted by the author is not perfectly clear.

ALVAH HOVEY.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.

DIE KLASSISCHE POESIE UND DIE GÖTTLICHE OFFENBARUNG. Von D. JULIUS DISSELHOFF. Kaiserswerth a. Rh.: Verlag der Diakonissen-Anstalt, 1898. Pp. vii + 562. M. 7.50.

THIS posthumous work of a thoroughly competent writer deserves an English translation. It is a contribution to comparative religion, rather than to pure literature. Poetry, as "the mother-tongue of the human race," the author would say, expresses, more completely than either history or philosophy, man's conceptions of reality. Dealing, therefore, with the substance, and not the form, of poetry, he would discover in it the actual attitude of man toward God. In classical poetry, including the poetry of the Iranian and Indian peoples, as well as of the Greeks and Romans, he traces a gradual decline from the early idea of a personal God, above the world and distinct from the world, to that of a God who is scarcely more than the personified elements of nature. Side by side with this growing deterioration in the conception of God he sees a deterioration in the conception of man. Man, too, loses his sense of personality, freedom, responsibility, and can only mourn his bondage to evil, while he sees no power either in himself or in God to deliver him from it.

The lesson drawn from this historical survey is that man needs a special divine revelation. The Gathas of Zarathustra maintain man's spiritual and moral nature, but at the price of losing unity in a thoroughgoing dualism. The author makes no mention of Rhys Davids' contention that the divine Being in the Avesta was originally one, and that "the twins," good and evil, were simply opposing principles of

his nature, which later teachers misinterpreted as eternally existent and warring spirits. But, while in the Iranian highlands man has roused himself to assert his own supernatural dignity and the spirituality of God, there is an antagonistic faith in the unity of things. This faith leads to conflict and separation. A great part of the race goes eastward and southward to serve the deified forces of nature. On the banks of the Ganges the Indian peoples sought to express the principle of receptivity, to rest from self-determination and its struggles, and to invest their gods with the same qualities which they desired in themselves. They sought unity, and they found it in a common source of good and of evil. This extinguished the sense of personality, and made the loss of selfhood the highest attainment. Evil has its deepest root in Brahma himself; hence there can be no redemption from it.

In a similar way our author represents Homer, Hesiod, and Pindar as recognizing an objective divine personality, though this personality is infected with the same weakness, anxiety and sin, which man finds in himself. The justice of God is believed in, more than his love. The term God is used, without the naming of any particular deity. The tragedians, Æschylus and Sophocles, regard God as the guardian of all moral laws; yet this God is unequal to his task: he punishes, but he does not admit to his favor. There is no reconciliation of the sinner with offended deity, nor is there renewal of nature in those who are punished. Sin is in the nature — it is not the result of man's self-perversion. The nature cannot be freed from sin, because this would involve destruction of the nature itself. Euripides cannot endure these contradictions and shortcomings of the old theology. He is skeptical, and pretends to bow to the gods, while he is really criticising them. Hence no one of his plays is a complete work of art, for skepticism mars and destroys poetry. In Euripides we see poetry going over from theism to pantheism.

Aristophanes, in comic form, but with tragic earnestness, stood for the old faith in a personal godhead. But comedy could not succeed, any more than tragedy, so long as the accompanying conception of the gods as nature-powers remained uncorrected. The poet could laugh at the low anthropomorphic popular conceptions, but he could not substitute any that were essentially better. And the philosophy of Socrates and Plato was equally powerless. It led men into a pantheism farther from the true God than that to which poetry had led. Nor could Rome accomplish what Greece had failed in. The external constraint of Roman law and organization could not renew the human spirit, and

the poetry of Vergil, which makes Rome the type of divine providence, only broke down more completely the boundaries between God and nature. Horace represents an absolute humanism to which the gods are only names. He is graceful and amiable, but he is also hopeless of the future. He confesses that the Roman world, with all its external greatness, is irrecoverably corrupt and lost. Rome, as Livy had said, cannot endure either her vices or their remedies.

And so the classical poetry which has run this course confesses its own insufficiency as an expression of the truth with regard both to God and to man. Man needs not so much instruction as example. The personality of God and his distinctness from nature need to be shown by an incarnation of God in humanity. Man's freedom must be demonstrated by one in whom the law appears drawn out in living characters. Dr. Disselhoff has given to the world a new and valuable argument for the divinity of the Christian system in his elaborate demonstration from the poetry of the ante-Christian and extra-Jewish world that the humanity which is ever groping after God cannot, without special divine revelation, find him. His copious citation of passages from the poets makes this book an excellent handbook and directory for the study of the history of religion.

AUGUSTUS H. STRONG.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE IDEA OF GOD: an Enquiry into the Origins of Religion. By GRANT ALLEN. New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1897 Pp. viii + 447. $3.

"AS IT costs but little to make generalizations," says somewhere Mr. Burke, "they may as well be brilliant." Generalizations concerning the origin of the idea of God and of religion as frequently appear as Richmonds confronted Richard Third on the field of Bosworth. Totemism, androgynism, or sex relation, deification of the dead, are successively exploited as the fundamental element of religion, the genesis of the idea of God. Mr. Grant Allen attempts to rescue the ghost theory of Herbert Spencer from the discredit into which it has fallen. The form of religion is mistaken for its essence; the occasion of its manifestation is confounded with the ultimate principle. Pathology is substituted for psychology. Primitive and advanced psychology undergo a violent breach of continuity. The Aristotelian

law that the potentiality presupposes the actuality, that the idea is prior to the fact, is lost from view.

No idea of God can be evolved unless it is implicit in the primitive constitution of man. In man's capacity for the concept the self-revelation of God is found. The idea may be wrongly conditioned, may be degraded to the forms of phallic or of totemistic worship, or of deification of the dead — facts belonging to the morphology of religion — but it is an immense blunder in both logic and psychology to mistake the form of religion for its essence.

The author has read widely the works of anthropologists, without, however, contributing any original data to the study of religion.

The title of the book is *The Evolution of the Idea of God*, but on p. 19 he proposes "to show, in short, the evolution of God," an attempt too ambitious for a finite mind. This omniscience, however, is not assumed in the next sentence, in which he sets as his goal the "proof that in its origin the *concept* of a God is nothing more than that of a dead man, regarded as a still surviving ghost or spirit, and endowed with increased or supernatural qualities."

In the last sentence of the book the author expresses the belief that "corpse-worship is the protoplasm of religion," and on p. 437 hopes that he has "rehabilitated Euhemerism." Students of religion cannot share this confidence after reading the book. The confidence of the author himself seems to ooze away, and amid so much apostolic affirmation he admits that his book is "no more than a summary of probabilities" (p. 435), that he only "ventures to think (p. 436) he shall at any rate have made him (the believer in primitive animism) feel that ancestor-worship and the cult of the dead God have played a far larger and deeper part than he has hitherto been willing to admit in the genesis of religious emotions." This consciousness that he has not established his thesis restores our confidence in the author's scientific modesty.

It seems impossible to deify a dead man, unless there is embryonic in primitive consciousness a prior concept of Deity. The apotheosis of men living or dead is a secondary, not primitive, impulse. To be raised to sit with the gods presupposes gods who are higher than men. How can men come to be regarded as supernatural unless the preconceived idea of the superhuman prompts to the act of deification? The idea of God is no late accident arising from the fear of a ghost who must be securely buried and prevented from return, but a dynamic cause of the impulse to worship, even though the impulse be perverted

to the cult of the dead. To derive the idea of God from the worship of a corpse or shade is as impossible as to extract gold from lead. Even granting that from worship of the dead man advance was made to the concept of God, the enrichment of idea must be explained. Whence this sublime plus of conception? The more cannot come from the less. Involution of the idea must be prior to evolution. Nothing can come out at the end which was not in germ at the first stage of process.

"Corpse-worship," or the reverence for the ghost or shade, is a less noble form of religion than that of the Vedic adoration of the great powers of nature. Awe before the powers of nature, a sense of weakness in presence of the universe, is naïve, primitive, and ennobling. The fear of ghosts is not so. We have only to consult the lofty hymns of the Vedic rishis to see that we are here face to face with the noblest attitude of the soul. The argument that ancestor-worship was the "protoplasm" of religion is shattered against the fact of the Vedic worship of great powers discerned as agents in the phenomena of nature. Upon these, as the hymns show us, man felt his dependence as non-human and non-finite power or powers whom he did not simply fear, but whom he could love and trust, in harmony with whom he desired to live. The external world oppressed his consciousness, and impelled him to supplicate natural agents. Today we feel crushed by the grandeurs of the universe and are impelled to pray to the power, Friend, Father, whose thought and purpose are expressed in the world.

Ancient cults, sacrifices, ceremonies, are but forms of the prayer of ancient peoples to the power above and around and within them. In the contact of man's will with the external non-human will or wills is found the secret of religion. The deification of shades or ancestors is but an attempt to place man in the pantheon.

Not only were the Vedic gods shining ones, supersensible, non-human agents, at first identified with the sensible, physical phenomena of nature, but in Egypt the sun-god is most conspicuous, and *Ahura Mazda* among the Persians is clad with light. In Mesopotamia *Ana*, the "exalted one," personified heaven itself. The Chinese *Thian* is the personified heaven, and the worship of ancestors is probably a graft upon prior nature-worship. Castrén found in Siberia persons who worshiped natural objects as non-human agents, and they had never heard of sprits. Hesiod divinizes the cosmic laws, and eternal night was regarded as a goddess. Among the Finns *Ukko*, the grand-

father, supplanted *Yumâla*, place of thunder, specifically related to the firmament. Bishop Callaway tells us that among the Ana Zulu the worship of ancestors does not extend beyond the father, nor do they know the names of more remote ancestors, but they recognize a superhuman being, *Mkulukulu*, creator, first ancestor—whether a nature spirit or a progenitor promoted to be a creator, it is hard to determine. The idea, however, of a superhuman creator is clearly grasped by the religious consciousness. Réville writes that among the Polynesians the worship of nature powers or wills was here and there succeeded by the cult of the dead, but the latter hardly penetrated Micronesia. Herbert Spencer's theory that the spirits are in all cases dead men who have lost individuality and have been deified is but a partial explanation of religion, a theory against which, in a wider induction, so many facts can be alleged that an anthropologist would imperil his reputation in adopting it, as Mr. Allen does, as an adequate basis of the science of religion. A host of facts gathered from the nature peoples can be marshaled to refute Mr. Allen's contention that shades of dead men raised to supernatural dignity constitute the essence of religion. As we have already pointed out, the concept of the supernatural is prior to the impulse to exalt manes or shades to godhead, and the supernatural is but a term for the unseen power or cause. With primitive man, as well as with the modern thinker, the causal idea is the boulevard of religious intuition. The fear of the corpse or ghost postulated as the ground of the idea of God is an insult to the capacity of the primitive man.

A true psychology can never rest in the theory of necrolatry. It fails to discern that no conception of God can emerge today in the consciousness of one who kneels in Westminster Abbey which did not exist in germ in the mind of the first man. That idea in the germ has been liberated by progress, as the oak grows from the acorn. The idea of cause was as truly a possession of primitive man as of the modern scientist or metaphysician. The causal will in nature appealed to his sense of the non-finite and non-human, as today the soul of man is awed by the universe as an expression of the divine will, an other-than-human.

By a process of exclusion, facts most of which seem to reinforce the ghost theory of the idea of God are admitted and marshaled in dense array in the present book. It is obvious that any theory may be made to appear invincible by so jealous a method.

Lately Miss Gamble, with much scholarship, has collated data to

prove that the "God-idea" is based upon sex relation. To transfigure the organs of sex into sources of religious feeling is a startling and delicate undertaking. To arrive at the supreme creative power by the apotheosis of the functions of sex, however much physical passion may be exalted into sentiment in souls which are pure, is a sadly inadequate account of the psychological genesis of the idea of God. Professor Jevons, on the contrary, assigns a large place to totemism as a stage of religious development, discerning, however, prior to that stage, a monotheistic impulse, totemism being a lapse from the prior and nobler religious feeling. He has made a very valuable contribution to anthropology, and deserves the gratitude of all who are interested in the study of religion.

It is impossible not to feel that in all theories which mistake forms for the essence of religion, violence is done to the sublime spiritual and religious ideals which in man's constitution attest the divine capacity with which his Maker has endowed him, and through which God reveals himself. Man was from the first moment incurably religious, and potential in his soul were the highest conceptions of God which man shall hereafter reach. The present conception of God could never have arisen, we believe, from fear of the dead. The stream can never rise higher than its source. The total of addition can never be more than the sum of figures which compose it. The primitive concept of God must be interpreted in terms of advanced psychology. From the first stage to the last of the march of the soul through time, the soul is one. As the potency to walk is latent in the infant, so the highest concept of the character of God is implicit in man's primitive constitution, to be unfolded by the impact of the forces of nature upon his mind, and by the reaction of progressive society upon his moral sensibility.

Criticism of Mr. Allen's psychology would perhaps be out of place in this review. The tone is pontifical when he affirms: "We now know that consciousness is a function of the brain." It is true that Letourneau asserts thought is a function of nervous centers. But eminent physiologists, like Ferrier, aver that, though we can determine the exact nature of molecular changes which occur in the cerebral cell when a sensation is experienced, this brings us not an inch nearer to the explication of the fundamental nature of that which constitutes sensation. "How a physical material phenomenon in the nervous fibers or in the ganglionic cells," says Griesinger, "can become an idea, an act of consciousness, is absolutely incomprehensible." Dubois Rey-

mond ridicules the effort of Haeckel to attribute consciousness and intelligence to atoms. A strict parallelism between brain movement and mental changes cannot be shown, and that there is an exact qualitative and quantitative proportion of mind to brain-stuff is a theory under fire, and can hardly ever be established.

The author takes as depressing a view of man's chances of immortality as he does of the dignity of intellect. Naturally, the conviction of any survival of death wavers and goes out when thought is regarded as a function of the brain. On p. 46 with *sang-froid* it is declared: "We also know that consciousness ceases altogether at death, when the brain no longer functions, and that the possibility of its farther continuance is absolutely cut off by the fact of decomposition." This naïve assertion would, by its omniscience, amuse a man like John Stuart Mill, who finds no proof that the soul dies with the body.

It is obvious that Mr. Allen, deriving all the ideals of reason and morality and religion from molecular disturbance, and lowering all the sublime aspirations and convictions of the race into the vault of decomposition to perish with the body, puts out all the lights and closes the shutters of life, and cannot be regarded as having grasped the essence of religion or morality.

With such a drastic — one might add, gastric — psychology, it is not strange that one of the erring impulses of religious feeling should be enthroned in place of religion itself.

CHARLES MELLEN TYLER.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY,
Ithaca, N. Y.

CHINESE PHILOSOPHY. By DR. PAUL CARUS. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1897. Pp. 64. $0.25.

THE author gives in his introduction terse and discriminating characterizations of the "rare mixture of deep thought and idle speculations" which make up the Chinese philosophy, and in his conclusion expresses equally just opinions of China's present unhappy helplessness.

Sixty pages can suffice to give but a cursory view of all the philosophical systems that have emanated from the minds and helped mold the lives of one-fourth the human race for forty centuries, but these pages contain the result of much research and careful selection — matter valuable and suggestive. A large share of attention is given to the

elaborate system based on the interaction of the two supposed elements, *Yang* and *Yin*, the "weak" and the "strong," and to the "well-nigh inscrutable" book, the *Yih King*, "Book of Changes," that describes their permutations. In contrast with this is given the less ancient theory of the *Tai Kih*, the "Great Origin," which later philosophers claimed was the primordial source of *Yang*, *Yin*, and "myriad things."

Dr. Carus depicts vividly and comments strongly upon the evils of *Yang* and *Yin* dualism, and commends warmly the *Tai Kih* monism, making it very plain that the object of this discussion, which originally was published as an article in *The Monist*, was to put China and her philosophy on the witness-stand, dualism being defendant and monism plaintiff.

While admiring the scholarship of the author, we are convinced that as full an acquaintance with Chinese life in the concrete as he possesses of Chinese literature would lead one to question seriously his conclusions that this mystical dualism had been so potent a factor in Chinese decadence. The Chinaman is first and last a utilitarian, and that is the center of his living philosophy.

We believe Dr. Carus has chosen wisely in appealing to China for evidence. She is the world's object-lesson, and has put to the test many a theory now considered new. We may learn many a lesson from the history of her brainy people.

J. M. FOSTER.

SWATOW, CHINA.

DER NEUERE SPIRITISMUS. Von DR. JOSEPH DIPPEL. 2. Aufl. München: Rudolf Abt, 1897. Pp. 280. M. 3.60; bd., M. 4.50.

THE earnest and well-intentioned author assumes the truth and validity of the various spiritualistic performances, asserts that they are legitimate material for scientific investigation, gives a history of earlier and later spiritualism down to about 1880, relates at length the stories of American and European mediums, and fills 108 pages with the long-since exploded pretensions and exposed swindles of these individuals.

The second part of the book is a parody on scientific method. First the author considers and classifies the phenomena of spiritualism; they are of thirteen classes: (1) movement of heavy bodies by

touch, without mechanical exertion of force; (2) the production of sounds, such as rapping, snapping, etc.; (3) changes in the weight of bodies; and so on. Thereafter we have an apparently learned discussion and explanation of the materialization of spirits. Finally it is shown that the spiritualistic ideas of religion and morality do not lead us to expect them to be productive of progress. The third part is a discussion of explanatory hypotheses: the space of four dimensions, magnetism, electricity, odic force, etc.— as we observe, a regular scientific procedure. The last chapter is so important that some sentences must be quoted. "We have come to the conclusion that in spiritualism we have to do with things not entirely natural, and that much that is 'kakodemonic' or devilish shows itself therein. From this it necessarily follows that great caution is to be shown in respect to the spiritualistic manifestations." Spiritualistic revelations are direct instigations of the devil and are opposed to Christianity; it is dangerous to deal too much with the devil even in this way. Many of the Roman Catholic bishops have certified that the rapping and writing are works of the infernal serpent. The Provincial Council of Baltimore admits that it is beyond doubt that satanic power plays a part in these manifestations. Spiritualism has been condemned by the pope. The author concludes that it is highly dangerous to have anything to do with spiritualism.

The credulity and gullibility of the author exceed anything that the reviewer has ever read or heard of. It is intelligible that persons who have become involved in the Society of Psychical Research should be eager to find something to believe in after the many frauds to which they have been subjected, for there would be no reason for the existence of the society if it could not prove something positive. Hence each new clairvoyant medium is believed in until exposed — and there is nearly always a new one. But here is an apparently sane man who is opposed to spiritualism, who believes it detrimental to religion, who writes a book for the purpose of destroying its influence, and who yet accepts a mass of material, the stupidity and mendacity of which are transparent. The book does not even contain accounts of the later mediums, like Mrs. Piper, concerning whom there is still discussion and more or less interest, but, having been for the most part written in 1880, it relates little besides worn-out and exploded fakes.

E. W. SCRIPTURE.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn.

DU SURNATUREL: *Études de philosophie et d'histoire religieuses.* Par PAUL CHAPUIS. Lausanne: F. Payot, Libraire-Éditeur, 1898. Pp. 298. Fr. 3.50.

THE aim of this work appears to be to gain a clear conception of the meaning and scope of the supernatural in order to bridge the gulf between anti-religious scientists on the one side and anti-scientific religionists on the other, with the purpose finally to establish the author's own view of the Christian religion. The method employed is that of analysis and exact definition of the notions: nature, law, divine activity in the world, religion.

The introduction points out that there are in human experience two categories of facts absolutely distinct: the phenomenal reality objectively observed and accounted for, and the supernatural, which is an inner experience or assurance of the human spirit; the attempt to explain one of these in terms of the other produces confusion and an injury to the spirit of piety. It is in the interest of religion that the problem of the supernatural, which itself is just religion, should be clearly stated and solved. This problem is then discussed under three forms: the philosophical, the historical, and the religious.

The prodigies which have been connected with all religions are accounted for as efforts of the human spirit to exhibit its consciousness and certainty of the divine activity in the world. But the mental state which is the basis of all scientific activity necessarily interprets these same "events" as normal effects of the universal causality in nature. The stability of nature is also at bottom the necessary implication of all moral action in the world and, under the form of the divine faithfulness, of religious faith. That this conception of law has become a part of our conscious mental make-up today is evidenced by the various apologetic, self-contradictory representations of the miracle as an objective fact supernatural in origin and yet somehow grounded in nature. The reality which imparts apparent value to such apologies is the true supernatural, the communion of the human spirit with God, the source of its being and of the being of the world; and this — not some objective transformation of nature, not some external communication — is just what redemption and revelation finally mean.

Accordingly the author treats the miracles of the Bible as on a level with other miracles, so far as historical accuracy goes; they, like the others, are creations which have grown up around a great personality; only in the case of those which gather round Jesus of Nazareth the personality possesses an immeasurable superiority to all others; for

in him is perfectly realized the communion of man with God ; and in the testimony which these accounts bear to the impression which Jesus made upon men lies their value.

But the religion of Jesus Christ — by which the author means, not the religion which has its center and source in his person, but that attitude of entire dependence on God, perfect trust in God, of which he was the perfect type — is the very opposite of the religion of miracles.

The book possesses great literary finish, and is written in a most interesting style. The author is more at home in science than in theology, and his many assumptions in the latter sphere are rather remarkable. For instance, he quietly asserts, without proof, that our conception of Jesus Christ would be unchanged were the miracles to disappear, while everybody knows that the accounts which we possess of him have all come down to us from persons who believed that he performed miraculous works. How can anyone prove that the possession of miraculous powers is not an integral portion of the description of his person ? The miracle still awaits adequate treatment.

The author's dependence on Strauss and Schleiermacher is very evident ; but, unlike the latter, he seems to have eviscerated the Christian religion of all other content than that of dependence on God. What he would do with sin, guilt, and salvation therefrom, does not appear.

GEORGE CROSS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN.

GENESIS. Erklärt von LIC. DR. H. HOLZINGER, Stadtpfarrer in Münsingen (Württemberg). Mit einer Abbildung. (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament. Abteilung I.) Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen : Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1898. Pp. xxx + 278. Subscriptionspreis, M. 4.50; Einzelpreis, M. 6.

THIS book is strictly true to the aim of the series, viz., to publish a commentary on the Old Testament, prepared from the historico-religious point of view. Faithful to this principle, the author, who has been known for some years by his elaborate book, *Einleitung in den Hexateuch* (1893), has written a commentary on Genesis, in which he seeks to interpret the book from this historico-religious point of view and to determine the value of the records which it contains, not for the biblical theology of the Old Testament, but for the history of Old

Testament religion. In his concise and well-written introduction he discusses the contents of the Hexateuch, and of Genesis in particular, and the testimony of the Hexateuch itself as to its author. He gives also a brief history of the criticism of the Hexateuch, and characterizes the documents J, E, and P, which appear in the book of Genesis; and last, and best of all, he presents in tabular form the division of the book of Genesis among the documents J, E, and P, with careful analysis of J^1 and J^2 in chaps. 4–11.

The distinguishing characteristic of the commentary proper is that, instead of following the order of the Massoretic text in his exposition, the author discusses independently the narratives of the two principal documents, the priestly and the prophetic. We thus have the interpretation of the story of the flood as preserved by P and as preserved by J, of the history of Abraham as told by P and as told by JE. The stories of Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph are examined in the same way.

In his treatment of the text Dr. Holzinger is by no means an extremist, and in his purely philological and grammatical interpretation he is guided by sound exegetical principles. These facts, together with the frequent references to the grammar and lexicon, will serve to make his book very helpful to the student.

But it is in his discussion of the significance of the separate narratives, and of the primeval history and of the history of the patriarchs as a whole, as well as in his keen eye for interpolations and later additions, that the author proves himself to be an ardent adherent of the newest school of criticism. In these discussions he does not, it is true, make any strikingly original contributions to the subject, but he does lay all students under a debt of gratitude to him for his careful and systematic application to the book of Genesis of the work of his predecessors and teachers, the most prominent of whom are, if we may judge from his references, Budde, Stade, and Wellhausen.

It is not possible, with the space at our disposal, to indicate Dr. Holzinger's interpretation of the various narratives. A few examples will suffice to show in a general way his position. With regard to P's narrative of the creation "myth," he agrees with Gunkel in holding that it was not directly borrowed from the Babylonians, but that it must have come into Israel by way of Egypt and Phœnicia (p. 22). The origin of the paradise "saga" cannot be determined, but with Wellhausen he suggests the possibility that it may have originated in Arabia and come into Israel by way of Damascus, and that it could not have taken its present form in Israel until after the people had passed from

the nomadic to a settled mode of life. In the narratives of the primeval history, as already intimated, he recognizes the presence of two Yahwistic currents, which, with Budde, he calls J^1 and J^2. With Budde, too, he regards J^2 as the principal narrative, but under the influence of Stade he doubts the unity of the so-called J^1, and suggests that the principal narrative may have been enriched by the addition of a number of older, independent "sagas" (p. 122). With regard to the patriarchal history, he denies absolutely that Israel was ever in Canaan before the Egyptian sojourn, and in general holds that these "sagas" have a historical worth only as they contain dim recollections of the origin of the various tribes and of the nation as a whole. In the interpretation of most of the names which occur in the patriarchal history as tribal names, and in the view that Abraham was the latest figure to be added to the group of the patriarchs, he agrees with E. Meyer, Stade, and Wellhausen, though he regards it as at least conceivable that back of the tribes may lie individual personalities who have given their names to these tribes (pp. 267–71).

The foregoing exposition of the purpose and contents of the book renders a detailed criticism unnecessary. Holzinger has succeeded admirably in his task, and has given us a clear and comprehensive statement of what the school of criticism to which he belongs regards the book of Genesis to be, namely, a collection of stories or "sagas" of no historical value, or, at the best, of the very slightest historical value, and, indeed, so far as the patriarchal stories are concerned, with the exception of the story of Joseph, worthless for purposes of religious instruction. Of revelation in the proper sense of the term there is not a trace. This commentary is simply and solely a species of historical literature, devoted to the examination of the historical and religious significance of one of the documents of the ancient Hebrew literature. Biblical scholars who still believe in a proper revelation may criticise the philosophical presuppositions of the author, but all must unite in congratulating him upon the successful accomplishment of his purpose.

An index of passages relieves the difficulty which might be occasioned by the treatment of the book according to documents rather than in the traditional order, and an excellent topical index increases the value of the commentary as a work of reference.

The typography of the book is excellent, but the proof-reading is not all that could be desired, especially in the matter of the Scripture citations.

WALTER R. BETTERIDGE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

DAS BUCH DER RICHTER. Erklärt von D. KARL BUDDE, ord. Professor der Theologie in Strassburg i. E. (Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament, Lieferung 3.) Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1897. Pp. xxiv + 148. Subscriptionspreis, M. 2.50; Einzelpreis, M. 3.60.

THE preparation of the commentary on Judges in the new series which Professor Marti is editing could not have been committed to better hands than Professor Budde's. His articles in Stade's *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentlische Wissenschaft* in 1887 and 1888, included with other studies in the volume *Richter und Samuel*, 1890, opened the investigation of the sources of the pre-deuteronomic history of the Judges — for Schrader's noteworthy analysis (1869) passed unnoticed — and put forward a hypothesis of the composition of the book about which subsequent discussion has chiefly turned. Various reviews in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung* and elsewhere show that he has followed attentively all the stages of this investigation and discussion. In the present commentary full account is made of the recent critical and exegetical literature,[1] as well as of new works in archæology and geography which serve to elucidate or illustrate the text.

Professor Budde has not materially changed his general view of the composition of the book. In the introduction (2:6—3:6) he now discovers a deuteronomistic hand distinct from the chief deuteronomic editor and earlier in time; but does not try to demonstrate a double deuteronomic redaction throughout the book. Kittel and Frankenberg have not led him to retract his opinion that the pre-deuteronomic Judges was the work of Rje (*ca.* 650), and its two chief sources J and E. But he properly says that those who hold this view do not, as Kittel assumes, mean to affirm that the author of the parts of Judges ascribed to J is the same individual man who wrote the Jahvistic patriarchal stories in Genesis. They use the signature J for the oldest Hebrew history book, the work of a succession of writers who, beginning in the tenth century with the history of the establishment of the kingdom, gradually ascended to the earlier times, and eventually — but not in one generation, nor perhaps in one century — produced a comprehensive history from the creation.

[1] Besides printed books, of which my *Judges* ("International Critical Commentary") receives generous recognition, Budde had the use of a manuscript work of Holzinger on Judg. 2:6—16:31, to which he acknowledges indebtedness for many acute suggestions.

In the analysis of the stories of Gideon and Abimelech (6–8, 9) Budde recognizes, with other recent critics, that chap. 9 is composite, and that antecedents of 8:4–21 are interwoven in 6:1—8:3; one version of the stratagem in 7:16–20 originally belonged to the account of the attack on the camp of Midian east of the Jordan (8:11), as Winckler suggested; the simplest hypothesis is that J and E here related entirely different victories of Gideon-Jerubaal, but contamination in tradition is possible.

In the story of Jephthah also (10:17—12:7) he finds, as others have done, two strands, and regards as highly probable the ingenious conjecture of Holzinger that one of these narrated a campaign of Jephthah against the Ammonites, the other against the Moabites. The long diplomatic communication, 11:12–28, which former critics have generally ascribed to an editor, belonged to the latter source (E); the contradiction which now exists between its contents and its address is due to maladroit harmonizing by the redactor who combined the two.

Mention should also be made of the analysis of the very difficult chaps. 19–21, as an example of the acumen and methodical tact of the author.

The Hebrew text of Judges is unusually well preserved, but it is not impeccable, and in many places the versions or a happy conjecture enable us to correct it. Professor Budde has applied a sound judgment to the emendations which have been proposed before him, and has added some felicitous ones of his own. In chap. 5, where for several verses together the text has suffered very badly, he is more sanguine of the possibility of restoration than I can be; but his proposals are sobriety itself compared with some more recent reconstructions.

I have spoken, at perhaps too great length, of the critical side of this volume. Let me dispel the impression—if I have thus created it—that it occupies a correspondingly disproportionate place in the book itself. In a commentary criticism is properly only the handmaid of exegesis, and so it is here. The exegetical part of the work is admirably done. Help is given where help is needed; and though very concise, the explanation is no less clear. The history of exegesis is excluded by the plan of the series, but the views of recent interpreters receive ample notice.

Altogether the volume solves in a very satisfactory way the difficult problem of a commentary, in small compass, of thoroughly scientific character, and adapted to the special needs of pastors and students.

The mechanical part of the work deserves high commendation; a typographical scheme which brings out clearly the excellent disposition of the matter, a clear open page, an analytical table of contents, and an index, are aids to the use of the book which publishers too seldom think it worth while to provide, but which readers cannot fail to appreciate.

GEORGE F. MOORE.

ANDOVER, MASS.

DIE EBED-JAHWE LIEDER IM II. TEIL DES JESAIA, exegetisch-kritisch u. biblisch-theologisch untersucht. Von LIC. THEOL. DR. L. LAUE, Hülfsprediger am königl. Prediger-Seminar zu Wittenberg. Wittenberg: P. Wunschmann, 1898. Pp. 74. M. 1.20.

SINCE the appearance of Duhm's commentary, *Das Buch Jesaja*, in 1892, in which he pointed out the probable separate existence of the so-called "Ebed-Jahwe Lieder" in Deutero-Isaiah (viz., 42 : 1–7; 49 : 1–6; 50 : 4–11; 52 : 13—53 : 12—four songs concerning the Servant of Jehovah), an unusual amount of study has been given to the possibility of this hypothesis. Martin Schian, in an inaugural dissertation (1894) entitled *Die Ebed-Jahwe Lieder in Jes. 40–66*, discussed the question fully and arrived at the conclusion that these "Servant of Jehovah Songs" are not the work of the chief author (p. 57). Cheyne, in his *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895, arrived at a similar conclusion (p. 246).

In the work before us, Dr. Laue has gone over the evidence again, and likewise concludes that the so-called "Ebed-Jahwe Lieder" (excepting 50 : 4 ff.) are to be separated from the body of the book as foreign elements, and on the following grounds: (1) The Servant who appears in them is anonymous, without identification, and different from 41 : 8, etc.; (2) the contents of the songs (except chap. 50) in case they are Deutero-Isaiah's would be utterly incongruous with the theological preconceptions of the author; (3) the songs are complete in themselves, having a definite plan of their own, and form "a book within a book," and are consequently to be separated from the context; (4) the songs have no connection with their surroundings; and the manner in which they are incorporated into the context is obvious through the interpolations accompanying them (*cf.* 42 : 5, etc.). A further proof that they are not genuine is evident from the conception of the Servant of Jehovah in these poems; he is here an indi-

vidual, not a personification, of the people of Israel (pp. 73, 74). Laue fixes the date of their incorporation into the main text as *after* the time of Ezra (not, as Duhm, *before*), *i. e.*, in late post-exilic times (p. 72). The fifty-third chapter, he feels, is only explicable when it is supposed to have had its origin in a period in which the three most burning questions of post-exilic Judaism were abroad: viz., sacrifice in the sense of the Priest codex, theodicy in the sense of the "Servant" psalms, and Messianic expectation.

Laue's discussion is an earnest attempt to solve one of the most difficult problems in the whole range of Old Testament prophecy. He agrees with Cheyne that all the Servant passages are, properly speaking, independent of their present contexts, but denies that they were inserted by Deutero-Isaiah himself. His discussion shows many signs of independent judgment, and is consequently of independent worth in the world of critical literature. Most readers will agree with the author that the subject of the *Ebed*-passages is an *individual* (p. 54).

GEORGE L. ROBINSON.

THE MCCORMICK SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

EXAMEN CRITIQUE DE L'HISTOIRE DU SANCTUAIRE DE L'ARCHE. Dissertation présentée à la faculté de théologie de l'université de Louvain pour l'obtention du grade de docteur. Par H. A. POELS. Tome I. Louvain: J. Van Linthout; Leiden: Brill, 1897. Pp. xiv + 422.

THIS lengthy dissertation is the first volume of a critical examination of the history of the Hebrew tabernacle. It covers the investigation from the conquest of Canaan to the time of the building of Solomon's temple. The general purpose of the writer is to show that the central sanctuary was an established feature of the national cult during this whole period, and that its history can be traced. The location of this sanctury changed at least once after being established at Shiloh, but there was never more than one recognized national sanctuary at a time. The habit of villagers to offer their everyday sacrifices on the altars convenient to them was undoubted; the existence of rival sanctuaries, such as that of Gideon at Ophrah (Judg. 8:27) and of Bochim (Judg. 2:5), is unquestioned, as well as the deliberate act of David in removing the ark to Jerusalem. Moreover, that God could be freely consulted wherever there was a priest with an ephod

(1 Sam. 14:18; 23:6, 9), and that private persons set up sanctuaries of their own (Judg. 17:5), are well-attested facts. Nevertheless the nation as a whole had but one widely recognized sanctuary, and to it the people were reasonably loyal.

This interesting thesis is supported by an ingenious and detailed examination of every passage in Joshua, Judges, and the books of Samuel that in any way bears upon the theme. The first set of facts to be explained away are the apparently clear references to legitimate national sanctuaries, prior to the time of Saul, at Shechem (Josh. 24:25, 26), Mizpah (Judg. 20:1; 21:8), and at Bethel (Judg. 20:26–28), as well as many references to one at Shiloh (Josh. 18:1; 21:2; Judg. 18:31; 21:19). Those as Ophrah and Bochim can fairly be ignored as illegitimate or temporary. Poels transforms the four sanctuaries into one by reading Shiloh for Shechem (with the aid of a version or two), and by translating *Ham-Mizpah* as "the hill" or "high-place," and Bethel as "the house of God," Shiloh being the actual locality in both instances. Shiloh, thus, from the conquest (Josh. 18:1) until the capture of the ark by the Philistines, was the only national sanctuary of which we have any record.

In the times of Samuel, Saul, and David the recognized sanctuaries seem very numerous. Language which could only be applied to a consecrated place is used in reference to Kiriathjearim, Nob, Gibeon, Ham-Mizpah, and Hag-Gilgal. The last three are unquestionably established sanctuaries of national significance (1 Sam. 10:17; 11:15; 15:33; 1 Kings 3:4). Because of the expression "before Jehovah" in 1 Sam. 21:9, probably Gibeah of Saul (21:6) should be added to the list. Poels reduces these six localities to what is practically one. Nob was the priestly settlement on the sacred hill (*Ham-Mizpah* or *Hag-Gilgal*) of the city of Gibeon. Gibeah of Saul is merely "Saul's hill" and refers to the same locality, although not probably to the same eminence. Kiriathjearim is another suburb of Gibeon, practically identical with Nob, so that the term "priests of Gibeon" would be synonymous with "men of Kiriathjearim." All this is the result of a very detailed argument. Poels fills out the religious history of the period as follows: When the ark was returned from Philistia, it was brought up to Kiriathjearim-Gibeon, because the sons of Ithamar (Eli's family) were but children and could not serve at the sanctuary, and because the sons of Eleazar, another priestly family (1 Sam. 7:1), lived at Gibeon. The tabernacle followed, and Gibeon-Kiriathjearim-Nob, etc., became the national sanctuary— not a neglected,

but a well-frequented one. In Saul's time the Ithamarites, perhaps under the patronage of Samuel and Saul, had regained their ancient prominence and were in charge of the sanctuary. In a fit of jealous fury Saul had them massacred (Abiathar alone escaping) and reinstated the Eleazarites. When David removed the ark to Jerusalem, he put it in charge of Abiathar, leaving the tabernacle at Gibeon in charge of Zadok.

Such a thesis as the above involves many interesting correlated questions, which are minutely discussed by the scholarly author. He opposes the view that the ark was ever removed from the tabernacle except for an extraordinary cause, arguing that 1 Sam. 4 : 3 f. and 2 Sam. 15 : 24 are each quite exceptional, and that 2 Sam. 11 : 11, etc., is quite indecisive. It was not a movable "palladium," so far as our testimony goes, but a carefully guarded and greatly venerated symbol of the divine presence. Poels thinks that he clearly proves that the idea of the central sanctuary of the nation did not originate after the period of the Judges, and that it must consequently be referred back to a Mosaic origin. He holds that the facts also prove beyond question that in any village where Israelites dwelt they were accustomed to worship Jehovah freely at the village altar, and that this private worship was wholly legitimate at the time, not antagonized by existing law. He claims two interesting results of his investigation in the field of biblical history. One is that the ark had no prolonged period of obscurity until David rescued it. The other is that Saul was as religious a man in his way as David himself. He claims two other results in the field of literary criticism. The first is that he succeeds in making legitimate and proper the references of the Chronicler to the ark and tabernacle. The other is that literary criticism furnishes a natural explanation of the apparent confusion of names for the sanctuary. Of the different sources recognized as being drawn upon by the compiler of Samuel each one has its own name for the hill of the national cult.

Poels' discussion is very detailed. His methods are perfectly legitimate. He is in hearty sympathy with the fairly established results of literary criticism. His work traverses the conclusions of many recent historical critics, his own point of view being distinctly conservative. He assumes, for instance, without discussion that the conquest of Canaan was the result of an agressive national movement which implied and fostered a national unity. His theory cannot be fairly criticised until the whole discussion is in, but this volume may be

heartily commended as a scholarly attempt to unify the many apparently discordant traditions regarding a subject of the first importance.

YALE UNIVERSITY. F. K. SANDERS.

LECTURES ON ECCLESIASTES. By the VERY REV. GEORGE GRANVILLE BRADLEY, D.D., Dean of Westminster. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; London and New York: Henry Frowde, 1898. Pp. viii + 200. 5s. 6d.

THE student of the Wisdom literature is indebted to the dean of Westminster Abbey for a suggestive book upon Ecclesiastes. Of "the seven puzzling books of the Bible," this one presents a most hopeless enigma to the average Occidental, mainly because he demands a logical and literary unity which is not in the writing. Dean Bradley's ten lectures are of less value to the critical student of the original text than to the homilist who is preparing for the pulpit. In recent years, Ginsburg, Cox, Wright, and Dean Plumptre, in Great Britain, have opened for the benefit of the reader of English the treasures of Koheleth. With these works, as well as with those of Renan, Graetz, Ewald, Hitzig, and Reuss, Dean Bradley has made himself familiar. It is, however, from the point of view of an independent student that he presents his meditations upon the text, in true conservative English style. He does not go into questions of either the higher or the lower criticism, but starts at once to correlate the wisdom of this mysterious author with that of great thinkers who have used the English language both in poetry and in prose, and also to apply the ancient Hebrew wisdom to the life and problems of today. The dean is especially felicitous, we think, in treating of those proverbs which are numerously imbedded in the text of Koheleth. Now that a second edition is out we welcome it as a help to the expository preacher who has the faith and courage to explore the text of this Hebrew debater, who has lost hope, but cannot let go of God because he believes God is righteous. There is plenty of material, we think, both in the original preacher and his latest commentator, for the edification of Christians as well as for their intellectual stimulus. The text of the Revised Version has been placed in the front of each chapter, but there is little or no revision of the first edition. The number of pages is thus increased, but the type seems to be sharper and clearer than in the old edition.

WILLIAM

ITHACA, N. Y.

NEUE BIBELSTUDIEN. Sprachgeschichtliche Beiträge, zumeist aus den Papyri und Inschriften, zur Erklärung des Neuen Testaments. Von LIC. THEOL. G. ADOLF DEISSMANN, Pfarrer und Lehrer am Kgl. Theologischen Seminar zu Herborn. Mit einer Abbildung im Text. Marburg: N. G. Elwert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897. Pp. viii + 109. M. 2.80.

THIS work, as its name implies, is a continuation of the author's valuable contribution to the study of the Greek Bible, *Bibelstudien*, published in 1895. In his earlier work the author, now professor in the university at Heidelberg, maintains the thesis that the language of the Greek Bible is not a unity in itself. It is but a portion, as far as the language is concerned, of the literature of its day. However great interest may center in it on account of its contents and their worth to mankind, it would be wrong for the student of language, and for the interpreter as well, to consider its language as something apart, and not to study it in the light that is thrown upon it by thought as expressed in the language of the time.

What Deissmann in his earlier work did for the Greek Bible he seeks to do for the New Testament in his later. Believing that existing lexicons of the Greek New Testament have proceeded upon the wrong method above stated, he has begun on a broader basis, and has studied its language in the light, not only of the classical authors, but in that of the many inscriptions and papyri which are being continually unearthed. These studies he hopes will lead up to a dictionary of the New Testament which will be based on the true scientific method.

Deissmann starts in each case with Wilke's *Clavis* in the editions of Grimm and Thayer, and with Cremer's *Biblical Theological Dictionary of New Testament Greek*, and compares the use of words and phrases as found in the inscriptions and papyri with their use as determined by the lexicons. He finds much that is enlightening for the study of the New Testament and much that is contrary to the statements of the lexicons. The cause of this latter is that the lexicographers, especially Cremer, have gone to work with the canon that Christianity possessed a special power in the formation of a language, which canon is a fetter to all scientific research. The lexicon should start with the question: In how far have we points of connection for single words and ideas in the use of the age? Whereas Cremer asks: In how far does the Christian use differ from the heathen? In doubtful cases one should

be content with the ordinary use, instead of seeking in every case to see therein something especially Christian or biblical.

For the material presented in this volume, Deissmann has worked over the collections of inscriptions of Pergamon and of the islands of the Ægean Sea, and the papyrus publications of the Egyptian documents at Berlin, and the papyri of the archduke Rainer. This grouping of sources is not arbitrary, since they come from Asia Minor and Egypt, which countries had more influence than others on Greek Christianity.

By going over this material our author finds much that is valuable. Results are gathered under three heads: I, "Orthography;" II, "Morphology and Etymology;" III, "Lexicography and Syntax." Under the first head, (1) "Change of Vowels" and (2) "Change of Consonants" are briefly treated; under the second the author discusses (1) "Declension," (2) "Proper Names," (3) "The Verb." The main part of the work, however, is devoted to the third head, which contains six sections, as follows: (1) "So-called Hebraisms," (2) "So-called Jewish-Greek," "biblical," *i. e.*, "New Testament," words and constructions; (3) "Common Greek," with so-called "biblical," *i. e.*, "New Testament," special meaning or construction; (4) "Technical Expressions," (5) "Frequently Recurring Phrases," and (6) "Rarer Words, Meanings, and Constructions."

Such words as ἀναστρέφομαι, "to conduct oneself," ἐρωτάω, in the sense of "beg" or "pray," καθαρὸς ἀπό τινος, and ὄνομα for "person" are shown not to be Hebraisms, as is claimed by the lexicons, but to be found in the common language of the time.

Among the words which are by the lexicons considered as "Jewish-Greek," "biblical," that is to say, "New Testament," words and constructions, but which Deissmann thinks belonged to the language of the day are such as ἀγάπη, ἀκατάγνωστος, ἐάν, εἰ (εἰ?) μήν, ἐλαιών, ἐνώπιον, ἐπιούσιος, ἱερατεύω, καθαρίζω, νεόφυτος, κυριακός, ὀφειλή, προσευχή, and others. Among those words which have been considered as having a special meaning or construction in the New Testament, which have, however, the same meaning or construction in the common Greek of the time, we find ἀντίληψις, ἀρεσκεία, ἐπιθυμητής, ἱλάσκομαι, λικμάω, λούω, πάροικος.

The meaning of such technical phrases as ἀθέτησις, ἡ βεβαίωσις, τὸ ἐπιβάλλον μέρος, ἐπίσκοπος, θεολόγος, πλῆθος, πρός τινα, πρεσβύτερος, υἱοθεσία, χάραγμα is lit up by comparison with their use in the other documents of the time.

Many of the phrases which are used in the New Testament are also found in the inscriptions and papyri, such as ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων ἀνέμων, ἀξίως τοῦ θεοῦ, ἐμμένω (ἐν) πᾶσι τοῖς γεγραμμένοις, καθὼς γέγραπται, δεξιὰν δίδωμι, μετὰ πάσης προθυμίας, τὸ αὐτὸ φρονεῖν, etc.

Certain rare words, meanings, and constructions are found in the early documents with the same use as in the New Testament, such as ἄδολος, ἀπόκριμα, βαστάζω (John 6:12), δοκίμιος, κακοπαθία, κατάκριμα, τόπος, etc.

To all who, whether they agree with Deissmann's thesis or not, are interested in a better understanding of the New Testament and the Septuagint these two books, *Bibelstudien* and *Neue Bibelstudien*, will be a great help as well as an incentive to further study.

HAMILTON FORD ALLEN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SYNOPSE DER DREI ERSTEN EVANGELIEN. Bearbeitet von A. HUCK, Pfarrer in Postdorf. Zweite, durch einen Anhang vermehrte Auflage. Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898. Pp. xvi + 101. M. 3.

DIE SYNOPTISCHEN PARALLELEN und ein alter Versuch ihrer Enträtselung mit neuer Begründung. Von LIC. THEOL. CARL VEIT, Pastor in Siegersdorf. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1897. 2 vols. Pp. vii + 212; iv + 162; 8vo. M. 7.

SYNOPSE DER DREI ERSTEN KANONISCHEN EVANGELIEN, mit Parallelen aus dem Johannes-Evangelium. Bearbeitet von REINHOLD HEINEKE. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xix + 196, large 8vo. M. 3.

THE second edition of Huck's *Synopse* differs from the first in the addition of four appendices; the first giving a list of the Old Testament quotations in the synoptic gospels; the second, a list of the Johannine parallels to the synoptists; the third, the text of the so-called *Doubletten*, that is, practically, parallels in the synoptists which do not appear in the body of the synopsis; the fourth, additions to and corrections of the variant readings given in the body of the book. These considerably enhance the value of what was already one of the best, if not the very best, of the arrangements of the text of the synoptists for the study of the "synoptic problem." The third appendix is particularly useful, at the same time that its presence is a confession of a defect in the book itself. The parallels given in this appendix ought all to appear in the pages of the book itself.

Veit's work is another attempt to present the Greek text of the synoptic gospels in a form facilitating their comparison, coupled with an argument in favor of the *Traditions-Hypothese* or oral-gospel theory, as advocated by Gieseler in 1818. In Part I we have an arrangement of the Greek text of such portions of the gospels as appear in similar form in two or three of them, the parts peculiar to any one being omitted. The sections common to all three gospels are arranged in the order of Mark, those common to Matthew and Luke being inserted at the point indicated by Matthew. The method adopted for facilitating comparison is not that of parallel columns, as in Huck and most gospel harmonies, but parallel lines running across the page, ditto marks instead of repetition of the text being employed to indicate identity, the rare agreements of Matthew and Luke against Mark being indicated by *. Light lines across the page enable the eye to see at a glance what lines of the text are in parallelism. This arrangement of the text is very convenient for the study of the verbal parallelisms. It is, of course, of little help in the study of the method of construction of the several gospels as respects order of sections, etc., especially as the portions peculiar to each gospel are wholly omitted. A few pages of tables at the end exhibiting the facts in this respect would have added greatly to the value of the book. Part II contains a sketch of the history of synoptic theories from Gieseler to Wetzel, to which is added a convenient collection of extracts from Volkmar, Weiss, Holtzmann, showing how these different scholars deal with the same facts; an argument, based on the existence of the Jewish traditional law, for the possibility of a similar Christian tradition concerning the words and deeds of Jesus, and finally an endeavor to show that there are traces of this oral tradition in our synoptic gospels.

In the course of the discussion of the possibility of a Christian tradition, the author takes occasion to object to the common assertion that Jesus took no pains to have his words preserved, maintaining not only that this is antecedently improbable, but that the exact preservation of many of Jesus' sayings which were evidently understood imperfectly or not at all can be accounted for only on the supposition that Jesus had verbally taught them to his disciples. This suggestion is certainly worthy of consideration, and the *a posteriori* argument for it has a sound basis. The weight of the author's thesis must, however, rest on his last argument, to the effect that our gospels show traces of the alleged basal tradition, which, by the way, Veit maintains, did not include the infancy narrative, but began with John the Baptist, and

ended with the visit of the women to the tomb on Easter morning. The germaneness of most of his evidence none will deny; the question is what it means. In Veit's judgment, the differences of the evangelists are greater than could arise in a case of documentary relationship, while the resemblances only prove the fixed character of the tradition. To other men the resemblances seem too close to be produced by tradition, while the differences only show the freedom with which the authors used their sources. Apparently there is no way to get beyond this deadlock, except by carefully observing in other works, the relation of which can be determined, the degree of resemblance produced by oral and documentary relationship respectively, and thus forming some objective basis of judgment. The only part of Veit's argument that seems wholly convincing is that in which he points out the inconsistency between the facts respecting the differences of the evangelists and the doctrinal tendencies sometimes alleged to characterize our gospels. Veit is apparently unacquainted with the modified oral-gospel theories of Abbott and Wright.

In Heineke's *Synopse* we have still another effort to present the text of the synoptists in a form convenient for the study of their mutual relation and sources. Like Veit, the author employs lines horizontally parallel, instead of vertically parallel columns, and instead of printing the text in full, leaving the student to discern resemblances and differences for himself, as Huck does, or indicating them by colors, as Rushbrooke does, he uses devices similar to those of Veit for indicating that the second and third accounts have the same words as the first. Unlike Veit, he includes the whole of all three gospels; indeed, some portions are included more than once. The book is divided into three parts, Part I containing Mark and its parallels, Part II Luke with the parallels in Matthew, Part III the portions of Matthew not already exhibited in Parts I and II, to which, however, there is added material like that of the Sermon on the Mount, the parallelism of which with Luke's material is such as to suggest a different recension, the Luke parallels being also repeated in this case. The plan has manifest advantages, and the book is a valuable addition to our synoptic apparatus. While the test of continuous use of the book must determine its precise value, it does not seem as yet that the change from parallel columns to parallel lines across the page is a wise one. A modification of Huck's work in the direction of more careful "justification" of lines to indicate parallelism and by a better arrangement of sections would produce a more usable book than either Heineke or the present Huck.

The addition of the Johannine parallels is a valuable feature of Heineke's book.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SAINT PAUL. Ses dernières années. Par L'ABBÉ C. FOUARD, professeur honoraire à la Faculté de Théologie de Rouen. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 90 rue Bonaparte, 1897. Pp. xii +426. Fr. 7.50.

IN his latest volume upon *Les Origines de l'Église*, Abbé Fouard discusses the history contemporaneous with the life of Paul from the beginning of his imprisonment at Rome until the destruction of Jerusalem. The volume is written in the author's customary graceful style, and is characterized by a generous classical and patristic learning, but by an almost unbroken silence as to the questions raised and discussed in recent works. The volume makes, therefore, little or no contribution to our knowledge of these enigmatic years, but repeats traditional views — a characteristic that almost attains the height of absurdity (p. 256, note), when it is said that the book of Enoch contains some of the authentic words of Enoch, and that the Holy Spirit revealed to Jude not only these words, but those that were authentic in *Assumptio Mosis* as well! (p. 257).

Nevertheless, there are certain points upon which one is interested to have the author's opinions. As one would expect, Abbé Fouard holds to the second imprisonment of Paul, his release occurring in 64 A. D. (p. 113) and his death with Peter, June 29, 67 (p. 331). Between the two imprisonments he visited Spain (p. 113) — an opinion the author justifies by an appeal to the customary authorities and the concessions of Renan (p. 115, note), and probably France, which thus became "ce qu'elle reste encore aujourd'hui, une terre d'apôtres, la nation très chrétienne" (p. 115). Pushing aside in a contemptuous footnote (p. 116) the recent discussions as to Acts, Abbé Fouard holds that the book was written by Luke in Rome at the close of Paul's first imprisonment, just as he was leaving for Spain (p. 118).

The author's discussion as to the existence of general persecutions under Nero and Domitian, which he thinks (contrary to Mommsen) to have been certain (p. 177), leads to his treatment of first and second Peter, the authenticity of which he accepts, again without question, although noting the resemblances between them and Ephesians and Romans (p. 187), and their superiority to the speeches accredited to

Peter in the Acts (p. 199). The epistle to the Hebrews is assigned to Barnabas, although its final words are from Paul, under whose influence it was composed. The other catholic epistles are accredited the persons whose names they bear, without discussion.

By far the most marked characteristic of this volume is its liberal spirit. Abbé Fouard is a member of the Roman Catholic church, and the volume contains the "approbation" of the archbishop of Rouen, but despite its obvious sympathies (as they appear in the chapter upon the episcopate), his work is marked by an interest in all the elements in the history he is writing. His views, even of the episcopate, are not those we have learned to expect from writers within his church, and as regards the traditional identifications in Rome, like that of S. Maria in Via Lata with the home of Paul, as well as regards the *Domine quo vadis* legend, and the belief that Luke painted a picture of Jesus, are healthily skeptical. Altogether the volume is worthy to stand with the others of its author, as a learned, stimulating, sympathetic, and uncritical study of Paul's life.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

KRITISCH-EXEGETISCHER KOMMENTAR ÜBER DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Begründet von H. A. W. MEYER. *Der Brief des Jacobus* von WILLIBALD BEYSCHLAG. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. 6. Auflage. Pp. iv + 237. M. 3.40.

THE interest in the study of the epistle of James lies rather in its criticism than in its exegesis, and the interest in its criticism gathers largely around two questions: (1) as to the time when the letter was written, with its bearing upon the relation to Pauline doctrine of the famous faith-and-works passage in the second chapter; and (2) as to the author of the letter, with its bearing upon the James referred to in Gal. 1 : 19, and inferentially upon the comprehensiveness of the apostolate in the early church.

The former of these two questions Beyschlag answers by locating the readers of the epistle in southern Syria and by placing the composition of the epistle before any Gentile evangelization had taken place in the region where the readers were. This naturally gives the epistle a very early date. It puts it into the first part of the Gentile mission work which extended out from Antioch—if not before that work had been formulated sufficiently to leave Antioch at all. This position Beyschlag holds to be clearly established from the epistle itself.

He claims the letter shows, not only that the readers are Jewish Christians of the diaspora, but that the Gentile element in the region where they were had not yet been Christianized — not even missionized. The epistle makes no mention of Gentile Christians associated with the readers, and this could not be the case if there were Gentile Christians in their communities, at least in any considerable numbers; since the brotherhood spirit so characteristic of Christianity would have brought Gentile and Jew together in their church life, and their mingled presence would have betrayed itself in any such pastoral epistle as ours was.

But regions of the diaspora in which such a condition of affairs could have obtained are admittedly few in number. The one altogether most likely, and the only one, in fact, for which actual evidence can be had, is this southern part of Syria, between Antioch and Galilee, which Beyschlag suggests. This neighboring country to Palestine was largely populated by Jews, who maintained a pronounced synagogal life; among its people Jesus himself had worked, and into its towns and villages, to a certain extent, he had carried his active ministry (Matt. 4 : 24 [15 : 21; Mark 7 : 24, 31]); through this country had passed those who had been scattered abroad by the persecution which followed Stephen's death, "speaking the word to none, save only to Jews" (Acts 11 : 19), and within its limits were found Christian communities to which this persecution directed its violent efforts (Acts 9 : 2; 26 : 11 f.).

The bearing of this dating of the epistle upon the relation of 2 : 14–26 to Pauline teaching is unmistakable. If the letter was written before the Gentile mission work of Paul began, then necessarily there is no Pauline polemic in the epistle's discussion of the relative redemptive value of faith and works. This is the historical presupposition to any exegesis of the passage. And, as a matter of fact, this presupposition is confirmed by the exegetical study of the passage. In spite of appearances there is no real contradiction here between Paul and the author of our epistle. As regards πίστις, ἔργα, and δικαιοῦσθαι, they do not think in opposition to each other, though they do not think precisely alike. Their thought directions — if one may so express it — are different. The author of the epistle represents a pre-Pauline stage of development, when Christian ideas generally had not yet worked themselves free from Old Testament influences and, at these points specifically, had not yet received the new direction which the Gentile universalism of Paul gave to them. This is borne out by the epistle's unique lack of views about Christ, and yet, at the same time, its unique wealth of

views which the synoptists show us were characteristic of Jesus' own teaching. This peculiarity of the epistle's thought, together with its sententious and yet its prophetic eloquence of style, and, altogether, its evident innocence of other views than the ones which it presents, forbids any reference of the epistle to a time succeeding Paul, however the post-apostolic age may have returned to a somewhat Jewish way of thinking.

Beyschlag takes thus a position between the two extremes of modern criticism — the one held by Holtzmann, von Soden, Jülicher, and Harnack, which dates the epistle late in the second century; the other held by Spitta, which places it before the Christian era.

Such a dating as Beyschlag gives the epistle makes it quite natural for him to hold its author to have been the historical James, brother of our Lord and head of the Jerusalem church. His method of reaching this view, however, is not, as it seems to us it should have been, by way of conclusion from the above evidence regarding the epistle's readers and time of writing. With the claim which the epistle makes for its authorship, this question should have come last. It should have been assumed as a working hypothesis and its confirmation been led up to by what the epistle had to say about itself at all other points. But Beyschlag has in fact treated the authorship first and by itself. His argument is, briefly, that of the three New Testament Jameses possible as the author — James the son of Zebedee, James the son of Alphæus, and James the brother of the Lord — the only one who can be reasonably assumed as probable is the one last named. The personal honor in which he was held because of his relationship to the Lord, the official authority which he possessed among Jewish Christians because of his leadership in the Jerusalem church, as well as what is disclosed to us in Acts, chaps. 15 [and 21], and Gal., chap. 2, of his trend of doctrinal thought, make such an epistle as ours a most natural product of his ministry.

As to the bearing of this upon Gal. 1:18 f., Beyschlag identifies the James there mentioned with the author of our epistle, taking ἀπόστολος in the broader sense of the word. At the same time he does not enter upon the larger question of the relation of such an interpretation of ἀπόστολος here to its general usage in the New Testament — whether there were two grades of ἀπόστολοι, a higher one, confined to the Twelve and Paul, and a lower one, which included along with them such noted workers as Barnabas (Acts 14:4, 14) and such distinguished personages as the James of our epistle; or whether, under the influence

of the church's election of a successor to Judas (Acts 1 : 15–26) and the divine appointment of an added apostle in Paul (Acts, chap. 9), as well as the church's increasing need of leaders in its work, the original sacred limits of the Twelve were not laid aside, and the original strict conception of the term ἀπόστολος was not gradually broadened out into a more general one, involving fewer technical qualifications for the office and yet recognizing more generously the practical abilities which might fit the incumbent for the needed service of the church. It is an important question, and might not improperly have been discussed in an excursus.

The exegesis of the epistle is grammatically wholesome and, with the background which is given in the position and personality of the author and the surroundings and religious needs of the readers, must prove very suggestive.

M. W. JACOBUS.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

THE CROSS IN TRADITION, HISTORY, AND ART. By REV. WILLIAM WOOD SEYMOUR. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898. Pp. xxx + 489. $7.50.

DIE GESCHICHTE DES KREUZES VOR UND NACH GOLGOTHA. Von FRANZ BÜTTGENBACH. Baden: Verlag von Ign. Schweitzer, 1898. Pp. iv, iii + 96, and frontispiece. M. 1.50.

IN Mr. Seymour's book there are 376 illustrations. The bibliography includes 283 titles in English, Latin, German, and French. The text is given in three parts, and fills 474 large, well-printed, and wide-margined pages.

In Part I the author writes of the cross before the Christian era and in prehistoric times; of types, early forms, uses, and legends of the cross; of the finding of the true cross by Helena and of its traditionary history.

In Part II, in twenty chapters, are described altar, reliquary, processional, pectoral, absolution, consecration, spire, gable, standard, memorial, sanctuary, preaching, market, landmark, wayside, street, weeping, mortuary, burial, and churchyard crosses. Numerous illustrations make the text clear.

In Part III the cross is treated as it appears in heraldry, on coins, on banners, and as it has been used in baptism, confirmation, the eucharist, benediction, ordination, prayer, signatures, in touching for the king's evil, and as it has been wielded to break the power of the devil.

The writer seems to have treated his subject from well-nigh every point of view, as it is seen in history, tradition, legend, and superstition; in archæology, mythology, theology, art, and nature; among pagans, Jews, and Christians, all the way from the cross in the hieroglyphics in Egypt to the Good-Friday cross buns in England.

The brief and popular treatise by Büttgenbach repeats the familiar story of the discovery of the cross by Helena; traces its liturgical, symbolical, and devotional place in the Christian church; describes altar, processional, pectoral, and wayside crosses; gives examples of its use in art and poetry, and points out the misuse to which it has been put through superstition.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

KREUZ UND GRAB JESU. Kritische Untersuchung der Berichte über die Kreuzauffindung. Von DR. EDUARD MARIA CLOS, Pfarrer und Dekan. Kempten: Verlag der Jos. Kösel'schen Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. vi + 644. M. 8.

THIS book, from the pen of a Roman Catholic priest, was written to defend a proposition which all Protestants and many Roman Catholics will refuse to believe, or even to consider worth discussion. The proposition is that the visions of Katharina Emmerich were divine revelations designed by God to give his people many details which the Bible omits. In these visions Katharina Emmerich looked back on all the course of sacred history and studied its scenes and characters minutely. She was also accustomed to write down what she saw. Thus her published writings contain descriptions of persons, of actions, of dress, of buildings, of landscapes, mentioned in the Bible, and of a thousand other things about which the devout Christian may reasonably be curious.

She often saw the crucifixion and burial of Christ, and she contemplated the crucifixion with such entire concentration of thought, and such excess of emotion, that she became one of the stigmatists of the Roman Catholic church, and the figure of the cross frequently appeared upon her breast in an exudation of blood. She also counted the paces which separated the cross of Christ from his sepulcher. Her statements concerning the form of the cross and the distance between the cross and the sepulcher differ widely from those of ecclesiastical tradition, and the discrepancy occasioned this book.

The cross was in the form of the letter Y, except that the stem extended upward between the oblique arms. She saw it innumerable

times, and always in this form, and in this form it was always imprinted on her breast. But the Romans had no such cross. The defender of the visions, therefore, must attempt to show that the Jews crucified certain classes of criminals, that the Jewish cross was of the form seen by the stigmatist, and that our Lord was crucified by the Jews, rather than by the Romans.

Again, ecclesiastical tradition places both Golgotha and the sepulcher in the Church of the Holy Sepulcher. But the distance which separates them in the visions of Katharina Emmerich is too great for this limited space. Hence the defender of the visions is compelled to show that either the one or the other is wrongly placed in the church. Accordingly he attempts to prove that, while the sepulcher is genuine, it has been cut out of the cliff of which it originally formed a part and removed to its present position.

It will be observed that the theories of the author regarding both the cross and the tomb are hazardous in the extreme. It would scarcely be worth my while to state them, were it not for the fact that his effort to defend them, and thus to defend the visions of one whom he holds to have been a saint divinely inspired, has resulted in a book in some respects quite remarkable. He seems to have gathered, through long years of study on this one theme, all the testimony which can cast any light upon it, and the reader, though caring nothing for the visions which interest the author so greatly, will be thankful for a study of the cross and the sepulcher of Christ at once novel, able, and exhaustive.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE LAUSIAC HISTORY OF PALLADIUS. A Critical Discussion together with Notes on Early Egyptian Monachism. By DOM CUTHBERT BUTLER. Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. xiv + 298, 8vo. (*Texts and Studies*, Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature, ed. by J. Armitage Robinson, Vol. VI, No. 1.) $2.50.

PALLADIUS UND RUFINUS. Ein Beitrag zur Quellenkunde des ältesten Mönchthums. Von ERWIN PREUSCHEN. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Buchhandlung, 1897. Pp. viii + 268, 8vo. M. 12.

BOTH of these works are intended as critical introductions to the history of the origins of monasticism, and both concern two of the

chief sources for such a history—the *Lausiac History* of Palladius and the *Historia Monachorum*. Both works contain critical discussions concerning the true form (text), authorship, date, and historicity of both sources, and on the original language of the Historia. The work of Preuschen, however, is from the standpoint of the Historia, the Greek text of which is included in the work, while that of Butler is from the side of the Lausiac History, to a Greek text of which, now in preparation, this volume is to be regarded as prolegomena. The works are, therefore, complementary rather than competitive in character, and the authors, while they arrive independently at the rather important results which they offer in common, were able to afford an example of literary good-fellowship by an exchange of offices in the matter of material. Each acknowledges the aid of the other in his respective line.

The chief result which they reach together is the delimitation of the respective documents. The commonly accepted form of the Lausiac History has hitherto contained the Historia; *i. e.*, the current Lausiac History equals the Historia plus "*x*." This has given rise to great critical confusion, which is now set on the way toward a clearing up by the independent discovery by Messrs. Preuschen and Butler, through a critical study of the text-transmission, that *x* equals the real Lausiac History. The current Lausiac History, therefore, equals the Historia plus the real Lausiac History. It is a capital example of the way in which the modern textual method tends to definite results. The sources were thoroughly discredited by their confusion in the half dozen or more Greek and Latin forms in which, in varying proportions, they were contained, and, as Preuschen says, the many hypotheses as to their relations "rather confused than cleared the problem." Both scholars saw that the only thread out of the labyrinth was that of the actual history of the text, and following this through the many manuscripts of the Greek and Latin forms, and through Syriac, Armenian (with the help of Professor Armitage Robinson), Coptic, etc., versions, they find that from the earliest recorded until comparatively modern times the Historia was never included in the Lausiac History, but that the Historia and the real Lausiac History were transmitted as independent works, and that, therefore, the current Lausiac History is a late redaction.

With this untangling, than which nothing could be more simple, the foundation is laid for the establishing of a very considerable historical value for the sources, which have been hitherto regarded as

practically worthless or as "having the same value as *Gulliver's Travels*." In this result, too, both writers are agreed, and consider, at least, that these sources are "precious documents" (Preuschen), although Preuschen does not go quite as far as Butler in thinking them as far removed from romance as Sinbad the Sailor from Christopher Columbus.

But while there is agreement on these two chief points, as well as many others, this agreement by no means extends to all details. On the question of the original form of the Historia Monachorum, and consequently on the authorship, the views are directly opposed. Preuschen maintains a Latin original and the authorship of Rufinus (*ca.* 402 A. D.), while Butler holds to a Greek original (by "Timotheus," *ca.* 396 A. D.), and a translation by Rufinus (400–410 A. D.). Both agree in rejecting Amélineau's hypothesis of Coptic originals. While this point does not affect the chief result, it is a matter of a good deal of academic interest, at least, and has some practical bearing on the final settlement of questions relating to the value of the sources. If the authorship of Rufinus were established, it would give definiteness to an estimate of the historic value of the document; but unfortunately, or fortunately, Butler's reasoning seems conclusive against this and for an original Greek whose text is transmitted to us in five lines: (1) the Latin version, (2) Sozomen's abridgments, (3) and (4) two Syriac versions, (5) extant Greek manuscripts.

The loss of Preuschen's critical contention adds, however, to the value of his book, since the text of the Greek Historia becomes the *editio princeps*, not of a translation, but of the original work — for it is the true first edition, in spite of the fact that the bulk of the work is contained in the Long Recension of the Lausiac History, and that the remaining fragments were published by Cotelier. The whole work, as a work, is here printed for the first time, and the book is, therefore, the only exhibition of one of the two chief sources of the history of monachism in Egypt. It is, therefore, essential to every student of early church history. Butler's forthcoming text of the Lausiac History, on the other hand, while it will not be a *princeps*, will be almost equally welcome with that of the Historia, from the fact of the comparative inaccessibility of the single edition of its ungarbled form (Leyden, 1616). The net result of the textual portions of the two works will be, therefore, the text of both the chief sources of Egyptian monasticism (one hitherto practically unedited, and the other inaccessible), each exhibiting a document so clearly discriminated from hitherto

confusing material as to have practically the value of a newly discovered document.

As to the value of the texts themselves, *per se*, it is safe to say that they are or will be excellent, though not final. In each case the text will have been founded on extensive and adequate text-critical material. In the matter of manuscripts, Preuschen enumerates some thirty containing the Historia, and sixteen more containing the Lausiac History and perhaps also the Historia. Of these the editor has himself seen nineteen. Butler's description of manuscripts is comparatively meager, and full treatment is probably reserved for the volume of text. He gives, however, sundry lists of known manuscripts of various versions, which are not given by Preuschen, and which are, therefore, a positive contribution to the bibliographical material.

The material of neither one is, however, absolutely exhaustive. It is possible to add several manuscripts to at least the Greek, Latin, and Syriac lists, and some of the catalogue material which might have been taken account of, but was not, is most suggestive; *e. g.*, the various catalogues of Abyssinian manuscripts, which exhibit the work of "Philexios" (which appears much like the Syriac of Anan-Isho), translated from the Syriac into Arabic, and from Arabic into Ethiopic. One might also with some reason look for a personal examination, on Preuschen's part, of more than nineteen out of the forty-five known Greek manuscripts. On the whole, however, it is a matter, not for regret, but for positive congratulation, that Preuschen has not waited to exhaust entirely his manuscript material before publishing his text, and it is to be hoped that Butler will not postpone his text long on this or any account. It is much better to have a good text now than a more exhaustively prepared, but perhaps no better, one by and by; and every student must be grateful to these two scholars for the extensive material which they have gathered, and their extremely able discussion of it. It is getting more and more clear with every year of advancing textual criticism that the fundamental problem which underlies all historical questions relating to the ancient world is a textual one, and that the problem which underlies textual problems is in large measure a bibliographical one. "Adequate texts, the essential prerequisite to every historical judgment; and adequate material, the essential prerequisite to every text," is the motto of present-day investigation.

It may be said that, for general adequacy of treatment, both writers —the one German and Protestant, the other English and Catholic— exhibit alike the most modern scientific method, and individually a

high degree of ability in gathering material, of penetration in its analysis and judgment, and of logical acumen in constructing results from material. It may be due to the difference between the spirit of the German and the spirit of the English university (certainly it seems natural enough) that Preuschen rather excels in the orderly gathering and display of his material, Butler in closely reasoned argument. Butler's work is an extremely brilliant piece of clear and conclusive argument — which is not, of course, saying that the results will infallibly stand. Dom Butler is one of the fruits of the recent "open-door" policy of the English universities; and neither Cambridge University, the Benedictine order, nor the Roman Catholic church has reason to be ashamed of this work.

ERNEST CUSHING RICHARDSON.

PRINCETON, N. J.

LES MOINES DE CONSTANTINOPLE, depuis la fondation de la ville jusqu'à mort de Photius (330–898). Par L'ABBÉ E. MARIN, docteur ès lettres, professeur à la Malgrange. Paris: Librairie Victor Lecoffre, 1897. Pp. xx + 546. Fr. 10.

THE Abbé Marin has filled an important lacuna in ecclesiastical history by this learned monograph on "The Monks of Constantinople." His own bibliography shows that the literature of the subject is by no means meager; but no other work, within the knowledge of the author, or of the reviewer, covers anything like the same ground, or brings together in anything like so complete a manner and so convenient form the available materials. It was something of a disappointment to the reviewer to fail to find any evidence that the author had visited Constantinople and prepared himself for his task by independent research in the libraries of the surviving monasteries and among the archæological materials that remain. Such research, if conducted by an expert in archæology and palæography, could hardly have failed to add to the value of the book. He has contented himself with bringing together and vivifying with his own personality and charm of style the researches of others. He seems to have used freely and effectively the Byzantine literature produced by and pertaining to the monks of Constantinople, to have fully utilized the copious French literature, and to have made considerable use of the German works, especially those of Catholic authorship. But he has neglected some

valuable material by German Protestant writers, and not a single English title is quoted. Diligent research could hardly have failed to find something of value in English, though English literature is relatively poor in this department of research.

The author has wisely adopted the topical method of treatment, and in five books of from four to six chapters each he has discussed five leading topics. Book I treats of "The Monasteries." The author seems to credit the tradition that, about 240 A. D., before the development of Egyptian monasticism by Antony the Great, a monastery for women was founded in the ancient Byzantium by Bishop Castinus, and dedicated to St. Euphemia. He seems to ignore the fact that Weingarten, Harnack, and others have utterly discredited not only Jerome's romances regarding Paul of Thebes and Antony, but the life of Antony attributed to Athanasius as well. Even supposing hermit life to have come into vogue to some small extent before the time of Constantine, of which there is no adequate proof, monastic life was probably still later in appearing, and it is not very likely that a monastery was founded in Byzantium as early as 240 A. D. Familiarity with recent German criticism would have saved him from this and other mistakes. It is by no means certain that, even in the time of Constantine, who certainly lavished money on church-building and other Christian enterprises in his new capital, monasticism figured as prominently as the author, following Du Cange, supposes. He does not even manifest skepticism when confronted with Sozomen's story that the angel Michael appeared to Constantine on the shores of the Bosporus, and that the emperor commemorated the apparition by constructing there a monastery called "Michaelion;" or with Baronius' statement that, when Constantine transmuted a temple of Æsculapius into Christian institutions, miraculous healings attested the divine satisfaction. One suspects that the intelligent abbé is not quite so naïve in his credulity as he seems, and that he counts upon sufficient skepticism in his readers to appraise such legends aright. But we are not kept very long in the realm of fable. After the union of church and state the monastic spirit developed with wonderful rapidity, and soon emperors, nobles, and wealthy citizens of Constantinople were vying with each other in the founding of monasteries, hospitals, almshouses, infants' homes, homes for the aged, and charitable institutions of almost every imaginable description. As the city grew in wealth and splendor, a vast proletariate was developed, the unfortunate and the impoverished flocking thither from great distances in incredible numbers. It is

probable that nowhere and in no age has the liberality of Christians been more abounding than in the new Rome. The author gives more or less trustworthy accounts of the founding of many monastic institutions. They came to be numbered by hundreds, and constituted a highly important element in the Christian life of the city, and their influence became world-wide. They varied in size from small houses capable of accommodating a dozen or less to great institutions for hundreds. Most of these were well endowed, and they used a large proportion of their income in charity. This fact gave to the monks almost unbounded influence with the masses, whom they could usually array in force for or against any religious or political measure.

Book II treats of "The Monks and the Religious Life." The monastic rules in force among the monks of Constantinople were in general those that had been drafted by Basil the Great, whose exalted character and great ability gave to oriental monasticism an impulse in the direction of simple and pure living and high thinking that was not speedily lost. The rules were modified from time to time by influential archimandrites, such as Theodore of Studion and Athanasius of Mt. Athos, and at the end of the period by Photius. The author devotes considerable attention to the names and functions of officials, and to the details of monastic life. He does not attempt to conceal the fact that, in the East as well as in the West, grave abuses soon grew up in the monasteries. Monks and nuns frequently had their habitations in the same court, and sometimes in the same house, and emperors and patriarchs strove, without complete success, to enforce laws against scandalous living. That unnatural vices were prevalent there, as in the West, is abundantly evident. The natural tendency of unregenerate men and women to vice was limited, to some extent, by the manual work in which they were required to engage, and by the surveillance under which they were kept; but in many cases the officials themselves were thoroughly vicious and inefficient. Laymen sometimes built monasteries and sought to manage them in their own way, to the great scandal of the faithful; and patriarchal authority was frequently called into requisition for the abolition of such irregularities.

In Book III "The Monks and the Spiritual Power" is the topic. Nominally the monks of Constantinople were subject to the patriarch. Yet obedience to this official was by no means blind and unquestioning. The heterodox patriarch met with little consideration at the hands of this vast aggregation of monastic life, that could be easily

and speedily aroused by the influential leaders to a fury of opposition. In general the relation between patriarchs and monks was cordial and harmonious. When out of harmony with patriarch or emperor, they were not at all averse to appealing to the Roman bishop, who was always glad of an opportunity to interfere in eastern ecclesiastical politics. Our author, as is natural, takes great pleasure in the evidences he finds of the willingness of the monks from time to time to recognize the authority of the holy see. Yet he does not seek to conceal the fact that, on some occasions, the monks themselves became involved in heresy, as in the case of Eutyches.

Book IV treats of "The Monks of Constantinople and the Byzantine Emperors." The struggles of the monks against imperial authority, especially during the long-continued christological controversies and the iconoclastic controversy, are discussed at considerable length. Emperors like Justinian legislated as freely for churches and monasteries as for any department of the civil administration. Every detail of monastic life, including the number that might be admitted into a monastery, was fixed by his legislation. But his laws gave so large a measure of recognition and protection to the monasteries that little resistance was evoked. The monothelite and the iconoclastic emperors met with the fiercest and most determined foes in the monks. That they should have suffered cruel persecution in consequence is what might have been expected.

The concluding book, on "The Intellectual Activity of the Monks of Constantinople," is, in some respects, the most pleasing of all. The high standard set by Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, and John of Damascus was not by any means maintained among the monks of Constantinople, but their achievements in historiography, biography, and especially in hymnography, were highly respectable. It is to their industry as copyists that we are indebted for the preservation of much of the Christian and pagan literature of the earlier time. Their artistic skill was also very considerable. The facts, however, as exhibited by the author, scarcely bear out his assertion that "it is by their intellectual activity and their marvelous fecundity in all kinds of literary and artistic work that the monks of Constantinople have acquired imperishable titles to the memory of men." Considering the number of the monks and the opportunities that presented themselves for intellectual achievement, the results of their efforts are meager and poor. It is impossible to point to a great thinker or writer who owed his training and impulse to the monasteries of Constantinople. The

notable preachers and writers of the East all had their training elsewhere. Antioch and Alexandria were centers of intellectual activity, but Constantinople never.

The work is a model of fine book-making.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Canada.

LA SITUATION RELIGIEUSE DE L'AFRIQUE ROMAINE, depuis la fin du iv^e^ siècle jusqu'à l'invasion des Vandales. Par F. FERRÈRE. Paris: Félix Alcan, 1897. Pp. xxiv + 382, 8vo. Fr. 7.50.

IT cannot be said that this study of the times of Augustine makes any distinct contribution to our knowledge of the subject. It is, however, a fresh and independent study from the sources of a subject that has a perennial interest for the students of the ancient Catholic church. While the author has used the sources diligently, he seems to have neglected the literature, since his knowledge of others' researches appears to be confined to the writings of a few French scholars. This decidedly limits the value of his book.

The work is divided into three parts, the first of which is devoted to a general survey of the church and Christian society in relation to heathenism. In this part the author is largely indebted to Aubé, Boissier, and others who have described the downfall of paganism. One suspects that his obligations to Allard are even greater, though quite unacknowledged. There is nothing, perhaps, in this general survey to require special dissent, except the calm assumption (pp. 31 f.) that the bishop of Rome was by the end of the fourth century recognized as pope, and acknowledged to be supreme in doctrine — though the author admits that ecclesiastical supremacy in Africa was still denied him. Of course, the bishop of Rome was called "pope" at this time, but in no exclusive sense; it was the usual title of bishops, being repeatedly applied, for example, to Augustine by Jerome in their correspondence. To make it the exclusive title of the Roman bishop and deduce from it conclusions regarding his authority is an anachronism of centuries, of which no scholar, Roman or Protestant, ought to be guilty in these days. The facts of the Donatist controversy, as recorded by M. Ferrère in later chapters, flatly deny what he has written here.

Part II is devoted to the Donatist schism. Peculiarly French is the author's view of the causes of this movement, among which he assigns the wrath of a woman to the most prominent place (pp. 135 ff.). This is carrying the maxim, *cherchez la femme*, into historical investigation with a vengeance! No clearer account can be found anywhere, however, than M. Ferrère gives of the spread of Donatism. His study of the economic conditions of Africa in the fifth century is unique; and he makes it evident that the Donatist schism was as much a social revolution as a religious reform — in this respect closely resembling the Anabaptist movement of the sixteenth century. This is the most valuable part of the book, and the most original. For the rest, all the well-known facts regarding the Donatists are stated with clearness and supported by abundant testimony. Thus it is made plain that they were the first to persecute (p. 171) and to appeal to the state, and only when defeated and proscribed did they become champions of religious liberty. Where the author fails in his study of the Donatists, however, is in his inability adequately to comprehend the spiritual significance of the movement (see pp. 165 and 246, for example). He is much more satisfactory in his treatment of the external phenomena, and he truly records facts, even when they make against his theories. Thus, for example, he shows that it was the emperor and not the "pope" who was made the arbiter in this whole dispute, not only in matters of administration, but of dogma. One is sometimes at a loss to conclude whether this is genuine candor, or only that the author had failed to perceive the conflict between his facts and his theories. In either case, his readers may congratulate themselves that he has given the facts so fairly. If he fails anywhere in accuracy, as in saying that the council of Arles condemned the Donatists, it is not lack of candor that causes him to err. In this particular he follows pretty nearly all his predecessors in the investigation of Donatism, but it is difficult to imagine on what evidence they found their statement. Certainly the extant records of the council, even if they are accepted as genuine (Mansi II, 472, 488, 489), warrant no such categorical assertion.

Part III is devoted to "heresies." Here M. Ferrère makes a scientific distinction too often obscured or neglected: Donatism was a schism, not a heresy; Manichæism and Pelagianism were heresies, not schisms. The study of Manichæism is of little or no value; the author has done almost nothing but give such an account of the system as may be culled from the writings of Augustine — a good beginning of an investigation, but no more. All that modern Orientalists have done

to illuminate the subject is ignored. Nothing shows more painfully the difference between German and French scholarship in the domain of historical theology than this part of M. Ferrère's work. It would be simply impossible for such an elementary, schoolboy performance as this to be published in Germany.

The study of Pelagianism is worked out on much the same lines, but the result is somewhat better, since in this case the writings of Augustine still remain our principal source of knowledge. But here, more than anywhere else in the book, the author's slight acquaintance with the literature limits the value of his results. No subjects have been made the occasion of more careful research by German theologians, not to mention English and American, than the doctrines of Augustine and Pelagius. Nobody can now produce a book of much value in this field, unless the results of these researches are duly weighed and utilized by him. For a writer of such a work as this to neglect a literature so rich is to fail of half his duty. His first duty is, of course, to the sources, but even here M. Ferrère's study is not exhaustive, as indeed it could not well be, when he passes by the labors of nearly all his predecessors. Only a scholar who had genius of the first order, and transcendent industry, could be justified in adopting such a method, and he could be justified only by success.

One should not fail to mention the chief merit of the book—its style. The easy, perspicuous, flowing sentences make the reading of these pages a constant delight. If the substance were in any way equal to the form, this would be one of the greatest monographs in the literature of church history. It is, as it stands, a performance for which a scholar should blush.

HENRY C. VEDDER.

CROZER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chester, Pa.

THE ENGLISH BLACK MONKS OF ST. BENEDICT; a Sketch of their History from the Coming of St. Augustine to the Present Day. By REV. ETHELRED L. TAUNTON. London: John C. Nimmo; New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898. 2 vols. Pp. xvii + 310 and xiii + 367. 21s., *net.*

THE writer of this book, though not himself a Benedictine, has a deep affection for the order. In so far he is qualified to write its annals. He is further qualified by his fair-mindedness, his frankness, his willingness to tell the truth, and his industry. He seems, however,

to have but moderate training as a scientific historian, to be gifted with little insight into motives and character, and to write with too many of the prepossessions of the ecclesiastic. Yet, notwithstanding these serious deficiencies, the book is a valuable contribution to the history of the English Black Monks. It gives a clear idea of the great work done by the order, of its daily life, of its objects, of its wealth and influence. Much of what the writer presents is new, being drawn directly from original sources. This is particularly so of the account given of the order since the dissolution, but even in the treatment of its prior history much new material is used.

The work is a history of the order from its first entrance into England in the person of St. Augustine down to the present day. This is on the whole unfortunate; the canvas is too vast, and the value of the work is diminished in consequence. Instead of being a continuous history, it is rather in the nature of a series of essays. In justice to Mr. Taunton it must be said that he recognized the fact, and made pretensions to writing only a sketch of the English Benedictines.

In a book thus written the merits of all the parts cannot be equal. Mr. Taunton is necessarily a specialist in regard to certain periods of the history of the Black Monks, while in regard to other periods his information is not only second-hand, but seems not to be thoroughly mastered. This is true of much of the first volume. There is too much that is merely descriptive; too much that is biographical, instead of historical. This is a defect that runs all through the work, and when we remember that the space is in any case too limited for the task set, it is apparent how great an error is committed. An entire chapter is given to Abbot John Fecknam, where a half dozen pages would be ample. Too much attention is devoted to the mode of life, and too little to the great work done by the Benedictines in the conversion, civilization, and education of England. When we come to the history of the order after the dissolution, the same objection holds, but with hardly so much force. Mr. Taunton seems to be most at home in this period. Probably the most valuable part of his work, looked at from a purely historical point of view, is that dealing with the history of the order during the reigns of Elizabeth and the first two Stuarts; that bearing on the order since that time is equally scholarly, but is of less general interest.

The chief failure is in the discussion of the dissolution of the monastic orders under Henry VIII. One can readily forgive any man for feeling despair at the thought of attempting to pluck the truth

from any memorial of that confused age. But the attempt must be made; the causes of the dissolution must be sought for, and in the main sought for in other directions than in the divorce of the king, or in his rapacity, or in the immorality of the monks and nuns. Henry was bad enough, but he could never have overthrown the church in England by his own unaided power. It would be as easy for the czar of all the Russias to destroy the Greek church in his dominions; but does any sensible man suppose for a moment that the czar could do it? So with Henry, his will was absolutely powerless as long as it stood alone. The primary causes of the fall of the monasteries and the revolt against the church must, therefore, be sought elsewhere. Nor will the corruption of the church serve as a sufficient reason to explain the immensity of the catastrophe. The great underlying cause seems to consist in a single fact: the monasteries had played their rôle; their capacity for performing even a tithe of the service which mankind had a right to expect from them was forever past. Yet, while capacity had ceased, possession of the instruments and the responsibilities of power remained. One-third of the landed property of England was in the hands of the church, most of it being held by the monasteries themselves; the education of English youth, the support of English hospitals and almshouses, the rule of life, the morals of the people—in a word, the entire economic and social life of England, depended upon the church; and the church fell far short of performing its duty. Pretension and performance nowhere squared, and destruction was inevitable. The same cause which lay at the root of the destruction of the monastic orders has denied them any great career in modern days, nor does the future hold much for them. Mr. Taunton thinks otherwise, but he is surely mistaken. They have done their work, and have outlived their usefulness. The success of the Jesuits in opposition to the Benedictines and kindred orders ought to teach a lesson that can never be forgotten. The Society of Jesus fitted the rules of its life to the conditions of the day. It refused from the first to wear the monastic garb; or to waste time in excessive prayer, fasting, and maceration. Its reward was the reconquest of half the world for the papacy. But what have the other orders done? Little enough, and it is not hard to see why. In the modern world there is no place for societies which squander energy, time, and strength as if these were limitless. The following *horarium* of a modern Benedictine convent is instructive: "3:45 A. M. Rise. 4 A. M. Matins and lauds, recited; half-hour mental prayer; prime *sung;* prime B. V. M. recited. 6:30 A. M. Private study; masses;

breakfast for those who had permission. 8 A. M. Lectures and disputations. 10 A. M. Little hours B V. M., recited; tierce, mass, sext, *sung*. 11:30 A. M. Dinner. 12 noon. None *sung;* vespers and compline B. V. M., recited. 12:30 P. M. Siesta. 1 P. M. Hebrew or Greek lecture. 2 P. M. Vespers *sung*. 2:30 P. M. Lectures and disputations. 4 P. M. Private study. 6 P. M. Supper. 6:30 P. M. Recreation. 7:30 P. M. Public spiritual reading; compline *sung;* matins and lauds B. V. M., recited; half-hour mental prayer. 8:45 P. M. Retire." Comment is superfluous. The world is too busy for this sort of thing, and if the Benedictines will do it they must be content to be sufficient unto themselves. We are not surprised to learn that Dom Walmesley, "a great mathematician and astronomer," finally "gave up all his favourite scientific pursuits, because he found they caused too many distractions at his office and mass."

There are occasional slips, as where the author speaks of Bishop Bishop, where he evidently means Bishop Smith; but, on the whole, the book is remarkably free from misstatements. It is to be hoped that its writer will continue his studies of the English Benedictines, and at some future day present to the world a history of the order since the dissolution, a history which will rank with Dugdale's great work.

RALPH C. H. CATTERALL.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

GRUNDFRAGEN DER REFORMATIONSGESCHICHTE. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit litterarischen Gegnern. (=Vorträge und Aufsätze aus der Comenius-Gesellschaft.) Von LUDWIG KELLER. Berlin: R. Gaertners Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897. Pp. iv+46. M 1.50.

IT is the purpose of this pamphlet to defend the author against the criticism of certain opponents. Keller has made several contributions to the history of the Reformation, and has been thought by some writers to esteem too highly the Anabaptists, the Waldenses, the Bohemian Brethren, and other antagonists of the papacy who labored before the Lutheran period, and, therefore, to esteem Luther and his associates too little. He maintains that there was an evangelical movement with an uninterrupted development and a historic continuity for many generations preceding the sixteenth century, and hence that Luther by no means first brought the light of the gospel to the modern world. He goes farther in this direction, perhaps, than any other German writer, though all careful students of the denominations which pro-

tested against the errors of the papacy before the sixteenth century tend to a growing appreciation of them as a whole. This defense of his views may bring some comfort to those who maintain the doctrine of "Baptist succession." He observes that all the organizations which troubled the Roman Catholics so much before the Reformation claimed to have a continuous history reaching back to the primitive churches, and he thinks this uniform tradition may possibly be well founded, though he does not advocate it. He observes, also, the curious resemblance of the traveling teachers of these bodies to the traveling apostles mentioned in "The Didaché."

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ALEANDER UND LUTHER AUF DEM REICHSTAG ZU WORMS. Ein Beitrag zur Reformationsgeschichte. Von ADOLF HAUSRATH. Berlin: G. Grote'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1897. Pp. viii + 392. M. 7; bound, M. 8.

JOHANNES JANSSEN'S *History of the German People since the End of the Middle Ages* is such an elaborate attack on Protestantism that an attempt to refute all of his statements in detail would prove a hopeless task. Our author deems it more feasible, therefore, to adopt von Bezold's plan of giving a detailed and accurate account of certain phases of the great confessional tragedy, showing the characters, aims, and methods of the contesting parties side by side, instead of refuting direct charges antagonistic to the Reformation. With this purpose in view, Hausrath has chosen to treat of one of the decisive epochs of the German Reformation — the diet at Worms.

By way of introduction the insignificant Worms of today is contrasted with the magnificent city of the days of Luther, a center of German culture, wealth, and public life, and a proud home of an independent and democratic spirit. The author then presents to us the great characters of the drama: Aleander, the papal nuncio to the court of Charles V., sent to uproot the "Lutheran evil," learned, egotistic, corrupt, a man with a career as brilliant as his character is despicable; Charles V., a melancholy, taciturn, bigoted youth of twenty years, surrounded by the dignitaries of the church; Frederic the Wise, of Saxony, faithful, parsimonious, pious, the protector of Luther and the most powerful antagonist of Aleander; Glapion, father confessor to the emperor; Franz von Sickingen, powerful with the sword, and Ulrich von Hutten, aggressive with the pen. We see the wild, lavish

life at the diet, the inconstancy of Charles V., the malicious intriguing and wholesale bribery in the Romanists' camp, the constant clash between the political and ecclesiastical interests, culminating in the 102 *gravamina* of the German nation against the curia. Luther, after much hesitation, is called to Worms, summoned to his first hearing, at which he requests *spatium deliberandi;* we follow him to his second hearing, at which he utters his famous words. He has a hearing before a special commission, returns home, and is captured on the way. After the adjournment of the diet, a manifesto against Luther is issued under false date and false pretenses by the intrigues of Aleander, causing the disrupture of Germany's unity and breaking the backbone of Hapsburg's rule in that country.

Admirers of Luther's undaunted courage are especially indebted to Hausrath for his detailed study of Luther's first hearing before the diet, at which his humiliating request for a *spatium deliberandi* seems so out of harmony with his previous temerity that it has been misconstrued by recent historians, such as Baumgarten, Bezold, Karl Lamprecht, and Janssen, as arising from intimidation. All these historians base either directly upon Leopold v. Ranke's brilliant description of this episode or upon his source, Philipp Fürstenberg, the "Städtebote" of Frankfurt. It is to be noted, however, with regard to Ranke that he does not, as a matter of fact, attribute Luther's action to fear, and that Fürstenberg, the only contemporary source which intimates such a motive, in his own report pleads unreliability, and explicitly begs not to have it published. Moreover, Aleander, who sat directly before Luther, quite on the contrary, is chagrined at Luther's audacity. If Luther spoke softly at this time, he did only what the occasion demanded, and his request for time for deliberation was a carefully planned piece of tactics calculated to gain for him an opportunity, in no other way to be had, of uttering his memorable words of the following day. Not Luther, the impetuous, was the author of this move; we see here the wisdom of "Fridericus Cunctator."

In this book Hausrath gives the Protestants one of the strongest contributions to the apologetical literature of the Reformation that have appeared in recent years, a book not only of great value to the theologian and historian, but intensely interesting to the general reader as well. His glowing ardor and almost boundless zeal for Luther and the cause of the Reformation, which, it seems, might at times be somewhat checked, are, after all, justified in view of the author's purpose in the work. His exhaustive and critical study and judicious use of the

original sources, which he prints in the last twenty-three pages of the book, with constant references to them in the body of the text, render his work most valuable historically in having enabled him to bring to light many new facts, to modify statements of other historians, and frequently to arrive at new conclusions.

J. B. E. JONAS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

HULDREICH ZWINGLI. Sein Leben und Wirken nach den Quellen dargestellt. Von DR. RUDOLF STÆHELIN, ord. Professor der Theologie zu Basel. Basel: Benno Schwabe, Verlagsbuchhandlung. I. Band 1895; II. Band 1897. Pp. 1081. M. 19.20.

IN these two portly volumes, embracing together more than a thousand pages, we have a most accurate and thorough biography of the Swiss reformer. Before he undertook this large work, Dr. Stæhelin had published a smaller one on the same subject, and had become well known for his mastery of the literature connected with it. There was need of this new study of Zwingli, for, though his life has often been written, and its principal outlines have long been in our possession, many of its minor features were left in a dim and uncertain light. During the last twenty years a rich store of new materials concerning it has been provided by the labors of both Protestant and Catholic scholars. Much of this has appeared in magazines, much in special monographs, much in official publications of Swiss archives. Dr. Stæhelin has gleaned carefully in these fields.

His work is of special value at two points. It sheds new light on the political development of the Swiss Reformation and on the theological opinions of Zwingli, often misinterpreted or miscolored. To the second of these themes Dr. Stæhelin gives more attention than to the other. He has made it possible for us to understand the reasons on which Zwingli based his conclusions. But he does not convince us that Zwingli was a theologian in the strict sense of the word. He shows us a man whose religious thinking is little influenced by emotion or mysticism, is clear rather than profound, and is distinct at individual points, but not well connected, like mountains arranged as a group, but not as a chain.

Admirable as the work of Dr. Stæhelin is, one cannot but wish it were different in some of its subordinate features.

He writes a stirring chapter of Swiss history, but he keeps out of

it, as with studious intention, all Swiss coloring. The history as it is told here could have been enacted on an American prairie as well as amid alpine peaks. The picture suffers for want of a frame.

Moreover, while the political relations of the Swiss Reformation are carefully traced, the peculiarities of the Swiss constitution are not sufficiently displayed. A citizen of Switzerland, like the author, may be so familiar with them from childhood as not to perceive the need of presenting them to his foreign readers. Yet they have affected the Reformed systems of church government so profoundly that no one can understand their genesis who is not well acquainted with the Swiss constitution in the sixteenth century.

A graver defect of the book is its apology for the cruel extinction of the Swiss Anabaptists by the Swiss reformers. This consists, first, in the claim that the punishment of the Anabaptists was relatively milder in Switzerland than in the neighboring Catholic countries. This I admit; drowning is a milder punishment than burning. But a cause which is forced to take refuge in such excuses must be in sore need of defense. A second claim, on which the author lays greater stress, cannot be admitted. It is that the Anabaptists were put to death on political, rather than religious, grounds, as persistent disturbers of the peace, who, if not silenced by the extremest penalties, would have excited the common people to revolt and anarchy. On the contrary, it was precisely these Anabaptists who most strongly opposed revolt and anarchy, and taught the duty of leading a peaceful life. The German Peasants' War had for a time caused excitement among the Swiss peasants, but the Anabaptists did not appeal to this excitement, and it had died out when the most horrible executions took place. The Zwinglians produced more of uproar and revolution in Switzerland than any other persons, and led their country into a disastrous civil war; and, if this plea is to be allowed, their Catholic opponents ought to have exterminated them.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

JOHN DONNE, Sometime Dean of St. Paul's, A. D. 1621–1631. By AUGUSTUS JESSOPP, D.D. With two portraits. London: Methuen & Co.; Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1897. Pp. x + 239. 3s. 6d.

DONNE was born in 1573, attended Oxford, traveled abroad, and was under Lord Howard in the Cadiz expedition. Returning to Eng-

land he became secretary to the lord keeper, a gay attendant at the court of Elizabeth, a trifler, and a writer of verse. He contracted a clandestine marriage, got into the Fleet for so doing, lost his secretaryship, and lived for several years on the bounty of his friends. He wrote a book on suicide, and another against the Jesuits, and a third in support of the oath of allegiance. Failing to secure a lucrative post from King James, he wrote an extravagant panegyric on a deceased young lady, which yielded him a substantial moneyed return from her vain father. Becoming somewhat "decayed in health," he saw the hollowness of worldly amusements and pomps, abandoned all hope of state preferment, turned his thoughts to holy orders, was ordained by the bishop of London, and two months later was made D.D. at Cambridge by command of the king. He was given the livings of Keystone and Sevenoaks, and soon after the preachership of Lincoln's Inn. He was now in his forty-third year, and his impecuniosity was at an end. King James made him dean of St. Paul's, and he became a practiced extempore preacher, "the greatest of his time." He was emphatically a High-Church man, and at the same time an almost superstitious bibliolater—a cross between an Anglican and a Puritan. In the latter part of his life he devoted himself to study and preaching, seldom attended court, broke intercourse with the nobility, and gave over versifying. In his last illness he looked after his portrait and monument, made his will, and deeded his literary remains to one of his executors. He died March 31, 1631.

Dr. Jessopp deals with Dr. Donne as a "leader of religion," acknowledging his inability to appreciate his "poetic genius." He has for his hero the highest admiration, accounting him his "great teacher and master and friend," and hence has written every page of the biography in a sympathetic vein.

ERI B. HULBERT.
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LIFE OF EDWARD BOUVERIE PUSEY, D.D., Canon of Christ Church, Regius Professor of Hebrew in the University of Oxford. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON D.D., LL.D., Canon of St. Paul's. Edited and prepared for publication by Rev. J. O. Johnston, Rev. R. J. Wilson, and Rev. W. C. E. Newbolt. In four volumes. London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1893–97. $18

THE first installment of the *Life* of Dr. Pusey, in four large and expensive volumes, was not issued until more than a decade after his

death. The preface to the last volume is dated September 16, just fifteen years after that event. During those fifteen years two of the four contributors to the *Life* and a vast number of Pusey's personal friends, who if living would have been among the most interested readers of the books, have passed away. Such prolonged delay in the issue of lengthy biographies of noted men must involve to writers the loss of most appreciative readers and to publishers serious pecuniary risk. Minor considerations like these could not prevent the delay necessitated by the illness and death of Dr. Liddon.

The colossal scale on which this biography was planned, the ability and eminent fitness of Canon Liddon for the work, and the great importance which he attached to its successful completion awakened somewhat extravagant expectations. Either because Pusey was not so great a man as the fond disciples who called him ὁ μέγας thought, or because these volumes do not represent him to have been so great as he really was, readers, who have anticipated at once a great literary production and an ideal history of the Tractarian movement, are destined to a measure of disappointment.

Notwithstanding his exceptional opportunities, his undoubted attainments in special lines of scholarship, his moral excellence, and prominence as an ecclesiastical leader, it cannot be truthfully claimed that Pusey was preëminent either for the vigor, originality, and profundity of his thought, or for the clear and forcible expression of fundamental moral and religious truths. His style was labored and obscure in contrast with the crystalline clearness of Newman's almost perfect English. He was so overburdened with his prejudices and assumptions, and in a way even with his learning, that he instinctively felt obliged to keep the well-trodden paths of traditionalism and to move within the bounds of precedent and authority. To minds of a different type it was a marvel that one so intelligent could utterly ignore rational considerations which seemed to them most urgent and convincing, and constantly yield with eager delight, with credulous and almost infantile submission, to external influences which appeared entirely unwarranted, if not unworthy. His extreme conservatism on all questions of biblical and historical criticism is well understood. Those who confidently ascribe the book of Daniel to the Maccabean period regard Pusey's habitual deference to antecedent opinion and precedent as practically destroying the value of his opinion on that and kindred subjects.

He learned to believe the doctrine of the "real presence" and to

believe that it was the teaching of the Church of England from his mother's explanation of the catechism, as she had been taught to interpret it by sacramentalist clergymen. Those early convictions were strengthened by the study of patristics and of the mediæval church.

After the exceptional educational advantages which wealth and rank furnish for the few most favored English youths, Pusey, having completed his course at Christ Church and become a fellow at Oriel, in 1825 and 1826 studied at the German universities of Göttingen, Greifswald, Berlin, and Bonn. It is said that at that time only two persons in Oxford knew German, and that only seventeen professors in all Germany then "contended for the truth of the gospel as a supernatural revelation warranted by miracle." Pusey became intimate with Bunsen and with Ewald, from whom he radically differed in later life. At Göttingen he heard Eichhorn and Pott; at Berlin, Schleiermacher, Strauss, and Neander; but he prized most of all the friendship of Tholuck. At Bonn he heard Nitzsch, Sack, Lücke, Augusti, and Gieseler. While in Germany he vigorously prosecuted the study of Syriac, Aramaic, and Arabic, and learned much of German theological thought.

As a result of his experience in Germany and occasioned by a controversy with Hugh James Rose, there was a widespread distrust of Pusey's orthodoxy. It was a curious episode in his career; for he had learned German in order to overcome the skeptical views of a friend; he had studied German thought in order to oppose unbelief; and he had selected the study of the Old Testament as a specialty in order that he might better refute attacks upon its authority. In 1825 Rose delivered four discourses at Cambridge on "The State of Protestantism in Germany." They represented the Protestant church in Germany as "the mere shadow of a name" and chargeable with "an abdication of Christianity." The prevalent rationalism was attributed to the want of a strong and effective church organization with a fixed form of worship, subscription to confessions of faith, and the general recognition of ecclesiastical superiors. In reply to Rose, Pusey urged a suggestion of Neander that the frigid and formal Lutheranism of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries was largely responsible for German rationalism, and also Tholuck's statement that the Wolfian philosophy and the influence of Frederick the Great's court were contributing causes of German unbelief. It is remarkable that this discussion and Pusey's very moderate expression of hopefulness for the religious condition of Germany brought distrust upon one who for a half century was to be

one of the most radical opponents of rationalism in England. Pusey ultimately withdrew his replies to Rose from circulation and in his will expressed the wish that they should not be published.

In 1828 Pusey was appointed Regius professor of Hebrew at Oxford, and was installed as a canon of Christ Church. The completion of a catalogue of the Arabic MSS. in the Bodleian Library occupied the next five years, after which Pusey sold his own Arabic library in order to purchase a "library of the Fathers," and soon became deeply interested in the Tractarian movement. The biography up to this point occupies the first volume and comprises "The Preparation," the first of the four chief divisions which Liddon planned.

The second general division, termed "The Movement," covers the second volume. This account of Tractarianism is in some respects less satisfactory than Dean Church's appreciative volume, *The Oxford Movement*, but the contributions of Pusey to the "Tracts" are fully described, important contemporary events are noticed, and much of interest is told of both Keble and Newman. Of especial interest in this second volume are Pusey's defense of prayers for the dead, p. 17; the criticism of Pusey by Rev. H. V. Elliott, p. 122; Pusey's own answer to the query, "What is Puseyism?" pp. 139, 140; the ineffectual efforts of the Tractarians to prevent secessions to Rome, pp. 150–55; and the attitude of W. F. Hook, the vicar of Leeds, to the movement, pp. 446 ff.

Liddon's third division, from 1845 to 1858, "The Struggle," is treated in the third volume. At the parting of the ways in 1845, when Newman passed to the Roman church, Pusey became the acknowledged leader of those Tractarians who remained in the Church of England. His followers greatly praise his unfailing patience and tenacious persistency during this time of denunciation and conflict. But the story of Pusey's inner life, as told in this volume, is painful to those who differ from Pusey in doctrine, yet desire to retain respect for him as a scholar and a man. This struggle of Tractarianism, first for toleration and recognition, then for an influential and a dominant place in the Anglican church, was coetaneous with a singular experience in Pusey's private life of morbid introspection, personal relation to Keble as his father confessor (continued from 1846 until Keble's death), asceticism, and self-inflicted "punishment for his sins," sometimes in forms from which Keble tried to dissuade. Pusey resolved "to wear hair cloth always by day unless ill; to use a hard seat by day and a hard bed by night; to travel as poorly as possible" (except when imperative

duties forbade); "never to notice anything unpleasant in what was set on the table, but to take it by preference and in a penitential spirit . . . . to look at nothing out of curiosity . . . . to keep the eyes down except for the sight of nature . . . . to address everyone, especially inferiors in rank, as his superiors in the sight of God . . . . 'to make the fire to me from time to time the type of hell.'" All this seems very pitiful; the expression of an arbitrary system, an artificially imposed isolation, strikingly contrasted with the healthful piety and virile activity of contemporaries like David Livingstone and John G. Paton.

The third volume treats specifically of the differences between Pusey and Wilberforce, then bishop of Oxford, the university discourses on "The Entire Absolution of the Penitent," the doctrine and practice of penitence and confession, the Gorham case, secessions to Rome (among others those of Manning and Robert Wilberforce), the reëstablishment of the papal hierarchy in England in 1852, ritualism, penitentiaries, and the maintenance of sacramentalist doctrine until 1858.

Of the fourth volume unfortunately only the account of Pusey's last days and death is from the pen of Liddon. Just how he would have justified his designation of the period from 1858 to 1882 as "The Victory" we cannot tell. In this connection the writers of the preface refer to the archbishops of England as addressing "the whole body of bishops of the Catholic church" and "able to assume as part of the undisputed heritage of the English church such doctrines as the apostolic succession and the sacrificial aspect of the holy eucharist." But if Pusey broke friendship with Gladstone when he appointed Frederick Temple bishop of Exeter, what pleasure could it have given Pusey to have "the whole body of bishops" or the whole Catholic church addressed by the contributor to *Essays and Reviews* who is now the primate of all England? With what agitated emotions would Pusey have read the recent papal denial of the validity of Anglican orders? Pusey's *Eirenicon* has not been accepted by Rome. While many English bishops sympathize with ritualism, and a few are its avowed supporters, the real victory has been largely gained by a combination of the rationalism which Pusey abhorred with the external or formal sacramentalism which he regarded as entirely subordinate to the inner and essential doctrine.

Judgments of Pusey are as diverse as those of Archbishop Laud. Some insist that he has "saved the Church of England." With more reason it is claimed that the ultimate influence of Tractarianism pre-

vented the disruption and the disestablishment of the church. It is certain that Pusey, Keble, and others like-minded kept many sacramentalists in the Church of England who, apart from such leaders, would have followed Newman into the Roman church. The present intense anti-ritualistic agitation indicates that there is an "irrepressible conflict" within the Church of England. Probaby the *people* of England are neither Romanists nor sacramentalists. In the end the Church of England must ultimately express the will of the English people or be disestablished. The issue of the present agitation may justify the conviction that Christendom is in reality divided, not so much into Romanists and Protestants as into sacramentalists and non-sacramentalists.

BENJAMIN O. TRUE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

THE LIFE AND TIMES OF CARDINAL WISEMAN. By WILFRID WARD, Author of *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival*, *Witnesses to the Unseen*, etc. With three portraits. Second edition. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1897. Pp. x+579; iii+656. $6.

CARDINAL WISEMAN died in 1865. This biography appears a generation afterward, and has already reached a second edition. That a life written more than thirty years after its subject has died can command the interest of so large a circle of readers marks out that subject as a man of unusual significance. That such a work should be delayed thus for over thirty years is also an indication that there were grave difficulties in the way of a more nearly contemporary biography. These difficulties lay partly in the personality of the cardinal and partly in the times in which he did his work. His life and times were stormy and passionate; and it was necessary for clouds to blow aside and winds to still before such a life and such times could be viewed with any measure of dispassion.

Cardinal Wiseman's reputation is fortunate in finding so skilled a biographer as Mr. Wilfrid Ward. While the fact that Mr. Ward was but a child at the time of Wiseman's death, and that his "own personal knowledge of Cardinal Wiseman was only such as a boy could have of one who was very fond of talking to children," necessarily deprives this life of that personal touch which is so great a charm in

Stanley's *Life of Arnold*, and for which we shall look in the forthcoming *Life of Philips Brooks* by Professor Allen, yet Mr. Ward has great fitness for his work, both in his position and his experience. He is a son of W. G. Ward, one of the most distinguished of the Tractarian converts to Rome, and has therefore all the advantage of his father's close knowledge of Wiseman. Moreover, Mr. Ward's two volumes, *William George Ward and the Oxford Movement*, and *William George Ward and the Catholic Revival*, had shown him to be an admirable biographer. Mr. Ward's other work, chiefly philosophical, also marks him as a careful and cultured student and writer. While, then, the present work necessarily lacks, as has been said, the living, breathing, throbbing style of presentation which a personal friend or follower of one but lately passed from life could give, and while it is quite as much a study of the times of Wiseman, as its title indicates, as of his life, yet the biography is skilfully done. That it is in some sort an answer to a recent *Life of Cardinal Manning* would be evident without a confession of that fact in the preface, for the prominence given to Dr. Manning and the famous Errington case which centered about him is very marked. The effort to relieve Manning of all blameworthiness is evident and apparently successful.

The critical times in which Wiseman's career found place and his importance in the Catholic revival in England are well portrayed and full of interest.

Wiseman's immediate ancestors were Roman Catholic and Irish. He claimed descent from an early Protestant bishop of Dromore, Ireland, and from Sir John Wiseman, an auditor of the exchequer in the time of Henry VIII. His grandfather and father were merchants in Seville, Spain, where Nicholas was born in 1802. The family was well-to-do, and his only sister became Countess Gabrielli of Fano in Italy. Though the family returned to Ireland on the father's death in 1805, yet those few early years in Spain left their deep impression. Cardinal Manning said: "The first *stratum* of his mind was deeply tinged by the soil in which he was born. There was about him to the end of life a certain grandeur of conception in all that related to the works, the creations, and the worship of the church, which is evidently from Catholic Spain. He had been born in an atmosphere of Catholic splendor, and all his conceptions and visions of the sanctuary were as he had seen them in childhood, and as it ought to be, rather than as it is, in the chill and utilitarianism of modern England." The chapter on his childhood and youth is very meager, and almost devoid of anec-

dote or reminiscence. Wiseman learned to speak English in Waterford, where he spent the years 1805–9. In 1810 he entered St. Cuthbert's College, Ushaw, near Durham. Here Dr. Lingard was one of his teachers. While here, at the age of sixteen, he chose the priesthood as his vocation. In 1818 he was chosen, as one of several promising candidates, to be sent to the revived English College in Rome. There he stayed, as student, teacher, and rector, for twenty-two years. His scholastic career was eminent, and he was made doctor of divinity upon examination at the age of twenty-two, before taking orders. His linguistic powers were very great, and he developed into one of the few oriental specialists of that date. His *Horæ Syriacæ* brought him international reputation. His versatility also was displayed in his lectures of 1835, *On the Connexion between Science and Revealed Religion*. That decade marked a great Catholic revival on the continent and in England. In the latter country it was partly a result of the Catholic Emancipation Act of 1829, but was also a part of the great European movement. To guide this English revival Wiseman was sent to England and made president of Oscott College. Mr. Ward's chapter on the "English Papists," introductory to the English career of Wiseman, is apologetic, but well done, and deeply interesting. He is very fair in his account of how England came so bitterly to hate "papists," and does not hesitate severely to criticise Queen Mary and the pope of her time. The course of events in which Wiseman found the Romanists of England a despised sect and left them a respected rival of the establishment in dignity and honor is carefully drawn. Of course, to most Protestant readers interest centers in the Tractarians and the "perverts." And the first volume, dealing mainly with them and Wiseman's relation to them, will prove much more absorbing than the second, taken up as it is with the internal troubles of the cardinal's English administration. We get a glimpse or two of Newman, and it is really refreshing to find him off the pedestal of dignity and asceticism and eloquence, and to catch him using slang, and unclerically arrayed. Newman wrote of an argument of Wiseman's on the superior claims of the Roman church: "It has given me a stomach-ache." And the way in which Newman is stated to have silently announced to a delegate from Wiseman that he had abandoned his clerical position as an Anglican and was ready to become a lay member of the Roman communion has a touch of the melodramatic. It was done (Vol. I, p. 428) by his withdrawing from the reception room and presently reappearing in gray trousers instead of black.

The jealousy of the new converts on the part of the old Catholics of England is clearly pictured, and the method of Wiseman in trying to harmonize the two parties seems to have been just and wise. Possibly he was too partial to the converts.

His struggle for justice and his victory in the "no popery" agitation over the introduction of the Roman hierarchy in 1850, and his own position as cardinal archbishop of Westminster, remind us of our own recent American Protective Association turmoil. Here he showed himself conspicuously cool and able.

The unfortunate appointment of Dr. Errington as his coadjutor in the archbishopric, their struggle over Dr. Manning, and the final forced retirement of Dr. Errington make the second volume wearisome. The treatment seems out of proportion. Its only excuse is a controversial one, as an answer to recent aspersions of Dr. Manning.

Cardinal Wiseman, as here set forth, is an interesting study. Versatile and cosmopolitan, he is broad, but not deep. Yet in his efforts to modernize Romanism he shows a true philosophic grasp. Personally we see a man of strange contradictions. Craving sympathy, and extremely kind, he yet seems to alienate his nearest friends. Energetic, he is nevertheless a procrastinator. His English is pedantic and clumsy, yet often eloquent, and his story *Fabiola* seems to have been the *Quo Vadis* of its time. The few glimpses into his devotional and spiritual life impress one with a sense of its formalism. His love of show was strong, and he was a martinet in ritual. He had what Father Faber called "his lobster-salad side." Altogether one gathers from the work of Mr. Ward the impression of a rather gigantic character, physically and intellectually, which one is compelled to respect, and in a measure to admire. Yet, as here set forth, our love is not won, and our hearts are seldom touched. This may be one of the necessary limitations in a work produced under the conditions of this one. Yet Cardinal Wiseman will always be recognized as an important factor in English nineteenth-century history. And the Protestant student cannot fail to recognize and acknowledge the masterly way in which Rome always knows how to put her ablest men in the most important places. It is one of the advantages of absolutism.

With many of Mr. Ward's and Cardinal Wiseman's contentions as to the "exclusive church" and "authority" we must widely differ; but from the Roman Catholic point of view the history is broadly and ably treated.

WILLIAM FAIRLEY.

WAQUOIT, MASS.

DER TRADITIONSBEGRIFF DES URCHRISTENTHUMS BIS TERTULLIAN. Von DR. MARTIN WINKLER. München: Verlag von Rudolph Abt, 1897. Pp. vii + 132. M. 1.80.

THIS tract is intended to show that the Roman Catholic doctrine of the court of appeal, the final authority in religious teaching, was the doctrine of the post-apostolic church in its earliest period, and for this purpose the author summarizes the teaching of the Fathers down to Tertullian. This doctrine, as he states it, is: (1) the inclusion of both Scripture and tradition as coequal grounds of this authority; (2) the inclusion of both our Lord and his apostles as coequal ultimate sources of this authoritative teaching; (3) the transmission of the truth taught by Christ and his apostles through the episcopate, whose authority is based, not on the individual gifts of its members, but on their official position, and is conferred by the gift of the Holy Spirit, this special *charisma veritatis* being always associated with the episcopate, and confined to it; (4) the supremacy in the Catholic Church of Rome, and in the episcopal succession of its bishop; (5) the inclusion of Scripture in this group of authorities, only as it is interpreted by ecclesiastical authority, and not by private judgment.

For this purpose he cites first the *Didaché*, as presupposing a fixed and authoritative scheme of doctrine, morals, and worship, reaching back to the apostles, and transmitted by both Scripture and tradition. Clement of Rome he cites as follows: that apostolic teaching, both oral and written, is of the same authority as that of Christ himself; that this is transmitted through the bishops; and that charismatic teaching is subordinated to this authoritative teaching. The *Epistle* of Barnabas shows use of tradition, as well as Scripture. The organs of revelation are prophets, Christ, and apostles; and its recipient is the church. Ignatius is the champion of ecclesiastical unity in the interest of orthodoxy, and of the episcopate as the seat of an authority to which all must submit, and of Roman supremacy. The Roman church he entitles προκαθημένη τῆς ἀγάπης, which Dr. Winkler makes to mean "mistress of the entire church, which is united by love." The *epistle to Diognetus* is cited to the effect that the Logos, not men, is the channel of revelation, which is communicated by him to the apostles for the world; that there is this common apostolic tradition communicable to all, and secrets reserved for believers; and that the transmission of truth is guarded by the Holy Spirit, which is confined to the church. The *Shepherd* of Hermas speaks of new revelations made to him, independent of Christ and the apostles, which sounds subjective. But the

revealer is the hierarchical church. He also asserts Roman primacy. However, he names teachers among the transmitters of revelation. Polycarp emphasizes tradition, makes bishops successors of the apostles, but without inspiration. Papias of Hierapolis preferred tradition to writing, and sought for reports at first or second hand of our Lord's discourse.

The apologists of the second century, including Justin, are passed over for the most part, because their subject did not call for the use of tradition.

In the church writers, from Irenæus to Tertullian, it becomes necessary to defend Catholic tradition against the Gnostic assumption of a secret tradition of higher truth. Irenæus opposes to this Gnostic heresy both Scripture and tradition, the one church, the apostolic succession, the *charisma veritatis*, and, finally, the Roman primacy. Hippolytus finds seat of authority in tradition, in the church, and in the charismatic endowment of the bishop. But in one passage he declares Scripture alone to be the source of our knowledge of God, which Winkler plainly garbles. Clement of Alexandria maintains the inviolability of tradition. But he distinguishes between πίστις and γνῶσις, and makes the qualification for the latter depend on gifts instead of official position. This also Winkler garbles. Origen also distinguishes between πίστις and γνῶσις, makes tradition the limit of speculation, bishops the channel of tradition, and the Roman bishop central. This, however, furnishes the foundation only, on which the complete system is to be built by human wisdom, which is not confined to the official class. Garbled again. Tertullian is narrowly objective, emphasizes the *regula fidei*, depreciates Scripture as divinely ordained to furnish materials to skepticism, requires of a true church to show the orderly succession of its bishops, and accordance with the original and mother church of Rome.

Now, so far as this is intended to throw doubt on the assumed Protestant doctrine of an infallible Scripture as the sole standard of faith, by showing that the church writers down to Tertullian did not hold it, it is quite convincing. But so far as it attempts to substitute the Roman doctrine of ecclesiastical and episcopal authority and an infallible pope, it is ludicrously inadequate. In fact, a careful examination of the treatise and of the writings which it expounds in regard to the single matter of papal infallibility will furnish a good idea of the limits, the very contracted limits, within which its various conclusions can be verified. It is not one fixed doctrine of the foundations of

belief which is revealed by a study of men so diverse as Irenæus, Papias, Origen, and Tertullian, but a varied opinion ranging from objective rigidity to subjective freedom.

E. P. GOULD.

ST. GEORGE'S CHURCH,
New York, N. Y.

CALVINS PRÄDESTINATIONSLEHRE. Ein Beitrag zur Würdigung der Eigenart seiner Theologie und Religiosität. Von LIC. DR. MAX SCHEIBE, Privatdozent an der Universität Halle. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer, 1897. Pp. 127. M. 3.

AS A representative of the Reformed theology and as an excellent representative, also, of the spirit and breadth of view characteristic of the best modern theological culture, Scheibe brings to the study of Calvin an exceptional fitness. He comes not only with a special interest in his subject, but also with the capacity for a real appreciation based upon criticism at once sympathetic and independent. The task to which he has addressed himself is not the superfluous work of exhibiting afresh what Calvin taught concerning predestination. On that point there is no controversy. The problem, as he conceives it, is to understand (1) the motives which led to Calvin's utterances concerning predestination, and (2) the relation of this doctrine (*a*) to Calvin's theological system and (*b*) to his religiosity in general. In the introduction he gives a brief summary of the noteworthy differences of opinion among scholars touching these points. Three typical views are specially noted. On the one hand, Schweizer held that the eternal decree was for Calvin the "central dogma" controlling the entire system. At the opposite extreme stood Ritschl, who contended that Calvin's doctrine of predestination occupied only a very subordinate place in his system — that it was an "attachment to the doctrine of redemption," introduced because of the authority of Scripture. The third typical view is that of Schneckenburger. He regarded the doctrine in question as essential, but not central, in Calvin's system. Its motive was the necessity of establishing a ground for the personal certainty of salvation. In view of such differences, a fresh examination of the problem was manifestly worth while. And Scheibe has done his work admirably. With abundant knowledge and fine critical skill he has traced the historical connections and development of the doctrine, and shown its relation, on the one hand, to Calvin's theological system — regarded both as a whole and in its several parts — and,

on the other hand, to his entire religious view and temper. The result of the investigation, into the details of which it is not possible here to enter, may be briefly stated as follows: The decisive motive with Calvin for his doctrine of predestination is to be found neither in the peculiar temperament of the man nor in the historical connections of his theological development, neither in his attitude toward Scripture nor in his interest in determining the ground for personal assurance of salvation. The decisive motive — to which it is granted these other influences may have been subsidiary — was an intense regard for the divine honor, a strong persuasion — religious rather than speculative in its nature — that the "sovereignty" of God is duly recognized and honored only when we acknowledge that all events are determined by his will and power. And all God's works, however inscrutable to us, must be acknowledged to be absolutely righteous, since their end is the highest good, even his own glory. With rigorous consistency Calvin subordinates everything to the thought of the "glory of God;" and for him that thought is not, as it is for Luther, inseparable from the idea of the divine love. This view resembles that of Schweizer, except that, according to Scheibe, the specific doctrine of predestination — the eternal decree of election and reprobation — does not, strictly speaking, perform the office of a "central dogma" in Calvin's system. It is rather the practical application to a particular problem of the fundamental, all-embracing principle of divine sovereignty which equally rules every other part of the system.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER. J. R. VAN PELT.

AN OUTLINE OF CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY. By WILLIAM NEWTON CLARKE, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. ix + 488. $2.50, *net*.

IN many respects this is a noteworthy volume. It is readable from first to last. No man of average intelligence will fail to understand the language employed. The author has at his command a pure and forceful style, and by this alone a reader would be led from chapter to chapter with delight. We risk nothing when we rank this volume with Christian literature that will not be suffered to perish.

The writer's thought is as clear and vigorous as his style. It is never shallow or sluggish, but uniformly vital and moving. Dr. Clarke avoids scholastic terms and definitions; he makes little effort to prove what he says, but presents a simple statement of his theology

in paragraphs that follow one another in a natural order, without apparent effort at condensation or expansion.

The author seems to speak from the depths of his own consciousness, or as one who has absorbed and tested the principles which he asserts. Thought and language are obviously from the same mint. There are few citations of any kind from literature. Even the Scriptures are rarely quoted. The reader must decide for himself whether the doctrines proposed have their source in the Bible or in direct suggestions from God. The method of teaching is declarative for the most part, though sometimes merely suggestive.

A delightful Christian spirit pervades the whole volume. It is a devotional book in its effect, if not in its aim. The sentiments which it expresses come through the head from the heart. There are pages in almost every great theology of which the same may be truly said, but we do not recollect any doctrinal treatise which is animated throughout by so high a degree of Christian feeling.

Yet with these many and great excellencies Dr. Clarke's volume does not satisfy in all respects our convictions of what an "outline of Christian theology" ought to be. It makes too little use of the Holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament. An author who founds his teaching on the only documents of the Christian religion which make known to us the words and deeds of its Founder ought to give his readers, by quotation or reference, the parts of those documents on which he builds his doctrinal structure. In this way he ought to make it easy for his readers to compare his interpretation of the records with the exact language of the records themselves.

But we discover another imperfection in this interesting and valuable work, namely, a view of inspiration which tends to reduce in some degree the proper authority of Scripture. "Inspiration," we are told, "is exaltation, quickening of ability, stimulation of spiritual power; it is uplifting and enlargement of capacity for perception, comprehension, and utterance; and *all under the influence of a thought, a truth, or an ideal which has taken possession of the soul.* When such influence comes from God *through the power of some truth* of his imparted, a man should be larger, freer, richer-minded, with ability more prepared, and touched to diviner issues." Observe the words that we have italicized. Do they not teach that inspiration is effected by the influence of truth on the soul? One truth from God prepares the soul to welcome another truth. But so does one error prepare the soul to welcome another error. Is there not reason to believe that God not

only selects the truth to be revealed, but also prepares the soul of his servant to receive, comprehend, and utter that truth? Nay, is there not ground for asserting that God in earlier times, as well as by the lips of Jesus Christ, occasionally imparted truth in verbal form to men? Truth which they did not fully comprehend, but were nevertheless enabled by the Holy Spirit to remember and repeat with tongue or pen? Highly as we prize the words of Dr. Clarke on this subject, as on any other, we are constrained to believe that his treatment of inspiration needs revision, especially in the light of Paul's teaching as to a diversity of gifts, but the same Spirit, in the early church.

Again, we do not find in this volume a satisfactory treatment of the righteousness of God in punishing sinners. The thought of retribution for sin is apparently rejected. God's love and mercy are asserted with none too great earnestness and frequency, but the function of pain and loss, as holy penalties for sin under His moral government, is less thoroughly examined. Hence the discussion of the self-sacrifice of Christ appears to us unsatisfactory. The possibility of penal suffering for another is denied. But if we do not import into the endurance of penalty some degree of sinful feeling or volition, there is no ground for denying that a holy being may bear it in place of a sinner. For nothing but wrong-doing or approval of wrong-doing is impossible to a holy being. Indeed, for one to bear for another the just penalty of his sin, provided that other may thereby be saved from it and made a friend of God, is perhaps the highest conceivable function of love or good-will.

Lastly, the view of things to come proposed in Dr. Clarke's *Outline of Christian Theology* seems to us more or less incompatible with a natural interpretation of the New Testament. Yet the language of Jesus Christ and of his apostles concerning the future influence of Christianity in the world and concerning the state of men after death is confessedly figurative and hard to be understood. Great caution is therefore necessary in explaining that language and in formulating a sober statement of the events which it foreshadows. Dr. Clarke is disposed to believe that the present order of things will be continued indefinitely, that the death and the resurrection of the saints take place at the same time, and that the predictions of a general or public judgment mean no more than that the process of divine judgment is carried forward with every moral being through every hour of the present life — being completed, if ever, at death. We do not think

that this view is an altogether just representation of the biblical doctrine.

ALVAH HOVEY.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,
Newton Centre, Mass.

DER DIENST DES CHRISTEN IN DER ÄLTEREN DOGMATIK. Von A. SCHLATTER, Professor in Berlin. (=Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, herausg. von A. Schlatter und H. Cremer, Vol. I, Heft 1.) Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1897. Pp. 81. M. 1.20.

THIS is the first of a series of studies issued under the editorial supervision of Drs. Schlatter, recently of Berlin, and H. Cremer, of Greifswald. The design of the series is, according to the express declaration of the editors, the collection and publication of such scientific contributions to the literature of theology, whether in the dogmatic or historical line, as may be deemed unsuited for the book form, but yet of too much value to be consigned to a mere passing life in the periodicals of the day. The standpoint of the series is that of confessional Lutheranism. The productions to be taken into it are to be, not controversial arguments, but positive and constructive essays intended to establish faith in the divine origin of Christianity as a religion, and to preserve for the church its theology as a Christian system, so far as this has not been lost, or restore it to her, as far as it has been allowed to disappear. The first number of this series, by Dr. Schlatter, is a minute investigation into the conception of the Christian's service as a part of the elder Protestant theology. Dr. Schlatter finds that in many essential particulars this conception was passive and ineffective as compared with that of the evangelicalism of today. With reference to the evangelization of the heathen world, for instance, the favorite theory of the older theologians was that the gospel had already been preached to the heathen in the apostolic age, and having been rejected by them at that time there was nothing left but condemnation for the heathen world. Christians of succeeding ages were no longer bound to consider foreign mission work a part of the service they owe as Christians. As to the delinquent and criminal masses at home, the elder theologians relegated them to the care of the state. Their view of the relations of church and state allowed them to devolve this responsibility on the secular power, thus relieving the Christian of another class of duties. In a similar strain the author points out the defectiveness of

the idea of Christian duty by bringing into view the essentially passive conception of the reformers as to the church, conversion, holiness, freedom of the will, inspiration, and, in fact, every other part of the human side of salvation. Accordingly his conclusion is that the more we study the conceptions of the Reformation period and those of the present age, the more fully shall we realize God's grace leading us to a higher appreciation of his thoughts. The heritage of the Reformation has not, indeed, been preserved intact, but much has been added to it of greater value than that which has been lost. And this has been due to the study of the Holy Scriptures. What is needed, therefore, is a renewed and deeper study of the Bible. To all of which we say, Amen.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

CHRIST OF HISTORY AND OF EXPERIENCE, being the *Kerr Lectures* for 1897. By REV. DAVID W. FORREST, M.A., D.D., Wellington Church, Glasgow. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark; New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1897. Pp. xx +479. $4.20.

THE Kerr Foundation, which was instituted by the United Presbyterian church in Scotland a decade ago, has already achieved an enviable reputation. Unlike so many special lectureships, it afforded occasion to the incumbents either to increase a name already won or to render noteworthy a name not previously familiar. Hitherto it has escaped the vice of some other foundations of a similar kind, which have been so used as to furnish little more than opportunities for eminent men to say over again what they had previously expressed less rhetorically and with greater scientific precision. Possibly this may be traced to the wise provision which insures the incoming occupant three years' notice, and requires that the lectures shall be published within twelve months of their delivery. But, whatever the causes, no Scottish theological lectureship has up to this point been so uniformly successful in its results. Professor James Orr, of Edinburgh, set a difficult example in his learned and timely book on *The Christian View of God and the World*. But Dr. James Kidd, of Glasgow, the second incumbent, was equal to the demands of the situation and, in his *Morality and Religion*, produced the best work in English on the subject, thus doubling Mr. Forrest's responsibility. The bril-

liant Glasgow preacher has equaled his predecessors, and once more we have a remarkable book. This has been recognized on all hands, as is shown by the fact that we must now dismiss Mr. Forrest, and speak of Dr. Forrest, for the University of Glasgow has been quick to see when the doctorate in divinity ought to be bestowed.

The main body of the book consists of nine lectures; an appendix of notes follows, extending to nearly one hundred pages, and containing valuable elucidations of the text proper. The lectures divide themselves naturally into three parts. (1) Lectures I–III, treating the "Christ of History," under the headings: "The Uniqueness of Christ's Moral Self-Consciousness;" "Christ's Self-Consciousness as Interpreted by His Claims;" "The Growth of Christ's Self-Consciousness, and the Method of His Self-Manifestation;" "Jesus and the Twelve." (2) Lecture IV, "The Transition from the Historical to the Spiritual Christ." (3) Lectures V–IX, dealing with the "Christ of Experience," under the titles: "The Person of Christ and His Revelation of the Godhead;" "The Objective Element in the Redemptive Work of Christ;" "The New Life in Christ and the Conditions of its Realization;" "The Relation of the Spiritual to the Historical in Christian Faith;" "The Conditions of Final Judgment—Is Faith in Christ Necessarily Conscious?" On the whole, the first part strikes one as the most successful, in the sense that it presents a single unity, welded in all its details with wonderful skill and insight, and with impressive force begotten of homethrusting conviction. At the same time the later lectures contain portions which at least equal the earlier, even though the unifying genius does not display itself so conspicuously, perhaps because the same occasion does not offer. I would direct the earnest attention of all students to the discussion of the resurrection is Lecture IV; to the admirable handling of the kenotic theory in Lecture V; to the timely, brilliant, and good-tempered criticism of the neo-Hegelian argument in Lecture VIII, which is particularly noticeable as coming from a graduate of the leading neo-Hegelian university; and to the acute, weighty, and highly original reply to the question, "Is Faith in Christ Necessarily Conscious?" with which the text proper concludes.

The book is one of which theologians ought to possess themselves, and its value to the working minister, in preparation for pulpit duty, is patent on the face of it. Taking it for all in all, I should be inclined to stamp it as the most brilliant defense of the orthodox position put before the public in recent years. In these circumstances, it is plain

that many passages might be quoted, and that some objections might be taken to the numerous problems brought under review. But, as a brief notice cannot convey anything of the distinct flavor of Dr. Forrest's writing, it may be more interesting and apposite to call attention to the changed theological atmosphere now prevalent in Scotland, of which the volume is a typical product and witness.

The confessional views so characteristic of the period dominated by Candlish, Chalmers, Cunningham, Cairns, and their fellows have completely disappeared. Dr. Forrest writes in the main as if such a body as the Westminster Assembly had never existed. At the same time he is orthodox. I am well aware that this puzzles Americans, who still suppose that Scotland remains the classic land of Presbyterianism of the true blue order. The fact is that the center of interest has shifted. While the traditional standards hold unaltered, men no longer discuss the doctrines involved after the style therein formulated. The return to Christ, and the determination to be restrained from him by no intermediaries, however reverend, provide Dr. Forrest with his motive force. Further, the general *milieu* is markedly social, ethical, and mastered by the immanent aspect of Deity, as contrasted with the individualism, doctrinalism, and dualism of the writers who were prominent in the fifties. In other words, oxthodox, and hyper-orthodox, in some ways, though he be, our author is modern. Hence the power, interest, and eloquence of his writing. He displays new and enlivening qualities without knowing it. For example, he is always concrete, never merely learned or pedantic; he is philosophically trained, knows at first hand what the destructive men have to say, sees their point of view, and disdains to reply by bare objurgation; he has plenty of humor, and fears no charges of irreverence for its free use; his psychological insight, especially in matters ethical, constantly wins upon the reader; and his moral swing enables him to realize the living import of the doctrines he discusses. In all these respects he stands sharply contrasted with the old protagonists of Scotch orthodoxy. The truth is that he has entered upon an inheritance in which they had no share. The generation of Hegelian domination at the western university, though it seemed at first to make for rationalism, now exhibits its true influence. Dr. Forrest has ploughed with the neo-Hegelians; he has caught their historical secret; he has been inoculated with their overwhelming sense for Christianity, but he has not broken with the historical Christ. His peculiar merit is to have united what is best in the new spirit with what is most stable in the

old orthodoxy. Hence his book is not only remarkable in itself, as I have endeavored to indicate, but it is a type of the kind of religious thought for which Scotland now stands. Faith has taken to itself a fresh body of life. So long as she can rely on men of Dr. Forrest's convictions, training, literary brilliance, and moral heroism, Scotland need have no fear that the apostolic succession of spirit, blood, and brain, so magnificently maintained since Knox, will be interrupted unworthily.

R. M. WENLEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN.

SYMBOLIK ODER CONFESSIONELLE PRINCIPIENLEHRE. Von D. K. F. NÖSGEN, Professor in Rostock. Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1897. Pp. xvi + 516. M. 8.50; bound, M. 9.50.

THIS is a book based on extensive and generally accurate learning. It surveys the entire field of religious life and theological thought as expressed in creeds and confessions from a Lutheran point of view, and might, therefore, be compared to a geocentric conception of the universe. Like the historical work of Ed. Koellner, *Symbolik aller christlichen Confessionen* (1844), a comparison of the Roman with the Lutheran system; or still more like the high-church Lutheran work of H. C. F. Guerike, *Allgemeine christliche Symbolik, vom lutherisch-kirchlichen Standpunkte* (3d ed., 1860), the *Symbolik* of Nösgen proceeds throughout from the point of view of the consensus of the confessions of the Lutheran branch of the church, and aims chiefly, neither at a vindication of the essential unity of all distinctively Christian teaching, nor at the essential unity of all evangelical Protestant teaching, but at a representation of the differences between the great historical branches of Christianity. It is fashioned in a polemic rather than an irenic mold. The consensus of the Lutheran confessions becomes for the author the critical standard of judgment respecting the scriptural truth and practical worth of the doctrines of all other branches of the church. In this respect the *Symbolik* of Nösgen resembles the celebrated Roman Catholic work of G. A. Moehler, *Symbolik oder Darstellung der dogmatischen Gegensätze der Katholiken u. Protestanten* (1834), which is a defense of the doctrines of Romanism in opposition to the divergent teaching of Protestantism. Books of this class may be regarded as important contributions to doctrinal history, but they fail to give an inquiring mind a just insight into the

distinctively Christian unity underlying and animating doctrinal differences, and thus they foster sectarian instead of catholic tendencies.

Nösgen discusses his general theme in three parts. The first deals with the doctrine concerning church symbols, and shows their nature, value, and necessity. Faith in Christ prompts to the confession of Christ (p. 33). This chapter is followed by a succinct account of the occasion, the origin, the formation, and the significance of the three great ecumenical creeds. From these the author passes to a general survey of the history and subject-matter of the Lutheran, the Reformed, the Roman Catholic, and the Greek Catholic symbols. The word "Reformed" is not used in contradistinction to Presbyterian, Methodist, Episcopal, or Baptist, but is taken in the comprehensive sense of the sixteenth century, as denoting all non-Lutheran Protestant communions, except Socinians, Mennonites, Quakers, and the like. This general survey, like the entire work, stands squarely on the fundamental mysteries of Christianity. The eye is not offended by any signs of skepticism regarding either the Christian facts themselves or the trustworthiness of the Christian records. Nor does intense Lutheranism here, as in the second part, influence the author in reviewing non-Lutheran confessions.

The second part, beginning with the doctrine concerning Holy Scripture, proceeds to review in order all doctrines concerning God, man, the person of Christ, justification, and onward to the question concerning the last things; in every case opening the review with the symbols of the Lutheran church, and then, from the Lutheran point of view, discussing and judging the Reformed confessions, and the confessions of the Roman and Greek Catholic churches. Unquestioning confidence in the superiority of the Lutheran interpretation of the facts of Christianity betrays the author into the habit of depreciating the worth of all phases of difference as taught by other confessions, especially by the confessions of the Reformed or non-Lutheran Protestant churches. Even when he concedes the agreement of the teaching of the Reformed with that of the Lutheran church, as concerning the sacrifice of Christ (p. 215), justification by faith (p. 227), and the last things (p. 413), he nevertheless deduces from varying modes of expression a more or less serious departure from genuine orthodoxy. In some instances Nösgen's zeal for setting forth the superiority of Lutheran doctrine betrays him into a misstatement of fact. Speaking of the incarnation, he asserts that "the Reformed church views the two natures, not as concrete, *deus et homo*, but only as abstract: *deitas et*

humanitas, that is, only as *Proprietätenkomplexe*" (p. 206), quoting in evidence a passage from the Belgic Confession. But the Heidelberg Catechism, of which the author says that "by Lutherans this confession has ever been held to be the most beautiful blossom of Reformed symbolism" (p. 108), teaches that the Mediator is true man and true God, *verus homo et verus deus* (Q. 15); and the Westminster Confession asserts that He "is very God and very man, yet one Christ" (VIII, 2).

The third part draws with clearness and force the broad line of difference between all Christian creeds and confessions, collectively taken, distinguished by belief in Jesus Christ as Lord and Savior, and every non-Christian system of belief or speculation; and may be pronounced the strongest and most healthy portion of the work.

Apart from the one-sidedness, and the incapacity or unwillingness of the author to do full justice to the non-Lutheran Protestant confessions, Nösgen's *Symbolik* is an excellent work of Christian scholarship, a meritorious contribution to this department of theological literature.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Lancaster, Penn.

EML. V. GERHART.

MORALE 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 & C^ie^, éditeurs; Paris: Fischbacher, 1897, 1898. 2 vols. Pp. 437, 460. Fr. 16.

THIS is the third and final part of an extensive "Étude sur l'Œuvre de la Rédemption," and has as an alternative and explanatory title the words, "Les Conséquences pratiques." References to the earlier volumes on the theology of the New Testament and Christian dogmatics abound;[1] and the three parts, taken together, form a coherent, progressive, and imposing system.

The subject-matter of the present volumes is disposed in three books, which discuss, respectively, the principle, the process, and the fruits of the Christian life. In the first of these the moral nature and estate of man without the law, under the law, and regenerate, is depicted, and the fundamental principle of the Christian life is unfolded, namely, an entering up of the soul into God by which it is vitalized and completed — such a losing of self as is its real finding.

[1] See the review of these volumes in the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, Vol. I, pp. 1082–9.

The second book deals with the Christian duties and virtues, reversing the order of treatment followed by Rothe. Duties are classified as those of spirituality, of justice, of love, of piety; and virtues as those of faith, of love, of gratitude, and of hope. The third book describes the fruition of the Christian life in the family, the state, the church; in science and in art. It will thus be seen — what is implied in the alternative title — that it is the practice of Christian living, the character and conduct of the Christian man, rather than ethical theory, with which the author occupies himself. "Christ, the man-God, giving himself up for us, this is the substance of the Christian gospel; Christ, the man-God, living in us, this is the substance of Christian ethics, the fecund principle of the believer's life" (Vol. I, p. 33).

The student of philosophical or "scientific" ethics will doubtless regard the work as a fresh demonstration of the inherent weakness and confusion of what is called "Christian ethics," always being deflected from the great questions or led to treat them in an evasive and left-handed manner by dogmatic prepossessions, exegetical interest, pious sentiment, and the homiletic habit. For the discussion of such problems as the nature of personality, of the *summum bonum*, of virtue, and the origin, grounds, and validity of moral obligation, no good thing can come out of Nazareth. Here, the philosophers will say, is a sample sentence (Vol. I, p. 318): "Christ is my law: such is the *résumé* of my duties, the sole obligation of the new covenant;" but this use of the words, law, duty, obligation, is utterly confusing; the "language of Canaan" is not current in the realm of science. And this impatient judgment of the philosopher will not be without some reason as concerns both this treatise and most others in the same field. But a different estimate is likely to be given by those who view the work from the standpoint of Christian experience, biblical study, and practical life. They will be impressed, we think, with the devoutness and fervor of its spirit, the general soundness and the breadth of its theology, the thoroughness and freedom in biblical research which it evinces, the candor and sympathy and good sense with which in general it treats the so-called "secular life," and, above all, its display of the immense and unique contribution of the Sacred Scriptures to the solution of the moral and social problems of mankind. It has not, indeed, the suggestiveness of Schleiermacher's work, the speculative subtlety and great grasp of Rothe's, the statesmanlike strength of Martensen's and Dorner's; but its exegetical learning is superior to any of these, and its discussions and literary references are in all fields

brought down to date. The author's mind is in a high degree both alert and hospitable. One could wish that he might have caught from Janet the secret of condensation and brilliancy of phrase. Here and there, too, matters are introduced which are only remotely ethical; thus the chapter on prayer, while excellent in its way, chiefly discusses petition and its answer. But this aspect of prayer belongs, we should say, in the first place, to the field of biblical theology, and, secondly, to that of dogmatics; under the head of ethics we ought to inquire, first as to its obligation, and then as to its influence on character and conduct. But to these matters — and what can be more important? — Bovon pays scant attention. Perhaps, also, there is some lack of maturity and firmness of view respecting the state, the nature of law, the function of penalty, socialism, and the ethical import of private property. Herbert Spencer is called an avowed materialist, and, by implication, a positivist, whereas, in any precise definition of these terms, he is neither. Henry George is called "the apostle of American socialism," but a socialist he assuredly was not. In general, however, as concerns this class of themes, the author shows a discrimination and a sobriety of judgment which are to be commended, especially to our perfervid writers on "Christian sociology." It is the great spirit and the fine and sane individualism of Alexandre Vinet — to whose memory the work is inscribed — which reappear in its pages.

WILLIAM FREMONT BLACKMAN.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

SURSUM CORDA. A Book of Praise. E. H. JOHNSON, Editor; E. E. AYRES, Assistant Editor. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society; New York: Ward & Drummond, 1898. Pp. viii + 654. $1.

THIS admirable hymn- and tune-book appeals at once to the lover of the best in music and words. It is prepared for the same class of users as *In Excelsis*, *The Plymouth Hymnal*, and the new edition of the (Episcopal) *Church Hymnal*. Granting to each of these books its own excellence, the very differences in their make-up reveal the definite aim of the editors of *Sursum Corda*. In size, weight, and general appearance there is little to choose between them, except that the *Church Hymnal* has smaller pages and is thicker. The sources of both the hymns and the tunes are substantially the same for all the books.

The difference between the books is largely in amount of material and use of space, as may be seen from the following tables:

	Sursum Corda	In Excelsis	Church Hymnal	Plymouth Hymnal
Hymns	856	861	685	638
Chant selections	35	18	16	27
Doxologies	....	15	38	....
Total	891	894	739	665
Tunes	992	871	818	527
Chants	68	52	154	31
Duplicates	353	221	244	165
Total	1413	1144	1216	723
Pages of music	624	727	832	502
Pages of index, etc	38	38	48	150
Psalter	....	...	....	30
Total	662	765	880	682

Thus the *Sursum Corda*, with the smallest number of pages, has much the largest amount of music and almost the maximum of selections. It is high praise for the editors that this has been accomplished almost solely by skill in the arrangement of the pages, with no sacrifice in size and distinctness of the notes. To crowd page after page in fact, while avoiding the appearance of doing so, means good book-making. The main object of this crowding, however, is not mere increase in number of tunes, but to contrive a large choice of music for each hymn. Two tunes to a hymn is the common arrangement, while not infrequently there are three, *e. g.*, one of the standard new settings, some entirely fresh composition, and the good old tune familiar to the last generation. Occasionally even four distinct pieces of music are printed with a single hymn. One is much impressed in looking through the book by the care taken to preserve familiar music which is good. A glance at the index of composers shows that the earlier American writers who have influenced our taste in church music receive generous appreciation, both in the compact, critical estimate therein added to their names, and in the abundant use made of their tunes. The catholic spirit of the book is shown noticeably also in the fact that scarcely a famous composer of any nationality fails to be represented in *Sursum Corda* by more tunes than in any of the other books mentioned.

It may seem ungenerous to point out faults in a book of such rare excellences. But from the musician's point of view it is a pity that most writers of tunes flounder in their notation of chromatic chords, and editors appear to be either shaky themselves or too kindly disposed toward the composer to adopt a uniformly correct notation. One may condone archaisms like the famous use of a signature of two flats for the key of c minor by Bach, but the modern poets of tone should be compelled to spell their music correctly. Thus in the first two tunes to Hymn 814 the composers chose to make use of the same chromatic chord on the word "and." One spelled it wrongly, the other (Tours) rightly. We might easily forgive the editors for correcting many an error of the same sort, even when committed by a Carl Maria von Weber or a Beethoven, in the interest of uniform accuracy.

One is likewise occasionally offended by the mutilation of some fine music in process of adapting it to a hymn. Thus the lovely "Child Jesus" of Gade is dished up as Denmark with a commonplace extension of the final cadence which fairly hurts one who is familiar with the tender grace of the original close. If editors can take such liberties in the adapting of music to words, how would it do for them to try the reverse sometimes? Thus a little refitting would make "Jesus, Lover of My Soul" go to "Portuguese Hymn" after this fashion:

O Jesus, Thou lover of my needy soul,
O let me, O let me to Thy bosom fly.
While yet the nearer waters wildly roll,
And while the raging tempest,
And while the raging tempest,
And while the raging tempest still is high. Etc.

Unquestionably after a time a new association is established for such remodeled music, so that we can both accept and love it. The same thing would be true of the mutilated poem. And yet one is fain to think that a keen sense of fitness would refuse to profit by such defacement of either words or music.

The above strictures are meant in the nature of a sigh that a book so unusually good should contain some of the old errors, and prove anew that perfection cannot be found in this world of "many men of many minds."

The book is well indexed and has a valuable collection of chants. Any congregation that adopts it will find it more and more satisfactory as its treasures are made familiar through use.

POUGHKEEPSIE, N. Y.

EVANGELISCHE MISSION IM NYASSA-LANDE. Von JULIUS RICHTER. Zweite vermehrte Auflage. Berlin: Buchhandlung der Berliner Evangelischen Missionsgesellschaft, 1898. Pp. 225. M. 3.

THE first edition of Pastor Richter's book, as we are informed in the preface, was published in 1892, and has met with such a rapid sale that a second edition has become necessary. This second edition has important additions: the later political history of the English and German possessions in central Africa, the later history of the Scotch and English missions in the Nyassa country, and the beginnings of the German missions in the Konde country at the north end of lake Nyassa. The book is, by reason of its subject-matter, a fascinating one, and is made much more so by the instructive manner in which it is written. We have, first of all, a description of the country and its inhabitants, based on Johnston's *British Central Africa* and Merensky's *Deutsche Arbeit am Nyassa*. Then follows a short history of Dr. Livingstone's discoveries and of his subsequent endeavors to have the Christian people of England and Scotland plant missions in central Africa. A description of the first unsuccessful attempt of the Universities' mission to plant stations in the territory south of lake Nyassa, a short history of the Livingstone, the Blantyre, and the later Universities' missions follow in this order. The last part of the book is devoted to the new missions of the Berlin missionary society and of the Moravians in the German possessions. The book is a real contribution to missionary literature. The author discusses with good judgment the problems that confront these missions in central Africa. He knows, too, how to draw valuable conclusions from statistics; *e. g.*, that in the oldest of these central African missions but 13 per cent. of the missionaries have stayed longer than five years, and that 29 per cent. of the missionaries have died on the field, showing with what sacrifices these new missions are being planted in the heart of Africa. On the slave trade the book has much to say that is interesting.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY. A. J. RAMAKER.

TWENTY-SIX YEARS OF MISSIONARY WORK IN CHINA. By MRS. GRACE STOTT, of the China Inland Mission. New York and Chicago: American Tract Society, 1897. Pp. 366. $1.75.

THIS volume is a plain, unvarnished tale, true to the missionary's environment. The profound piety of Mr. and Mrs. Stott is patent.

The portrayal of incidents, familiar to the missionary, novel to the general reader, is extremely lifelike. The Chinaman, converted and unconverted, is faithfully depicted. The genuineness of the conversions from all ranks in life is reassuring. The growth of adherents, within twenty-five years, from zero to one thousand is inspiring. The consummation in a jubilee, in which even the heathen join, is thrilling. This sentence fairly represents the author's conclusion regarding her work in China: "The dark places of the earth are still full of the habitations of cruelty, and yet the missionary's life is one of surpassing joy. It is true that the Chinese as a race are dirty, treacherous, and, in many instances, cruel; but I can bear testimony to a warmth of earnestness, to fidelity, and patient devotion among the converts, not exceeded by the Christians of any country."

LOUIS AGASSIZ GOULD.

SHELBYVILLE, IND.

Sin and Its Conquerors. By Very Rev. Dean Farrar. (Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1897; pp. 147; $0.50.) These five sermons exhibit that wide acquaintance with literature, that felicity of style, and that knowledge of his age, which always win for Dean Farrar interested and thoughtful attention. The theme and the treatment accorded it make it a welcome addition to the series of "Little Books for Life's Guidance."—*Four Essays.* By Rev. George Henslow, M.A., F.L.S., F.G.S., etc. (London: George Stoneman, 1897; 3s.) Two of these four essays deal with themes central in theology. The former of these, "Christ Not Evolved," is a suggestive and, in the main, a logical argument for the reality of the incarnation. The latter, "The At-one-ment, Not Atonement," seems to base its argument that the reconciliation effected by Christ has relation to man only, and not to God, upon the etymological signification of the English word "at-one-ment." The position of the essay may be tenable, but it is not to be defended in this way. Throughout the essays the author appears to be better versed in the modern theories of evolutionary science than in the scientific study of the New Testament.—HENRY TODD DEWOLFE.

Lao-Tze's Tao-Te-King: Chinese-English, with Introduction, Transliteration, and Notes. By Dr. Paul Carus. (Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co., 1898; pp. 345; $3.) This work is divided into six parts, the first of which is forty-seven pages of introduction, discussing the facts in the life of Lao-Tze and the scope and meaning

of his philosophy. Then follows the text in Chinese characters, occupying about forty pages, clearly and accurately printed, arranged in perpendicular columns, but reading from left to right, as in English. After this comes the translation into English, occupying about the same space. An effort is made to imitate the terse and rugged style of the original, even to adopting metrical renderings wherever they occur in the classic. By far the most important section of the work is the 138 pages following, which consist of a transliteration of the text, character by character, with an appended translation opposite the characters, so that the most careless reader is never in the least doubt how the author arrived at his interpretation. About forty-seven pages of notes and comments are succeeded by a careful index, intended to be also a sort of concordance to the text itself, the key-words being in English, but the passages where the corresponding Chinese words occur are noted.

The author has availed himself of previous translations, but his own is quite independent of them, and in many cases an obvious improvement. His linguistic and philosophical knowledge is wide and thorough, and he shows a skill in explaining the almost incomprehensible enigmas of the classic of reason and virtue which is most surprising. Whether he is right in his opinion that this fragment of antiquity "is an indispensable book, and no one who is interested in religion can afford to leave it unread," is to us doubtful, but not to Dr. Carus, who is certain that "there is need of a popular edition that will help the English-reading public to appreciate the philosophical genius and the profound religious spirit of one of the greatest men that ever trod the earth." The translator finds abundant parallels between Lao-Tze and the Hebrew writers, and at every step illustrates his theses with lucid candor. It did not lie within his plan to consider the fact that practically the *Tao-Te-King* is in China an almost unknown book. It is significant that of the five editions consulted in the preparation of this translation four are published in Japan and one in Paris, not one of them within the limits of the Chinese empire. The classic has no "clear exposition of the duties of men in their marital, parental, and fraternal relations;" no "instruction upon their obligations and rights as members of the family, the village, and the state;" and is "silent upon the voice of conscience and the effects of sin upon the soul of man." As Dr. Williams justly remarks, this shows Lao-Tze to have been more of an ascetic than a philanthropist, more of a metaphysician than a humanitarian. There are few or no misprints in

the Chinese characters, but several in English words. To all who are interested in the abstruse topics touched on by the venerable Chinese philosopher this latest rendering is to be commended as in every respect scholarly and in its way quite a model.—ARTHUR H. SMITH.

The Zend-Avesta. Translanted by James Darmesteter. "Sacred Books of the East," American edition, Vol. III, containing: Part I, "The Vendidad," and Part II, "The Sirozahs, Yasts, and Nyayis." (New York: Christian Literature Co., now Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898; pp. 390 + 384; $3.) The admirable American edition of the "Sacred Books of the East" is continued by Professor Darmesteter's classical translation of the Avesta. This edition has been able to take advantage of the work done by Professor Darmesteter before his death in preparing a second edition of the Vendidad and a new introduction to the Avesta literature as a whole. It is well known that the author completely changed his views on the age and growth of the Zoroastrian writings. These new ideas are presented in the introduction. According to him now all this literature is late, and the Gathas, although still the oldest part of the Avesta, represent the latest growth of the Zoroastrian spirit. The Vendidad, though later in its composition, is older in its material. One can easily understand how such a state of things may be possible, since ritual like that whose record is contained in the Vendidad preserves its form much longer than prophecy, to which the Gathas may be best compared. Nevertheless, many have not been convinced by Professor Darmesteter's arguments, and the majority of scholars still maintains the antiquity of the Gathas, both in form and in content.—G. S. GOODSPEED.

A la suite des Israélites du Sinaï en Canaan. Étude biblique. Par Jules Gindraux. (Lausanne: Georges Bridel & C^ie^, 1897; pp. 225; fr. 2.50.) In a former volume the author treated the exodus; in this he brings the narrative down to the entrance into Canaan. His aim is not to write a critical history of the period, but to point out, first, the bearing of the events of the wandering upon the religious development of the people; and, secondly, to suggest spiritual lessons for Christians of today. His point of view is that of a strongly evangelical and rather conservative observer of contemporary critical discussions. While he accepts certain principles of the literary analysis of the Hexateuch, the fact seems to have little influence on his interpretation of the history. In most cases no attempt to analyze the sources of a particular narrative is made. The most suggestive passage is in the

first chapter, where the author discusses the supernatural elements of the history in relation to the Hebrew conception of God and nature. His elaborate review of various theories as to the stories of Balaam's ass and the "standing still" of the sun at Joshua's command, concluded by the suggestion of a historic basis for each narrative, sufficiently indicates his confidence in the general historicity of the documents.— JOHN R. SLATER.

St. Pauli Brief an die Römer, in Bibelstunden für die Gemeinde ausgelegt. Von W. F. Besser. Dritte Auflage. (Halle a. S.: Richard Mühlmann's Verlagshandlung, 1897; 2 vols.; pp. 781 and 630; M. 10.) Besser's expositions are a standard work in Germany. They comprise Matthew, Luke, John, Acts, Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, the story of the passion, and the story of the exaltation of our Lord. Some of the volumes have run to the seventh and eighth edition. They give a running exposition, in terse and vivid style, getting at the heart of the text, orthodox in doctrine, with real spiritual unction, often passing quite naturally into invocation and prayer. "Bibelstunden" are a kind of free devotional meetings that are very popular in Germany; they are devoted to an expository study of the Bible. Besser's books probably originated in such work, and are designed to assist in it, but they are good devotional reading. We heartily commend the book as a fine product of German piety.— *Das menschlich Anziehende in der Erscheinung Jesu Christi.* Von Dr. Gustav Zart. (München: Oskar Beck, 1898; pp. 95; M. 1.20.) A volume, slight in size, but rich in matter. It is an analysis of the attractiveness of the human personality of Jesus, done with really artistic delicacy of touch and rare exegetical insight. The reviewer did not merely dip into the book, but read it through. What more can one say? The person of Jesus awakens fresh admiration and homage in the reading. Preachers will find rare homiletical matter in it.— WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Die paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht und ihre Beziehung zur jüdischen Apokalyptik. Von Ernst Teichmann. (Leipzig: J. C. B. Mohr, 1896; pp. vi + 125; M. 2.50.) A prominent feature of this monograph is the relating of Paul's doctrine to the later Jewish apocalyptic ideas — an important procedure, since the idea of a glorious coming of the Messiah in his kingdom did not originate with Paul, but was current among the Jews before his time. The early Christians changed the first and only coming of the Jewish apocalypse into a

second appearance in glory. Paul's expectation that "the day of the Lord" was at hand is apparent in Phil. 4 : 5 ; 1 Cor. 7 : 29 ; 1 Thess. 4 : 15, etc. His conception of the advent has features of the Jewish apocalyptic which show its influence upon him, such as the idea of the preceding distress and the descent out of heaven.

Teichmann does not find in Paul a doctrine of an intermediate state explicitly formulated, although it is implied in the resurrection. He concludes, on account of ἄβυσσον (Rom. 10 : 7), that the notion of an underworld was not foreign to Paul's thought. The doctrine of the resurrection of the dead at the parousia our author finds in its "simplicity and originality" in 1 Thess. 4 : 13 ff. But his conclusion that to this originality belonged the idea that the dead would rise "with their earthly bodies" is open to serious question. 1 Thess. 5 : 23 does not support this interpretation, for "body" (σῶμα) does not mean "the flesh" (σάρξ), but the *form* of body, which may be either of flesh or "spiritual" (πνευματικόν). The fact that Paul does not mention in this epistle the distinction later made by him between σῶμα and σάρξ is not proof that he did not entertain it when he wrote the letter. He was concerned only with comforting the believers who had "sorrow" lest those who had died would not share in the bliss of the kingdom.

The situation in Corinth was different, and to meet it Paul discusses the nature of the resurrection-body. It will be "spiritual," and the believers who survive the parousia will be "changed," putting off "corruption" and putting on "incorruption." Teichmann finds similar ideas in Baruch, Enoch, and Maccabees. Our author finds, however, that the apostle's perils led him to think that he would not survive the parousia and to the abandonment of the doctrine of the resurrection. This opinion is based upon 2 Cor. 4 : 16 — 5 : 10. Yet the distinct affirmations in the same epistle, and in the later one to the Philippians (2 Cor. 1 : 9 ; 4 : 14 ; Phil. 3 : 11), are not accorded due consideration. Accordingly, in two epistles there stand side by side two opposite conceptions of the future life of believers — the intermediate state and resurrection at the parousia, and immediate judgment and entrance upon the heavenly life at death. The judgment now by God and now by Christ is shown to have a parallel in the Jewish apocalypses. Those will be saved in the judgment who believe (Rom. 10 : 9). The unbelievers are not eternally punished, but their fate is the same as that of the believers would have been if Christ had not been raised — they "perish" (1 Cor. 15 : 18). Yet our author finds in Rom. 8 : 1 the abrogation of the judgment of believers. He finds,

too, the doctrine of universal salvation in the declaration that all will be made alive in Christ; since, if all are to be raised, all must have become possessed of the πνεῦμα (1 Cor. 15 : 22, 28; Rom. 11 : 32). "Paul raises himself above himself. . . . . His mind was great enough to include in itself the contradictory." Here is abundant material to choose from for those who will support their dogmatic theology on the authority of Paul! — ORELLO CONE.

Die Wahrheit des Christentums, ihr Gewicht und ihr Erweis. Von Dr. P. Bard. (Schwerin in M.: Fr. Bahn; pp. 32; M. 0.60.) The author shows in the first part of his pamphlet that pessimism is the only alternative for those who reject Christianity; in the second part he defends the genuineness and historicity of the apostolic literature upon which the great historical truths of Christianity are based.— *Glaube und Wissenschaft.* Von Dr. P. Bard. (Schwerin in M.: *ibid.*, 1898; pp. 20; M. 0.40.) Christian faith, which is not to be confounded with a belief in the infallibility of the Christian Scriptures, has nothing to fear from modern science.— *Papst oder Bibel?* Von Dr. P. Bard. (Schwerin in M.: *ibid.*, 1898; pp. 23; M. 0.50.) The Protestant position of the supreme authority of the Scriptures is vindicated as against the Vatican doctrine of papal infallibility.—*Christus oder Buddha?* Von Ernst Haack. (Schwerin in M.: *ibid.*, 1898; pp. 24; M. 0.50.) The author gives a short sketch of the principal doctrines of Buddhism, and shows by contrast how much superior, ethically and philosophically, the doctrines of the Christian religion are. Modern Buddhism, as it is being taught in Germany, he says, is not religion at all, but a philosophical speculation.—*Über den fundamentalen Unterschied der Ritschlschen und der kirchlichen Theologie mit besonderer Berücksichtigung der Ethik.* Von Ernst Haack. (Schwerin in M.: *ibid.*, 1897; pp. 56; M. 0.90.) Ritschl is characterized as a man of uncommon mental ability, having a strong will, but no emotion and no imagination. The practical tendency of his system is to make Christianity a religion without a Christ, and an ethical system without the fact of sin. —*Die Aufhebung des Magdeburger Domschatzes durch den Administrator Christian Wilhelm von Brandenburg im Jahre 1630.* Von R. Heinrichs. (Cleve: Fr. Boss' Witwe, 1897; pp. 26; M. 0.75.) Some time ago the author found in a private library in Sangerhausen, in the province of Saxony, a manuscript containing a carefully prepared inventory of moneys and other valuable treasures belonging to the cathedral of Magdeburg, and still in its possession in 1630. It has all along been maintained that Tilly took away these treasures with him in 1631, but

from this inventory it clearly appears that, before Tilly could accomplish this, William of Brandenburg took them, and, as it is supposed, used this money to pay his soldiers.— A. J. RAMAKER.

L'Église catholique et les Protestants; par Georges Romain (Paris: Bloud & Barral, 1897; pp. 64; fr. 0.60), is a booklet of Roman Catholic controversy. As it forms one of a series called "Science and Religion," we were greatly disappointed to find in it that abuse of Protestantism which ought to belong to a past age. Never have we seen in a work of the kind more bad faith or greater ignorance. Were such books widely distributed in France, we might expect to find shortly, by the side of the anti-Semitic agitation, an anti-Protestant one.— One turns with a sense of relief and satisfaction to another booklet of the same series, *Faut-il une religion?* par Abbé Guyot (Paris: Bloud & Barral, 1897; pp. 64; fr. 0.60). This is the work of a candid mind. In a popular way he has studied the nature of religion, and its necessity for man, for society, for the state, and has shown the impossibility of the normal life of all without it. He goes even so far as to advocate a state religion. As this work is intended for popular apologetics, one does not feel inclined to raise the objections which would be imperative were it of a more pretentious character. It is a good sample of the more popular works produced by earnest contemporary French Catholic clergymen.— *L'Évangile et le temps present.* Par Abbé Élie Perrin. (Paris: Victor Rétaux, 1898; pp. xii + 364; fr. 3.50.) This volume contains fifty-two addresses. Although they are furnished with texts, it is impossible to give them the name of sermons. They are intended by Abbé Perrin to be models of Sunday pulpit ministrations, and they have for their title "The Gospel and the Present Times," but they are practically religious talks touching upon all the questions which affect the Catholics of France. By the side of mystical effusions there are discussions concerning schools, military service, workingmen, politics, and international difficulties. The greatest independence in the criticism of Roman Catholic practices is manifested, yet the pope is almost deified. From the beginning to the end one finds the glorification of the church, and the idealization of her life. Those who have read many of the later Roman Catholic sermons, poor colorless imitations of the sermons of the classic preachers, will not only feel refreshed in reading these interesting addresses, but will learn more of the spirit of the new French Catholicism than from any book known to us. If the word "gospel" is read "Catholicism," the character of the book will appear.— J. C. BRACQ.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume III APRIL, 1899 Number 2

RELIGIONLESS MORALITY.

By OTTO PFLEIDERER,
Berlin, Germany.

THE Society for Ethical Culture, which originated in America, has spread extensively in Europe during the past decade, and counts among its members many men and women, chiefly from the educated middle class, whose moral earnestness and whose zeal for the general welfare are beyond question, but who have become estranged from church life and are convinced that morality should be severed from its past connection with religion, which has proved harmful rather than helpful, and should be put on its own feet. Opposed to them are the representatives of the churches, who assert that in the past history of mankind religion has ever been the basis of morality, and that therefore no other condition is possible in the future; unless the moral order of society is to collapse, it must rest on an absolute authority superior to all human desires and preferences; but such an authority can be found only in the law given by God, which is to be communicated through the church. Thus two diametrically opposed views concerning the very foundations of our entire private and public life confront each other today in open conflict, and the question is forced upon us more and more peremptorily: On which side is the truth? Are the representatives

of the churches right, who insist on basing all morality on their positive and divinely revealed authority? Or are the advocates of "ethical culture" right, who would have all morality emancipated from religion, put on its own feet, and based on human nature alone? Or—as is the case with all great questions that stir an entire age—are truth and error distributed on both sides, so that neither party is wholly right and neither wholly wrong? In that case it would be the task of sober scientific research to sift out truth from error on both sides and to seek the reconciliation of the apparently insuperable antagonism in a higher unity. We shall be disposed in favor of the latter answer, if we consider that a movement like that of the Society for Ethical Culture, which has secured the support of so many and so respectable names among our contemporaries, cannot be wholly causeless, but must have in it some truth, some justification; and that, on the other hand, the representatives of religious morality cannot be wholly in error, when they conclude, from the past historical connection between religion and morality, that there must be some inherent and permanent necessity for this relation. Our task will be, therefore, to show, *first*, where the relative truth and justification lies for the effort to emancipate morality from religious authority; *next*, in what the weakness and error of this tendency consists; *finally*, how the just demands of morality and religion can be reconciled and brought into peaceful concord and harmonious interaction.

I.

At the end of the last century Kant called his age the age of enlightenment, in the sense that men then began to pass from their self-imposed tutelage and resolved to use their own reason: "*Sapere aude!* Dare to use your own mind!" This "motto of the age of enlightenment" has come to be the program for all the movements of our century in science, morality, law, and politics. Humanity, at least in western civilization, has come of age and refuses to walk any longer in the leading-strings of extraneous authority. It refuses to accept anything as true simply because ancient tradition teaches that it is true. It insists

on looking at the world with its own eyes, on investigating and proving everything for itself, and on accepting only what can be clearly and obviously recognized as true in accordance with its own laws of thought. The scientific knowledge of the world owes its tremendous progress during this century to this principle of autonomous thinking, and the results achieved furnish such evident and tangible proof of the correctness of the methods of investigation by which they are obtained that in this domain dissent hardly dares any longer to raise its voice openly. But if reason can autonomously perceive the truth as to what is, why not equally the truth as to what ought to be? If the right to independent thought and investigation is once granted to theoretical reason in matters of science, the same right will have to be conceded to practical reason in matters of will and action; for it is the same reason in both cases, and it has the same world before it: in the one case as the object of knowledge, in the other as the object of action. When man has come to the estate of manhood, he does not care to accept the ethically true or good on mere external authority, but he accepts as good only what is irresistibly commended to him as something that ought to be, by that inward sense which we are accustomed to call "conscience." Blind obedience to extraneous law does not approve itself to us as really moral. Man acts morally only when he does what is good because he is himself convinced that it is good; how he arrived at this conviction is a matter of indifference, if only he is clearly conscious of the obligating demand and yields his inward assent to it. This autonomy of man's moral nature has become a common possession of the civilized world since Kant, though its roots strike farther back, as far as the Reformation. When Luther appealed to his conscience against the authority of the church, and set the personal certitude of faith over against tradition as a higher court of appeal, he asserted the principle of the ethical autonomy of the individual, though his subjection to the letter of the Scriptures hampered him in carrying out the principle consistently. To that extent the modern effort to secure an autonomous morality may be called the direct outcome of Protestantism, and no good

Protestant has a right simply to condemn it and to attempt to bring humanity again under the authority of the church.

When the representatives of this authority assert that the moral law is derived from God, we believe that they are right in their assertion, provided the assertion is understood correctly (this will be discussed more fully later on); but in so far as this assertion usually implies a positive external revelation of divine commandments, the knowledge of which is transmitted to men by the tradition and interpretation of the church, it will have to be admitted that this view is open to the most serious objections. If the knowledge of what is ethically good were transmitted to us only by this external channel, we could never attain to real certainty as to what is good and in accordance with the will of God. For who will guarantee that the men who are supposed to have received a revelation of the divine will in every case understood and communicated that will correctly; that they did not confound their own opinions with divine revelation, or at least so mingle the two that their message cannot be regarded as a pure expression of the divine will? This uncertainty becomes the more distressing when we remember that all the various religions equally claim a divine revelation as the source of their codes—the Brahmins for the laws of Manu, the Persians for the laws of Zoroaster, the Mohammedans for the Koran, exactly as the Jews for the laws of Moses. But there is a wide divergence among these codes, so that they cannot possibly have been all and equally revealed by God. How, then, are we to know which really was revealed by God? We are helpless in the face of this question, unless we have an inward ethical criterion and can test the alleged authorities of the historical religions by that norm. But even if we consent to confine ourselves to the Bible as the only record of a true revelation, we are still in the same plight. For here, too, we are met by very diverse laws and ethical ideals which it is not easy to harmonize. Are we to assume that the ritual precepts of the Mosaic law were revelations of the divine will in the same sense as the moral laws of the decalogue? That the sacrifice of Isaac, the spoiling of the Egyptians, the extermination of the Canaanites with their women

and children, were really commanded by God? That the imprecatory psalms of the Old Testament and the woes against Rome in the apocalypse of John are an ethical standard in the same sense as the Sermon on the Mount or Paul's injunction to be in subjection to the powers that be? All these and similar points give no offense to a historical treatment of the Bible, which takes account of the gradual development of the religious and ethical consciousness in Israel; but for the orthodox view of the Bible as a homogeneous and infallible canon of all religious and moral truth they are exceedingly embarrassing.

And while the Bible contains many things that we cannot acknowledge as an ethical norm, it also fails to contain any instructions on many departments of ethics which are of real importance to us. That is a matter of course about Old Testament legislation, which was intended for the primitive civilization of the small Israelite nation. That deficiency caused the Jewish scribes to supplement the Jewish legislation by their precepts, for which they claimed divine authority equal to that of the written law. Thus the entire public and private life of the Jews was imprisoned in a network of observances, which converted religion into the most external performance of ritual works and stifled the ethical life by an unnatural constraint. Although Christianity broke these bonds and gave play to the freedom of the spirit, yet the same process which had taken place in Judaism was repeated in the church: ecclesiastical precepts and ordinances were elevated to the dignity of a "new law," which was supposed to have had its source in apostolic tradition, or in the continuous revelation of the divine Spirit, and which took equal rank with the canon of the Scriptures as its authoritative interpretation and complement. The priesthood, organized as a hierarchy and early centralized in the Roman bishop, claimed to be in a sense the permanent oracle of the divine will, and sought to control the entire life of western Christendom in conformity with ecclesiastical points of view and in the interests of ecclesiastical ends. As dogma controlled the intellectual life and suppressed free inquiry, so the church by its ethics, its penitential discipline, and canonical law ruled

the entire secular life—the family, industry and commerce, finance, the relation of the social classes, and the politics of the princes. Secular government was to be but the obedient tool of the spiritual powers, as subordinate to them as the moon is to the sun. This system of ecclesiastical world-rule reached its most consistent development in Jesuitism. Jesuit morality recognizes nothing as good in itself; whatever the church commands is good, and it is good because the church, the bearer of all divine authority, commands it. But the church commands what appears advantageous to it and augments its powers, its wealth, its rule in the world.

It is manifest that by this system of ecclesiastical morality the moral personality is stripped of all chance of determining its own ends; when the confessor speaks, conscience must be mute; his oracular dictum supplants individual ethical judgments and feelings; the development of personal conviction and independent character, which alone constitutes the moral worth of man after he has outgrown childhood, cannot and must not be allowed; every awakening of personal judgment at variance with ecclesiastical precept, every striving for a characteristic expression and exercise of a man's individuality, is regarded as revolt against the sacred authority of the church, and therefore against God himself; it is held to be a mortal sin, threatened with temporal and eternal punishment. Society, too, is not permitted to order its life and activities according to its natural needs; it is not permitted to shake off institutions which have been hallowed by the church and are useful to it, though they are antiquated and have become injurious to the common weal, nor to organize its life more adequately in new forms and exercise its forces with greater freedom; every effort for progress and for the reform of intolerable conditions is met by the resistance of the church, which places existing conditions, however corrupt and corrupting they may be, under the ægis of its immutable authority. Thus the moral life, which can thrive and attain to healthy development only in the atmosphere of liberty, is gagged and stifled under the terrible ban of the organized religion of the church; the masses stagnate in ignorance and

superstition, in indolence, poverty, and misery; the upper classes seek to maintain their rights by allying themselves to the priesthood, but forget their duties to the commonwealth, and decline to a life of pleasure and levity, under whose pestilential breath all ideal efforts sicken; art and science and social life degenerate to mere show and form, and politics become the arena of conscienceless intriguers. That has ever been the fate of a society whose moral life was enchained by ecclesiasticism. The most striking example in our own day has been the Spanish nation, in which the saying has once again come true: "The years of history are the day of doom."

The Protestant nations have been saved from these evil effects of a rigid ecclesiasticism by the fact that they have admitted the principle of moral autonomy into their religion, at least up to a certain point. It is true, they, too, subject their faith to the positive revelation contained in the Bible; but as the Bible fortunately contains no definite precepts for the concrete moral conditions of present-day society, Protestants have no decisive authority on ethical questions in the letter of the Bible, but only in its spirit; but to comprehend the spirit of the Bible, and to apply it to the ethical life according to their best knowledge and judgment, is their recognized right, and is even laid upon them as their duty. Thus the Protestant churches, in spite of holding to the authority of the Scriptures, after all refer their members for guidance to their own convictions, to the judgment of their individual consciences, trained by the spirit of the Bible. To that extent they stand on the basis of modern ethical autonomy, at least in practical life; and, indeed, the Reformation itself won its most direct and potent successes in the same direction, by liberating the family, society, and the state from the yoke of the Roman church. For this reason the conflict between religion and ethics can never culminate in as sharp an antagonism of principles in Protestant nations as it usually does in Catholic nations. In fact, in the sphere of ethical *practice* that antagonism is hardly ever seriously felt by Protestants. On the other hand, in the sphere of scientific knowledge, the fact that they hold to the traditional doctrines of

the Bible and the church is a stone of stumbling which leads to endless collisions between faith and knowledge. But since the schools, which are the nurseries of knowledge, are institutions of civil society, a clash between ecclesiastical and civil interests is possible at that point, even in Protestant countries, and may lead to the formation of parties and to party conflicts similar to those occurring in Catholic surroundings. However, though Protestant church authorities and clerical parties may occasionally cherish the lust of clerical rule over society and education, this desire never carries so serious a menace, because in the Protestant world there are no powerful organs to secure the satisfaction of the desire. No one can be persecuted in a Protestant state because his convictions differ from the doctrines of the church. Consequently conflicts between faith and knowledge are generally confined to the inner life of individuals; every man is allowed to solve them if he likes and as he likes. Yet, for the individual sore inward struggles and scruples of conscience, which are not without danger in the formation of his moral character, may take their rise at this point. If we bear in mind that the scientific comprehension of the world is one aspect of the moral activity of the mind and follows its own inner laws, and that the striving for truth and the communication of truth to others are a moral duty, we cannot deny that the subjection of the mind to the dogmatic authority of the Bible and the church acts as a check injurious to the intellectual morality of modern men. When we observe the desperate attempts made nowadays by theologians and laymen to harmonize the results of modern natural and historical science with supposed infallible Scriptures, we can hardly avoid the impression that violence is done here to sound sense, that the simple love of truth is darkened, and that honesty suffers damage. But that always to some extent inflicts a moral damage on character. Any man who, for the sake of any religious authority, closes his eyes to the facts, covers over manifest contradictions by sophistical arguments, and persuades himself that he thinks what is unthinkable, certainly is wanting in that inward sincerity, ingenuousness, and truthfulness which are essential to a pure and sterling character. This explains the

not infrequent experience that men whose conscientiousness is without blemish in general secular life feel no scruples about using even dishonest weapons to injure their opponents in ecclesiastical controversies. The wicked old saying, "*Hæretico fides non est habenda*," is still too often found valid in modern churches. And all this is the very natural consequence of the fact that the principle of heteronomy, of the subjection of the mind to a positive, immutable authority, which is retained even by Protestants, at least in the domain of theory, stands in irreconcilable antagonism to the autonomy of the thinking and acting mind, which modern men with entire justice esteem the principle of a true ethical culture. This heteronomy prevails in varying degrees in the various churches; in the Catholic church it embraces the entire life, social and individual, practical and intellectual; in the Protestant churches it is almost entirely restricted to the individual and intellectual life; but in some measure it is ever present in every organized religion, and everywhere works more or less serious damage to ethical culture.

It is apparent from the above in what point we shall have to recognize the relative justification of a non-religious morality; it is the energetic but one-sided reaction of the autonomous moral spirit against the heteronomy of church religion. The more closely religion is linked to church authority, and the more completely spiritual piety and churchly devoutness are identified in the common mind, the more inevitably will religion itself be included in the protest against that form of religion which is embodied in church authority. Because practically religion and ecclesiasticism are always found united, the distinction between the two is overlooked, and religion is combated in championing morality, while really it is only the heteronomy intrenched in the churches which ought to be combated. To combat the latter is the right and the historical mission of the Society for Ethical Culture; its mistake is that it regards religion itself, as well as the heteronomy of the churches, as an enemy of morality, and thus deprives the latter of its most potent ally.

II.

Two questions are of fundamental importance for morality: (1) For what reason should we act morally? What is the ground of our obligation? and (2) For what end should we act morally? Have we any well-founded hope that it will result in anything of value? Wherever these two questions are left without a satisfactory answer, the content of the single moral demands may be ever so excellent, yet the whole edifice is, after all, suspended in the air, and lacks that sustaining foundation which only a comprehensive philosophy of life can furnish. I find a remarkable proof for this in the book on *Ethical Religion* by W. M. Salter, the founder of the Society for Ethical Culture at Chicago. It contains much in its details that is excellent and wins our cordial assent, and yet the total impression is unsatisfactory because these cardinal questions receive only vague, ambiguous, and contradictory answers. To the question concerning the source of the moral law he replies in one place that it is posited in and with the nature of things; again, that it is reason giving expression to itself; then again, combining the two, that moral obligation rests in reason and the nature of things; but finally we are also told that reason in us is only the faculty which recognizes the moral law and not itself the source of the law, because the moral law really has no source, but is a final, uncreated, immutable law, the primitive rock on which the moral universe rests; that no one can state a ground for this highest law, and that no serious man inquires for it. It is plain that these are very diverse answers, the meaning of which is by no means perfectly clear, and the consistent agreement of which is not at all self-evident. Every student of the history of ethics knows what different results are obtained in the construction of the system, according as the nature of things or reason is made the principle; the former leads to the empiric (eudemonist, utilitarian) ethics, the latter to the idealistic ethics, which has found its classical exponent in Kant. It is, of course, not our task now to discuss these different ethical systems; we merely raise the question: Can a satisfactory solution of the cardinal questions stated above be reached by the one way or the other?

If by "the nature of things" we are to understand nature outside of man, we do not see how such a thing as a moral law can be posited in that at all. It is true we speak of "laws" of nature, which we abstract from the observation of natural phenomena by the process of induction. But these "laws" are something totally different from the moral law; they are not demands addressed to a will which can obey or disobey them; they are only a name for the regularity and necessity of the interaction of cause and effect; they are a description, a statement of what actually is and takes place, and not an expression of something that ought to be, but to which reality may, and often actually does, fail to correspond. And if we observe what actually takes place in the sphere of nature which is closest to us, in the animal world, we find there anything rather than moral laws or exemplars. On the contrary, we have learned from Darwin that the all-controlling law in the world of nature is the struggle for existence, the competitive effort of all living beings for self-preservation, and in that pitiless struggle no other right avails aught save the right of superior force or cunning. Of anything moral there is here no trace, therefore this "nature of things" cannot be the source of a moral law. If we pass on to the nature of man, which Salter probably intended to include in that conception, experience at first sight finds here a spectacle precisely similar to that of the animal world, namely, the heedless sway and exercise of selfish passions. Salter concedes this, for he repeatedly says that ethical ideals are not to be drawn from the experience of the actual life and doings of average humanity, because the practice of most men confirms the "law of individual self-interest," rather than the moral law. But if the moral is neither to be drawn from nature below man, nor from human nature, as experience shows it to be, then the assertion that the moral law is given "in and with the nature of things" appears obscure and enigmatic, to say the least.

This is the more the case when we find in addition that Salter rejects the only way which can possibly lead from a naturalistic starting-point to any ethical system — the way of utilitarian morality, because a prudential morality, constructed on the basis

of wisely interpreted self-interest, lags too far behind his moral ideals. He may be quite correct in that, but from his premises his idealism seems inconsistent. But before we follow him farther in his course of thought we must stop a moment to examine utilitarian morality, because it is the system supported by most of the adherents of non-religious morality. It seeks to derive moral precepts from the natural desire of men for individual happiness or well-being, by proving to their reason that the lasting happiness of the individual is so intimately connected with that of the rest that every man will best care for his own welfare by striving at the same time for the welfare of others, and of the largest possible number of others. But in this reasoning the evident fact is overlooked that the welfare of one man is by no means always identical with the welfare of the rest, but often runs counter to it; that the welfare of society demands of its members many sacrifices of personal happiness, the renunciation of personal profit, and under certain circumstances even the surrender of life. Now, what motive is there, from a utilitarian point of view, to impel a man to such sacrifices, to such renunciation of his own desire for happiness? The demand to deny egoism for the sake of the happiness of others can never be deduced from the principle of egoism; all the motives that are deduced from that principle only suffice to modify the exercise of egoism by wise caution and by yielding to circumstances; they will not avail to overcome egoism inwardly. This method will only furnish us prudential maxims for outward action; it will not supply us with moral laws of absolute authority, nor with ideals for the moral character. Salter concedes this, for he says that the sense of obligating authority is the accompaniment only of such moral ideas as bear on goodness, and not of such as bear on happiness.

Does this law, then, which in the face of all natural impulses and desires asserts itself as an absolute "ought," have its source in our reason, as Kant taught? That this answer, too, is insufficient was felt by Salter, for he says in one place that human reason is only the faculty in us which recognizes the moral law, but is not itself the final source of the law, because the moral

law was not made by us, but is independent of our will and our ideas, bearing its authority in itself: "The earth and the stars do not create the law of gravitation which they obey; no more does man or the united hosts of rational beings in all the universe create the law of duty." That is certainly true. The very consciousness that there is a binding law to which we owe obedience implies that we are not the authors of that law, for we cannot be both sovereigns and subjects. A law which is obligatory and binding for all men cannot have been made by men, either collectively or singly, as little as the law of gravitation, which is common to all bodies, was made by those bodies. But what then? Are we to stop short with Salter and rest in the assertion that the moral law has no origin at all, but is something ultimate, for the ground of which no serious mind inquires? But a law is not an entity, but an idea, a demand made on volitient spirits. How, then, can it be conceived as something ultimate and primary, as if it hung suspended above all reality in the void of space? That seems to me an impossible conception, which only proves the perplexity in which Salter is placed; for while he is determined in advance to do without the idea of God, his ethical idealism evidently points him to that idea as the only solution of the enigma.

We find in ourselves, as the fundamental moral fact, the consciousness of duty, the "I ought" — absolute, independent of all our personal desires, and totally distinct from any extraneous compulsion. That is the one constant element in all the movements of our conscience. The form of our consciousness of duty remains ever the same, however diverse and variable the content and scope of duty may be. It is a demand which is addressed to our will, and which makes itself felt as the expression of another and commanding will. But as soon as we feel this demand of duty, we realize also a constraint, which we cannot escape, to acknowledge the rightfulness of the demand. It is this *inward* constraint to acknowledge the rightfulness of the moral demand which we call "the sense of moral obligation." Precisely that constitutes the distinctive character of the consciousness of duty as distinguished from mere prudential

maxims on the one hand, which carry no absolute imperative with them; and from external coercion on the other hand, which carries with it no inward acknowledgment of the rightfulness of the demand. Now, if in the moral imperative the demand of another will whose right to command we spontaneously acknowledge makes itself known, then that fact presupposes two others: first, that the will expressed in the moral imperative is *superior* to ours, for otherwise it could issue no commands to us; but, also, that it is not wholly alien from our will, but in some respects is *one* with it, for otherwise we could not feel inwardly bound by it; we could not acknowledge the rightfulness of the demand it makes on us. In other words, the moral law commands us to adopt ends for our volitions and actions which are absolutely superior to our personal desires, and which contain a universal good, valuable for its own sake. But if these higher and universal ends were entirely foreign to our own will, we could never adopt them as the content of our own volition, nor acknowledge their right to be realized, because the will can acknowledge and adopt as its own only such ends as find a basis in its own nature, are germane to and consonant with its life-purpose. The ends marked out for us by the moral law may, therefore, be superior to our own personal ends, but they must include and not exclude them. Accordingly we shall have to recognize in the moral law the ends of a will which towers infinitely above ours, and which is yet as essentially one with ours as the life of an organism is one with the life of its several members. Now, this will, which is at once above us all and in us all, infinitely superior to our finite determinations, and yet so closely akin to us that we feel that we are spirit of his spirit — what is this will but God? Only in him, in the holy will of the absolutely good, can the ultimate ground of all moral obligation be found. The autonomy of our moral and spiritual nature, so far from being incompatible with "theonomy," rather finds therein its firmest stay and final foundation. The reason why Salter so stubbornly refuses to accept this conclusion, which he yet approximates so often himself, is the fear that the recognition of "theonomy" will destroy the moral autonomy of man. But that is only a prejudice growing

out of that same unspiritual and un-Christian conception of God as an alien and extraneous sovereign which he condemns so severely in religion. If he entertained a worthier conception of God, such as Christianity by its noblest teachers has inculcated—the conception of God as the holy will of love, who is above us and in us, whose children we are, spirit of his spirit, and in whom we live and move and have our being—it would immediately become evident that the inward revelation of this holy spirit in our moral and religious consciousness does not destroy its autonomy, but establishes it. Theonomy is not identical with heteronomy; on the contrary, it is the surest guarantee, the strong fortress, of our personal freedom against all servitude of man. Even Seneca said: "*Deo parere libertas est.*" And the apostle Paul writes: "We have not received the spirit of bondage unto fear, but we have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry: Abba, Father!" "Where the spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty" (Rom. 8:15; 2 Cor. 3:18). And in John we read: "If, therefore, the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed" (John 8:36). The entire New Testament, from the Sermon on the Mount to the second epistle of Peter, is full of this idea: that as children of God we are partakers of the divine nature, and that the surrender of our will to the divine will is not the entrance into bondage, but into true freedom. We hear the echo of the same glad tidings in all the writings of the reformers, who discovered in faith, that is, in the surrender of the heart to the holy love of God, "the freedom of a Christian man," the power to overcome the world and to break all the fetters of bondage to man. In short, theonomy and autonomy are not incompatible; they are rather the two sides of the same truth. The same fact which is called autonomy when we contemplate its human and psychological phenomena is theonomy when viewed in its metaphysical ground.

As the first cardinal question of ethics, the question concerning the ground of our moral obligation, finds an adequate solution only in God, so also the second cardinal question, the question for the guarantee of the attainableness of our moral ends in the world. If the moral law had its final source only in our human

reason, or in "the nature of things," we should have no safe guarantee whatever that our moral ends can be realized in the world. What begins as a subjective thought of human reason may well end as a mere pious desire and beautiful dream, the realization of which would be hopelessly wrecked against the hard necessity of the actual world. "The nature of things," as it presents itself to the sober view of the realist, is so far removed from our moral ideals, and so often opposes its hostile resistance to our moral aims, that the contemplation of it is calculated to paralyze our moral courage rather than strengthen it. Ethical idealists have always felt that, and even if they saw no such necessity to secure a higher ground for the moral obligation of man, they have at least felt compelled to "postulate" a higher power, supplementing our own impotence in order to guarantee the attainment of our endeavor. We remember Kant's postulate of a God to assure the highest good, or to harmonize the antagonism, insuperable to us, between the world of sense and the moral world, between happiness and virtue; or Fichte's postulate of a moral order of the universe, in which the victory of good is guaranteed. But we must not forget that such postulates rest on a weak foundation as long as the ground of morality is sought in men and not in God. For who gives us the right to demand that a higher power must put itself at the service of our purely human ends? If there is such a higher power, we may presume that it will realize its own ends, and not lend itself as a servant to alien ends. Unless human ends coincide with its own, it will be as indifferent to them as the Epicurean gods. But in that case we have no right to expect any help from it, and hopelessly face a hostile world with our own impotence. If, on the other hand, we believe that our true moral ends are not of our own devising, but have been set for us by God; that they are his own eternal purposings, for which he seeks temporal realization in us and through us, then it is not a mere "postulate" with us, but a self-evident certainty, that the God who worketh in us to will will also work in us to do and to accomplish; that he has not only set us the task of laboring in his kingdom of goodness in the world, but that he lends us the power to accomplish that task,

and orders and guides the facts of life and the course of the world in such a way that all things must serve and promote the achievement of the supreme divine and human end, the coming of his kingdom. It will have to be conceded that this view of life and the world is coherent and clear, while the theory which has so generally prevailed since Kant, according to which religion is to be added to a merely autonomous (not also theonomous) morality as a "postulate" to supplement and round it off, is a self-contradictory and untenable hybrid of belief and unbelief.

All this applies especially to Salter's book, to which reference has been made. We note there a remarkable ambiguousness on this point. He says that the religious men of the future, who have abandoned belief in God, providence, and eternal life, and believe only in their duty, will none the less cherish their dreams of perfection without doubt or fear; they know that they are under a higher and stronger protection than any they could devise; that the holy powers which no one can name hold and encompass them; that if there is in them aught of worth, it will survive, and so on. These words do indeed give expression to the same tendency which forms the content of the Christian belief in providence, and which finds its classical expression in the words of the apostle Paul: "We know that to them that love God all things work together for good" (Rom. 8:28). But is it a mark of progress in religious insight and clearness, when the religious men of the future, instead of sharing the apostle's faith in the omnipotent sway of the God whom we love and by whom we believe we are loved, are to put their trust in "holy powers whom no one can name"? Or when, as Salter expresses it in the same connection, they bow, not before men and not before God, but before "something so mysterious and necessary that without it the stars would disappear from the heavens and human society would sink back into chaos"? How are we to put our trust in powers so inscrutable and mysterious that no one can name them, of whom, therefore, we cannot know if they feel any concern for us and our human welfare and goodness, nay, whether they have any thoughts or purposes at all, or are merely the blind necessity of fate, the inflexible law of the unpurposing

mechanism of nature? If this ethical religion of the future is to bow only before the mysterious "necessity," without which the stars would disappear from the heavens, it really does not rise even above the heathen belief in fate, above which even Socrates and Plato had risen to the God of wisdom and beneficence. And how little of comfort and encouragement such a faith in the mysterious powers of necessity or fate contains Salter might learn from every tragedy of Æschylus and Sophocles, in which man, with his moral claims, is set face to face with the fearful powers of fate, and bows before them, indeed, but in despairing resignation and not in hopeful trust. And the same sad strain of the fearful law of necessity runs through all the wisdom of India, and, in fact, through that of all the decadent ancient world. Hence its pessimism, its weariness of the world, its yearning for salvation. But salvation came when, instead of the unknown God and the dark world-powers (Acts 17:23; Gal. 4:8), the God of the gospel was proclaimed, who is spirit and light and love; whom we may call our Father, because we are spirit of his spirit and ordained to be conformed to his image; whom we may love because we know we are loved by him; whom we may trust because we have been called to share with him the work of salvation in redeeming the world and making it holy. If the ethical religion of the future expects to replace this evangelical faith in God by the faith in mysterious, unnamable powers of necessity, I can see no progress in that, either in theory or in practice, but on the contrary a relapse to the pre-Christian stage of the ancient philosophy of life. The same dualism of ethical ideals on the one side, and of a soulless and heartless naturalism and fatalism on the other, which then crushed the best minds and paralyzed their courage in life and their joy of work, would renew its baleful reign with that religion of the future.

Salter and his friends charge the Christian faith in providence with making men indolent, because they expect God to act for them, instead of acting for themselves. But this rests on a misconception of true religious faith, to which some who seek in religion an excuse for their moral indolence occasionally may give color. For true religiousness, however, faith in the

providential care of God has ever been, not a pillow of ease, but a motive and feeder for the most energetic moral exertion. For the religious man does not imagine that God realizes his ends by miraculous intervention direct from heaven. He knows that God's activity in the moral world is everywhere mediated by human organs. He knows, too, that he himself is called to the work in God's service according to the kind and measure of the powers given him. The consciousness of being an ally and fellow-worker with God, the Lord of the universe, furnishes him with a buoyant energy of immense force, with a courage that tramples on impossibilities. And since he regards all his powers and means as gifts of God, meant to accomplish tasks of corresponding magnitude in the service of the divine household, he feels responsible, as a steward of God, for the faithful use of the talents intrusted to him. Thus religious faith in providence does not issue in indolence, but in a quickened sense of responsibility and of obligation to exert all powers in faithful work. We may assert that nothing so deepens the seriousness of conscience as the religious contemplation of life, when its duties are accepted as tasks set by God; its blessings and joys as gifts of God; its evils and woes as provings by God; and, on the other hand, every neglect of duty and every wrong done is felt as guilt against the Lord of the world, as disloyalty to the holy God and gracious Father. I do not believe that any morality divorced from religion, be it utilitarian or idealistic, can possibly have at its command ideas that would equal the immense motive energy of this religious view of the world and of life, to say nothing of excelling it. And not only motives, but sedatives; not only reasons impelling to action, but others nerving to endurance and silence; comfort and cure for the sick and suffering soul of man, are offered by religion, in ways for which there is no substitute. When the noblest endeavors suffer shipwreck against the resistance of an apathetic world; when the most strenuous toil in the service of the good cause appears to be fruitless and is rewarded only with ingratitude; or when the willing worker finds his own powers failing and is forced to stand idle when he longs to work; how easily then does a man, if he

is centered in himself alone, grow faint of heart and embittered; he withdraws wearily from the stress of life and fortifies his dreary soul against the miseries of his fate with the defiant resignation of stoic apathy. The religious man knows even then that he is not forsaken. He seeks comfort with his God, wrestles with him in prayer to gain new blessings and strength, and hears in the depth of his soul the comforting words: "My grace is sufficient for thee, for my power is perfected amid weakness" (2 Cor. 12:9). And when man has weakly strayed from the straight path; when he is lost in the maze of selfishness and love of the world, and sinks prostrate under the weight of his own guilt, then morality surrenders him to the inexorable judgment of those fateful powers of whom the poet says:

> To earth, this weary earth, ye bring us,
> To guilt ye let us heedless go,
> Then leave repentance fierce to wring us:
> A moment's guilt, an age of woe!
>
> (GOETHE'S *Wilhelm Meister*, Carlyle's trans.)

But the religion of redemption takes the lost one by the hand and leads him back to the house of his Father, and lets him find peace and new salvation at the heart of the everlasting love, which is able to overcome even sin and guilt, and to transform lost sinners into new men and children of God.

III.

Morality, then, cannot take the place of religion. If in frigid self-sufficiency it seeks to sever its pristine connection with religion, it robs itself of its own firm stay and the well-spring of its power. But neither can religion dispense with morality. It must let the current of its force pour out into active life, and in turn receive back a current of air and light, freedom and clearness; otherwise it will waste away and decay, and become a curse to men instead of a blessing. For the idea, so prevalent today, that men can choose whether they will have religion or not, is false. Religion has us and will not let us go. It is one of the essential elements of human life, which no power in the world can eradicate. Every attempt to ignore or to isolate this most potent of all the forces in the historical evolution of

our race; every attempt to exclude it from the interaction of all the forces of our intellectual and ethical life, could have only one final result: religion would fall a prey to the nether, sinister powers of human nature and would drag down all the other powers of the mind in its ruin. It is, therefore, in the interest of religion, as well as of morality and science and civilization in general, that the vital connection and interchange of influence between the two be maintained intact.

Religion is the immediate consciousness that our life is bound to the higher power which governs both us and the world, and ordains and defines our relation to the world in which it has placed us. A consciousness that we are bound, I say; and I mean by that the dependence of our existence and welfare, as well as the duty to subject our volitions and actions to that sovereign power, which is realized as a volitient power by the very fact that it obligates our will. The bond which unites us to God in religion is deeper and stronger than any other, because it goes back to the ground of our existence, and every ethical relation, every social tie, among men has its transcendental root in this religious relation, in the common bond which unites all members to the divine power that encompasses their lives and correlates their aims. Thus religion from the outset has an ethical direction; the feeling of reverence, duty, and trust, which unites men to their deity, is transferred to the social relations of children to their parents and ancestors, of citizens to their nation and sovereign, and invests these relations with their moral sanction to bind the consciences of men.

But because the consciousness of God contains the all-inclusive unity superior to self and to the world, therefore it is always affected and defined by the quality and content of the self-consciousness and world-consciousness. According as a man conceives of himself and the world, so will he conceive of his God too. It is natural, therefore, that in the stage of humanity's childhood, and also in the childhood of individuals, when consciousness is limited by the world of sense, the consciousness of God and of his relation to us should usually be very low and sensually phantastic. Poetic imagination does not really create

the idea of God, for that is an *a priori* content of our reason, though, perhaps, but a vague intuition. But imagination does embody this unconscious idea in the concrete form of a vivid conception, so that it becomes a clearly defined object of religious knowledge and action. This conceptual image is taken by imagination from the accumulated store of experiences as it lies ready to hand in consciousness. Now, since man in the stage of childhood does not yet conceive of himself as spirit, but as a sensual being alike in kind to nature that surrounds him, he cannot at first conceive of the deity except as a sensual and natural being, which excels him and other creatures of which he has experience only by subtler senses, greater powers, and longer life, but otherwise shares his own natural needs, desires, and passions, and demands of its worshiper service and offerings corresponding to these needs. Religion was carried beyond this gross and primitive stage of naturalistic conceptions and ceremonies by the development of ethical self-consciousness and theoretical world-consciousness among the nations that entered on the career of civilization and culture. When by the common life of the tribe the first rudiments of a stable reign of law were evolved, and when a regular order came to be recognized in the external world, in the course of the stars and the recurrence of the seasons, the gods were held to be the founders and guardians of this twofold order. But as custodians of the right they became the friends of the righteous and ensamples of all that was esteemed worthy and noble among men. This process of filling the conception of God with ethical contents was a gradual one and made headway only amid constant conflict with the naturalistic forms of conception, which held their ground tenaciously. Hardly anywhere in the pre-Christian history of religion was the latter element completely extruded and the ethical ideal wrought out purely. An undefined blending of the naturalistic and ethical elements everywhere prevailed in religious conceptions and ceremonies. Even the religion of Israel, in spite of the lofty ideals of the prophets, retained a considerable remnant of heathenism in the cult of its temple and its sacrifices. Christianity was the first to commit itself to thoroughgoing work in this matter

of formulating a purely ethical conception of God and ejecting all naturalistic elements, by teaching men to conceive God as the perfectly good Spirit or as holy love. Here too, as everywhere in the pre-Christian history of religion, progress in the knowledge of God was linked to progress in ethical self-consciousness, to a profounder realization and valuation of personal ethical qualities.[1]

But while it is certain that Christianity as a principle rose to a purely ethical idea of God and to a corresponding worship of God "in spirit and in truth," we must not overlook the fact that by the very constitution of human nature it was impossible that all Christians individually should attain to this level and that all generations should maintain it equally. The naturalistic form of thought is too deeply rooted in our nature to be overcome at one stroke and finally. Every generation had to face it as the enemy that had to be fought incessantly and ever anew. Moreover, its power was so immensely augmented by the mass of pagan customs that poured into the church at the conversion of heathen nations that we can easily understand how the gold of Christian truth came to be alloyed with much of baser metal in the development of ecclesiastical doctrine and practice. Heathen philosophy forced its way into the doctrine of God (trinity); the expiatory system and magical rites of the pagan mysteries forced their way into the worship of the church (sacraments); and when sacrifice and magic returned, the priesthood with its monopoly of grace returned too. And all this led to that distortion of religion in external ecclesiasticism, with its train of evil ethical consequences, which we discussed above. The tendency to sensualize the spiritual and to naturalize the ethical is but too deeply seated in human nature, and at the bottom it is this which ever clings to religion like a weight of lead, clogs its ascent to the ideal, and from heights once attained drags it down again and again to lower levels.

How can this hereditary evil, this *vitium originale* of our race, which has wrought such an infinitude of harm, be cured? By

[1] For a fuller exposition of this process of development in the history of religion I refer to my *Religionsphilosophie*, 3. Auflage, 1896.

ignoring religion, and fancying in self-sufficient pride of culture that there is nothing to be gained and nothing to be feared from religion? This opinion is very prevalent nowadays, but it is none the less a short-sighted and pernicious error. If religion is discarded by the cultured classes and left to be the toy of the masses, it will inevitably run wild and be lowered and coarsened. The spiritual content of its symbolisms will be covered and hidden by their sensual forms. These forms themselves will become grosser, more ponderous, calculated only for the sensual effect on the masses. The ethical ideals will be supplanted by the selfish and sensual desires that seek satisfaction in the ceremonial of worship. The fear felt by the natural man in the face of the beyond, the invisible, the unknown, will be unchecked and ungoverned by any ethical and rational culture, and will become the lever by which priestcraft will sway and fanaticize the masses. Thus religion degenerates into superstition, and the demoralizing power of superstition threatens destruction to every civilization, whether the destruction come slowly by wasting disease, or suddenly by revolutionary explosions. Therefore it is my conviction that those who desire the sound and steady development of the culture of modern society can make no greater mistake than to dissolve its connection with religion, and thus at the same time to condemn religion to congeal into superstition, and to rob morality of the most efficient and indispensable source of its power. The very opposite, the most intimate connection, the most vigorous interchange of influences between religion and ethics, is demanded in the interest of both sides, and is, in fact, nothing less than the fundamental condition of the future progress of our race.

Religion must ever anew measure its inherited ideas and customs against the standard of the ethical ideal, and in so far as they do not harmonize with that, it must strive after their purification and progressive development. That is not to say that strict scientific exactness can ever be demanded of its forms of teaching — that is impossible, because the transcendental relations of religion can never be expressed save by symbols, that is, by forms only approximating to the facts expressed — but only that it

may justly be demanded that its teachings shall not conflict with what has been established as theoretical or practical truth, and especially that it shall not lag behind our ethical ideals. As to how much of the received ecclesiastical dogma, and especially of the popular faith of the church, would demand correction in accordance with this canon — to investigate that would far exceed our present limits. But as to the method of this critical process I beg permission to add a remark. We must not imagine that such an improvement of existing forms of belief or worship can be secured suddenly, say by the majority vote of a synod, or by act of government. Every attempt of that kind would work more harm than good, for it would either awaken the resistance of the masses, which might easily flare up into fanaticism; or it would root up the wheat with the tares; it would convulse and imperil faith along with superstition, for both are closely intertwined in the heart of the people, and in outward form they are often much alike. Commands and edicts within the church are just as undesirable as rupture with it or attack upon it from without. There is only one method that attains its ends: to remain within the church and to utilize its existing forms, but to labor without ceasing to make the ethical element supreme in faith and worship, and all the rest but a serviceable means to that end; to interpret and apply the forms of doctrine and the ceremonial of worship in such a way that the ideal motives, which in fact underlie them, are clearly and consciously understood and made operative upon the hearts of men, while anything which clings to them and is susceptible of misunderstanding is either silently set aside or corrected by sober discussion. It is true, this is not an easy task. It requires more patience, more humility, more self-denying love, and more pedagogic wisdom than is dreamed of by those who naïvely imagine that they can overthrow the walls of Zion by the trumpet-blast of their anti-religious polemics!

The more religion is thus steadily purified, spiritualized, and deepened in its ethical aspects, the more certainly will it exert the most salutary influence on the ethical life and culture of individuals and nations. It makes conscience keener and more insistent by presenting moral duties as divinely given tasks, and

the violation of duty as guilt against God. In general it furnishes us with the highest standard for our critical judgment of ourselves by placing before us as a norm the perfect will of the holy and all-knowing One. It spurs on to moral activity by the consciousness that we are responsible stewards of God's gifts and workers in God's kingdom. It invigorates our courage in the battle with the adversities of life by the certainty that all the universe cannot harm one who is an ally of the lord of the universe. It saves us from arrogance in prosperity and from discouragement in misfortune, by accepting both as sent by God to serve for our self-discipline, for the purification and strengthening of our character. Futhermore, religion, by binding all men to God, is the strongest bond of all social relations; the duties of family life and of citizenship in community, state, and personal calling receive from religion their sanction, the significance and importance which lay them with obligatory force upon the conscience. It does not, like the ecclesiastical hierarchy, desire to rule the life of the world by external force, and to keep the family and the state, art and science, under its tutelage; the ethical spirit justly reacts against such an attempt; but it does desire to render to society the most valuable service by overcoming selfishness and implanting in the hearts of men love, the unselfish devotion to the common weal, the self-sacrificing enthusiasm for noble aims, the faithful endurance in doing and suffering for the cause of goodness. The more this spirit prevails in a nation and inspires the actions of individuals in the various callings of life, the firmer will be the foundation of culture and prosperity, and the easier will it be to overcome the dangers with which society is threatened by the errant spirits from the deep that demand a false, because godless, autonomy, a license undisciplined by law and order. There is only one salvation from this false liberty: the true liberty, which is bound in God; the autonomy which is also theonomy; in short, a morality which is allied to religion and founded on religion.

THE IMPORT OF THE CHRONICLES AS A PIECE OF RELIGIO-HISTORICAL LITERATURE.

By THEODORE G. SOARES,
Rockford, Ill.

IN the religio-historical literature of the Hebrews the book of Chronicles has a place of more interest and importance than has often been assigned to it, and one which any student either of the pre-exilic or post-exilic history of Israel must take into account. A discussion of the import of this writing may consider: I, the place of the Chronicles in Hebrew historiography, *i. e.*, the place of this book in relation to the other historical books; II, the historicity of the Chronicles, discussing its absolute worth as a historical source; III, the truth in the idealizations of the chronicler, considering the basis for his representations; IV, the Chronicles as an outgrowth of its times, discussing the political and religious forces that shaped its composition; V, the chronicler as the Levitical prophet, considering the contribution of the work to the advancement of Hebrew thought.[1]

I. THE PLACE OF THE CHRONICLES IN HEBREW HISTORIOGRAPHY.

Following the almost unanimous opinion of modern scholars, it may be accepted that Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah form a single work from the hand of a single writer or editor. On this theory the place of the Chronicles in Hebrew historiography becomes clear. The prophetic histories of Judges, Samuel, and Kings (from the point of view of their historical purpose, which must never be overlooked, however great be the importance assigned to their religious purpose) had carried forward the theocratic history from the death of Joshua to the destruction of the

[1] The compass of this article has made it necessary to state positively very much that might reasonably be regarded as needing careful discussion. Merely results and conclusions have been given. The writer expects to publish at some future time materials which he has collected and prepared to supply the basis and justification of this paper and a full discussion of the problems of the Chronicles.

temple and the captivity of Judah. We cannot tell what connection the writers of these books had with one another. But it remains clear that each has linked his work to that which went before, so that a complete history, in general outline, is presented. And this is the more significant when it is noted that the book of Judges is itself a natural continuation of JE.

The work of the next canonical historian would naturally commence with the return of the people from captivity. Ezra and Nehemiah present the most natural continuation of the theocratic history. And, from the point of view of the chronicler's *historical* purpose, I am of the opinion that Ezra and Nehemiah represent his proper contribution to the historiography of his people. In common with the historians who preceded him, he takes up the thread of the history where they had let it fall, and continues it until he has presented a picture of the rebuilt temple, the reorganized Levitical service, and the reëstablished government under the firm rule of Nehemiah. Considering the work still from the point of view of the *historical* purpose of the writer, the book of Chronicles is an introduction to Ezra and Nehemiah. The previous historiography of the Hebrews had been continuous, because it had proceeded on the same general lines, and had been produced in the same spirit. It was all prophetic. The work of each writer naturally followed upon that of his predecessor. But the books of Ezra and Nehemiah could not as well rest on the book of Kings. The whole meaning of the restored legal constitution depended upon a proper picture of the original constitution. So the chronicler goes back. He pursues the thread of the history in a way that shall naturally connect itself with that which is his own proper contribution to the historiography of the Hebrews.

That the place of the Chronicles is properly as an introduction to the further parts that were connected with it is borne out by the fact of its position in the Hebrew canon. Ewald has suggested[2] that the division of the large work was made in the middle of the decree of Cyrus, in order to admit only that part which was an actual contribution to the theocratic history. But

[2] *History of Israel*, Vol. I, p. 196.

much more likely the division was made at that point because the chronicler had himself made such a division.

I do not, of course, mean that the Chronicles was an afterthought or was of secondary consideration in the mind of our writer. Indeed, from the importance of tracing the religious institutions back into the past, the pre-exilic portion of the great work was probably the more important. But it became so because the continuation of the theocratic history demanded it. It became the more important because it was necessary to have such a pre-exilic history before the post-exilic history could properly be written.

In considering the place of the Chronicles in Hebrew historiography, the method of introduction is worthy of notice. It is possible that the first chapter beginning with Adam is already the beginning of the custom which later became universal among the Arabs.[3] But it is, perhaps, more probable that this simply grows out of the conception that the Israel of the post-exile is the representative of the entire Israel, and that this in its turn is the representative of all humanity. Keil[4] is, perhaps, correct in the suggestion that the later usage of the Arabs is itself borrowed from the Chronicles.

But the most important historiographical characteristic of the Chronicles is the change which it manifests from compilation to authorship. The narratives peculiar to the chronicler — and they constitute a large part of the book — are written by himself and bear the stamp of his own personality. A critical analysis of the narratives is impossible. There is unity in style, phraseology, and conception. The sources of these narratives cannot be determined. Whatever those sources may have been, the chronicler made the information his own. He presented it, not as detached fragments, but as a narrative. And it is not difficult to discover why he has combined the compilatory method with that of the author. Partly, of course, he is under the influence of the prevailing historiographical methods. He

[3] So DRIVER, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 485; EWALD, *History of Israel*, Vol. I, p. 173.

[4] *Chronicles, Ezra and Esther*, p. 21.

can only change those methods in so far as he is compelled by the purpose of his writing. The following principles of the chronicler's historiography may be deduced from a study of his work:

1. Wherever he was acting simply as a historian, and giving narratives simply for the facts contained in them, and to secure historical continuity to his work, he compiled. The material which he used was quite satisfactory to him in the form in which it existed.

2. When he would narrate an event for the purpose of conveying the same moral and religious teaching which had already been conveyed by the same narrative in the earlier prophetic histories, he naturally compiled from the earlier histories, for the narrative was already in the literary and prophetic form in which he needed it.

3. When a narrative appeared in the earlier histories in a form to convey much of the religious teaching which the chronicler would desire to enforce, and yet did not exactly suit his purpose, because of its lack of emphasis upon the ceremonial law, he partly compiled and partly rewrote.

4. When historical events were only referred to in a brief historical manner in the earlier works, which events the chronicler thought should be written in a form to convey religious truth, he generally discarded the compilatory method and rewrote the history.

5. In the great periods of the history and for the critical events the chronicler discarded the method of compilation altogether. It would only have trammeled him as he sought, in his own style and with his own phraseology, to present a picture of the past that should come with a forceful message to the Israel of his day.

The first two principles explain why so large a part of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah are compilation. The sources of the writer were nearer to his own time and his own spirit. As the prophetic compilers incorporated prophetic narratives in their works, this disciple of Ezra and Nehemiah naturally incorporated their memoirs with little change. Narratives peculiar to the

chronicler are, of course, found in this latter part of his work, but it is in the former part that they are found more largely, because his sources for the pre-exilic history were not as generally satisfactory for his purpose. It may be worth while to run through the narratives of Chronicles, and to note how the principles above cited explain the various methods of composition that are employed.

In the first nine chapters the chronicler compiles, because he is simply concerned to record the facts of the genealogies and registers. The narrative of the death of Saul (chap. 10) is compiled from Samuel, the chronicler simply adding his estimate of the character of Saul and the reason for his rejection. David's coronation and the names of his mighty men (chap. 11) are also taken from Samuel, for the *fact* is the important thing. Chap. 12 the chronicler writes himself. He presents the picture of the spontaneous passing of the people from Saul to David, and then of the whole nation unitedly and magnificently assembling at Hebron to make David king. Wellhausen sneeringly remarks that the mighty men "talk in a highly spiritual language" (vs. 18). Of course they do. The picture is ideal. The chronicler is representing in his own way the providential guidance by which David was brought to the throne of Israel. Doubtless his sources did not so express it, and so he rejects the compilatory method. The account of the first bringing of the ark (chap. 13) is taken from Samuel. It is simply a historical preparation for the second and greater attempt. The events of chap. 14 are mere history. But the bringing of the ark to Jerusalem (chaps. 15 and 16) is more important. Nine verses —just the skeleton of the history—are taken from Samuel. The psalm is adapted from several already in the Psalter. But the picture belongs to the chronicler. His is the description of the priests and Levites, the singers and the porters, upon the great occasion which to him was the reëstablishment of the splendor of the Mosaic ceremonial. Compilation would have been impossible. The account of David's intention to build the temple (chap. 17) has deep religious lessons, but they are already brought out in the prophetic history, and a compilation

suits all the purpose of the chronicler. The wars of chaps. 18–20 are but connecting history. The census (chap. 21) needs only to be adapted from Samuel, for there its prophetic teaching is made clear. The chronicler ends the account with the theophany, which forms a natural transition to the preparations of David for the great work that occupies the central position in the history. Chaps. 22–29 could not be compiled.[5] Whatever may have been the sources from which the facts were drawn, they must have been in a very different form from that in which they appear in the present narrative. The chronicler could be satisfied with no patchwork picture of the arrangements of the great king for the building of the temple of Jehovah. He must paint it with the beauty of detail and with the warmth of color that his own vivid imagination had conceived.

The account of the reign of Solomon (2 Chron., chaps. 1–9) is wholly based on Kings. Only occasionally are there divergences. And the reason is clear. The earlier writer had already dwelt upon the magnificence of the monarch, the splendor of his reign, the wisdom of his rule, and particularly upon his devotion to Jehovah and upon the richness and beauty of his temple. The chronicler needs only to adapt the narrative to the different conditions of the post-exile. The history of the disruption (chap. 10) may be compiled, for its lessons are suggested in the book of Kings. The expedition of Shishak (chap. 11) must be rewritten, for the moral of the event and the intervention of the prophet are not referred to in the early history. The chronicler's purpose in the reigns of Abijah and Asa (chaps. 13–16) demands almost an entire rewriting. Only the skeleton is taken from the book of Kings. The same is true of the reign of Jehoshaphat (chaps. 17, 19, and 20), with the exception that the account of the alliance with Ahab (chap. 18), so prophetically narrated in the older history, may well be copied as it stands. Jehoram's wickedness (chap. 21) may be compiled from Kings, but the punishment and the interference of Elijah must be told in the chronicler's own language. The religious and prophetic

[5] That is to say, in general. There are probably some old lists, etc., that are inserted.

teaching of the reigns of Ahaziah and Athaliah (chap. 22) is narrated to the taste of the chronicler in Kings. So, also, is most of the reign of Joash (chaps. 23, 24),[6] only that his defection and punishment must not be omitted. The reigns of Amaziah and Uzziah are largely rewritten by the chronicler because of the religious and theocratic lessons which he desires to draw from them. Jotham's reign (chap. 27) is simply historical, and the compilatory method may well be used. Ahaz' wickedness and punishment call for a narrative from the chronicler's own standpoint, and hence he uses very little of the earlier material. Hezekiah's reformation and Passover (chaps. 29–31) mark one of the great epochs in the history to which the chronicler desires particularly to call attention. Here again it can only be said that, whatever may have been his sources, they could not have presented the information in the form in which he desired to present it. So the chronicler enters *con amore* into the task of picturing the utter removal of the heathen worship, the purifying of the city and the temple, the reconsecration of the priests and Levites, and the Passover, celebrated with all the prescriptions of the ancient law. Compilation would have been impossible.

The chronicler does not care to give the details of the Sennacherib campaign and of Hezekiah's later years (chap. 32). He therefore briefly abstracts from Kings. He does, however, add, in his own style, an account of the preparations of Hezekiah to meet the siege. The outline of Manasseh's reign (chap. 33) is taken from Kings, and the account of his wickedness, which is given there in such detail. The punishment and repentance of Manasseh the chronicler writes in his own style, probably because his source of information was very indefinite, and he wished to make the presentation very strong. Compilation naturally serves for Amon's reign. The treatment of Josiah (chap. 34) in the older history cannot be improved. The chronicler presents it in abbreviated form. He wishes, however, to describe with fulness the Passover that is referred to so briefly

[6] There are minor differences, the special reasons for which might easily be pointed out. But, of course, this whole argument takes into account only the general structure of the book. There are many slight divergences from the earlier works, even in the compilation.

in the book of Kings, and compilation naturally fails him at this point. The history of the later kings can be given in briefer form than in the older narrative. The prophetic teaching is on the surface. The chronicler need only add his significant summary (2 Chron. 36:21) and give the reason for the seventy years' captivity.

I have run through the book of Chronicles thus in detail because, if the view be correct that the chronicler represents a change in the methods of Hebrew historiography, that fact is of peculiar interest to the historical student.[7] Compilation is the rudest method of history-writing. It fails to present the history of the past as a continuity, because it fails to observe the principles that were determining the history. The method of the chronicler is an advance upon that of compilation, because it seeks to catch the spirit of the past (albeit the success may not be great), to view the events of the past as dependent one upon the other, and to present those events in their relation to one another. From the point of view of historical accuracy the method of the chronicler is doubtless a step backward. He has seen an evolution in the history of the past, but the evolution is determined by his own point of view. It is ideal and not real. The chronicler has introduced a change in the method of Hebrew historiography which, in hands less skilful and less trustworthy, can only work sad havoc in historical composition. But it is the recoil in order to advance. It is a necessary step in the passage from the rude methods of compilation to the scientific methods of critical historiography.

II. THE HISTORICITY OF THE CHRONICLES.

The historicity of a narrative will depend upon (1) the writer's acquaintance with the facts; (2) his willingness to present the facts as they are; (3) his ability to interpret the facts correctly.

[7] I have assumed, simply for the convenience of the discussion, that the chronicler used Samuel and Kings as his main sources. If he used a later redaction of the kingly histories, the argument is not seriously affected. Driver, to be sure, considers that the stylistic unity of the portions of the book that are peculiar to the chronicler simply indicates a compilation from a writer shortly preceding. I think this is only an evasion of the real issue by positing a chronicler before the chronicler.

We may consider these points with reference to the chronicler.

1. In the books of Samuel and Kings the chronicler undoubtedly possessed the nearest approach to the exact facts of the pre-exilic times. He had other sources of information. Presumably his chief source, "the book of the chronicles of the kings of Israel and Judah," contained very much that was not in the earlier prophetic books. The chronicler could not be expected to discriminate very carefully between the comparative values of these two sources of information. If, as seems very probable, the latter source had included very much of later tradition, we can only expect that this would make itself apparent in the chronicler's writing. As regards his acquaintance with the facts, then, it can only be said that in very many cases he probably had reliable information from sources reaching back to an early time, while, on the other hand, in not a few instances he may have been misled by a somewhat faulty tradition.

2. The modern critical spirit was, of course, absolutely unknown to ancient writers. It was particularly foreign to the biblical writers, with whom the mere narration of historical fact was always very subordinate. They were not always desirous of telling everything of the facts, unless it suited the main ends of their work. The chronicler in particular was guided by certain very definite purposes in the selection and presentation of his material. It was no part of his purpose to show the dark sides of the reigns of David and Solomon, and he therefore omitted what was derogatory to these monarchs. How far he may have carried this purpose through his history we can only judge as we compare it with the earlier parallel accounts. It is at least evident that his whole idea is to present only one phase of the life of pre-exilic Israel.

3. The ability of our historiographer to interpret the facts must be considered in the light of his manifest prejudgment of the earlier history. He invariably interprets from the Levitical point of view. He interprets without any idea of historical development or perspective. Hence his history must always be accepted with this reserve. His interpretation of the history

naturally modifies his presentation. A careful consideration of his purpose is necessary to any clear judgment of the real basis of fact in his narratives.

It would not, therefore, be expected that the Chronicles would present a narrative of fact, full, faithful, and unbiased. The chronicler had not access to all the facts, it was not his purpose to present all the facts, and he was not in a position to understand all the facts.

So much *a priori*. The study of the book itself must reveal the extent to which the author was influenced by the conditions under which he worked. An examination of the Chronicles from various points of view seems to yield the following principles regarding the historicity of the accounts:

a) *Dominated by the notion of the complete observance of the full Mosaic ritual from the earliest times, the chronicler has presented an ideal, rather than a real picture of the ecclesiastical arrangements of the first temple.*—Waiving the question of the date of origin of the Levitical ritual, it would seem to be clear that the full observance of that ritual belongs to the second and not to the first temple. Never in the pre-exilic history was the full pomp and ceremonial of Judaism in operation at Jerusalem. Magnificent as was the temple of Solomon, it was never the building of surpassing grandeur that the chronicler has pictured. Important as was probably the position of the priesthood under the Judæan kings, they never, before the exile, held the commanding position to which the chronicler assigns them. It is altogether likely that the prophetic author of the book of Kings had little interest in priestly ceremonial, and has furnished a more meager account of it than the history warranted. Undoubtedly there was a gradually developing sacerdotalism from the time of David, and the temple records and traditions may well have furnished the chronicler with the basis for his ecclesiastical narratives. He has elaborated upon this basis. Because the modern student cannot separate between the basis and the elaboration, this material is not of high historical value. But it does not follow that the ecclesiastical narratives are misrepresentations, inventions, or imaginations. The narratives represent the

idea of the chronicler of what the ecclesiastical arrangements of the first temple must have been if the law were in fullest operation. When we have determined how far the law was in operation at a given time, we can decide how far this ideal of the chronicler corresponds with historical fact.

b) *Under the influence of the splendor of the Persian empire, the chronicler has often presented an exaggerated picture of the condition of the Hebrew monarchy.*—The chronicler dwells with much elaboration on the wealth, the military force, the magnificence of David, Solomon, Jehoshaphat, Hezekiah, and others of the Judæan kings. The comparative insignificance of the Hebrew kingdom was naturally not understood by him or his contemporaries. Already the books of Samuel and Kings had presented a splendid picture of the reigns of David and Solomon, and tradition had not failed to heighten its coloring. Similar to the Levitical material in the Chronicles, this is simply an idealization. It is a picture making real to the unhistorical imagination a past historical fact. Superficially it detracts from the historical character of the work. But really it detracts very little. On careful examination the nature and reason of any exaggeration are easily discovered. Allowance is easily made for it; and the true picture of the history is not difficult to obtain. That Solomon made silver *and gold* to be as stones in Jerusalem is only the hyperbole of the oriental. The significance of the expression is easily apparent to the western mind.

c) *Living in different circumstances, and far removed from the events which he narrates, the chronicler occasionally, like other biblical historians, falls into error, or fails properly to interpret the history.*—After the allowances for idealization demanded by the two preceding principles have been made, the chronicler does not present more of error, inaccuracy, or misinterpretation than is to be found in any of the other writings of the Old Testament. The nature and purpose of the historiography, the character of historical sources, and the standard of historical accuracy must always be taken into account. A careful examination of the Chronicles reveals that it does not demand a larger application of these corrective principles than other portions of Hebrew

canonical literature. If the chronicler applies the principles of the Levitical code as a test of the religious zeal of the Hebrew monarchs, the compiler of the book of Kings has equally unhistorically applied the standards of the deuteronomic code. If the chronicler represents Josiah as punished for his disregard of God's warning through Pharaoh-Necho, the earlier writer represents the son of the prophet as devoured by a lion for his refusal to smite his brother. If the chronicler records the descent of the heavenly fire upon the altar of the temple, the prophetic historian has recorded the similar miracle in the presence of the priests of Baal at Mount Carmel. All these events may be historical. At least in each case the narrative in Chronicles stands upon the same plane as the narrative in Kings.

The chronicler is peculiarly liable to detection in any error into which he may fall, for we have his sources always as a standard. If the sources of Judges, Samuel, and Kings could be obtained, the criticism of these writings might be as severe as the criticism of the Chronicles.

d) *After all allowance has been made, the chronicler's contributions to the history of Judah are essentially accurate and reasonably complete.*— Later and calmer criticism has overthrown the violent attacks of De Wette and Gramberg. Graf himself admitted that he had gone too far in his impeachment of the Chronicles. There is a practical consensus of opinion among the more careful critics of today that the narratives of the Chronicles are very largely reliable. As they are separately examined, it will, I think, be found that, in almost every case, they yield a reasonable and helpful contribution to the history. There are errors in the Chronicles, there are misconceptions of the earlier history, there are representations which are anachronistic, there are sometimes homiletical reflections which do not grow out of the historical narrative. But it is probable that, in the main, the chronicler has obtained his material from reliable sources. He has presented it with reasonable fulness and fairness. And thus he has rescued from the Hebrew literature that is now lost some very important and very interesting items of historical information.

III. THE TRUTH OF THE IDEALIZATION IN THE CHRONICLES.

The ideal always governed the highest thought in Israel. The prophets, representing at once the intellectual and spiritual forces of the nation, were always idealists. All the best conceptions of the Hebrews were conceived in the ideal form. The creation, the beginning of the nation, the promulgation of the law, the establishment of the monarchy, were ideally represented. And for the future they were looking for an ideal land, an ideal condition of prosperity and peace, and an ideal Messianic king. The Messianic ideal was not an isolated concept; it was the florescence of the idealization of the Hebrew mind.

It is aside from our purpose to discuss the source of this ideal. Some scholars have succeeded in accounting for it to their own satisfaction. But when it is noted that these early ideals of the Hebrew people dominate the best Christian thought of today; when it is noted that the ideal pictures of the prophets, apparently so extravagant, are progressively realizing themselves in Jesus Christ; and when it is noted that our own Christian optimism still seeks to clothe its spiritual aspirations in the poetic language of the Hebrew seers — then the seeker after truth may well pause to inquire whether there be not a continuity in Hebrew and Christian thought, which can only be accounted for by what the Christian church has denominated the *divine inspiration.*

It is necessary to come into sympathy with the idealism of the Hebrews in order to understand the import of the Chronicles. It is not an easy task for the occidental mind. We understand it to be poetic hyperbole, when a great preacher, picturing in prophetic vision the peaceful future, sees the lion eating straw like the ox, and the wolf and the kid lying down together. But we do not so easily understand a magnificent, though unhistorical, picture of the past as the same poetic hyperbole. Yet so it is. The prophet's vision of the splendor of the Messianic reign, that shall come from the righteousness of the people, and the chronicler's vision of the splendor of the Davidic and Solomonic reign, which *did* come from the righteousness of the people, are precisely similar. Idealization of

the future or of the past carries with it the same prophetic truth, and supplies the same motive to action.

But manifestly there is no abiding force in a deception. Only as the ideal can actualize itself in the real can it have power. What, then, was the truth in this ideal of the chronicler that could make it of any moral or religious force? We may consider separately the different phases of the ideal.

1. *The splendor of the Davidic kings.*—The chronicler represents the first kings of Israel as ruling a most magnificent empire. Their riches excite the wonder of the neighboring kings, and their power reduces all enemies to submission. Hundreds of thousands of warriors form their standing armies. Universal peace and prosperity reward their piety.

The purpose of the chronicler is manifestly to show that through the grace of God, and because of the righteousness of the rulers and of the people, Israel was the foremost nation of the time, and enjoyed a very golden age. And who shall say he was wrong? Doubtless Israel was the foremost nation of the East under these early kings. To be sure, Assyria and Egypt were out of account, and her supremacy was only manifested over Syrians and Moabites, Ammonites and Philistines. But doubtless it was in the providence of Jehovah that the monarchy was formed when there were no serious rivals to prevent. The chronicler's idealization is true to the fact of the history: he cannot be expected to observe due relative historical proportions. If Israel stood above the nations, it meant to the chronicler and to the men of his time that she stood higher than the Persian empire, with which they were familiar. No matter where the chronicler obtained his numbers and his estimates, he was obliged to get them somewhere, or his narrative would convey no meaning. Could he paint the magnificence of the faithful kings, chosen by Jehovah, if he stated their body-guard as six hundred mercenaries—less than the soldiery of the petty pashas of the Persian provinces? Naturally the state of the Hebrew monarchy was compared, not with that of the Syrian governor, but with that of the Great King himself. Fundamentally the chronicler's representation is correct.

The impression it produced was justified. What more can be demanded?

What can be said of David and Solomon is true in a lesser degree of Jehoshaphat and Uzziah and Hezekiah. They were great kings. Their power, as compared with the neighboring monarchs, was very great. And no doubt Jehovah had blessed them for their faithfulness. All this the chronicler portrays; and his language is suited to his readers.

2. *The emphasis upon the goodness of the pious kings.*— Part of the idealization of the chronicler arises from this emphasis upon the virtue of the faithful kings, and his omission of their unrighteous acts. Historically, of course, David's reign is not properly represented without an account of his sin and of the troubles that followed it. Solomon's declension and political difficulties are likewise of particular historical significance. The chronicler mentions none of these. Hezekiah's faithlessness, his alliance with Egypt, and his submission to Assyria are passed over by the chronicler. What is the truth in the idealization? Partly, perhaps, it must be considered that the patriot of the post-exile, when the monarchy that was the pride of Israel had departed, preferred to draw a veil over the darker portions of its history. But principally the idealization has a truth, in that it indicates the causal connection between the righteousness of the kings and the prosperity of their reigns. The chronicler's philosophy of the history was correct. Spite of his sin, David was the man after God's own heart. Before he was led astray, doubtless Solomon was a God-fearing ruler. And if there be any truth in the doctrine of the providential tutelage of Israel, certainly Sennacherib was overthrown because Hezekiah cast himself upon Jehovah. It was entirely aside from the chronicler's purpose to discuss the sins of these monarchs. It would have weakened the force of his presentation. In the elaboration of the thesis the antithesis must, of necessity, be somewhat neglected. Writings designed to fire the imagination and move the heart seldom contain deprecatory parentheses and historical footnotes.

3. *David's relation to the Levitical ritual.*— It is in this that

the idealization of the chronicler particularly manifests itself. He represents the Mosaic law as in full operation in the times before the monarchy, and as reinstituted and reorganized by David. The priests and the Levites, the singers and the porters, in large numbers, and with approved genealogies, are divided into their courses and assigned to their duties, and the arrangement remains permanent through the succeeding centuries. In the face of the almost certain fact that the pomp and ceremonial of the Levitical law never had any objective existence, and probably no existence at all, in the reign of David, what can be said of the truth of this idealization? Much can be said. Let the most radical position regarding the Levitical system be maintained. Let it be granted that the Levites had no connection with the temple before the exile; that the singers and porters were a class of servants after the return; and that the twenty-four courses of the priests were not thought of till the time of Jeshua. It would still remain true that David was the organizer of the temple ritual and the temple song. It was he who first realized the magnificent conception of a central and national worship for the scattered tribes of Israel, which he had cemented into a single people. It was his statesman-like foresight that selected Jerusalem, not only as the national, but also as the ecclesiastical capital of the people of Jehovah. It was his piety and sagacity that brought back to Israel the neglected ark, and conceived the magnificent temple that should enshrine it. It was his enlightened wisdom that collected the scattered priests of the ancient worship, and made them the firm adherents of his dynasty, and the faithful servants of his God. It was, indeed, his prophetic spirit that established, and guided, and legalized that pure and spiritual monotheism which gave all its meaning to the temple and all its sanction to the law. And radical criticism can scarcely overthrow the tradition, so well authenticated, that it was David, "the sweet singer of Israel," who gave the first impulse to the temple song. Of course, succeeding ages idealized him as the second founder of the Jehovah-worship. The most natural result would be that the chronicler should transfer from his own time all the institutions of Judaism in a body back

to the man from whom they sprang, and back to those beginnings in which potentially they were contained.

There is a large and sufficient truth in the idealization, though David inaugurated only in the simplest way this national worship. But it is very questionable whether scholarship will not find it necessary to concede more and more the claim of the Davidic age to very many of the institutions now generally considered to be of later growth.

As this idealization of David must be understood, so must that of Hezekiah. The great fundamental truth was that Hezekiah purged the service of Jehovah from the abominations of Ahaz. He followed the law of God as he knew it. He brought the people back to a right worship and to a right relation to Jehovah. And undoubtedly he was blessed and prospered for his pious deeds. That the chronicler has represented Hezekiah's acts under the forms of his own thinking is not surprising. To have done otherwise would have been impossible for himself, and meaningless for his contemporaries. The impression that was conveyed and the truth that was taught were absolutely correct. If this demands idealization, who shall contend for realism in didactic composition?

Certainly as the event realized, or shall yet realize, the inner meaning of the prophetic idealization of the future, so certainly did the past of Israel warrant its presentation in the ideal form, which should embody and set forth its moral, and religious, and theocratic lessons. There is no invention, there is no exaggeration, there is no misrepresentation in the Chronicles. It is only such a picture of the Hebrew monarchy as would satisfy and stimulate the little nation, struggling beneath the oppression of her Persian masters.

IV. THE CHRONICLES AS AN OUTGROWTH OF THE TIMES.

The conditions under which the Chronicles was written were wholly different from those of the earlier times. The national existence and independence of Israel were no longer burning questions. The rule of the Persian had been accepted. The manner in which piety and submission to Jehovah should be

manifested was no longer matter for dispute. The law was established. The history of the past that would address itself to the present must take into account these new conditions, and, indeed, must of necessity be formed by them.

The environment of the chronicler, as it shaped his composition, may be considered under its various aspects.

1. *Israel's relation to the outer world.*— Israel was no longer the free monarchy, well defending itself against the neighboring states. She was no longer the coveted ally of contending empires. She was not even the important tributary kingdom of a foreign suzerain. She had become a petty province in one of the many satrapies of the Persian dominion. Politically she was a nonentity. Yet though her place in the imperial system was insignificant, she felt all the burdens of the system continually present. There was practically no provincial autonomy under the Persian rule. Oppression and injustice were constantly manifested, and taxation became increasingly burdensome. But more galling even than the foreign rule was the constant irritation of the Samaritans. Aliens in race, apostates in religion, rivals alike for the favor of Persia and the countenance of Jehovah, the Samaritans, inhabiting the old seats of Israel, were most objectionable neighbors of the Jews.

Naturally the subject people looked back to the time of their freedom as to the golden age of Hebrew history. They loved to think of their own monarchs ruling from the Euphrates to the river of Egypt. The wretched present led them to idealize the past. The oppression from without made them remember the days when they had ruled the outside nations. The Syrians had been their subjects. The Arabians and Idumæans and the neighboring peoples had paid tribute. And the fear of their kings had been "upon all the earth." The interference of the Samaritans called to remembrance the times when the north had acknowledged the sovereignty of David and Solomon, and when the righteous remnant, after the captivity of the ten tribes, had flocked to Jerusalem in recognition that from Zion should go forth the law.

In the light of these feelings of the people, the Chronicles is

easily understood. The idealized past is the expression of what they feel particularly wanting in their present.

And, further, the past is pictured under the forms of the present. The Persian empire becomes the model of the Hebrew empire. Solomon's splendor can be no less than that of the Great King. The old Hebrew armies cannot have been much smaller than the Persian armies. The subjection of the kingdoms about Israel must have been as complete as that of the provinces of the Persian empire.

In this twofold aspect the political situation of the times of the chronicler influenced his composition. On the one hand, he idealized the past as a reaction from the present; on the other hand, he idealized the past under the influence of the present.

2. *The nation's conception of itself.*—The hopeless dependency of Israel was almost sufficient in itself to crush the national aims of the people. But a more potent force in this direction was the introduction and acceptance of the law. To be a people "holy unto Jehovah," in the strictest sense demanded by the Levitical ceremonial, was to be separate from the nations round about. It was, of necessity, to cease to be a nation and to become a church. This end the Israel of the post-exile deliberately chose. For a short time after the return there was a longing for a national life under a Davidic king. But with the retirement of Zerubbabel this hope began to languish, and with the firm establishment of the law it died away. A new prospect and a new mission seemed to open before the chosen people. Their ancient desire to rule the nations and to make Jerusalem the political capital of the world gave place to the ambition to be the holy separate people, satisfied if they could preserve the cleanness of the Holy Land.

But side by side with the renunciation of national aims there was a corresponding emphasis upon the national integrity. The Levitical law based itself upon the Israel of the twelve tribes. The jewels of the high priest, the loaves of shewbread, and the representative character of the Levitical order derived their meaning from the original number of the tribes. And all the promises were to the twelve sons of Israel. Hence the little

company of post-exilic Jews that returned to Palestine were most solicitous to preserve the conception that they were the representatives of the ancient Israel, and heirs to the promises of the fathers. At the Feast of Dedication (Ezra 6: 17) *twelve* he-goats are offered, "according to the number of the tribes of Israel." The prophet of the captivity gives the boundaries of all the tribes in his vision of the reapportioned land (Ezek., chap. 48). And the attitude of the Jews toward the Samaritans indicates their feeling that they alone were the representatives of the ancient people.

From this twofold conception of themselves, which possessed the nation, the Chronicles took form. The very renunciation of national aims made them proudly remember their former national greatness. At the same time, it deprived them of a reasonable standard of comparison, and gave rise to a wholly extravagant and erroneous conception of the importance of pre-exilic Israel. The book of Chronicles was naturally influenced by this environment. The army of David serving in courses like the priests, 12,000 per month, is a conception of a nation which has become a church. The error of the Tarshish ships (2 Chron. 20: 36) is that of a people which has ceased to be commercial. And the greatness and magnificence of the political movements that are described are as a reaction from the political insignificance of the post-exilic people.

And the desire of the new religious community to represent itself as the true Israel explains very much of the material in the Chronicles. The registers in the opening chapters of all the tribes are manifestly given to connect the post-exilic fragments of the nation with the earlier complete Israel. The frequent reference to representatives of Simeon, Ephraim, Manasseh, and the other tribes coming to Jerusalem to participate in the religious observances grows out of the feeling that Zion was the religious center for all the tribes. And there is no doubt in this a reference to the apostate Samaritans with their temple at Gerizim, a repetition of the schismatic worship of Jeroboam.

It is not, of course, to the purpose whether the chronicler had authority for his references to Simeon and Reuben and the

other tribes, or not. The purpose of his insertion of these notices can only connect itself with the desire of his contemporaries to view themselves as the continuation of the old Davidic kingdom, and to view that kingdom as always representative of the true Israel.

3. *The dominance of the law.*—The chronicler, living at least a century after Ezra, was under the full influence of the legal system which had come to dominate the political, religious, and social life of the Jews. The law related itself to everything. It touched every man in his daily life. It supplied the principles and standards of his most ordinary acts. The Jews of that day must, of necessity, think in terms of the law.

The government of Judæa, so far as there was any local government, had by this time passed entirely into the hands of the high priest. The judiciary was the Aaronic priesthood. The teachers were the scribes. And this law, which had become of such paramount importance for the post-exilic Israel, was conceived as having existed, with all its forces and all its sanctions, since the days of Moses. David's relation to the law could have been, therefore, in no wise less vital than Nehemiah's. And thus the pre-exilic history was re-read in the light of the Levitical system. The statement that Solomon sacrificed three times a year on the altar of burnt offering could only be a brief statement of the fact that the three great feasts were observed with proper solemnity. The notice of Josiah's Passover could only be a reference to the full ceremonial observance of that institution.

This dominant influence of the law has naturally determined the form of much of the narrative of the chronicler. The picture of the bringing up of the ark, and of the establishment of a regular Jehovah-service, essentially historical no doubt, is yet thrown into the ideal form in which alone the chronicler and his contemporaries could think of it. The speech of Abijah is quite impossible in the mouth of the son of Rehoboam, who "walked in all the sins of his father, which he had done before him" (1 Kings 15:3). But, with the freedom with which speeches were put into the mouths of historical personages, it

serves admirably to express the chronicler's conception of Jeroboam's schism, and the post-exilian view of the alien worship of Mount Gerizim. The statement is undoubtedly correct that Hezekiah purified the temple and restored the worship of Jehovah according to its ancient form. But the chronicler has naturally presented the fact ideally—as it would have been in the fourth century, not as it was in the eighth.

Further, there can be little doubt that in his description of the judicial arrangements of the pre-exilic times the chronicler has expressed himself in the language of his own day. To be sure, it is not at all unlikely that David established a judicial system under the religious teachers of the kingdom, and that Jehoshaphat elaborated the system, and provided, perhaps, a primitive appellate court. But manifestly the chronicler has transferred the arrangements and organization of the provincial and national synedria to the earlier period, and has represented the scribal teaching to have been in full operation before the deuteronomic law.

We have already discussed the truth of these idealizations. Essentially they are true. But naturally the chronicler, living and thinking and writing under the influence of the dominating law, can only express himself and can only make himself intelligible to his contemporaries in the terms and under the forms of that law.

V. THE CHRONICLER AS THE LEVITICAL PROPHET.

Every great work is at once a product of its times and a message to its times. It expresses itself in the forms of thinking that prevail; it embodies the dominant ideas; and also it supplies a stimulus to the best thought of the age. Such a work is the Chronicles. We have noted how it is an outgrowth of its time and a product of its environment. It remains to consider its contribution to the current thought.

The Chronicles appeared after the departure of Hebrew prophecy. In the dependency of Judæa, and under the all-pervading law, the free spirit of prophecy had ceased. The chronicler in no small degree took the place of the prophet. Prophecy always

connects itself with crises in the national history. And it is by no means improbable that the Chronicles, sounding the note of the time and bringing back the lessons of the past, connects itself with that great crisis in the history of the people when the hated yoke of Persia was exchanged for the more kindly rule of Greece. Full of hope and full of danger as was the new condition, the Levitical prophet might well bring his word of warning, of courage, and of hope.

The chronicler was the Levitical prophet, as Ezekiel was the priest prophet. In the beginning days of the more developed law, Ezekiel encouraged the people by a picture of the ideal future under the beneficent dominion of the law—the prince leading the people in righteousness, the priests teaching "the difference between the holy and profane," and the complete Israel holy to Jehovah. In the days of the full sway of the Levitical law the chronicler encouraged the people by a picture of the ideal past under the same kindly dominance of the law, when the princes were prospered as they kept its precepts, and the land was in peace as the priests and Levites kept their courses, and the smoke of the morning and evening sacrifice ascended from Mount Zion. The burden of Ezekiel and of the chronicler is the same, and the prophetic spirit breathes through all the legislative details.

The chronicler is a prophet, for he belongs to that best age of Judaism when the moral and spiritual elements of the law were still paramount, and before its ritual had degenerated into cold pharisaical formalism. The prayers and speeches he puts into the mouth of David breathe the spirit of genuine piety and humility before God. The punishment and repentance of Manasseh are told as Isaiah or Jeremiah would have told them. Even the detailed narratives of the festivals of Hezekiah and Josiah exhibit the people rejoicing and thanking Jehovah, and gladly offering of their means for his sacrifice.

The prophetic character of the Chronicles becomes clear as it is compared with the book of Kings. The teaching of the latter is manifestly that God punishes sin and rewards righteousness, and the standard which underlies the book is manifestly

the moral and ceremonial deuteronomic law. The chronicler's teaching is the same, but the moral and ceremonial precepts of the Levitical law are the standard. The people are shown the blessings that came to the early kings as they kept themselves pure unto Jehovah, as they provided for his sanctuary, as they abstained from heathen connections, and as they cultivated a spirit of piety and faith. These were the lessons that the Judaism of the end of the fourth century needed earnestly to take to heart.

Had the prophetic teaching of the chronicler made a deeper impression upon the nation, the priesthood would have learned lessons of piety, and honesty, and judicial fairness that would have made the later Sadducean worldliness impossible; the religious classes would have maintained a simple faith, a voluntary zeal of worship, and a strict observance of the law without formality, that would have made the later Pharisaism an impossibility; and the common people (עם־הארץ) would have continued the joyful servants of Jehovah, instead of becoming that outer class that was gradually lost to the better influences of the law.

It is a mistake to look upon the Chronicles as a historical romance, growing out of national prejudice and priestly pragmatism. It comes from a people glorying in its past, faithful in its present, and anxious for its future. And it brings to them a message that points the moral of the past, supplies motive for the present, and gives a ground of promise for the future.

RELATIVE AUTHORITY OF THE GOSPELS.

By EML. V. GERHART,
Lancaster, Pa.

THE question respecting the authority of the gospels in com parison with the other books of the New Testament I propose to discuss exclusively under the guidance of the facts recorded, especially in the gospels and the Acts of the Apostles.

"Back to Christ" expresses the keynote of a sentiment that is becoming widely current in America and in Great Britain—a sentiment suggested by the assumption that the words spoken by Jesus when upon earth, as represented by the gospels, have more significance and greater authority than the teaching concerning Christ and his kingdom as given in the epistles. Relatively to his person this sentiment assumes that what he taught while in his state of humiliation has higher claims upon the confidence of the church, and stronger regulative force for Christian conduct, than what in his state of glorification he is teaching by his Holy Spirit through the agency of apostles.

In the interest of Christian truth and sound christological thought such an assumption may be justly challenged.

I.

The four gospels reflect, each from its own point of view, the progress of the personal history of Jesus on earth. But it is deserving of special consideration that no gospel, nor the four gospels in their connection, give us a complete history. Each portrays a progressive development of his life and ministry, but each stops short of the complement which fulfils and reveals the teleology of this development.

The retirement of thirty years looks forward to his baptism and the functions of his public ministry—a period in which, as we are taught by Luke, Jesus advanced in wisdom and stature and in favor with God and men.[1] His baptism is preparatory to

[1] Luke 2:52.

his fasting and temptation in the wilderness. When in solitary cummunion with the Father he has achieved the victory, he goes forth from his seclusion; he enters the cities and villages of Galilee, proclaiming the kingdom of heaven to be at hand; and he continues to go about throughout Galilee and Judea from year to year, until he is betrayed, condemned, and crucified.

A thoughtful review of the gospels makes the impression that Jesus during his ministry is only to a degree satisfied with the status of his life. He looks upon the miraculous works he is performing as but a partial manifestation of the intent of his mission. To the seventy that returned rejoicing "that the devils are subject to us in thy name" he said: "In this rejoice not that the spirits are subject unto you; but rejoice that your names are written in heaven."[2] Time and again he speaks of his "hour" or his "time" which has not yet come.[3] He speaks of an impending baptism with which he is to be baptized, and "how am I straitened until it be accomplished;"[4] which, as Bengel expresses it, "implies the will struggling through obstacles." To his disciples he announces that the priests and elders will kill him, but on the third day he will rise again. On the mount of transfiguration Moses and Elijah, who appeared in glory, spake of the departure of Jesus which he was about to accomplish at Jerusalem.[5]

To heal the sick, to cleanse the leper, raise the dead, and give sight to the blind—this is a part of his mission, but this is not his whole work. The final goal of his teaching was not the truth which he taught in the period of his humiliation, nor was the goal of his working those deeds of mercy which he was daily performing. Though he spake as man had never spoken, yet he was not content with the truth he was teaching; for what he taught was not the whole truth. He had yet many things to say to his disciples, "but ye cannot bear them now."[6] Though

[2] Luke 10:20; *cf.* 1 Cor. 12:31.

[3] John 7:6, 8, 30; 8:20.

[4] Luke 12:50; *cf.* Heb. 5:7.

[5] Mark 9:31, 32.

[6] John 16:12, 13; *cf.* John 14:26.

he did what man had never done, yet he was not content with the works he was doing, for these works were not the full realization of the purpose of his mission: he was ever looking forward to a mightier work which he had to accomplish, and to a far more glorious manifestation of the Father's love which he had come into the world to reveal. The evidence lies before us.

Each gospel has its own method and its own peculiar aim, yet these various biographies are in entire accord in this, that they set forth a history of Jesus which is progressive, yet incomplete—a history that anticipates future momentous events of his mission—events which, on the one hand, will consummate his mediatorship, and, on the other, will impart final virtue to his words and deeds.

In reflecting the development of his mission the gospels imply and teach the progress of Jesus in the formation of spiritual *character*. The temptation in the wilderness was a test of moral strength and of fidelity to his mediatorship. The test was a severe trial, and it became needful for angels to minister unto him.[7] Then, "in the power of the Spirit" who had led him into the wilderness, Jesus returned into Galilee.[8] He returned possessing a spiritual "power" to teach and to work miracles greater than he had before.

Though he could meet his enemies with the bold challenge, "Which of you convinceth me of sin?" yet his sinlessness was not itself the ultimate perfection of spiritual character. Evidence comes to view under different aspects. An instance we have in the solemn experiences of his agony in Gethsemane. Thrice in profoundest anguish of soul he prays: "Father, if thou be willing, remove this cup from me. Nevertheless not my will, but thine, be done."[9] The law of his mediatorship in process of fulfilment on earth, and the law of personal qualification for the perfection of his mediatorship in heaven, required that he drink this cup of suffering. The indescribable agony of the garden fitted him for the patience, meekness, and unwavering fidelity

[7] Matt. 4:11; Mark 1:13.

[8] Luke 4:14.

[9] Luke 22:42.

displayed during his trial, and for that unique majesty with which he bore the passion of the cross.

On these mysterious scenes of Gethsemane light is shed by the epistle to the Hebrews. We are taught that "it became Him, for whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the author of their salvation perfect through sufferings."[10] His sufferings were a part of the discipline for the development of his ideal character. As by the fasting and temptation in the wilderness he advanced in wisdom and in favor with God, so by the agony and the prayers of Gethsemane he advanced to a stage of spiritual perfection which transcended the sinless life he had lived during his public ministry.

This truth is supported by the words of Jesus spoken, on the day of his resurrection, to the two disciples to whom he drew near when they were going to a village named Emmaus. They were depressed because their hope that Jesus, whom the rulers had crucified, was he which should redeem Israel had been turned into despair. To them he said: "Behooved it not the Christ to suffer these things and to enter into his glory?"[11] His condemnation by the rulers and his execution were in the wisdom of God a necessity. *Behooved* it not the Christ to suffer these things? According to all the prophecies, "beginning from Moses," which he had interpreted to them, the Messiah must suffer on behalf of his people. And these things it behooved the Christ to suffer that he might "enter into his glory." Otherwise than through suffering he would not be the mediator, nor would he be qualified to transcend the limitations of this world. Otherwise than by triumphing over death he would not acquire the spiritual fitness for enthronement at the right hand of God.

Sinless he was in boyhood and youth, morally perfect in every transaction of his history; yet this history requires us to recognize a succession of stages in the formation of his character. By the interview in vision with Moses and Elijah and the attestation of the Father at his transfiguration, and by the mysterious experiences of the cross, he attained and realized an order of divine-human righteousness which transcended the

[10] Heb. 2:10. [11] Luke 24:26.

righteousness both of his private life and his public ministry. For the development of this final order of perfection his baptism, his temptation, his observance of Jewish festivals, especially his sufferings, were the necessary discipline. So long as this order of spiritual elevation had not been attained, his power to influence the world was limited. He teaches: "And I, if I be lifted up out of the earth, will draw all men unto myself." The death "he should die," to be followed by his glorification, was the condition on which depended the power to draw to himself all classes of men.

The final object on which the eye of Jesus during the earthly period of his life is steadily fixed is the "glory of the Father." That glory is his glory. To enter into the glory which the Son of Man[12] had with the Father before the world was is the end at which he is aiming by his humiliation, by all his teachings, ministries, and sufferings. To his disciples he says: "I came out from the Father, and am come into the world; again, I leave the world and go unto the Father." To go unto the Father, to be glorified with the glory of the Father, is the consummation of himself and of his mediatorship. In his great sacerdotal prayer, "lifting up his eyes to heaven, he said, Father, the hour is come; glorify thy son, that the son may glorify thee." This fact that he is looking forward to his entrance into the glory of the Father as the consummation of his mission implies that his antecedent mediatorship on earth was wanting in completeness, that what he had been or what he then was did not fulfil the purpose of his mission. The life he was then living was not realizing its type under its final form, nor did the miracles which he was performing express the depth and entire compass of his authority. The life he lived moved on a lower plane than his intrinsic dignity anticipated and demanded; it was by itself of less moral value for man and less honorable for God than the completed work which he was sent to perform. The work he had come to do for the world he was doing, but doing only in part. It was not yet fully accomplished; and the whole work could not be accomplished while he was living in the natural body. The moral

[12] John 17:5; 3:13; 5:27; Matt. 25:31.

and spiritual glory of his person was attainable on the plane of spirit, transcending all earthly conditions. Hence his profound desire to ascend from earth to heaven: "Oh, Father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was."

His glorification was the condition of his mediatorship in its final character, the condition also of its final virtue. So long as he was not enthroned, the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Promise, would not come, could not come. "If I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. But if I go, I will send him unto you." And so long as the Spirit had not come, the proclamation of life and salvation in his name was by his command suspended. "Behold, I send forth the promise of my Father upon you, but tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high."[13] Suspended the proclamation was because until the Spirit from Christ glorified had come the proclamation would be fruitless.

The change realized in the personal life of Jesus by his translation into the glory of the Father constitutes the ultimate epoch on which both the rich blessing of the new creation of which Jesus was the principle[14] and the efficiency of his redemption for the salvation of the world depend. His glorification through the presence and agency of the Spirit conditions the authority and validity of the ministry, the spiritual import of the sacraments, the wisdom of preaching, the possibility of gospels and epistles, and the spiritual understanding of the books of the Old Testament.

The pentecostal gift, the consequence of the translation of Jesus, is the epoch in which, on the one hand, the entire antecedent history of Messianic revelation reaches its relative conclusion; on the other, the epoch in which the church, the apostolate proper, and the movement of Christian history on the higher plane of spiritual life begin.

From this point of view, as set forth by the synoptists and by the apostle John, we have to study the reciprocal connection and the relative authority of the gospels and epistles.

[13] Luke 24:49. [14] Col. 1:18.

II.

Though Jesus himself did not write a book nor a letter, though he did not command his disciples after his departure to record either his words or his deeds, yet the Christ enthroned in heaven is, by his presence through the Spirit in the church, indirectly, but in the profoundest sense, the author of all the canonical books of the New Testament, of the epistles no less than of the gospels, of the one class as really as of the other.

The advent of the Spirit sent by the enthroned Christ wrought a radical change in the disciples, a change so great that, unless we carefully study the difference in the attitude of these chosen men before and after this epoch, we shall fail to appreciate its extraordinary significance. The change involves both their character and their Christian knowledge.

Prior to the crucifixion and during the trial before the Sanhedrim and before Pilate the disciples were unsteady and fearful, even cowardly. The prophecy of Jesus was fulfilled: "All ye shall be offended in me this night."[15] Only one apostle had the courage "of the mother of Jesus, and his mother's sister, Mary the wife of Clopas, and Mary Magdalene," to follow Jesus to the cross. But on the day of Pentecost these very same men who less than two months before had by his betrayal and arrest been scattered hither and thither like timid sheep confessed and proclaimed the crucified Nazarene to be the Christ, and maintained their confession before the multitude and before the rulers, deterred by no authority, no imprisonment, no form of death. Fear was supplanted by confidence, disappointment and despair by assurance, sorrow by an ecstasy of joy.

So great a contrast in the conduct of the disciples before the resurrection with their conduct on the day when "they were all filled with the Holy Spirit," a contrast subsequently heightened by their unwavering persistence in the faith of Jesus as the promised Messiah, is the expression of a contrast equally great in their knowledge before his resurrection with their knowledge of him and his kingdom after the advent of the Spirit. This

[15] Zech. 13:7; Matt. 26:31.

revolution of Messianic judgment is demonstrated by a comparison of the lucid, profound, and comprehensive spiritual knowledge of the disciples, as embodied in the Acts and the epistles, with the superficiality and narrow-mindedness of the Twelve evinced for a period of three years under the tuition of Jesus.

Under his tuition the Twelve prove themselves to be very slow learners. Neither his parables, nor his miracles, nor his private instructions broke the spell of their false Jewish conception respecting a magnificent temporal kingdom. When he taught them some of the distinguishing mysteries of his mission, "they understood not the saying, and were afraid to ask him."[16] Instead, "there arose a reasoning among them,[17] which of them should be greatest," still assuming that the Messianic kingdom would be an earthly empire of Solomonic grandeur. Even after the resurrection onward to the day of the ascension the same misapprehension continues, as we learn from the fact that when they were come together on Mount Olivet they asked him: "Lord, dost thou at this time restore the kingdom of Israel?"[18]

But several days later, what a quickening of their capacity of insight into Messianic truth confronts us!

After they had with one accord continued in prayer for ten days in "the upper chamber, the promise of the Father" was fulfilled; they were "baptized with the Holy Spirit." Then there is a new birth of Christian knowledge as extraordinary as the revolution wrought in their character.

To illustrate this contrast it will suffice to look at the conduct of Peter when Jesus went forth with his disciples into the villages of Cæsarea Philippi.[19] He proceeds to teach them that the Son of Man must suffer many things, and be killed, and after three days rise again. Then the very apostle who has the distinction of being the first person to confess Jesus to be the Christ begins to rebuke him. Evidently the violent death of Jesus, to be followed by his resurrection, had no place whatever in the conception of Peter respecting the mission of the Messiah. In Peter's judgment Jesus had the requisite power to foil all the

[16] Mark 9:31, 32. [17] Luke 9:45, 46. [18] Acts 1:6.

[19] Mark 8:29–33; 9:31, 32; 10:33; Matt. 16:13–23.

machinations of his enemies, but according to his prophetic utterances it was not his intention effectually to put forth his power. This passive attitude would be a wrong done to the oppressed nation.

But what is the conception of this rebuking apostle concerning the mission of the Messiah after the disciples have received the baptism of the Holy Ghost? Standing up with the eleven he is the first apostle to preach the glad tidings, not of the advent of a Solomonic empire, but of a spiritual kingdom founded by the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus. Now he sees in the offering on the cross "the determinate counsel and foreknowledge of God;" and in the resurrection he sees the "man approved of God by mighty works, whom God raised up, having loosed the pangs of death." Quoting the prophet Joel 2 : 28–32, he declared the wonderful phenomena of Pentecost to be the fulfilment of the ancient prophecies. And quoting Ps. 16 : 8–11, he teaches that the Psalmist did not refer to himself alone, but being a prophet he spake of the resurrection of the Christ.[20] The death which Peter had condemned as unworthy of the Messiah he now vindicates as a necessary part of his Messiahship. The resurrection which to him was utterly unintelligible he now sees to be a fundamental truth, and he interprets it in the light of prophecy.

The great change wrought within the brief space of several weeks in the knowledge of Peter respecting the mission of the Messiah is on any purely natural principle unaccountable. And the experience of Peter may justly be taken as representative of the experiences of all the disciples. We can account for so great a change only on the ground of a twofold miracle: the consummation of Christ by glorification in his enthronement, and the quickening of the life of Christ in the hearts of his disciples by the gift of his Spirit. Raised from a lower to a higher plane of religious life, they begin to live in Christ glorified, and Christ glorified begins to live in them.[21] The contrast between the Son of Man in his state of humiliation with the Son of Man in his state of glorification is repeated in the contrast of

[20] Acts 2 : 31, 32. [21] John 17 : 22, 23.

the religious character of the disciples before and after Pentecost. By as much as the enthronement of Jesus transcends his earthly history, by so much do the spiritual character and spiritual intelligence of the chosen disciples through the advent of the Spirit exceed their previous insight into the nature and purpose of the Messiahship.

III.

The status of Jesus Christ conditions the spiritual status of the disciples. His character conditions their character, his knowledge their knowledge. So long as Jesus was with the disciples, they could neither appreciate the true purpose and compass of his mission, nor appreciate the intent of their calling. Hence in different forms he endeavored to teach them the blessing that would ensue from his departure. "It is expedient for you that I go away." His departure would be a gain as regards their spiritual life, their moral character, their insight into his mission and into the meaning of the Jewish Scriptures. So long as he was not glorified, they could not share the full blessing of his Messiahship; and they could not for the reason that the perfection of his Messiahship, prior to his resurrection and ascension, was prospective only, not consummated. While prospective, his glorification had force proleptically as the principle of his history, but as final reality its force was in abeyance. The spiritual progress of the Messiah conditions the spiritual progress of the disciples.

The import of this reciprocal connection justifies Christian reason in formulating several pertinent propositions, which I pass on to state and develop.

1. The teaching of the gospels, it has been assumed, moves on a plane higher and more authoritative than that of the epistles, because they give us, in part at least, the words spoken by our Lord. Is this assumption valid when studied in the light of his glorification?

Silently accepting an affirmative answer to this question, critical inquiry has in our age been diverging in two directions. Some critics feel justified in detracting from the worth of the

Acts and the epistles, on the ground that they contain no spoken words of our Lord. Others, influenced by the same general view, feel justified in detracting from the worth of the gospels, on the ground of a doubt whether we have the very words of Jesus—whether, after all, we have not the words of the writers only. The critical questioning of both classes of scholars proceeds on the silent assumption that, if we were certain that we have the very words of our Lord, we should then possess the most authoritative teaching respecting Jesus Christ and his religion.

A thoughtful study of the personal history of Christ from the viewpoint of the whole New Testament will show that both of these tendencies of criticism have no trustworthy foundation. The authority of the gospels is not derived from Jesus of Nazareth. Were we certain that we have the words, and all the words, spoken by him, and had we no more than these words, we should not have authoritative Christian teaching comparable with what we have, as the canonical books now stand.

Jesus, as he was when living among men on earth, did not claim either to possess the highest order of authority or to exercise power, either divine or human, in its final form. To him that dignity was a future exaltation. It was after his resurrection and just before his ascension that he said: "All authority hath been given unto me in heaven and on earth." Though his life in all its relations was the unique ideal of manhood, though his teaching concerning God and man transcends the teaching of all other founders of a religion, yet while in the natural body he was in the state of humiliation, limited to a degree by an environment of moral evil. While increasing in wisdom,[22] advancing in the process of spiritual development, he nevertheless was looking toward a goal of moral maturity. That goal appealed to him, not from any advanced stage of his Messianic vocation in his earthly history, but from the transcendent state of exaltation.

Not from Jesus of Nazareth, but from this same Jesus, the Christ of God, risen, ascended, glorified, the authority of the four gospels is derived.

[22] Luke 2 : 52.

This final authority touches his disciples through the advent of his Holy Spirit, the continuous bond of fellowship between Christ in heaven and chosen men on earth. By the Spirit he speaks to apostles and evangelists, and speaks in them, imparting new life and new light, agreeably to his great promise: The Spirit of truth "shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you. All things whatsoever the Father hath are mine; therefore, said I, that he taketh of mine, and shall declare it unto you."[23]

In virtue of this revelation made through the Spirit, each writer, agreeably to his intellectual capacity and the degree of his appropriation of spiritual truth, became qualified, the one in a higher, the other in a lower, degree of completeness, to preach and write respecting the doctrine of Jesus and the events of his history. The ordinary conditions of memory and reflection and speech are not superseded. But the qualification by which the remembrance of the miracles and parables, of the conflicts, the crucifixion and resurrection of Jesus, as also the resources of tradition, become available as material for the gospels, is the extraordinary endowment of Pentecost. Agreeably to the word of the Master, chosen men were lifted up into a new spiritual atmosphere akin to the glorified realm of the ascended Christ. A fellowship of life with him was quickened, other than that which obtained before the crucifixion; and, as a consequence, their moral character and their Messianic conceptions underwent a transformation corresponding to their new personality. From this supernatural source and under these new spiritual conditions come the four inimitable books.

Under no other conditions could such books have been written, or even conceived. Had chosen men not by the Spirit become members of Christ glorified, we should not have either the synoptists or the gospel by John. No one would have had the requisite spiritual character and insight. Neither a faithful memory, nor traditions however closely in accord with historical facts, nor a high order of human genius, accounts for their unique character. Nay, more; for the sake of argument assume that

[23] John 16:14, 15.

Jesus had not risen and ascended, then Jesus himself during his natural life could not have written our gospels.

Such a proposition does not betray a lack of reverence. It is a just inference from his own teaching. In view of his prospective glorification and the advent of the Spirit, he announces in his final discourses that his disciples will do greater works than he had done: "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and greater than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father."[24] Not only will the disciples do the works which he had done, but greater works than he had done will they do; and the reason for this difference is that he will go to the Father. From the throne they will be empowered by himself to perform deeds in the service of the kingdom greater than his own.

As regards the teaching of Jesus, it follows that the chief thing is not somehow to get the very words spoken by him when he was living among the Jews in Palestine, but to have a representation of the Son of Man, of his person, his teaching, and his mediatorship on earth and in heaven, as given by himself from the throne by his Holy Spirit active in the hearts of chosen men.

2. The authority of the gospels is not to be discounted on the assumption that it is uncertain whether they contain the very words spoken by our Lord.

Were we certain that the gospels record the very words of Jesus as they fell from his lips on all occasions, what should we have? If we accept our gospels as they stand; if we believe in Jesus of Nazareth as these gospels, the Acts, and epistles represent his personal history, then we can estimate the relative worth of his "very words." We shall have to maintain that, had we his "very words," and no more, we should have the teaching, not of the perfected Son of Man, but of Jesus in process of perfection; not of the glorified, but of the unglorified, Christ. And the unglorified Christ, sinless and holy as is his character, mighty as are his deeds, profound, spiritual, and unique as is his teaching, is, after all, only the Christ on the earthly plane of deep

[24] John 14: 12.

humiliation; oppressed by an environment of moral and physical evil; confronted by the kingdom of darkness overcome in principle, but in fact as yet not overcome. Of the higher Christ, triumphant over sin and death, we should have no words; no light from the Sun of righteousness standing in the zenith of his glory. His "very words" would be weaker and less inspiring than our gospels by as much as his state of humiliation and "suffering in the flesh" was lower than his state of exaltation and perfection.

Mind and thought answer to the genius and status of the man. The genius and environment of Shakespeare account for the high order of his tragedies; and the superiority of his later over his earlier productions we account for by recognizing the growth and maturity of his powers. The wide difference between the wisdom and strength of a man at maturity and the same man in early manhood is universally conceded. This principle of judgment is applicable to our Lord.

For Jesus was really human; possessing the essential qualities of a man, developing conformably to all the laws of human nature, put to the test and tried in all points like as we are, yet without sin. But his entire earthly life was only the beginning of his history. Sublime though it be, it was the lower, immature, and preliminary part of his extraordinary mission, which, had it been the whole, might have assigned him a niche among the great men of the world, like Moses and Socrates, but would not have constituted him the Man for all men, nor invested him with "authority to execute judgment because he is the Son of Man."

As with other great men, so with Jesus: his mind was responsive to the status of his personality. In the nature of the case, neither his words nor his works on earth could be equal to the wisdom and authority with which he, the King of Life, is clothed in his state of final perfection.

For the divine worth of our gospels, accordingly, we do not account chiefly on the assumption that they record Christian truth in the exact words spoken by our Lord. That we have his teaching largely in his own words I do not dispute; nor do

I undervalue the spiritual worth and power of his words. This fact, however, does not account for the authority of our gospels. Their unique genius is due indeed in one respect to his words spoken and his deeds enacted on earth, but due mainly to the fact that the mature Son of Man in the state of divine exaltation, triumphant over all limitation, realizing the final ideal of manhood, is through the presence of his Spirit speaking in the words of the evangelists, speaking in his own words, with an unction and incisive force which his words did not have when they fell from his lips.

His ministry of three years won for him less than a thousand faithful followers; but the sermon of Peter, under the inspiration of the higher Christ, issued on the day of Pentecost in the conversion of three thousand Jews. Peter did greater works than Jesus had done, because Jesus himself was greater.

If some critics are correct in asserting that the discourses of our Lord as contained in the fourth gospel are not literally the discourses as pronounced by him, but a reproduction or an interpretation of his teaching by John, what follows? That the fourth gospel is unworthy of confidence? or that it is not deserving the high honor which the church has accorded to it? So some scholars have inferred who fail to recognize the cardinal significance in the Christian economy of our Lord's glorification. But if, as a comprehensive exegesis requires, we emphasize the glorification as the consummation of his personal dignity and mediatorship, then legitimate reasoning from the hypothesis will have to draw directly the opposite inference. If the discourses be largely a reproduction of Jesus' teaching by John, the church has lost nothing, but may have gained much. Instead of being less worthy, the fourth gospel is more worthy, of our confidence. On that hypothesis we have in this gospel, not the teaching only of Jesus in his low estate, straitened until his baptism "be accomplished," but we have the teaching of the Son of Man, who, having a name that is above every name, is head over all things unto the church. Is it unscriptural, is it unpsychological, to hold that his teaching from the throne by the Spirit through the medium of John is so far more potent

than his words spoken on earth as his enthronement in the glory of the Father is more exalted than his humiliation "in the likeness of sinful flesh"?

3. This principle of judgment respecting the gospels is applicable to all other books of the New Testament. The authority of Acts and the epistles is not to be discounted on the ground that these books contain, not the words of Jesus Christ, but the teaching of chosen men.

The argument does not hinge on a theory of inspiration. That Jesus was raised from the dead; that he was exalted to the right hand of God, and given a name that is above every name; that his exaltation conditioned the advent of the Spirit—these are facts apart from any theory of inspiration, facts prophetically announced by the gospels, and by the other books presupposed and recorded as parts of Christian history. The great contrast between the authority and power of Jesus exalted and Jesus during the period of humiliation; the great contrast between the moral strength and spiritual knowledge of the chosen disciples after and before Pentecost—these also are facts that the records place before our mental perception, however we may account for them.

On every stage of this inquiry we have to bear in mind that in the history of Jesus Christ the dominant epoch is his glorification, a mystery to which Jesus, as set forth by the gospels, is ever *looking forward* as the goal of his life, to which the authors of all the other books are ever *looking back* as the fountain-head of their authority and mission.

And the dominant epoch in the history of Jesus becomes the dominant epoch in the history of his chosen disciples. As the glorification conditions the ultimate authority of Jesus, so the advent of his Spirit conditions and introduces the new character, the new knowledge, the new resources of the disciples.

However we may interpret the action of the Spirit on the disciples, there is no room to question the fact that the advent of the Spirit is the decisive and controlling epoch of their ministry. By a dynamic transition they are lifted up to a new, a

unique plane of spiritual life. Responsive on this new plane, they attain to a fellowship with the enthroned Christ such as when he was suffering in the flesh they had not and could not have; they enter into living sympathy with the order of truth which Jesus became by his transition. Thus empowered in their new fellowship by the authority and enlightened by the light of Jesus on the throne, they do not record the parables spoken and the miracles performed by him during his history on earth, but, presupposing his history and his works, especially his passion, death, and resurrection, as essential parts of his mediatorship, they emphasize his ascension and session at the right hand of the Father, his universal headship, and his abiding presence by the Holy Spirit in the world. They emphasize "the greater works" he is doing by christianizing the nations, by advancing and perfecting the community of believers. That the Son of Man glorified is the "head of the body, the church;" that by his word and Spirit he is regenerating and sanctifying all classes of men; that through a succession of epochs he is steadily inspiring the conflict of righteousness with unrighteousness, and achieving the victories of the kingdom of light over the kingdom of darkness; that, swaying the scepter of dominion in heaven and on earth, he is active in the world and upon the world, shaping and controlling all physical conditions and all moral forces with reference to the consummation of history at his second coming—these are some of the facts which the Acts, the epistles, and the book of Revelation set forth, expound, and emphasize; facts which are the necessary complement of the gospel history; facts without which the events recorded by the gospels would lack regenerative and saving virtue, and the prophecies of the gospels would prove themselves to be prophecies only.

The difference and contrast between the gospels and the other books of the New Testament are analogous to the complemental relation which the Christian economy bears to the pre-Christian economy. Progress is, in the first instance, not subjective and doctrinal, but objective and historical; not fundamentally a progress of development of the Christian knowledge

of chosen men, but a development of the concrete order of divine-human life. As the old covenant passes from type to antitype in the personality of the Son of Man, so does the Son of Man himself pass from the temporal form to the eternal form of his mediatorship, and the mysteries of his kingdom enacted on earth are complemented by the transcendent mysteries enacted in heaven. Progress in the evolution of spiritual realities conditions the progress of apostolic knowledge.

Now, if we estimate the worth of the Acts and the epistles in the light of the objective process of Christian revelation, it will be seen that the absence of the words of Jesus spoken in his state of humiliation is an implicit testimony to the truth and authority of the Acts and the epistles. The absence of his "words" in these books has the force of evidence that it is not their office to look back and reproduce pre-resurrection events and teaching, but to declare the mysteries of the advanced stage of revelation. If, like the synoptists and John, they recorded the words and deeds of Jesus while "suffering in the flesh," they would be tautological, and therefore of inferior value. The sublime complement of the suffering Savior would be wanting; and of Him whom we now know to be the glorified Son of Man, ruling in heaven and on earth, we should have a one-sided conception which of necessity would be essentially defective. The fact that the Acts and the epistles represent his exaltation, the progress of his mediatorship in heaven, his teaching from the throne, his abiding presence, his regenerating and saving activity, by the Spirit among the nations from age to age — this fact gives them a unique position and a supreme value for which the gospels cannot be a substitute.

4. The result of these studies justifies the proposition that all the canonical books of the New Testament address the faith of the church from the same plane of divine authority, the warrant for truth of no class being better or stronger than of another.

Gospels and epistles are written by the same class of authors; not the same in intellectual ability, nor in learning; not the same in spiritual intuition and in uplifting conceptions of Christ and his kingdom. Each author stands in social and historical rela-

tions peculiar to himself, and has a distinctive aim. Though the first three gospels form a group, having special characteristics in common, yet each has distinguishing features. Nevertheless it is a truth calling for emphasis that, however various, all the canonical books proceed from that class of men who move on the post-pentecostal plane of life and knowledge. Each writer is an elect man of the new-born community of the Spirit of the Son of Man glorified, the community of which, by his creative work from the throne, he is the founder, in which he lives, in which after an original manner he speaks.

The enthroned Christ by the Spirit immanent and active in chosen men, members of his mystical body, manifests the grace and might of his enthronement in the wonderful works which in his name they perform. He is manifesting the truth he was living in his humiliation and the truth he is living in his exaltation — manifesting this truth in the words which they speak and write in his name.

To this unique class of chosen men, the exponents of a new spiritual creation, we are indebted for the gospels no less than for the epistles. What Paul says of himself is applicable to every writer. It was the good pleasure of God, who separated him, even from his mother's womb, and called him through his grace, to reveal his Son in him that he might proclaim Him among Gentiles and Jews.[25] The revelation of the incarnate Son from the throne in the personality of the writer is the primordial qualification of Matthew, as of John, to commit to writing the deeds and words of Jesus of Nazareth. The personal intercourse with the persecuted Jesus, the hearing of his voice with their bodily ears, the witnessing of his miracles with their bodily eyes, external association with him in private and public, had, as the gospels testify, left them disqualified both as to faith and courage for their apostolic vocation.

The gospels and the epistles stand or fall together, rise or sink together. If in order to exalt the historic Christ the authority of the epistles is depreciated, we by that act depreciate the authority of the gospels, both classes of books being vitalized

[25] 1:15.

by the same breath and referable to the same conditions. Further, if the Jesus of the gospels is made the final criterion of judgment respecting Christian truth, and the Jesus of the Acts and the epistles is subordinated to this assumed criterion, we ignore the pivotal epoch of his mediatorship and subvert the objective order of revelation. Then exaltation and humiliation exchange places. The enthronement in the glory of the Father, the goal of his mediatorial work on earth, becomes a fact of less value for the New Testament authors, as to spiritual character and spiritual intelligence, than the power and teaching of Jesus limited by the state of humiliation.

RECONSTRUCTION IN THEOLOGY.

By HENRY CHURCHILL KING,
Oberlin, O.

RECONSTRUCTION in any living thing is constant, but it may still have its marked stages. To affirm, therefore, that there is need of reconstruction in theology is not at all to overlook the fact that such reconstruction has been constantly going on, that there have been many formulations by individual men more or less satisfactory; but it is simply to say that there is much to indicate that we have reached a point where our great inherited historical statements are quite generally felt to be inadequate, and where conditions, long at work, are so culminating and combining as to give promise of a somewhat marked stage in the development of theology.

Nor does the recognition of the need of reconstruction in Christian theology reflect a feeling of dissatisfaction with the Christian *religion*. On the contrary, the need of reconstruction is perhaps felt most strongly by those who have themselves gained a new sense of the absoluteness of the Christian religion, and call the old theological statements in question, because these statements make this absoluteness so little manifest. Obviously here the dissatisfaction is not with the Christian religion, but with our intellectual expression of its meaning. And it ought not to surprise or trouble us that this intellectual expression must change from time to time with other intellectual changes.

There is abundant evidence that the need of reconstruction in theology is widely recognized, but a single judicious testimony must suffice. In his recent *History of Christian Doctrine*, speaking simply as a historian, Professor Fisher says:[1] "It is plain to keen observers that, in the later days, both within and without what may be called the pale of Calvinism, there is a certain relaxing of confidence in the previously accepted solutions of

[1] P. 551.

some of the gravest theological problems. This appears among many whose attachment to the core of the essential truths formulated in the past does not wane, whose substantial orthodoxy, as well as piety, is not often, if it be at all, questioned, and who have no sympathy with agnosticism, in the technical sense of the word."

As is implied in this statement of Professor Fisher's, the reasons for this feeling of need of reconstruction—to state it summarily—are neither a rationalistic spirit in the church, nor the reaction on the church of what is called the anti-religious or anti-Christian spirit of the age. It may be distinctly denied that that spirit is especially characteristic of this age. But the reasons are to be found in a deepening of the Christian spirit itself, and in the *influence of the new intellectual, moral, and spiritual world* in which we live, and upon which this spirit has been working. Just as the acceptance of the principle of the correlation of forces called for a rewriting of physics—a "new physics," or the theory of evolution for the rewriting of biology—a "new biology," so, in the same sense, the acceptance of certain great convictions of our own day calls for a rewriting of theology—a new theology. Not that in any of these cases the great underlying facts have changed, but our conception of them and of their relations has changed. These dominating convictions of our age form a universal permeating atmosphere, which inevitably affects in some way all schools of theology.

What makes this new atmosphere, this new world? What are the convictions increasingly shared by all our generation, whose influence on theology is indubitable and inevitable? It may be worth while, at the risk of rehearsing some familiar facts, to get a clear view of precisely those convictions that make our modern life.

I. THE NEW WORLD.

Even a cursory glance discloses many phenomena fairly peculiar to our age, and we are coming to an increasing understanding of the great undercurrents which produce these phenomena. We belong to the modern period, to the nineteenth

century, and to the last quarter of the nineteenth century. We inherit all the influences and problems of the past. Historians in all fields recognize the modern period as throughout revolutionary, critical, protestant, but protestant for the sake of reconstruction. This distinguishing characteristic of the new age has been defined as "that enlightenment, destroying in order to reconstruct, which sought to break the dominion of all prejudice, and to undermine every ill-founded belief."[2]

A. IN RELIGION.—The protest began in religion, and was a protest, as Erdmann puts it, on the one hand, against everything in which the church had become secularized, paganized, Judaized; on the other hand, a protest "against everything in which the church had opposed itself to the rational and justifiable interests of the world."[3] Positively the protest meant, as the whole world knows, insistence, in the first place, upon justification by faith and the priesthood of all believers, and, in the second place, the recognition of the rights of property, marriage, and the state. The appeal made in support of these positions to Scripture and primitive Christianity against the authority of councils and ecclesiastical tradition could end logically only in a defense of entire freedom of conscience and freedom of investigation. This is the only consistent Protestant position.

B. IN THE STATE.—Revolution in the state ends in the practical universal recognition of both absolute natural right and historic legitimate right, as Lotze names them. In this recognition of the double duty of the state—on the one hand, the duty of keeping faith with the past, of preserving some living community with those gone, the conservative tendency, the recognition of historical right; on the other hand, the duty of fidelity to the interests of the present, of revolt against the "dead hand," the radical tendency, the recognition of absolute natural right—in this double recognition lie inclosed all the modern problems of sociology and social evolution.

C. INTELLECTUAL.—In the intellectual sphere the same revolutionary and protestant spirit is to be seen.

[2] LOTZE, *Microcosmus*, Vol. II, p. 286.

[3] *History of Philosophy*, Vol. II, pp. 3, 4.

1. *Modern philosophy* in its rebound from scholastic dogmatism begins with Descartes's "methodical doubt"—the deliberate questioning of everything that could be questioned—and early made its chief investigations in the theory of knowledge, and throughout the period this question has been prominent, if not foremost. That its great subject is man—the whole man—and neither God nor the world, means that it finds its key only in itself, and not in any external source or authority. Our own century begins with the *Critical Philosophy* of Kant that was intended by its theory of knowledge to make philosophical dogmatism forever impossible. Kant's problems were all problems of mediation and remain essentially the present problems of philosophy, though they are much differently conceived, since the great systems of Fichte, Schleiermacher, Schelling, and Hegel lie between us and Kant. These problems may all be summed up in the problem of bringing into unity the mechanical and ideal views of the world. The last few years have seen the remarkable growth of the newer psychology, the increasing influence of the idea of evolution and the accompanying historical bent of philosophy, and the hardly yet understood complete collapse of materialism as a philosophical theory. The philosophical world is utterly different from that of the Reformation.

2. *In science.*—To the modern period, too, practically belongs the very birth of natural science, in the sense of exact investigation with deliberate experiment and repeated testing. This development of modern science, it has been pointed out, has implied three things: an immensely increased respect for experience, emphasis on the universality of law, and a threefold restriction on the part of science to experience, to a mathematical, not a speculative, development of its data, and to phenomena. That is, modern science distinctly disclaims to be either *a priori*, speculative, or ultimate.

Modern science has besides greatly affected the thought and imagination of men in its immense extension of the world in space and the discernment of its laws through astronomy, and in a similar extension of the world in time and the discernment of its laws through both astronomy and geology.

To these influences science has added to the thought of the age a sense of the unity of the world which is fairly overpowering. Extensively, spectrum analysis has been made to testify to uniformity of materials; gravitation and magnetism to uniformity of forces. Intensively, the principle of the conservation of energy is held to prove the unity of all forces, and the theory of evolution aims to include all phenomena under the unity of one method. Practically, scientific inventions have made our earth a unity, in a way not only to affect our imagination, but to change in a marked manner almost all the problems of our time. No man can conceive even superficially the changes involved in the rise of modern science and not feel how impossible it is for men of this generation to occupy precisely the point of view of not more than fifty years ago, even in their theological statements.

3. *In historical criticism.*—In the field of historical criticism our characterization of the intellectual changes which have taken place must be confined to those which bear specially on our theme. "Edwin Hatch," a recent reviewer says, "rejoiced to hear 'the solemn tramp of the science of history marching in our day almost for the first time into the domain of Christian theology.'" The historical sense is itself almost a product of this century (for it practically begins with Herder), and it meant real and great changes, in the first place, in *biblical interpretation;* since interpretation now seeks to give full weight to the intellectual, moral, and religious atmosphere of the time. And to this conviction the immense increase of the last fifty years in the literature of the historical criticism of the Bible bears unmistakable witness. It was inevitable that the same historical spirit should recognize differences not only between Old Testament and New Testament times, but differences as well within these periods, and differences also in the point of view of different classes and individuals in the same period. This brought into being the whole new science of *biblical theology*, in which all rejoice, but which, in any strict construction of it, is less than fifty years old.[4] To the same historical movement, coupled with literary

[4] *Cf.* OEHLER, *Theology of the Old Testament*, pp. 32 ff.

analysis and carried into the individual books, belongs the so-called *higher criticism* of the Old Testament. In its recent really influential form it is scarcely more than thirty years old, since it virtually dates from Graf (1866).[5] But far the most important result of historical criticism for theology has been what Fairbairn calls "the recovery of the historical Christ." It is the unique and greatest service of Principal Fairbairn's epoch-making book on *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology* that it makes so clear the place that Christ occupies in the thought of our generation. "Our day," he says, "has also been marked by a return to the sources of a quite specific character—it has been more distinctly than any other a return to the historical Christ . . . .—to him as the person who created alike the evangelists and the apostles, by whom he is described and interpreted."[6]

Let one bring together now, for a moment, in thought the intellectual changes in philosophy, in science, and in historical criticism of the last seventy years, and he must agree with John Fiske that "in their mental habits, in their methods of inquiry, and in the data at their command, the men of the present day who have fully kept pace with the scientific movement are separated from the men whose education ended in 1830 by an immeasurably wider gulf than has ever before divided one progressive generation of men from their predecessors."[7] If the man of today, therefore, is really alive to the movements of his own time, it is simply impossible that he should use most naturally and easily the language of the older generation in expressing his deepest convictions on any theme.

D. MORAL AND SPIRITUAL.—Side by side with the revolution in religion, in the state, and in the intellectual sphere, and influenced by these, there have taken place in the modern period similar changes in the general moral and spiritual convictions. Is it possible to state with some clearness and precision, and yet

[5] *Cf.* BRIGGS, *The Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, pp. 90 ff. See also PFLEIDERER, *The Development of Theology*, pp. 258 ff.

[6] *The Place of Christ in Modern Theology*, p. 187.

The Idea of God, p. 56.

with the utmost brevity and without argument, the greatest of these fundamental moral and spiritual convictions of our day? —(1) From modern humanism, the special influence, most of all of Christianity, but also of political and social evolution, of philosophy, and the newer psychology, has come a greatly heightened sense of the *value and sacredness of the individual person* in his entirety. Sensitiveness as to the personal throughout is stronger, as it ought to be, than in any preceding period, and under it may be brought almost every other moral characteristic of our age.—(2) From the whole spirit of the modern period, but especially from Protestantism, and the influence of philosophy and of science, has come, we may hope, finally full recognition of *freedom of conscience* and *freedom of investigation.* These principles are distinctly moral, though applied in the intellectual sphere.—(3) The influence of natural science, moreover, has been effective in bringing into clear consciousness Christianity's latent *recognition of law, conditions, and time* in the moral and spiritual life, as truly as in any other sphere.—(4) The idealistic trend in philosophy, so strongly asserted by Paulsen and evidenced by the collapse of materialism, and the teleological view of evolution, added to the constant pressure of the Christian spirit, have made two closely connected convictions increasingly dominant: that, in the order of the universe, *the mechanical is means only*, and that the *unity of the ethical life is found in love.* Even where not distinctly affirmed, but perhaps even questioned, it is believed that these two convictions are really present as fundamental assumptions in the reasoning of our time.—(5) Out of Protestantism in its original criticism of Catholicism, out of philosophy in its emphasis on man as *both* microcosmus and microtheos, and out of science with its implied trend toward the doctrine of divine immanence, has grown the *denial of the separation of the sacred and the secular.*—(6) From the growing sense of the worth of personality, helped particularly by the immensely deepened knowledge of "the other half," and the great influence of the analogy of the organism in the history of thought, has developed the *social conscience* of our time—the definite avowal that we are all members one of another.—(7) The new

psychology, too, the latest conspicuous intellectual movement of our day, has not only confirmed the other tendencies already named, but has also added one distinctive contribution of rapidly growing influence—*the central importance of action.* Body and mind, we are made for action. Nor is this a rebound to a new extreme. The natural terminus of all experiences, bodily and mental, is action. For the very sake, therefore, of thought and feeling, one must act. The emphasis on action is, indeed, a protest against mere intellectualism or romanticism, but it is at the same time an insistence on the unity of man, and on the *whole* man.—(8) And historical criticism has not only strengthened the emphasis on the historical, the concrete, and personal, but has brought into the very foreground the greatest of all spiritual influences, *the practical Lordship of Christ.* "This is not," it has been well said, "an individual or incidental thing, but represents the tide and passion of the time; is, as it were, the sum and essence of the living historical, philosophical, and religious spirit."[8]

These, then, we may believe, if we have succeeded in correctly discerning the trend of the modern age, are the fundamental moral and spiritual convictions of our time: reverence for personality, freedom of conscience, and freedom of investigation; law in the spiritual world, yet the subordination of the mechanical, and the unity of the ethical life in love; no separation of the sacred and secular; the social conscience, the central importance of action, the recognition of Christ as the supreme person.

They are not wholly new—of course not, and they have not grown up in a night, as their sources plainly show; but their present emphasis *is* relatively new, and on the farther side of these convictions lies, not our world, but another. And an age in whose life and thought they are working like yeast simply cannot express itself adequately in the terms of statements made when these convictions were not so felt, and it would be no real service to the church if it could, for it belongs to the very nature of spiritual truth that each age must be its own interpreter in spiritual things.

[8] FAIRBAIRN, *op. cit.*, p. 188.

II. THE INEVITABLE INFLUENCE OF THIS NEW WORLD ON THEOLOGY.

Now, it is this new world in which we think and live that is the one great source of our dissatisfaction with the older statements in theology. These ruling ideas of our time are constantly at work. We all accept them more or less fully in themselves, and they are certain to prevail increasingly, and their ultimate influence in theology is simply inevitable, and ought to be. What, now, do they mean for theology?

In attempting to indicate some of the ways in which it seems that the atmosphere of our time (so far as it is right) is certain to affect theological statements, one can only bear honest testimony as to the direction in which progress seems to lie for our own generation. In a time of transition like the present it is impossible for any man to speak with frankness and definiteness on theological themes and command the assent of all, or perhaps the full assent of any. But truth comes, not through the silence of all, but by each declaring honestly and earnestly his best. Honest, thoughtful testimony, charitably and reverently borne, is the greatest need of the immediate present, if we are ever to come to that better intellectual expression of Christianity for which all wait.

A. MAINLY INTELLECTUAL INFLUENCES.—1. In the first place, the Protestant principle of *freedom of investigation* means the full recognition of the legitimacy, value, and authority of literary, historical, and scientific investigation in its own sphere —that of the tracing of causal connections. It means that theology refuses to settle *a priori* how God *must* have acted in any case in nature or in revelation, but turns over to humble, patient, scientific inquiry to determine how he *did* and *does* act. All questions, thus, of natural or mechanical *process* by which things came to be what they now are are unreservedly committed to scientific investigation. This means, *e. g.*, that all questions as to the conditions of the appearance of life, of man, of conscience, and all questions of the method of God's historical self-revelation, all questions of the authorship, age, and

unity of the Scriptures, are to be freely and fearlessly investigated in a strictly scientific way. Scientific investigation can only make more clear to us exactly how God did proceed. And this, if we are really in earnest in our desire to understand God, we ought to be glad to know. If tomorrow men were able to trace in the laboratory the precise steps by which the living arises from the non-living, or if in some historical seminar the exact source and composition of Isaiah could be demonstratively made out, no ideal or religious interest would be in any manner affected, except that we should simply understand a little more fully the method God took in a case in which the mode of his action is to us now quite obscure. Our only anxiety can be that the investigators be really competent, and particularly in the investigation of moral and religious problems competence requires personal experience in the sphere investigated. It is, therefore, the poorest possible policy for the church to warn off its own scholars from these investigations. Moreover, the only answer to erroneous criticism is better criticism, not the forbidding of criticism. And the latter, we may be sure, is no service to the church, by whomsoever advocated. As Julius Müller long ago said: "Wounds which have been inflicted on humanity by knowledge can be healed only by knowledge." This is the one sure road to peace. Of these scientific investigations theology simply takes the results. It is itself strictly an interpretative science, and it reserves to itself the right to interpret the results of scientific inquiry. It leaves absolutely to science the tracing of the causal connections; it claims for itself the ideal interpretation. The process belongs to science, the meaning to theology.

2. *Its relation to natural science.*— Of the purely intellectual influences on theology in our day that of natural science is particularly strong. We cannot, therefore, avoid, in the second place, the question of the relation of natural science to theology. What does the influence of natural science mean for theology?

It is well to notice at the very start that it is easy to overestimate the importance of this relation and the extent of this influence; and both are often overestimated, I believe, today.

Professor James puts the matter in his usual vigorous fashion, when he says: "The aspiration to be scientific is such an idol of the tribe to the present generation, is so sucked in with his mother's milk by every one of us, that we find it hard to conceive of a creature who should not feel it, and harder still to treat it freely as the altogether peculiar and one-sided subjective interest which it is."[9] Nevertheless, the immense progress and rightful influence of natural science in our own generation force upon theology (in its wider sense) the problem of the mediation of the mechanical and ideal views of the world. Of the ultimate solution of the problem Christian theology can have no doubt, for it is involved in the central faith in a *God of love*. And, meanwhile, it addresses itself without misgivings to the adjustment of its relation to natural science.

(1) It accepts, in the first place, *science's own restrictions of itself* to experience, to the tracing of purely causal connections, and to phenomena. This restriction necessarily excludes all questions of ultimate origin and destiny. The scientific question is one of *process* merely. And, as no one thinks of seeing God at work like a man in the changes of nature, the process would seem the same to the observer, whether he thought it purely mechanical or wholly due to God.

(2) Secondly, it accepts unreservedly science's main contention of the *universality of law*, that mechanism is absolutely universal in extent, though it requires that the principle shall be exactly defined. It asks, *i. e.*, that it shall be noted that the principle is *universality* of law, not, as much talk would seem to imply, *uniformity* of law. There has been an amazing haziness concerning this simple point. The true scientific contention is, not that laws are always and everywhere the same, but that there is always law. With this guarding of the principle theology may well not only accept, but itself vigorously affirm on ideal grounds, the universality of law. Religion has as great an interest as science in asserting a sphere of law. For a sphere of law is necessary in order to any growth in *knowledge* through experience, since, if there were no law, nothing learned today

[9] *Psychology*, Vol. II, p. 640.

would be of any value tomorrow. Nor could there be any growth in *power* without law, for all our power of accomplishment depends wholly on knowledge of the laws of the forces with which we deal. Growth in *character*, moreover, is similarly conditioned. A sphere of law, therefore, is the only possible sphere for a progressive being, and it is precisely his progressiveness—his capacity of indefinite growth—that mainly distinguishes man intellectually from the lower animals; and with man all ideal interests come in. It is to be further noticed that a sphere of law is necessary to give any significance to *freedom* itself, the condition of character; for choices look to ends, and there can be no accomplishment of an end without law. For another reason, too, religion can brook no lawless world; for to allow such a world would make God play fast and loose with his creatures. In order to faith in the fidelity and trustworthiness of God himself, therefore, there must be law. In its own distinct sphere of the moral and spiritual life, moreover, theology distinctly welcomes the idea of law. Drummond, more than any other man, has brought this home to the religious consciousness of our generation, and it is his greatest contribution—*not* that there is the *same* law for the natural and spiritual world (as he at first affirmed), but that there *is* law; that there are definite conditions to be fulfilled for any spiritual attainment, that these conditions may be known, and that when fulfilled you may count on the results. Theology has much to gain in clearness and precision of statement, and in power of appeal, in development of this line of thought.

The whole ideal contention and the interest of theology, therefore, is not at all against law, against mechanism; it must rather, with science, insist upon law; it *is* that mechanism is means only, and means must not be mistaken for ends nor dominate ends. Exactly here lies the religious interest in *miracle*. The insistence on miracle for the religious man means the insistence on a living God, and the insistence that, though mechanism is absolutely universal in extent, nevertheless, as Lotze says, "it is completely subordinate in significance." We are not to make a god of mechanism, it declares, nor put mechanism above God.

The universality of law, therefore, is to theology only the perfect consistency in the modes of activity of God in carrying out his immutable purpose of love. Hence, God will always act according to law — that is, in perfect consistency with his unchanging purpose of love; but his action may not always be formulable under any of the laws of nature known to us. "*All's* love, yet *all's* law."

(3) In the third place, in the relation of theology to natural science, theology accepts from natural science the *theory of evolution* as a general statement of the method of God's working, and renews in consequence its own older emphasis upon the immanence of God.

Here, too, it wishes only that there should be real precision of thought as to what the evolution theory is. It has a suspicion that, as in many another case, difficulty comes only because the principle is not carried completely through. The trouble in evolution is that we are only *half* evolutionists. Theology is interested only to insist that evolution means real evolution — a succession of stages with new phenomena and new laws (and this the law of cyclical movement itself asserts), and that it *does not stop with the animal series*, but includes the human stage. It insists, therefore, that evolution does not mean the putting of everything on a dead level, especially not a degrading of everything to the lowest level, but that when the new appears it is really *new* — it has not appeared before. It may be assumed, as in the development of the individual, that the process is ever so gradual, and that the power is there ready to appear when the conditions for its appearance are completed; but when the new power appears — life, self-consciousness, moral responsibility, or what not — it is really new. It had not appeared before. Courtney[10] maintained the whole ideal contention more fully, perhaps, than he knew, when he wrote fifteen years ago: "I *was* an anthropoid ape once, a mollusc, an ascidian, a bit of protoplasm; but, whether by chance or providence, I am not now. When I was an ape, I thought as an ape, I acted as an ape, I lived as an ape; but when I became a man, I put away

[10] *Studies in Philosophy*, chap. vi.

apish things. Man's moral nature is what it is, not what it was."

If, then, that conception of evolution is maintained which its own definition and laws require, theology finds no religious or ideal consideration that need hinder it in accepting the most absolute and radical form of the evolution theory without any thought of intervention at any point in the process. It feels no interest in insisting upon certain unbridged gaps in the series as essential at all to a religious view of the world. The most absolute evolution theory, so long as it is scientific at all, can be only a description of the process by which God has worked, of the method which he has employed. Theology is perfectly ready to accept the facts, whatever they may be. As it has been well said: "Whichever way of creation God may have chosen, in none can the dependence of the universe on him become slacker, in none be drawn closer."[11]

And more than this is true. Not only is the religious interest here not opposed to the scientific; in one important particular it is identical with it. For its own sake, theology can remain satisfied no longer with the old, inconsistent view of a virtual independence of the world in the larger part of it, and of direct dependence on God at certain points only, where we cannot yet trace the process of God's working. It is quite unwilling to say God is only where we cannot understand him. It is quite unwilling to admit that increasing knowledge of God's working is progressive elimination of God from the universe. It is quite unwilling to take its stand on gaps or base its arguments for God on ignorance. It believes in *God*—in a God upon whom the whole universe, in every least atom of it, and in every humblest spirit of it, is absolutely dependent. Of that dependence it is certain, and no study of the *method* of it can make it less certain.

Theology rejoices, then, in the larger view evolution seems to give of the method, plan, and aim of God in the universe; in the great extension and strengthening of the design argument; in the harmony it brings into the divine methods, and in the enlarged conception of God in his immanence in the world.

[11] LOTZE, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 374.

Outside of these general gains which the evolution theory seems to bring, and in which most would probably agree, exactly what does the detailed application of evolution to theological and ethical problems mean? Is there not much confusion of thought here that seems often to end only in juggling with phrases, both on the side of the mechanical philosopher and on the side of the religious apologist?

If the *entire* evolution series, including man, with his moral and spiritual nature, is meant, then the later stages will be recognized, according to the law of cyclical movement, as higher, and as having their own peculiar phenomena and laws, and interpreted accordingly, but with due regard to the lower stages.

If the *purely animal organic evolution* is meant, then the analogy is taken wholly from the realm *below* man; and, however suggestive, must obviously, on the principle of evolution itself, prove inadequate for an interpretation of the intellectual, moral, and spiritual life of man, and must finally break down, as it does even in the hands of so skilful and sympathetic an interpreter as Drummond. The analogy of organic evolution is only the farthest possible extension of the very fruitful analogy of the organism that has been so influential in the history of thought from Paul to Shaftesbury and Kant, and down to modern ethics and sociology. It is the most adequate analogy that nature furnishes us, and it is *useful* to apply it as fully as possible in order to discern the essential harmony of the laws in all the stages, and to see that the natural world is from the same hand as the moral; but, after all is said, it is still only an analogy from nature, and quite inadequate to set forth all the life of the spirit in itself and its personal relations. We are spirits, not organisms, and society is a society of persons, not an organism. The theory of the evolution of the animal series, fully accepted, therefore, in its most radical form, is still no universal solvent of ethical and theological questions where personal relations replace organic. It is a perversion of the evolution theory in its real entirety to attempt to bring all the higher stages under the laws of the lower. Yet this is what the application of evolution to theology and ethics seems to mean to many. The inadequacy

of the method is seen from the way in which many of the most serious difficulties have to be solved by bringing in considerations entirely apart from evolution. Although, therefore, the writer shares with the enthusiastic advocates of evolution in theology the freest acceptance of evolution in its fullest form, he does not have their confidence in its wonder-working power in theology. It is true that the attempt to state the entire ethical or sociological or theological problem in biological terms — in terms of life — of organic evolution, is very fascinating and sounds very scientific; but in truth its success is its failure, for it can succeed only by forgetting the essential nature of that with which it is dealing — spirit, not physical life. Guardedly used, the analogy is helpful, but adequate it never is. On the human stage of evolution we have reached persons and personal relations, and the laws are those of personal relations. God will deal with us on this stage in accordance with the principle of evolution, if he deals with us as persons and enters into personal relations with us. And this Christianity has always believed. The application of evolution here will simply mean, therefore, that in these personal relations with men God's self-revelation at every stage will be adapted to men's capacities to receive, and will progress as rapidly as possible; that the complete revelation in Christ comes as soon as there are men who can use it with value and preserve it for a progressive evaluation by those who follow. We have no call to show that in these personal relations of men with men, or of God with men, all that occurs can be brought under the laws that hold on the lower stages. It is vain, therefore, to look for revolutionary results in the statement of individual theological doctrines from the theory of evolution in its narrower scope. Helpful analogies and suggestive points of view we shall have, but scarcely more. But the legitimate application of evolution in its entirety is a thing to be welcomed, not feared. All God's ways are harmonious.

3. *As necessarily affected by historical criticism.*—Of the mainly intellectual influences on theology, the most important must be that of historical criticism. Christianity is preëminently a historical religion, and such persistent and painstaking histor-

ical researches as those of the last sixty years must help us to more accurate and illuminating statements. Theology can be certain that the assured results of patient investigation (it is quite too early to dogmatize as to details in higher criticism, if we can ever do so), because they will show us more perfectly the method that God actually did take in his revelation of himself to men, will bring, not disaster, but great enrichment to theology. His ways are higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts. Some of the adjustments required will in the time of transition no doubt seem difficult and even threatening; but it is certain that, so far as we are able actually to find God's way — and this is the sole final result of historical criticism — it will be *better* than our way. And the time is not far distant, we may believe, when we shall enumerate the blessings of critical investigation, including the higher criticism. We shall rejoice in the better understanding of God involved in the more vivid setting forth of his persistent, patient, loving adaptation to men; we shall, indeed, have lost a uniform authoritative lawbook, but we shall have gained instead a living revelation of a living God in living men, rich and throbbing as life itself; we shall be grateful that the phenomena of the Bible disclosed by patient study *compelled* us to a restatement of the doctrine of inspiration that eliminated from it the mechanical, and brought it into full accord with the working of God in our own hearts as promised by Christ — never God alone, and never man alone, but always God and man, in a personal coöperation that means character and love. We shall come to see with some surprise that a view of inspiration as really moral and spiritual, with its natural implications, has practically removed all our own difficulties concerning the Bible and disposed of the main attacks upon it, at the same time.

Positively for theology these implications of the changed view of inspiration, which the results of historical criticism require, include, in the first place, a much fuller recognition of the principle of *progress in revelation*, that this involves inevitably the relative imperfection of the earlier stages and makes Christ the absolute standard in the Bible as well as out of it.

Theology never had any need to affirm any other principle than this, but it has certainly not yet fully adjusted itself to this fact.

Further, this study of the Bible itself has brought out into striking light its one great *purpose* in absolute agreement with Paul's own clear statement[12] — that it is neither science nor history, but solely and simply a record of the historical self-revelation of God to a single people and so to all men. This means that, even in books called historical, its writers are not interested in strict scientific history at all, any more than in some other books they are interested in pure natural science. Nature and history both concerned them only as revelations of God. A complete account of either lies quite outside their task. They select only those features that can be turned to religious account. They make no attempt to trace all the causal connections; they *do* seek to show what both nature and, especially, history *mean* for religion — how God reveals himself in them. Because they concentrated themselves upon this one task, they are the world's teachers in neither science, nor history, nor law, nor art, nor philosophy — but we all sit at their feet in religion. Even the historical writers, especially in the Old Testament, are, therefore, properly prophets, preaching from historical texts, and the Jews rightly called them so.

In the third place, this more careful biblical study is making clear, what a really spiritual view of inspiration would lead us to expect, that, with all its wonderful unity of development, there is no mechanical unity in the Bible or even the New Testament, but that the different writers show *individual reflections* of a religious experience more or less common to them. In the New Testament this gives individual reflections of Christ. It is in this very way that we are able to approach any adequate conception of the real significance of Christ, and of that larger unity which comes from him and not from the single expression of even his greatest disciple. No one view, no single expression, can suffice. The work of Christ is deeper and broader than any single statement of it, even in Scripture. The recognition of this fact has promise, not only of a reasonable freedom for theology, but of

[12] 2 Tim. 2 : 16–17.

large growth as well, and of a better appreciation of the richness of the New Testament testimony itself.

B. MORAL AND SPIRITUAL INFLUENCES.—When we turn from the mainly intellectual influences on theology to those distinctly moral and spiritual, we may perhaps group them all under the two heads of the deepening sense of the value and sacredness of the person, and the growing recognition of Christ as the supreme person.

1. *The inevitable influence on theology of the sense of the value and sacredness of personality.*—The greatest outcome of an advancing civilization is the deepening sense of the value of the individual person. This is the very flower and test of civilization. If it be true, as was said, that the sensitiveness as to the personal throughout is stronger in our age than in any preceding, this is certain in time to influence theology profoundly. It affects at once our view of inspiration and our whole doctrine of the spirit in its hidden working, and throws light on the providence of God, on the meaning of prayer, and on the obscurity of spiritual truth; as well as affects the tone of the presentation of every doctrine.

(1) Out of it grows at once the obligation of love, and of a love that not only includes all persons, but that is such a love as to include all virtues. It means, therefore, a true humanism, but no sentimentalism, for it looks only to the complete character. This *unity of the ethical life in love* is the first clear step in an ultimate philosophy; it is the most important inheritance left us by Edwards; it is soundly biblical; and it is constantly gaining ground. But it is still fully recognized by few in theology. The old dualism of justice and love, or holiness and love, still works confusion in both ethics and theology. It is still too largely felt that there is division in God, that nature, law, and grace root in different purposes, instead of all working to the same end. Even those who have meant wholly to accept the all-embracing character of love have seldom carried it fearlessly out for God and for man at all times and in all conditions. But to carry entirely through this principle of the unity of the ethical life in love is the only logical consequence of the present

sense of the value of the person. "Not that we love God, but that he loved us." "Every one that loveth is begotten of God and knoweth God."

And it is the very sense of the sacredness and value of the person which has brought about the "reduction of the area of Calvinism" of which Fisher speaks. It is simply impossible to hold to arbitrary decrees in the old sense in the face of this conviction. The reaction, also, by elaborate argument and labored exegesis against the universal fatherhood of God, that all men as men are the children of God, is for a like reason simply hopeless. The conviction of the fatherhood of God has grown directly out of the representation of God by Christ, and its connection with the root cannot be severed by ever so elaborate an argument.

(2) The deepening sense of the worth of the person means, in the second place, *the recognition of the whole man.* The whole man is expressed only in personal relations. Theology accepts heartily psychology's new assertion of the unity of man, and seeks to take account of the entire spirit. It believes with modern philosophy that man is the key to all problems, but only the whole man. If I do not mistake the drift of modern thinking, it is in essential agreement with Lotze's main contention, "that the nature of things does not consist in thoughts, and that thinking is not able to grasp it; yet perhaps the whole mind experiences in other forms of its action and passion the essential meaning of all being and action, thought subsequently serving it as an instrument, by which that which is thus experienced is brought into the connection which its nature requires, and is experienced in more intensity as the mind is master of this connection."[13] This is no underrating of the intellectual, but an insistence that man is more than intellect, and, therefore, that an adequate philosophy, no less than an adequate theology, must take account of all the data—emotional and volitional as well as intellectual; æsthetic, ethical, and religious as well as mechanical. It is a revolt against a misnamed rationalism that knows only intellect, in favor of a genuine rationalism that knows the

[13] *Op. cit.*, Vol. II, pp. 359, 360.

whole man. It believes, therefore, with Armstrong's putting of Seth's position, that "the language of morality or religion, the language which speaks of God in terms of our own highest experience, is really *truer* than purely metaphysical language concerning God *can be*. 'Religion and higher poetry . . . . carry us nearer to the meaning of the world than the formulæ of an abstract metaphysics.'"

(3) In the third place, this emphasis on the personal means for theology *the exclusion of the mechanical* (as contrasted with the spiritual) everywhere. It is noticeable that all agree essentially in this aim of excluding the mechanical, though they do not agree as to what is mechanical. It is this spirit that makes it so certain that the attempt to press the analogy of the lower evolution is wrong. It is this that leads strong conservatives like Frank, liberals like Pfleiderer, and Ritschlians like Herrmann, all alike, to emphasize the importance of the inner spiritual evidence to Christianity. This movement logically requires of theology that it do not stop until it interpret all its strictly theological problems in terms of personal relation. The relations are nowhere more intensely personal. Theology will yet put more meaning than it ever has put into Christ's declaration: "This is life eternal, that they should *know thee* the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ." Deepening acquaintance with God is the one all-embracing problem of the Christian life; every step of it is a personal relation; and its laws are the laws of friendship. This steady and certain movement away from the mechanical to the personal is the inner ground of dissatisfaction with all natural, legal, and governmental analogies, applied, *e. g.*, to the doctrine of the atonement. The deep significance of Dr. Trumbull's exhaustive survey in his remarkable books on *The Blood Covenant* and *The Threshold Covenant* is that he traces back so clearly analogies that have been otherwise interpreted to the closest personal relations. And yet the more or less mechanical analogies will pass away as only subordinately helpful, not because they are attacked from without, but because, in the deepening sense of the intensely personal nature of the relations involved, the basis

of their appeal will have broken down within. They will be set aside, not because they make too much of the work of Christ in his life or death, but because they make too little of it; because they leave our relation to him still too external and mechanical, and fail to bring it home to us as a moral reality. The more personal view believes that more truly and really than any other it can say: "He was wounded for our transgressions; he was bruised for our iniquities; the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed."

This interpretation of all strictly theological problems in terms of personal relations will bring great gain to theology in both simplicity and unity; it will make theology *seem* to many less scientific, because it will have dropped much technical language which has no longer any proper application; but it will have *deepened* in the same proportion the perception of the real spiritual problems, and will lean more on psychology and ethics, and less on metaphysics and jurisprudence.

(4) The denial of the separation between sacred and secular things, which also grows out of the sense of the sacredness of personality, looks to the inevitable *rejection of all sacramentalism* as necessarily mechanical. It knows no sacred things, but only sacred persons. The sacredness of things and places and times is wholly borrowed from persons. And between things no line is to be drawn of sacred and secular. "All things are yours," and all are means only, but all may be made means. There is to be war on the worldly spirit, but not on the world. We are to be in the world, though not of the world. It is by no means unimportant to a theology that intends to keep itself free from mere mechanism and superstition to see clearly two sides of the truth: that the most holy things are so only because they minister to the spirit of a living person, and that *all* things are to be so used as to give this ministration. If one chooses to say so, this is to make all things sacramental; but this is the death of the older sacramentalism which lives on the assertion of the sole virtue of certain things. Just now the doctrine of the incarnation is being widely used to put new life into sacramentalism; but it is only the sound of the word, not its true

meaning, which gives the view any support. The revelation of God in Christ is beyond all else personal, and only personal; it is no mere toying with the flesh of humanity. The church is no institution, but, as Fairbairn says, "the church is the *people* of God; wherever they are he is, and the church through him in them."[14]

(5) The *intense quickening of the social conscience*, too, which also is born of the sense of the worth of the person, cannot help deep ening our insight into another side of biblical and Christian teaching. This is for theology simply the clear recognition o the large place given to the kingdom of God in the teaching of Christ. The astonishment is that, even apart from the explicit teaching as to the kingdom, with Christ's statement of the great commandment before men, any other view could have been held. Flight from the world, and flight from human relations, were no legitimate growth from the spirit of Christ. In any case it would seem that we can never again forget that "we are members one of another." And few principles have so many vital applications in theology. As certain as that the great commandment is love and that the great means to character is association, so certain is it that we are necessary one to another. As certain as that each has his own individual outlook on the divine, so certain is it that we need to share each other's visions. The principle sheds its light on the problem of evil, and on the meaning of intercessory prayer, and on many another dark place in our thinking. Only through it is the full greatness of the human spirit seen, and the largeness of the life open to it, for it implies the divine friendship as well. All this is true, and much more. But we must not make here another false application of the analogy of the organism. To press, as many are now doing, the analogy of the organism is really to repudiate that out of which the whole development of the social conscience has come —the sense of the value of the individual person.

(6) Every one of these considerations drawn from emphasis on the personal implies an *increasing emphasis on the ethical* that affects theology at every point. The very definition of religion

[14] *Op. cit.*, p. 530.

is changed. The separation of the ethical and religious is becoming impossible. The reality of the moral life of man seems to us now one of the main foundations of a religious view. And we can conceive no salvation that does not include character. We believe that the ethical is *always* involved in every genuine religious experience. As Herrmann puts it: "Neither in what is opposed to duty, nor in what is indifferent to it, can we meet with God, or do we desire to do so."[15] We are compelled, therefore, to a reinterpretation of the Reformation formula. We see with Paul in faith a real personal relation, but one that is the germ of *real* righteousness. To deny all worth to faith, any activity on the part of man, is simply to deny that that has taken place which it is the whole aim of redemption to bring about—the voluntary choosing to be a child of God, of like character with him. A thoroughly ethical conception of salvation affects theological statements in unlooked-for ways, and to an extent impossible even to indicate. It is no denial of a real forgiveness of sins, but it makes sin not less but more serious. On the other hand, it puts an absolute bar to the older Calvinism of salvation by divine decree, supposing that that made conceivable the idea of character at all. The atonement, too, can get its full meaning only as it is conceived as ethical *throughout*.

(7) And if theology accepts the guidance, not only of ethics, but also of psychology, with what Paulsen calls its "voluntaristic trend," it must be *practical*. Certainly in religion—giving principles for life, a method of living—if anywhere, judgment by consequences ought to apply. Moreover, all doctrine is originally only the thought expression of experience or its supposed implications, and has, therefore, a solely practical source. And all doctrine must have meaning for life. It must be seen to bear on life; something must follow from it for attitude and conduct. This is the very ground of distinction between other truth and moral and spiritual truth. The latter is always an appeal to character. If it is not so, we may be very sure it is not correctly stated. The New England theologians, therefore, rightly sought a theology that could be *preached*. So far as

[15] *Communion with God*, p. 106.

theology is a science of practical religion, the test is genuine and needed, but it would cut severely much that goes under the name of theology.

2. *The influence on theology of the recognition of Christ as the supreme person.*—All these deeper moral convictions of our time which we have been considering lead naturally to the recognition of Christ as the supreme person, and therefore the supreme fact of history, and the supreme revelation of God, and this recognition in turn strengthens all the other convictions. This growing convergence of the thought of the world toward Christ is far the greatest fact of our time. At the end of every path there looms up before us this one great towering figure. The simple truth is that we stand face to face with the historical Christ, as it has been said, "in a sense and to a degree unknown to the church since the apostolic age." It is a most significant fact that every single great life of Christ since the gospels is the product of but little more than the last sixty years. Every ray of light, historical, critical, philosophic, ethical, religious, has been concentrated upon him. No such study was ever given to any theme. It would be criminal thoughtlessness that could make that fact without effect in theology. Better to know Christ is certainly to be able to speak more adequately about him. And it would be our shame, not the glory of the Fathers, if in spite of the deepening knowledge of Christ, we were content to speak precisely as they spoke. We would much better try to speak as we believe they would speak now. The very movement itself makes it certain, however, that this is not to make Christ less, but more.

(1) The recovery of the historical Christ, this growing recognition of his supremacy, means for theology, then, in the first place, that it accepts Christ in truth as the *supreme* revelation of God, its one great source of the knowledge of God's character and purpose. With this fact it is in dead earnest. It does not deny that there are other sources, but it holds them to be distinctly subordinate. Christ and only Christ is adequate to give the Christian conception of God. It welcomes gladly all other light, and it knows that the mind must do its best to bring into unity all

its possessions, but natural theology is for it supplementary rather than basic, subordinate to, not coördinate with, Christ. It seeks with all earnestness approximation to *Christ's* theology. It erects no altar to an unknown God; it takes refuge in neither scholasticism nor mysticism. It knows one God, the God revealed in Christ, and it accepts with confidence the affirmation of Christ: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father; how sayest thou, show us the Father?"

The cry "Back to Christ" means for theology that Christ is really supreme, in the Bible and out of it. And it believes that any reaction against the cry so interpreted is doomed to failure. Theology must recognize the indispensable value of the apostolic testimony to Christ, but it must reserve the right (and it is vain to deny it) by legitimate historical criticism to appeal from the reflection of Christ to the Christ reflected. That Christ is Lord ought to be no divisive cry for any disciple of Christ.

(2) And of the character of the God who reveals himself in Christ theology can have no doubt. It sees God *in Christ;* it knows and seeks no better name for him than Christ's own constantly repeated name, Father. And when it seeks to interpret that name by Christ's own spirit in life and death, it seems for the first time really to know what love and what sin are. God is no longer onlooker, nor even sovereign merely; but Father, holy and loving, who because he hates sin and knows its awfulness, and yet loves with surpassing love his child, suffers in the sin of his child. It is no sentimentalism. The more the Father loves the child, the more he hates the sin of the child, and must use every means to put the sin away. On the other hand, the revelation of the Father alone brings his sin adequately to the man himself. It puts his sin in the light of the suffering love of God, of what it costs the Father's heart, and brings home so the shame of it and the guilt of it as no punishment could possibly do. Christ's conception of God as Father, as Fairbairn justly says, must be taken as the really ruling conception, determining all else in theology.

(3) Historical criticism has brought us also into the very presence of the *man* Jesus, and has renewed for us, therefore,

the gospel's own emphasis on the humanity of Christ, almost forgotten by the church in spite of both gospels and creeds. But it is most significant that it is directly through this study of the humanity of Jesus that his lordship and divinity have become so plain. It is no Unitarian drift which the age has disclosed, and yet it accepts the emphasis on Christ's humanity. The religious need of the humanity of Christ is very great, for otherwise his whole life is unreal, and has no true relation to our life, and he could give to us no perfect revelation of the perfect filial relation to God. But more than this is true. It is supremely in the *character* of Christ that God stands fully revealed, and this character must be real—the real character of the man Jesus. His true humanity is, therefore, essential to the revelation of his divinity. The two stand in closest relation. Not God *and* man, but God revealed because true man.

(4) But there is one inference widely drawn from this newly awakened belief in the divinity of Christ, against which, it seems to the writer, earnest and honest protest should be made. The evangelical church knows well, with van Dyke,[16] that "the unveiling of the Father in Christ was and continued to be, and still is, the palladium of Christianity;" and no age has had a more thorough and intelligent conviction of the lordship and divinity of Christ than ours. This conviction is the deepest and most inspiring influence in theology today; but this conviction is grounded on straightforward historical study of the character of Christ, not on metaphysical speculation. It can be no service to the church, it would seem, under this fresh and independent conviction to react toward a really metaphysical tritheism, affirming social relations and love within the Godhead, in the immanent trinity. The attempt has been widely approved, but I cannot doubt that, so far as it becomes a living faith, it means tritheism pure and simple, and will surely bring its own punishment. This, at least, is true: nothing calls for more absolute and complete personality than love and social relations. To affirm social relations, therefore, in the Godhead is to assert absolute tritheism. And no possible

[16] *The Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, p. 110.

manipulation of the terms can avoid it. The analysis of self-consciousness, also, taken from Hegel—to put it flatly—helps not at all to a real trinity and proves nothing. It is far better that we should admit that we simply do not understand the eternal trinity than that by explanations that do not explain we should be driven to ascribe three persons to God in the only sense in which we can understand person, and not be able to say that God is one person in any sense we can understand. This new tritheism seems to me far less defensible than even the oldest credal statements of the trinity, for those were at least scrupulously careful to insist that the distinctions in the Godhead were not personal, but that God was in truth one. We are likely to find the biblical doctrine of the trinity more satisfying both intellectually and religiously than any later abstractly wrought out statements. We believe in one God, our Father, concretely and supremely revealed and brought nigh with absolute and abiding assurance in Christ, and making himself known in the hearts of all who will receive him, in the most intimate, constant, and powerful, but not obtrusive, friendship possible to man, giving thus the supreme conditions of both character and happiness.

Moreover, the religious need of the strict unity of God is very great. I want to know that God himself, the infinite source of all, is my Father; that he, not some second being, loves me. And this is the very significance of Christ that *God* is in him, speaks and works through him. This seems to be Christ's constant testimony, and the one view that includes both sides of John's representation of him. It is the whole meaning of Christ that he reveals God himself, that we may see God's love in his love. Less than this seems still to leave us far from the gospel, as Luther felt, and underestimates the significance of Christ. "He that hath seen me *hath* seen the Father." Unitarianism emphasizes the *humanity* of Christ to preserve the unity of God, the true view emphasizes the *divinity* of Christ to preserve the unity.

(5) But it is the greatest glory of this new sense of the historical Christ that, whether we are able adequately or in agreement to phrase his relation to us or to God, the fact stands out

with increasing clearness for all men that simply coming into his presence we find the key to the meaning of life, we find ourselves, we find God. Not apologetically, therefore, not with misgiving, but in glad confidence, we own him Lord. In our intellectual formulations of his person we may not satisfy one another. But "no man can say Jesus is Lord, but in the Holy Spirit." It is hardly possible to mistake, *e. g.*, the note of personal confession and joy in these words of Adolf Harnack: "When God and everything that is sacred threatens to disappear in darkness, or our doom is pronounced; when the mighty forces of inexorable nature seem to overwhelm us, and the bounds of good and evil to dissolve; when, weak and weary, we despair of finding God at all in this dismal world — it is then that the personality of Christ may save us."[17]

When theology tries now honestly to take account of these great convictions of our own age, it only attempts more adequately to conceive the great abiding truths of Christianity, and make them real to *this* generation. It seeks to be more *Christian* — closer to the very spirit and teaching of Christ, its supreme authority; more *personal* and reverent of personality — insisting on the whole man and the personal relations which are essential in every moral and spiritual problem; more *biblical* — with unfaltering faith in the historical revelation of God, and owning the priceless value of the reflections of Christ in his own generation, it means to give a weight to biblical statements in theology that has not yet been given; more *historical* — for it wishes humbly to know the actual way that God has taken, not its own imaginings; more *practical* — for it looks only to life, the highest life; more *ethical* — for it knows that to be a child of God is to be of like character with God; more *social* — for it remembers the great commandment: — Christian, personal, biblical, historical, practical, ethical, social, and, once again and supremely, Christian. "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." "And this is life eternal that they should *know* thee, the only true God, and him whom thou didst send, even Jesus Christ."

[17] *Christianity and History*, p. 47.

MODIFICATIONS IN THE THEOLOGICAL CURRICULUM.

FOUR principal suggestions, indicated below by italics, are made in President Harper's article, "Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How?" (the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, Vol. III, pp. 45–66). The first two do not commend themselves to me; with the last two I am in substantial agreement.

1. *The seminaries should make up certain deficiencies of college education, especially in science and psychology.*

Because some students come from small denominational colleges which give no instruction in those branches, it does not follow that the seminaries should provide it. If the third-rate colleges do not furnish it, students should take a year or two in a good scientific school, or, if they are enrolled as members of a seminary which is a department of a university, they can learn more in the scientific courses of the university than in the seminary. Law schools do not teach political economy and history, nor medical schools chemistry, for those studies belong to the college. Some years ago many law and medical students, even at Harvard, were from small colleges, or had never seen a college, and elementary instruction was given. But, in the interest of those professions and of the community, the standard of admission was raised and the schools limited to strictly professional education. The real difficulty for the seminaries is precisely opposite to lack of scientific knowledge. Many college students are taking the scientific rather than the classical course. Even at Dartmouth 49 per cent. are in the scientific department. In the universities a large majority do not elect Greek. Some of these men, late in their course, decide to become ministers, but, not having Greek, cannot enter the seminaries. Yet the education they have had is a good preparation for the ministry, as President Harper rightly argues. The seminaries should receive them and give such instruction in Greek as is needed. This very change has been made at Andover the present year. As to English literature, that is now taught in the colleges, and in the seminary there should be, not elementary instruction, but clubs for the study of the poets (which Andover has), while practice in writing should be gained by preparing essays in the various departments.

2. *The seminaries should prepare students for other kinds of Christian work besides preaching.*

With this suggestion I do not agree. The pastoral care always has been and always should be taught. Few churches have both a preacher and a pastor. Nine-tenths of the graduates will be clergymen in country parishes, and each must be preacher and pastor — the best possible arrangement; for to preach well the minister must know his people. Even in city churches, as a rule, the work is not divided among two or more ministers. Those who are to do special work, as secretaries of Christian associations or of charitable organizations, may profitably spend a year in the seminary, taking courses in the Bible, theology, and social science, for which no change in the curriculum is needed; or, still better, may attend schools established for the training of Christian workers. In the churches the laity should do a good part of the work and not turn it over to paid officials. The main object of a seminary is, and should be, the training of preachers. It is preaching the churches want. The seminaries should not attempt, on the one hand, to exercise the functions of a college, nor, on the other hand, the preparation of all kinds of Christian workers, but should be devoted to the training of preachers and pastors.

3. *There should be a considerable proportion of elective courses.*

To this I heartily assent. Certain studies, to be sure, are necessary to all preachers. Their profession is in itself an election of the Bible, theology, church history, and homiletics, just as the study of law and medicine is the pursuit of certain kinds of knowledge. But there should also be other courses made elective, and opportunity to specialize in one or another department. The chief additions are the history of religions and social ethics. After the first year the student should be encouraged to specialize on biblical, theological, or historical lines. At Andover (of which I speak because I know it best) more than half of the courses offered are elective, and every student is required to choose one-third of his work from electives. President Harper's elective dream is a very good description of the Andover that now is. It is the oldest seminary, not "of a century or more," but of ninety years ago; but it has departed widely from the original model, partly in subjects, and more in method, scope, and adaptation to the tastes of students.

4. *Hebrew and Greek should not be required of all students.*

Agreed, especially as to Hebrew. For many students the study of Hebrew is a sheer waste of time. Its requirement is a tradition from

the days when there were no commentaries, and when the doctrine of verbal inspiration called for microscopic exegesis of the text in the original. The historical and literary method of studying the Old Testament may be pursued intelligently without knowledge of Hebrew. Those who have acquired it can use a better class of commentaries than the books provided for Sunday-school teachers, but one can get on very well without it. In this seminary not one-fifth, but one-ninth, of the time, that is, one-third of the first year, is given to Hebrew, and it is not required afterward. Even so, in some cases it might well be remitted altogether. As to Greek, I take somewhat the same view, yet those who have studied that language in college may easily and profitably master New Testament Greek. In my judgment, German is of more value to theological students than either Hebrew or Greek.

As to location, there are advantages in a university and in a city. But a country town near a city has also great advantages. Study is without distractions, the spiritual life is promoted without going into "retreats" for part of the time, and yet there is easy access to the city.

I doubt the wisdom of sending students to spend a few weeks each year with pastors. The students come from active work in the churches and may teach in churches near the seminary. A better arrangement is that of becoming assistants, for a year or two after graduation, to pastors of large churches, an arrangement which is now adopted in several Congregational parishes, and is common among Episcopalians.

GEORGE HARRIS.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

President Harper's position as head of a great new institution in a great new city gives him a peculiar advantage. He is unfettered by precedents, and he can test the schemes which he is so expert in framing. But he has his disadvantages. He has never been a pastor, a preacher, or even a student of theology. Actual experience in these relations would, I think, have made him somewhat more slow in charging to our theological seminaries, and especially to their defective method and organization, so large a share of the present shortcomings of the churches. The remedy which he suggests is a radical one: the seminaries should have a metropolitan and university location, and seminary training should be conducted by purely university methods.

Further experience will possibly convince him that this remedy is impracticable, inasmuch as it would involve the abolition in his own denomination of all seminaries but his own.

John Foster once wrote an essay on *Some Causes by which Evangelical Religion has been Rendered Unacceptable to Men of Cultivated Taste.* I do not know that among these causes he mentioned theological seminaries. The fact that so large a proportion of the able preachers and pastors of our city churches have come from the country seminaries should have led Dr. Harper to qualify his intimation that church abandonment and pastoral weakness are the product of these institutions. They are without doubt capable of improvement, but they have made the Christian ministry in America the most intelligent of the learned professions, and it is greatly to their credit that with means so insufficient they have done so much for public instruction.

The chief mistake of the article before us, in my judgment, is that of its point of view. It is conceived from the point of view of the scholar and specialist, rather than from the point of view of the preacher and pastor. It does not take account of the real object of the theological seminary — that of fitting the average candidate for the ministry to do his work as preacher and pastor in the average church. Granting that a young man has had three years of academic and four years of college training, what theological studies should he ordinarily pursue to fit him for ordination and for success in his calling? Dr. Harper would give him one hurried year of encyclopædia, to show him what there is to be learned, and would then remit him to the pursuit of some specialty. His principal work must be done in some one of the six departments of Old Testament, New Testament, church history, systematic theology, sociology, or homiletics, while theme-writing, natural science, psychology, pedagogy, music, or medicine may be given the second place in his attention. I do not understand, however, that either Hebrew or Greek would be required in any portion of the course.

The scheme seems to me exposed to both general and special objections. The general objection is that it fails to give to the average college graduate that all-round preparation for his work which the churches may reasonably require. One year does not suffice to give that thorough grounding in the Hebrew Bible, the Greek Testament, church history, systematic theology, homiletics, pastoral theology, and elocution which is indispensable to a well-equipped ministry. Three years are barely sufficient for this elementary work; and, until this

elementary work is finished, special studies have no proper place. In this respect the theological seminary should conform its policy to that of the best schools of other professions. In order to graduation, the school of law insists upon the candidate's attainment of a certain minimum of knowledge with regard to all the main branches of legal science, and much knowledge about contracts does not make up for the absence of knowledge about evidence. The school of medicine will not graduate a man who has never studied anatomy, even though he may be an expert in *materia medica*. The Military Academy at West Point and the Naval Academy at Annapolis provide a comprehensive training in all the branches pertinent to their respective professions, and specialization is not encouraged until the student graduates and is assigned to some particular department of service. In a similar way the theological seminary should regard its office to be the furnishing of the most thorough elementary theological training, leaving special studies to be pursued after the seminary course is finished.

To allow college graduates to omit Hebrew and Greek from their theological studies insures, to my mind, a great decline in the learning and influence of our coming ministry. I am one of those who believe that it is richly worth the while for the student to take Hebrew, even though he never uses it after his three-years' course is over. There is an understanding of Hebraistic usage which can be gotten in no other way, and the oriental atmosphere and phraseology of the class-room tinge all his after-studies. No man, moreover, knows whether he has the capacity for Semitic studies until he has attacked them. Many good Hebrew scholars will be lost to the church when Hebrew is made purely elective. And the argument applies yet more forcibly to Greek. That men who have had a classical training in college should be permitted to drop their Greek on entering the seminary seems to me a policy most irrational and disastrous.

On the other hand, the admission into the theological course of certain other studies which properly belong to the college unduly hampers the course, makes it less strictly theological, and takes time from the very work for which the traditional three years is already far too short. It is quite true that many a student needs training in English. But it is quite beside the purpose of a theological seminary to teach him mere English. He should have learned this before he came to the seminary, nor can the seminary be expected to make up his deficiencies. Some seminary students, college graduates though they

are, cannot spell — shall the seminary teach spelling? And so with English grammar and natural science. Let the seminaries exert pressure upon the colleges, and the colleges in turn upon the academies; let the preliminary training be made more thorough; but do not let the time of theological instructors be frittered away in teaching what belongs to the lower stages of education.

I am far from denying that the theological seminaries do now incidentally help men in all these respects to supply the defects of their early training. Much of science and of philosophy is taught, though not systematically and of set purpose, in connection with the department of systematic theology; and much of rhetoric and composition is taught, in connection with the department of homiletics. But to make these things main features of a theological course would be to defeat the purpose of that course, which can be successful only as it gives time predominantly to theology. Similarly I dissent from Dr. Harper's plan of attending to the religious life of the seminary by providing monastic "retreats," in which religion can be specifically cultivated. Let the spirit of instructors be what it should be, and no such retreats will be needed. Daily prayer will obviate the necessity of special monthly or half-yearly periods of seclusion.

The scheme unintentionally plays into the hands of those who regard the Scriptures as a somewhat antiquated source of doctrine, who doubt the possibility of deducing from them any consistent scheme of theology, and who esteem modern inspiration as better than that which is three thousand or more years old. It permits a man to enter the ministry without systematic instruction as to the harmony and unity of Christian truth, while at the same time it encourages a one-sided and fragmentary development that promises the exploitation of multitudinous eccentricities of belief in our churches. We could not, and would not, prevent individual interpretations of Scripture, but we would prepare the way for these by a thorough study of theology as a system. There is such a thing as the analogy of faith, and every preacher should know something of it. The churches demand rounded and well-equipped men in the ministry, and we should not give them mere specialists or pedagogues. They need men, indeed, who can think, and who know how to correlate what they learn in one department with what they learn in another. But thinking and correlating, to be of value, presuppose an acquaintance with elementary facts. This acquaintance with facts our seminaries seek to give. Dr. Harper's plan, I fear, would lead to partial inductions and premature conclusions — a science free

from traditions, indeed, but a science that is falsely so called. The seminaries are not universities; they are professional schools. They were founded in order to make preachers, pastors, and missionaries, and not to make technical scholars and scientific specialists. With their present endowment and equipment they cannot do the work of the university; nor, if they could, would it be well for them to attempt it.

There is one suggestion in Dr. Harper's article which, in spite of these animadversions, I think of value. It is his suggestion that in all our seminaries a larger amount of time should be given to the study of the English Bible. But to do this requires, in the case of most of us, not only an additional professor and an increased endowment, but also the addition of another year to the course of study. At present we do what we can with the time at our disposal. We give the student a start in his Bible study, teach him a method of interpretation, and give him an example of thorough and minute investigation of single Scripture books. A larger and broader treatment of Scripture is, indeed, desirable. We believe that our best students learn this for themselves. Since we have our option to teach small portions thoroughly or large portions superficially, we choose the former alternative, and we believe that every discerning pupil approves our choice.

The fixed curriculum of our theological seminaries is not the same thing that it was fifty years ago. It has grown with the needs of the churches, and it expresses the wisdom of several generations. I have hope that larger means will in time enable us to lengthen our course and to do a better work. President Harper has done well in calling attention to one present need. But the need is not to be supplied by giving up our requirement of Hebrew and Greek. If these come to be neglected, study of the English Bible will be discounted with them. Let us do the one, and not leave the other undone. And, when our students have finished their systematic and elementary studies in the main branches of theology, we will gladly send some of the brightest and aptest of them, not to the Chicago Theological Seminary, nor to the Chicago Divinity School — for we so far agree with Dr. Harper as to think that the name of that should be changed — but to the University of Chicago, to prepare themselves, by post-graduate work, for professorships and for other special lines of service, for which, fortunately, the average preacher and pastor is not qualified, and to which he is not called.

AUGUSTUS H. STRONG.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

Dr. Harper's article entitled, "Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How?", interests me very much; partly because I see that Dr. Harper has arrived, by independent observation and reflection, at certain conclusions which I published in 1883 in the then *Princeton Review;* but chiefly because he recommends even more radical changes in the prevailing methods of theological education than those I suggested sixteen years ago. Dr. Harper recognizes the fact that election of studies in theological seminaries has become essential — a doctrine which I have preached for many years — and he also states very forcibly the imperative need of modifying the exaggerated beneficiary system which has so enfeebled the ministry. The uniformity of program becomes more and more harmful, because it is now contrasted with the freedom of study obtaining in the graduate schools which have come into existence within the last twenty-five years; and the degrading effects of the indiscriminate beneficiary system are so manifest that no argument on that subject is any longer required.

These are seminary evils, and may there be remedied; but, in my judgment, there is something deeper which keeps young men of promise out of the ministry. Dr. Harper speaks as if it were the seminary which has become unattractive to the best young men. In my belief it is more the profession than the seminary which is unattractive. To many young men the ministry seems to be a profession which is not as untrammeled as the other learned professions, and which subjects a man, as he grows older and wiser, to grave temptation to insincerity. The youth going out of college, who has obtained some clear, though partial, view of various departments of knowledge, perceives in them all a steady expansion, or at least a continual change. He knows that many things habitually taught thirty years ago have proved to be untrue; or, at least, have been replaced by more comprehensive or more accurate doctrine. He observes in the other learned professions that men expect to change their minds as years go on, and do not hold at sixty just the same opinions which they held at thirty. He sees throughout society a general expectation of new light and new truth in every field of human knowledge. But, on the other hand, the minister seems to be expected to hold throughout life a fixed, unchanging body of opinions; and his livelihood, or at least his comfort in life, seems to depend on the unchangeableness of his convictions on subjects which relate to the highest interests of humanity. The young student of today looks with grave suspicion on this situation of the ministry; he can hardly conceive that fixity of opinion on the most

difficult subjects of human speculation can be consistent with candor or with logical precision of thought. Now, candor and incisive clearness in reasoning are the intellectual qualities which the best young men of today most respect and admire. They perceive plainly enough the immense ethical opportunity which the preacher enjoys; but they are afraid that this opportunity is purchased in many instances by the sacrifice of candor in public speech, and of the delights of a lifelong search for new truth, or can be used to the full only by one who lacks intellectual curiosity and the power of clear thinking. To remedy the main evils in the seminary will not suffice, therefore, to recruit the profession with the best young men. It will be further necessary to modify the adverse conditions under which the ministerial profession now labors. The community must come to believe that the ministry shares the modern scientific spirit, which implies curiosity, freedom, and an indefinite reach for truth-seeking.

Dr. Harper dwells on the undemocratic quality of the theological curriculum. While I agree with him that the ordinary theological seminary is out of sympathy with democracy, I believe that it is not so much the seminary, or its curriculum, which is undemocratic, as it is the creeds or the rituals of the churches which the seminary furnishes with ministers. Are not the Evangelical creeds correctly described as exclusive? Is not a modern Protestant church a highly exclusive organization? Here again it seems to me that Dr. Harper does not go to the root of the matter, when he complains that the seminary is undemocratic. Primitive Christianity was democracy itself; but a modern Evangelical church is distinctly aristocratic for this world and the next.

Dr. Harper insists that the seminary should not be a place "in which men are to learn certain views, or to receive and adopt certain opinions." Nothing can be more timely and admirable than this doctrine; but so long as ministers are educated in denominational seminaries, expressly maintained to educate men for churches which hold certain stiff, unchanging creeds, how can the theological seminary be anything else than a place where young men are taught certain views which they are expected to hold for life? The denominational seminary is, in practice, a place where students adopt certain opinions and undertake to promulgate them.

In some of his recommendations Dr. Harper is less specific than one could wish. Thus, what is that general and comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures which, in his view, all should acquire? Is it an

approximate and superficial knowledge, as against a precise and thorough knowledge? It cannot be a knowledge of only parts of the Scriptures, for it would not then be comprehensive. Yet, if all theological students are really to obtain a general and comprehensive knowledge of the Scriptures, what else will they have time for? One is driven to suppose that Dr. Harper intends by this formidable phrase some outline or sketch of the Scriptures, else it certainly could not be required of all. In another connection Dr. Harper complains very properly that neither the college student nor the theological student of today knows his English Bible.

Many of Dr. Harper's recommendations in detail are admirable. He objects strenuously to the requirement of Hebrew within the seminary; and it is greatly to be hoped that his objection will be taken to heart by the managers of all theological seminaries. The Divinity School of Harvard University ceased several years ago to require the study of the Hebrew language. The study of the Hebrew language in most theological seminaries has long been a farce; and Dr. Harper truly says that no greater farce can be found in any field of educational work. Nevertheless, as I pointed out in 1883, it remains very desirable that every student of theology should have a fair knowledge of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, and German. An adequate knowledge of these languages should have been obtained in college by every student who was looking forward to the ministry; and all theological schools should require a college education of all candidates for admission.

Dr. Harper recommends an increased attention to English literature and to the English language. He says, indeed, that there should be a special chair of instruction in the English language in every well-organized seminary. The substance of this recommendation I heartily agree with; yet I cannot but think that the study of English literature, with practice in writing, and careful instruction in the elements of a good style, ought to form a part of the college education of candidates for the ministry. So, too, with regard to the knowledge of psychology, political economy, history, and science for which Dr. Harper pleads. The elements of these subjects are all prerequisites for theological study, and should, therefore, be included in the college training of candidates for the ministry. It is not to be expected that the seminary should provide for the elementary teaching of these subjects.

But assuming that the candidate for admission to the theological seminary brings with him an adequate collegiate training, I entirely agree with Dr. Harper that the theological curriculum itself requires

grave changes. If free election of studies is allowed within the seminary, and courses are provided in sufficient variety to give the student a fair degree of choice, intelligent experimenting by both teachers and students will in a few years develop the most desirable and useful combinations of studies. The courses offered must, of course, include Old Testament and New Testament studies, ecclesiastical history, comparative religion, the philosophy of religion, the history of the Christian doctrines, and scientific methods of charity and reform.

Finally, I value highly Dr. Harper's recommendation of "clinical" instruction. He has in mind actual observation of the moral and social conditions in crowded districts — observation strictly analogous to that of the physician at the bedside or the geologist in the field. His recommendation of an apprenticeship for every young graduate in theology is also an interesting and useful one. An active pastor in a city church could nowadays make good use of such apprentices. This recommendation naturally accompanies another of Dr. Harper's suggestions — namely, that the theological seminary distinctly undertake to produce for the service of the church, not only preachers, but teachers and administrative officers for its charitable and social work. The seminary's requirements would, of course, be different for these different groups; but a broad elective system in the seminary would lend itself to the best preparation of members of any one of the groups.

Dr. Harper seems to contemplate some coöperation between theological seminaries and medical schools for the production of practical workers in both fields. This project seems to me eminently unsafe. If the church is to employ medical officers, they should be men of medical training exclusively. The church should not become responsible for an inferior sort of medical officer.

Every president of a university will, of course, agree with Dr. Harper that the theological curriculum can best be carried on in connection with a university, and preferably with an urban university. In no other way can the necessary broadening of theological education be so promptly and effectually brought about.

Dr. Harper's paper ought to be seriously considered by every board of trustees and every faculty of a theological school in the United States.

CHARLES W. ELIOT.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass.

President Harper's paper on the theological curriculum is full of valuable suggestions and sagacious criticisms. His mind is virile, eagerly observant, committed to progress, impatient of unreality. The helpfulness of such a mind, as a factor in educational evolution, is large. It challenges traditions, it disturbs quiescent routines, it invades the dusty security of obsolete methods. Its sturdy questioning of things long taken for granted reminds one of Browning's reference to Luther in *Paracelsus:*

> His plain denial of established points
> Ages had sanctified and men supposed
> Could never be oppugned while earth was under
> And heaven above them.

In no department of education should the frank questioning of methods be more welcome than in the divinity school. Ever present is the danger that a veil, curiously woven of natural and artificial elements, shall be let down between the theological seminary and the world, separating the one from the other; and, from the point of view of the seminary, obstructing its sense of "the requirement of modern times." To rend this veil in twain is, we assume, the motive of President Harper. This, at all events, he does, and with a two-edged sword, which, while it cuts through much that ought to be shorn away from the theological curriculum, strikes at some things which, in our judgment, ought resolutely to be maintained. We cannot too earnestly express our concurrence with President Harper in his statement of the ends to be held in mind if the curriculum of the theological seminary is to be modified in accordance "with the assured results of modern psychology and pedagogy, as well as with the demands which have been made apparent by our common experience." We believe that the work should be so adjusted as to render it attractive to the best men; that allowance should be made for the taste and capacity of the individual student; that seminary work should encourage lifelong habits of study which should grow stronger from year to year; and that that training is demanded "which, upon the whole, will best adapt the individual to his environment." Among the many suggestions and criticisms contained in President Harper's fertile paper we wish to select seven for special comment, as representing the sound wisdom and common sense of his main position.

Against two traditional practices of seminary life — its monastic seclusion and its enfeebling benefaction — the president of the Univer-

sity of Chicago lifts up his voice in tones which should echo eastward and westward:

1. *Monastic seclusion* is one of the most subtle perils of seminary life. From the animating and wholesome excitements of the university and the college men relapse into the restricted and hypercritical world of the seminary. If allowed to live apart from the world, as within a monastery, they run enormous risks. Petty jealousies tend to obliterate noble and sacred ambitions; scholasticism unrelieved by social service hardens into unspirituality; lack of contact with men of affairs begets strange and impossible standards of conduct. All this should be changed. If existing rural seminaries cannot be removed to towns, no new seminaries should be founded in country places. The student who is to give his life for men should live among men, and among those who are working for men. Along with his scholastic training should proceed his training in social and evangelistic efficiency through contact at short range with the great human facts of life.

2. *Enfeebling benefaction.*— The noblest motives have animated the donors of scholarship funds to theological seminaries, but grave perils hover in the train of such gifts. A man's comparative poverty ought not to constitute the primary ground of his eligibility to partake of scholarship funds. Many poor men seek to enter the ministry, but poverty is, in itself, no qualification for the ministry. Where such funds are administered as charitable gifts they tend to enfeeble the recipients. They differentiate the seminary unfavorably from other professional schools; they breed unmanly jealousies; they imperil self-respect; they tempt to untruth. They should be removed from the eleemosynary basis and be placed upon the competitive basis. Men should win them by merit, not plead for them in supplicatory letters. This system of enfeebling benefaction cannot too soon, nor too absolutely, be broken up. The ministry cannot hold its own beside other professions until the pauperizing of its students is brought to an end.

In addition to his salutary protests against erroneous conditions still clinging to the seminary system, President Harper advocates certain lines of progress:

1. *Larger provision for the training of teachers.*— His observations upon this subject are most wise. Certain men have teaching gifts of which they may be unconscious until the strenuous theological disciplines awaken those slumbering powers. For the development of such men provision must be made if the schools of theology are to equal in academic distinction the schools of medicine and of law. Special

opportunities should be presented to men of very high grades of intellectual power, whereby they may specialize long and under the most favorable conditions in their chosen departments. These opportunities should not be limited to residence in foreign universities. Provision should be made for very advanced specialization in this country, in the higher theological disciplines.

2. *The lengthening of the seminary course.*—The traditional "three years" should be augmented by larger and richer periods of time for those who will use them. The "fourth year" is essential; with a fifth, sixth, and seventh year made possible under an extensive scheme of graduate work leading to the degree of doctor in divinity. Graduate work should not be regarded chiefly as the opportunity for men in the pastorate to take a breathing spell from active toil, for the recruiting of their intellectual energies. Valuable as is such a function of the graduate curriculum, it is secondary to the major function of mature, comprehensive preparation for life work on the part of those who are to begin their ministry within the searching and exacting conditions of the twentieth century. The ministry in days to come is "not to be entered into unadvisedly or lightly."

3. *The development of the seminar method.*—The "assured results of modern psychology and pedagogy" contain no law more fundamental than the law of self-activity. From the kindergarten to the professional school that law is operative wherever scientific methods are recognized. The seminar is the highest academic illustration of self-activity. To deal effectively with modern problems of theology, of history, and of exegesis is impracticable without the seminar.

4. *University connection.*— The enforced limitations of the theological curriculum shut out the possibility of introducing science to the extent demanded by President Harper. But the need in this direction is met by university connection. Let a seminary enter into relations of comity with a university, let the use of the university privileges be restricted to men of comparatively high scholarship, let the university hold its theological guests strictly accountable for faithful work, and a vast step forward is taken in the unification of an academic system.

5. *Lay training.*—Candidates for the ministry ought not to have a monopoly of the rich advantages collected in a modern seminary. University extension can be applied to the seminary as reasonably as to the university. Lay training is university extension applied to the seminary. One of the most urgent questions of the day relates to the

religious training of the young. The theory and practice of teaching in religious schools are far behind the theory and practice of teaching in secular schools. The seminary that is awake to modern requirements will accept as a part of its duty some system of extension lectures that shall provide for the systematic training of the laity as teachers in religious schools.

These are brief but appreciative comments on matters urged with singular clearness by President Harper. We could wish that his words might sink down into the hearts of all who have part in building the curricula of the many seminaries in this country.

But we are compelled to record with equal earnestness our dissent from certain positions taken in this very able paper.

1. We dissent from Dr. Harper's contention that Hebrew should be made elective, and from his conclusion to that effect founded largely upon the neglect of Hebrew study by men in the active ministry. That such neglect prevails throughout the ministry in this country is scarcely to be doubted. Hebrew is not the only branch of learning increasingly discarded by men toiling under mechanical systems of church life that compel ministers too often to leave the Word of God and to serve tables. But even the voluntary neglect of the study of the Word of God in the original is not conclusive evidence of the inexpediency of requiring that study to be extensively undertaken in the seminary. Our contention is that the study of Hebrew is infinitely more than a linguistic exercise. It is the profound investigation of one part of the Sacred Scriptures, wherein divine truth is conveyed through the Hebraic medium. The truth cannot be fully known by him who is to teach it until his mind has viewed it through the original medium of revelation. In the day that Hebrew is made elective it will be rejected by four-fifths of the men that enter the seminary; and the rejection of the Semitic discipline means the arrest and the decline of Old Testament study.

For a short period the church would not perceive the consequences issuing from the decline of Old Testament study. But the logic of time would reveal them. We are entering an age wherein materialism will contend with superficial spirituality for the control of the church. The saviors of the church will be those who are filled with the very life and essence of the Word of God, and who have entered through toil and pain and vigilance into its profoundest meanings. The doctrine of expediency, which would relegate the severe study of any part of God's Word to the realm of choice, making it to depend on the

personal inclinations of untrained youth, must, if it prevails, threaten the church with a deluge of utilitarianism which shall sweep out of sight, not sacred scholarship only, but the very landmarks of intelligent biblical knowledge.

2. We must dissent also from President Harper's doctrine of specialization as applied to students of theology. We believe in specialization as a condition of broad efficiency. We believe that seminaries were made for the world, not the world for seminaries, and that to train the ministry along traditional lines, unrelated to the imperative demands of modern life, is a crime against society and against the theological students who, thus trained, are flung out into their age crippled by professional malpractice. But specialization unlimited by antecedent obedience to prescribed routine is a questionable blessing. Its likeliest fruit is the one-sided life. And the ministry cannot be risked in the hands of one-sided men, whether they be specialists in administration or specialists in preaching (to employ President Harper's illustrations). Men may have special adaptations, and strong men do have special adaptations. Nevertheless, all who are to go forth as ambassadors of the one Lord Jesus Christ require to have in common a certain discipline in the rudiments of the Word of God, in the history of Christianity, in the substantial elements of belief, in the cardinal principles of the cure of souls. Specialization should be encouraged in the later year, or later years, of the course, but in the divinity school, as in the medical school, there is a certain amount of foundation work that all men must do in common. And the first year of the divinity school should make large requirements of the men who are undertaking the public ministry of Christ and the public preaching of the ancient and impregnable Word of God.

3. We must also dissent from President Harper's tendency (born of his noble earnestness) to overstate the backwardness of the modern seminary to adjust itself to present-day conditions. If there is overstatement, it proceeds from motives that do honor to his candor and to his eagerness to promote the efficiency of the ministry. But we cannot agree with him when he says that, "while the environment of the seminary has utterly changed in this century, the seminary itself has practically remained at a standstill." We think that there are seminaries moving rapidly toward readjustments in harmony with new requirements. There are seminaries in this country where monastic seclusion no longer exists, being supplanted by the active work of the students in the social problems of great cities; there are

seminaries where the enfeebling system of benefactions has been put away for a merit system of graded bursaries; there are seminaries that, by richly endowed fellowships and by the establishment of graduate courses, are making special provision for the training of teachers; there are seminaries that exalt seminar work, that maintain university connections, that are evolving plans for lay training.

We are, perhaps, more hopeful than President Harper, more optimistic, for the theological curriculum as it already has come to be in some of the seminaries; but we rejoice that his awakening and educating paper has been written, and we believe that the discussions suggested by it will give large impulse to a forward movement already begun.

CHARLES CUTHBERT HALL.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York.

The theological seminary aims at science and at skill. What science? Either a knowledge of all religions, or a knowledge of a particular religion. What skill? The skill to apply the truths of this science to the problems of human life and society. It may aim to produce both science and skill in the same pupil; or it may aim to produce the science in some and the skill in others.

A theological seminary might develop its curriculum from the point of view of comparative religion. There is a slight suggestion of this in President Harper's propositions. Of course, to do this thoroughly we should need to teach the Vedas and the other "sacred books of the East" in the original. The systematic theology arrived at would be a synthesis of the generic principles of all religions and the specific principles of the ultimate religion. This is very enticing, but has an infinite number of difficulties, of which I may name two: (1) The acquisition of such a theology would be possible to very few indeed, and to them only after long and painful study. (2) The workers in a church based upon such a theology would be slaves of routine. We should have the old separation again. Theology would be sundered from life, the thought of the church from the activities of its ministry, and the end would be the ruin of both.

Take, then, a narrower basis for the curriculum, the Bible. Unfortunately Protestantism forsook its *magna charta*. It reverted generally to the system of Aquinas. Only instead of the *summa* of doctrine for the church universal we had *summas* for the churches particular. Let

us return to the *magna charta* of the reformers. Teach the Scriptures, whether in the original or not; teach the Scriptures! Faraday understood Galvani very well, without learning Italian; intelligent men and women can learn the contents of the Bible without Hebrew and Greek. I agree with President Harper that to learn what the law and the prophets mean in wholesome English is far more important than a confused and a thoroughly inadequate knowledge of them in the original. I agree, too, with his suggestion of a scientific training for theologians, if for no other reason than the inadequate training of our students in modern modes of reasoning. The old curriculum of the college aimed to afford both a logical and a linguistic training. It did not; and, therefore, perished. But the new curriculum is no better. No wonder that men flounder in the depths of higher criticism. Their logical training and their linguistic outfit are wholly inadequate for the problems that they confront.

Two groups, however, seem to me sufficient: a group of students set apart for the severer task of investigation; and a group of students in applied Christianity. I use this much-abused term in its proper sense: an application of the teachings of Jesus to the individual and the community. This involves, first of all, the acquisition of disciples, and, secondly, their perfection in the graces of the kingdom of Christ. It will require Christians to apply Christianity. And the seminary must train up ministers who can persuade men to become such.

In rare cases the scholar and the practical worker may be combined. Men of the type of the late Dean Church are greatly needed in the modern church, uniting, as he did, the scholar, the thinker, the preacher, the pastor, and the administrator. And I dread the overspecialization that tends to destroy this type. Such men will naturally find their place among the investigators during their student days. Now, to these investigators — and I would admit none to their ranks who lack the endowments and the training for research — to these I would open the entire field of theological inquiry. But the practical workers should be instructed only in ascertained truth and in the views of noted and acknowledged teachers of the gospel. The theology of the Scriptures should be made the center of the cognate questions of philosophy and science; the anthropology of the Scriptures for cognate questions of psychology, ethics, and sociology; the historical development of Christianity, beginning with Judaism, the center of all cognate questions of history. Exegesis should support the three great departments of systematic, historical, and practical theology. And

these students of applied Christianity should be required to know every essential Scripture, *i. e.*, every Scripture necessary to the understanding of the biblical teachings about God and Christ, the church and the Spirit, man and society, the nation and the world. If this could be done in the original, all the better. But the Protestant principle requires that it should be done, and done thoroughly.

There is, however, a yet narrower basis for a curriculum which I prefer—a New Testament basis. I would make the curriculum Christo-centric; subordinating the old to the new, other religions to the religion of Jesus, and bringing all the sciences into captivity to Jesus Christ and his kingdom. The present curriculum is based upon the theory of inspired verses, each having equal value with every other. It is not based upon the theory of inspired books of which Jesus Christ is the key.

President Harper's suggestions might—many of them at least—be adapted to this Christo-centric idea. Thus the general course might include New Testament history and theology; the theology and literature of the Old Testament in their relations to Jesus and his kingdom; the history of Christ's kingdom since its beginning at Jerusalem; a study of Christ's teachings in their relations to science, to philosophy, and to existing society. But all this should be in order to apply the science thus acquired to christianizing men and the world in which they live. Clinics, retreats, apprenticeship to active pastors? By all means, every one of them! Encouragement of special aptitudes, musical, medical, scientific, by means of neighboring schools? Certainly. But I repeat, I would have two groups only, not four. I am willing to separate the investigator from the minister. But never the preacher from the pastor. The preacher's persuasiveness and power (not his popularity) depend upon his acquaintance with actual life. We need, not men to gather crowds, but men that can gather Christians. And the pastor requires for the work of these days an intelligence and a skill of simple speech that approach genius. As to electives, they might be permitted to these prospective ministers in the three great departments. New Testament study, though, should be continued throughout the course. But the topics selected should bear chiefly upon the urgent problems of our age. These prospective ministers should aim at science, only to increase their skill in dealing with men and communities.

Psychology, science, literature, pedagogy should be studied somewhere. If in the seminary, three years will not suffice. President

Harper's plan involves, in its entirety, a revolution of the churches. Possibly the Christians of our large cities may be organized ultimately into great communities, demanding a varied supply of preachers, pastors, and musical and medical workers, all operating under a single chief. Just now, however, the urgent cry is for ministers in the large sense of the term; men who can gather and foster Christian communities; men who can persuade and direct the intelligent as well as the excitable; men who can perceive the necessities and the opportunities of their environment and of their age; men who can illuminate the perplexed, and minister to the diseased mind; men who add to their experience knowledge, and who go about doing good. These the seminaries might and should furnish.

CHARLES J. LITTLE.

THE GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE,
Evanston, Ill.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

THEORIES OF THE WILL IN THE HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY. By ARCHIBALD ALEXANDER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. viii + 353. $1.50.

FEW treatises on the will have dealt with the subject from a purely historical point of view. Jonathan Edwards knew but little of preceding discussions, and they had extremely small influence upon his thinking. In his *Freedom of the Will* he makes almost no reference to them. Subsequent writers have very generally followed his example. Each new author has seemed determined to work out the problem for himself without help from the past. The common histories of philosophy have given their chief attention to the intellectual part of man, and the will has been comparatively neglected. To learn what has been thought about the will one has been compelled to rummage through many a dusty tome and to disentangle the doctrine, even when he found it, from a portentous network of metaphysics and theology.

Professor Alexander has rendered a valuable service to all investigators. His book is a sort of elementary *Leitfaden* through the earlier history of opinions respecting man's voluntary nature. The author does not expound to us his own views, although his remarks on Kant permit us to guess them. The volume professes to be only preliminary, and prepares the way for another in which we shall be treated to his reasonings and conclusions. Although this method may be disappointing to some, it should be welcomed by all earnest students of philosophy. It is the German method: before attempting a theory of your own, learn all that has been written upon the subject since the foundation of the world.

A work of no greater compass than this could not be expected to deal exhaustively with any single one of the great names of which it treats. The array, indeed, is somewhat appalling. It includes Plato and Aristotle, the Stoics and the Epicureans, St. Paul, the Greek and Latin Fathers, Augustine, Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, Calvin, Episcopius, Bacon, Hobbes, Locke, Berkeley, Hume, Reid, Descartes, Malebranche, Spinoza, Leibnitz, Kant, Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, Schopenhauer, and

Lotze. The conceptions of will held by these writers are presented with varying degrees of fulness, and on the whole we cannot quarrel with the relative importance which Dr. Alexander has assigned to them respectively. In each case the treatment shows large reading, and the brief citations from the originals — which for the sake of the novice we could wish had been accompanied by English translations — are exceedingly judicious and suggestive.

Unless this volume is to be followed by a second devoted to the history of the doctrine, we shall be compelled to criticise the point at which the author closes his account. It is difficult to understand why Jonathan Edwards should have been omitted from the chapter on "Theories of the Will in Christian Theology," and why Lotze's *Medicinische Psychologie* should be included, while such modern writers as Julius Müller and Ernest Naville on the continent, Spencer, Martineau, Solly, Sidgwick, and Green in England, and Hazard, Whedon, James, Ladd, and Bowne in America, should not be mentioned. The statement that the present essay is the first of a series, and the intimation that recent theories of the will have been greatly influenced by the evolutionary philosophy, lead us to hope that our author may be meditating a supplementary historical account of these more modern views.

The importance of the subject is well indicated in the saying of Augustine, "We are nothing else than wills," and to this conclusion our author himself seems to tend. It is interesting to learn that indeterminism dates back to Epicurus, and that in his case materialism did not exclude a belief in freedom. Until recent times, indeed, it may be said that only the knights-errant in theology and philosophy, like Duns Scotus, Episcopius, and Berkeley, have been indeterminists. But the growing sense of personality which naturally results from the Christian revelation has made not only tenable, but necessary, the maintenance of a doctrine of freedom against which our fathers would have fought as utterly inconsistent with the sovereignty of God. With Reid, Kant, and Lotze, we must modify our conceptions of causality so as to leave room for human self-determination, responsibility, and guilt; and our author says well that we must return to Kant, yet must at the same time do Kant's work over again so as to reconcile reason and understanding. Kant certainly approaches the truth when he criticises the determinism of Leibnitz as conceding to man only the freedom of the turnspit, which directs its own movements when it is once wound up.

In our judgment the modern conception of nature as the present manifestation of an infinite mind and will furnishes the key to the problem of freedom. If nature itself is the expression of freedom, then nature cannot give evidence against freedom. Personality is itself freedom, and our freedom alone reveals to us our personality. So far Kant has testified to the truth. He has only obscured the truth when, in his third antinomy, he has set over against his thesis the antithesis: "There is no freedom, but everything in the world happens according to the laws of nature." The laws of nature are only the regular workings of freedom.

There is no conflict between the phenomenal and the noumenal, nor is freedom only noumenal. Will is the only cause, whether noumenal or phenomenal, and in knowing the phenomenal we know the noumenal also. In the words of James Martineau: "The whole illusion of Necessity springs from the attempt to fling out, for contemplation in the field of Nature, the creative new beginnings centered in personal subjects that transcend it;" or, as we should prefer to phrase it, the attempt to reduce the unique and initiatory acts of will to the category of regularity and order.

The subject is important because of its relations both to science and to religion. Biedermann, the German theologian, has indicated the tendency of modern thought when he writes: "Everything is miracle — therefore faith sees God everywhere; nothing is miracle — therefore science sees God nowhere." It is the same thing as to say that science and theology are but different aspects of the same series of events — the one looking upon the series from below, the other from above. The more we study nature, the more shall we discover will, and that, too, a will that is free. If Dr. Alexander will now give us a second volume in which are described Jonathan Edwards and the way in which his determinism has played into the hands of modern agnosticism and materialism, together with the rising tide of ethical thought which has made the view of Edwards no longer tenable, he can then with a good conscience proceed to state in a third volume his own philosophy of the will. *Hic labor, hoc opus est.* Yet so good a beginning as is the present volume would promise a good ending.

AUGUSTUS H. STRONG.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

THE FIRST PHILOSOPHERS OF GREECE. An Edition and Translation of the Remaining Fragments of the Pre-Socratic Philosophers, together with a Translation of the more important accounts of their opinions contained in the early epitomes of their works. By ARTHUR FAIRBANKS. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. vii + 300. $2.

THE rapid growth of interest in the problems of philosophy which has marked the last two decades of academic life in America has naturally been attended by a quickened interest in the history of philosophic thought. In this movement Greek philosophy has received its full share of attention, and is now made the subject of courses of undergraduate study in nearly all colleges and universities. The reasons for this are not far to seek. Not only is a thorough knowledge of Greek philosophy absolutely essential to an understanding of the development of mediæval and modern speculation, but Greek philosophy possesses also a unique value as an introduction to the study of the subject. The types of philosophic thought, both ethical and metaphysical, are here exhibited with a simplicity and clearness nowhere equaled. The beginner can move in this field with comparative ease at a time when he would quite lose his way in the complex systems of modern thought. And it is not merely to the great period of Plato and Aristotle or to the post-Aristotelian schools that one turns for material of instruction. The pre-Socratic thinkers also are seen to constitute an essential moment in the development of European speculation. They grappled with the real problems of philosophy, seeking, as they did, to penetrate beneath appearance to reality, and to view the world-order *sub specie æternitatis*.

Students of early Greek philosophy have been chiefly indebted to the Germans for those philologico-historical investigations on which alone can be based a valid interpretation. The monumental work of Zeller, the critical studies of Diels, as they appear in his *Doxographi Græci*, voluminous contributions by other writers who have devoted themselves to this period, as well as many articles in the *Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie*, constitute a rich mine of wealth from which the student may draw. In addition to these sources may be mentioned Tannery's *Science hellène*, published in 1887, and Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy*, which appeared in 1892, and which offers, together with an extended exposition, an English translation of the chief fragments.

In the present volume Mr. Fairbanks has supplemented the last-

mentioned work in several important particulars. He presents to the reader (*a*) the Greek text of the fragments, accompanied by a translation; (*b*) the translation of the most important passages in Plato and Aristotle which relate to the pre-Socratics; and (*c*) translations from the epitomes of the doxographists. The student is thus offered in the body of the work the materials for a study at first hand of the development of the early Greek systems of philosophy. In an extended appendix an excellent account of the sources is given, with a critical estimate of their relative values. Finally, the volume is equipped with elaborate indices of sources, and of subjects both in Greek and English. No pains have been spared to make the book a convenient and serviceable one.

The philosophers treated are Thales, Anaximander, Anaximines, Heracleitus, Xenophanes, Parmenides, Zeno, Melissus, the Pythagoreans, Empedocles, and Anaxagoras. It will be observed that no account whatever is taken of the atomists. The reasons for this omission are doubtless our lack of knowledge concerning Leucippus, whose very existence has been doubted, and the fact that Democritus' birth, as Diels has shown, cannot be placed earlier than 460 B. C., while his theory of knowledge shows such clear traces of sophistic influence as to warrant one in excluding him from the earlier period. But it is practically certain that the atomic theory existed, in outline at least, before the time of Democritus. If Leucippus was not its author, someone else was. In the absence of any other credible founder of the school, and in view of the statements of Aristotle and Theophrastus, both of whom regard him as the real originator of the system, one wishes that Mr. Fairbanks had included Leucippus in his treatment, and given us the interesting passages that relate to his speculations. This would have rounded out the treatment of the pre-sophistic period and completed the survey of the various attempts to mediate between the opposing systems of Parmenides and Heracleitus.

In attempting an estimate of the author's success one must recognize the nature of the task which he had set himself. This was mainly philological, and he has discharged it with painstaking scholarship. The result is a generally satisfactory text of the fragments and a quite literal translation. The chief defects are a certain lack of literary quality and a failure to give a spirited reproduction of the philosophical content of some passages. In these respects he is often less happy than Mr. Burnet (not "Burnett," as frequently appears in the text). As an illustration of the difference one may compare the translations

of Heracleitus, Frag. 4: *κακοὶ μάρτυρες ἀνθρώποισι ὀφθαλμοὶ καὶ ὦτα, βαρβάρους ψυχὰς ἐχόντων.* Mr. Fairbanks renders: "Eyes and ears are bad witnesses for men, since their souls lack understanding" (pp. 24, 25). Mr. Burnet translates: "Eyes and ears are bad witnesses to men, if they have souls that understand not their language." This rendering most happily reproduces the philosophical meaning, which is that for true knowledge one must appeal, not to the senses, but to reason, their judge and arbiter. The point of view of Frag. 13—*ὅσων ὄψις ἀκοὴ μάθησις, ταῦτα ἐγὼ προτιμέω*—appears to be similar. I think Mr. Fairbanks quite misses the mark in rendering, "What can be seen, heard, and learned, this I prize" (p. 27). As it stands, without the interrogative form which Schuster gives it, it may be translated: "I prize these things above what can be seen, heard, and learned by report." This not only gives *προτιμέω* its proper force, but also yields a meaning in consonance with Heracleitus' scorn for the kind of knowledge that depends upon sense-perception or traditional and popularly accepted views. Among infelicities in the English rendering of other fragments of Heracleitus may be mentioned "bad art" for *κακοτεχνίην* (17, p. 20), "bending back" for *παλίντροπος* (45, p. 37), "one which is divine" for *ἑνὸς τοῦ θείου* (91, p. 47), "a wall" for *τείχεος* (100, p. 47), and "to whomever they go mad and share the revel" for *ὅτεῳ μαίνονται καὶ ληναίζουσι* (127, p. 53). In the text of Xenophanes, Frag. 5, it seems difficult to justify the adopted reading *ἐοθῆτα* as preferable to *αἴσθησιν*. It is not an easy matter to translate Parmenides satisfactorily, but a stronger sense of the rights of the English reader to clear-cut and perspicuous sentences would have aided in the task. In Anaxagoras (6, p. 241) one reads: "But nothing different is like anything else, but in whatever object there are the most, each single object is and was most distinctly these things." This surely gives the impression of something either untranslated or utterly untranslatable. But not to multiply examples of what sometimes seems a slavish and indefensible literalism, the book is, in spite of all defects, a most important contribution to philosophical literature, and is not likely soon to be superseded. It will prove a boon to many teachers and students who, not content to take their interpretations of the early Greek philosophers at second hand, desire to construct them for themselves out of the actually existing remains of the classical world.

WALTER G. EVERETT.

BROWN UNIVERSITY,
Providence, R. I.

SPINOZA IN DEUTSCHLAND. Gekrönte Preisschrift. Von DR. MAX GRUNWALD. Berlin: Calvary & Co., 1897. Pp. iv+380. M. 7.20.

THIS book certainly quickens the modern interest in statistics. It comprises in all three hundred eighty closely printed pages, of which eighteen are given to a preface and ninety-seven to notes, bibliographies, index, etc., and within these limits it treats individually, under separate headings, the Spinozism or anti-Spinozism of one hundred three persons and collectively the relations to Spinoza of more than a dozen groups or schools. To each separate heading an average of a little over two pages has been allowed, but such as Mosheim, Rappolt, Stolle, Brucke, Arnold, Jean Paul, Haeckel, and Geiger get only a few lines, some only three or four, while Leibnitz gets seven pages, Edelmann over twelve, Herder over six, Goethe nearly ten, Schiller six, Kant over five, Fichte six, Auerbach four, Schleiermacher six, Schelling over eighteen, Hegel nine, Herbart over two, Schopenhauer and von Hartmann about six each, and Nietzsche about three. And as to the number of references and quotations, suffice it to say that this is very large, and with all the other signs gives evidence of a prodigious amount of reading and research.

Judged more internally — although statistics are not altogether superficial — Dr. Grunwald's *Preisschrift* is an unusually successful bit of just such investigation as competition for a prize is likely to bring forth, having alike the merits and the defects of such a competition. Thus, it realizes the still vigorous, although, according to some, the now passing, ideal of thoroughly working a particular field hitherto untouched, or at least only very superficially gone over; and it is also an intelligent as well as a faithful research. Although at times, as might be expected under all the circumstances, Spinozism seems to have been confused with the mere mention of the philosopher's name or use of his terms, in the main the understanding of the book is much deeper. Its historical sense is good; its perspective is fairly true, as the figures above will show; its appreciation of Spinoza himself is above any dependence on mere method and jargon, from which so many writers on Spinoza have not been able to free themselves; and, as still further evidence of its intelligence, it both seems and is timely, Spinoza's monistic philosophy being in remarkable sympathy with some of the strongest tendencies of current thought.

But that good historical sense and accurate perspective may be faults as well as virtues in a book is true in general, and is conspicu-

ously true of Dr. Grunwald's investigation, which is, as implied already, too objective, or, let us say, too "scientific." It is seriously lacking in spontaneity. To explore a new field, however accurately and completely, is not the end, although it may be the beginning or forerunner, of originality. Committees on prize essays, like committees examining for the doctor's degree, are naturally, or necessarily, prone to confuse originality with accuracy of method and newness of material, but originality is always something more, and this something more is just what Dr. Grunwald has failed to realize. The very objectivity of his science has made it phenomenalistic. So, although faithful and "scientifically" successful, and also although wholly bound neither to the conventional understanding of Spinozism nor to the purely philosophical field of its influence, the research, *Spinoza in Deutschland*, is disappointing. At least it must disappoint any who really believe in Spinoza; not perhaps in the letter, but in the spirit, of that saying which Dr. Grunwald has quoted on his title-page: "Non dico me optimam invenisse philosophiam, sed veram me intelligere scio." Well written and very much more readable than most books that have so many divisions and headings, it is still only a contribution to material science; it is not a contribution, or at least not a direct contribution, to thought.

In the preface we are told that the judges who "crowned" the research found in it "eine vollständige Geschichte des Spinozismus in Deutschland," accomplished through the greatest industry and maturest judgment. Especially have they recognized and appreciated that the author has included in his work, not only the philosophers, but even the poets, "einen Grillparzer, Lenau u. s. w." But this extension of the field, while it does imply some freedom from the letter of Spinozism, does not in itself save the book from the criticism here made upon it, and the judges themselves seem to have felt the difficulty that we feel, although they expressed themselves from a different standpoint. Thus they objected to the author treating Spinozism as a known quantity. "Als ein schwerwiegender Fehler . . . . muss es bezeichnet werden, dass die Lehre Spinozas als bekannt vorausgesetzt wird, so dass die Arbeit sofort *in medias res* geht." At this time, when in so many ways there is a return to Spinoza, and with the return discovery and reinterpretation, to take him and his philosophy for granted, to give less than ten pages (pp. 4–13) in answer to the question, "Wer war und was lehrte Spinoza?" was, indeed, a serious mistake, putting the author's critical discussions quite in the air and

greatly intensifying the phenomenalistic character of the work as a whole. Forsooth, is Spinozism so fixed a quantity that the study of its history in Germany is to have no enlightening effect upon it? Are the German poets and philosophers not also interpreters? Finally, then, although Dr. Grunwald has shown us so well that Spinoza has made a mark in Germany far more widely and deeply than even his most devoted friends have imagined, and although he has told us very fully who the men influenced were, he has not done a philosopher's complete duty to Spinozism itself. Spinoza has made his mark, and the present day is peculiarly interested in Spinozism; but *seriously*, who was Spinoza and what did he teach?

ALFRED H. LLOYD.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

DIE WELTANSCHAUUNG EINES MODERNEN CHRISTEN. Von C. A. FRIEDRICH. Leipzig: Verlag von W. Friedrich, 1898. Pp. viii + 255. M. 4.

THE author holds that a "modern" Christian cannot adopt the view of the world which prevailed in the Middle Ages. He is obliged to transform it so that it may harmonize with the established results of recent investigations. The traditional views are received with skepticism by the thinker; hence they are subjected to severe tests in order to make them authenticate themselves. The author does not take up historical and biblical criticism, but confines his investigation to the demands made on Christian faith by natural science. "I should regard myself fortunate if my book helped to reconcile modern thought and the old faith in an invisible world with which the visible is connected, from which it proceeds, and to which it returns. It is innate for man to believe that, although the earth is his mother, he yet has something in himself which emanated not from his mother, but from some other source, and that therefore this other source must exist."

Natural science strives to overcome the dualism which sees different essences in mind and matter. But the monism at which it aims cannot be satisfied with materialism. The hypothesis that matter is ultimate fails to explain the universe. Matter must be endowed with all the qualities which exist in mind in order to interepret man; but with this endowment it ceases to be what we call matter. The higher can proceed from the lower only if the lower contains the higher. The substance or force which explains the universe must contain

potentially all that appears in that universe during the process of evolution.

Empirical investigation is not ultimate for the intellect. Science cannot but admit that certain forces are at work behind the phenomena witnessed, forces whose conditions of operation are in part known (natural laws), but whose essence is unknown. "Behind what we see something exists which we do not see." Unless this is so, whence the tendency of natural objects to develop? Rejecting dualism, how are we to conceive the substance in which inheres the power to develop the universe? He answers that we do not have the primitive substance either in the body of man or in his spirit; that which is primitive consists of that which is identical in both, which they have in common. This he calls "life," using life in the general sense which makes all that exists partake of it. All that is has life, but all objects do not have an equal share of life.

This primitive substance, primitive power, primitive life, is God. He is personal. From him all life proceeds, to him all life returns. He posits other individualities and personalities, and gives them an existence in a measure independent of himself. Beings made in the likeness of God have the power of self-determination. It is thus evident that, while all life comes from God, we have neither a pantheism like the system of Spinoza, nor the reign of absolute necessity, as in the case of materialism.

It would require too much space to follow the author in the process of developing all being from the original Life. He everywhere accepts what science has demonstrated; then he aims to show that there is still a place for God, for religious faith and aspiration, and for the hope of immortality. Man's religious tendencies in all stages of culture must be accounted for no less than natural phenomena. The author's presuppositions, of course, lie beyond the realm of demonstration; but so do those of materialists. Those of the author have the advantage of explaining the facts, which those of materialism do not. The volume is largely speculative, and from the nature of the case must be; but the conclusions and demands of science are everywhere considered.

The volume closes with three chapters which are an appeal to make education subserve the highest interests of man. Science has too much ignored the nature and claims of humanity, and has promoted the anti-religious trend. The church, the author thinks, is too much involved in the beliefs of the Middle Ages to meet the intellectual demands of the times. Cannot the state give the enlightenment

needed, and uplift humanity to the attainment of its goal? Unless the universities exalt man instead of promoting agnosticism and atheism, revolution seems unavoidable. "Reform or revolution" is the alternative. The reform must begin with the universities. The education and character of the "upper classes" must be better, and these classes must themselves become Christian, or the social problem will not be solved in a humane way. "Our universities do not train men who know what they ought to do and what they want. This is our curse. Hence the political and social distraction." Education should aim to enable man to attain his destiny, which destiny is not in material things, but in God. "Everywhere ferment. Everywhere evidences of the dawning of a new era. The old notions are fading away. Whoever loves his people and believes in the exalted destiny of humanity and of the human personality ought to do his part in substituting for the vanishing beliefs new and abiding ones, permeated throughout with the truth."

The volume is to be commended particularly to those whose faith has been shaken by the materialistic trend in science. It does not give a new scientific basis for religious faith, but it gives convincing evidence that for man natural science is not ultimate, but a faith which springs from his nature and satisfies the demands of his intellect and his heart.

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

CHRISTIANITY AND ANTI-CHRISTIANITY, in Their Final Conflict. By SAMUEL J. ANDREWS. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898. Pp. 356. $2.

FOR over thirty years students of the New Testament have been using *The Life of Our Lord upon Earth*, by Samuel J. Andrews, and whatever comes from that writer's pen deserves the candid attention of Christian scholars. His new book is ample in learning, and written in the calm, dispassionate style of one whose conclusions are fixed and irrevocable. Yet not since Nordau's *Degeneration* was put into English dress have American students been presented with so sweeping and relentless an indictment of the entire fabric of modern civilization. Here is pessimism, not as a mood, but as a settled principle, grounding itself in obscure passages of Scripture, frankly deploring all modern education, literature, science, and art, seeing the entire world on the

down grade, and having no hope save in the catastrophic ending of the world-order by the visible advent of our Lord.

The great evil of our time, he declares, is the modern pantheistic philosophy. This philosophy has led inevitably to the doctrine of the divine immanence, which is a virtual denial of human sinfulness; it leads thus to the deification of humanity, and to the multitudinous errors of modern biblical criticism, modern science, and modern literature. Of modern biblical study the writer says: "It is a striking illustration of the separation between the Head and the church, that after eighteen centuries its scholars are going back to the records of his earthly life to find out who he was!" He declares Godet's preliminary discussions in his commentary on John to be mischievous, for "the natural effect is to awaken doubts in our minds." "Almost any modern commentary is an illustration of the critical spirit of the times, and of the perplexity which it brings to the common reader." Modern science, he affirms, is directly preparing the way for Anti-Christ. It exalts unchanging law, whereas "the only permanent law we know is that of change — a perpetual flux." Modern literature is full of the dangerous spirit of democracy, "which makes humanity the center of all thought." It leads directly to Christian socialism, which aims at improving man's condition on this earth. Carlyle, Tennyson, Browning, as well as all the novelists of the century, exalt humanitarianism above Christianity, and the periodical press even "accepts the principle that whatever a man thinks he may express."

And this process will not be arrested by any human effort. "The supremacy of Satan, as the prince and god of this world, will continue to the end." "Literature must take on itself more and more an anti-Christian character." "The growth of democracy serves to prepare the way of the Anti-Christ." "We hear many voices crying out against the subjection of woman to man." The Parliament of Religions, the polychrome Bible, the Salvation Army, and the civic church are ominous signs of the times. The vaunted "brotherhood of the nations" will probably have Anti-Christ as its head.

The reader will find in this carefully written volume the extreme premillennarian view set forth with a wealth of quotation, and with that logical relentlessness which renders the theory impregnable to some minds, and incredible to others. Every chapter teems with citations, but scarcely a single author is mentioned save in condemnation, not one tendency in modern Christianity is approved, not one writer or worker of the nineteenth century is named as truly representing Chris-

tianity, and the entire horizon is shrouded in a horror of great darkness. The writer has done substantial service in showing the necessary sequences of a certain system of scriptural interpretation.

W. H. P. FAUNCE.

GREATER NEW YORK, N. Y.

DIE FÜNF MEGILLOTH. Erklärt von KARL BUDDE, ALFRED BERTHOLET, G. WILDEBOER. (="Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament," Lieferung 6.) Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1898. Pp. xxiv + 202. Subscriptionspreis M. 2.70; Einzelpreis M. 4.

THE scope and purpose of this new commentary on the Old Testament are set forth in the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY for 1898, pp. 658 ff., where the volume on Proverbs is reviewed. The present volume contains Canticles, by Budde; Ruth, by Bertholet; Lamentations, by Budde; Ecclesiastes and Esther, by Wildeboer. Each book is provided with a brief introduction and a compendious commentary.

Canticles is treated by Budde along the lines indicated by his article in the *New World*, March, 1894. His view is that the book is a collection of wedding songs parallel to those still sung in Syria. This implies the rejection of all attempts at a dramatic understanding, and naturally of all attempts at allegorical interpretation. The introduction here given, after discussing the place of the book in the canon, sets forth the author's theory. Of an allegorical purpose on the part of the author he finds not the slightest trace, but he gives in outline the history of interpretation in this direction. So at greater length he recounts the dramatic hypotheses. His own view is not far from that of Herder and Reuss. The Solomonic authorship is given up. Linguistic indications point to a late date, probably the Greek period.

The exposition seems to give all that is necessary to the understanding of the text—so far as it can be understood. The author emends freely on conjecture, but apparently with judgment.

In the introduction to Ruth, Bertholet discusses the age and purpose of the book. The former is found to be "relatively late," apparently post-exilic. The purpose is to defend the foreign marriages which were the subject of controversy in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. The exposition gives the reviewer little to remark, except that it meets all reasonable expectations.

Budde, at the opening of the next part, discusses the form and contents of Lamentations, and proceeds to the tradition as to its authorship. This tradition, in its earliest form (2 Chron. 35 : 25), attributes only one *kina* to Jeremiah, the rest being assigned to the singers and songstresses (if the word be allowed). Internal evidence does not favor even so much authorship on the part of Jeremiah. The point of view is throughout quite different from his. Chaps. 2 and 4, however, were written by someone (apparently one of Zedekiah's officers) who was eyewitness of the fall of Jerusalem. The other parts of the book are later. A separate introduction is provided for each chapter, pointing out its characteristic marks.

Professor Wildeboer is already favorably known by his works on Old Testament introduction, and by the commentary on Proverbs in this same series. The position he takes in regard to the book of Ecclesiastes is sufficiently known from these works. He here dates it about 200 B. C. In describing the book he declines to share Renan's admiration on one hand, or to class it with the philosophy of Schopenhauer on the other. "Not a harmonious whole, not a product of logical thinking, but the honest confession of an earnest man who doubts much that others unreflectingly believe, but who will not give up his childhood's faith"—this is his description of the book. The current optimism which shows itself in the Proverbs is not shared by Koheleth. He is unaffected by the extravagant Messianic expectations which are reflected in the Jewish apocalypses. His reading of history taught him to look for nothing new under the sun. Yet he is not an atheist or a materialist. In his struggle with the problems of the universe he still holds that God is righteous, and that in due time he will act as judge.

The same author gives us the exposition of Esther, which, he says, was written with the purpose of explaining the feast of Purim and of enforcing its observance. The feast itself was probably borrowed from the Babylonians (not the Persians, as heretofore supposed), and the legend which explains it is an old Babylonian myth converted to Hebraism. Esther is Ishtar, Mordecai is Marduk. Their enemy, Haman, reminds one of an Elamitic god, Humman, naturally the enemy of Marduk. The deposed Vashti also appears (or her name appears) in Elamitic mythology. The details may be read in our author's introduction. They come primarily from Professor Jensen, who will probably publish his theory in full before long. The outline already given makes us desire more.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST COLLEGE,
Amherst, Mass.

DAS DEUTERONOMIUM. Übersetzt und erklärt von LIC. DR. CARL STEUERNAGEL, Privatdozent der Theologie in Halle a. S. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. xlii + 130. M. 3.20. (= "Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," herausgegeben von Dr. W. Nowack, ord. Prof. d. Theol. in Strassburg im Elsass. I. Abtheilung: *Die historischen Bücher*, 3. Band, 1. Theil.)

IN writing this commentary on Deuteronomy, Dr. Steuernagel is upon familiar ground. His two treatises, *Der Rahmen des Deuteronomiums*, 1894, and *Die Entstehung des deuteronomischen Gesetzes*, 1896,[1] have introduced him to the world of scholars, and this new work will undoubtedly serve to enhance his reputation. The commentary proper is concise, and yet sufficiently full to explain most of the points upon which the ordinary student would need light. It is an occasion for thankfulness that the space at the disposal of the author did not permit him to introduce long-drawn-out etymological discussions, nor to seek to controvert the opinions of his predecessors. The monumental work of Dillmann will not be displaced by this new book, but there can be no doubt that, with its generally lucid style, its freedom from parentheses and references to the views of other authorities, and its moderate price withal, this commentary will win for itself a place in the field of Old Testament science.

In the translation which accompanies the commentary the author has succeeded in turning the Hebrew into good idiomatic German. In his treatment of the text he adopts a large number of what seem to us uncalled-for emendations, on the authority chiefly of the Samaritan Pentateuch and of the Septuagint. For the difficult passage in 32: 5, for which Driver could do no better than to follow Oettli and render, "Corruptly has dealt toward him — not his sons are their blemish — a twisted and crooked generation," our author reads with Samaritan and LXX, שִׁחֲתוּ לֹא לוֹ בָּנֵי מוּם, and then by cutting out לֹא, which is only a variant of לוֹ, he secures the very satisfactory translation: "Gefrevelt haben gegen ihn die Schändlichen, etc." The suggestion that in the obscure passage 18:8*b* we should read לְבַד מִכְּמָרִים עַל הָאֹבוֹת "ausgenommen Götzenpriester samt den Totenbeschwörern," is also ingenious and worthy of mention.

Questions of geography, archæology, and biblical theology receive but slight consideration. In this respect the book is much less valuable

[1] See AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, April, 1897, pp. 386–9.

than Driver's commentary, and even with the limited space at his disposal our author might have made a more useful book if he had been willing to curtail his discussions of minute literary analysis and to devote more space to these important topics.

But it is perhaps unfair to criticise the book at this point, for it is plain that both commentary and introduction have been written to set forth and defend the author's views as to the origin and composition of the book of Deuteronomy, and its relation to the historical and religious development of the Jewish people.

In the long introduction[2] the author gives a comprehensive statement of his views and of his reasons for them, and in the commentary itself applies his principles, and sets forth the results of his analysis, by the employment of no less than eight different kinds of type in the translation. His thesis is that the deuteronomic law-book upon which the reform of Josiah was based is not a unity, but that it is the result of a process of growth extending over more than half a century. The clue to the analysis of this deuteronomic law-book, 4 : 44—30 : 20, is furnished by the use, now of the second person singular, now of the second person plural, as forms of direct address, in the introductory chaps. 5–11. On the basis of this distinction these chapters may be divided into two parts, each of which furnishes an introduction to a distinct body of laws. In the introduction which uses the second singular (Sg.), Moses is represented as prefacing his promulgation of the law by a hortatory address to the people when they were on the point of crossing the Jordan, urging them to continue faithful in their service of Jehovah. The same author also supplemented the law with an address in which blessings were promised for obedience and curses were threatened for disobedience. The introduction in which the second person plural (Pl.) is used represents Moses as telling the people how he came to be the recipient of the divine laws, and as warning them against idolatry. According to this author the address was delivered at Horeb shortly after the command to leave Horeb had been received.

Each of these introductions has its own body of laws, but while those of Sg. are comparatively homogeneous and use throughout the second person singular, those of Pl. use now the second person plural, now the second person singular, and sometimes have no formula of address. The nucleus of both of these collections is to be found in the law demanding the centralization of worship (chap. 12),

[2] xlii, not lxii, pages, as the transposition of x and l on the last page of the introduction makes it read.

which is probably a recapitulation of an edict of Hezekiah, whose recorded efforts to reform the cult (2 Kings 18:4) are regarded as historical; the law with regard to the treatment of an inciter to idolatry; the law as to the court of last resort; and, finally, the law in regard to the cities of refuge. This primary collection which appears in the recensions of both Sg. and Pl. is regarded as having been composed probably at the suggestion of Hezekiah. It was taken up and worked over and largely supplemented by Sg., a writer living about 690 B. C., or at any rate in the reign of Manasseh. At about the same time this collection was united with a distinct body of laws dealing with family relations into a collection called the laws of the "elders," from the frequent mention of the city elders. These laws of the elders were taken up by Pl., an author living about 670 B. C., and united with a number of other laws, among them being certain war laws, and "abomination" oracles. Still later, probably about 650 B. C., these laws, with their introductions and conclusions, were united by a redactor of the reform party into one book. Owing to adverse circumstances it was not promulgated at the time, but was laid away in the temple and lost, to be discovered at a later date by Hilkiah and made the basis of the reforms of Josiah.

After the reform of Josiah, but before the exile, this law-book (D^1) was provided with a historical narrative describing the last days and death of Moses (D^2). In the course of time it was united with the Hexateuch document known as JE, and still later, in the days after the exile, this consolidated document was united with P. During these years, and especially in consequence of the union with other documents, Deuteronomy was being gradually enlarged until it assumed the form in which we now have it. Apart from the Decalogue, two of the most important independent addresses are the Song and Blessing of Moses. The Song originated in the days of Deutero-Isaiah, but was provided with an introduction, 31:16–22, 24–30, and a conclusion, 32:44–47, after the close of the exile, and incorporated in the book of Deuteronomy. The Blessing, 33:1–29, consists of an introduction, vss. 2–5, a conclusion, vss. 26–29, and the blessing proper, vss. 6–25. This blessing was written in the northern kingdom in the days of Jeroboam II. After the exile, however, vss. 2–5 and 26–29, which originally formed one psalm, were separated from each other and made to serve as introduction and conclusion respectively to the blessing. In this form it was inserted probably after the time of Rp. in the book of Deuteronomy.

As a result of Steuernagel's labors, we are led to the conclusion,

therefore, that the document D or D^1 is not essentially a unity, as has usually been supposed, but is rather a collection of the productions of a school of reformers.

The relationship of the various documents is not considered at length in this book, as the introduction to the Hexateuch is to appear in connection with the commentary on Joshua. But the order of documents which is fast becoming traditional, viz., JE, D, P, is assumed. Our author is of the opinion that the Decalogue did not form a part of the original deuteronomic law-book, but that it is a later composition which was afterward inserted in Deuteronomy and copied from Deuteronomy in Exodus. He also holds that the "book of the Covenant," as a literary document, was unknown to D^1, and is inclined to believe that the resemblance between the laws of Sg. and the laws collected in Ex., chap. 34, is due to the fact that the authors of the two collections were familiar with the same customs. It cannot be determined whether Sg. used J or E or JE as the authority for his account of the wanderings, but it is insisted that both Pl. and D^2 knew and used E and E alone.

The concluding portion of the introduction is a valuable table of the vocabulary and peculiar idioms of the book of Deuteronomy. The author has made a list of no less than eighty-nine words which are used either alone or in connection with other words in certain set phrases. This table with its references is very full, and the attempt is made in it to classify the various usages of Sg., Pl., D^2, and R. Steuernagel asserts, it is true, that he regards the linguistic argument as of only secondary value, but there is no doubt that in more than one case this argument has been the determining one in his analysis.

There is unquestionably a strong attraction about this theory which shows us the deuteronomic law growing up, as it were, under our very eyes, and if we had any external evidence that Sg. and Pl. were actual men, or that these various collections grew up as the result of the formulation of royal edicts and prophetic and priestly discussions, it might be possible to believe that later additions which are left entirely unaccounted for to the amount of between 150 and 160 verses, or about one-sixth of the whole book, were made by many unknown and irresponsible copyists. But when we have only the finished work, we must confess that we are unequal to the strain which is put upon our imagination. Furthermore, the very difficulty of making the decision between Sg. and Pl., and the not infrequent resort to the theory of interpolations to account for the presence particularly of Pl. in Sg. sections, taken together with the fact that, with the exception of the law

with regard to the centralization of worship, nearly every law which is assigned to the Pl. collection which has the formula of address at all has the address in the second person singular, do not increase our confidence in the correctness of the theory. The analysis of 17:8–13 must suffice to illustrate the violent methods which must sometimes be employed. To Pl. are assigned 8*a*, 9, with the exception of the reference to the Levitical priests, 11*a*^{B} *b*, 12, omitting the reference to the priests who stand before Jehovah; to Sg. 8*b*, 10*b*. According to Sg. the court of last resort is the central sanctuary, according to Pl. it is the judge, probably the judge κατ' ἐξοχήν, the king. As a result of the process of amalgamation and redactional glosses, two laws which seem to be mutually contradictory are united into one law, which is usually interpreted as presupposing "a supreme tribunal composed partly of Levitical priests, partly of lay judges."

But whatever may be thought of our author's theory as to the origin of the book, we gladly acknowledge that he has made a valuable contribution to the subject, and hope that he and others who shall be stimulated by his example may lead us nearer to the solution of the problem.

It only remains to add that the book is admirably printed, and, with the exception of a few slips in citations, and the dropping of the ב before לֵילִים on p. 119, l. 8 from the bottom, is unusually free from typographical errors.

WALTER R. BETTERIDGE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

DIE SPRÜCHE. Uebersetzt und erklärt von LIC. DR. W. FRANKENBERG. PREDIGER UND HOHESLIED. Uebersetzt und erklärt von DR. THEOL. C. SIEGFRIED. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. iv+170 and iv+126. M. 6. (="Handkommentar zum Alten Testament," herausgegeben von Dr. Theol. A. Nowack, ord. Prof. der Theol. in Strassburg im Elsass. II. Abtheilung: *Die poetischen Bücher*, 3. Band, 1. und 2. Theil.)

THE "Handkommentar" of Nowack is already favorably known, and this volume seems to maintain the standard set by the earlier issues. Pastor Frankenberg we have not met before. The present work is a good testimonial to his capability, though his subject gives less room for originality than some other parts of the Old Testament. His introduction takes the position now generally accepted, namely: that the Wisdom literature belongs altogether in the post-exilic period. More particularly (and in this he can hardly count on unanimous support)

he says that the book of Proverbs in its finished form is not older than Sirach. Parts of the book, however, he is willing to date earlier. In questions of textual criticism the author of the commentary gives comparatively little weight to the Greek translation.

Professor Siegfried, well known to Old Testament students, is especially happy in his treatment of Ecclesiastes. As a connoisseur of post-biblical Hebrew he is able to give an instructive discussion of the grammatical phenomena of the book, which he, like all recent scholars, makes to be the latest Old Testament book in point of time.

The commentary will attract most attention by its literary criticism. The contradictory declarations of Koheleth make it impossible (in Siegfried's mind) to attribute it all to one author. The skeptic to whom we owe the body of the book is really a skeptic. "He, a thinker of iron consistency, does not shrink from showing things in the cold clear light of reality in which he himself sees them." His light (such as he had) came from Greek philosophy. But this light was rather darkness to some of his readers. These, therefore, became glossators of his work, endeavoring to correct or to counteract the avowals of his book by numerous insertions. Three of these glossators can be clearly distinguished, while various fragments may be assigned to a fourth — though possibly these may not all come from the same hand. The analysis is made clear to the eye by the different type in which the translation is printed. I must confess that the impression made upon myself is quite strong in favor of the analysis.

In his treatment of the Song of Songs, Siegfried ranges himself on the side of Reuss and Budde. His full discussion of the dramatic theory results in its rejection in all its forms. The conclusion is that Canticles is a *catena* of Palestinian wedding songs. This is also the position of the other recent commentary, that of Budde in Marti's series, which is noticed above, on p. 356.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST COLLEGE,
Amherst, Mass.

SOUVENIRS DE TERRE-SAINTE. Par LUCIEN GAUTIER. Seconde édition, avec 60 illustrations d'après des photographies de M^me^ Lucien Gautier. Lausanne: Georges Bridel & C^ie^, 1898. Pp. 348.

TWO CONSIDERATIONS, apart from the merits of the work itself, will help us to understand why a second edition of this book of travels in the Holy Land has been called for. They are the prevailingly Roman

Catholic stamp upon most of the French literature of this kind, and the relative meagerness of books in French upon this theme as compared with the number and variety to be found in English or German.

M. Gautier's *Souvenirs* will be attractive because of its fascinating style, and because he has gone over parts of the land not visited by the ordinary tourist. Notably is his description of the land of the Philistines full of freshness and charm. There is just that admixture of the personal element with discussions of biblical references and descriptions of scenery which keeps one reading on to the end. M. Gautier has not written without a knowledge himself of what students have done, but the whole is so presented as to give one a clear, vivid picture of actual present conditions. In seeing them one is made at the same time to see their relation to the past. One chapter is thus devoted to Michmash and its gorge; another to Carmel; another to the region west of the Jordan in northern Galilee; and still another to the Phœnician coast. Gautier purposely omits Jerusalem, since this has been so well described by one of his countrymen and pupils. We regret that he, too, has not, with others, given us a picture of the city. The whole is beautifully illustrated by sixty photographs, and is carefully indexed.

J. S. RIGGS.

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Auburn, N. Y.

EINLEITUNG IN DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Von F. I. TRENKLE. Freiburg i. B.: Herder'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung; St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1897. Pp. xi + 487. Bound, $2.70.

THE author of this book belongs to the Roman Catholic church. His work displays comprehensive learning and is written in a pleasant style; but it does not conduce to a real knowledge of the scientific problems with which New Testament introduction has to deal, much less does it contribute in any degree to their solution. This is prevented by the author's subjection to the traditions of his church. The information he gives in regard to the various views of recent criticism is mere embellishment, and leads to no real understanding of those views or their grounds; and the very superficial attempts at refuting them, so far as such attempts are made, would enable no one to overcome doubts raised by criticism.

After a brief sketch of the history of the science of introduction, in which, as a matter of course, Catholic writers play the foremost part, little as they have really worked in this department, the author begins with the Pauline epistles. In treating of the second epistle to the

Thessalonians there is certainly something said as to doubts of its genuineness, but of the main difficulty, in connection with the apocalyptic ideas in chap. 2, we hear nothing. What is said concerning the false teachers who are combated in the epistle to the Galatians gives no hint of the real question which is discussed in that epistle. The important question as to the character of the parties in the church of Corinth is passed over with few words, and no real view whatever is presented of the sharp discussions which have been had in regard to the events intervening between the writing of the two epistles. It is extremely interesting to note the cautious way in which the author expresses himself in regard to the founding of the Roman church. Of course, he no longer dares to uphold its foundation by Peter, but only commends this as a "tradition worthy of respect." Unhappily science must ask, not if a tradition be worthy of respect, but if it be true. As to the epistle to the Hebrews, the author merely goes back to Origen's view, that the thought is Paul's and the expression that of a disciple and friend. That is certainly no "tradition worthy of respect," but only the great Alexandrian's way of escaping a difficulty by reconciling his scientific insight with school tradition, and a very unhappy way, whereby an understanding of the grand epistle is only hindered.

Very singularly the discussion of the Pauline epistles is immediately followed by that of the synoptic gospels, which are, of course, held to proceed directly from the hand of the authors to whom tradition ascribes them. To show this, even in regard to the gospel of Matthew, the author requires less than half a page. In regard to the so-called synoptical question the most familiarly known views are given, without our getting any kind of insight into their motives, no solution of the problem being attempted. The Acts of the apostles is next taken up, and little more than two pages suffice for discussing the subject of its sources; then the Apocalypse, the fixing of whose date still remains an obscure question. As to the recently raised doubts concerning the unity of this book we get meager information, and no confutation of them is attempted.

The gospel of John, of which even the narrative as to the woman taken in adultery is accepted as genuine, is pretty thoroughly treated so far as its relation to the synoptics is concerned, yet without furnishing anything important on the question of its genuineness. The section treating of the catholic epistles is of the feeblest quality. James is still identified with the apostle James, the son of Alphæus; his epistle, written about 61 or 62 A. D., is possibly addressed to the

whole of Christendom; and it only brings into prominence one of the less generally regarded sides of the teaching of Paul, whose epistles James knows and uses. Only the Protestant doctrine of justification makes the question of the relation of the two apostles on this subject insoluble. Seven pages suffice for the establishment of the genuineness of the first epistle of Peter; the doubts in regard to the second epistle are mentioned on four pages, but nothing is contributed to invalidate them.

In the second book we come to the history of the canon. But one can hardly speak of a history; for from the outset the author treats the New Testament as a collection of sacred writings, which were read in divine worship and stood alongside of the Old Testament Scriptures. What is further given as to the testimony of the Fathers, extending to a hundred pages, is perfectly superfluous and profitless learning. The section treating of the criticism of the canon by Protestant scholars is naturally meager. On the other hand, the second division of the second book, which treats of the text, is a careful and sound piece of work. Wherever the author is engaged merely in compiling and expounding material acquired by learning, he exhibits both scholarship and literary ability; but he is mistaken if he supposes that the study of Scripture is hereby furthered. What good purpose is served by a book of from four to five hundred pages, if the historical understanding of the New Testament is not promoted by it in one single point? Even the most convinced Roman Catholic, who agrees with the author in all his details, will tell him that his understanding of Scripture is not furthered by it; which, however, is of no moment, since his church furnishes that understanding with absolute certainty. What, then, does the author achieve with this so-called introduction? From the Roman Catholic point of view it really answers no purpose.

BERNHARD WEISS.

UNIVERSITY OF BERLIN,
Germany.

FOUR LECTURES ON THE EARLY HISTORY OF THE GOSPELS. Delivered at Milborne Port, Somerset, Advent, 1897. By REV. J. H. WILKINSON, M.A., Rector of Stock Gaylard, Dorset; sometime Lecturer at Queen's College, Oxford. London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. vii + 100. 3s., *net*.

ALL students of the synoptic problem are familiar enough with the statement of Papias that "Matthew composed an account of the sayings

of Christ in the Hebrew dialect." In the four lectures before us Wilkinson proposes to go behind this statement and discover, if possible, what sort of a work Matthew's "Logia" was. He uses principally for this purpose the researches of Harnack and Zahn, and gives us a study full of interest and notable for its ingenuity in putting together the evidence gained from extra-canonical gospels. We can do no more than indicate his conclusions and point out some which will certainly be questioned. And first his conclusion regarding the "Logia." This was "a naïve, simple narrative thrown together in a curious unliterary way, and recounting, now in the person of one apostle and now in that of another, the history, and more particularly the inspired utterances—the 'sayings'—of our Lord Jesus Christ" (p. 13). This conclusion is gained by identifying the "Gospel of the Nazarenes" with the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" and the latter again with the "Gospel according to the Twelve," and making "the Ebionite Gospel" in the main a translation of the Nazarene Gospel according to the Hebrews, with the help of a good translation of the Hebrew Logia, and of Mark's original gospel. There are here almost as many difficulties as there are processes, for there is good reason for not identifying the Gospel according to the Hebrews with the Gospel according to the Twelve, and the statement that the Ebionite Gospel is a translation of the Nazarene Gospel is certainly questionable. Indeed, to treat the Ebionite Gospel and the Gospel according to the Hebrews as though they had equal claim to an antiquity indicated in the heading "The Gospels in Palestine before 100 A. D." is misleading. Whatever may be the real age of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Ebionite Gospel is certainly later than 100 A. D. Dr. Salmon does not hesitate to call it a "third-century forgery." If it cannot be identified with the "Gospel according to the Twelve," then, whatever the general likelihood of Wilkinson's final supposition as to the character of the "Logia," it cannot be established by this method.

The "memoirs of Peter" referred to by Justin Martyr are looked upon by our author as part of the Logia, and he thinks that the "Gospel of Peter" and the Didascalia may both have used this source. These are certainly interesting suggestions, but they need further examination. On p. 26 is given the genealogy of our four gospels and of the four chief uncanonical gospels. It puts the dates of our gospels as follows: John about 100 A. D., the others about 100–115 A. D.

The second lecture considers the gospels in Egypt about 100–150 A. D. It is only a short time since fragments of the Gospel of Peter

were discovered in Egypt, and we all remember what interest the discovery awakened. Wilkinson concludes that the author of the Gospel of Peter was a Gnostic Ebionite, and that the Gospel of Peter was probably a shorter form of the Ebionite Gospel. This, of course, presupposes the earlier date of the Ebionite Gospel. As showing how far it points back to "that part of the Logia in which Peter speaks," it may be well to quote the words of another student of it, who says that "it reveals an acquaintance with all our four gospels apparently without any misgivings as to their equal authority."

Wilkinson's study of the fragments of the Gospel according to the Egyptians leads him to think that its source was the gospel used in 2 Clement; that this gospel was the Greek Logia; and that it was prior to the synoptic gospels. The Gospel according to the Egyptians, he thinks, may have been framed by Basilides, and it was perhaps otherwise known as the "Paradoseis of Matthew." There is no statement in all this which will not be questioned.

The famous "Logia of Behnesa" discovered in 1897 he considers extracts from the Gospel according to the Egyptians. In that case they are closely related to the original Greek Logia of Matthew.

Space is wanting to mark all the positions of this suggestive little book. We are shown the relation of the Greek Logia to the Church of Rome, both from the Muratonian canon and from Justin Martyr, and a careful review of what evidence can be gained from the Syrian church is also made.

The whole is timely, helpful, and stimulating. Well does the author say that "without some external clue it would seem impossible to decide between the conflicting theories regarding the origin of the gospels which various writers, working only from internal evidence, have propounded." Such a study of external evidence as Wilkinson has given us deserves the appreciation of all who know what patience and care its preparation requires.

J. S. RIGGS.

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Auburn, N. Y.

DER PROLOG DES VIERTEN EVANGELIUMS. Sein polemisch-apologetischer Zweck. Von W. BALDENSPERGER, Professor an der Universität Giessen. Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898. Pp. vii + 171. M. 4.40.

PROFESSOR BALDENSPERGER opens with the confession that the "sphinx at the entrance to the fourth gospel has not yet told all her

secrets to any inquirer," and offers a new solution of the riddle in the thesis that the fourth gospel marks the reaction of the church against the definite exaltation of John the Baptist to Messianic rank as the rival of Jesus (pp. 139 f.). In accordance with this thesis, the prologue is interpreted as a polemic against the disciples of the Baptist, showing a steady crescendo in the argument from the οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν and οὐκ ἦν τὸ φῶς of vss. 3 and 8 to the exclusive μονογενής of vss. 14 and 18 (p. 57). In particular, vs. 8 gives the kernel of the argument, the negations of vss. 3 and 8 being in the nature of warnings (pp. 6 ff.), and vss. 9 and 10 are intelligible only as the strongest possible contradictions of the erroneous conception suggested in 8*a*. The setting forth of the relations of the Logos to the human world, from vs. 9 on, serves the purpose, not of adding precision to earlier statements about the Logos, but of correcting false conceptions of the disciples of John (p. 11). Vs. 11 is interpreted of the λόγος ἄσαρκος, and vs. 13 is referred to the miraculous interposition of the Logos (= κύριος) in the birth of Isaac, Jacob, and, in general, of all the patriarchs who were born to fathers of advanced age (pp. 24 f.). The whole section (vss. 9–13) has apparently the purpose to lead readers to appreciate how great a sphere and how long an activity the Logos had before the appearance of John the Baptist (p. 30). Vs. 14 first introduces the incarnation, and because this seems to put the Logos and John on a level as men, the author hastens to assert that the earthly life of the Logos served only to show to men his heavenly glory (p. 14*b*), while the adjective μονογενής sets the incarnate one above all possible rivalry (pp. 31 ff.). The ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν of vs. 15 indicates some sharp contradiction of the Christian claim, which needed just this testimony from the Baptist himself (p. 43), and the πάντες of vs. 16 includes the Baptist and his followers (pp. 44 f.). Vs. 16 concludes from the *Pleroma Christi* the inferiority of John in the history of salvation (p. 47). Vs. 17 expands the thought of vs. 16, and the two halves are not antithetical, but supplementary, the Mosaic law being one grace proceeding from the *pleroma* of the Logos, while, since the fulness dwelt in Jesus Christ, grace and truth are said to have come through him completely (p. 52). The ὁ ὢν εἰς τὸν κόλπον τοῦ πατρός (vs. 18) refers to preëxistence, and, in fact, the characteristic feature of the whole gospel is its celestializing and deifying of the person of Christ, thus elevating the Messianic conception beyond any possible rivalry.

Passing from the prologue to the gospel, Baldensperger finds in the body of the book a systematic depotentiation of John's baptism, and

a counter-emphasis on the blood of Christ as the means of life and cleansing. Thus the foot-washing of 13:1–11, standing as it does at the opening of the story of the passion, is meant to indicate the washing by the dying Christ, that is, in his shed blood (pp. 62 f.). Of course the Cana miracle is interpreted as the displacing of water baptism by the blood of Christ (pp. 61 ff.). John is always introduced simply as a witness to Jesus; hence the absence of the title ὁ βαπτιστής from the gospel. The denial of John's identity with Elijah (1:21) seems to have been occasioned by a belief that he was the ancient prophet returned to earth from his heavenly abode. In fact, the whole argument of the gospel seems directed against opponents who accord Messianic honors to John the Baptist.

This discussion has all the charm of great ingenuity, backed by wide learning; its lack is the failure of any adequate evidence of the existence of so well-defined a Baptist party as this argument requires. The chief evidence for our author is this gospel; for those who find his thesis over-ingenious such evidence is inconclusive. Outside the gospel appeal is made, of course, to Acts, chaps. 18 and 19, where Baldensperger holds that the τὰ περὶ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ which engaged the eloquence of Apollos (Acts 18:25) were the familiar features of the Messianic hope, the name Jesus having been used by the author of the narrative interchangeably with Messiah (pp. 94 f.). These disciples of John were probably the fruit of a mission of John's followers which was prosecuted among the diaspora after the death of John. The conversion of such men as Apollos aroused the jealousy of the John party and precipitated the controversy of which our gospel is a result (p. 106). The issue was the discomfiture of the John party, and their gradual return to the synagogue or their disappearance in some of the minor sects of the second century (p. 108). Our author finds traces of them in the Baptists referred to by Justin Martyr, *Trypho*, chap. lxxx; and also in the *Hemerobaptists* of Hegesippus, the *Apostolic Constitutions*, Epiphanius, and the Talmud. Our author has certainly confirmed the opinion, quite generally held before, that the fourth gospel was directed in part against an over-exaltation of the Baptist; it is when he asks us to believe that these disciples of John were the chief object of the evangelist's polemic, and, consequently, proceeds to predicate of them the characteristics of the Ebionites and other second-century sects, that we are compelled to hesitate and ask for fuller evidence. I still feel that the Logos doctrine is more easily understood in connection with the rest of the gospel as an introduction for Hel-

lenistic readers, notwithstanding Baldensperger's strictures on Harnack (p. 165), and that early tradition is correct in holding that the opposition which the evangelist met was mainly of the Gnostic speculative sort.

RUSH RHEES.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION,
Newton Centre, Mass.

NOTES ON ST. PAUL: CORINTHIANS, GALATIANS, ROMANS. By JOSEPH RICKABY, S. J. London: Burns & Oates, Limited, 1898. Pp. vii+455. 7s. 6d.

THIS book bears the *Imprimatur* of the cardinal archbishop of Westminster, and is interesting as an attempt to popularize St. Paul's letters for Roman Catholic readers. It should prove a successful attempt, for its author brings to his task considerable learning and admirable power of clear and concise expression, and an open mind on all questions that have not been closed for him by authoritative declarations of the church. For some Protestant readers there will be surprise that so great freedom is tolerated, especially in the criticism of the text of the Vulgate. Galatians, chap. 2, in no wise compromises the supremacy of Peter, while the epistle to the Romans was written "not for their need, but for their dignity, as one dedicates a book to a man of great name" (p. 291). The finality of ecclesiastical authority is supported by 2 Cor. 10:5 and Gal. 1:8. The "pledge of the Spirit," in 2 Cor. 1:22, is interpreted of priestly orders. The sacrifice of the mass is found in 1 Cor. 10:17 and 11:25, in the last passage, in obedience to the declaration of the council of Trent. Some particular interpretations call for remark. The author follows Chrysostom and Theodoret in finding in 1 Cor. 7:21 advice to slaves not to run away; the "angels" of 1 Cor. 11:10 are the "ministering angels" of Heb. 1:14; Romans is "really a glorification of the sacramental system, not of free grace away from sacraments" (p. 321); hence we are not surprised to find Rom. 3:26, "him that hath faith in Jesus," needs to be supplemented by Mark 16:16, "and is baptized." Faith throughout is understood of assent to a creed (see the quotation from Aquinas, p. 251), and this leads inevitably to a misunderstanding of the Protestant doctrine of justification (p. 219). In like manner grace is always interpreted sacramentally, an interpretation which reaches its extreme in identifying the ἀγάπη of 1 Cor., chap. 13, with the ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ of Rom. 5:5, and explaining it of "the theological virtue of

charity, which is either identical with, or inseparably attached to, the gift of sanctifying grace, by the possession of which we are said to be in a state of grace" (p. 98); hence the following comment on 1 Cor. 13 : 4–7 : "A man may of course be in the state of grace and commit many venial sins of impatience, unkindness, selfishness, etc.," the author appealing to Luke 13 : 6–9 to indicate the danger of failing long to bear "the fruits of charity" (p. 100). But it must not be understood that such violence of interpretation is characteristic; the general impression of the book is very favorable, and some difficult passages are handled with uncommon skill, notably 2 Cor. 5 : 16 ; Gal. 3 : 20, and the familiar antithesis of "flesh and spirit" (p. 277). The author follows Lightfoot on the order of the epistles he treats, quotes several times from him, and once from Ellicott. Apparently his chief master has been Chrysostom. One feels the lack of adequate introductions to the several epistles. The book is excellently printed. Two type errors, however, have been noticed : P. 34, l. 2 from top, 2 Cor. v. 5 should read 2 Cor. ii. 6 (?), and on p. 407 the heading should read ROMANS xi. 1, not ii. 1. The notes on 2 Cor. 12 : 2–4 and Gal. 1 : 17 need to be brought into agreement concerning the time of Paul's special revelation. There is a good index.

RUSH RHEES.

THE NEWTON THEOLOGICAL INSTITUTION.
Newton Centre, Mass.

EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS. A Practical Exposition. By C. GORE. London : Murray ; New York : Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. x + 278. $1.50.

CANON GORE says in his preface that the "ordinary Christian reading of the Bible is at a standstill ;" academic study of the New Testament has made great headway, but popular appreciation and use of it has fallen badly off. It is, accordingly, his purpose to put the epistle to the Ephesians within easy reach of the average modern reader. The exposition is practical and homiletic. And the line of practical exposition taken is largely "social." The epistle is treated as a body of ethics which deal with the individual only in so far as he is a member of an ideal ethical society, by Paul called the church.

In pursuance of this end, the introduction, in a clear and pleasing way, describes the place of the epistle in its relation to Paul's own mind and to the heathen society he confronted. The body of the book is an easy and flowing exposition. There are no technicalities of

exegesis. The paraphrases, in which the book abounds, are well done. It is plain that the book was preached before it was printed. And the interpretation has the merits of a happy homiletical commentary. The author only once forgets his purpose—in the notes. In the first place, notes to a purely homiletical commentary are nearly as little to be desired as notes to a good sermon. And, in the second place, these notes are very miscellaneous in their character and loose in their construction.

A practical commentary is not to be judged by strict exegetical standards. Yet, after allowance has been made for the needs and methods of effective homiletical interpretation, the author cannot be pardoned for a certain slashing way he has. It is essential that the Bible should be made contemporary with modern readers. But it is equally essential that the modern reader should catch something of the spirit of modern methods. There is no excuse or forgiveness for interpretation that speaks thus: "From time to time St. Paul actually calls Christ God, as in the epistle to the Romans (9 : 5), and probably in the epistle to Titus (2 : 13)." These are the only cases to be found, and both of them have a large amount of exegetical authority against the interpretation which Gore takes. But the author, with his "from time to time" and "as," speaks as if Paul every now and then called Christ God. This is patristic exegesis, and not the only example the book affords.

HENRY S. NASH.

CAMBRIDGE DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Cambridge, Mass.

JOHANNEISCHE STUDIEN. Von WILHELM A. KARL. I. *Der Johannesbrief.* Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898. Pp. vii + 104, 8vo. M. 2.40.

IN form, this little work is a minute study of St. John's first epistle. Eighty pages are devoted to an exposition, verse by verse; this is followed by sixteen pages containing an analysis and a translation, interspersed with explanatory words and phrases, making a very clear paraphrase of the epistle; finally eight pages are devoted to a "Systematic Abridgment of the Contents of the Epistle." Although the study is thus minute and full, the writer disclaims the idea of presenting a complete commentary. "My purpose is," he says, "in brief to give a modest proposal of an essentially new method of exposition of this hitherto truly obscure epistle. . . . . I know very well that my own exegesis bears, in many points, only a hypothetical character. But

without hypotheses we shall gain nothing at all." He finds as the underlying thought of the epistle that which, in an earlier work to which he regards this as supplemental, he has shown to be the central thought of St. Paul's writings—the real indwelling of Christ in the Christian, producing ethical perfection and faith in the Messiah, as well as ecstatic manifestations, and assuring to the Christian eternal life. He holds that the date of this epistle (as well as of the fourth gospel) is not far from that of Paul's principal epistles; and, consequently, that the false teachers who "deny that Jesus is the Christ" are not Cerinthians of the close of the century, but unbelieving Jews who deny the Messiahship of Jesus. He finds throughout references to a previous letter which had been misunderstood, not only in 2:13, 14, but also in 2:21, 26, and other places. The Jewish opponents are inspired by demons; but the Christians by the divine Spirit, with his host of spirits (*Geisterheer*, 4:2). The Holy Spirit is distinct from Christ, and is the means through which Christ works, not indeed moral results, but "ecstatic"—visions, knowledge, faith, assurance. Yet the proof of the divine indwelling is brotherly love, which is the keeping of the commandments, or ethical righteousness.

Pfarrer Karl's exposition is thoroughly independent, and therefore, perhaps, necessarily off from the beaten track, and sometimes strained; but it is honest, reverent, and suggestive.

J. H. BARBOUR.

BERKELEY DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Middletown, Conn.

DER BRIEF DES JUDAS, exegetisch-praktisch behandelt. Von DR. GEORG WANDEL. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1898. Pp. iv + 94. M. 1.40.

AFTER the larger efforts of Spitta and Kühl, this brochure of Wandel's seems small in the amount of material contained and not very weighty in the scholarship displayed; yet it shows an extensive acquaintance with the literature that has gathered around the epistle, and does not fail in evidence of a careful consideration of the critical and exegetical positions which this literature presents. The writer's plan is to make more of the exegesis than of the criticism, and his purpose in the exegesis is to serve the practical theologian, as well as the scientific exegete—a somewhat difficult purpose with such an epistle as Jude's, and one which, we are prepared to find, has not been very largely brought to realization.

. The critical position which is held in the book regarding the epistle is, briefly, as follows: The author is a younger brother of the James who wrote the epistle bearing his name, and, as this James is held to be the James who was head of the Jerusalem church, the Jude of our epistle is necessarily considered a brother of our Lord. The readers are identified with those of the elder brother's letter—the churches of the extended Syrian diaspora. They are here addressed after the death of James had left them without a pastoral head, and, as the epistle, in its recital of the historical examples of punishment inflicted upon the wicked, makes no mention of the fall of Jerusalem, they must have been addressed before this catastrophe took place. The epistle is consequently dated between 62 and 70 A. D. As to its relation to 2 Peter, the way is thus opened to holding it the prior writing, which the ungenuine Petrine letter has largely followed in its plan of composition, and whose statements it has generously reproduced, showing us, indeed, how some of our epistle's difficult passages were interpreted in that early time when 2 Peter is held to have been written. This practically reverses the view of Spitta; though, to a certain extent, it may be said to agree with Kühl's. As to the interesting question of the epistle's errorists, it is claimed that, however their teachings may have been, and doubtless were, based on theoretical principles, and had to do, at some points, with doctrinal beliefs, they were, in their purpose and effect, characteristically practical, affecting life and character in a libertinistic way. They were not formulated into anything of an ordered system, otherwise our epistle would have shown more of a doctrinal polemic in opposition to them; at the same time, they were promulgated in the dogmatic spirit of a propaganda. They are consequently not to be identified with the later scholastic Gnosticism, but to be regarded rather as representing, like other errorists of the apostolic age, a stage merely preliminary to this final system. In fact, they cannot be identified with any known heresy or sect—not even with the Nicolaitans and Balaamites of the Apocalypse (2 : 6, 14 f.). In this respect the priority of Jude to 2 Peter is confirmed; since the latter epistle shows clearly a more developed form of error. This is again directly contrary to Spitta's position and, while it agrees generally with that of Kühl, goes beyond this in the non-identifying of the Jude errorists even with those of the Apocalypse. This naturally wins for the epistle an early date, as von Soden's and McGiffert's ethical classification of the Colossian errorists does for that epistle; though it must remain a query whether, in view of certain significant

passages in the epistle, such an interpretation of the Colossian trouble is altogether justified.

Wandel recognizes a dependence of the author upon extra-canonical sources for his illustrations, as well as upon the Old Testament itself. Such dependence, however, he believes, appears only in the reference to the apostate angels (vs. 6); to Michael's contention with the devil concerning the body of Moses (vs. 9), and to the prophecy of Enoch (vss. 14 f.). The first and last of these illustrations, he holds, are taken from the book of Enoch, which he dates 130–100 B. C., and the other from the *Ascensio Moysis*. This is somewhat less of an extra-canonical relationship for our epistle than most critics maintain.

In the detailed exgesis of our epistle, which occupies the major part of the book, there is shown a carefulness of judgment which is commendable. This is perhaps especially noticeable in the treatment of τῇ ἅπαξ παραδοθείσῃ τοῖς ἁγίοις πίστει (vs. 3); τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν χάριτα μετατιθέντες εἰς ἀσέλγειαν καὶ τὸν μόνον δεσπότην καὶ κύριον ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀρνούμενοι (vs. 4); μνήσθητε τῶν ῥημάτων τῶν προειρημένων ὑπὸ τῶν ἀποστόλων τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (vs. 17).

The indications of a cultus claimed in vss. 20 f. are evidently correct.

He follows the text of Tischendorf's *Ed. acad. XVIII*, which is conformed to his *Ed. crit. VIII*. In consequence of this he reads (vs. 22) ἐλέγχετε before διακρινομένους (with A C*, various minuscules and versions), instead of the Westcott and Hort, Weiss, Weizsäcker, and Revisors' reading ἐλεᾶτε (with B C²). By this he loses, not only a more strongly attested reading, but one which furnishes a better and more fruitful exegetic thought.

The book may scarcely be termed a contribution to the criticism and exegesis of the epistle. It is rather a study of such contributions as have been made, with, however, a wise judgment as to conclusions.

M. W. JACOBUS.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hartford, Conn.

DIE LEHRE DES APOSTELS PAULUS. Von PROFESSOR WILH. SCHMIDT. (= "Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," herausg. von A. Schlatter und H. Cremer, Vol. II, Heft 2.) Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1898. Pp. 125. M. 2.

THE teachings of Paul derived from a careful, sober exegesis of his own words have always a fresh interest. One might think that thus

derived they would always appear the same, but we have only to open the various books on biblical theology of our time to find that these do not all have the same results to offer, even when they are declared to have been reached by an earnest study of the apostle's assertions. This makes part of the interest in each new setting forth of these inexhaustible teachings. Professor Schmidt puts before us his interpretation in compact, concise form. It is well worthy of consideration, and sure, in more than one instance, to provoke discussion. The sources of the Pauline teaching are for him the speeches in the Acts, and nine of the epistles. He excludes the pastoral epistles as too doubtful, and Philemon as not offering material for his purpose. He begins his unfolding of the "Lehre" with the conception of the "righteousness of God," which he interprets as "the righteousness which God gives," and which has always for its "Correlat" salvation. Salvation has a negative and positive side. The former is rescue from death which is separation from God, and the latter is fellowship with God in Christ. There is no such thing in Paul as "the righteousness of God" without the accompanying reality of a salvation which is fellowship with him. This interpretation sets forth clearly a fundamental verity of Paul's thought. When our author passes on to the relation of sin and death, he finds no warrant for an interpretation of "death" — the result of sin — which includes physical death. The term "death" in Paul, when used to express the consequence of sin, is "spiritual death," *i. e.*, separation from God. Nor will he allow that "death" in this latter sense has come upon all men because of Adam's sin. "Geschah es aber deshalb, weil sie alle gesündigt hatten, so geschah es eben damit nicht durch Erbe, sondern durch eigene That" (p. 41). The whole force of the antithesis set forth by Paul between Adam and Christ is in the understanding of purely spiritual issues in the case of each — spiritual death in connection with one, spiritual life in connection with the other. Schmidt finds no such teaching of the atonement in Paul as sanctions substitution. It is "the inexpressible love of Christ" which wins men.

There is not the slightest trace of Hellenism in the Pauline psychology. The σάρξ is not in itself evil. There is no such doctrine of predestination in the eighth and ninth chapters of Romans as is commonly taught. His eschatology was brightened by the hope that as soon as death removed him he would enter into the full resurrection life. The parousia which might be in his day would bring the end and the realization of all the greatest verities of the kingdom. All this, with an exalted Christology and a sturdy emphasis upon the actualities of grace,

such as adoption, increasing and unfailing sanctification, are among the notable features of Schmidt's interpretation. Not a sentence is wasted, and all is imbued with a spirit of full, glad sympathy with him whom he seeks to interpret. In the best sense of the word the book is "liberal." It gives a reason for every statement and is free almost entirely from a polemical spirit. J. S. RIGGS.

AUBURN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Auburn, N. Y.

DIE HEILIGKEIT JESU, als Beweis seiner Gottheit. Von DR. CARL HENNEMANN. Würzburg: Andreas Göbels Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898. Pp. vi + 152. M. 2.

THIS is a well-arranged and clearly written argument for the ethical uniqueness of Jesus, traversing ground already made familiar by Ullmann and Bushnell, but needing to be traversed afresh in each decade of advancing Christianity. The author's Roman Catholic standpoint appears in his conception of the Bible rather than in his defense of Jesus. After a preliminary discussion of the fundamental principles of ethics, he divides his work into three parts: first, speculative — a discussion of the holiness of God; secondly, historical — the actual sinlessness of Jesus; thirdly, polemical — a consideration of the various objections that men have made to the teaching or conduct of Jesus. Jesus, he says, is not simply the founder, but the center and essence, of Christianity; hence our religion vanishes if Jesus was not historically and absolutely "the holy one." In his examination of the biblical records the writer follows faithfully the "proof-text" method, making no attempt to distinguish sources, but quoting all the books of the New Testament and some in the Old Testament as of equal authority. He then briefly shows that the sinless Jesus of Nazareth finds no analogue in either Buddha, Socrates, Marcus Aurelius, Mohammed, or Francis of Assisi.

But the most difficult and interesting part of his argument is the "polemical," in which, with varying degrees of success, he attempts to meet especially the ethical objections to the character of Jesus which were urged by Albert Dulk (*Der Irrgang des Lebens Jesu*, Stuttgart, 1884). With much thoroughness and considerable formality he names twenty-two different objections to the ethical perfection of Jesus, stating in each case first the "objection," and then at once appending the "answer." To the objection, *e. g.*, that Jesus, being human and finite, must share the imperfection of finiteness, the answer is that

perfect virtue in humanity is not the absolute holiness of God, but is perfection in kind, incomplete but innocent. To the objection that "the idea" must realize itself, not in an individual, but in collective humanity, the answer is that the entire redeemed humanity constitutes the evolved mystical body of Christ. Then the writer proceeds to deal with a surprising list of specific accusations against the ethical attitude of Jesus, *e. g.*, his rough speaking to his mother and his brethren, his demand that one should hate his own kindred, his severe treatment of the Pharisees, his intentional veiling of truth from the multitude, his demand for renunciation of property, his aversion to marriage and approval of self-mutilation, his non-resistance to (and therefore encouragement of) evil, his indulgence in threatening and revengeful language, his actually causing his own betrayal, his fear of pain and death, the "planlessness" of his career, etc. Indeed, it seems as if no reproach ever cast on Christ, in his own time or since, is here left unconsidered. The answers are sometimes ingenious, sometimes trite, sometimes unsatisfying. Probably the author has done the best that could be done in this line of argument. If "forewarned is forearmed," this book certainly arms the student at every point. But for most men the convincing argument will be found in setting forth the beauty and wonder of the sunlight, rather than in detailed answers to those who find spots on the sun.

W. H. P. FAUNCE.

GREATER NEW YORK, N. Y.

AUS GESCHICHTE UND KUNST DES CHRISTENTUMS. Abhandlungen zur Belehrung für gebildete Gemeindeglieder Von DR. ADOLF HASENCLEVER. Zweite (Schluss-) Reihe. Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke & Sohn, 1898. Pp. iv + 194. M. 2.

THIS book contains a series of five essays written in popular language. In the first essay the author tells the story of the literary assaults upon early Christianity, and gives copious extracts from the writings of the apologists and early Fathers. The second essay contains a short historical account of the doctrinal controversies of the first five centuries that led finally to the framing of the symbol of Chalcedon. The author then discusses with much frankness and ability, but with decided leaning toward the Ritschlian school of theological thought, the relation of doctrine to the individual confession of the believer in Christ. In the third essay Dr. Hasenclever inveighs

severely against those Roman historians who, like Janssen, delight in maintaining that the Protestant Reformation sounded the death-knell of Christian art in Germany. He admits that many works of art were destroyed by over-zealous iconoclasts in some parts of Germany in the early part of the sixteenth century, and grants also that the new evangelical movement at that time was not over-friendly to works of plastic art; but he maintains that the evils of image-worship in the mediæval church called forth this extreme position. In later centuries Protestantism has done its share toward the further development of the fine arts in all their departments. Indeed, by freeing the mind from the fetters of priestly domination, Protestantism has created an atmosphere in which art can attain its highest development. In the fourth essay the author shows how poorly adapted mediæval church buildings were for the new services the Reformation made necessary, and how little by little the interior arrangements of the churches were totally changed. In the last essay of the collection some reasons are given for the decadence of the religious element in modern painting. The author believes that many of the most eminent painters of our time are inwardly estranged from religion, and that this fact constitutes one chief reason. Then, too, painting has been influenced, he says, by the new scientific thought of today, and painters have turned away from the historical and the ideal to the real, and have found fruitful fields in representing everyday life. Although the book is popular rather than technical, it is very suggestive and shows wide reading.

A. J. RAMAKER.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

THE KEY OF TRUTH. A Manual of the Paulician Church of Armenia, the Armenian Text edited and transliterated with Illustrative Documents and Introduction. By FRED. C. CONYBEARE, M.A. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde, 1898. Pp. cxcvi + 201. 15s.; $4.50, *net.*

THE appearance of this book is noteworthy in more than one respect. It is a valuable contribution to a much-neglected field. We regret to say that the value of the Armenian language and literature has not been appreciated by European scholars as it deserves. Once in a while a Lagarde or a Müller has done considerable work in this line, but the number of such has been lamentably small. The future, however, seems hopeful. Scholars like Gelzer, Vetter, and Hübschmann

in Germany, Meillet and Carrierre in France, and Conybeare in England, have come forward, and their contributions have not been few nor unimportant.

Mr. Conybeare's articles in the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY and the *American Journal of Philology*, and his contribution on the Armenian version in the Hastings *Dictionary of the Bible*, had already convinced us of his fair knowledge of the Armenian language and literature, while this book proves him to be the leading Armenian scholar of Europe, outside of the native-born Armenian circles. Moreover, the book is significant in its numerous and somewhat startling conclusions. Whether one accepts them or not, they are worthy of the careful attention of every reader with a taste for the subject.

During his visit to Armenia, in 1891, Mr. Conybeare had seen an Armenian MS. in the library of the Holy Synod at Edjmiatzin, and, finding it related to a subject in which he was interested, had asked the library authorities to favor him with a copy of it. He received the copy in 1893, and the present volume is the editing of that MS., called *The Key of Truth*, with an English translation, preceded by an elaborate introduction.

The MS., according to the colophone, bears the date 1782, but, both from the style and from the agreement of its contents with outside literature, he assigns its origin to a date not later than 850 A. D.

The Key of Truth contains the beliefs of the Paulician church, and they may be summarized as follows:

Jesus, though Messiah, the eternal only-born Son, mediator of God and man, was yet not God; he was a created man, a κτίσμα. He received the Holy Ghost in his thirtieth year on the occasion of his baptism.

Only three sacraments are necessary to salvation, viz.: repentance, baptism, and the eucharist. Baptism must be preceded by repentance and faith; infant baptism is not valid. The Holy Ghost enters the catechumen immediately after baptism, which probably must not be administered before his thirtieth year. One unleavened loaf and wine are to be offered in the eucharistic sacrifice. The virgin Mary is not ἀειπάρθενος. Intercession of the saints, purgatory, images, pictures, crosses, sacrifices of animals, confession to priests, are strongly rejected.

The canon includes the Old and New Testaments, except perhaps the Apocalypse. The Logos doctrine is rejected, though the fourth gospel is accepted. The "elect one" seems to be worshiped as Christ.

It is a pity that the document is not complete. During a heresy-hunting at the beginning of the century those who had the MS. in their possession tore out some of the leaves (about thirty-eight out of the 100), and here and there erased one or more words out of their fear of the persecutors. Mr. Conybeare tries to fill up the gap from the reports of that inquisition which took place in 1837–45 in Arkhwêli.

The first half of the book (pp. xvii–cxcvi) is devoted to a long discourse, in which Mr. Conybeare arrives at the following conclusions:

Paulicianism has its origin in the Adoptionist or Ebionite doctrine, which was the faith of Jewish Christians of the apostolic age. Its earliest monument is the *Shepherd* of Hermas, as the later monument is *The Key of Truth*. Soon it spread through Asia Minor and Persia, embracing the entire range of the Taurus mountains. The first Syrian church was Adoptionist, and from it Armenia received the first tidings of Christianity, long before the preaching by Gregory the Illuminator. Gregory himself was an Adoptionist, and the first translation of the Scriptures from the Syriac was probably made by these pre-Gregorian Adoptionists. But in the fourth century a new movement began by Nerses and his students, and through their influence the Greek Christology was introduced with such success that by the end of the fifth century Adoptionism had retired to obscurity, only to be revived as a new force in the eighth century.

Early in the fourth century the Adoptionists were known to the Greeks as "Pauliani," after the name of Paul of Samosata, but during the following centuries, through persecution, they were lost sight of by the Greek theologians, and it was in the eighth and ninth centuries that "Grecized" Armenians brought them afresh to the notice of the Greeks under the Armenian form "Paulicians," which means "the followers of the wretched little Paul."

Of the Paulician Armenians of Taurus about 200,000 were deported to Thrace and the Danube provinces in the eighth and tenth centuries, whence they found their way to various countries of Europe. The Bogomile church of the Balkan provinces, the mediæval Cathars of Europe, and the Anabaptist and Unitarian movements of the age of the Reformation, owe their origin to these Armenian refugees. To quote Mr. Conybeare's own words: "It was the church of hardy mountaineers, the rampart of Christianity and Roman civilization against the Arab and Tartar hordes. When reasons of state or bigotry failed to exterminate this primitive church among the ranges of the Taurus,

its members were deported by hundreds of thousands to Thrace. There they throve for centuries, and the spread of their tenets into Bohemia, Poland, Germany, Italy, France, and even into our own England, must have helped not a little to prepare the ground for the Puritan Reformation" (p. civ). Mr. Conybeare strongly repudiates the charge that they were Manicheans.

Our space does not permit us to criticise these views in detail. Mr. Conybeare himself does not claim them to be conclusive, but "probable." His conclusion that the Adoptionist or Ebionite doctrine was the earliest apostolic faith is an old assertion, and the attempts to prove the contrary have been too many. The arguments brought forward to prove that both the early Armenian church and the Cathars of Europe were Adoptionists are very meager and weak. Too much weight is imposed on some doubtful expressions, which can easily be interpreted otherwise. On the other hand, his attempt to fix the date of the document is very scholarly, and fairly conclusive. And although he magnifies too much the influence of Paulicians in Europe, we would not hesitate to agree with him that they have had their share in shaping the destiny of the German Reformation, and we would therefore regard the Paulician church as the first Protestant church.

The Armenian text covers the pages 1–65. The type is clear and fine. We could detect only two typographical errors: "*tzartzakoumn*" (p. 4, l. 8) should be read *hartzakoumn*, and "*Vazoutz*" (p. 9, l. 26) as *Vaṭoutz* (after the transliteration of Mr. Conybeare). The translation, occupying pp. 71–124, is to be highly recommended, being painstaking and accurate, though we are afraid it is too idiomatic.

The translation is followed by nine appendices (pp. 125–86), which are translations from old Armenian authors. These are followed by an excursus on the style of the Armenian text (pp. 187–90), which is a piece of profound scholarship. Mr. Conybeare, following the style of the ancient MS. copyist, adds a colophon to the end of the text in the Armenian language, giving his name, the date of the editing, translation, etc. It contains two cases of curious confusion in dentals.

As to his method of transliteration of Armenian names, we are obliged to say we cannot approve of it. These names already in their simplest possible forms seem horrible to foreigners, while the transliteration of Mr. Conybeare makes them horrible both to foreign and native Armenian scholars. For example, Mkherttschian, Indshidshian, Tchrgan, etc.

Why the original text and the translation have not been given on alternate pages we cannot see. It would have been a great help to those who care to study the text.

Another defect in the arrangement of the book is that the introduction, which consists of 174 pages, is a continuous long discourse, without chapters or similar breaks, which it is a hard and tedious task to read through.

On the whole, the book is one which certainly will be welcomed and valued by all who are interested in church literature, and Mr. Conybeare rightly deserves our hearty congratulations for his excellent work.

ARMENAG HAIGAZIAN.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn.

ITALY AND THE ITALIANS. By GEORGE B. TAYLOR, D.D. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898. Pp. 441. $1.50.

THE purpose of this volume is indicated by the author in his modest preface: "It is not intended for persons well acquainted with Italy, her land, history, institutions, literature, and people. Leaving out these, there remains a large class, including many of the cultured and the traveled, to whom it may appeal."

It is also written with the hope that it may, at least indirectly, promote the cause of Christian missions. The author is the superintendent of Baptist missions in Italy, and has lived in Rome almost a quarter of a century. He has had the opportunity of knowing much of the Italians in every section of Italy.

The first fifty pages of the volume are devoted to the making of Italy. He has drawn his information from the best sources, such as the letters of Count Cavour, and the files of *La Nuova Antologia*.

Chapter third discusses Italy's dynasty, constitution, etc. Chapter fourth is devoted to contemporary history, from 1870 to 1898. Chapters fifth and sixth are largely descriptive of his own journeyings, which he calls "A Run through Italy." Then follow five chapters on: "Rome;" "Traits and Customs;" "The Home;" "The Army, Industries, the Lottery, Emigration;" "Language, Literature, Public Instruction." The last hundred pages are devoted to the strength and weakness of Romanism and its relations to new Italy, and the evangelization of Italy.

The volume, as a whole, is one that will interest and instruct the general reader. To the one who contemplates visiting Italy for the first time it will prove of real value as a brief preparation for understanding the historical setting of the Italians, who have been called "the chosen and peculiar vessels of the prophecy of the Renaissance." The book has an additional charm for one who has seen Italy and the Italians, since it brings only the most pleasant reminiscences, while it has neither "extenuated nor concealed aught necessary to a just estimate."

In his discussion of the many forces that have contributed to the evangelization of Italy, Dr. Taylor has been free from sectarian bias. Yet he does not seem as hopeful concerning the Free Italian Church, now called the Italian Evangelical Church, as we had hoped the facts in the case might warrant.

The portion of the volume treating of the strength and weakness of Romanism and its relations to new Italy is timely and well worth the serious attention of Protestant Christians today.

The volume contains about fifty illustrations, which add much to its attractiveness.

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

MORITZ VON SACHSEN. Von ERICH BRANDENBURG. Erster Band: Bis zur Wittenberger Kapitulation (1547). Mit Titelbild. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1898. Pp. viii + 557. M. 12.

NO OTHER character in German history has been the subject of so many conflicting conjectures as Maurice of Saxony. Two of these conjectures are especially prominent. To some writers he is an extreme Protestant, and aids the emperor in the Smalcald war, and turns against him afterward, because he believes that his course in both instances is required in order to defend the Lutheran religion. To others he is from boyhood a cool and calculating diplomatist, with no religious preferences, but with an overmastering determination to promote his own interests; and at twenty-five he is so skilful in political bargaining and deception that he outwits the shrewdest statesmen and makes them his tools. The author of this book begins it without announcing any theory. He aims to produce an inductive study of Maurice, and he derives his conclusions from a painstaking investigation of all the accessible evidence. He weighs not only the published

materials, but also the official documents pertaining to the subject preserved in the archives at Dresden, Marburg, and Weimar. The larger part of these documents have never before been used.

The result is a solution of the enigma presented by the career of Maurice which must be pronounced satisfactory on the whole. Maurice was indifferent to the religious controversy of his time, and, though a Lutheran, was not an admirer of Luther. He found himself in the Protestant ranks by the action of his parents, and ruling over a people ardently attached to the evangelical faith. Nor could he fail to perceive that his people had done well for themselves, temporally at least, by casting off the papal yoke. There were many such reasons which forbade him to change his church relations. Furthermore, as he was not interested in religious matters, so neither was he scrupulous in personal morality. Nor was he a patriot burning with zeal to set Germany forward on the path of virtue and prosperity. He was concerned chiefly about his own ambitions.

But, on the other hand, he was no such miracle of successful diplomacy and greed as he has been portrayed. He was but twenty when he became duke of Saxony, and his policy frequently wavered. While he was a Lutheran, the majority of his counselors were Catholics, and he was influenced now by his own ecclesiastical position and now by theirs. It is true that he joined hands with the emperor in the Smalcald war. It is true that the emperor gave him more than the Smalcald League would give, and hence it has been inferred that he sold himself to the highest bidder, and aided the Catholic party in order to possess himself of the electoral dignity and to enlarge his territories at the cost of his cousin.

It is chiefly at this point that the researches of Brandenburg bring us new light. Maurice had determined to remain neutral, notwithstanding the alluring promises of the emperor. But he learned that King Ferdinand was planning to overrun electoral Saxony, and to annex it to his own possessions, already dangerously large. Should this purpose be accomplished, Maurice would have on his borders a Catholic power so preponderant as to menace his territory, and, indeed, as to disturb the political balance of all Germany, but especially of the central and northern states. Before deciding on any course, he visited Bohemia, where the invading forces were being collected, that he might make himself certain of all the facts. He then determined to join the emperor and conquer electoral Saxony for himself in order to keep a far worse thing from being done.

The demonstration of this truth is the principal contribution made to our knowledge of Maurice by the author. But it is not the only one. From the beginning to the end of his work he produces an abundance of fresh material. Nothing escapes him, either of dry financial and political detail, or of stirring achievement on the field of battle, or of anecdote concerning private and domestic affairs. He causes not only Maurice, but the men and women about him, to live before us, and shows us the inner motives which inspired their actions.

Should the author be as successful in the second volume, yet to appear, as he has been in the first, he will lay the student of the Reformation under very great obligations, and it will be impossible for anyone to write intelligently of the Smalcald war without referring to his work.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LES ORIGINES DE LA COMPAGNIE DE JÉSUS. Ignace et Lainez. Par H. MÜLLER. Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1898. Pp. vi + 329.

THE Society of Jesus is 350 years old. Its original purpose was to oppose everything that was Protestant. It has exerted a powerful influence in church and in state. Its missionaries have gone to China, Japan, India, Paraguay, and Canada. Its enemies have been not only Protestants, but also popes and princes. By its very constitution it was calculated to stir up the most decided and bitter opposition. The historian of the Society of Jesus, therefore, finds himself much perplexed to get at the exact facts which alone can lead him to right conclusions.

On the one side the society is composed exclusively of hypocrites and fanatics, capable of all crimes and deserving of all accusations. On the other side the Jesuits are, each and all, saints above eulogy and above panegyric. The probabilities are that the truth lies in neither of these extremes, but somewhere between them. It is the business of the historian to sift all the evidence, find the fragments of truth, and, so far as possible, combine them into a symmetrical whole.

The author of this book fully appreciates the responsibility of his undertaking. He believes that he is peculiarly qualified because he is on neither side of the controversy; he studies simply to know the truth; and he has no other interest than that which is yielded by the

debates themselves. Why should he not, therefore, prosecute the work "with absolute impartiality, with entire sincerity"?

But his diffculties become real the moment he begins his investigation. There is an abundance of second-hand documents, but relative poverty of documents whose authenticity cannot be questioned.

The book is divided into four chapters: "The Founder of the Society of Jesus;" "The Genesis of the Society of Jesus;" "The Foundation of the Society of Jesus;" "Lainez and Paul IV." It ends with some documentary proofs.

It will be seen that our author does not pretend to write a complete history of the society. His purpose is rather to elucidate a single problem which he has met in his historical researches.

After this general description of the work we have barely space to mention a single point — the origin of the book of *Spiritual Exercises*.

In the composition of this book, was Ignatius directly inspired by God, who alone was his master, or did he derive suggestions and instruction from purely human sources? After a careful investigation the author reaches the conclusion that the *Spiritual Exercises* is not an inspired book, but that substantial assistance came from several human sources. Among these are to be mentioned: (1) *The Spiritual Exercises* of Garcia de Cisneros, which was printed in Castilian and Latin in 1500. Now, while a comparison of the *Exercises* of Ignatius with the *Exercises* of Cisneros shows striking differences, it shows resemblances only less striking. For instance, Ignatius took from Cisneros the title of his book, its great outlines, and so on (p. 37). (2) The constitutions of the different Mussulman congregations.

Here we find, not resemblances, but identities. Müller's analysis is very searching, and apparently leaves no doubt as to Loyola's great indebtedness to Islam. It is, of course, impossible here to give the reasoning, but the conclusions, and some of the identities, can be easily given. The most remarkable cases are given on p. 51: (1) "In the form of government in the Society of Jesus, and in the nature of the obedience which it requires of its proficients." (2) "In the method of initiation and of formation to which it subjects its disciples." (3) "In the different degrees which it establishes among the members, and in the occultism which it practices." (4) "In the end which it has in view, and in the confusion which it causes between the spiritual and the temporal order."

The Jesuits themselves say that these are the fundamental and essential points of the order.

This description gives a very imperfect idea of the book. To be fully appreciated it must be closely read.

Probably it will satisfy neither of the extreme parties in the case, but, unless we are entirely mistaken, the historian will find it a book very much after his own heart.

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

STUDIES IN SCOTTISH ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY IN THE SEVENTEENTH AND EIGHTEENTH CENTURIES. By M. G. J. KINLOCH. London: Simpkin, Marshall, Hamilton, Kent & Co.; Edinburgh: R. Grant & Son, 1898. Pp. xi + 347. 6s., *net.*

THE book begins with the accession of Charles I. in 1625, and ends with the unfurling of the banner of the pretender, James VIII. and III., in 1745. England and Scotland are so tied together in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that it is impossible to give an account of the latter without going with considerable detail into the history of the former. The story is told from the point of view of an intelligent and temperate Roman Catholic. He draws his material in part from sources with which Protestant writers have made us familiar, but chiefly from Catholic sources, which impart a freshness to the narrative which it could not otherwise possess.

In a clear and pleasing style, but with a distinct Romanist bias, we are told of the attempt of Charles and Laud to force episcopacy upon Scotland, of the introduction of Laud's liturgy into St. Giles in 1637, of the National Covenant and the Glasgow assembly in 1638, of the war on Scotland which grew into the civil war in England, of the Long Parliament, the Westminster assembly, and the union of Scotch Calvinists and English Puritans under the Solemn League and Covenant, and of the execution of Charles and Laud. The author seems hardly to know how to deal with Cromwell and the Commonwealth. He loses his vivacity and seems anxious to hurry over this part of his story. "The records which describe that mournful period are the records of a national humiliation." He entitles the chapter "The Humiliation of the Land." He is hardly prepared to deny that Cromwell brought order out of chaos, but to his mind "the lull in Scotland during the orderly sway of the Commonwealth was the lull of death." When he reaches the Restoration he is once more in his element. In a graphic way he tells of the horrible struggle between

Charles II. and the Covenanters — "a record of hangings, torturings, mutilations, transportations, and general strife" — of the accession of James VII. and II., and the troubles he brought to Scotland, of the coming of William in 1688, of the revolution settlement in 1689, and of the union of the parliaments under Queen Anne.

The author is at his best when he is describing the intolerant and vindictive temper of the Protestant factions fighting for the mastery on Scottish soil, and the barbarities which characterized Episcopalians and Presbyterians alike. It is not needful, and he seems to have no disposition, to exaggerate or falsify the facts. Grant the facts, and the interest of the Protestant reader lies in seeing how a Romanist will tell them.

Mere curiosity passes on to instruction when the author turns from warring Protestants to the church of which he himself is a member. Of course, all his sympathies are with "the children of the holy see." Throughout, the "vicissitudes and sufferings of the Catholic remnant" are talked about as though the spotless "spouse of Christ" was the innocent victim of unprovoked Protestant hate. Of the horrible immoralities which precipitated the Scotch Reformation he seems wholly ignorant. English Episcopalians and Scotch Presbyterians simply "united in vilifying and torturing the bride of the Lamb." The church "which alone has the gospel and the promises" was overwhelmed by the Scotch "sons of havoc." He finds relief in turning from the bitterness, intolerance, and uncharitableness which animated the Prostestants, from the "battlefield, the strife of tongues, the scaffold, the torture-chamber" in which Anglicans and Presbyterians had been the diabolical and frenzied actors, to a description of the "royal bride," the "King's daughter," in her tribulations, as "she lay crushed under penal legislation and punished for sins she had never committed." In the midst of it all "Rome continued ever mindful of her afflicted northern child." Hardships unspeakable were endured by her Jesuit and other missionaries who, in disguise, labored to reconcile to the mother church the deluded Scotch Protestants. This detailed information drawn from Catholic sources concerning the systematic and persistent attempts of the papacy to retrieve its disasters and to win back its alienated subjects is the most original, instructive, and valuable part of Mr. Kinloch's book.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DE DANSKE BAPTISTERS HISTORIE. Af PASTOR SÖREN HANSEN OG PASTOR PETER OLSEN. Köbenhavn: Baptisternes Forlagsekspedition, 1898. Pp. 199. Kr. 1.75.

THIS history of the Danish Baptists is given in four divisions: (1) "The Time of Persecution, 1839–1849;" (2) "The Time of Extension, 1850–1864;" (3) "The Time of Organization, 1865–1883;" (4) "The Modern Time, 1884–." Rev. Julius Köbner, a Dane who had lived many years in Germany, was the pioneer. In 1838 he found in Copenhagen a company of believers who had embraced Baptist doctrines. They were entirely ignorant of other people entertaining the same views. Having returned to Hamburg, Köbner wrote a pamphlet entitled *The Mode of Baptism and Its Subjects*. This was lithographed and circulated in Denmark. The result was that the believing company in Copenhagen wrote to Hamburg, asking that provision be made for their baptism. In October, 1839, Köbner and Oncken, the Baptist apostle of Germany, went to Copenhagen and baptized eleven believers, and secretly organized the first Baptist church in Denmark. The matter soon became public, and the newspapers and rabble ridiculed and persecuted the church. A month after its organization the members were cited to appear in court. The decision was that the organization was illegal. The members were not permitted to hold meetings nor partake of the communion together, and it was ordered that their children should be baptized and confirmed according to the Lutheran creed. Severe penalties were threatened if they disobeyed. Notwithstanding these enactments, the church grew, and in 1840 twenty-four members were added. Outside Copenhagen several small churches were also organized. The authorities undertook to crush the movement by casting the pastor into prison. One after another the leading brethren were likewise imprisoned. The members were steadfast, however, and their numbers increased. An urgent appeal having been made by Oncken to the English and American Baptists, they separately sent deputations to the Danish government in behalf of their persecuted brethren. Lord Palmerston pleaded their cause in an official document sent directly to the Danish government. Drs. Hackett and Conant, representatives of the American Baptists, arrived in Denmark in 1842. The brethren were released from prison, but their properties had been sold to pay fines. Outside of Copenhagen the churches also suffered great persecution. To administer baptism brought to the

offender imprisonment and ruinous fines. The Lutheran priests were the leaders in this persecution. In 1849 the new constitution guaranteed religious liberty. The Danish Baptists came out of the conflict with six churches and 400 members.

In the second period, 1850–64, new churches were organized and 1,200 converts were baptized.

In the third period, 1865–83, more than 700 Danish Baptists migrated to America. In this way the mother church lost many of her younger and more energetic members. It was also a hindrance to the cause in Denmark that many of the pastors were obliged to earn their bread by manual labor. They were deficient in theological preparation. It became evident that the need of an educated Baptist ministry was urgent.

In the fourth period, 1884–96, this need began to be met. A turn for the better came in 1884, with the meeting of the Baptist conference in Copenhagen. Professor Jensen, of Morgan Park, Ill., was present. Through his influence it was arranged that candidates for the ministry should be sent to America to study at Morgan Park, in the Danish-Norwegian department of the Baptist Union Theological Seminary. Here the younger men were trained for their work, and returned to the mission full of enthusiasm. In 1887 the American Baptist Missionary Union undertook the support of the work in Denmark. Through the assistance of the Missionary Union and the Theological Union the progress has been of the most gratifying character.

Danish Baptists both in Denmark and America will read this history of struggle and triumph with the liveliest interest.

H. GUNDERSEN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

A HISTORY OF THE BAPTISTS IN THE MIDDLE STATES. By HENRY C. VEDDER. Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898. PP. 355. $1.25.

THE "Baptist History Series" is to be completed in five volumes. It is designed to "form a complete history of the denomination down to the time of publication." The volumes on *The Baptists in New England* and *The Baptists in the Western States East of the Mississippi* have already appeared.

Dr. Vedder has drawn his material from the original sources. In this he had no option, since there are no second-hand authorities

which are of any special value. Out of "many thousand volumes and piles of documents, to say nothing of manuscripts and pamphlets amounting to many more thousands," the author has sifted and combined the materials of this orderly, perspicuous, aud valuable treatise.

The opening chapters deal with the early days in New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware. They exhibit the denomination in its formative processes. In the "Growth of Organization" we see the local churches combining in associations, state conventions, foreign and domestic missionary bodies, and in educational, publication, Sunday-school, and young people's societies. In this way the denomination is unified and solidified, and in every way augmented in strength. Powerful revivalists inaugurate an evangelistic era, resulting in a great increase in numbers and in renewed activity in missions.

The body is distracted and weakened by grave controversies. Alexander Campbell leads a movement which divides churches and associations, and which results in the founding of a sect closely akin to the Baptists in nearly all points of fundamental import. The murder of Morgan starts a crusade against free masonry, in which hosts of Baptists join, and over which the denomination itself breaks into ugly factions. Miller announces the immediate coming of Christ, and multitudes of Baptists are caught in this Millerite craze. They contend likewise over such petty matters as the use of hymn-books and such supreme matters as the Arminian theology. They get into a war with the American Bible Society over a Bengali version of the Scriptures, and then into a war among themselves over an English translation. It is a conflict not without its good results, for it anticipates and prepares the way for the Revised Version, which is rapidly taking the place of our King James Bible.

Though in the early times there were many Baptists who were hostile to an educated ministry, this opposition was borne down, and the denomination entered heartily into the founding of schools of higher learning — Columbian, Hamilton, Rochester, Bucknell, Crozer, Vassar, and numerous academies.

In treating of these and kindred subjects, the author has gone into details, and has given to the public an interesting, trustworthy, and instructive treatise.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LIFE AND LETTERS OF BENJAMIN JOWETT, M.A., Master of Balliol College, Oxford. By EVELYN ABBOTT, M.A., LL.D., AND LEWIS CAMPBELL, M.A., LL.D. London and New York: E. P. Dutton & Co. Two vols. Pp. xii + 446 and viii + 499. $8.

THE first of these volumes, covering the period before Jowett became master of Balliol, from 1817 to 1870, was prepared by Professor Campbell; the second describes the later life, from 1870 to 1893, and was written by Dr. Abbott.

From a somewhat unsatisfactory chapter of twenty-eight pages, devoted to an account of Jowett's ancestry for two hundred years, we learn that his father, though a worthy and an honorable man, was so unsuccessful in business, first as a furrier, then as a printer, and was so unfortunate in practical affairs, that he accumulated scarcely any property, and for many years after the father's death Jowett assumed the support of his mother and sister. Until middle life this necessitated severe economy and self-sacrifice, and doubtless determined his celibate life.

From the age of twelve to nineteen Jowett was a pupil at St. Paul's School, and from nineteen to twenty-three a scholar at Balliol. He always regarded his election to the scholarship at Balliol as "the happiest event of his life." While yet an undergraduate, to his great credit and delight, he was chosen a fellow of Balliol, where he remained as a teacher, tutor, professor of Greek, master of the college, and vice-chancellor of the University of Oxford until his death, October 1, 1893. He took deacon's orders in 1842. He early became an intimate friend of Stanley, with whom he traveled and corresponded until Stanley's death. He became Stanley's natural successor as the leader of those known as broad or liberal churchmen.

In 1854 Jowett was defeated for the mastership of Balliol by a narrow margin of votes, and Robert Scott, the Greek lexicographer, was elected. This defeat was a bitter disappointment, only partially relieved by election to the Greek professorship the following year, after it had been declined by Liddell. Scott's name was also considered for this professorship, for which he had manifest qualifications; but it was deemed best not to appoint the head of a house. Thus, though Jowett's mastership of Balliol was postponed sixteen years, until Scott was made dean of Rochester in 1870, Oxford secured Jowett as professor of Greek, and the English-speaking world obtained a worthy translator of Plato. For many years the Greek professorship was unendowed,

yet Jowett preferred it to any other "except one of theology." It was most fortunate for himself and the world that he was chosen professor of Greek and not of theology; for it is certain that, with Pusey as Regius professor of Hebrew and Wilberforce bishop of Oxford, Jowett's life would have been one of incessant contention had he been professor of theology, and he professed the greatest abhorrence for prolonged controversy.

Jowett's long life was given primarily to the instruction of young men, but his work was by no means confined to formal teaching. His contributions to university reform and to the advancement of all educational interests were especially valuable because of his exceptional experience and his close friendship with such remarkable men as Stanley, Sir Robert Lowe, Tennyson, Browning, Matthew Arnold, T. H. Green, and Professors Seller and Campbell. Concerning the higher education of women he held a middle course. He believed that few women should be subjected to the full courses of severe disciplinary studies which furnish suitable preparation for the exactions of professional life. He was jealous for the retention of the "accomplishments," such as music, drawing, and a generous familiarity with literature. But he was not blindly or unreasonably conservative; he gladly recognized the enlarged opportunities and the increased educational advantages of women.

In early life Jowett illustrated the most independent and unconventional treatment of theological subjects. His *Theological Essays*, written in connection with his commentary on the Pauline epistles, were published and for nearly half a century have been circulated by the American Unitarian Association. In 1861 he contributed the essay on "The Interpretation of Scripture," the fruit of long reflection, to the famous volume of *Essays and Reviews*. In later life his views of inspiration, of miracles, and of the atonement became even more radical; and his idealization of the person of Christ, the uncertainty of his teaching concerning the immortality of man and the personality of God, and his intimation that "changes in religion" and the "new Christianity" may issue in the abolition of historic doctrine, and the adoption of "a doctrine common to Plato and the gospel," gave such offense that some earnest churchmen did not hesitate to characterize his teaching as anti-Christian, and even pagan or infidel. By others of broad-church sympathies he has been regarded as the precursor of an intellectual movement among disciples now living, who, when the present urgent conflict between evangelicalism and ritualism is past,

are expected to advocate intellectual freedom concerning disputed questions of theology, the closest relation between religious and secular life, and the largest liberty of teaching in the schools and in the Church of England.

Whatever may be the justice of these opposite claims, it is certain that, notwithstanding Jowett formally deprecated in the strongest terms slavery to any philosophical system, even refused to be accounted an unconditional disciple of Plato, and severely criticised Comte, whose writings he carefully studied, he was greatly influenced, either consciously or unconsciously, by both Plato and Comte. In his deliverances upon theological subjects he reveals a curious blending of idealism and positivism. Even his admiring editors characterize an unpublished essay on the person of Christ, written about 1850, as "an extremely subtle, but hardly a satisfactory piece of work. . . ." "Traditional orthodoxy is sublimated and held in solution by an application of Hegelian method." (Vol. I, p. 137.)

Jowett's literary *magnum opus* was his translation of the works of Plato. This is not a literal translation; possibly not the most perfect in respect to niceties of technical scholarship; but it is the translation of ancient works, which represent the high-water mark of pre-Christian thought, into pure, delightful English which will serve generations of appreciative students, all of whom will owe to the master of Balliol a debt which they can never repay. The long and faithful service bestowed upon three editions of this great work insures the translator a deserved eminence among the great men of English letters. Fortunately we are not called on to declare whether the adapted encomium of Socrates by Plato, with which the biographers close their work, be just or extravagant: "Such was the end, Echecrates, of our friend; concerning whom I may truly say that of all the men of his time whom I have known he was the wisest and justest and best."

BENJAMIN O. TRUE.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

CHARLES PORTERFIELD KRAUTH, D.D., LL.D. By ADOLPH SPAETH, D.D., LL.D. In two volumes. Vol. I, 1823–1859. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons; formerly, The Christian Literature Co., 1898. Pp. xiv + 425. $2.

A SKILFUL hand, moved by a loving heart and directed by an appreciative judgment, draws in this volume a lifelike portrait of a noble man who, for thirty years or more, was aiming to perform the

function of a peacemaker amid the conflicting elements of the Lutheran church of America, but gradually became the able and central representative of her most conservative tendencies in belief and doctrine.

The son of Rev. Dr. Charles Philip Krauth, who for sixteen years (1834–50) was the president of Pennsylvania College, Gettysburg, Pa., and from 1850 to 1867 (the year of his death) professor in the Lutheran Theological Seminary located in the same place, Charles Porterfield Krauth received his classical and theological education in these institutions. The principal molding influence of his college course is to be ascribed to the spirit of his father, of his seminary course to the theology of Rev. Samuel S. Schmucker, D.D., who was the exponent of thought and sentiment diverging from the Reformation symbols. Completing his studies in his nineteenth year, Dr. C. Porterfield Krauth entered the ministry (1841) at a time when a moderate rationalism, inherited from Germany, was waning, and a radical reaction toward the system of "new measures," so-called, had set in, and had become dominant over a large part of the territory, east and west, occupied by the Lutheran and (German) Reformed churches.

While the leading facts in the external history of Dr. Krauth are not overlooked, it is especially his spiritual and theological development that Dr. Spaeth represents. We see the religious life of the son as a preacher and a theologian growing in sympathy with the general character and sound judgment of the father. The material is comprehensive, derived from all the original sources; it being the author's aim, as he says in the preface, "to make his memoir as nearly an autobiography as possible." His success is admirable. With unflagging interest the reader is led onward from one stage to another of the religious history of Lutheranism. Three aspects of this religious history come definitely to view: the wisdom, theological views, and admonitions of the father, Dr. C. Philip Krauth; the life, labors, studies, and spiritual growth of the son, Dr. C. Porterfield Krauth; and the ferment of antagonizing forces, the intellectual conflicts, and the slow but steady progress of conservative ideas throughout the whole Lutheran church.

In 1841, the first year of his son's ministry, the father writes: "Make a primary study—the Bible. Your plan of reading the Hebrew in connection with the Septuagint and the Vulgate is a good one. By all means aim to be familiar with the Scriptures in the original" (p. 51). Later: "I would lay myself out in the study of the Scriptures, not to depend much on commentaries, but to read the original with good

lexicons. I may say that I have thrown practical commentaries out of my library" (p. 58). Still later: "I insist upon it, your great business now is, not to read a great deal, but to study the Bible, as I have again and again instructed you" (p. 90). These wise counsels were observed. In 1844 the son writes: "I have devoted myself almost exclusively for some time past to the direct study of the Holy Scriptures" (p. 95). At another time he says: "I think that I could with pleasure make a thorough and critical knowledge of the Hebrew one of the great pursuits of my life." Of Dr. Krauth's biblical studies Dr. Spaeth says: "The thorough and continued exegetical study of the Holy Scriptures in the original languages, which formed the solid foundation for his whole theological position, led him to the christological question. The 'Person of Christ' was the first subject of a purely dogmatical character on which he published an article in the *Mercersburg Review*, May, 1849" (p. 157).

The important question at issue during this period between different branches of the Lutheran church was the doctrine of Luther on the Lord's Supper. Largely under the influence of Professor S. S. Schmucker, many ministers were inclined to the doctrine of Calvin, some even to the position of Zwingli. Professor C. Philip Krauth was disposed to maintain an intermediate attitude. In 1845 he writes to his son: "The presence of Christ in the ordinance I have regarded as a spiritual presence, and no other. . . . . In common with many others I have considered the Lutheran view as so closely related to the Roman Catholic as perhaps not to give it a proper hearing" (p. 108). But in 1862 his status is more definite. He says: "I have three times defined my position, and at each time offended both extremes. Some call me a rigid symbolist, others an extreme new-measure man. I am neither. If I say so again, I draw down upon me the extremists of both sides. I acknowledge no standard of Lutheranism but the Augsburg Confession" (p. 19). His son was by nature more disposed to a favorable view of all Lutheran symbols; but revering as he did the scholarship and theological judgment of his father, he studied under his father's restraining influence, especially during the first five or ten years of his ministry.

But, brought into contact with the superficiality and excesses of "revival meetings" (pp. 64, 67), devoting himself to the study of the symbols of Lutheranism and to the works of prominent Lutheran theologians of the sixteenth century, he steadily cultivated a more intelligent and a more favorable conception of the original Lutheran

doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Yet as late as 1895, the year with which Dr. Spaeth's first volume closes, we find Dr. C. Porterfield Krauth consecrated to an effort, by voice and pen, to effect a conciliation of opposing tendencies of belief and thought within the "General Synod." To many a break seemed to be inevitable; but Dr. Krauth, as it appears, was then not yet prepared to become the open leader of a division; though, consciously or not, his studies and his teaching were a moral force shaping events toward that issue. His conciliatory labors, however, were not entirely satisfactory to his own mind, as we may infer from a criticism passed upon himself in 1864, when he characterizes them as immature, "well meant, but full of inconsistencies brought about by the struggle between the influences of education and the incoming, but yet imperfectly developed, power of a truly consistent Lutheranism" (p. 380).

The work of Dr. Spaeth is a truly valuable contribution to the history of the Lutheran church during the fifth, sixth, and seventh decades of our century.

EML. V. GERHART.

THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY OF THE REFORMED CHURCH,
Lancaster, Pa.

DAS VERHÄLTNIS DER RÖMISCHEN KIRCHE ZU DEN KLEINASIATISCHEN VOR DEM NICAENISCHEN KONZIL. Antrittsvorlesung von MAG. THEOL. A. BERENDTS, etatsmässiger Dozent an der Universität in Dorpat. (="Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche," herausg. von N. Bonwetsch und R. Seeberg, Band I, Heft 3.) Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1898. Pp. 26. M. 0.60.

IN this modest but painstaking study Berendts has made a real contribution to the understanding of a problem which hitherto has been much neglected, or, at any rate, inadequately treated. It is, of course, only natural that evangelical theology, in its zeal to understand the two epochs of church history which are of decisive significance for the Protestant church — the period of the Reformation and the age of primitive Christianity — and to trace Romish errors back to their sources, should well-nigh have forgotten that the strife which issued in Protestantism "is not the only one that has disrupted Christendom." But even the two churches directly concerned in the first great disruption have labored especially to describe the actual

breach and to fix the immediate responsibility for it, while the deeper and remoter causes they have very generally neglected. Of course, recent Protestant church historians, in so far as they have seriously taken up the problem, have done much better than that. It is no longer attempted to explain the later relations without understanding the earlier. But even so good an authority as Kattenbusch has traced the oppositions between Roman and eastern churchdom with adequate thoroughness only as far back as to the Nicene council. Berendts would see the same thorough examination applied to the ante-Nicene period and extended backward even into apostolic times. And this brief study is on the whole a very successful attempt in that field. There is evidence of a careful examination of such historical sources as we possess and of a talent for sound criticism. Berendts makes it very clear that the divergence between the eastern and the western ecclesiastical principles and spirit began at a very early period and grew to considerable proportions before the Nicene council. All this, without doubt, had been in a general way already accepted. The merit of Berendts is that he has set the problem in a clearer light and by judicious criticism and combination made some real advance toward its solution.

J. R. VAN PELT.

UNIVERSITY OF DENVER.

DIE GOTTESLEHRE DES HUGO VON ST. VICTOR, nebst einer einleitenden Untersuchung über Hugos Leben und seine hervorragendsten Werke. Von DR. JAKOB KILGENSTEIN, Priester der Diöcese Würzburg. Würzburg: Andreas Göbel's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xii + 229. M. 2.50.

THERE seem to have been two lines of consideration which led the authorities of the university of Würzburg to offer a prize in 1895 for the best essay on Hugo of St. Victor's doctrine of God. The first of these was the intrinsic interest of the subject itself from the point of view of history. The school of St. Victor has been variously estimated. In general, however, its mediating standpoint has left it open to criticism on both sides. The sympathizers of the mystic tendency have objected to the modicum of dialectic used by its representatives; whereas those who are inclined to lay stress on the use of purely rationalistic methods have taken offense at the mysticism of the Victorine theologians. It has been next to impossible to do full justice to the school. And although the school, as a whole, has been made the

subject of several extended investigations, as appears upon an examination of Kilgenstein's bibliographical list, yet the system of Hugo himself had never been treated of in a monograph before the offer of the prize that elicited the present essay. But Hugo's theology is of interest also because of its influence on the subsequent development of thought. Thomas Aquinas recognized and honored Hugo as his teacher. The whole course of scholastic thinking is, in fact, more or less tinged with the color infused into it by this leader. Kilgenstein fully recognizes this double importance of his subject. He begins his study with a careful and thorough investigation of the biographical and literary facts regarding Hugo's life and works, which must serve as a necessary foundation for an essay on his theology. In the second part of the essay he considers the views of Hugo on the knowableness of God and the methods of reaching a knowledge of him. In the third he examines his subject's arguments for the existence of God. In the next he expounds Hugo's doctrine of the being and attributes of God. From this topic he proceeds to the exposition of the doctrine of the Trinity, and in the last he indicates Hugo's thought regarding God's relation to the world as Creator, Preserver, and End, under the general head of the character of God's work.

The investigation is carried throughout with great care and fairness. The author succeeds in vindicating Hugo as a sound thinker and relieving him from the distrust created by the charge of a too confused mysticism. The weak point of the essay is to be found in the failure of the essayist properly to connect Hugo with his antecedents. He is made to appear on the scene like Elijah the Tishbite in the biblical narrative, without any preparation or announcement. We can trace his influence on others; but of the forces that contributed to the formation of his own views we are told absolutely nothing. But such study fails to give the fullest and best-balanced idea of its subject.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

THE RITSCHLIAN THEOLOGY AND THE EVANGELICAL FAITH. By JAMES ORR, M.A., D.D., Professor of Church History in the United Presbyterian College, Edinburgh. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1897. Pp. xii + 271. $0.75.

THIS book is written in a clear and pure style, as is everything that comes from the author's pen. It is the most comprehensive

treatment of the movement in English. He considers in order the rise and influence of the Ritschlian theology, the Ritschlian theory of knowledge, of religion, of revelation, and of Holy Scripture. Then he descends to particulars and presents the special doctrines as set forth by this school. In the closing chapters he traces the later developments of the Ritschlian theology, and seeks to show that it is inadmissible as a substitute for the older evangelical faith. In the execution of his task Professor Orr shows familiarity with the entire Ritschlian literature—and it was a happy thought of his to give in an appendix a selection of the principal books of and on the Ritschlian theology. This book aims to be — so the author himself says — "as objective a presentation of the Ritschlian theology as is possible to one who, while conscious of having benefited by its teaching, does not share the standpoint of the school." By way of comparison, it may be said that, while no less subjective than Ecke's *Theologische Schule Ritschls*, Orr is not so appreciative and mediating; and that, while more objective than Pfleiderer's *Die Ritschl'sche Theologie*, he is not so caustic and damnatory. Orr's is an iron hand in a velvet glove. The outcome of his discussion amounts to Pfleiderer's assertion that "what in Ritschlianism is true is not new, and what is new is not true." But the contribution this school has made to historico-critical work, its unsurpassed effort to restore the historical Jesus Christ and the kingdom of God which he founded to a central and sovereign place in Christian doctrine, its emphasis upon revelation rather than speculation as the source and norm of theological propositions — all this and more besides should prompt to a more generous treatment of the Ritschlian movement than Professor Orr has been willing to accord it.

GEORGE B. FOSTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE SPIRITUAL PRINCIPLE OF THE ATONEMENT, as a Satisfaction Made to God for the Sins of the World: Being the Twenty-seventh *Fernley Lecture*, delivered in Leeds, July, 1897. By JOHN SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A., Warden of the Bermondsey Settlement. Second edition. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1898. Pp. xxiii + 498. 5s.

THE author undertakes an exhaustive discussion of the atonement, so far as its constitutive principle is concerned. After tracing the death of Jesus to its historical causes, he exegetically unfolds the bib-

lical teaching on the atonement, treating the matter intelligently and with good judgment. He then presents, reviews, and criticises the principal theories that have been framed, candidly exhibiting the strong points of each, and showing where he considers each defective. This work is done in the best possible spirit. Then, in a chapter entitled "The Satisfaction of God," he presents his own account of the matter. By way of completing his own statement, he discusses the ethical perfection of our Lord, the relationship of our Lord to the human race, and the relation of our Lord's divinity to the efficacy of the atonement; and he concludes with chapters on the principle of the atonement in relation to the spiritual life of individuals, and the principle of the atonement and social progress. An appendix contains a sketch of the history of the doctrine of the atonement, and a note on the idea, not favored by the author, that the atonement is incomprehensible.

Finding in the Scriptures the doctrine of an objective offering to God by way of satisfaction for human sins, the author judges this offering to consist, not in sufferings endured, but in the spirit in which the atoner performed his work, especially in the endurance of sufferings that were more or less distinctly penal. The principle of the atonement is spiritual. The relation of God to men within which the entire transaction moves is that of fatherhood, and the satisfaction that God must needs receive was the satisfaction of the demands of fatherhood in view of sin. The supreme requirement was obedience, rendered in the filial spirit, for this fulfils the duty and destiny of man. Christ, being the eternal Son in the Godhead, is the original and natural head of humanity, and is therefore competent to perform a representative act in its behalf. In the incarnate life he lived perfectly as a son, and it was for his filial loyalty to God that he was put to death. His death was the culmination of his obedience, and was endured in unswerving fidelity as son to God. His entire career, indeed, was one of ethical perfection, the spirit in which he died crowning the whole. Death is penal, as being the witness and the earnest of wrath and punishment upon sin. The perfect endurance of this in the filial spirit completed the satisfaction of the Father. The satisfaction applied to the entire race of which Christ was the head and representative; but it becomes effective for an individual when he accepts it as expressive of the spirit that he adopts as his own — in other words, when a sinful man enters in fellowship with Christ into the filial spirit and life. Thus the spiritual principle of the atonement is filial obedi-

ence, rendered by Christ in the name of humanity, and rendered in consequence by humanity in fellowship with Christ.

The book abounds in fresh and vital thought, which rings with the tone of reality. The acceptance of fatherhood as the relation within which the work of Christ is included, and in the light of which it must be explained, is a genuine contribution to the doctrine, and the discussion of the point is admirable. The same may be said of the recognition of the value of Christ's work apart from any expiatory effect. The book contains a multitude of valuable suggestions in the general field of theology. But that fine tone of reality which sounds throughout the book is least ringing and impressive at the very center. The endeavor to interpret the satisfaction of God is in some parts labored and unsuccessful. There is too much construction, and too little naturalness. The main trouble is with the penal element. This the author admits, but handles feebly. He does not succeed in making plain what he means by the penal element in the death of Christ. He contends that death itself is penal, but there is an air of constraint about the contention, and the definitions here are loose and uncompelling. Just here he has entered a region where he has to construct his doctrine, instead of perceiving it. The perception of spiritual reality is the strong point of the book, but here the vision fails. The fact is that the author's scheme of thought really contains no place for the penal element, and his doctrine would be stronger if this were eliminated.

It cannot be said that Mr. Lidgett has set the doctrine of the atonement in full light, but for this no one who has wrought upon the subject will reproach him. Nevertheless, he has done the doctrine a noble service. He has discussed it and its history with calmness and candor, without the slightest controversial bitterness. He has set it free from a multitude of crudities, and placed it in the atmosphere of high spiritual thought, where alone it should be considered. He has brought to his work a worthy conception of the great spiritual realities with which it is concerned, and he has bent with the deepest reverence over the mysteries which "angels desire to look into." His best service consists in his exhibition of the work of Christ in its vital relation to the other great realities of the spiritual world. If, as he claims, that work is vitally related to the fatherhood of God, a multitude of possibilities of misconception is cut off, and a rich and satisfactory spiritual doctrine must yet be developed.

The book has an analytical table of contents, but it has no index,

and its usefulness is thus greatly diminished. A table of contents will not take the place of an index, any more than an index will take the place of a table of contents.

WILLIAM N. CLARKE.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
Hamilton, N. Y.

DIE CHRISTLICHE LEHRE VON DEN EIGENSCHAFTEN GOTTES. Von H. CREMER. (="Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," herausgegeben von A. Schlatter und H. Cremer, Vol. I, Heft 4.) Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1897. Pp. 111. M. 1.60.

IT is an open secret, according to Dr. Cremer, that the topic of the divine attributes has never been treated in a satisfactory manner. Investigations on this subject have hitherto been carried on exclusively by the *a priori* method. Nowhere in the realm of systematic theology have the traditions of scholasticism yielded less than here. The result is that Christian theology has not secured through its doctrine of the divine attributes a firm basis for a clear doctrine of the incarnation. On the contrary, the difficulties of this doctrine have been sorely aggravated by the prevalent treatment of the divine attributes. So much so, indeed, that some, like Thomasius, have been compelled to assume that the second person of the Trinity renounced certain divine attributes in assuming humanity, while others, like Ritschl, have had to abandon the essential deity of the Christ altogether. What is needed is the application of the inductive method to the study of the subject. By the use of the Areopagite's triple way (*via negationis, eminentiæ et causalitatis*) no solid results can be gained, not simply because, as Kahnis says, thereby one can reach the most divergent and contradictory conclusions, but also because through speculation no real knowledge of God can be attained. God can be known only through the observed facts of his relations to men and the world. And these are given in revelation. They are given as acts in behalf of men or toward men in a process of redemption. Thus Cremer falls back on the biblical foundation almost altogether. And though he does not take his stand exactly on biblical theology or adopt its method altogether, he approaches its standpoint very closely. The conclusions he reaches in this way are necessarily preliminary and tentative. They may be summed up briefly as follows: The central element in the Christian idea of God is love. The special aspects of this idea may be studied

as given in revelation, and as deducible from the concept of God in the light of revelation. Upon the basis of this twofold study he groups the attributes of God. In the first group he puts holiness, justice, and wisdom; in the second, omnipotence, omnipresence, omniscience, and eternity or immutability. The essay closes with a section on the unity of the divine attributes or the glory of God.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

THE CHURCH OF CHRIST. By the late REV. E. A. LITTON, M.A., late Rector of Naunton, Gloucestershire; sometime Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford; Bampton Lecturer for 1856; Examining Chaplain to the late Bishop of Durham, 1856–70. With an Introduction by REV. F. J. CHAVASSE, M.A., Principal of Wycliffe Hall, Oxford. London: James Nisbet & Co., Limited, 1898. Pp. xvi + 327. 5s.

THIS is a revised, but essentially unmodified, edition of Mr. Litton's work on the church first published in 1851. Originally it was meant to be a contribution to the discussion of the subject occasioned by the Tractarian movement. The tendency of that movement was away from the ideas of the Reformation, and Mr. Litton appeared as the defender and expounder of those ideas. He was throughout his whole life a prominent leader of the so-called low-church, or evangelical, party in the Church of England; and the steady loss of ground by this party during the last half century does not seem to have affected his attitude in the least. At the end of his life he found little, if anything, to alter in the treatise he had put before the public half a century earlier. He starts with the fundamental idea that for the Church of England, as for all Protestant churches, the Bible is the sole and absolute rule of faith. The common objection to this position, made so much of in our own day, to the effect that the church had no Bible in the apostolic age, that the Bible came historically after the church and was authenticated by the church, he does not ignore. On the contrary, he sees its full force, but he sees also that it is only a formal objection. The function of a rule of faith is the conveyance of the divine authority to men. The Bible as a rule of faith existed in the mind of Christ and the apostles and prophets long before its appearance as a written work or collection of written works. Accordingly it precedes and conditions the organization of the church. Mr. Litton shows by this primary contention that he has grasped the meaning of the controversy between

evangelicalism and ritualism in the Church of England. It is at this fundamental point that his high-church opponents will enter their demurrer. If it is true, as they contend, that the Bible is for some reason or other either insufficient or obscure, and it is necessary to resort to the early Fathers to clear or supplement it, Mr. Litton's subsequent utterances lose their force. But if he has established his position as against the position of the Roman Catholic church or of those who hold to the *via media*, his reasoning from this point on is conclusive. For this reasoning consists in a simple exposition of the facts of the New Testament, as far as they bear on the matter of the organization and government of the church. Some little light has been thrown, of course, on this subject by the investigations of Harnack and Hatch, which Mr. Litton has failed to appreciate, or, at any rate, to use; but in the discussion between the high- and low-church parties this additional knowledge favors rather the low-church view than its opposite. From the discussion of the New Testament facts Mr. Litton passes on to the historical unfolding of the subject, showing how from primitive presbyterianism the church passed into episcopacy, following the same law which governs the development of all institutions. With the synagogue as its basis the church, on the one hand, appropriated to itself what was well known and put it to a new use, and, on the other, it devised new regulations as need required. When its outward unity was lost, the church still remained spiritually one. It is one today in spite of the many names and contending claims of denominations. As an evangelical Mr. Litton recognizes the validity of the claims of all Christian bodies that are actuated by a living union with the Head of the invisible church and extends the right hand of fellowship to them. The only difficulty we find with this theory is that the inner and spiritual unity which it postulates in the body of Christ is not an effective unity. It evidently does not lead the parts to recognize their organic relations to one another and to enter into fellowship with one another. If it were of such a nature as to do this, it would inevitably lead to outward unity also. If Mr. Litton is right, then efforts toward bringing about the reunion of Christendom are superfluous. They would, indeed, be superfluous if such an inner sense of fraternity existed among Christian bodies of different names as would lead them to recognize each other as the members of the body of Christ. But who will assert that such a unity does exist?

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

ESSAI SUR L'OBLIGATION MORALE. Par GEORGES FULLIQUET, docteur ès sciences, licencié en théologie. Paris: Ancienne Librairie German Baillière et C^ie^; Félix Alcan, éditeur, 1898, Pp. vii + 454. Fr. 7.50.

THIS essay in the *Bibliothèque de philosophie comtemporaine* is characterized by a clear, pure style, a natural order of development, comprehensiveness of view, freshness and independence of thought, and a reverent regard for the theistic basis of morals. It is a valuable contribution to ethical science.

By a psychological study the author firsts develops and supports his own theory. He follows this with a critical study, in which are stated and tested ethical principles antagonistic to his doctrine. He closes his discussion with a rapid but searching historical review of seven eminent theorists — Kant, Schopenhauer, Renouvier, Herbert Spencer, Sécretan, Fouillée, and Guyau. The reader is thus in the shortest time enabled to see with the author's eyes and to have in mind the test by which all moral systems and principles not in harmony with his own are judged and condemned.

Fulliquet credits to M. Malan that which specifically and essentially distinguishes his theory, but claims that he has more adequately expounded and defended the theory than Malan himself. Its characteristic doctrine has respect to the determining source of obligation. We are taught that our obligation, and in consequence our obligatory acts and courses of action, are determined as categorical requirement by nothing directly known to us, whether within or without ourselves, whether in finite or in infinite being, whether in motives or in motors. We do, indeed, indirectly ascertain the determining source through a study of the facts of obligation as directly known in consciousness. From these facts we infer the otherwise unknown source. The knowledge of obligation, whether in the general or as specific requirement, never does and never can arise from a knowledge of its determining ground, but always, instead, the reverse holds — the knowledge of the ground arises from the knowledge of the fact.

What, now, is that, known indirectly but not directly, which imposes upon us the supreme or moral law of our conduct? We have self-consciousness. This consciousness is immediate knowledge. In the self as thus known is a free power — the power of self-determination. This self-determination is in a measure independent of action. But with this independence, this self-determination, goes the conscious fact of obligation. This obligation presupposes the independence of power and

leaves it intact, but is itself an imperative, binding man to one and only one act, or line of action, which nevertheless it is in his power to realize or refuse to realize. Thus obligation, or that from which it springs, is not a motive or motor. It does not determine the realization of the act, but only that the man himself, in his freedom, ought to determine and effect its realization. Thus every form of determinism, open or disguised, is excluded as fatal to obligation and true morality.

Again, the fact of obligation, consciously known, is found, when carefully studied, to have the two significant characteristics of absoluteness and sanctity or holiness, while the study of the conduct in which obligation is realized shows that it always causes a supreme satisfaction comparable to no other, and hence that such conduct in itself and its results is man's *summum bonum*, is "*the good.*" Now, we safely argue from the nature of an effect to the nature of its cause. In this case such argument justifies the conclusion that the determining source or ground of our obligation is the divine, or, we may say, the divine nature. Absoluteness and holiness are distinguishing characteristics of that being, and are thus immediately inferred from the same characteristics in obligation, while the union of supreme happiness with moral obedience shows also supreme goodness in the source of obligation.

Yet, again, the further study of the conscious fact of obligation shows that obligation is to nothing outside of man and foreign to him, but to that which is within him and is constitutive of him. But having already found that all obligation comes to us from the divine nature and holds us therefore to the divine nature, we safely infer that the divine is an element of our own being or self, and the most essential fundamental element, because it is regulative of all else. Behold, then, the result! The total self-constituting man is dual, is in fact two selves. The one is self-conscious, self-determining, measurably independent, yet in this freedom and independence is subject to a supreme law from without itself. The other self is unconscious, sovereign, divine, necessarily imposing upon the self-conscious self the imperative of action.

From lack of space no further statement of this extremely interesting discussion can be given, a discussion always felicitous and in its concise criticism of other theories and theorists luminous and searching. The author nowhere betrays the slightest suspicion that his own theory is defective in either its substance or its exposition. This happy

assurance is enviable. But how can some of us fail to ask whether man is such a duality? Whether it is not the whole man rather than an inferior fraction of man that is at once the self which is conscious of the self and of which the self is conscious, that at once knows and obeys the moral law? Whether the divine nature, strictly considered, is not the nature of a divine being, and that divine being one and one only, rightly called God and worshiped as God, other than man, yet within man? Whether it is not characteristic of the divine in its real existence to be self-conscious and to act in obedience to the moral law which has its seat and home within him? Whether the good, as realized in obedience to obligation, has no natural good as its rational presupposition, which through obedience becomes the moral good and can be known by an adequate intelligence as determining obligation? Reason can never consent to the empty formalism of the Kantian ethics to which Fulliquet gives his unqualified assent. There must be a possible science of conduct which will make known that natural good which, because it istwhat it is, carries to the moral agent the obligation to adopt it as an end of action and by adoption transforms it into moral good, the true *summum bonum*. God's nature has definite, rational contents and requires contents in all rational agents in complete conformity with itself. Fulliquet's fundamental doctrine is unsatisfactory.

GEO. D. B. PEPPER.

COLBY UNIVERSITY,
Waterville, Me.

THE CHRISTIAN PASTOR AND THE WORKING CHURCH. By WASHINGTON GLADDEN, D.D., LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. "The International Theological Library." Pp. xiv + 485. $2.50, *net*.

IT is a fundamental defect of American and English works on practical theology that they lack in comprehensiveness and thoroughness of treatment. They are fragmentary in their character. They discuss but relatively few of the topics that belong to church and pastoral life. Each writer selects such phases of the broad subject as he may regard of most practical importance and discusses them in a somewhat isolated and unmethodical manner. This is in line with the practical character of English and American theological thought, and particularly of church and pastoral life, and while some may regard it as a defect, others doubtless would regard it as a merit.

There are many most excellent works of this eclectic character, of which the volume before us is one of the best. In the aggregate they pretty thoroughly cover the field of practical theology, and on the whole serve their practical and helpful purpose. But it is to be regretted that there is no work written in the English language, so far as the writer knows, that undertakes to cover the whole field, and that grapples with the subject in a comprehensive and scientific manner. In this respect other branches of theology, and particularly dogmatics, are far in advance of this. It is the habit of American writers, especially, to detach homiletics from its relation to other departments of the theological discipline to which it belongs. It is set over against pastoral theology, rather than included in it. The preacher is thereby practically differentiated from the pastor. Preaching is thus treated as if it belonged to an independent department, or were only a branch of general rhetoric and oratory. Thus the teaching function of the church is measurably lost sight of, and preaching is treated characteristically as the rhetorical function of a minister, whose representative position as teacher and advocate for the church in the discharge of its own responsible task of presenting Christianity to the world is largely ignored or obscured, or at least not accentuated. The scope of pastoral functions is limited, dealing largely with the pastoral care of individuals or classes, and a few other and sometimes subordinate functions, and thus the pastor fails of full recognition as a preacher, and preaching of full recognition as a church and pastoral function. Moreover, pastoral theology is separated from practical theology and treated as if it were an independent department. The consequence is that the problems of practical theology are not discussed with adequate fulness and in proper relation to each other. The choice of topics for discussion often seems a matter purely of individual caprice, or preference, or supposed practical utility, rather than of sound theoretic judgment. No two works on pastoral theology indicate any harmony of view as to what may properly be included within its scope, as to what, properly defined, pastoral theology is, or as to how it differs from practical theology. Discussions waver between the church point of view and the pastoral point of view, and there is no well-defined line of demarcation between them, and full justice is done to neither point of view. Confessedly, in this country it is difficult to discuss the problems of practical theology from any other than the pastoral point of view, for the reason that the free-church system prevails, the autonomy of the individual church and the freedom of the ministry are strongly

emphasized, and much depends on individual pastoral initiative and leadership. It is true that in some of our churches or denominations many ecclesiastical and pastoral questions are settled for the local church and its pastor. In churches of a centralized ecclesiastical polity, questions of government, discipline, many questions of practical administration, questions of worship and of preaching upon the basis of the Christian year are settled for the local church, and the results are ready at hand for the pastor. He has no initiative here and no responsibility, save as leader along lines already marked out for him. It is natural that in such churches, and especially in the Roman Catholic church, practical theology should take the form of pastoral theology, and that pastoral or priestly problems should be relatively few. But in our independent churches all questions relating to the ordering of church life, that is, all questions of practical theology, with whatever incidental helps from representative bodies, which are only advisory, are strictly local church questions, and ultimately most of these questions are practically in the hands of the pastor as the leader of the church. In our independent church systems the local community has the initiative in all questions of its own organization, being guided by no external legislation and by no formal rules, but simply by the fundamental principles of church polity. It has the initiative in all questions of government, discipline, and administration, being neither dependent upon nor helped by any prescribed laws or rules, save such as it may freely adopt for itself. Each church chooses its own forms of worship. Each church is responsible for the proclamation of the gospel in the community where it is placed, and for the administration of its benevolences. All these questions are therefore preëminently local church questions. In considering them we cannot lose the church point of view, nor ignore the responsibility of the whole brotherhood of the church. But at the same time, these local churches are dependent upon their pastors for the realization of their church functions. Each pastor, therefore, has leadership in all lines of church activity. And for this reason, among others, doubtless, most of our American works on practical theology are in fact only works on pastoral theology. For the most part they take the pastoral point of view. Some, indeed, lay stress upon the responsibility of the church. But the point of view is the pastorate, not the church. Now, it would seem to be a practicable thing, as it is, indeed, a desirable thing, to discuss church problems from the church point of view, and, at the same time, in such way as to include pastoral responsibility in the leadership of the church.

This would properly accentuate the responsibility of the church as the body that represents Christ and his work, and at the same time it would look at the ordering of church life and the realizing of its duties as a responsible body as accomplished under the leadership of the pastorate. Such a work should be much more systematic and complete than any work that may properly be called pastoral theology.

The work before us is in its general character like other American works on pastoral theology. It differs, indeed, from many in the fact that it is more modern, and that it brings under discussion more fully than many the important questions that are confronting the churches and their pastors in our day. But its point of view is in the main similar to that of other works that undertake to discuss pastoral problems. The author selects for discussion such subjects as seem to him most important for the help of pastors, and, somewhat arbitrarily seemingly, he omits subjects that might well come into the field of discussion, and which would appear if he wrote from the church point of view. It is true that he lays much stress upon the responsibilities of the church as the community into whose hands has been placed the deposit of truth and life, and which is the appointed agent in bringing to completion the kingdom of God. The demand for church activity is abundantly recognized. "The theme of our investigation is the working church," he says (p. 4). Some of the topics are, indeed, church topics. Still, on the whole, the pastoral point of view prevails, and most of the topics relate to the duties of the pastor. This may not be, indeed, a matter of reproach. It simply indicates that the pastoral and practical interest predominates in the mind of the writer, and that he wishes to be helpful to pastors in the doing of their practical work. It may be negative criticism to say that he does not undertake a larger, more comprehensive, and more scientific work. And yet his work suffers from the defect of its method. It lacks in scientific quality and scope. It does not sufficiently grapple with what is fundamental. Too much is taken for granted. Too many topics are arbitrarily excluded. Topics are not carefully related to each other and to what lies back of them, are not properly grouped, and do not appear in a well-ordered scheme. What belongs to the church as an organized body, and what to the individual Christian, or to the church official, is sometimes apparently lost sight of. In a word, the practical dominates the theoretic aspects of church and pastoral life.

And yet it must be said that the work is well adapted to the realization of its manifest design, and it is highly to be recommended

for its practical helpfulness. As above suggested, subjects of modern interest and importance are selected for discussion. The significance of the church as well as of the pastorate is emphasized. Much stress is laid upon the work of religious education in the parish. No one can fail to receive the impression that Christian pedagogy is one of the most important subjects with which the modern church and pastorate can concern themselves. Woman's work is judiciously discussed. The institutional church is made attractive, and its importance is made apparent. Parish evangelization is not forgotten, and the principle of church fellowship is duly urged. It is not apparent that the author regards it as supremely important that the pastor should be a theologian, but neither does he advocate the substitution for theology of economics or sociology, or even Christian ethics. It is the work of a wise pastor, whose observation has been wide, whose experience is varied, whose judgment is sound, whose sympathies are distinctly Christian and in the best sense evangelical, whose spirit is catholic, whose instincts are strongly ethical, whose interests are modern, and whose standard for the Christian ministry is high; and it is the more weighty that it is the product of one whose success in the ministry has been notable. The style in which the book is written — if sometimes a little careless, sometimes over-colloquial and defective in elegance and purity — is nevertheless plain, idiomatic English, direct, and notably simple and unpretentious. It will prove to be a practically helpful book to all pastors.

LEWIS O. BRASTOW.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn.

SERMONS TO YOUNG MEN. A New and Enlarged Edition of *Straight Sermons*. By HENRY VAN DYKE, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. xiii + 253. $1.25.

THE volume designated *Straight Sermons: To Young Men and Other Human Beings* was published in 1893. Since, however, this title hardly suggested the contents of the volume and was liable to be misunderstood, in this new and enlarged edition it has given place to another which is more fitting.

These discourses were first prepared for a congregation in which there were many young men, and were subsequently delivered "in college chapels at Harvard, Yale, Princeton, and elsewhere." The

author studiously avoids the phraseology of theological treatises, and uses the plain, popular language of the people. The style as a whole is clear. The truth of the gospel is presented in a fresh, attractive form. The living, present, personal Christ is the keynote of the entire book.

But, while these discourses as a whole merit high commendation, in some respects they seem to us to be defective. A part of them, not all, are essays rather than sermons. They lack that direct address which should characterize genuine pulpit utterance.

Moreover, there is at times a lack of progress. On a thought already sufficiently clear the author stops to pile up a mass of statement, and this is sometimes continued until the point under discussion seems to be quite hid under the rhetorical luxuriance. This, perhaps, might be tolerated in the essay, but it is a manifest incumbrance in the sermon.

The author at times also lacks thoroughness of analysis. For example, in his discourse on "Abraham's Adventure," having discussed the broadest meaning of faith's adventure and what the adventure of faith involves, he last of all lays down the proposition that "faith is an adventure." Logic would require the proof of the last proposition before the discussion of its broadest meaning and what it involves. But it probably cannot be proved. Adventure has in it the two elements of uncertainty and hazard; while the innermost kernel of faith is certitude, and in it there is no hazard in the sense of liability to failure. So that the proposition "faith is an adventure" is really self-contradictory. Strictly speaking, Abraham was no adventurer.

While the author's interpretation of Scripture is usually both just and suggestive, in his discourse on Solomon he goes quite beyond the historical record in his disparagement of Bathsheba, in order that he may find in her a hereditary basis for the fleshly follies of her son. But why not, in part at least, find that basis in David? Guided simply by the historical statements of the Bible, he was the greater sinner of the two, and in his great penitential psalm he bewails his inbred corruption and bitterly repents of his "blood-guiltiness."

There are in this book some ambitious sentences, which are always a reproach to good preaching. Our author also says, "the mellow apples ripen and fall." But a *mellow* apple is already ripe. He speaks of a "tumultuating heart;" but we are grateful that that adjective is now obsolete and a barbarism. On p. 167 a passage from Mark 2:5, 6 is attributed to 2 Chron. 1:10.

But, while these discourses cannot be classed with truly great sermons, they are fresh in thought and reflect the most advanced and best religious thinking of the day.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE AMERICAN MISSION IN EGYPT: 1854 to 1896. By REV. ANDREW WATSON, D.D. Pittsburgh, Pa.: United Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1898. Pp. 479. $2.50.

IN view of the international questions among the nations of Europe centering in the land of Egypt, and the recent movements of the English and Egyptian soldiers under General Kitchener in the country of the upper Nile, any book well conceived and well written about Egypt would command attention these days. Dr. Watson's book is not only well conceived and well written, but it deals with a subject which must attract the attention of all lovers of the world's progress. Egypt is the gateway to the whole of the great Nile valley. Her civilization must of necessity affect that of much of the territory of central Africa. What is her state of preparation for this work? A study of this book gives its readers a fairly clear conception of the situation, though it was not written from this point of view.

The author was particularly well fitted for writing this history of the American mission in Egypt by his long connection with it. The United Presbyterian Church of North America began mission work in the land of the Pharaohs in 1854. Dr. Watson became identified with the mission in 1861, by appointment of the home church, only seven years after its inception. During all these thirty-seven years he has been an efficient worker in the field, laboring in Cairo, Alexandria, Monsourah, Asyut, and other prominent centers. He has been a professor in the college training school at Asyut, and in the theological seminary at Cairo. He knows every foot of the field. Then, too, the author has the true instincts of a historian. His large use of the early records of the mission, and of the records of previous missionary attempts, makes one feel that he is in possession of the final word on the subject.

The book is admirably illustrated with over a half hundred full-page half-tone pictures. There is a good table of contents and an index. The book is well gotten up — good paper, good type, and well bound.

In chap. 1 the author gives a brief sketch of the Christian church in Egypt from the apostolic age down to modern times—the planting of the church, the conquest of the country by the Muhammedans, and the subsequent oppressions and persecutions. In chap. 2 he gives a brief but clear account of the earlier efforts of the modern church to lead Egypt into the light: that by the Moravians, 1750 to 1800; that by the Church Missionary Society of England, 1819 to 1840; and other desultory efforts. Chap. 3 gives a review of the history of the Egyptian government, especial attention being bestowed on the rule of the house of Muhammad Ali, 1801 down to the present. There is also a fairly good description of the Muhammedan and Coptic churches, the two principal faiths of the country. The importance of this section is very great, as one must know something of these faiths, and the lives of the people holding them, before he can appreciate the magnitude of the work undertaken by the American mission. There are some noble features about the Muhammedan faith, and it has done much for its adherents along certain lines, but its lack of power to save the individual, and to regulate and purify society, is strikingly shown in this volume. Under the oppressions of the land the Coptic church, with its membership of 250,000, has lost all spirit, and religion has degenerated into mere form, and a following after superstition. The morals of the Coptic church are even below those of the Muhammedans. While a few converts have been made from the Muslims, the great body of the membership of the American mission has been taken from the Coptic church. This chapter furnishes us with the background for the study of the work of the American mission, giving the environment in which it found itself in beginning its work. The early success is accounted for, in part at least, by the fact that, in the very year the mission was established, Said Pasha, the most liberal, tolerant, and broad-minded governor Egypt has ever had, began his rule. Though a Muhammedan, he showed his tolerance by donating to the American mission in 1861 a fine building site in Cairo. This favorable environment did much for the cause in its early history; while its absence accounts in part for the failure of all previous missionary effort in Egypt. The author interprets this as the providence of God, calling the United Presbyterian Church to evangelize the land of the Pharaohs. For while the missionaries and the native converts later suffered persecution, it was a great thing for the mission that it got a firm footing under such favorable conditions.

The great body of the book is taken up with a somewhat detailed account of the planting of the mission, and its history from 1854 to 1896. One sees the work growing from Cairo to Alexandria, to Monsourah, to Asyut, to Luxor, until the whole of the Nile valley to the first cataract — a distance of about one thousand miles — is occupied. It is a fascinating history. There are a number of sections that read like a novel, *e. g.*, the case of Fam Staphanos, and the marriage of the young Christian girl Bamba to the Maharajah Dhulup Singh, the Indian royal prince so well known in England. The reader gets a clear idea of mission work, the difficulties encountered, the self-denials of the missionaries and the converts, the methods of work, the greatness of faith required to go forward in the face of tremendous and seemingly insurmountable opposition, and the power of the truth to conquer the hearts of men. I know of no book whose reading will give so clear a view of the real problems and the workings of missions. Egypt being but a strip of land along the Nile, one can follow the conquest of this land for Christ, never getting lost in his bearings and geography.

In the closing chapters the author takes up for special discussion education, workers under presbytery, the book department, etc. This part of the work will be found most instructive. It is gratifying to see the importance which the mission has attached to educational work. There are 168 schools, with 11,000 pupils in them. There are (1) out station schools, (2) mission schools, (3) boarding schools, (4) a training college, and (5) a theological seminary. The mission is training up teachers and preachers.

This book may well be read as a study in the organization of mission work. Perhaps nowhere is work so thoroughly and wisely organized as in Egypt. The early missionaries seem to have been guided to a wise distribution of responsibility between missionaries and native workers. The missionary association, composed of all the missionaries, lay and clerical, has charge of all moneys coming to the mission as such, the book work, etc., while the presbytery, composed of all ordained ministers and one elder from each organized congregation, has charge of all ecclesiastical matters, such as the admission of students of theology, their licensure and ordination, the organization of churches, the appointment of native religious workers, and the use of money collected in the native churches. Since the native ministers and delegated elders have, for years, outnumbered the ordained foreign missionaries, the responsibility for the regular working of the native church rests largely on the natives themselves. No congregation is organized

until the people are willing to pledge themselves to raise at least half the pastor's salary. Under these conditions twenty-six congregations are in existence, and several of these are entirely self-supporting. Thus is the native church being prepared for self-support, and later for a part in the evangelization of the Soudan.

D. A. McCLENAHAN.

THE ALLEGHENY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Allegheny, Pa.

THE SOCIAL MIND AND EDUCATION. By GEORGE EDGAR VINCENT, Assistant Professor of Sociology in the University of Chicago. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897. Pp. ix+ 111. $1.25.

THE well-informed man, the highly intelligent man, the fully educated man, will know what fields of knowledge have been explored — the results, substantially, of investigation in these fields — how these results are synthesized, integrated, unified, into a system which is the content of the social self-consciousness — a part of, or the whole of, a science of society, a philosophy which is the true *scientia scientiarum*. To give the student this content of the social mind, and to enable him, in some degree, to enlarge and perfect it, to see the place in it of the results of future investigation, to see the gaps and how to fill them, must be the aim in a fully adequate scheme of education. The practical problem is to arrange a curriculum of studies that will secure this end as fully as possible. Professor Vincent proposes a "tentative curriculum," which will, for the present, exhibit somewhat fully the content of the social mind, and serve as a basis of future development — a scheme or framework into which the results that change and enlarge the content of the social mind may be wrought without making it necessary to take the whole thing down and build it over again for every advance in knowledge made in any of the several fields.

In order to show the importance of — not to say necessity for — such a curriculum, and to explain and justify it, the author has written several chapters defining the social mind and discussing its development, supporting the proposition that social philosophy is the true *scientia scientiarum*, pointing out the analogy and tracing the parallel between the development of social and of individual thought, showing that social self-consciousness is a matter of — is realized in — education, and

presenting the principle of, the reason for, and the leading schemes of an integration of studies.

The book shows wide reading and clear and deep thinking. The pains taken with the subject, and the mastery of it, are shown not only by the consistent and systematic treatment of it, which is the author's own, but also by the numerous and pertinent citations from the best authorities, and the just and acute criticism, that make up a large and valuable part of the discussion. Even under the difficulties inherent in the subject itself, and arising from the vastness of the field, although limited to the cognitive function of society, the work is extremely instructive and highly suggestive. It makes one hunger for more of the same sort, and it is to be hoped that the relation of the social mind and education will be further discussed from points of view that it was impossible to include in a work of this size.

P. B. REYNOLDS.

WEST VIRGINIA UNIVERSITY,
Morgantown, W. Va.

SELFHOOD AND SERVICE. The Relation of Christian Personality to Wealth and Social Redemption. By DAVID BEATON. Chicago, New York, and Toronto: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1898. Pp. 220. $1.

THE author's purpose is clearly to exalt at the same time the rights of individualism and the duty of social service. The purpose is carried out by the following line of thought, so far as one may roughly condense each fluent chapter into a single sentence:

Friends and foes of Christianity alike believe that it ought to redeem society, and that the outcome at present is very disappointing. Socialism is plausible, but Christianity is the exaltation of individualism. Christian individualism creates wealth. Individualistic wealth is essential to the production of great men. Society must be redeemed by rich personalities. Individualistic wealth serves the community by producing great educational institutions. Sinful conformity to the world "is crossing the invisible line which separates the Christian virtue of self-improvement from the vice of self-seeking." The philanthropic use of individual wealth in the spirit of Jesus and in the light of modern knowledge is the hope of the world. We have learned in our day that the distinction between sacred and secular is false, that society as well as the individual must be saved, and that wealth is a

good only when rightly used. Instead of extravagant luxury, "elegant simplicity" is the Christian ideal, especially for the sake of its effect on the rising generation, and because extravagance when so many are in need looks unsympathetic.

A vital need is that the children of well-to-do parents be educated to hold not wealth but service as the ideal of life. Not the work of proxies, but the personal service of rich, cultivated, strong men and women, after the spirit of social settlements, "is the link to bind rich and poor together in the redeemed order of society." Noble lines of personal service for sons of wealth are politics, education, and missions. Business itself is one of the chief lines of social service, and should be conducted for the sake of the welfare of the community, thus becoming a divine ministry. There are great advantages and blessings to the wealthy man himself, and to his family, in the philanthropic administration of his wealth while he lives. The bequeathing to children of a comfortable estate, especially one involving local attachments, is a clear duty, but the heaping up of grea family fortunes is a curse to all concerned. The greatest need is that Christians of wealth become filled with an enthusiasm for bringing to pass a spiritual civilization.

In the last chapter the author clearly states the temper and intention of his work as follows: "The intelligent reader of these pages will readily perceive that no appeal has been made to passion and hardly any to mere sentiment. Our aim has been to present the sanity and sweet reasonableness of the doctrine that wealth is a trust, and that its wise and Christian administration demands the exercise of the noblest religious character and the rarest civic spirit."

Selfhood and Service is a book which well-to-do church members will accept with pleasure and profit — pleasure because it defends them in their personal possession and use of property, profit because it puts their own best sentiments into words and holds before them an imperious and world-renewing ideal. "The persons for whom these considerations are especially intended are, in most instances, careful, experienced, wise, perhaps even shrewd, men of business who have accumulated or retained wealth, and by virtue of this fact are not subjects upon whom the dreams of socialists or the ravings of fanatics are likely to produce much effect. But they are Christians, presumably open to consider the reasonable moral obligations which wealth entails, and susceptible to the spiritual ideals of life which lie at the basis of all really Christian society, and must inspire every method for the higher uses of wealth."

If the author had held a brief for the defense on Christian principles of the present social order, he could not have made a better special plea. Any social order, even that which exists at the present time, thoroughly administered on the principles which he inculcates, could not stand fatally in the way of the answer to the prayer, "Thy kingdom come on earth." The last half of the book especially is full of noble, millennial thoughts, which ought to be absorbed by every well-to-do Christian in the land.

The author assumes, without attempting to prove, that strong personalities could not be developed without unlimited private ownership of property. To many Christian thinkers this is by no means axiomatic. The author's aim is altogether practical, but even so it might have been wise rather than unwise, for the sake of the very audience which he seeks to reach, to intimate the possibility that private monopoly of natural resources may need to be modified further than it now is, even if not radically displaced, in the interests of society at large. However incomplete the author's discussion is in these directions, he distinctly sets forth the fact that Christian civilization is in the presence of a great crisis, and that the emergency cannot be met without radical measures on the part of Christian men of wealth.

LEMUEL CALL BARNES.

PITTSBURGH, PA.

Current Questions for Thinking Men. By Robert Stuart MacArthur. (Philadelphia: American Baptist Publication Society, 1898; pp. 422; $1.50.) *Gladstone, and Other Addresses.* By Kerr Boyce Tupper, D.D., LL.D. (*Ibid.*, 1898; pp. 266; $1.) At least one-third of the themes here propounded and discussed by Dr. MacArthur contain suggestions of interest for men of all denominations. The remaining two-thirds are, for the most part, of especial interest to Baptists. All of them are admirable examples of the writer's ability to present with freshness and much oratorical power a statement of some of the questions of present-day life which demand recognition and answer. The same may be said of the seven addresses here brought together by Dr. Tupper. Aside from the two purely denominational, and the two others whose bare mention must suffice ("The Central Theme of the Christian Ministry" and "Immigration and Christianity"), the author writes enthusiastically and entertainingly of Gladstone, Knox, and Luther. Addressed to popular audiences, one does not expect an

elaborate and philosophical treatment; but less eulogistic and more discriminative statements were desirable. The mechanical construction of the books is excellent.—HENRY TODD DEWOLFE.

Die monistische Weltanschauung, dargestellt und geprüft. Von Lic. E. G. Steude, Seminaroberlehrer in Dresden. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898; pp. 98; M. 1.40.) The theory presented and opposed from the theistic point of view is that of the mechanical development of organic and spirit life from Haeckel's living (*beseelten*) atoms which constitute the only original world-substance. From these atoms, as a product of natural, mechanical development, come reason, the religious emotion, and the categorical imperative (p. 14). Religion is transitional, and should be displaced by philosophy—an extreme to which the disciples of Haeckel go, while he himself would unite this peculiar monism and religion.

In morals, the monistic view is represented by Herbert Spencer and Harald Höffding. The author outlines the doctrine of the evolution of morals, and reaches the conclusion that monistic ethics, based upon the theory of mechanical development, does not get beyond well-organized egoism and obedience to authority (p. 52).

The monist claims that his theory is the only one possible in view of modern natural science. The author shows that the natural scientist does not reach ultimate causes, which compels retreat to the theist's position. Finally, it is impossible upon this view to account for man's higher life.

In short, the author's destructive criticism is skilful; but what shall we put in the place of the view set aside? The reply is only an assertion of the theist's position, with little discussion of the relations between God and the world. The problem of the one ground of all and its relation to the world-process still remains.—JAMES TEN BROEKE.

Le danger moral de l'évolutionnisme religieux. Par Gaston Frommel, professeur à l'Université de Genève. (Lausanne: F. Payot, 1898; pp. 124, 16mo.) This suggestive little book, by the author of *Esquisses contemporaines*, consists of four lectures read before various organizations at Geneva, Lausanne, Sainte-Croix, and Paris, in the closing months of 1897. In a restrained and moderate spirit it calls attention to the rapid invasion of "evangelical theology" by the doctrine of evolution. Reference is made to the works of such French theologians and philosophers as A. Sabatier, H. Bois, A. Westphal,

F. Godet, J. Bovon, M. Millioud, and P. Chapuis. A wide acquaintance is evinced, not only with the primary sources, but with the large magazine literature. The main purport of the central contention may be summed up by saying that it is another evidence of the growing perception that evolution has been adopted with too little inquiry. What warrant have we for transferring a purely biological theory to other spheres, without alteration of method and application? Are the presuppositions it involves apposite in a region so contrasted as that of religion? Professor Frommel places his finger upon some of the resultant dangers, and sounds a clear note of warning.— R. M. WENLEY.

Six leçons sur les Évangiles. Par Abbé Pierre Batiffol. 3e édition. (Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1898; pp. 133; fr. 1.50.) These six lectures upon the origin of the gospels were delivered before young women admitted for the first time to the Catholic *Institut* of Paris. This institution, which represents the liberalism of the Catholics of France, has recently made what seems in France a great innovation; that is, it has admitted women to higher studies. After opposing the secondary education of women, the liberal Catholics, realizing the value of what it has done, have, at last, taken up a policy worthy of them. The opening of the *Institut* to women is a first step in the new direction, and the book before us is a sample of the teaching they receive. These six lectures are an introduction to a course in church history. The author deals with the conditions amid which the Christian Scriptures, and especially the gospels, came into existence, and the place which they filled in the early church. The lecturer says that he believes in plenary inspiration, but he discusses his theme with real independence. The field that he presents to us has been thoroughly worked by Protestants, and with greater ability and freedom; yet there is something fresh and interesting in his way of presenting his theme. The author is a man of learning and of faith. Let a large number of French young women read such healthy books, from the Roman Catholic point of view, and the religion of the future women of France will be of a higher order.— J. C. BRACQ.

La mort et la resurrection de Jésus-Christ. Par Edmond Stapfer, professeur à la faculté de théologie protestante de l'Université de Paris. (Paris: Fischbacher, 1898; pp. 352; fr. 3.50.) An attempt has been made by our author to interpret the thought of Jesus during the last six months of his life from a standpoint which presents a conflict

between a growing expectation of death and a hope to escape it. Behind these lay a profound faith in the immediate coming of God's kingdom and of his own coming as its king.

These furnish the key to Jesus' conduct through the scenes which culminated in his death. He went up to Jerusalem to overcome his foes or to die. He spoke the parousia discourse in the hope of his triumph. He made his triumphal entrance into Jerusalem to win the people to his support. His failure doomed him to death, and he felt it; still, through the last days, the last supper, the Gethsemane scene, the trial, and close up to the end, he hoped and planned to escape death and win his triumph.

An exegesis like this makes many and wide departures from the usual view of Jesus' thought. His idea of God's kingdom lacks most of the spiritual aspects which the gospels present. He fails to comprehend the moral temper of his countrymen, and is constantly deluded as to the outcome of his own work.

Naturally the resurrection has no place in Jesus' thought; so our author treats it only as an appendix. One wonders why he treats it at all. It certainly breaks the unity of the book; and one could almost wish he had omitted its discussion as he beats the air through the two concluding chapters.

His criticism leaves the reader frequently in the dark. The portrait which the fourth gospel draws of Jesus he declares to be substantially correct; yet its fundamental lines surely make his main positions impossible. He pronounces in favor of the genuineness of the parousia discourse, even in its most external sense; but he does not deal with the many passages which present a contradictory view of the kingdom.

One rises from the reading with the feeling that our author has missed what was central in Jesus' character and in his idea of his mission. — G. M. HARMON.

In his *Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater bis zur Errichtung der römischen Provinz Asia*, a dissertation for the doctor's degree (Basel: Druckerei der *Allgem. schweizer. Zeitung*, 1897; pp. 104, 8vo; M. 1.50), Felix Stähelin gives us the results of a fresh investigation of the history of the Gauls in Asia Minor from 281–133 B. C., with abundant references to the original sources of information, inscriptional and other. Concerning the later period of Galatian history, in which the New Testament scholar would be especially interested, he

says that it "presents neither more nor less attraction than that of any other vassal state of Rome. . . . . The Galatians are no more the wild, defiant fellows who with sword in hand overrun half the world, depending solely on their own power and spreading terror wherever they come; they have become a diplomatic people that compete with their neighbors in ingratiating themselves with the Romans and in shrewdly turning to their advantage the power of the rulers of the world" (pp. 103, 104).—ERNEST D. BURTON.

The Bible of St. Mark. St. Mark's Church, the Altar and Throne of Venice. By Alexander Robertson, D.D. With eighty-two illustrations. (London: Allen; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1898; pp. xvi + 376; 10s. 6d., *net.*) We have in this volume a concise history of St. Mark's, and then an elaborate catalogue and explanation of the sculptures and mosaics which adorn the church. Most of these represent scriptural scenes and characters, and hence Dr. Robertson gives his book the title of *The Bible of St. Mark.* He writes in a clear and popular style, and with a thorough mastery of his subject. His mind seems somewhat prosaic, and he describes all the splendor of the building with but few words of critical appreciation. Perhaps this, in one sense, is fortunate for the ordinary visitor to St. Mark's, who needs a careful guide rather than a poet. Other persons, who want more of rapture and eloquence, can find them in Ruskin's *Stones of Venice.* The text of Dr. Robertson's book is accompanied by eighty-two illustrations. These are photographic reproductions of the most important of the sculptures and mosaics. They cannot be praised too highly. Many of them represent objects not before photographed, and almost all of them are exquisitely soft, and yet clear and distinct. Dr. Robertson has produced a guide to St. Mark's which will prove invaluable to those who wish to become really acquainted with the church.—FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

Der Werdegang des deutschen Volkes. Von Otto Kaemmel. Erster Theil: Das Mittelalter. (Leipzig: Fr. Wilh. Grünow, 1896; pp. xx + 366; M. 4.) This little book, in which the author has attempted to tell the story of the upgrowth and progress of the German people during the Middle Ages, is not a book for beginners, but for the mature reader, who in small compass wishes to get at the hidden meaning, the underlying unity, of vast cycles of apparently disconnected historic events. That Dr. Kaemmel has done his work well

goes without saying. There is the same clear and straightforward recital of the story, the same deep sympathy with the German people in their long and almost hopeless struggle after unity and great national statehood, the same profound comprehension of the sources of national strength, which have made his larger work so long and so deservedly popular.— BENJAMIN TERRY.

Martin Luther. The Hero of the Reformation (1483–1546). By Henry Eyster Jacobs, Dean and Professor of Systematic Theology, Evangelical Lutheran Seminary, Philadelphia, Pa. (= "Heroes of the Reformation," edited by Samuel Macauley Jackson, Professor of Church History, New York University.) (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898; pp. xv + 454; $1.50.) Seven other biographies are to appear in this series of "Heroes of the Reformation." Of these *Martin Luther* is the first published. Dr. Jacobs treats his subject under three heads: "The Monk (1483–1517)," "The Protestant (1517–1522)," and "The Reformer (1522–1546)." The proportion of attention given to each topic or section is judicious. One sees prevalent errors in dates and in emphasis quietly set aside. Abundant references disclose the sources of his statements. For those interested in the theological positions of Luther this book is an admirable work. About fifty pages are devoted to a summary of Luther's theology. The sympathy and ability of the author for this part of his task are most evident. There is lacking, however, any adequate treatment of Luther's relation to the profound intellectual and theological unrest of his time. The Humanists and other leaders of the new learning, together with the influences of the university of Wittenberg, founded just at the time when Luther was prepared for intellectual advance, deserve a place in the biography of the hero of the Reformation. Luther's dominance in the subsequent history of civilization is so important that this history is manifestly defective without it. "The Zwickau prophets" have scant notice, and the Anabaptists are treated as monstrosities; yet the great truths which they held in common with Luther ought not to be overlooked. With the abundance of material at hand modern taste has the right to demand a psychological estimate of Luther's development; but there is little of this. The book is, however, admirable as a modern, accurate account of his deeds and beliefs. The illustrations are numerous and historically interesting. There is an index and a map.— HERBERT E. THAYER

John Knox and John Knox's House. By Charles John Guthrie. (Edinburgh and London: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, 1898; pp. 140; 2s.) This small treatise gives an account of the house in which Knox lived in Edinburgh — its situation, structure, erection, and early history. Then follow chapters on the connection of this house with Knox, the home life of the reformer in Edinburgh, the later history of the house, and the contents of the rooms now shown to the public. The last part of the book, giving testimonies to Knox's character and a list of his extant writings and a meager bibliography, is only remotely connected with this subject, and ought to have been omitted. There are eighty-nine illustrations, which greatly enhance the value of the treatise. — ERI B. HULBERT.

Thomas Cranmer. By Arthur James Mason, D.D. (Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898; pp. 203; $1.25.) (="Leaders of Religion," edited by H. C. Beeching, M.A.) No books are more promotive of historical study than such a well-written, brief biography as this. The most important function of such a book is the diffusion of established facts and sound generalizations among readers who lack facilities for investigation, or are unable to utilize facilities that are theirs. As time-savers, books of this class also commend themselves to many who persuade themselves that they are unable to read more extensive works. Nor is a book like this to be despised by more thorough historical students; it has considerable value as an introduction to research; there is no better way of beginning an independent investigation than by reading such a book as Dr. Mason has given us. This sketch of Cranmer — it can hardly be called a portrait — is admirably fitted to introduce one to the study of the English Reformation. Cranmer is the central figure of that movement, and the Church of England of today is substantially his handiwork. This, and much more, the author makes clear. The author does not lack candor, but his strong bias in favor of the "Catholic" theory of the Church of England, and his desire as canon of Canterbury to make out a good case for a former archbishop, sometimes contend with one another in an amusing way. On the whole, apology is a trifle overdone, since it is hardly possible to propound a hypothesis that will account for all the acts of Cranmer in a way creditable both to his intelligence and his moral courage. The reader is not likely to be misled, for Dr. Mason gives the facts accurately and adequately, and his pleas may be taken for what they are worth. — HENRY C. VEDDER.

Der heilige Märtyrer Josaphat Kuncewicz, Erzbischof von Polozk. Von Johann Looshorn. (München: P. Zipperer's Buchhandlung, 1898; pp. vi + 189; M. 2.50.) The subject of this sketch is a Roman Catholic archbishop, born in 1580 in Wladimir, a city in the Russian province of Wolhynia. In early life he came under the tutelage of Jesuits, who instilled in him an intense hatred of every form of Christianity other than the Roman. It was this uncompromising position which led him afterward into great difficulties, and which was the primary cause of his assassination in 1623 by adherents of the Russian orthodox church. Kuncewicz was evidently a devout man, and he deserves a better biography than the one before us. The book is so full of extravagant statements of the archbishop's superior holiness as to be positively unreal. The miracles he is said to have wrought after his death are so transparently apocryphal that their narration, in a book which is calculated to be taken seriously, appears highly amusing. This part of the book is a translation from a Latin original by Jakob Susza. Appended to the biography of Saint Josaphat, Looshorn gives us a historical survey of the persecutions which the Roman Catholic Ruthenians suffered at the hands of the Russian government. — *Die Reformation der Kirche in Bamberg unter Bischof Weigand 1522–1556.* Auf Grund archivalischer Beilagen dargestellt. Von Otto Erhard. (Erlangen: Fr. Junge, 1898; pp. iii + 99; M. 1.80.) The author in a short preface modestly expresses the wish that his book might be a slight contribution toward a fuller and more perfect presentation of the religious history of Bavaria during the sixteenth century. We confidently believe that students of church history will gratefully accept his contribution. The book is one of those monographs which, because they are based upon the study of contemporaneous writings and of official papers, cause the writer much labor, but which are indispensable in historical investigations. The epoch covered by the book is a most eventful one, and Weigand, who had the good fortune of being at the head of the important bishopric of Bamberg throughout that stirring period, comes in for a large share of characterization. The history of his several acts has an important bearing upon the Protestant Reformation in his diocese. The author maintains that the reform movement had struck deep roots in Bavaria during the reign of Weigand's predecessor, and that Weigand, who had no sympathy with the Reformation at all, could not fight it successfully until 1548. Weigand's temporizing policy and his underhanded dealings he makes largely responsible for the growth of an anarchistic spirit

which caused the good bishop such trouble in the Peasants' War. The book alludes also to the persecutions of the Evangelicals and Anabaptists after 1525. The narrative is a connected one throughout. We would venture the criticism, however, that the value of the book might have been enhanced if the author had thrown his material into chapters. There is no table of contents, but an alphabetical list of names used in the book is subjoined.—A. J. RAMAKER.

Die Heilsordnung. Von Emil Wacker. (Gütersloh: Bertelsmann, 1898; pp. 334; M. 4.) The author is director of a deaconess institute and has published a number of devotional books and discussions on practical piety. This book insists on conversion and the personal appropriation of salvation. He feels that Lutheran theology has dealt too exclusively with the doctrine of justification by faith and the objective side of salvation, and has neglected the dealings of the Spirit of God with the soul of man. To those of us who have been bred in evangelical religious bodies of America or England the gospel preached here will seem elementary; but every nation knows its own needs, and the ponderous German thoroughness of the author brings out many familiar truths in a new light. He carefully, and, on the whole, wisely, warns off the dangers of the revivalism that is lumped as "Methodism" in Germany, and, like a good Lutheran, ever insists on the work of God and abhors synergism.—WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Christi Person und Werk in der Predigt. Von D. Hermann Gebhardt, Kirchenrat. (Gotha: Gustav Schloessmann, 1898; pp. xv + 140; M. 2.60.) In the preface the author very cleverly portrays the different classes of ministers he has known and their attitude to preaching: the easy-going men, content with reading the papers and cultivating their hobbies, who regard the sermon as an unwelcome interruption and get over it as lightly as they can; the men who scold at the morals of others, but have no religious life in them; the zealous parish workers, who consume their time in societies and meetings and social schemes, and have little strength to spare for their sermons; and the really faithful and able preachers. They all seem to him in a measure to fail in holding and impressing their audiences, especially the men. The author thinks the fault is largely with their message. He tries to set forth the doctrine of the person and work of Christ as it ought to be preached. The book is a useful and concise summary of biblical teachings, but we have failed to see that it rises to so ambi-

tious a pledge. The style has an unusally rapid and pleasant movement.— WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Jesus and the Resurrection. Thirty Addresses for Good Friday and Easter. By Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D., Rector of St. Mark's, Philadelphia. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898; 5s.) This volume contains two series of related addresses: one delivered at a three-hours' service on Good Friday; the other delivered at various Eastertides. The Good Friday addresses are based on the seven words from the cross; the Easter addresses are based on the various incidents connected with the resurrection of our Lord which the evangelists have preserved.

The purpose of this little volume is to furnish an addition to the already vast mass of devotional literature, the distinctive feature being the coupling of the incidents of the resurrection with the scenes at the cross. The note of all the Good Friday addresses is love; and this note is continued in the first of the Eastertide sermons.

The author is well known as a member of the "Catholic" school of thought, and it was to be expected that these sermons should show the characteristics of the school. And so, as a matter of fact, they do, though in a less degree than one might anticipate. Most Christians would not feel that Friday, during the hours from twelve to three (see p. 16), is any more appropriate for intercessory prayer than any other day or hour. Nor will the author's idea of apostolic succession (Sermon XII) find acceptance outside of his own school.

Nevertheless, the religious tone of these addresses is a healthful one. The preacher has used his imaginative power to good purpose, and offers real food to the people who were fortunate enough to sit at his feet.

The reproduction from stenographic notes is faithful. The occasion is clearly perceivable to the reader. The author, in revising, has apparently preserved well the form of the sermons as they fell from his lips.

The express devotional literature is not always the best thing to inspire true devotion. In aiming at the heart many preachers and writers have ignored the fact that there is a head. Dr. Mortimer has not done this, and his addresses will take their place among the best of the literature of that class.— L. W. BATTEN.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY has received books from the following firms:

E. R. Herrick & Co., New York:

Horton, Robert F., M.A., D.D. Women of the Old Testament. Studies in Womanhood, 1898; pp. xii + 291; cloth. $1.50.

Peloubet, F. N., D.D. Suggestive Illustrations on the Acts of the Apostles, 1898; pp. iv + 483; cloth. $1.25.

Peloubet, F. N., D.D. Suggestive Illustrations on the Gospel of John, 1898; pp. iv + 543; cloth. $1.25.

Peter Eckler, 35 Fulton street, New York:

Morehouse, George W. The Wilderness of Worlds. A Popular Sketch. The Evolution of Matter from Nebula to Man and Return; the Life-Orbit of a Star, 1898; pp. 246; cloth. $1.

Henry Frowde, New York and London:

Doane, William Croswell. The Manifestations of the Risen Jesus, their Methods and their Meanings. The Charlotte Wood Slocum Lectures in the University of Michigan, A. D. 1897; 1898; pp. 189; cloth. $1.

Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia:

Hay, Charles E., D.D. Luther, the Reformer, 1898; pp. 201; cloth. $0.40.

Open Court Publishing Co., Chicago:

Candlin, George T. Chinese Fiction. With illustrations from original Chinese works, 1898; pp. 51; boards. $0.15.

Karl J. Trübner, Strassburg:

Goedeckemeyer, Albert. Epikurs Verhältnis zu Demokrit in der Naturphilosophie, 1897; pp. 157; paper. M. 4.

Victor Lecoffre, Paris:

Horn, E. Saint Étienne, roi apostolique de Hongrie ("Les Saints"), 1898; pp. viii + 197; paper. Fr. 2.

Victor Retaux, Paris:

Le Gouvello, Le Vicomte Hippolyte. Le vénérable Michel le Nobletz (1577–1672), un apôtre de la Brétagne au XVII^e siècle, 1898; pp. xv + 489.

Zurcher, Rev. Geo. (author), Buffalo:

Monks and their Decline, 1898; pp. 88; paper. $0.25.

Stolz, Rabbi Joseph (author), Chicago:

Funeral Agenda, 1898; pp. 23; paper.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume III JULY, 1899 Number 3

HAS THE GOSPEL OF THE REFORMATION BECOME ANTIQUATED?

By FRIEDRICH LOOFS,
Halle.

WHAT is the gospel of the Reformation? Among evangelical Christians this ought really to be an entirely superfluous question. For did not Luther himself define the gospel, times without number, simply as the glad tidings of Christ our Savior, who died for us and rose again that he might redeem from sin and death all who believe in his name? And was not the gospel to him always identical with the promise of the remission of sins through the merits of Christ? It is this note of gospel-truth, indeed, which pervades our hymns and books of devotion. Nay, more than that, it is in this sense that every schoolboy is taught the gospel. And yet I find it necessary, to my regret, first and foremost to defend this conception of the gospel against a two-fold opposition.

This opposition to the conception of the gospel indicated above is raised, not only in the name of the modern science of history, but also in the name of scriptural authority, interpreted according to the old doctrine of inspiration. It will serve my purpose best to begin with the first of these two classes of objections.

It is claimed that the gospel of the Reformation cannot be adequately characterized or defined in terms which either disregard or entirely efface the peculiarities and idiosyncrasies of that age; that the spirit of modern times finds nothing congenial earlier than the beginning of the eighteenth century. This point of time is held to be the dividing line, the boundary beyond which everything bears the stamp of a bygone age, not merely in old-fashioned and easily separable externals, but even more in those things which constitute its very nature and essential being. And thus, it is said, Luther's conception of the gospel must of necessity be inseparable from his mediæval notions of the devil's domination and power on the earth; inseparable from his views, shaped by the current mythology, of Christ's struggle with the law, with death, and the devil; inseparable from his ideas concerning penances, vicarious suffering, and the tyranny of the law — ideas entirely foreign and unintelligible to us, save in the light of the conditions then prevailing; inseparable, moreover, from the narrowness of his pre-Copernican view of history, which was fixed by the old doctrine of inspiration, erroneous exegetical traditions concerning the Old Testament, and legendary traditions concerning an everywhere uniform preaching of the apostles.

In considering such objections as these the fact must, to be sure, be conceded that the endeavor to understand the men of the past as children of their own time, and to judge them in the light of their surroundings, the *milieu* in which they lived, is an advance in modern historical investigation. For, indeed, Luther was not a Lutheran of the kind of those who boast that they, in contrast to others, still acknowledge the *entire* Luther as their teacher. Notwithstanding I have no sympathy whatever with that historical work which, though basing itself upon the correct method I have just referred to, fancies that in its pictures the colorings of place and time cannot be laid on too thickly, and which seems in its representations to aim above all things else at emphasizing the distance of time which separates us from the past. To be sure, this statement of my position is in no sense a refutation. Even if a thousand others should, like

myself, feel themselves repelled by this pseudo-realistic art of historic representation, it would still be true that feelings have no place in argumentation. For it belongs to the dignity of truth that she never allows herself to be fretted by sentimental considerations; a self-sacrificing servant of her austere majesty will gladly suffer the martyrdom of being decried as impious or irreverent. But it is not only feelings and moods with which I am occupied. They are merely the sentimental expression of the resentment which I feel at the false results attained. And my conviction that the results are false is based upon the most unmistakable evidence. If history were nothing more than a gallery of disconnected pictures, then this pseudo-realism, even if not less in the wrong, would at all events be somewhat less open to attack. But history is more than that. To array right against wrong in brief terms which shall not be liable to a false interpretation is on this point doubtless a difficult task; but a comparison may serve to illustrate my meaning. Anyone who is at all familiar with original prints of Luther's works or their exact reproductions knows that his German differs, at least in orthography, in about every third word from the German of today. In a critical and complete edition of Luther's writings, and wherever the interests of German philology require consideration, it is right and proper that his language and orthography should be reproduced with critical accuracy. But it would be folly for a modern historian, writing for a larger circle and wishing to give his readers a sample of Luther's masterly manipulation of the German language, to insert such quotations in exactly their original form. It would be quite impossible for the modern reader to recognize the characteristic elements of his style under this strange disguise. And the essayist who, in dealing with Luther's place in the history of German literary style, should declare that the peculiarities of Luther's language which are due to the period in which he wrote are inseparably bound up with its stylistic characteristics, and who should therefore endeavor, with the utmost philological accuracy, to catalogue all forms and expressions which might seem strange to us, would simply make himself utterly ridiculous. A Chinaman might consider such an

essay a triumph of scholarly care and exactness; one who understands modern German would judge differently. For the language which we speak today is to such an extent the same language which Luther spoke that the question as to what constituted the characteristics of his rhetoric and of his style scarcely necessitates the consideration of the differences between the German of our day and that of the Saxon court of the sixteenth century. We find an analogous case when we examine the history of the Christian faith. None of the Christian centuries has so exclusively sung its own melody that certain of its notes cannot be said to be even today ringing in the hearts of all believers; and Luther's piety is still intelligible to thousands and tens of thousands of evangelical Christians, not indeed in a few isolated notes, but in a far larger measure. He who writes history should not only take into account the distance of time which separates the centuries, but should also duly emphasize the bonds of unity which bind them together. In scientific monographs it is altogether in place to give due prominence to the strange background of the pictures which are being painted, although even then only on condition that the writer does not forget that the background must be worked up in paler colors and less sharply outlined in its details than the real subject of the picture. This concession does not, however, apply to the presentation of historical development, particularly when for practical purposes the writer attempts to draw a picture of the past for men of the present. It is true, of course, that the prominence given to the difference of *milieu* existing between two periods of time does not obscure their kinship for one who knows, not only the scenery of both stages, but also all the intervening scene-shifts, and who rightly estimates the significance of such differences. But how few periods of time are known to us in all their phases! How small is the number of modern readers who are fully equipped with knowledge of this kind! And how often, to retain the metaphor, does the lover of historically accurate scenery overestimate the value of such scenery! Whenever a historian emphasizes the dissimilarities of different ages in such a way that the elements which they

possess in common are thereby rendered less clear than their importance would warrant, historical caricatures, or at best distorted photographs, and not faithfully drawn pictures, are the result. For a reading public which does not possess a general knowledge of culture-history the historian must not only modernize antiquated word-forms in his citations, but also in many other places do the work of a translator.

It may, indeed, be objected that the very thing which I have advanced as a counter-argument is open to doubt; that the contention that the Christian centuries are linked together by a considerable identity of Christian faith is a debatable proposition; and that I am therefore taking for granted what I wish to prove when I say that Luther's piety is, in a very large measure, still intelligible to the present generation. I have, indeed, actually encountered this objection. And on this point, I must confess, it is difficult to argue. If anyone should controvert the statement that Luther's German is at the present day and in its essentials still capable of being understood, I could offer nothing to substantiate my statement other than my own experience and the similar experience to which others testify. And so, in the present case, Luther's catechism, his hymns, entire passages in his sermons and writings have been directly edifying to me, and that before I was in a position to understand them historically; and that this experience of mine coincides with that of thousands of others is proven by Rade's *Luther*, the Braunschweig edition of Luther's works for the Christian home, and many other evidences. If, therefore, anyone sees fit to call in question the fact thus attested, namely, that Luther's piety still appeals to the present age, with such a one I cannot argue. But neither am I taking for granted what I wish to prove, for as yet I have not so much as hinted at the extent to which Luther's piety is today intelligible, and not until I raise this question do I come to that which I have to prove. This only have I premised as an incontestable fact that a considerable measure of intelligibility still exists, and all that I have thus far attempted to substantiate by this fact is that in discussions addressed to men of the present day, and aimed at practical results rather than at

scientific accuracy, it is the exact opposite of real historical fidelity to burden the conception of the gospel of the Reformation with all those peculiarities which attached themselves to it in the minds of men of the sixteenth century.

In defining the gospel of the Reformation, the question *which* of these peculiarities may be overlooked without detracting from historical accuracy in no way anticipates the answer to the question of my theme: in what relation the gospel thus defined stands to the present age. It is correct, of course, to say that because the definition may and must, according to what I have just demonstrated, disregard some details due to the conditions of the time, it is not altogether without prejudicating significance; and for this reason I must dwell upon it a little longer. The task of such definition is more complicated than it may seem. If, as I have shown above, it is wrong to burden the conception of the gospel of the Reformation with all those peculiarities attaching to it in the sixteenth century, it would, on the other hand, be quite as unconscientious on the part of the historian to endeavor to determine the nature of this gospel by discarding all those elements that might appear to the modern man, or to any type of that genus, as antiquated sixteenth-century views. Again, for the avoidance of this second error, the above-quoted illustration from Luther's German furnishes a valuable hint. How little would remain if, in determining the characteristics of his style, we should disregard everything in his language that presents a sixteenth-century coloring! All those elements pertaining to the language of the sixteenth century which are connected only externally, and not essentially, with the peculiarities of his style, these, and these only, may be regarded as irrelevant in determining the characteristic qualities of his style and rhetoric. For a single word may be highly characteristic, while the entire sentence structure may sometimes be irrelevant. No mechanical rule can be laid down for one who wishes to present to modern Germans the characteristic elements of Luther's language relieved of the ballast of nonessential sixteenth-century idiosyncrasies. One who does not understand German thoroughly, and who is not equipped with a keen linguistic sense, is incompetent for

such a task. And so it is in determining the definition of the gospel of the Reformation. That which constituted the central interest in Luther's understanding of it must be taken as the starting-point. Everything that stands in constant and inner connection therewith—that is, everything which regularly appears in connection with it, and evidently belongs to Luther's inmost conception of it—is inseparable from the conception of the gospel of the Reformation. All things else constitute only its temporary garb, the *Zeitgewand*, and not its essence. But there is no mechanical rule for the elimination of these nonessentials. A historic sense must here coöperate with a fine appreciation of the specific elements of evangelical piety as it exists today.

Evangelium est proprie promissio remissionis et justificationis propter Christum, says the Apologia of the Augustana (67, 43); and none, I fancy, will controvert that. But it is an undeniable fact that in this definition, given by Melanchthon and quoted with almost indefinite frequency in a similar form by Luther, "Christus" is introduced as a known quantity.

Now arises the question, which of the representations of Christ's life, of his person, and of his work shall be included in the conception of the gospel of the Reformation, and which shall not. And this question can be decided only by the test of constant and inner connection. On occasion and in the interest of vital piety Luther has brought all the religious ideas of his time which he took up into an inner connection with his conception of the gospel. It will not suffice, therefore, to base the decision upon the fact that there is an inner connection. Only a constant inner connection can be decisive. Now, the following is beyond all doubt, beyond all need of proof: (1) that many of Luther's representations of the life, the person, and the work of Christ have their origin entirely in the fact that Luther accepted as indisputable everything that is narrated by the Holy Scripture, and, furthermore, that he interpreted the Scriptures according to the standard of mediæval traditions which he had retained; (2) that this valuation of the Scriptures as the *verbaliter* inspired word of God, and certainly his acceptance of erroneous mediæval

traditions concerning Scripture interpretation, do not stand in any constant inner connection with his central thought. Everything, therefore, even in his christological representations, which originates solely in this valuation of the Scriptures, either directly or, inasmuch as the then prevailing interpretation of Scripture seemed to support many old theological traditions, indirectly, I regard as the temporary garb of the gospel of the Reformation. But to this does not belong his conviction that in the Holy Scripture we hear the word of God addressed to man, and that his Holy Spirit generates faith in us through the word; nor does it include his estimation of Christ's death as the act performed for our salvation; nor his belief in the resurrection of Christ; nor yet his view of Christ as the *deus revelatus*. For in Luther these four elements stand in such constant and inner connection with the *promissio remissionis peccatorum* that each one of the thoughts—"The word shall they leave unassailed," "Given for you," "Christ is risen," "God revealed in Christ"—became for him on more than one occasion a distinguishing mark of the gospel. Thus Melanchthon expresses himself in his Apologia (279, 13): "*Diximus in confessione remissionem peccatorum gratis accipi propter Christum per fidem. Si hæc non est ipsa evangelii vox, si non est sententia Patris æterni, quam tu qui es in sinu Patris revelasti mundo, jure plectimur. Sed tua mors testis est, tua resurrectio testis est, spiritus sanctus testis est, tota ecclesia tua testis est, vere hanc esse evangelii sententiam.*" The powerful and sure testimony of the church to which Melanchthon here appeals extends beyond his time down to the present day. In defining the content of the gospel of the Reformation in the manner above indicated, I can appeal to the testimony of our hymns and books of devotion, in short, to everything that pertains to genuine evangelical faith, as evidenced through the entire course of the last three centuries and a half in the hearts and lives of thousands. *The gospel of the Reformation is the message of God to our humanity, offering us justification only through faith in Jesus Christ the Savior, in whom the eternal God has revealed himself to the world in the life of a human person by whose death and resurrection he has redeemed us from sin and death.* This definition I can advance with a clear

conscience, in the face of all criticism to which it may be subjected in the name of the modern science of history.

Can I have a clear conscience toward those also who declare this definition to be too meager, and who, on the basis of scriptural authority interpreted according to the old doctrine of inspiration, desire to see all the details of the second article of the Apostles' Creed and of its explanation by Luther incorporated into the conception of the gospel of the Reformation? I think so. But, let me postpone for the present the justification of this confidence—which, in the face of the clamor for clear dogmatic formulas concerning the work of Christ and divine revelation, I nevertheless hold—in order that I may first of all dispose of another matter, which has, however, three phases. In the name of Scripture authority the demand is made that we include in the conception of the gospel (*a*) the "born of the virgin Mary;" (*b*) the ascension as a distinct event, separated from the resurrection by a period of forty days—it is only as such that it comes into account here; that the resurrection is inconceivable without a subsequent ascension I concede; (*c*) our redemption "out of the power of the devil." No doubt Luther included all three in the glad tidings of Christ. Is it, nevertheless, possible without insincerity to espouse the cause of the gospel of the Reformation without including in it these three elements? Most assuredly. It is not only justifiable, but also a twofold duty, not to confuse the conception of the gospel with these three things.

It is justifiable. For it is not a mere matter of chance that Luther, in giving the content of the gospel, very often makes no mention of the virgin-birth and the ascension. Witness his well-known words: "St. John's gospel and his first epistle, St. Paul's epistles, particularly to the Romans, Galatians, Ephesians, and the first epistle of St. Peter—these are the books which show you the Christ and teach you all things whatsoever that are needful and blessed for your knowledge, even though you should never see nor hear any other book or teaching."[1] Now, it would

[1] "Johannis Evangelium, und seine erste Epistel, S. Paulus Epistel, sonderlich die zu den Römern, Galatern, Ephesern, und S. Peters erste Epistel, das sind die Bücher

be entirely erroneous, of course, if one should attempt to deduce from the words just quoted that Luther thereby declared the virgin-birth and the ascension on the fortieth day to be matters immaterial. In writing those words he has not in mind the fact that the books of Scripture which he named make no mention of either. Indeed, it is altogether probable that he would have disputed the fact, on the ground of the traditionally biased exegesis of his time. But the passages concerning the content of the "gospel," in which he mentions neither virgin-birth nor ascension, demonstrate this fact, namely, that Luther arrived at a firm assertion of these things, not in the course of his thought about the "gospel," but solely on the basis of Scripture authority. And, therefore, even those who are convinced of the actuality of the virgin-birth and of the ascension on the fortieth day must concede that these biblical narratives do not belong to the "gospel" in the restricted sense of the term. Otherwise we should have to consider the salvation of a Christian maiden seriously jeopardized by her failure to understand the *natus ex virgine*.

Luther's conceptions of the devil and his dominion present a somewhat different aspect. In Luther's mind, and according to his perception, these ideas doubtless stand in a constant and close connection, even though it is not invariably expressed; and, if we disregard the massive mediæval form with which he invested them, they may claim the consensus of New Testament Scripture. But is the connection of these ideas with the *promissio remissionis* really an inner one? On the contrary, is not the fact that his inner experience of salvation from sin and death presented itself to Luther as a salvation also from the devil merely a coloring derived from the time — a *Zeitfarbe*, a result of the external influence of Scripture and of church traditions? Even Luther, in spite of his assertion that he had seen the devil, was directly concerned only with sin and death, and with the temptation of the world and of his own flesh. And so it is today.

die dir Christum zeigen und alles lehren das dir zu wissen not und selig ist, ob du schon kein ander Buch noch Lehre nimmer sehest noch hörest." (*Luthers Werke*, Erlanger Ausg., 63, 115.)

The question whether there is behind sin and death a personal power opposed to God is unessential to faith in the salvation from sin and death. Therefore, in speaking of the gospel at the present time and for practical purposes, we are justified in leaving out of consideration these conceptions, also, of the devil and his dominion.

Indeed, such a reservation is here, just as in the case of the virgin-birth and ascension on the fortieth day, a duty—and for two reasons. In the first place, because no well-informed and at the same time honest and conscientious theologian can deny that he who asserts these things as indisputable facts affirms what is open to grave doubts. I am well aware that orthodoxy charges the fostering of such doubts to a certain prejudice against miracles. I have no such prejudice; indeed, I consider the existence of a personal power of sin as entirely credible, and have personally no object or interest whatever in believing Matt. 1: 18 ff., Luke, chap. 2, and Acts, chap. 1, to be unhistorical. Therefore I am in a position to say how unjustifiable this convenient argument is. It is no more to be justified than would be the charge that the position of orthodoxy is determined by intellectual laziness or ignorance, or even by motives of church policy. Anyone who understands anything about historical criticism must concede that the virgin-birth and the ascension on the fortieth day belong to the least credible of New Testament traditions. Of course, it is a very easy matter to cover up all the difficulties which may arise in connection with the criticism of original sources by simply applying the old doctrine of inspiration. But the covering is riddled and full of holes. The old doctrine of inspiration has fallen; it is not sustained by even a single passage of the symbols of the church, and no modernizing of it can obscure the obligation which devolves upon historical criticism in relation to the biblical narratives. For this very reason it becomes a duty to refrain from flatly declaring the scriptural representations of the devil's dominion to be "revelations." Through prophets and apostles, even through our Lord himself, God has revealed his eternal truth to us in the temporal garb of the time in which the bearer of this revelation lived. If

we assert, then, that the belief in the existence of a demoniacal kingdom is more than a conception of the times—a conception unessential to salvation, which was accepted just as much as a matter of course in the time of Christ and of Luther as was the geocentric theory—if we assert this, what firm ground shall we have upon which to base our assertion? I readily concede that, in spite of these serious doubts, the demonological representations of the Scriptures *may* be more than the ideas of those old times; I can concede, too, that the accounts of the virgin-birth and the ascension on the fortieth day, even though emanating from sources of doubtful credibility, are not necessarily unhistorical; but something that *may* be real, that *may* not be unhistorical, must not be set up as an integral part of the gospel, demanding a faith "so firm that for it one would die a thousand deaths" (Luther, Erlanger Ausgabe, 63, 125). It is a duty, therefore, in the first place, on account of the uncertainty which attaches to them, to leave these things unmentioned, or at least to place them in the background.

A second consideration makes this duty still more imperative. For no one can deny that not a few of our contemporaries—whether they do so rightly or wrongly is entirely unessential in this connection—regard these things with a suspicion which would inevitably become a serious impediment in the way of their faith in the saving gospel of Christ, the moment these elements were included as an inseparable part of that gospel. And it seems to me that the Lord who reproached the scribes because they laid unbearable burdens upon the shoulders of their disciples will honor the fidelity which, even for the sake of seekers after salvation, declares it to be a duty not to include in the gospel, as an inseparable part of it, things which are not only by their nature separable from it and uncertain, but which are, moreover, liable to become a cause of offense.

It is with a good conscience, then, that I champion the definition of the gospel of the Reformation which I have already given.

Is this gospel of the Reformation today still *the* gospel? Can

it still serve as the banner for theologians who desire to help men of the present into a clear faith in God? Or has it become antiquated? With this I have now arrived at the real theme of my discussion.

I shall deal unevasively with all difficulties. It cannot be denied that the limitations of Luther—arising from the conditions of his time—are evident, not only in other things which did not stand in a constant and intrinsic relation to the gospel as he understood it, but also in those which did so stand. Luther's conception of the gospel itself is closely connected with a series of ideas which at that time were easily explained, but which are much more foreign to modern times—I might even say, which have to no small degree lost standing with men of the present day. But this last-mentioned fact does not in itself prove that the gospel is antiquated. Throughout the centuries Gods' truth has become in any age that has accepted it a conception of the time. That the gospel of the Reformation took on the forms of thought peculiar to that age does not disprove its divine character. It may be our age that is wrong in its tendencies and views. But if the present age is right in its tendencies and views, then the gospel of the Reformation is not divine truth; and we shall be obliged either to plow anew, or to cast aside the plow and see what the soil of this world may bring forth of itself. If I judge the case rightly, the considerations which make the gospel of the Reformation as foreign, not to say offensive, to the present age as it was self-evident to the sixteenth century, are fourfold. The first is the dependent relationship of man to God, presupposed by the gospel of the Reformation, or, rather, to speak more accurately, by the reformers; the second, the fundamental stress which it lays on the remission of sins; the third, the conditioning of this remission upon the death of Christ; and the fourth, the supernaturalistic interpretation of history by the reformers, especially with reference to the person of Christ.

Turning now to a discussion of the first point, certainly the sixteenth century was not without men who actually lived, like the heathen, "without God," and yet that age was as certain of

the fact that there is a God to whom men must give an account as it was of death. Luther considers it self-evident "that every man should desire to conduct himself so that he may become pious (well pleasing to God) and may attain unto eternal bliss" (Erlanger Ausgabe², 16, 251), and this supposition furnishes the starting-point for his gospel of the Reformation. The question which this gospel answers, namely, How shall I get into a *right* relation to God?, seemed to the reformers a question whose meaning and urgency must be plain to every man. Who can deny that the disposition of the present time in this respect differs materially from that of the sixteenth century? I have now in mind not only theoretical and practical atheists, although the number of the latter is not inconsiderable. But think, in the first place, for a moment of the middle classes in our cities. Here there are to be found thousands of men who seldom enter the doors of a church, perhaps never except on a great holiday. In their homes the last remnants of Christian family customs have disappeared; grace at meat, or family worship, are things unknown; reading matter is supplied by the daily newspaper. Now, it is not hostility to the church which causes all this — in very many cases it is not even consciously harbored doubt. The fact is simply this, that men thoughtlessly lose themselves in the secular interests of life, in the hot chase of business on working days, and the quest for pleasure on Sundays. Side by side with these things operate imperceptibly (though we can name the channels through which they work: our newspapers, the theater, the observation of other circles of society) the same factors which produce the corresponding disposition in the higher ranks of the people. Here, side by side with the all-engrossing material interests of life, modern culture exerts an enervating influence. But to think only of the natural sciences in this connection would again be altogether superficial. We have to consider the enlargement of the whole circle of vision which modern culture brings with it, including an undoubtedly refined moral sensibility and tact. People know something about history; they know what significance religions which have now disappeared once had; they know that the

pious Mohammedan is just as firmly convinced of the truth of his religion as is the Christian; that the Catholic is just as zealous in his Mariolatry as the faithful Protestant is in his belief in Christ. People see through the political cunning of the Catholic church, and for this very reason ascribe the same cunning to conservative Protestant circles; although it must also be admitted that this latter judgment is in many instances arrived at on the basis of personal experience. They have reason to appreciate the excellent characters of men who profess no religion, while even among those who consider themselves pious they find vanity, uncharitableness, intellectual narrowness, untruthfulness, selfish ambition, and the like. The things which they read, newspapers as well as books, have no Christian interest, if, indeed, they are not actually anti-Christian; in the social life, belief or unbelief plays no part whatever; Christianity is regarded only as on a level with everything else that has ever served in the world as the religious embellishment of this life. All sense of personal dependence of thought and life upon God has been absolutely lost. Against all this it is very convenient — but equally stupid — merely to declaim, in the style of the preacher of repentance, out of a quiet corner of the parsonage.

One must form a clear conception of how difficult it is for the individual to withdraw himself from these influences. Do we not feel them ourselves? When we consider what is so deplorable in the condition of the church at the present time, the narrow fanaticism of large circles in the church, the unscrupulousness which such circles show in the choice of their weapons, the diplomacy, the political methods which play a part in matters ecclesiastical, the low Byzantinism which is asserting itself among us, together with the painful fact that much-lauded pillars of the church or of ecclesiastical organizations, viewed near at hand, have, in many cases, exhibited very plain moral defects — when we consider all these things, and look at them in connection with the part which has been played by the clergy of all times, I ask: Are we not ourselves sometimes seriously tempted to unbelief? We are stayed by the inheritance of experience; we are brought

back from such distractions by our calling and our established ancestral customs. But if we wish to estimate how these impressions operate upon thousands of others, we must think of them as deprived of these restraining influences. When we travel we see the same hurry and bustle at the railway stations on Sunday as on weekdays, and observe thousands of people who seem to have not the remotest idea of religious needs; when we consider the sphere of interest of circles in society with which we come in less frequent contact, and their ideas of what constitutes the enjoyment of life; when we perceive how, under the corrupting influence of modern life, our good old Christian customs are being destroyed even in our quiet mountain valleys; when we appreciate the fact that in the gold-grabbing haste to be rich we are shutting our eyes to the pictures of distress down in the cellar-homes of the cities; when we perceive what a mighty power the Church of Rome still exerts upon the life of the people throughout large districts of our fatherland, not only in spite of, but largely by means of, her baseless superstition; only when we realize all these things can we estimate how those men think and feel who have hitherto been without any religious experience whatever, and who are tossed about on the sea of modern existence without the guidance of tradition, of calling, or of customs, to direct them into the channel of a religious life. Then, truly, we can understand the fact that so many men of the present day lack all sense of relationship to God. What place has the gospel of the Reformation here, a gospel which presupposes such a relationship, which seems to take it for granted that the question, "What must I do to be saved?", must move the human heart? Is it not antiquated? Only a superficial judgment could answer in the affirmative. For to the thoughts about God which precede the faith in the gospel Luther certainly attached little value. He was filled with the conviction that all faith in God that is worthy of the name must have its origin in the experience of the remission of sins. The Augustana (Art. II) says of the natural man, *i. e.*, the man who has not yet been born again through the grace of God, that he is *sine metu dei, sine fiducia erga deum.* Can the fact that this circumstance asserts itself even more strikingly and

undeniably now than it did in the sixteenth century render the gospel antiquated? Certainly not, provided that the gospel of the Reformation, though having lost in the minds of many of our contemporaries all possibility of connection with an external ecclesiastical organization, and with the fear of God's wrath and eternal punishment, shall not lack other points of contact with the ideas of modern life.

But this "provided that" would seem to lead only to a further and still greater difficulty. The gospel of the Reformation *est proprie promissio remissionis peccatorum propter Christum.* The remission of sins is Luther's pivotal thought. "There is no greater sin," says he (Weimar ed., II, 717, 33), "than that one should not believe in the remission of sins;" and even in our childhood we have learned from the catechism that "where there is forgiveness of sins, there is life and happiness." Where the significance of this remission is not understood, there can be no understanding of the gospel of the Reformation. Does this not present a dark outlook for the position of the old gospel in relation to the present? In spite of all its religious indifference, our age is still not without susceptible points of contact for religion: it is not a happy age. In moods of depression and melancholy a yearning after peace pervades the souls of men, and in the time of suffering they, more than the men of the sixteenth century, feel the burden of the enigma of life. On the moral side, too, there are points of contact to be found. But modern men do not understand the fundamental emphasis upon the remission of sins; to them the tirades of the Roman church against the dangers of such remission seem more reasonable, from a moral point of view, than the disposition to consider unbelief in such remission as the worst of sins. And of the points of contact with religion which we find in the present age, none seems to provide a connecting link with the gospel of the Reformation.

And yet the state of affairs is not so bad as it might seem. To be sure, we must admit that a yearning for peace and a desire for comfort in suffering do not lead by any direct road to evangelical faith; for the gospel knows no peace, no consolation in

suffering and death, where the *remissio peccatorum* is not understood and believed. But this is nothing to be deplored. On the contrary, it is a noble trait of the gospel of the Reformation which we should never deny, however often it may be denied by some. Genuine evangelical Christianity never consents to be misused as the sentimentally æsthetic gilding of shallow living. It offers no balm of consolation for pain and death, which, like the Roman Catholic mass for the dead, could be magically applied. Neither can modern culture fail to acknowledge this nobility of evangelical Christianity. That such use of religion is even today possible to a very large extent in spite of all our enlightenment, and not only, I am sorry to say, in Catholic circles, simply shows how inconsistent, and, in spite of all its pride of culture, how unstable and despondent, the modern human heart is. But modern culture, when it thinks soberly and apprehends clearly its own ideals, acknowledges that here the gospel is in the right. So that our difficulty is reduced to the fact that that which I mentioned as the third connecting point of contact for religion with our modern tendency of thought, namely, the moral ideals and interests of modern culture, seems rather to be repelled than attracted by the gospel of the remission of sins. But here again the appearance is deceptive. To be sure, thus much is indisputable: *evangelium est proprie promissio remissionis peccatorum.* But the *prædicare remissionem peccatorum* is not of necessity the first thing with which the evangelical sermon has to begin; nor is the *accipere remissionem peccatorum* on the part of the hearers its ultimate object. The comprehension of the second point is of particular importance for our time, and is a prerequisite for a proper utilization of the first. Therefore I shall begin with it.

There was a time, it is true, when the Protestant doctrine of justification was liable to be misinterpreted—and that, too, not merely by those who were hostile to it—as though it were the final object of God's plan concerning us to hold us sinners free from the charge of our sins and to attribute to us the active righteousness of Christ as our own. Since the proposition that no one has ever been saved without good works (*Form. conc.*, 591, 16) was denied; since Flacius expressed the opinion, in

opposition to Major, that the majority of men are converted only upon their death-beds, such misinterpretations were almost inevitable. Yet they are misinterpretations nevertheless. If we should endeavor to explain Luther's fundamental thoughts in the light of the Scripture passages which he cited with particular frequency, which were above all others his guiding stars, this verse would have to occupy a very prominent place: A good tree cannot bring forth evil fruit, neither can a corrupt tree bring forth good fruit. Either make the tree good and his fruit good; or else make the tree corrupt and his fruit corrupt (Matt. 7:17; 12:33). "Good works do not make a man good, but a good man does good works"—how many times Luther expressed this thought! We are justified, indeed, before God only through faith, and this faith means for us simply the renunciation of all self-righteousness, casting ourselves humbly upon the mercy of God, in which attitude of heart nothing could be more remote from us than to think of our faith (which was always regarded by Luther as a *donum dei*) as being man's *qualitas* wherewith to satisfy God's exacting justice. But this very faith constitutes one *persona justa coram deo*, and this *persona justa* can and must do good works. Such a one *can* do them, because faith makes the heart confiding, childlike, happy, new, and pure, and good works must be done out of a glad, childlike heart; he *must*, because the heart that has been reopened to God in faith cannot help reflecting his holy will. From the beginning Luther's thoughts were determined not only by the desire for pardon, but also by a hungering after righteousness in the moral sense. And it is an essential fact respecting his conception of the gospel that he did not separate these two ideas, but rather combined them into one. The gospel taught him both where pardon is to be found and how we may become qualified for truly good works. When he states in the explanation of the third article of the larger catechism (*Libri symbol.*, 497, 41) that the Holy Spirit sanctifies us through the forgiveness of sins, this statement can be rightly interpreted only when we do justice also to the thought to which Melanchthon gives expression in the Apologia: "*bona opera nonsolum requirimus, sed etiam ostendimus, quomodo fieri possint*" (*ibid.*, 85, 14). This touches the point

at which it is possible to establish a connection with the moral interests of the present age, viz., by comparing the ideals of a morality which has its origin and development in the Christian faith with modern moral ideals. There will be found to be more positive points of contact than negative, and the more carefully we avoid meaningless phraseology, that is, the more we guard against treating Christian and moral conceptions as fixed and known quantities without regard to their psychologico-ethical explanation, the more certainly will such a promulgation of the gospel appeal to the consciences of men of today.

But someone may say that this representation of the moral, or, more accurately, of the ethico-religious, ideal of evangelical piety is, according to the judgment of the reformers, in no sense the preaching of the gospel, but the preaching of the law. Even if this were true, the objection need not be feared. For the true preaching of the gospel is certainly not bound to begin everywhere and always with the *prædicare evangelium*. True, Luther did so in 1517, after a certain fashion. But at a later time (*Disputationen*, ed. Drews, 477) he opposed Agricola with the argument that changed times demand changed methods; that in 1517 the whole world had been in terror over its sins, for which reason it had not been necessary to preach the law, the times needing rather the consolation of the gospel; that the self-confident and wicked men among whom they were now living (1538), these Epicureans who feared neither God nor man, these had to be judged in a different manner. Moreover, even from the point of view of the reformers, it is not an out-and-out preaching of the law to attempt to delineate to our hearers a morality developed out of the remission of sins; according to Luther's later views, and in a certain sense according to what he always regarded as right, it is, to use the terminology of the sixteenth century, the preaching of that combination of law and gospel with which it is our duty to begin.

Where such a proclamation of the gospel gives a man an insight into his own moral imperfection, and the fact presses itself upon him that God's holy will is behind the ideal with its claims, the sense of his indebtedness to God will begin to assert itself;

here, then, an understanding of the gospel, in the most restricted sense of the term, of the *promissio remissionis peccatorum*, becomes possible. The fact that this process does not take place in all those who recognize the moral ideal of Christianity as an ideal does not characterize the present more than it did the past, for even Luther, in the sixteenth century, declared himself unable to determine the causes of this state of affairs. We can readily understand how faith grows and where it grows: the man upon whom the ideal of Christian morality has really gained a hold as an ideal for him feels at the same time the obligation of a personal relationship to God; he feels something of the claims of the divine will; and he is then able, through the emancipating experience of the remission of sins, to arrive at a real faith in the living God. We can see, furthermore, that this development fails to take place largely on account of the fact that men only half recognize these ideals. They recognize them, not as ideals for themselves, but only for those who still retain their faith in God. Sometimes such failure is due to the circumstance that men play with their ideals—and how prone men are to do this! Still, we must admit that in many cases the primary, and in every case the ultimate, reason for the diversified conduct of men toward the ideal of Christian morality which they have recognized must remain hidden from us. But, as I have already said, it has never been otherwise. Let it suffice that even today the way to the faith which we have had under discussion is not barred. The gospel, as far as we have hitherto discussed it, is after all not less intelligible to men of the present than it was to men of the sixteenth century, not less intelligible to the European than to the catechumens of our missionaries. The ways by which we may attain to such an understanding are various; but finally the whole matter resolves itself into the very simple elements of which our Lord treated in the parable of the prodigal son, so simply that a child cannot fail to grasp them. Just now there is a tendency to exaggerate the differences of men and of times, a tendency which might be compared to the folly of obscuring a picture with arabesque. Just as love and fidelity, after all, appeal to the hearts of men today in no other way than of old, so it is with guilt and

pardon. The gospel of the forgiveness of sins not only points us, even yet, to a possible way by which we may reach the right faith in God, but to the only possible way. I do not intend by any means to assert by this that there is but one form of conversion. I am well aware that no program of experience can do justice to the diversified life and experiences of the human heart, but I merely desire to protest against erroneous differentiations. No man can truly know God who does not know him as the Holy One and the Merciful. But only he can know him as such who understands also the meaning of guilt and pardon. This understanding may, so far as the feelings are concerned, assume widely divergent modes of manifestation. Do not the same notes produce quite another tone when played upon the violin than when struck upon a bell? Does it not make a vast difference whether they are played alone or with a full accompaniment? And yet they are, after all, the self-same notes.

This brings me to the third point which we have to discuss. I have characterized as irrelevant all these differences of feeling which variously express men's experience of guilt and pardon. But it happens sometimes at the present day that among such irrelevant differences is reckoned the fact that in some instances the experience of forgiveness is inseparably bound up with the belief in Christ's death for us, while in others men think themselves justified in emancipating such experience from that traditional Christian idea. Many in their attempts to modernize Christianity believe themselves obliged to do so. To accept this latter view, and to judge the *propter Christum* as unessential adornment, simply implies the assertion that the gospel of the Reformation, in its genuine form, has become antiquated. For in the gospel of the Reformation, as a matter of fact, not only is the *remissio* invariably thought of as *remissio propter Christum*, but the reformers considered this *propter Christum* as absolutely indispensable, as the very core of the gospel. Accordingly a twofold question presents itself for discussion: Has it become untenable to base the *remissio* on the *opus Christi*, and can this basis really be dispensed with? Men have declared these Reformation

ideas to be untenable, partly on the strength of what they believe they have ascertained in regard to primitive Christianity, and partly under appeal to more general religio-historical arguments.

An adequate discussion of the objections of the first sort would be entirely impossible, even if it were a matter of detail in historical exegesis, which it is not. We have to deal here, not with the details of historical exegesis, but with its underlying premises. If, indeed, it is a justifiable principle in New Testament biblical theology to regard the simpler thoughts, those thoughts more closely related to Old Testament piety, as the oldest, and from this starting-point to proceed to a grouping of sources, not only in regard to their date, but also in regard to their interdependence, then the alleged results are also valid, and in that case we may assert that the bringing of remission into causal connection with the death of Christ, if not as late as St. Paul, is at all events, as compared with that which is primitive, an illegitimate conception; that, as is claimed, this later conception has exerted an obscuring influence upon the transmission of the words of Christ, for example, concerning the "ransom for many" (Matt. 20: 28), and at the institution of the Lord's supper; and, moreover, that when we find, not only in the deutero-Pauline letters and in Hebrews, but also in 1 Peter and in the Johannine literature, the expression of thoughts which are cognate with the Pauline valuation of Christ's death, we have to explain such thoughts as due to Pauline influence. But we must not forget that these alleged results of historical exegesis stand or fall with their premises. And I can find no valid argument or cogent analogy to support these premises or to justifiy their acceptance. And, on the other side, the arguments to the contrary are weighty. Paul and the celebration of the Lord's supper in primitive Christian churches furnish us with chronologically the oldest testimony to the valuation of the death of Jesus in ancient Christianity. Therefore to consider their valuation of Christ's death as illegitimate — I use the term "illegitimate," not "secondary," because I do not wish to exclude the idea of a gradual development of a right understanding of the significance of the Last Supper in the *earliest* Christian community —

to consider, I say, this valuation as illegitimate would, in my opinion, be justifiable only if we were compelled to do so. But wherein lies the compulsion? Is it to be found in the fact that the Old Testament piety of prophetic times, and even later than that, the Psalms, speak of forgiveness without any sacrifice? Was it then *inevitable* that Christ and the apostles should confine themselves within the limits of such views? What precludes the possibility that new experiences added a new thought to these old ideas? Now, if we may attach any value at all to what is certainly the primitive as well as the universal Christian estimate of Old Testament development as one preparatory to redemption, and if the law is later than the prophets, I fail to see how we could conceive of a preparation for the *gratia in Christo* in any other way than as we have it. Even without the untenable assumption of a *fides in venturum Christum*, the penitential psalms will permit of interpretation in the light of the saying: *vetus testamentum in novo patet.* And what about the gospels, with "Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," their parable of the prodigal son, their accounts of the assurances of pardon which Christ expressed without any reference to his work of atonement? For centuries they have been regarded as not in contradiction to St. Paul; and therefore — to speak mildly — it might even be considered possible that their authors thought as Paul did concerning the death of Jesus. Even though they did thus agree with Paul, they would have had no opportunity, when transmitting the sayings of Christ, to develop a *theologia crucis.* But, does anyone ask, is not this very fact decisive enough, namely that, aside from Matt. 20:28, his words at the institution of the Supper, and a few passages in John, the sayings of Christ have nothing in common with the later valuation of his death? He only can think so who strikes out those few passages — few in number, but present nevertheless — and who forgets that the simple words of Jesus, "Thy sins are forgiven," brought consolation, and the parable of the prodigal son carried a positive teaching, to his hearers only on condition that they trusted in him who spoke these things. Even before his death Christ was to his disciples the guarantee, the security, for the forgiveness

of sins, the basic foundation of their faith in it. That the crucified and risen Lord should after his resurrection be all this in a much higher degree to his disciples, who in the meantime had become more mature, can be explained readily enough on purely psychological grounds. And I am convinced that our sources not only do not forbid us to regard the *remissio propter Christum* in this sense as a universal thought of primitive Christianity, but they actually require it. This, then, confirms the statement that historical exegesis has not rendered the gospel of the Reformation antiquated. For everyone who has learned to distinguish between theology and faith will concede that, as in St. Paul, so in the gospel of the Reformation, it is not a question of dogmatic interpretation of the *propter Christum*, but only of the *propter Christum* itself. Luther's ideas as to the nature of the process of *remissio* through Christ were manifold; and, even today, when anyone has in real faith understood the *propter Christum*, according to his character and the degree of his culture and Scripture knowledge, that faith will find various intellectual forms of expression. None of the biblical modes of expression and none of Luther's forms of statement will be unintelligible to true faith, and the keynote of passion-hymns,

"Nun was du Herr erduldet, ist alles meine Last,"

will find an echo wherever faith puts its confidence only in the crucified Lord. But all this does not alter the fact that not various interpretations, but the *propter Christum* itself, is the essential matter. Whether this *propter Christum* should be interpreted from the point of view of a sacrificial system, or from that of a theory of substitution; whether the necessity for the death of Christ proceeded directly and solely from God, or whether it was influenced by the consideration that only by such means our faith could be secured against a light estimate of sin: these are dogmatic questions. For our faith the *propter Christum* is the only essential thing; nor do the results of historical exegesis hinder us from preaching this fact to the present age, with the same good conscience with which the reformers preached it to theirs.

But do not the more general considerations which are derived

from the history of religion forbid such preaching? In an earnest conversation about the significance of the gospel for our times, I once appealed to the fact that the piety of the heroes of faith in our church is inseparable from their faith in the Savior, and I was met with the reply that in the Catholic church Christian piety is just as inseparable from faith in the virgin Mary. Now, I ask, must we regard faith in the mediatorial office of Jesus merely as an amplification of the faith in the forgiveness of sins, which, according to the analogies of the history of religion, was certain to come about, but which is merely a crutch worthless in itself, and useful only for people with devotional needs; must we accept this view of faith simply because we find the idea of pardon through sacrifice and through the meritorious deeds of others to be present also among non-Christian peoples, and because in the Roman church a hollow confidence in the Virgin and the saints exerts a similar quieting influence? The answer may be very brief. The trust in the pure *mater dolorosa* and the trust in the saints are later imitations of the faith in the Savior, without any added content. They represent, not independent developments of human thought analogous to faith in the Savior, but dependent modifications of it. And the quieting influence which even this erroneous faith is able to exert—and I will not deny that it does sometimes exert such an influence—is easily understood when we consider that it retains the definitive thought of the true faith while effecting a substitution merely of persons—we might almost say, merely of names—but not of content. And as long as true simplicity of heart has this substitution thrust upon it, we shall find here and there the verification of God's word (Isa. 65:1): "I am sought of them that asked not for me; I am found of them that sought me not: I said, Behold me, Behold me, unto a nation that hath not called upon my name." Finally, the analogies in non-Christian circles can be considered analogies only in regard to the most general basic ideas of belief in the mediatory office of Christ; they prove nothing more than that the human heart, burdened with guilt within, naturally yearns for something without upon which it may rest its confidence and trust in forgiveness.

If this yearning is natural, is it also justifiable or necessary? Should not our more vigorous age cast aside its crutches and stand alone upon the great mercy of God? We shall be able to answer this question when we recognize the truth that the *propter Christum* is something else than a crutch, that it is still today indispensable as the rock upon which our feet must be placed if we would not be whirled away by the waves of despondency on the one hand or of frivolity on the other. Our trust in the remission of sins involves a moral danger. Does it not evidence a greater moral earnestness when a man is unable to forget the burden of his sins? And yet, how can he act cheerfully when, instead of striving after that which is before, he turns back in dismal thought to the place where he fell? Only the faith in the *remissio propter Christum* can lead us out of this dilemma. He who accepts the forgiveness of sins for Jesus' sake may forget his sins and all that is behind. But he will not esteem them lightly, for he knows too well "the price Christ paid for our redemption." And the more we feel this, the more will our grateful love increase toward Him who gave himself for us; and the greater this love, the greater will also be our zeal to continue in his footsteps. And thus our forgetting of our sins not only does not become a temptation to frivolity, but it does become indirectly an incentive to the struggle against sin. This wonderful interdependent mingling of joyous oblivion and grateful recollection of sin, of despair of self and courageous trust, of the death of the old nature and the new life of faith—this wonderful intermingling to which Paul Gerhardt's lines give expression:

An mir und meinem Leben
Ist nichts auf dieser Erd,
Was Christus mir gegeben,
Das ist der Liebe wert,

—this is the deepest and most heart-felt testimony for the truth of the gospel, for the imperishable significance of the *propter Christum*, which in the minds of the reformers is inseparable from the *promissio remissionis*.

But does our age understand this *propter Christum?* I purposely avoid narrowing the question down to any particular

doctrine of atonement. For, although I am positive, as I have already stated, that every believer will, as his faith develops, form a detailed conception of the process of the remission of sins through Christ, after all we are dealing here only with the fundamental principle. And wherever this is received into the heart, it matters not in how primitive a form, there we may speak of faith in the sense of the gospel of the Reformation. Does our age, then, comprehend this *propter Christum?* I fail to see any reason why the present should not comprehend it as readily as did the past, unless it be that the placing of Jesus in his extraordinary position above all other men, which undoubtedly is in every respect one of the premises of the *remissio propter Christum*, should prove such a hindrance.

But it is this very hindrance which constitutes the last difficulty that obscures the understanding of the old gospel in our times. And this last difficulty is the most important. It could not have been difficult for Luther and his contemporaries to regard the *remissio peccatorum*, for us and for all men, as conditioned upon the person and the work of Christ, and, therefore, to see in him the pivotal point of all time. From the days of their childhood the whole field of biblical story was to them a well-authenticated wonderland. Its central figure was the Lord, the eternal Son of God made man, whom angels accompanied to earth, whom angels waited upon as he ascended to heaven, a Lord over sickness, pain, and death, who revealed his glory in ministering to others, a Lord over death and the grave, even in his victorious resurrection and ascension to the right hand of God's majesty. How different all this is now! The present, so far as it is the conscious representative of modern thought, will have nothing to do with happenings, either now or in the past, which are conditioned upon the supernatural. It believes that it has discovered the laws of nature which govern occurrences in the physical world, and posits analogous laws for psychic life; it recognizes no process that does not conform to the laws which are immanent in our world. Accordingly, our modern scientific history-writing is naturalistic. Not in the sense, at least as a rule, that it denies the existence of a reality

outside of and above nature — its work furnishes it with no occasion for the expression of such dogmatic naturalism — but in the sense that, in its conception of the method in which this reality works, it is naturalistic. It has to deal only with material which it is able to recognize empirically (out of the rescued remains of the past) as having once existed, and it associates with this recognition of the once-existent the thinkableness of its natural origin. Where, then, is there room in history for the reformers' conception of the Savior? It would seem as though the whole religious view of history, which must regard the living God as the sovereign Lord of nature, even historically, were here deprived of its basis.

But it surely cannot be considered my task to include in this discussion the full consideration of the question that arises out of this condition of things, the question, namely, as to the right of the old supernaturalism. I shall enter into it only so far as my theme requires it. Does the difference of the times, of which we have been speaking, render a hearty acceptance of the gospel of the Reformation impossible? Does it dispel the hope that the gospel of the Reformation is still, for our own times, *the* gospel? I answer, No!

This confidence of mine is founded neither on the possibility of reconciling the religious view of history with the naturalistic, nor on the hope of seeing these two views existing peaceably side by side on the basis of a tolerant separation, but upon the conviction that to modern men also, if they but ponder the matter deeply enough, the necessity for a clear decision in favor of supernaturalism, as concerning the person of Christ, will become evident.

We find the reconciliation of the religious view of history with the naturalistic attempted in the effort to measure the significance of Jesus by the help of a term not unfamiliar to historical science, viz., the term *genius*. The enigma of his person, then, resolves itself into a special case of the inconceivability of men of genius in general. This attempt at a harmonizing of antagonistic views is attended with the difficulty, in the first place, that the conception of genius may take on three different forms. It may,

in the first place, be conceived on purely naturalistic lines; for even an atheistic naturalism may admit that personalities of true genius are to our comprehension incommensurable quantities. In the second place, it may be brought into relation with thoughts of the divine, without, however, abandoning the idea of its natural origin. Lastly, it may take on a supernatural character, if we accept the view that new creations of genius owe their ultimate origin, not to those things which are the intellectual conditions of the existence of genius, but to a special divine force entering from without. Furthermore, each of these three phases is open to particular objections. I need not mention that in the first case even the broadest use of the term "genius" must fail to satisfy religious interests; the antagonistic views are not, in fact, harmonized in this way; we have simply charitably covered up the nakedness of an irreligious naturalism with a word. But in the second case also, that is, when attention is called expressly to the consideration that it is God who raises up heroes in the spiritual world, even then the religious element is deprived of its "vital air." To be sure, in this case the conception of genius, as applied to Jesus, is more than a mere expression to cover a bare naturalism; here we really have an attempt to harmonize the old thoughts and the new. For, it is claimed, the interests of faith cannot attach to the manner in which God enters into the process, whether directly or according to divinely established natural causes; and we have satisfied the claims of these interests when we recognize the natural development proceeding under divinely instituted laws, as being ordered and sustained by the living God. But when this view is taken, does God then really remain the "living" God? I am confident that for some who hold this view he does. For I know that in the minds of speculative theologians this view, when associated with profound dogmatical considerations concerning the relation of the eternal God to time, of his *providentia* to human liberty, may exist side by side with a firm faith in the living God. But not all other men live amid the dizzy abstractions which view the course of time *sub specie æternitatis*. We have to consider those also whose minds are limited to a more circumscribed, vulgar view of history, and for

them the theory of a natural development, divinely ordered, will result either in a deistic emptiness of faith, or in obscure pantheistic mysticism. If this were the only possible solution of the difficulty, the gospel would have no place in modern intellectual life.

Far better are the chances of the religious interests in the third case. This may be discussed simultaneously with a second theory for the harmonizing of these contrasts, a theory which virtually amounts to the same thing, although it makes use of more strictly theological terminology. According to this theory all heart-felt religion rests upon revelation, upon a comprehension of God by man. In the heroes of religion this comprehension has been realized in a higher measure than in those who merely follow the thoughts of such heroes, and corresponding to the gradation of religions there is also a gradation of intensity of revelation. Do these suggestions really succeed in harmonizing the religious view with the naturalistic? Do they give free course to the gospel in our modern world? If a pantheistic theory is taken as their background, then the interests of modern naturalism are preserved. But in that case it is too plain to need proof that Christian religious experience will be stripped of its most essential premises. If the thought of a personal God is retained, then we have a real adjustment of naturalistic and religious interests, an adjustment which, in the sphere of physical phenomena, concedes to naturalism its rights, and at the same time recognizes in the sphere of intellectual life an undeniable influence of the supernatural upon natural phenomena. And, according to the breadth which we attribute to this influence, we make room, if not for the genuine gospel of the Reformation, at least for a modernizing reinterpretation of it. And wherever in such a reinterpretation the definitive character of divine revelation in Christ receives its due, wherever there is in the heart a living faith in the *remissio propter Christum* and a hope of eternal life founded upon his conquest of death — where these conditions prevail in men's hearts, far be it from me to affirm that the intellectual surrender of the *plus* of biblical ideas which I have retained over and above those which they hold, is for them a *minus* in their personal Christianity.

But, after all, if this solution of the difficulties were the only possible one, we should still be unable to answer the question of our theme unconditionally in the negative. For a whole-hearted "Christ is risen" undoubtedly belongs to the gospel of the Reformation. Moreover, it seems to me that the position of a gospel thus modernized is in our modern world by no means unassailable. Its connection with the faith, with the *credere* of our fathers, by which even the modern mind is instinctively impressed, is weakened, while receiving no scientific reinforcement to compensate for this weakening of its position. From the one side we shall hear the objection that supernaturalism in the domain of intellect is just as irrational, just as untenable, as a supernaturalism which sets aside the natural laws of physical existence; and from the other it will be objected, and I think rightly, that proscribing supernaturalism in the sphere of physical phenomena, while at the same time rejecting naturalism in the realm of spirit, is an inconsistency. May we not suppose that here, too, connecting lines may be drawn from the physical sphere to that of spirit? But who will undertake to draw these lines and establish the limits to which they shall run? What do we know concerning the relation between the incorporeal and the corporeal? And in this case the incorporeal, the spiritual, with whose ultimate influence upon the physical we are now dealing, is, at the same time, the divine!

Neither upon this nor upon any other attempt at harmonizing the religious view of history with the naturalistic do I base my confidence that the old gospel of the Reformation even for our age has not yet lost its savor.

But neither do I base it upon the supposition that these two views of history could be brought to exist peaceably side by side, under the truce of tolerant separation, assigning to one the religious sphere and to the other that of science as its absolute domain. I think, of course, that one of these two sides, namely, the side of science, can and must tolerate such a coexistence of these views. It must do so, because the science of history cannot adopt the religious view of history; faith and knowledge are two different things. We Christians, too, have to content

ourselves with the empirically established, in the work of scientific history; divine agency cannot be introduced into historical representations as a factor in empirically established phenomena. And science *can* tolerate such coexistence, for even the most consistently naturalistic science of history may recognize its limitations in the matter of religious faith. Science can leave room for the existence, side by side with it, of a supernaturalistic, religious view of history, if, at the point where its own method proves insufficient, science is conscientious enough to admit its own inadequacy in ascertaining the facts of the past. On the other side, however, on the side of religion, such coexistence of the two views cannot, in my estimation, pass as the final conclusion of wisdom. It is not altogether incorrect, of course, to say that for religious faith in inself it is immaterial how the Lord God has proven himself and still proves himself sovereign Lord of nature; whether by dealings such as we are continually able to observe in the world, or by means that are without analogy. And it is conceivable that in a religious estimate of the person of the historic Christ a mind accustomed to abstractions might succeed in refraining altogether from reflections as to the natural explicability or inexplicability of that historic figure. Nevertheless, a twofold consideration renders it impossible for the religious view of history to ignore the dilemma between naturalism and supernaturalism. In the first place we have the universal desire for a unified theory of existence. To be sure, those of us who are accustomed to abstract speculations may allow the naturalistic view of history to follow its own course parallel to the religious method of interpretation, without thereby endangering the unity of our theory of life. For the essential question for us in regard to history is how much of the past is scientifically *knowable*. But for the layman history has a different significance. No matter what degree of knowledge may determine his judgment, for him history includes everything that he accepts as having actually taken place. This view of history is either dogmatically naturalistic or supernaturalistic. Even for this reason alone it is impossible for theology to tolerate the coexistence of the religious and the naturalistic views with regard

to the historic figure of Jesus. Theology must recognize the fact that, because the religious view of history must become for each individual the frame, as it were, for a unified conception of history, it must also arrive at a decision between naturalism and supernaturalism. Corresponding to an obligatory reserve on the part of naturalistic research in regard to the things which its methods are unable to measure up, we have, on the side of the religious interpretation of history, a justifiable reaching over into the work of ascertaining the facts of the past. The second element in the twofold consideration which I have mentioned is this: even if an abstract method of thought should succeed in refraining from reflections as to the explicability or inexplicability of the historical figure of Jesus, as applied to the gospel of the risen Lord such restraint becomes impossible. Here our decision for or against a fact premised by the gospel becomes absolutely inseparable from our decision between naturalism and supernaturalism. And it seems to me that this stumbling-stone for modern men has been put in the way *non sine numine;* for even the simplest mind can see that the Christian faith deals with things that are above and beyond the nature which limits us. If this faith is to make us "wholly free men," as Luther puts it, then it must also give us the guarantee that we shall be free from the natural law of death, and from all the other laws of this perishable world which now enslave us. If we accept this without the belief in Christ's bodily resurrection, we are simply thrusting the question of God's power over nature farther back, remanding it to a sphere in which it is even more impossible for us to grasp the conceptions of things than when dealing with the bodily resurrection. And to abandon entirely all recognition of God's power over nature and its laws is something which a true faith in the living God will never be able to do.

I am thus brought to the positive assertion that we are justified in hoping that men of the present will see the necessity of a clear decision for supernaturalism as regards the person of Jesus. This hope is justifiable for several reasons: by the reports which we possess concerning his deeds and experiences, particularly of his resurrection; by the fact that the belief in

Christ has, since the days of the apostles, evidenced its supramundane power in many thousands of men; and, lastly, by reason of what is known to us of the self-consciousness of Jesus. As respects the first point, I will not repeat here what I have said in another place[2] concerning the narratives of the resurrection. As respects the second, the testimony of the past to the influence exerted by the belief in Christ can only appeal to our feelings. I shall, therefore, limit myself to a consideration of the third argument, which is, moreover, the weightiest. The naturalistic view of history knows only men whose personality has its origin in a coöperation of natural talent with experience, talent which owes its origin to entirely natural laws, and experience which is also naturally conditioned. But these two elements so conditioned impose a temporal limitation upon the significance of any such personality. A naturalistic theory of history of necessity interprets everything as only relatively significant. That Jesus attributed to himself a significance for humanity exceeding these limits is proven by his assumption of the title of Messiah, and by a large number of the sayings of Christ which have been handed down to us; Matt. 5 : 22, 26, 28; 10 : 24, 37, 40; 11 : 20 ff., 27; 12 : 30; 13 : 16 f.; 16 : 17; 18 : 11; 20 : 28; 25 : 35 ff.; 26 : 28; *cf.* Jer. 31 : 31 ff.; 26 : 64; Luke 9 : 26, 55 f.; 11 : 22; 12 : 49; John *passim*, cannot possibly be all of them later fictions. Consequently we must conclude, either that Jesus was a self-deluded fanatic, or that he is more than a link in the chain of naturally conditioned human history. This is the dilemma with which we find ourselves confronted in regard to the person of Jesus; we must choose between a relativism which gives him the lie, and a clear decision for supernaturalism. And so, if we only delineate Jesus with absolute fidelity, or, to use the words of St. Paul to the Galatians (3 : 1), if we "evidently set forth Christ" before the eyes of our contemporaries, I am confident that modern men, too, will be convinced of the impossibility of estimating the person of Jesus on a naturalistic basis. But if at that point in the history of this little earth of ours the

[2] *Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihr Wert.* Hefte zur *Christlichen Welt*, No. 33. Freiburg, Leipzig, und Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1898.

Almighty interposed supernaturally in the development of humanity, who shall say that his influence is limited to the sphere of the psychical! A divine interposition in the course of human development which is not circumscribed by the chain of natural causes so far transcends all natural experience that, wherever we have to suppose such interposition, all the arguments of reason based only on natural experience are inadequate. I need not enter into the details of the supernaturalistic estimate of the person of Jesus. For if the mind has been brought to decide clearly in favor of supernaturalism in regard to the person of Christ, faith will not hesitate to acknowledge Christ's human life to be a definitive divine revelation. And I think I may take it for granted that this valuation of the person of Christ is unassailable by any theologian in the name of the science of historical exegesis. On the other hand, I should be little concerned if such valuation should be characterized as insufficient. In defining the old gospel in my introduction, I intentionally avoided all "cut and dried" christological formulas. For wherever the truth prevails that in the human personality and life of Jesus the eternal God himself has revealed himself to the world, there the gospel can be understood, and wherever this divine self-revelation is accepted in faith in the *remissio peccatorum propter Christum*, there the gospel is understood, and there the words of the Apologia apply: "*quærere apud Christum remissionem peccatorum est summus cultus Christi; nihil possumus majus tribuere Christo*" (88, 33). Our own age is peculiarly able to incite us in reference to this matter to think great thoughts on great subjects. In the past, when the supernaturalistic theory of existence was a matter of course, dogmatic traditional formulas were necessary in order to establish the significance of the person of Jesus as above that of a prophet; they are still necessary in our day because, fortunately, modern methods of thoughts have not yet entirely driven out the naïve supernaturalistic view of history among the people; they are necessary, also, in order to prevent any pantheistic reinterpretation of God's revelation in Christ. But really modern thought will perceive that the Rubicon has been crossed when a self-revelation of

God in the person of Jesus without any naturalistic qualifications is acknowledged. All further christological formulas are, so far as truly modern thought is concerned, not a whit more irrational than such an acknowledgment, and only from the person of Christ as a starting-point will modern thought arrive at a supernaturalistic interpretation of the prophets and of all history. Therefore my theme does not call for a more detailed discussion of the question as to how far the old christological formulas may still be maintained.

But I have one more objection to meet. On January 9, 1771, Lessing wrote to Mendelssohn (Hempel, 20, 1, 400) expressing a fear that, in casting aside certain prejudices, he (Lessing) had cast aside a little too much, and some things which he would have to accept again; but that hitherto he had been prevented from reaccepting them by a fear that he might find himself "gradually dragging all the old rubbish into the house again." Similar thoughts occupy the minds of many modern men, and of not a few modern theologians. If I accept supernaturalism in one point, so they say, then I shall have to go back to a recognition of the whole supernaturalistic theory, with all its incredible miraculous stories which in the Scripture are set forth as facts, and this my conscience will not allow me to do. This objection has little to justify it, although it is unfortunately true that many are doing the very thing — to use the language of Lessing, "dragging the old rubbish into the house again"—to which those who raise this objection object. Thus arises very often what is termed modern orthodoxy, reminding one of that which Lessing says a little later in the passage already quoted: "For many minds the final goal of thought is the point at which they have become weary of thought." We should not become weary of thinking at this point. We can accept a phenomenon as supernatural only when we have cogent reasons for so doing. Thus one may experience the "power of the resurrection of Christ" (Phil. 3:10). No such inner corroboration is possible for any of the other miracles narrated of Jesus. To be sure, he who follows a truly

supernaturalistic method of thought may say: Faith will credit the Lord with such power. But a single miracle, as such, can never become the object of a faith for which one would "die a thousand deaths," even when no doubts exist as to the credibility of the story. And when the existence of such doubts cannot be denied, a man is not an infidel because he considers the report unhistorical. The present age cannot go back to the standpoint of a time in which historical criticism was unknown. It must not return to that standpoint, because the scientific conscience will not allow it to do so. It need not return to it, because faith is founded only upon the gospel. Indeed, the liberty which is born of faith must protest against seeing that faith bound to historical, or even biblical, traditions which are unessential to salvation.

Orthodoxy may perhaps urge in reply to this that criticism could be more easily tolerated if it were always accompanied by true belief; but that unbelieving criticism—and who will deny that such exists?—must be repressed with might and main; that he who loves the gospel must associate himself for this purpose with all who are like-minded. But this is not the spirit of the gospel. The gospel contains within itself its own verification and defense, says Zwingli in his Theses of 1523; it needs not the protection of man. Luther's desire was to fight *solo verbo*. And so it should be today. But the question is, after all, a profitless one, for not even the pope succeeds in suppressing unbelieving criticism outside of his church. The only pertinent question is to what extent we may invite the spiritual coöperation of those who seem to be affected by unbelieving criticism. But even in regard to this important question the gospel of the Reformation does not leave us unadvised. Faith in the gospel cannot be measured by formulated statements; it is altogether a matter of our inmost being. Where is the dividing line between nascent belief and unbelief, between unbelief and a belief that is handicapped by prejudice of position and idiosyncrasy of character? And again: it is the *word of God* which works in the heart, and not the belief of the preacher. Therefore the evangelical churches should accept the

coöperation of everyone who, in the measure of his knowledge and discernment, is willing to help in making way in our modern world for the gospel of Jesus Christ. I will not deny that such toleration has its limits; but these I have already indicated. And yet I wish to state distinctly that in my estimation we cannot possibly leave it in every case to the conscience of the individual to decide whether he is still serving the best interests of the gospel. As respects the ordinary work of the professors in our institutions of learning, such liberty seems to me justifiable and right. For we must avoid even the appearance of implying that the gospel needs any human safeguards against science. Moreover, all reprisals are ineffective; what would it avail us if we should request a professor to enter another faculty, or to resign? We cannot thereby silence his pen. David Friedrich Strauss did not become less influential by reason of the fact that he was prevented from entering on the professorship to which he had been elected at Zürich, but only more embittered. But in regard to the clergy and other like servants of the church, church governments are in duty bound—and in regard to the question of religious coöperation all individuals are likewise bound—to draw the line in accordance with their own judgment of the limits within which profitable coöperation is possible.

Where shall this line be drawn? The question is a much simpler one in America than in the established churches of the Old World. In America every denomination thinks it necessary to preserve its distinctive peculiarities, and expulsion from one denomination does not prevent the expelled member from uniting with another that is more congenial to him. But even in America there are already denominations situated similarly to our own, and for all American denominations this same problem presents itself as soon as the question of an interdenominational association is raised. Where, then, shall that line be drawn? In my opinion there is only *one* answer befitting the churches of the Reformation: it should be drawn at a point where a positive attachment to the gospel of the Reformation no longer exists, where its path is being *obstructed* instead of being made smooth. This line is a broad one, very broad; and yet it is narrow enough.

For what more does our own age need than the gospel? Among us in the Old World the question as to the limits of liberty of instruction, and among English-speaking people the question of Christian union, are being widely discussed. But that the gospel of the Reformation *alone* can and must be the basis of all spiritual coöperation, the basis of all Christian union, this thesis has been championed in its full breadth only by individuals here and there. Zealous attachment to the gospel of the Reformation has, as a rule, been bound up with a lot of untenable ideas concerning the restoration of primitive Lutheranism, or at least with a ballast of dogmatic traditions; and, on the other hand, the attempt to compromise with "modern thought" has too often entailed an enfeebling of religious energy. An honest, whole-souled, out-and-out fight *for* the gospel of the Reformation, and an equally determined fight *against* all obsolete tradition and dogma, *this* standard, I believe, would carry success with it in the modern world, such as no other watchword, whether traditionalistic or liberal, could hope for. And even though the victory of this banner were reserved for future generations, yet it will exalt, even now, every individual who rallies around it. Under this flag we need not ask to have the security of our position guaranteed by the state or its favor, or by partisan journals and conferences, or yet by the applause of irreligious science, or by the approval of "enlightened" periodicals and *salons:* here we stand upon a foundation laid by a higher hand, free on every side, and secure for time and for eternity.

PERSONALITY FROM THE MONISTIC POINT OF VIEW.

By GEORGE F. GENUNG,
Richmond, Va.

THE monistic idea, when once it enters the mind, is so great and so pervading that by its light the whole universe is transformed. This mighty frame of objective existence, which in our unspeculative or materialistic realism we have thought of simply as Thing, becomes at once a great Subject of which we form a part, and from which we feel ourselves scarcely separated by the primary distinction of me and not-me. At first our whole thinking seems to be reduced to a state of flux, hopefully or tremblingly awaiting the crystallization of restatement. For does not the monistic thesis mean that God is the one central Reality; that his mind pervades the whole universe from smallest atom to highest product of human genius; that the Infinite is not dualistically set over against, and wearisomely toiling with, a dead load of matter that retards his free movement, nor eternally mocked by the sin of a puny race of created spirits who defy his will; but that somehow all these are but manifold expressions of the nature of one Being who is perpetually creating the world and its history by the eternal movement of his spirit? With such a mighty reconception of the real essence of all being it almost seems as if our whole mental life must for the time being revert anew to a state of query. If all nature and humanity is an expression of God, then how is one form of knowledge or worship, which all comes inevitably to him, higher or lower than another? or how is religion any more vitally a having to do with God than the healthy performance of animal functions, since these are but the creative Will forming and sustaining us? "If every event be wholly due to him, how can we say that any single event, such as a miracle, or any tendency of events, such as 'making for righteousness,' is specially his? What room for difference or distinction is there within the

circuit of his universal power?"[1] What shall we do with those salutary conceptions of the universe which depended on our thought of the Artificer as outside of its plastic substance, or with those ideas of sin and redemption, historically so practical as working principles, which can rise only from the hypothesis of a dualistically judging Mind and forgiving Will? These and similar questions are constantly coursing through our thoughts as the immanence of God becomes magnified to greater proportions in our contemplation of the universe.

A natural dread which obtrudes itself upon the mind of the one who finds himself carried into the current of monistic thought is the dread of pantheism. This dread arises from the perception of those dangers lurking in pantheistic systems which threaten our conception of personality. Monism insists that its infinite Energy of which all things are but the expression is a person, or at least includes in itself all essential personal powers. Whether consciousness, which marks that stage of the cosmical process attained in psychical life, is the summit and crown of personality, or only the attribute of an intermediate and finite grade, like light which is caused by ether waves only while vibrating at a certain intermediate rate, may be a further question. The first fact, at least, with which monism must reckon is the fact of personality in God and man. How it defines and interprets personality is the prime consideration in any estimation of its adequacy as a theory attempting to account for the phenomena of the universe. The conception of personality, as the one most likely to be obscured by the monistic view, is the conception that most urgently calls for readjustment and definition. At the same time it must be borne in mind that, in the attempt at such readjustment within the limits of a paper like the present, it is possible only to indicate a few of the landing places for thought, and so not improbably to start a great many more questions than there is the opportunity to settle. It is hoped that the writer's aim will be accepted as one of outlining and suggestion, rather than of the impregnable and final establishing, at this stage, of his views.

[1] BALFOUR, *Foundations of Belief.*

I.

First of all, let us consider what possible personality we can predicate of God; and especially whether that personality is like the psychical life which we find in man, or higher than it, and yet including it, as the infinite includes the finite.

We form our conception of personality from what we find in humanity. This is the highest personality that we comprehend, and in predicating personality of God we reason up from our own natures to his. For this we find a theological sanction in the ancient formula that God created man in his own image, and after his likeness; from which we infer that all that is in the original or substance we may find in the image or shadow. The soundness of this method of reasoning remains to be considered. We find this personality to be composed of self-consciousness and self-determination. Of these two elements the psychical life seems to be built upon self-consciousness as the central one. By its consciousness that life is unified; the sensations of the organism and the thoughts of the mind coalesce into a soul only as consciousness arises and proclaims all these operations to be the manifestations of one being. Even our self-determination or volition we know to be will, rather than reflex organic function, only as we are conscious of a purpose preceding and determining it. Thus the very center and unity of our psychic life is self-consciousness.

But even in ourselves we apprehend and feel impelled to something higher than the mere psychical life. Our conscience and our religious intuition recognize a distinction between soul and spirit, even though our understanding may not separate them one from the other. While the soul accepts the responsibility that comes of being distinctly spiritual in its nature, spirit is nevertheless something transcending soul—something of higher reach or larger aspect, if not a separate entity in a tripartite being. Is spirit simply that side of the soul which faces toward, and receives influences from, above, as the body with its senses is the side or organ of the soul which communicates with the world? Such a definition may seem satisfactory when we are looking only at the spiritual side of our own nature,

but it is hardly a definition that will cover all spirit, the infinite with the finite.

When we study our will more deeply we find that it is more than the mere faculty of conscious volitions, and that there is a movement of our being over all which is freer, more expressive of our character, than the temporary choices into which we may be beguiled by our feelings or misled by an imperfect understanding, which, as an indication of our real self, is to the chance volitions of the moment as the main current of a river is to the ripples and eddies along its banks. This higher movement of our being we call our spirit. In speaking of spirit as a phase of the personal manifestation we do not often separate the thought of it from that of psychic life as its center and substance. But as a social[2] force or a certain emanation from the general condition of a period, spirit is often spoken of in popular language in a sense whose connotation of personality is doubtful. We speak of the spirit of an age, the spirit of a community, the spirit or animus of a movement, the spirit of this world, or the *Zeitgeist;* and of such forms of specific influence we often hear used the expression "impersonal spirit," because these forces are diffused and we find no center for their self-consciousness. But is not impersonal spirit a contradiction in terms? Is spirit below personality because it has an exactly representative center in no one finite soul? Such diffused spirit is really above personality, in that it sways personality and carries it along with it; it really commands and characterizes the age in which it appears. "Among the energies of the world it appears weak, but it is in reality supreme. Slowly but surely everything gives way before it. What is it? All we know is that it is the radiated spiritual life."[3] It seems to us weak only when in thought we try to separate it from its forms of manifestation, and view it in its rarified inner essence. When we remember that spirit does not fly around in the air, but that it is immanent and organific in humanity, we are in a better position to recognize its strength. But here at least we come to something in personality which we cannot formulate

[2] See DR. COYLE, *The Spirit in Literature and Life*, Boston, 1896.

[3] JOHN H. DENISON, *Christ's Idea of the Supernatural*, Boston, 1895.

in terms of soul; and it all shows that there is something beyond psychical life which we must take into the account as we reason from ourselves up to God.

It is interesting to observe the Scripture differentiation of psychic and pneumatic, or soul and spirit life, though we can take the time for no exhaustive examination of passages. Without pressing to a rigid trichotomic interpretation such passages as that in Thessalonians where Paul prays that God may keep his readers' spirit and soul and body, but conceding that this may be a rhetorical pleonasm for the whole man, and no attempt at exactness of terminology, we may nevertheless everywhere see that Paul recognizes some distinction between psyche and pneuma, and between psychic and pneumatic life. His order of spiritual development is, first that which is psychic, then that which is pneumatic. The summing up of functions and ends for the psyche is that it is ζῶσα, or living—the first Adam was made a living soul—while the spirit is characteristically ζωοποιοῦν, or life-giving—the last man was made a life-giving spirit. There is a radical contrast between the psychical, or soul-man, and the pneumatic, or spirit-man. The psychical man receiveth not the things of the spirit of God, for they are foolishness unto him, and he is not able to know them because they are pneumatically or spiritually discerned; but he that is pneumatic discerneth all things, and he himself is discerned by no one. Paul even speaks of a psychical or soul-body as the one in which our humanity is sown, and of a pneumatie or spirit-body as the one in which it is raised and inherits eternal life; while nevertheless, as to the separation of psyche and pneuma, the writer to the Hebrews implies that there is so intimate a blending that the living Word of God exemplifies most strikingly its power in being able to effect that separation.

To summarize the passages in which the term spirit is introduced antithetically, we may say that spirit is spoken of in the Bible in contrast with various entities; but it is always as the freer and more spontaneous term of the comparison—indicating that which is less rigidly bound by form or by necessity. In legal and scriptural interpretation it is contrasted with γράμμα,

or *the letter*, where the very point of the comparison is that the letter is fixed, confining, and narrowing, unadaptable to the various exigencies to which moral law must be applied. In ethical theory, especially in John's terminology, spirit is contrasted with σάρξ, or *flesh*, where the latter is the egoistic, or individualized, often, though not always, sinfully selfish principle. In one instance (1 Cor. 14:15) it is even placed over against the νοῦς, or *mind*, where the latter is evidently that faculty or inward operation which labors more for intelligibility and effect, or is perhaps more subject to modifications by human science and convention—in either case is more bound by circumstances or demands. As contrasted with the σῶμα, or *body*, spirit refers to all the higher part of man which is above the natural law of growth and death, and the term is often thus used synonymously with *soul*. Spirit being thus common with soul in constituting the freer part of man, we should expect that when this essentially free entity goes farther, and even splits itself off or contrasts itself with the ψυχή, or soul, it should still be the freer term of the comparison, and should point to a determination or limitation in our psychic personality to which spirit is not subject.

And, indeed, when we come to form for ourselves a conception of the nature of spirit in its distinction from everything else—even soul, which in some connections of thought is identified with it—we shall hold our thought to this one fact of freedom as the center of the distinction. We seek a clear conception of a thing by comparison or contrast with something else; but when we place pure spirit in antithesis with anything that may be compared with it, we only discover this in each case, that spirit is freer. Its freedom differentiates it. In fact, spirit is essentially freedom. "It is a result of speculative philosophy," says Hegel, "that freedom is the sole truth of spirit." And by freedom we mean self-movement, or activity. Spirit is active, not passive; it cannot be acted upon. Whatever there is in our personality which is capable of entering into passive relations belongs to our psychic, as distinguished from our pneumatic, life. Spirit in its purity we cannot bring into passive relations even

to the extent of making it the object of knowledge. No one knows spirit ontologically; we put ourselves into relation with pure spirit only dynamically, that is, by experiencing its power or being swept along by its movement. "For who among men knoweth the things of a man, save the spirit of the man which is in him? even so the things of God none knoweth save the Spirit of God." Spirit-knowledge is subjective; and a spirit only knows its like by those sympathetic vibrations, as it were, like those of consonant strings, by which the like spirits share in a common movement, and each in its act of knowledge knows itself. Pure spirit never places itself over against us as a not-me, no matter to what degree we may be possessed by it. The believer is never so unified, and never so truly and strongly himself, as when he is most filled with the Spirit of God. We know that spirit subjectively, namely, as the highest will and deepest tendency of ourselves, never separating it from our own consciousness, and indeed never bringing it before consciousness for contemplation at all. So in mentioning the disciples' relation to spirit above themselves, Jesus does not speak of apprehending a spirit, or of getting acquainted with a spirit; but he uses the remarkable form, to be *of* a spirit, that is, to share its movement; and he tells the disciples on one occasion that in their superficial eagerness they do not know what manner of spirit they are of — their spirit is not mirrored in their consciousness.

In our human personality we found the two elements to be self-consciousness and self-determination. We found the first of these to be the center of the soul or psychic life. The soul is unified by its consciousness, and it is this which separates all existence as non-ego from its own self or ego. But as to the pneuma or spirit, may we not say that its center is the self-determination or will? It is will which unifies the spirit of man. Spirit is defined only in terms of will, and not in terms of consciousness, or ontologically. Even the spirit of a man is never studied as an object, but only subjectively, that is, by being *of* it; or else dynamically, that is, by feeling its embodied effects. We never know a spirit outside of us by what it *is*, but only by what it *does*. For us it exists simply as movement or

tendency, and nothing else. We know a man's spirit by kinship, sympathy, like tendency, if we are of a like spirit; if we are not, we can only apprehend it by its utterances, which may or may not be a perfect expression of that spirit, and through which, therefore, we may often do injustice to it by our criticism. The pneumatic or spiritual life of man has as a center of unity, and that center not a point, but a direction or motion, his will or inner movement.

The higher side of our personality, therefore, seems to be that which is centered in our will, or freest and most characteristic tendency, rather than in our consciousness. In most general terms it is our *direction*. It is all one thing or all another. It is not, like the soul, a congeries of conflicting wishes and propensities over which angels watch in solicitude to see which shall have the ascendency. Nor does the higher spirit, like soul, present a lower nature and then a better nature which may stand as a *pou sto* from which higher influences may operate to save the rest. God does not transform a spirit. He simply replaces it by another spirit. The evil spirits are, therefore, never represented as redeemable; and in Christ's argument it is treated as incredible that the prince of demons should have a complex nature enabling him for any purpose to do the work of God. The higher side of our personality is the central will, the deepest and dominant force of our being, which cannot act in two directions at the same time, and which, if evil, can minister to our redemption only by being replaced by an opposite spirit, which operation is scripturally called our being born anew of the Spirit of God.

Now, in finding such higher personality as we can predicate of God, we are led to think of this higher than psychical life as in the direction of, and throwing light upon, the divine. In other words, the divine personality is not a magnified psychical life—for the psychical cannot apprehend the things of God—but an infinite spiritual life. When, therefore, our Lord says, "God is Spirit," he is saying something more than simply that God is a person. Why should he take the trouble to tell the woman of Samaria a truth which her worship presupposed and fought for no

less vitally than his own? He was evidently trying to impress on her that God is freer than mere psychic personality, and therefore not confined to places, nor to be apprehended as one soul apprehends another soul. Jesus goes on to say, "They that worship Him must worship in pneuma, or spirit, and truth"—that is to say, not as soul, unified by our consciousness and guided by knowledge that comes to our perceptions, but as spirit, brought into *rapport* with the divine by our inner movement or will; do we worship the infinite Spirit. All this makes us think of God as a mighty Movement, to be known dynamically rather than ontologically, a Being whose sole essence, for our apprehension, is Freedom. Need we be so greatly shocked by reading Matthew Arnold's translation of this passage: "God is an Influence; and they who worship Him must worship of inner movement and in sincerity"? This is only making the passage say—though it strikes us suddenly and baldly, like an unprepared chord in music—that the divine, so far as its substance is concerned, can only be conceived of as a mighty Movement, or Pressure, or Tendency, differentiated from all lower forms of being in that it is absolutely free and self-moved, the Primal Will of the universe; and that He is worshiped by means of harmonious motion in us, rather than by such knowledge and predilection as form the basis of personal affection between soul and soul.

Such a rarifying of our conception of personality to that of pure tendency is not a de-personifying of God. It is only viewing personality in its higher aspect, namely as creative. God is essentially a Creator—such is the whole character of the divine movement. Creation is the objectifying of will. Whatever by any possibility becomes an object, or capable of entering into passive relations, is so far created thing, not creative energy—it is will arrived at its goal or objectified. To resolve personality into freedom, or self-originating movement, is simply to think our way in the reverse order back up the stream of the creative process, from the created or objective person up to the Person who is uncreate. It is not to de-personify God, but only to de-objectify him or consider him as Creator.

But the question arises: Can there in the possible circle of our knowledge be such an entity as is indicated — a movement that is not any objective thing moving, a somewhat so free and active that it cannot enter into passive relations even to the extent of being an object of knowledge, no objective thing at all, but only a sweep of tendency — well, let us fall back on Scripture and say, a puff, a breathing or panting, a πνεῦμα? Is not your God who is purely a Motion inconceivable? Herbert Spencer was honest enough to call him the Unknowable; and we are aware that the bulk of the answers to him were but the outcry of outraged, unspeculative dogmatism which had not taken the trouble to examine the content of his concept, but wreaked itself, as does all external criticism upon pure spirit that is alien to it, on the logical implications and contradictions of a term. Inconceivable as thing, yes, but not as power. In our physical science we have a similar conception which we use every day. It is the conception of force, an entity which as thing or mere object is just as inconceivable as pure spirit. We know force only by its effects. We measure it by placing in its train some specially contrived object which is affected by its motion. Force, like what I have already affirmed spirit to be, is in our minds purely a dynamical conception; and we cannot therefore conceive of it as consisting of any substance which can enter into passive relations at all. It is purely active in any conception which we can form of its nature.

I have said that we know force only in its effects. This is, indeed, true of force so long as it remains below the level of our personality. But suppose that in its essential nature it is higher than our personality. Then, in that manifestation of it which comes to the level of our personality or will, we begin to know it in another way, the way in which I have said we know pure spirit, namely by moving along with it, becoming an organism for its working, being *of* it. This is a subjective knowledge, that is, a knowledge of a movement which has become our own inner state rather than a contemplated object — and this knowledge, Schopenhauer says, is our only possible apprehension of the thing-in-itself. But why do we need to say that this higher

movement which we apprehend subjectively, in our personality and in our worship, is any different in its nature from the force which, in the world of necessity below us, we can study only in its effects? Why should we not say that all force is but the all-pervading will of God, and that the difference between the sanctifying spirit within us and the moving principle of the cosmos below us is but a difference of manifestation? Indeed, does not our deeper thinking seem destined to drive us to this conclusion? Since the discovery of the principle of the correlation of forces we have been led to suspect that all force may be ultimately resolvable into one. But as we attempt to think our way back, from derived force to that which causes it, until we come to the primal uncaused and absolutely free Energy, we can stop at nothing short of Will. Self-originated energy is will; and self-originated energy is but coming to its differentiated manifestation in all that infinite manifold of ceaseless forces with which the universe is filled. All nature comes in direct contact with the omnipresent God and is moved, or rather, we may say, constituted, by him; we as more highly organized beings come to him as our Father. Therefore, in knowing God by his external effects we shall still confine ourselves to our scale-pans, and our thermometers, and our electrometers, which are but registers of his impact as force; while in knowing him subjectively we worship him "of inner movement and in sincerity."

Let us think of God, then, as the primal Force or Will of the universe, the ultimate Energy into which all force is resolvable. I will not say the soul of the universe, standing in a relation to the cosmos like that of our soul to our body, for the end and goal of a soul's existence is to acquire and subserve an individual life—the first Adam was made a *living* soul; but I will say, the life-giving, or, what is the same thing, creative Spirit of the universe, whose breathing or essential movement is not to live, but to make to exist. Soul animates its body: the eternal Spirit constitutes or creates its cosmos. It does not simply live in its body, like a soul, borrowing the body's organs to subserve its own existence; rather, the eternal Spirit's existence is complete, and its wealth of organific life overflows in the ceaseless

process of expressing itself through the ever-developing manifold of the universe.

Thus thinking of God, we find no longer any place or need for the jejune deistical question whether there is a God. There *must* be some origin from which it all starts, some prime impulse which resides at the very seat of all power — in other words, some First Cause. That Beginning of all things we will call God; and that his power moves in us and in all phenomena becomes so obvious as to admit of no argument. If the old deistical question assumes another shape, and expresses itself as Huxley propounded it, "Whether there is anything psychical in the universe higher than ourselves," then, indeed, we may find some occasion for debate; but I humbly submit that the conclusion of our reasoning need not disturb us, whichever way it may establish itself. Though there be nothing psychical in the universe higher than ourselves, there is something spiritual — something far higher than psyche or soul, and including in itself all its distinctive powers. Indeed, we may say with Spencer that "the Ultimate Power is no more representable in terms of human consciousness than human consciousness is representable in terms of a plant's functions." We have found that which is highest in ourselves to be something more than psychic life; why, then, should we weary ourselves with striving to maintain that the infinite Creative Power is a soul? Perhaps we have shrunk from using Matthew Arnold's form of words, thrown out as his concept of God, which designate him as the "Stream of tendency by which all things fulfil the law of their being." Impelled by a natural prejudice, we have repudiated Spencer's agnosticism on general principles, although he says: "But amid the mysteries which become the more mysterious the more they are thought about, there will remain the one absolute certainty that the inquiring soul is ever in the presence of an Infinite and Eternal Energy from which all things proceed." But have we not failed to profit by the utterances of these men because we have neglected to consider what an immense deal they have said when they have said thus much; and would not our more profitable course be to see how much of content we shall find in that conception of spirit which

is purely dynamical, if we run out all the relations of the infinite Cosmic Movement to those facts of personality and spiritual aspiration with which we concern ourselves in our study of religion and the incarnate Son of God?

II.

We come now to consider that form of personality which we call psychic personality or soul. This is personality as found in ourselves. In common with all personality it consists of self-consciousness and self-determination. But the constitutive factor, that by which personality comes to be known, is the self-consciousness. Round this the powers of the soul group themselves, or englobe themselves into a possibility of manifestation, so that the soul becomes a thing that can be known, while, on the other hand, pure spirit cannot be known as thing at all, but only dynamically. And yet, with all our contrasting of soul and spirit, we cannot regard them as separate parts of a tripartite being. Man consists of body, soul, and spirit, but soul is nevertheless essentially spirit, only spirit acting in a certain way. It is spirit working to constitute something. If we think of spirit as essentially movement, then we may think of soul as movement seeking a center. It is a vortex of spirit. Thus forming a vortex of ever-moving activity, it becomes cognizable as a thing, and we call it soul. But while as thing it is soul, as force it is spirit. Schopenhauer has pointed out that even in self-consciousness it is will that holds the primacy.

We can thus see how it is that God may be the universal spirit, not dualistically set over against us through a hard-and-fast oppositeness of essence, but capable of constituting us by the goings forth of his creative energy; and yet how at the same time the assertion that God is all does not imply a swallowing up of our personality in the sea of infinite Being, as the pantheists are charged with imagining. There is the infinite creative Spirit ever expressing himself in us, and yet that constant activity is engaged in forming vortices of spirit, which constitute little quasi-independent centers of activity knowing themselves and known as persons or souls.

This new vertical determination of the creative spirit constitutes an entity that is capable of entering into passive relations It can be acted upon. It can be known as a concrete object or ontologically. In its act of knowing, too, knowledge may impinge upon it *ab extra*, or through sensation. All such knowledge puts the soul into a passive attitude, which is impossible in pure spirit. The saying, *Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius in sensu*, may apply to finite intelligence, but not to the infinite Spirit. With the infinite Spirit there is no knowledge *in sensu*, for the infinite Spirit constitutes no vortex of individuality on which impression can act. The knowledge of the infinite Spirit or the absolute Activity is knowledge from the inside, or subjective knowledge. It is the knowledge of active, creative intelligence, a knowledge like that which we have of the states of our own will, not when reflecting, but when acting. To the infinite Intelligence, therefore, as we conceive of him monistically, the whole universe is known simply as the working of his own creative processes. "God, the absolute reason," says W. T. Harris, "is perfect knowing and willing in one—what he knows he creates; for his knowing causes to be that which he intellectually perceives."[4] The soul, on the other hand, is distinguished from the absolutely free and active Spirit in being capable of being impinged upon by knowledge which comes as sensation or impression. All its objects of knowledge, indeed, outside of its purely spiritual operations, are distinguished from itself as not-me. The soul is that particular activity of spirit which concerns itself with constituting an individuality on which influence may act.

This action of creative energy resulting in a vortex of spirit is what constitutes the soul a created object. Our psychic nature is created, but it is created, be it observed, not by being shaped by an external Workman out of material wholly alien to his nature, but by being a particular mode of his ever-flowing activity. We have erred in making the Creator and the created wholly opposite in essence. We have thus found it difficult, perhaps even sacrilegious, to conceive of ourselves as of identical

[4] *The Spiritual Sense of Dante's Divina Commedia*, New York.

nature with God. But in common with the whole universe of created things, we *are* the divine Spirit constantly acting in a certain way. He is ceaselessly creating us by flowing in a vortex which by this constitutive action acquires individuality and plasticity, and which turns about and formally thinks of its very Creator as a not-me excluded from itself.

When this creative energy is wholly immanent, that is, wholly taken up, as it were, in the process of constituting itself a concrete object, then we have the merely animal soul, or the functional intelligence. Such a soul exists in the brute, and, as wholly exhausted in frankly *being itself*, is sinless and irresponsible. That side of our human nature is the merely psychical man which knoweth not the things of the Spirit of God. But in us the creative energy is also transcendent, just as God is not only immanent, but also transcendent in the universe. It rises above itself. It looks back upon itself and judges itself for its acquired character and deeds. It thus becomes conscious of sin and shortcoming. Such a transcendent and judging element in our personality is our distinctively spiritual nature. It is the residue of spirit over and above that vortical activity which is absorbed in constituting soul. It is the spiritual man; and it exists in every accountable human being, whether regenerate or not, in the form of conscience.

Observe, however, that while this residue of divinely creative spirit which acts as conscience and the spiritual man is distinctively will, it is nevertheless not simply a synonym for the volitional activity of the soul. It is rather a divine activity *within* the soul. The soul, ever being constituted by that vortical determination of the creative Spirit, exists as a quasi-independent activity, and has not only its capacity for passive relations and its knowledge of itself as an individual, but its finite habit of volition or will. This is not the original activity of the creative Spirit, but a derived action; it is the created soul, in its turn, exercising the functions of a free being like a little image of its Creator. It differs from the freer creative Spirit in being the faculty of conscious choices. And its wishes center in the ascendency or pleasure of the finite self or soul. It is

the soul acting, just as we have also the soul knowing and known. It reflects the wishes, not only of the individual, but of the species, so that we see its freedom modified by merely animal determinations and by heredity. It is of precisely this activity of our nature that the doubt is possible whether we are free or not. We seem to make our choices freely, and yet we have that invariable determination to evil which furnishes a ground for the theory that we are fallen beings; and the collective choices of men, according to their class and environment, may be predicted and built upon with a considerable degree of certainty. The soul is but an imperfect image of its infinitely free Creator, and the more imperfect as it is more exclusively guided by its psychic volition. When it is simply soul, acting in its purely self-centered personality, it is only a created thing: the creative Force which constitutes it has centered into a concrete entity like the material atom. Its fancied freedom is but a finite and derived freedom. The real dividing line between the world of necessity and the world of freedom is not at conscious personality, but a little higher. It is at the spiritual, as distinguished from the psychical, nature of man. Here we see the universal Spirit, not concreted to a soul, as in the material world we see it concreted to an atom, but free and transcendent, judging its psychic self and seeking the universal Good as an end—in short, creative or life-giving Spirit.

This idea of vortices is not one that has its place only in picturing to ourselves the nature of the soul. We have the same idea in the science of the material world, assisting us to form a notion of the atom. In common with all ultimate conceptions, the nature of matter is one of the irreducible enigmas of philosophy. Precisely what is matter? We have got as far as to conceive of it as composed of infinitely small specks in motion. To use Balfour's summary statement:

> According to [the view of the best science] the world consists essentially of innumerable small particles of definite and unchanging mass, endowed with a variety of mechanical, chemical, and other qualities, and forming by their mutual association the various bodies which we can handle and see, and many others which we can neither handle nor see. These ponderable

particles have their being in a diffused and all-penetrating medium, or ether, of which we know little, except that it possesses, or behaves as if it possessed, certain mechanical properties of a very remarkable character; while the whole of this material system, ponderable particles and ether alike, is animated (if the phrase may be permitted me) by a quantity of energy which, though it varies in the manner and place of its manifestation, yet never varies in total amount.

To this limit, then, science comes in its working concept — it finds the world composed of particles animated by energy. But the thinking mind cannot rest in this conception; indeed, as a theory it does not account for the facts.[5] If matter is ultimately distinct from the energy which moves it — something inert and passive — then we have an irreconcilable dualism, and the universal Spirit cannot be infinite. It is forever confronted by a passive load or burden which it must move. Such a cosmology may well exercise itself with the doubt whether matter is eternal, and whether the visible universe is a piece of carpentry shaped out of preëxisting materials. But this idea of the material particle is not an ultimate conception. The question still remains, Just what is this particle of matter endowed with such wondrous properties? It will be noted that the "mechanical, chemical, and other qualities" with which science finds the atoms endowed are but manifestations of energy. And such we may call the particle itself. "Matter is nothing," says Ostwald, "but a spatially contiguous group of different energies." The atom is, in other words, a vortex of energy; and that vortical action of force constitutes a local point where the movement, being no longer outward, appears endowed with passive qualities. A point at which force acts to a center becomes manifest as matter. Thus we have no longer the irreducible dualism of inert matter and animating energy: it is all energy; and that inertia or passivity which in the atom seems so opposite to the free energy of will or spirit is but a difference of manifestation. Instead of using the term which Balfour introduced with hesitancy, and saying that these particles are "animated" by a fixed quantity of energy, let us say they are constituted, or created,

[5] See article in *Popular Science Monthly*, Vol. XLVIII, pp. 589–601 (March, 1896), by WILHELM OSTWALD, on "The Failure of Scientific Materialism."

by a ceaselessly moving energy which is not to be thought of as like the living soul animating a physical body of diverse nature, but like the life-giving or creative Spirit whose movement is the constituting substance of all that exists.

Precisely similar, from a monistic point of view, is the nature of that personal unity which we call the soul. That is a vortex of spirit which by its activity to a center is made capable of passive relations and can thus be known ontologically, can know as a result of the impact of sensation, and can will as a finite unity or selfhood by conscious volition. It is the spiritual atom, constituted by the same creative Energy and by the same kind of processes as the material atom, only on some higher stage, so that consciousness gives us a glimpse here and there of its activity and its intention.

"So schaff' ich am sausenden Webstuhl der Zeit,
Und wirke der Gottheit lebendiges Kleid."

III.

With regard to the third division of my subject, namely, the redemption of the human personality, I can only indicate very briefly the main direction in which thought may labor to give an account of the facts and problems from a monistic standpoint Our cosmological thinking has brought us to this point: we have found that the highest form of spiritual life is not psychic personality or the individual soul, but a determination of spiritual force which is absolutely active, not seeking a center or individualized, but outward-flowing, altruistic, creative, or self-expressive, or, what is the same thing when related to free beings, self-imparting movement or love. The lower or human personality is unified by self-consciousness, and thus becomes an individual; and yet genetically it is an atom or vortex of spirit, that is to say, nothing else than the same creative movement working about a center. Endowed with self-consciousness, this psychic being knows that he is not the final or highest form of life. A being whose life-forces, or spiritual tendencies, all labor to constitute himself an objective, finished product is a selfish

being; and that selfish or individual determination the self-conscious unit feels to be sin or a missing of his true end. We are, therefore, confronted with a problem of redemption, that is, the producing in humanity of something more than a created product.

Here, then, we find a restlessness in one species of God's creatures which can be appeased only by a progress or transition to a higher form of life. How it comes that "the Divine Being Who is the Ground and Source of everything that is, Who sustains all, directs all, produces all," can have preferred forms of life concreted from his universally pervading activity, or one part of his universe which is nearer to him than another, is a question which reaches into the inner nature of the Infinite himself. That he does is a presupposition, however, not alone in our conviction of the need of redemption, but in all evolutionary thought. "Can we, then," says Balfour, "think of evolution in a God-created world without attributing to its Author the notion of purpose slowly worked out; the striving towards something which is not, but which gradually becomes, and in the fullness of time will be? Surely not. But, if not, can it be denied that evolution—the evolution, I mean, which takes place in time, the natural evolution of science, as distinguished from the dialectical evolution of metaphysics—does involve something of the nature of that 'preferential action' which is so difficult to understand, yet so impossible to abandon?"

In redemption the movement is in the nature of a return of the created life to its Source. And yet, though the sin of the psychic personality consists in an exaggeration or idolizing of that movement which produces individuality, its salvation or final blessedness is not to be in the losing of individuality, or reabsorption into the sea of infinite being. That is a pantheistic view which thinks of the Absolute as the universal Ocean of existence whose surface ceaselessly gleams out in human consciousness into sparkles of personality, ever twinkling into evanescent light and sinking back into eternal calm, like the reflection of the sunlight on the waves. But to create a luminous finite intellect in order simply to dissolve it and reabsorb it

into undifferentiated existence would be only aimlessly to fashion in order to destroy. That individuality once constituted is to remain an individuality through all the stages of its higher or ethical evolution. Individuality is not redeemed by vanishing, but by broadening itself, diffusing itself, throwing the force of its unified energy into an outward-flowing movement which is creative like that of the universal Spirit, filial or toward its Source, altruistic or self-diffusing. The moral death of the soul is in stopping at being vortically constituted, as if that were a completion; its redemption is in using that individual life which is constituted by the vortical creative process as a beginning or a genetic element in a new creative movement on a larger stage engaged in producing something higher. Whatever in this world is completed is dead. The only continued life possible is that which consists in using the completed thing as a reproductive element in the formation of a higher product. The soul is completed in becoming an individual. Its redemption or blessedness consists, not in losing that individuality, but in augmenting and bringing to fruition its freedom in the production of an altruistic and spiritual existence which shall work up the conscious purpose and striving into the collective unit called society, and into the redeemed unity in Christ, the Word made flesh.

We here catch a glimpse of our place in a mighty creative movement constituting the world and its history, which ever repeats itself in wider circles and with higher units of force. We have identified all force with the will of God. That force seems to be acting in vortices. In creating matter it plays around the minute vortex which constitutes the atom. But these atoms do not stop at being created. Neither do they lose their individual atomicity in becoming genetic elements in the production of the next higher unit, the chemical body. There are in the maze of chemical activities plenty of breakings-up and recombinations, but the atom always remains an atom, and is not reabsorbed into undifferentiated, unvortexed force. The next higher species of vortical activity is in organic life, and the new unit which is produced is the cell. Here the working is on

a scale which admits of its being studied with the microscope. Microscopical research shows us that in every living organism there are countless minute cells which constitute its substance. Every cell is composed of three kinds of matter, not to be distinguished in any way except by how they act; and every particle of the substance of the cell passes successively through these three states. There is first what is called nutrient matter, that is, matter that the cell feeds upon, so to speak, or builds itself up out of. And then there is living matter, which, as it were, attacks the nutrient matter and converts it into the third kind, formed matter. In every cell of every living organism, whether vegetable or animal, there is constantly going on that process of converting nutrient matter into formed matter, such as makes up the substance of the living tissue; and this is all that the microscope discloses of the nature of life. But notice this, that we do not see the living germ in the cell convert dead food matter into living substance, but rather into finished or formed matter. The remarkable thing is that when the formed matter of the cell is once finished it is ready to be thrown off. It is practically dead, and once dead and finished it can never be resuscitated in that organism. It is only while it is living matter, actually going through the mysterious process of being made alive, that it is alive at all. The whole substance of each of us is constantly being changed from nutrient matter into formed and virtually dead matter, with which the body has thenceforth nothing to do except to get rid of it; and this active process of dying inch by inch is what constitutes our life. "Four-fifths of the bulk of most organisms, animal and vegetable, is made up of formed matter. Only one-fifth is really alive."

I have entered at some length into the description of this lowest form of creative activity, whose movement may be followed by the eye, because it presents some striking analogies with that vortical action which I have conceived to be concerned in forming the self-conscious soul. The cell whose formation we have seen does not cease to be an individual cell in its higher work of constituting an element in an organism.

But what might be called its selfish or constitutive life is completed in the process of becoming formed matter. In the same way the soul which simply labors to constitute itself, or to give objective existence to its centripetal wishes, is producing something which is virtually dead as soon as it is finished. This is why the selfish life is spiritual death. The only redemption for the soul is to become, in its whole completed unity, a living or genetic element in the production of higher social and spiritual units. Its outward-flowing or altruistic energies manifest themselves as motives and affections, warm desires and adoring prayers, intellectual, æsthetical, and ethical longings attracted to the true, the beautiful, and the good. These use the soul's whole individuality, and do not break up, but only augment its force and will-power in employing it as a higher unit of energy in the production of institutions, nationalities, civilizations, the general Assembly and Church of the First-born. But all these higher phases of the creative process are but the ceaseless production of formed matter in one or another form of social or spiritual tissue, which becomes dead and outworn as soon as it is rested in as a final thing. Our institutions, civilizations, creeds, "little systems" which "have their day," enslave us and corrupt themselves as soon as they are treated as finalities. It is only while they are creative that they are alive. As created things, the prey of criticism and idolatry, they are dead. As parts of this great and manifold process we ourselves die as mere creatures; our redemption consists in being made creative, or altruistically active and self-expressive, like the universal Spirit. As the Absolute is essentially a Creator, so we find our eternal life only as we become creators, or active sharers in the eternal cosmical movement.

Always preserving, then, and augmenting its personality, the redemptive movement of humanity is toward its Source. If that Source is thought of as the Brahmins and Buddhists think of it, namely, as a stationary center of being, an eternal repose, then the final consummation of the blessed humanity is Nirvana, or eternally will-less peace. If the Ground of all being is will or movement, as we have figured it, then we have still to avoid the

thought of that Movement as irrational, unsatisfied, restlessly seeking for objectification or life. This is Schopenhauer's thought, and it lands him in a pessimistic view of humanity which makes the thought of the Buddhistic Nirvana a relief and a refuge. But we think of it rather as an eternal Movement outward, instead of an infinite craving for satisfaction — an eternally altruistic movement which in the lower realm is creation or self-expression, but to the awakening sympathy of like spirit becomes manifest as love. "God is Spirit; and they that worship Him must worship in spirit and truth." "God is love; and he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him." These two utterances, which express substantially the same truth, are the most fundamental religious propositions in all the world. The higher movement of the Eternal Energy, which has as its design the redemption of the human, is simply the calling out of the spiritual powers of the man into a voluntary, altruistic, filial response to the infinite Life which is Love.

The first dawn of this response in the soul is the sense of sin. It has sometimes been regarded as an insurmountable barrier to the acceptance of a monistic theory that it does not account for the manifest fact of human sinfulness. That the infinite One is the ground of all existence, even the soul's life and activity, seems to be an assertion that God is the author of sin, and therefore a denial of human responsibility. Some would impart an "ethical" complexion to monism by a reasoning which virtually introduces the old dualistic philosophy under cover of a confusion of thought. I have attempted to account for that detached activity of the human personality which makes sin possible by the hypothesis of a vortical determination of the creative Spirit resulting in individual character. So far from its being impossible to account for the fallen state of humanity on the supposition that God is the central ground of the soul itself, that very supposition, on the contrary, seems to me necessary in order to make intelligible the elevation of man, as the creature of evolution, into a responsible and therefore guilty being.

Our theology characterizes the sinful state of humanity as the result of a fall. Such language implies that the primitive

condition of the human race was spiritually higher than the moral condition which was the result. Its redemption, therefore, must consist in the arrest and reversal of the process which has been universally established in natural humanity. All attainable evidence of natural science, however, has so uniformly pointed to upward progress, rather than degeneration, as the observed direction of human development, that evolution pictures our race as having sprung from the lowest beginnings, and as inheriting traits that even ally us to the inferior animals. Our original sin, or fallen condition, therefore, consists in an inherent obligation to rise, that we may realize a better self. Evolutionary philosophy figures sin as a survival of the animal propensities which have come to be out of keeping with the higher development to which we have attained, and lays it down as our redemptive task to throw off the brute inheritance.

But why there should exist an obligation to throw off anything which has come to us by nature it is difficult to see. If the only task of the man is to become something higher than he is, how is any law of his nature transgressed in his failure to reach that higher ground? If the new state is not his own, but some higher state, which, as it were, lies next to him as a neighbor, then its laws simply impose upon him an alien obligation. But such imposing of law from a purely external source is nothing else than tyranny. The laws whose transgression is sin for me must be laws of my own being. I am only braving an alien power when I do not conform to some preferred fashion of conduct, not defiling the image in which I was created. That there may be an obligation for me, therefore, to throw off the brute inheritance, any more than for the brutes themselves, my real nature must be something higher than that of the brute. And if there is no upper limit at which mankind is to cease throwing off its imperfect past, but on the contrary its only assignable goal is perfect holiness and love, then mankind's essential ground and creative center is the infinite Spirit. Man is fallen because in creative intention he is divine. His inner, most essential nature has been sinned against and defiled when he has conceded the primacy to that nature which he has inherited from the brute.

This can only mean that he is not only a creature of God, as is all existence which is concreted after its kind by the eternal self-objectifying activity, but, in the language of Scripture, he is made in the image of God. His actual beginning in the world of space and time may be very low indeed, and all his observable progress may be an evolution upward from the brute, but his real nature according to the creative intention is akin to the divine; and his present animality and selfishness is a fall from that high ideal estate to which his conscience will ever testify by its sense of sin until he reaches the stature of a perfect man in Christ Jesus.

Conscience with its sense of imperfection is, therefore, the first characteristic movement of the spirit in man as it transcends that self-constitutive determination resulting in psychic personality. Transcendent spirit, whether in the soul or in the cosmos, is judging spirit. The transcendent God is the Judge rather than the immanent Creator; the world of redemption is the realm of him who at the end of his creative work looks back upon it and pronounces it very good. As the spirit in man looks back upon itself, it induces that conscience with its accompanying sense of shortcoming which is the first step in the filiation of the sons of God.

The time cannot be allowed me for a further description of the redemptive process. That process may be studied by noting what steps are significant in the voluntary return of the spiritual man to his Source in the infinite Love, and interpreting them as the movement of a divine Spirit. There is repentance, or the acceptance of our spiritual kinship to God as our true life. There is faith, or the realization of, and committal to, infinite Love as the real ground of all things. There is regeneration, or the ushering forth of the psychical unit on its new life as an altruistic element in a higher form of being. There is worship, or the leaping up of the spirit to meet its Father and Lord. In all the steps of the progressive spiritual life there is a conscious nearing of the personality to an identity with the will and love of God, from that point where the self-reproaches of conscience established a sense of antagonism and condemnation to that pitch of personality where God becomes incarnate, and the Word made

flesh says, "I and my Father are one." One being alone ever made objective this divine-human life in its full meaning on the earth. He, our Lord Jesus Christ, was fully conscious of his divine origin, and of the rightful destiny of all personality to become one in purpose with the infinite Will. It was the inspiration derived from his insight which laid down the principle that no man ascendeth into heaven but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven. He, by objectifying the divine love, has become an atoning object of all saving faith; and by his resurrection he widens his personality from a living soul to a pervasive life-giving spirit whose movement is the salvation of the world.

THE SO-CALLED "EBED-YAHWEH SONGS," AND THE MEANING OF THE TERM "SERVANT OF YAHWEH" IN ISAIAH, CHAPS. 40–55.[1]

By KARL BUDDE,
Strassburg, Germany.

ONE of the most noteworthy features of recent Old Testament criticism is doubtless the tendency to interpret in a collective sense the "I" of certain portions of the Old Testament. This sense of the pronoun is found by interpreters not only in the Psalms, but in many other books as well; and that, too, in passages in which no hint from the author suggests such an interpretation, and in which the individual traits are so clearly marked that an interpretation of this kind makes it necessary to presuppose a continuous allegory throughout. We are all the more surprised, then, to find that in *one* point scholars are tending to move in exactly the opposite direction, and with ever-increasing unanimity. In a passage in which formerly the individual was taken, almost unanimously, to represent a community, and in which this interpretation is confirmed by unmistakable expressions on the part of the author, it is now confidently affirmed that the reference is to a single individual. So positively, indeed, is this held that it has been actually attempted by revising and "correcting" to force the collective name out of the text. I refer, of course, to the servant of Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah. The question which the presentation of such views has opened anew has been discussed with the utmost eagerness; the past year alone has witnessed the publication in Germany of no fewer than four monographs, all more or less from this point of view.[2] It is a well-known fact that this exposition

[1] I desire to call attention particularly to the fact that in this treatise I have seldom referred to Canon Cheyne's view, and that with great caution, because his latest expression on this subject in the "Sacred Books of the Old Testament" has hitherto been inaccessible to me.

[2] L. LAUE, *Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder im II. Theil des Jesaia*, 1898; ERNST SELLIN, *Serubbabel*, u. s. w., 1898; ALFRED BERTHOLET, *Zu Jesaja 53*, 1899; RUDOLF KITTEL, *Zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 1899, II, "Jesaja 53 und der leidende Messias im Alten Testament."

had its origin in Göttingen. It was Heinrich Ewald[3] who first separated 52:13—53:12[4] from its connection, claiming that it is a production of the time of Manasseh, and that it refers to an unknown martyr, perhaps to Isaiah. He believed that Deutero-Isaiah inserted it in this connection, because the latter could find no better words than these earlier ones with which to express his thoughts concerning the servant of Yahweh, as he conceived of him, viz., in a collective sense; and that only here and there, in 52:14; 53:10 f., did he add any original matter. Bernhard Duhm[5] expanded this theory, to the effect that 42:1–7; 49:1–6; 50:4–9 are also taken from a separate writing, which in turn may have been based upon a narrative of the life and work of Jeremiah, perhaps written by a younger contemporary prophet. Duhm suggested that these passages were inserted and at the same time freely revised by Deutero-Isaiah. But all this he set forth merely as "not impossible." Not until he had very positively reasserted the same view, with a few material alterations,[6] in his commentary on Isaiah,[7] did he receive such general support that, as Bertholet affirms, his opinion has now become almost common property. Those who do not wish this to become the universally accepted view have therefore no time to lose in entering their protest. To enter such protest on my part is the purpose of the present article. For I see in this view a deplorable error which not only obstructs the understanding of one of the grandest books of the Old Testament and one of the most important steps in the development of Old Testament religion, but makes such an understanding entirely impossible.

In *what* is there unanimity? *What* is about to become common property? Certainly not that the four passages I have

[3] *Die Propheten des Alten Bundes*[2], Vol. III, 1868, pp. 27, 89 ff.

[4] "54, 12," on p. 27, is a misprint.

[5] *Die Theologie der Propheten*, 1875, p. 289.

[6] The first passage has been restricted to include only 42:1–4. The hero seems to have been a historical person, a teacher of the thorah, and a pastor; the composition of these "Ebed-Yahweh songs" probably dates back to the first half of the fifth century.

[7] NOWACK'S *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament*, III, 1, 1892, "Das Buch Jesaia."

named (viz., Isa. 42:1–4; 49:1–6; 50:4–9; 52:13—53:12) are no longer to be attributed to Deutero-Isaiah; for aside from the hesitancy with which Cheyne[8] expresses himself on this point, it seems to me that Sellin, who is otherwise one of the most decided followers of Duhm, has brought forward cogent reasons for attributing all of them to Deutero-Isaiah himself.[9] Nor has it been unanimously accepted that these four passages belong together, and to one author, for Schian,[10] Kosters,[11] and Laue[12] attribute chap. 53, and Bertholet at least the greater part of it, to still another author, while Ley and Laue see in 50:4–9 a passage of separate origin.[13] Is there unanimity in restricting the theory to these four passages? Scarcely, when Sellin[14] adds to them a fifth in 42:18–25, and finds kinship with it in many other places, and Laue believes 51:16 to be either an Ebed-Yahweh fragment or a comment upon one.[15] Quite as divided are the opinions in regard to the interpretation of the servant as representing an individual. Kosters[16] considers this interpretation everywhere out of the question; in the fourth passage he sees the congregation of the pious, in the remaining ones the collective conception of certain teachers of the law who taught in the spirit of Deutero-Isaiah. Bertholet also accepts the latter explanation, with some slight modification, everywhere except in the interpolated passage 53:1–11*a*, in which, according to his view, an individual is meant. Smend[17] clearly recognizes a collective conception, the people of Israel, at least in chaps. 42 and 49. Kittel, in his commentary, expresses himself in a very undecided manner. But are those who interpret the

[8] *Introduction to the Book of Isaiah*, 1895, p. 309.

[9] SELLIN, pp. 97 ff. and 105 ff.

[10] *Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder in Jes. 40–66*, p. 53.

[11] *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1896, pp. 591 ff.

[12] LAUE, p. 11.

[13] LEY, *Historische Erklärung des zweiten Teils des Jesaia*, 1893, pp. 63 f., 71 f., 85; LAUE, p. 8.

[14] SELLIN, pp. 107 f., 216.

[15] LAUE, p. 16.

[16] *Theologisch Tijdschrift, loc. cit.*

[17] *Alttestamentliche Theologie*, 1893, pp. 256 ff., esp. p. 261.

servant as an individual unanimous even among themselves? So far is this from being the case that Laue emphatically restores the conception of the Messiah of the future, while the others traverse the whole period between Isaiah and the time of the Maccabees in order to find the historical martyr to whom the song, or songs, could apply. I need not discuss the various explanations of the manner in which the songs were introduced into their present connection, whether accidentally or otherwise; at this point all the paths diverge. So much so, indeed, that one could scarcely imagine the possibility of a greater confusion; and yet I am convinced that it is by no means at an end. For only truth is simple, while error involves us in a thousand devious ways. Nor will it be necessary therefore to follow up each and every new version in particular. In fact, under these circumstances I know of no better way than to begin my discussion at the point regarding which all those whom I have named, excepting Kosters, are unanimous, namely with the interpretation of the hero of 53:1 ff. as an individual. This brings us back to our starting-point, to Heinrich Ewald.

CHAPS. 52:13—53:12.

The fundamental objection to the collective interpretation of the servant of Yahweh in chap. 53 is, as Ewald expresses it, the fact that "nowhere else does the prophet represent the servant so emphatically as a single individual of the past." In various forms of expression nearly all the later commentators[18] repeat the same idea. And yet it is surely evident that this is merely a subjective impression and nothing more; no hard and fast rule of expression can be laid down for the representation of an individual on the one hand, as distinct from the individualizing of a community on the other. Moreover, in recent criticism, the particular characteristics which 53:1 ff. exhibits are,

[18] Compare particularly SELLIN (cited above), p. 149: "If the three songs, 49:1–6 (*cf.* esp. vss. 2, 5 f.); 50:4–9 (*cf.* esp. vss. 4, 6); 52:13—53:12 (*cf.* esp. 53:1, 2, 5, 9), do not plainly speak of a definite individual, who had a mission to the people, who suffered, and who at the time when the last composition was written was already dead, then I am at a loss to know how anything could be expressed in plain language."

whenever they occur elsewhere, claimed by the opposite side, with an exactly opposite interpretation, as a proof that the "I" of the subject is collective. In vs. 2 the speakers see the servant coming into the world and growing up as an unusually weak, puny, insignificant child.[19] In vss. 3 f. he is afflicted with a loathsome disease, which beyond all doubt is leprosy. In vss. 5, 7 he is tortured and abused by external violence; in vs. 8 death overtakes him. Whether his death is caused by this same external violence, or whether it places him beyond the reach of that violence, we are no longer able to make out with certainty from the text as it now stands. This very mingling of the most varied misfortunes and sufferings Smend[20] once used very cleverly, in treating of the psalms that speak of the poet's sickness, as an argument for the collective "I," and found many adherents. We can readily understand, then, why Duhm should wish to reduce these various manifestations of suffering to the single one of leprosy. But that is by no means possible. Nor will it avail to eliminate entirely the maltreatment of the servant from 53:5 ff., because in 50:6, as Duhm also admits, he himself bears witness to it, and to it only, without any reference whatever to leprosy. Moreover, according to vs. 2, the servant has been the picture of wretchedness from his very birth. But by what process of transformation a child born in leprosy could have become Duhm's teacher of the law, or Bertholet's Eleazar, not to mention Sellin's Zerubbabel, is by no means apparent.[21] Nor will Smend's rather timid suggestion hold good, that possibly there lived a prophetic martyr who was persecuted, and who at the same time was actually sick. It is, rather, in his preceding sentence that Smend is right, when he says: "Now, since the distress which is brought upon Israel by its enemies is very often represented metaphorically as a disease, both in the prophets

[19] Along with ורנראהו, the emendation of לְסָגִיר to לְסָגִירוּ (Ewald, Giesebrecht' Cheyne, etc.) becomes absolutely necessary, although the above conception does not depend upon the alteration.

[20] *Zeitschr. f. alttest. Wiss.*, 1888, pp. 68 ff.

[21] Sellin therefore vigorously opposes a literal interpretation of the passages which speak of disease. Only in regard to disease resulting from maltreatment does he leave the question open. *Cf.* pp. 161 f.

and in the Psalms, it seems very probable that we have here an instance of the common personification of Israel, and that the disease and death of Yahweh's servant either denotes the destruction of Israel or at least coincides with it."[22] Very similar to the view expressed in this sentence is that of Laue, who actually affirms that a "sickness-psalm" or a theodicy-psalm was the basis of the passage in question, and then takes particular pains to defend the individual interpretation of Pss. 6, 38, 22, etc. (pp. 11, 49 ff.). Here too—although it is expressed in slightly different terms—we find the same argument with which Smend endeavors to support the individuality of the servant against his own counter-arguments.

But most conclusive is the fact of the death and revivification of the servant. This is entirely natural as applied to a community, to a people, whose personality continues through succeeding generations. Ezekiel, chap. 37, has familiarized everyone with the figure of awakening from the dead as representing the restoration of the people of Israel, nor was the figure less familiar in the days of Deutero-Isaiah.[23] On the other hand, in order to interpret these expressions as applying to an individual, we are obliged to resort to all kinds of improbable suppositions to sustain this interpretation.[24] Certainly the least plausible attempt to apply this resurrection to an individual is the suggestion that his existence is continued in his spiritual descendants. That the servant has descendants is set forth in vs. 10, along with the other statement that he himself lives to an old age; unless the latter statement is removed by revision of the text.[25] But particularly noticeable is the personal character of the representation maintained throughout the entire passage. The same servant whose death and burial are portrayed in vss. 8 f. stands before the speakers in the very first verse of the passage (52: 13), raised from the dead, and with unexpected splendor.

[22] *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 257.

[23] *Cf.* esp. LAUE, pp. 46 ff.

[24] For numerous passages in the Psalms with the same content *cf.* KOSTERS, *Theol. Tijdschr.*, 1896, p. 594.

[25] BERTHOLET, p. 22.

This is simply impossible as applied to any of the individuals who have been suggested in this connection, but very easily comprehended when applied to a community. Therefore the assertion that the individual interpretation of chap. 53 is necessary, and the collective interpretation impossible, must be exactly reversed; in view of the whole tenor of the chapter, the collective conception alone has any claim upon our consideration. Wellhausen rightly says:[26] "It would be presumptuous to depart from this interpretation and think of an individual."

It is easy to see, indeed, that Smend at least would accept this conclusion, if he could only succeed in determining in some reasonable way who the persons speaking and the person spoken of are. If "the penitent Israel of the future" is to be regarded as the speaker, and "the true Israel within the false" as the person spoken of, *i. e.*, as the servant,[27] then, to be sure, we should have to despair of attaining a right understanding of the passage, because the sufferings which Israel endured fell, without reference to this distinction, upon all alike. In reality the speakers, the "we" of vss. 1 ff., are the heathen nations; the servant of Yahweh of whom they speak is the people of Israel. I have never been able to understand why Giesebrecht's[28] excellent exposition of this old interpretation did not settle the question, at least for some time, and why his work is mentioned only casually, if at all, in the numerous recent treatises on this subject. Duhm, commenting upon 53: 1 ff., simply says: "Oddly enough, many commentators attribute these words to all sorts of strange speakers; sometimes to those who once were unbelievers, *then again even to the heathen of 52: 15*. But inasmuch as there is not the slightest allusion to so remote a speaker, why should it not be the author himself?" Kittel[29] contents himself with repeating

[26] *Israelitische u. jüdische Geschichte*[1], p. 117.

[27] So also in Kosters.

[28] *Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik*, 1890, pp. 146 ff.: "Die Idee von Jesaia 52, 13–53, 12." I wish to acknowledge, once for all, my indebtedness to this fundamental work in order that in the following pages I may develop my argument without constant reference to Giesebrecht.

[29] In his new edition of the KNOBEL-DILLMANN Commentary in the *Kurzgefasste exegetische Handbuch*, 1898, p. 449.

one of Dillmann's counter-arguments, although in the meantime the position of this interpretation had been materially strengthened by Giesebrecht: "We cannot take this 'we' to mean the nations (52:15), as is claimed by the rabbis, Rosenmüller, Hitzig, Beck, and of late especially by Giesebrecht, because a confession on the part of the heathen that Israel had suffered for them would be entirely unprecedented in the Old Testament (Dillmann)." And this is Smend's only counter-argument of any importance in his rather more detailed discussion.[30] He adds that nowhere in Isaiah, chaps. 40 ff., is this idea alluded to, but that, on the contrary, Israel's sin is everywhere mentioned as the cause of its suffering. Dillmann advances the same argument, supporting it[31] with the passages 42:24 f.; 43:27 f.; 47:6; 50:1, mentioning at the same time 42:13; 49:25 f.; 51:5, 23, and others, in which the punishment of the heathen is announced to them. These two series of passages are the only ones which are of any weight against the position here maintained. For no one, surely, would wish to deny that Deutero-Isaiah might introduce an entirely new thought not found in the earlier prophets; and the more peculiar that thought, the more natural it would seem that it should subsequently be forgotten. The only question that can arise is whether Deutero-Isaiah itself contains statements which oppose this interpretation. Now, it is certainly true that here and there the heathen nations are threatened with punishment, particularly those that have maltreated Israel. The threat against Babylon in chap. 47 is the culminating point of these expressions. But, at the same time, is not Cyrus represented as the anointed, the friend of Yahweh, to whom the fullest salvation is promised? Where in the Old Testament is this paralleled? And, what is of still greater importance, the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," according to unanimous opinion, state that the heathen as such (גוים, 42:1; 49:6) are to receive the light, the true religion of Yahweh. Is not this salvation, and can we reconcile with this thought the penal annihilation of the heathen? Is it not, on the contrary, entirely possible that those nations upon whom judgment comes

[30] *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 258.

[31] *Kurzgef. exeg. Hdb., Jesaja*[5], 1890, pp. 455 f.

may subsequently be made to share in such salvation? So much as against the argument based on Dillmann's second list of passages.

This, to be sure, does not yet bring us to the thought that Israel suffered for the heathen, but it at least prepares the way for it. To me the most remarkable feature in Duhm's explanation of the servant of Yahweh has always been that this historic individual in Israel is to lead the heathen to a knowledge of Yahweh. This idea, whether conceived of as realized in Zerubbabel or Eleazar, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Job, or anyone else, is nothing short of fantastic, and the extreme of absurdity. Nor is it any more satisfactory when applied collectively to the scribes or teachers of the law. Whether taken as signifying the entire class or, with Kosters and Bertholet, following Gesenius, as referring to a definite group within the class; whether with Kosters it be applied to the first three of the passages, or with Bertholet to all four, with the exception of Isa. 53: 1–11*a*— in all its forms the explanation is inadequate. Bertholet's arguments (pp. 11 f.) in support of this theory, it may be added, are exceedingly weak. Least of all can we comprehend how the abasement and exaltation of the servant, so interpreted, could make an impression upon the heathen such as is described in 52: 14 f. If, however, we seek in Deutero-Isaiah himself the explanation of this conception of Yahweh's servant, then, and only then, the matter assumes a different form. All the supporters of the theory of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" concede that everywhere outside of these songs the servant of Yahweh designates the people of Israel as such (41: 8; 42: 19, *cf.* 22; 43: 10 (?); 44: 1, 21; 45: 4; 48: 20). Israel is the sum total of all those who serve Yahweh and who enjoy the privilege of knowing him, and if this knowledge is to be transmitted through any human agency to other nations, it must be through that of the people of Israel. This is made possible, on the one hand, by the vicissitudes of Israel's fortunes and, on the other, by Israel's activity. The former is well illustrated in 52: 14 f. The joys and sorrows experienced by an individual, or even by an entire class within a nation, do not attract the attention of

another nation, certainly not of any considerable number of surrounding nations. But let a whole people be humiliated, even annihilated, and then wonderfully exalted again, and all the surrounding nations must be witnesses to the fact and cannot escape the impression made by such an event. And when, moreover, this people is robbed of its very existence, and scattered far and wide among foreign nations, it cannot be restored to its former estate without affecting those nations in its transformation. The more brilliantly and wonderfully Deutero-Isaiah, from the first chapter to the last, portrays this prospective restoration, the more powerful is the impression which we must conceive he expects it to make when it comes to pass. And this finds admirable corroboration in the statement made in 52:14 f. With the fortunes of a nation, however, is intimately connected, of course, its activity. The nation preaches Yahweh by its existence; by its own service of Yahweh; by the argument from prophecy, to which the prophet appeals again and again as perfectly convincing. Furthermore, it may preach him also by the word of prophets such as Deutero-Isaiah and other individuals who may venture to undertake such a task. But the accomplishment of this result is conditioned upon Israel's constant contact with the heathen nations as such, and therefore upon a scattering among the nations, a ceasing of its individual existence. In every respect, then, Israel's suffering, its very annihilation, is the prerequisite for the fulfilment of Israel's mission to the heathen, for the transmitting of salvation to other nations in the form of the religion of Yahweh. *Therefore* the heathen may well say in 53:5*b* that Israel, the servant of Yahweh, had *suffered for their salvation.* But he suffered also *in their stead,* in expiation of their guilt, as stated in 53:4, 5*a*, 6*b*. The heathen are taught by Israel that Yahweh alone is God. Thus their idolatry becomes guilt which they have all in their several ways incurred. "All we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned every one [every nation] to his own way" (6*a*).[32] Consequently, Yahweh would

[32] These words can be understood only as referring to this guilt. It would be sophistry to say that there could be no guilt on their part because Yahweh had

have been obliged to punish and destroy *them.* But he punished his own people instead, the only nation which honored him, the true God, and which therefore had deserved no punishment: "but the Lord has laid on him the iniquity of us all" (6*b*). Now they see that this was done through pure kindness for their salvation; for Israel's suffering was to be the means of their redemption.

Thus we dispose at once of the first series of passages upon which Dillmann bases his objections, those passages which speak of Israel's being punished for its *own* sins. Whatever justifying *grounds* Yahweh may have had for the chastisement of Israel, as respects the heathen, who are here the speakers, not these grounds, but Yahwe's purpose, comes into consideration. Though Israel may have sinned, yet in the conscience of the heathen the only worshiper of the true God appears as the only innocent one. But, further than that, it is a well-known fact that, compared with other prophets, Deutero-Isaiah lays very little stress upon Israel's trespass, that the tone of sympathy predominates throughout and strongly. Nor does he fail to state expressly that Israel has suffered more punishment than its sins have deserved. He begins his entire book with the statement that his people, that Jerusalem,[33] has received a double measure of retribution for its sins. This is not, as Duhm thinks, an allusion to Jer. 16:18, where a doubling of the punishment is announced, only, however, for renewed offenses.[34] On the

revealed himself only to Israel, and that he had not before been preached to the heathen. It goes without saying that Deutero-Isaiah's universalism is something very different from the old particularism of Israel's religion. If we read between the lines, we shall find the necessary complement in the two versions of the primeval history in Genesis. At the basis of all idolatry is a sinful straying away from the common original revelation of the only true God. Only a rectified conception of revelation can give us more light on the subject.

[33] By means of such passages as 48:2; 49:21, and especially 51:16, Duhm (Com., 40:2) proves that "my people" and "Jerusalem" virtually signify the same thing. This alone will suffice to discredit the attempt made by Briggs to split the book into two, one of which, he claims, deals with the deliverance of Yahweh's servant Israel, and the other with the deliverance of Zion, Yahweh's bride. In regard to this attempt *cf.* CHEYNE, *Introduction*, pp. 309 f. Kosters follows a similar line of thought, pp. 580 ff.

[34] As to the genuineness *cf.* Giesebrecht.

contrary, Deutero-Isaiah distinctly says that half of the punishment is undeserved, and on the basis of general prophetic premises we have a right to ask what may have been the occasion of this second undeserved portion; and when we find the figure of Yahweh's servant already introduced in 41:8, and his mission that of carrying the true religion to the heathen stated in 42:1, we cannot avoid the conclusion that even here the prophet already has reference to the suffering which was indispensable to the fulfilment of that mission. The problem of theodicy is for the entire century the really vital one. The people solve it, not without a feeling of bitterness, by applying the doctrine of suffering for the sins of the fathers, *i. e.*, for the sins of Manasseh (Ezek. 18:2, etc.), while Ezekiel tries to solve it by enormously exaggerating his accusations in an endeavor to balance guilt and punishment. Deutero-Isaiah alone finds a really satisfying solution by associating with the cause of the punishment its purpose, and we can understand all the more readily that this solution was beyond the comprehension of the masses of the people, as well as of most of its leading spirits, because his hopes and predictions were not realized. The glorious restoration of his nation did not come to pass, neither were its sufferings or its teachings able to lead the heathen to Yahweh. Under these circumstances we are not at all surprised that the understanding of such utterances was largely obscured, and that it was not long before their original forms were tampered with; in fact, what ought to surprise us is that this was not done to a far greater extent. Everyone knows that the second half of chap. 53 has suffered serious corruption of text;[35] but the only corruption which interferes with a proper interpretation is the עַמִּי in vs. 8, "for the transgression of *my people* was he stricken." But that admits of no explanation whatever. It cannot be explained by taking it as "Yahweh's people," and Yahweh as the "I," because in the tenth verse Yahweh is still spoken of in the third person. Nor can a member of the people — perhaps, as Duhm and Bertholet suggest, the prophet himself — be taken as the subject, because

[35] *Cf.* the numerous emendations suggested by Bertholet, pp. 20 ff., 15, which are, however, for the most part in the wrong direction.

the speaker throughout the entire passage is not "I," but "we." According to that we should at least expect עַמֵּנוּ "of our people," or, according to the interpretation which I am controverting, עַמּוֹ "of his people." But if we are to make a change and must do so, then quite the most probable reading is מִפִּשְׁעֵינוּ "for our transgressions," which will easily explain the corruption מִפֶּשַׁע עַמִּי. This is the actual reading in vs. 5; *cf.* also vs. 4 and vs. 6.[36] Then the "we" of the text means just what it has meant from the first verse on. Others may interpret this "we" as the people of Israel, or as certain ones of the Israelites. We interpret it to mean the heathen. At any rate, the correct interpretation cannot be called in question on the strength of this one word, itself an evident corruption of the text.

With a proper interpretation of the passage we are able also to understand its literary form and many of its expressions, particularly the marked individualization which has so often been declared incompatible with the collective conception. This might furnish grounds for objection, it is true, if a few persons were speaking of their nation, or if the nation were speaking of one of its parts. But if all those who constitute the "we" are simply individual nations, then nothing is easier to comprehend than that the people of Israel appears to them as an individual also, and is treated and spoken of in an entirely personal manner. Moreover, the nations that are speaking are older and greater than Israel. Therefore they have seen the servant's coming into the world, and therefore, even before his sufferings, his puny form has aroused their disgust and scorn.

And only in this way is the introduction of the "we" and the connection with 52 : 13 ff. explicable. The "many nations" and their kings mentioned in these verses are in any case the only available plural subject. How Duhm can speak of them as remote subjects, while to the prophet they seem so near at hand that they are deeply moved by the fate of the servant, is beyond all comprehension. Smend explains that the "many" in vs. 14 are to be clearly distinguished from the "many nations" in vs.

[36] Only this emendation is perfectly satisfactory. Less acceptable is Giesebrecht's reading, מִפִּשְׁעָם יְנֻגַּע, to which עַמִּים would be preferable.

15, and that the former has reference to the Israelites of the past. This again is impossible, and simply an evidence of extreme perplexity. Accordingly, vss. 13 ff. would have to be paraphrased thus: "as the Israelites of the past were amazed at the disfigured appearance of the servant, so shall the heathen nations of the present or future be moved by his glorification." The very logic of this sentence ought to warn us against accepting it. But at what are the speakers amazed in 53 : 1 ff. (surely not here the Israelites of the *past*), if not at the contrast between the present and the past appearance of the servant? They enlarge upon the picture of his dejection only *because* his present splendor stands in such inexplicable contrast to his former estate. They have, accordingly, seen both periods in his career, as have also the many nations and kings in 52 : 15, who of course are simply the "many" of vs. 14 more fully described. If the servant represents a nation, then the same is evidently true also of the many. Dillmann's objection that the nations of 52 : 15 cannot be the speakers in 53 : 1, because 15*b* is contradicted by 1*a*, is altogether too fine-spun. He is quite right, of course, in translating שִׁמְעָתֵנוּ by "the report which we have received," not "our preaching." Now, it is stated in 52 : 15 that the heathen suddenly behold with their own eyes what hitherto they have not even so much as heard of. Undoubtedly this climax from hearsay to actual beholding is deliberately planned. But is it for this reason less probable that the nations should receive the report of the glorious restoration of Israel? *Formerly* they had heard nothing; *now* they hear and see. But, says Smend, a speech by the heathen would require a different, that is, a more distinct, introduction. And yet it is a well-known fact that everywhere in elevated style the express introduction may be omitted before a direct speech, and that in the prophets this omission is very common,[37] the condition of such omission being, of course, that the speaker shall be evident from the context. But, in this case, the only possible speakers are the heathen; the

[37] This is particularly the case in Deutero-Isaiah, and also in all the Ebed-Yahweh songs, whether Yahweh is the speaker, as in 42 : 1, or the servant, as in 49 : 1; 50 : 4. Exactly the same thing is true, therefore, of the "we" in 53 : 1. To hold that an introduction was once present and has been lost is entirely out of the question.

absence of an introduction, therefore, simply proves that they, and they alone, are meant. As applying to them the sudden burst of eloquence is poetically beautiful, while with any other reference it becomes labored and ungainly. In the latter case we have no other alternative than to sever all connection between 52:13–15 and 53:1 ff., as Bertholet, following Duhm's suggestion (p. 365), has done, by making 53:1–11*a* an interpolated martyr-song. The false interpretation of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," like *aqua fortis*, ruthlessly destroys all obstacles before it, and each succeeding one of its adherents finds something more to cut out. A single glance will convince anyone that all the arguments adduced by Bertholet on p. 30 in favor of this solution are based solely upon a wrong definition of the speaker and the person spoken of in the passage.

But chap. 53 is connected with still earlier passages just as closely as with 52:13–15, and in this connection also the correctness of our definition of the speakers finds corroboration. With an exclamation of surprise the speech begins: "Who would have believed it? Who would have considered that possible?"[38] The second half of the verse is not merely parallel to the first. Over against a subjective belief it speaks of objective visibility. Therefore the line, "but to whom was the arm of Yahweh [hitherto] revealed," is in antithesis to the preceding, and must be interpreted as an excuse. The speakers now believe the report which they have received, *because* the arm of Yahweh has now been revealed to them, that is, because they hear and see at the same time. But just before, in 52:10, it is said that Yahweh makes bare his holy arm; since that time, therefore, it has been visible.[39] Vs. 10*b*, and, in fact, the entire connection, tells us that by the arm of Yahweh is meant his saving and redeeming work in Israel and Jerusalem. Moreover, those before whose eyes the arm of Yahweh is made bare, those who are permitted to behold the salvation of Israel's God, are כל־הגוים

[38] Idiomatically expressed. The sense is: "No one would have believed what we are hearing." *Cf.* our, "Who would have thought it!" In Hebrew *cf.* מי מלל, Gen. 21:7.

[39] The result of the חשם in the former passage is the כי לוה here. For the interchange of both verbs in the same writer *cf.* 47:2 f.

"all nations," and כל־אפסי־ארץ "all the ends of the earth," so that, when in 53:1 the speakers premise as a fact that the arm of Yahweh has been revealed, and revealed to them, we cannot avoid the conclusion that they are the very nations, the dwellers in the ends of the earth, who in 52:10 are made witnesses of the work of Yahweh.[40] This, therefore, establishes who the speakers of chap. 53 are, and also the close connection of this chapter with what precedes, back to 51:9, where the arm of Yahweh is invoked for that new demonstration of power whose full realization is portrayed up to 52:12.[41] Anyone, therefore, who desires to sever 52:13—53:12 from its connection is certainly bound to propose a suitable revision of 53:1.

CHAP. 50:4–9.

The connection between 51:9 and the preceding "Ebed-Yahweh song," 50:4–9, is very easily shown. The arm of Yahweh which is here invoked is in 51:5, according to Yahweh's own statement, the hope of the nations. But at the same time we find all sorts of links reaching across the boundary between the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" and what is usually attributed to Deutero-Isaiah. The servant's particular mission, as described in the first and second songs, and indeed, as we have seen, still more fully in the fourth, to become the light of the heathen and to carry to them, as the servant and ambassador of Yahweh, the true religion—this is announced in 51:4 f. as the purpose of Yahweh himself, in closest connection, moreover, with the salvation and redemption which Yahweh's arm is to bring about—all this corresponding exactly to the portrayal of its *fulfilment* in the two following and closely connected chaps. 52, 53. It is not expressly stated here whom Yahweh has selected to be the human agency for this enlightenment of the heathen; but when in vs. 7 the people of Israel[42] is addressed as "the people in whose heart is my *thorah*,"

[40] Duhm proceeds altogether arbitrarily when he interprets זרוע יי in 53:1 as "divine activity itself," visible only to the initiated, and in 52:10 (read thus instead of 12) as the effect of this activity, which is to be visible to all.

[41] Within these two points are the passages referring to the suffering *people* (Israel), 52:5, 3; 51:22 f., 12, to which Sellin (p. 101) has rightly called attention.

[42] There is no reason for thinking only of the elect, although, so far as concerns the question here under consideration, this interpretation would serve the same purpose.

when the promise is given in vs. 4, "*Thorah* shall *proceed* from me and my *mishpat* for a light of the people," it is certainly clear that the agent chosen by Yahweh for the work is none other than this people in whose heart is his *thorah*. Moreover, the forms of expression in 51 : 4 correspond exactly to those in 42 : 1, 4, in the first "Ebed-Yahweh song." And when finally we compare 51 : 7 f. with the "song" 50 : 4–9, just preceding it, no other conclusion is possible than that the people in 51 : 7 is none other than the servant of the "songs." What the servant says of himself in 50 : 4–9, Yahweh in 51 : 7 f. addresses as an encouragement to the people. Corresponding to 50 : 4 f., in which the servant glories in his position as Yahweh's pupil, receiving his instruction, we have in the following chapter, vs. 7, "Ye that know righteousness (צֶדֶק), the people in whose heart my *thorah* is." Corresponding to the servant's statement in 50 : 6, that he has patiently endured all revilings and abuse, we have in 51 : 7*b* the admonition to the people not to fear the reproach and revilings of men.[43] In 50 : 7–9*a* the servant expresses his confidence in the help of Yahweh, and in 51 : 8*b* that help is vouchsafed to the people. Corresponding to the servant's certainty in 50 : 9*b*, that all his adversaries shall wax old as a garment and shall be eaten up by the moth, we find in 51 : 8*a*[44] exactly the same expression, in the promise which is given to the people. Nothing could be more evident than that the servant of Yahweh in 50 : 4–9 is neither more nor less than the personification of the people, and that in his joyful testimony he

[43] In distinguishing between the servant of Deutero-Isaiah and the servant of the songs, Duhm (p. 285) includes in his definition of the latter the idea that he suffers from the revilings of unbelievers (his fellow-countrymen), and not, like Israel, at the hands of foreign oppressors. This can apply only to 50 : 6, since Duhm sees in chap. 53 only leprosy. Laue also says (p. 28): "It seems certain that his countrymen are the ones who maltreat the servant." But in the חרפת אנוש, 51 : 7, we have the same generality of expression, so that here also a similar conclusion would be valid. Now it is self-evident, of course, that if in 50 : 4 ff. the people is represented as an individual, the nations which ill-treat it must also be represented in the same manner, and that such ill-treatment must, in consequence, assume a very personal character. The inference that fellow-countrymen of the servant are referred to in chap. 50 is, therefore, entirely unfounded. Moreover, the general expressions used in 51 : 7 are explained in 51 : 12 f. by מציק, "the foreign oppressor," so that for this passage also the same meaning is secured.

[44] With 50 : 9*b* *cf.* also 51 : 6.

simply represents as accomplished the things to which Yahweh still finds it necessary to exhort the people. Such an exhortation we find in 51 : 1–3, the passage immediately following the third "song."

The case of this song is thus a peculiar one. In it Yahweh's servant (although not called by that name) corresponds exactly, even in his blindness and deafness, to the conception of the servant in the rest of Deutero-Isaiah, as Kittel, for example, sums it up (p. 379), "protected, comforted, freed by Yahweh, but himself passive," and not at all to the conception of the servant in the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," concerning which Kittel says: "Here he appears in an independent activity, carries the thorah to the heathen, and redeems his people." Not the slightest suggestion of the latter ideas is to be found in this song.

No wonder, then, that Ley and Laue have struck this song out of the series of four; and yet it is not so easily disposed of as might seem at first sight. For although there is no mention in it of a mission to the heathen, and although the punishment of the adversaries is directly opposed to that idea, still the fact that the speaker in 50 : 4–9 is so thoroughly saturated with Yahweh's teachings and inspiration provides the prerequisite and preparation for his carrying the thorah to the heathen; and the relation between vs. 4 and vs. 7 of chap. 51, to which I have already called attention, is clearly such that it must have been thought of and intended by the author. Nor can we disregard the literary form. If the theory of the separate origin of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" is to be held, it is exceedingly dangerous to concede that in the book itself other persons can be introduced as speakers, in the same way as the servant in 49 : 1 ff. It is doubtless because of his perception of this fact that Laue declares that the passage has been *artificially formed* into an "Ebed-Yahweh song." He does not say how much of it he attributes to the reviser, whether the latter has changed the form or the contents, or both. But his supposition presents grave difficulties. Any writer who intended deliberately to add a fourth song to the other three would certainly have made his purpose very clear. He would scarcely have neglected to insert the name "servant

of Yahweh," perhaps in the form of an assurance such as appears in 49: 3, and to assign to him duties and work such as are mentioned in 42: 1 ff. and 49: 1 ff. And are we to suppose that he would have introduced the first personal pronoun "I," thus making the servant the speaker? We should be tempted to ask, then, what there is really left of the original passage. There is very little likelihood, therefore, that Ley and Laue will find many followers, particularly since the share of the author of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" becomes a very meager one, if we subtract this passage, and with Bertholet 53: 1–11 as well, not to mention Schian, Kosters, and Laue, who, in addition to these, omit 52: 13—53: 12 entire. But if we would avoid Laue's conclusion, we shall be obliged to admit the intimate relation, demonstrated above, between the passage under discussion and the rest of the book, together with the inferences resulting from such relation.[45] It is clear, at any rate, that all the statements made in 50: 4–9 by the servant are applied in 51: 1–8 to the people.

CHAP. 49: 1–6.

Let us go back now to the second "Ebed-Yahweh song," 49: 1–6, which is separated from the third by comparatively short passages. This brings us to the passage which has of late been alleged to be of itself and alone sufficient ground for rejecting the interpretation of the servant of the "songs" as the entire people of Israel. Bertholet, opposing this view (p. 6), appeals, along with Isa. 53, to 49: 5, and then quotes what Schian says (p. 24): "For however we may explain these words, we cannot get away from the fact that they speak of an active influence of the servant upon Israel." In Laue (p. 14) we read: "But this verse places beyond all doubt that the Ebed as speaker is distinguished in some manner or other (to express myself cautiously) from the nation as a whole, ... as the one affected by his action;" whereupon this commentator appeals (p. 41; *cf.* 28) very confidently to the exegesis of the case, without, however, developing the latter. Sellin says (p. 104): "Now, it is perfectly

[45] In this connection *cf.* also Laue and Ley, although neither of them appreciates the exact import of the facts.

clear that in 49:5 f. the Ebed is plainly distinguished from the whole people, and therefore from the righteous part of it as well." But after we have been convinced that the individual interpretation of chap. 53 is impossible, and the reference of the term "servant" to the people is the necessary view, we shall not be inclined to overestimate the importance of such an interdict based only upon a single passage. At any rate, these verses merit a much more minute examination than they have received since Duhm, who devotes an extended discussion to them.

It is an exceedingly important fact, in the first place, that in 49:1 the servant immediately addresses himself, not to Israel, but to the nations. Therefore, what he has to say applies to them. Furthermore, the servant, directly after his first address, harks back to the time of his birth. Even from his birth Yahweh had called him and equipped him for his calling, by which is meant the preaching of the word. For the servant's mouth is his sharp sword (*2aβ*), and the shaft in *2bα* must be interpreted in the same way. But the servant is not to enter upon his calling at once; until the right time shall come Yahweh has hid him in his quiver (*2bβ*), and in the meantime covers him in the shadow of his protecting hand (*2aβ*).[46] The time shall come when Yahweh shall be glorified through him[47] whom he calls his servant. Here he calls him not only "my servant," but also "Israel," and this, for us, would settle the case. But many have long since evaded this conclusion by striking out ישראל[48] in the face of all the translations and on the strength of only a single manuscript.[49] This is the last extreme measure, which, according to accepted scientific methods, should not be resorted to unless all other reasons make such a course compulsory. But we cannot rely

[46] *Cf.* 51:16, where the same thing is plainly stated of the people. Hence Duhm is compelled to strike out this verse as a gloss, while Laue regards it as a misplaced gloss of an Ebed-Yahweh song.

[47] The equipment for future activity in vs. 2 precludes the possibility of translating "*in* whom I will be glorified."

[48] This was done by J. D. Michaelis, then by Gesenius, who afterward reinstated it as genuine (*cf.* Hitzig *ad loc.*), and latterly by all those against whom this paper is directed.

[49] Kennicott 96.

solely on evidence contained in the verse itself. It must be remembered that, according to vs. 1, we are here carried back to Israel's cradle; that, according to the tradition contained in Gen. 32:29, Israel is a significant name of honor, given by Yahweh to the people in their ancestor Jacob. Above all things must it be remembered that the servant is here addressing the heathen (1*a*), to whom he is under obligation to state his name, as would not be the case were he an Israelite, addressing his own people. There is, therefore, not the slightest necessity for "desperate expedients of interpretation" (Duhm). ישראל is simply the second predicate of אתה: "Thou art Israel through whom I will be glorified."

But this future, in which the glorification is to come to pass, has seemed to the servant to be so long in coming that he has sometimes experienced a despondency, which he has had to overcome by calling to mind the reasons for encouragement (vs. 4). Now, however, this time has arrived, as expressed by ועתה in vs. 5, and to Yahweh's words spoken to him in ancient times (vs. 3) he adds what Yahweh has imparted to him *now*. Accordingly, only that portion which concerns the heathen, to whom the entire speech is addressed, can be regarded as the new revelation, yet to be realized, of which the servant speaks. In reality, it is quite clear that vs. 5 forms no part of this revelation. For the ויאמר in vs. 6 simply takes up again the אמר of the preceding verse, vs. 5 being nothing more than a single extended characterization of the subject Yahweh: "Yahweh who formed me from the womb to be his servant, etc." In the words which now follow is supposed to lie the proof that the servant cannot be the equivalent for the people of Israel; the succeeding infinitive clause is almost invariably paraphrased, "in order that *I* may bring Jacob again to him," and by the aid of this interpretation it is attempted to prove that the servant has a mission to Israel, and that he is, therefore, distinguished from Israel. But it seems to me that those who base such far-reaching conclusions upon this explanation of the verse are at least in duty bound to mention the possibility of another explanation, not to say refute it. Hitzig takes Yahweh, and

not the servant, as the subject of the infinitive. "Not gerundive and action of Yahweh (Hitzig)"—so is the matter tersely disposed of in Dillmann-Kittel; Schian simply remarks that this interpretation makes no sense;[50] in the rest of the most recent commentators I have been unable to discover any mention of this explanation of the infinitive. And yet it is in the main identical with Duhm's, who proves it to be necessary by the next following clause. He adds, to be sure, that, even if Yahweh is regarded as the subject, the servant still remains the instrument, the teacher, comforter, etc. But this cannot be admitted without proof. Formally it would necessitate construing the infinitive as a clause of purpose: Yahweh formed the servant in order (thereby, that is, by the servant) to do this and that. But what? Duhm concedes, in regard to לֹא יֵאָסֵף (so he reads, following the Kĕtîb), that this is primarily Yahweh's work; on שׁוּבַב, on the other hand, he says that, unlike הָשִׁיב, it is to be understood in a figurative sense as a spiritual leading back to God by instruction, exhortation, and comfort. He cannot prove this by 47:10 (read thus instead of 12), because he attributes this chapter to another author. But, aside from this, we cannot compare these entirely different uses. There are no other proofs available, but in Ezek. 39:27 and Jer. 50:19[51] שׁוּבַב is used to express the bringing home of Israel out of exile, exactly as הָשִׁיב is used elsewhere, *e.g.*, in Ezek. 29:14; 34:4, so that the presence of the two forms side by side in vss. 5 and 6 is not at all surprising. In the following clause the reading לֹא יֵאָסֵף means, "in order that Israel may not be swept away," an exceedingly clumsy and questionable construction. The Kĕrê לוֹ—a parallel and alternative to אֵלָיו (so also in a number of MSS. and most versions)—is by all means preferable. Then, however, יֵאָסֵף is not to be punctuated as Niphal, but as Ḳal אָסַף

[50] P. 24. The omission of the second quotation mark in l. 8 after "erstrecken" gives the impression that this clause, too, belongs to Duhm.

[51] In this way also the passive is used in Ezek. 38:8, at least essentially so. These are three out of the twelve passages in which we find שׁוּבַב. It is well known that הָשִׁיב is also employed in a figurative sense. Still the exact meaning which Duhm insists upon cannot be proved in any of them. *Cf.* in this connection also SELLIN, pp. 156 f.

Yahweh gathers Israel to himself, draws it to him.[52] Only in this way is the construction good and natural; but then the necessity for taking Yahweh as the subject of both clauses is at once proven. If these were clauses of purpose, no doubt they would have to be taken as referring to Israel's being brought back out of captivity, and the conception would be that Yahweh had formed the servant to be instrumental in this work. This could not apply, it is true, to Duhm's teacher of the law, nor to that class of teachers (as Berthelot holds), nor to the heart of the nation, although it might perhaps apply to Sellin's Zerubbabel.[53] But we are as yet dealing only with the subject, not with the predicate; not with what is to happen, but with what has long since happened. Hitzig's explanation as a gerundive is, therefore, in my judgment, the only correct one.[54] Now, it certainly implies a contradiction if we read: "that formed me from the womb to be his servant, in that he brought Jacob (out of Babylonian captivity) again to him." Neither at that time nor ever did Yahweh do that. And when, moreover, we consider the fact that not until vs. 6 is there mention made of "raising up the tribes of Jacob and restoring the preserved of Israel[55] (note the remarkably different manner of expression, strongly emphasizing Israel's deterioration), we get for vs. 5 an entirely different meaning. The act is one which lays the foundations of Israel, and 5*a*, *b* must be read, "in that he brought Jacob again (out of Egypt) to him, and drew Israel to him (into the desert)." This is confirmed in the succeeding statements: וְאֶכְבַּד בְּעֵינֵי יְהוָה וֵאלֹהַי הָיָה עֻזִּי,[56]

[52] Here the punctuation of the Kĕtîb (with לֹא) has been substituted for that of the Kĕrê (with לוֹ), probably because the old, correct interpretation of Yahweh as subject was afterward altogether discarded.

[53] *Cf.* SELLIN, pp. 157 ff. Here Sheshbazzar still gives him some difficulty.

[54] Claimed, for example, by Duhm for 42 : 7. He also claims this interpretation of the infinitive in respect to the subject for 49 : 8*b*, 9, and Dillmann-Kittel for 51 : 16.

[55] There is every reason to emphasize the name Jacob, and not to explain the passage of any act of founding previous to Jacob's time. Jacob it was who went down to Egypt, and who in his descendants was brought back again. Then, without a doubt, vss. 5 f. correspond accurately to 52 : 4, where the Egyptian captivity, being the first, is set over against the Assyrian, with which the Babylonian is associated.

[56] The ו consecutive is, as is well known, and as Klostermann especially has shown, often misunderstood by those who pointed the text of Deutero-Isaiah. That this is the case here is proven by the following הָיָה.

which are entirely out of place if the preceding clause applies to future time.[57] Rightly interpreted, vs. 5*a* represents the whole period of Israel's happy existence in the promised land, in which the people experienced the favor of Yahweh; in introducing the newly received promise, the servant surveys Yahweh's entire dealings with him. Thus it becomes evident that vs. 5, so far from opposing, expressly confirms the identity of the servant with the people of Israel, and every argument for striking out ישראל in vs. 3 disappears. And now vs. 6 easily explains itself: "It is too light a thing to me that thou shouldest be my servant, inasmuch as I raise up the tribes of Jacob and restore the preserved of Israel; rather will I give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that my salvation may extend to the ends of the earth." Thus the sentence agrees with what we have been expecting from the beginning. The salvation of Israel is not a new promise; it has long since been assured and is presupposed. But concerning the heathen the promise is new, and is here for the first time proclaimed to them. The conception of the servant is thus broadened. Henceforth he is not to be simply the suffering and receptive one, but, over and above that, active and creative; he is not merely to be the slave of Yahweh, even though the preferred and beloved one, but he is to be his co-worker and assistant in a work of world-wide scope. The verse, therefore, distinctly refutes the erroneous view that where the servant of Yahweh represents the people of Israel, he plays in Deutero-Isaiah only a passive part, and in the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" only an active one. Here one and the same author expressly appropriates these two conceptions, and this fact proves that they belong to one subject. This shows as plainly as it could be done that he is the author of the passages in which the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" are imbedded. Of course, my interpretation of 49:5 f. is not necessary as a premise of the refutation of the false view above referred to; for is not the passive, receptive attitude of the servant undoubtedly present also in vs. 2, as well as in 50:4 ff., and in the whole of chap.

[57] Duhm noticed this fact, and accordingly placed 5*b* immediately after vs. 3, where it is more than ever out of place.

53 ? This is, indeed, self-evident; for how could there be a servant of Yahweh who could dispense with Yahweh's protection and care ?

But, on the other hand, the other side of the conception of the servant, his active qualities, appear also in the rest of the book. The proclamation to the heathen ends with vs. 6 (chap. 49), and now it is no longer the servant himself who speaks, but the prophet, who introduces a new promise from Yahweh to the servant, thereby confirming what the latter has just reported. Again, as in vs. 5, the introduction itself is of the greatest importance. Here the person spoken to is not addressed as the servant of Yahweh, but as the servant of tyrants.[58] This alone would indicate that the reference is to a people, and this reference is placed beyond all doubt by the epithet " Redeemer of Israel " with which Yahweh is introduced. And yet, Yahweh's speech contains in condensed form everything that is said of his servant in 52 : 14 f., the former being understood, of course, to include its necessary presupposition, the servant's conscious and unconscious activity in behalf of the heathen. It is merely a desperate expedient when Duhm maintains that the idea of this activity is excluded from the passage under discussion because there is no mention of a restoration to life. In so condensed an account of the final result, such an omission might easily occur, even if the servant in both places represented an individual. But as he represents the people of Israel, the restoration to life merely signifies the release from the bondage of the tyrants, which is spoken of in vs. 7. The relation of vss. 7 ff. to vss. 1–6 is simply as follows: In vss. 1–6 the *servant* announces to the *world of nations* that Yahweh has promised him a successful mission to them; in vss. 7 ff. Yahweh informs the *servant* of the honor and blessing which he shall receive (as a result of this successful work), and so it is quite correct to say that vss. 1–6 are not merely repeated in vss. 7 ff.,[59] but the latter passage is not intelligible without the former. It

[58] Besides this we must read לִנְבְזֵה and לִמְרוֹעֵב, and perhaps also אֲנִשׁ instead of נָפֶשׁ.

[59] *Cf.* SMEND, *Alttest. Theol.*, p. 260; KITTEL, *Kommentar*, p. 427. Sellin on p. 100 shows that he recognizes the close connection of the two passages.

is, therefore, impossible to understand why Kittel should find it necessary to warn us against an "artificial welding together" of the two pieces. Those who, following the lead of Smend,[60] consider 49:7 ff. an interpolation for the purpose of connecting the Ebed-Yahweh song with Deutero-Isaiah show more insight. But whether here and elsewhere the connecting sections are attributed to Deutero-Isaiah or to a third author, those who find themselves compelled to adopt such questionable suppositions must first have made a forced cleavage between the "songs" and the rest of the book, occasioned by a false interpretation of the servant. Since Duhm, the originator of the entire movement, simply denies all connection between the songs and what follows them, the acceptance of such connecting sections means neither more nor less than that the theory as first proposed has been wrecked on the rock of facts, and that it would need to possess most extraordinary merits of another sort in order to justify such a subsequent reconstruction for the sake of retaining it.[61]

CHAP. 42:1–7.

Without dwelling further upon details of interpretation, let us now go back from chap. 49 to the last of the four passages, 42:1–7, which in the order of the series is the first. It is remarkable, as Sellin suggests, that these two songs are separated by so long an interval, but this fact requires no artificial hypotheses to explain it, because the intervening passages, being chiefly polemical in character, representing the strife with the idols and with Babylon, easily and naturally extend to this length.

In respect to 42:1–4, so far as the material itself is concerned, there is entire unanimity. The servant, whoever he may be, is to carry religion to the heathen, the only true religion, that of Yahweh.[62] He is of a gentle and quiet disposition, forbearing

[60] *Alttest. Theol.*, pp. 370 f.

[61] Duhm and Astruc stand in about the same relation to their respective successors. It is, however, a great mistake to assume at once that the phenomena which characterize the compilation of sources in the historical books are simply repeated in the prophetical books.

[62] Only in this way can the absolute משפט, which only occurs here, be explained. *Cf.* משפטי, 51:4, and also Jer. 5:4; 8:7; 2 Kings 17:27.

and patient, and will not become weary until the nations[63] shall sit teachable at his feet. Here the independent activity of the servant receives greater prominence than in chaps. 49, 50, and 53, where his protection, preservation, and suffering are more strongly emphasized. And yet his characteristics are the same, although turned in the opposite direction, and everything that is stated in those passages is here foreshadowed and predicted. But again we ask in vain how such things could be stated of an individual; Isa. 2:2–4 alone is sufficient evidence of the existence of the conception that Israel has a mission of instruction to the heathen. The next verses (42:5–7) also prove that this is the only possible interpretation of the servant. For, in whatever way we may explain the difficult ואתנך לברית עם[64] in vs. 6, in any case it can apply only to the people, and not to an individual.[65] And at the same time the statement is made concerning this people that Yahweh will make it the light of the heathen; precisely the same, therefore, which is said of the people in 49:6; 51:4, and in 42:1–4, of the servant of the "songs." For anyone who is not utterly blind, this again proves the equation: servant of Yahweh = people of Israel. It is one of those bold strokes of which Duhm's commentary contains so many, when he gives to לאור גוים an interpretation different not only from that in 49:6, which he attributes to another author, but different also from that in 51:4, where he admits the same Deutero-Isaiah. "The theocracy is the pattern for the other states. As is shown by what follows, this is not a principal thought, but merely an additional idea which is intended to emphasize the glory of the theocracy." Then it would seem that לאור גוים does not depend at all upon ואתנך, but upon ברית עם, and not the person addressed, but his reorganization as a nation, constitutes the light; so that we are no longer dealing with an active bringing

[64] The correct translation, in my opinion, is "to make [the subject] of a people's covenant," *i. e.*, to make a covenant with the scattered and dispersed people of Israel as with a nation; in other words, to reëstablish it as a people and at the same time renew its covenant. We have simply to deal, therefore, with a pregnant construction.

[65] The interpretation of ברית as "mediator of the covenant," which Sellin has again adopted, is, and always will be, impossible.

in of the light, but only, as it were, with a mechanical reflection of it. Not only does Duhm in this explanation fail to mention the parallel passages 49:6; 51:4, but I do not find that this interpretation is even referred to by any of the adherents of his view, which is the best possible evidence that his views in this connection are generally conceded to be impossible. Since Smend it has been common instead to explain these verses, like 49:7 ff., as a connecting link with vss. 1–4. I have already sufficiently characterized this interpretation. Moreover, these verses are not at all essential to prove that the servant is identical with the people.[66]

Against all this, 42:18 ff. is said to constitute a second conclusive proof (49: 5 f. being the first) that the Ebed of the "songs" cannot be the same servant whom we find in Deutero-Isaiah, namely, the people of Israel. Upon this chiefly is based Duhm's portrayal of Deutero-Isaiah's servant (p. 284): "He represents Israel in its present condition as the servant of Yahweh, chosen and protected by Yahweh, and destined by him to a glorious future, but at present blind and deaf, captive and despoiled, a worm, despised of the heathen and full of sins."[67] As I have already stated, one of his followers, Sellin,[68] questions his right to use the passage thus, and sees, on the contrary, in vss. 19–21, 23 (he places vs. 22 after vs. 23), a fifth "Ebed-Yahweh song," in which also the reference is to an individual and not to a collective conception. He is quite right in saying that in vs. 19 the form of expression is as individualistic as anywhere in the "songs;"

[66] On the other hand, attention may be called to the fact that Yahweh's two promises —to make Israel ברית עם and אור גוים—occurring in such close proximity, are very difficult to harmonize, especially without a ו to distinguish them. The question arises whether one of them is not an insertion. In deciding which one may have been inserted, vs. 7 would be very important, although formally the interpolation of לברית עם from the passage 49:8 would offer the most easy explanation.

[67] Only this last trait, "full of sins," has probably been borrowed from elsewhere; since Duhm with great insight strikes out 42:24 from הלא, believing it to be a deuteronomic gloss. But even in view of 43:24 ff. and 50:1, the expression "full of sins" is rather too strong.

[68] *Serubbabel*, pp. 107 f., 178, and especially 216.

for this reason he believes a reference to the people to be impossible. But the claim that "blind and deaf" in vs. 19 need not be taken as the expression of an ethico-religious defect, but simply as a statement that the servant has undergone suffering in his exile, just as the figure of darkness is used to designate the land of exile, is hazardous in the extreme. For in vs. 20 responsibility for his blindness and deafness is charged in unequivocal words to the servant himself: with seeing eyes he observes not, and with open ears he hears not; and vs. 21 says just as distinctly that, despite his infirmities, Yahweh has destined him for great things, not for his own, but for Yahweh's sake. He is called to exalt and glorify the thorah. It is radically wrong to follow Duhm in interpreting the word תורה here in a strictly deuteronomic sense, and then to question the genuineness of the verse. On the contrary, we know from 51:4 that תורה is simply synonymous with משפט in the same sense of "religion" (*cf.* also Isa. 2:2–4), and thus again, as in vss. 1–4, the expression can be interpreted only as referring to the dissemination of Yahweh's religion among the heathen. Here, then, according to a certain school, the servant would again appear as an individual. But immediately following we have a second obstacle in the way of his call, the fact, namely, that the servant is a despised, despoiled, and captive *people*. Sellin thinks the prophet is here returning to the collective conception of the servant; but how in the world could he identify both conceptions in the one word והוא? Nor does the transposition which Sellin proposes help the matter. The dire confusion will admit of no solution, so long as distinctions once adopted and enacted are tenaciously adhered to. This ever-advancing process of analysis will not content itself with raising the questions which it has already suggested, but will sweep away the entire passage, a work of incomparable beauty, as a piece of patchwork based upon misunderstandings.

On the other hand, everything becomes clear when we admit that the prophet has adhered throughout to his purpose of representing the people by the servant of Yahweh. Then the simple solution may be found in Duhm's own characterization, as

literally quoted above. The servant as representing the people is "destined to a glorious future, but at present is blind, deaf," etc. And accordingly, if two contrasting phases of disposition and conduct appear in his nature, why should we be surprised to find a detailed portrayal of both? What reason have we for obstinately refusing to acknowledge the inner unity of the two, or venturing to tear asunder what legitimately belongs together? If the servant were an individual, the question might arise whether in *one* person and in *one* human life such contrasting phases of character could be found combined. But in the case of a people such a combination cannot occasion surprise. A people, and particularly the people of Israel, has a long history, in the course of which it experiences varying conditions, without, however, losing its undivided personality. Our prophet looks back to the legendary beginnings of his nation, back to Abraham and Sarah (41 : 8 f.; 51 : 2). In those times Yahweh called it to be his servant, and his servant it has remained until the present day. But in this long period of time it has by no means maintained and conducted itself with unvarying blamelessness as Yahweh's servant. In times past it committed grievous sins, and has thereby brought punishment upon itself. At present it is blind and deaf, in that it will not or cannot hear the decrees of Yahweh announced to it by the prophet; it is fearful and intimidated, in that it overestimates the power of the enemy and lacks the right confidence in the omnipotence and grace of its God; but, in spite of all this, it does not cease to be Yahweh's servant, for no one else has a claim upon the nation (50 : 1 ff.). This prophet is able to reveal to the people for the first time the full significance of its title, and only in time to come will that significance be fully realized in the people. It culminates in the mission to win the nations for Yahweh, to preach his religion to the heathen, and only in the light of these things can the sufferings of the people in the present and recent past be rightly understood.

As a matter of fact, the only enemies with which Deutero-Isaiah has to contend, and against which he struggles with all available means, are faint-heartedness, fear, and indolence. And

as one of these means shall we not allow him to contrast the Israel of the future, happy and well-pleasing to God, with the Israel of the present, in its fallen and abnormal condition? The contrast is not, as some have supposed, between the heart of the nation, well-pleasing to God, and the masses, nor between the ideal of the people and its actual status. What is meant is rather the entire nation and the actual nation, as it must and shall be when the fulness of the prophet's promises shall be realized. That such is the case these "songs" themselves show with remarkable clearness. In 49:4 the servant confesses how faint-hearted he formerly was,[69] and in 50:7–9 we can also read between the lines how much he has needed help to keep him from despair.[70] Finally, in this passage (50:4 ff.), and particularly in 52:13—53:12, all the misery of his unfortunate past, of his disgraceful ruin and subsequent dishonorable life among the heathen, finds its complete expression.

When viewed in this light, the relation of 42:18 ff. to what precedes seems perfectly simple and unobjectionable. In vss. 1–7 the activity of the servant in his calling is portrayed; everything is represented as taking place in the future, and the climax is reached in his becoming the light of the heathen. *The eyes of the blind shall be opened*, the captives are to be released from prison.[71] This is followed in vss. 10 ff. by an exhortation to a song of triumph in which Yahweh's victory is celebrated, and in vss. 14 ff. by an expression of Yahweh's impatience to see this triumph speedily realized. The (innocently) *blind* are assured of safe guidance, while those who defiantly cling to their idols (which by no means refers to *all* those still living in heathendom) are to be put to shame. Then, in vs. 18, there comes a call to the

[69] Vs. 4*b* expresses, by way of contrast, his present better insight, and is in no sense a continuation of the statement of his former thoughts which begins with ואני אמרתי.

[70] Smend asks, p. 257: Where *in the past* could the Israel have been found which would have patiently endured the abuse and scorn of the world *while proclaiming the truth to the heathen?* It must be remembered that up to this song at least the preaching of the servant has consisted largely of that patience which is here praised, and, above all things, that here too that which is described as past is really future.

[71] Yahweh most probably remains the subject of the infinitives in vs. 7, and the blind and captive are the heathen who are to receive the light.

blind and deaf. And not until now does it become apparent that none is more completely blind and deaf than this same servant through whose agency all these deeds are to be accomplished. He neither heeds nor understands the purpose for which he has been called, nor yet the reason of his suffering. Thus the hearer is transported from the glorious future to the far different present, and now, in chap. 43, begins anew the work of making faint-hearted Israel willing and able to fulfil its mission. I cannot comprehend why Deutero-Isaiah should in consequence deserve the reproachful title of "the strangest writer in the world,"[72] who does not by a single syllable, or by any variation of tense, indicate that here he has in mind the present and there the future. But are not all the tenses in 42: 1–4 and 14–17 future, and in vss. 6 f. and 21 perfect, wherever the old calling is referred to; and perfect again in vss. 22, 24 f., where Israel's deliverance to suffering and bondage is mentioned? In vs. 19 the nominal clauses מִי עִוֵּר, etc., show that the present is meant, while in vs. 20 Duhm himself by accepting the perfect רָאִיתָ draws a distinction between past experiences and continued failure to make proper use of them. Wherein the author has blundered in this matter is, in fact, impossible to discover. And, moreover, in vs. 19 he says expressly: "Who is so deaf as my messenger *whom I will send.*"[73] Surely this could not refer more unmistakably to the calling of the servant in vs. 1, "he *shall carry forth* religion to the heathen," nor could it call attention more plainly to the contradiction existing between the servant's appointed mission and his present conduct. Not often in the history of exegesis have clear waters been so unwisely made turbid as has been done by the assertion of the inharmoniousness of vss. 18 ff. with vss. 1–4. If those who have created for themselves the conception of the servant as an individual are determined tenaciously to cling to it, then there is no other recourse than the knife of criticism, and the foregoing evidences for the opposite view must also be forcibly removed.[74]

[72] DUHM, p. 292.

[73] Translating it as a present does not help the matter.

[74] I should not like to overlook entirely a counter-argument to which Sellin attaches great importance. He says (p. 108) concerning 43: 10: "If in this passage anyone

Let us return now to 42:1, where the servant of the "songs" is first introduced. How is he introduced? I find the generally prevalent view most forcibly expressed by Laue;[75] still he may reasonably be taken as the representative of all. "Everyone," so he says, "who carefully reads the Ebed-Yahweh passages must be struck with the fact that in them the Ebed is spoken of, it is true, but that this Ebed appears *anonymously*. With unmistakable certainty Deutero-Isaiah applies to Israel and Jacob (Isa. 41:8, etc.), *i. e.*, *to the people as a whole*, the honorary title Ebed. . . . . In other words: so much must be conceded, namely, that the Ebed passages do not claim to contain the same conception of the Ebed as does the rest of the book; they leave the reader free to form a different conception of the Ebed." This cannot be for a moment admitted, for its exact opposite is true. When an author introduces a new designation, we rightly demand that, at the place where he first makes use of it, he shall adequately define and explain its meaning. But, having *once* done this, he may demand of the intelligent reader that the latter shall from this equation find for himself the value of x in the subsequent passages, that is to say, that he shall understand this designation wherever it may afterward occur, in the sense in which it was first explained; no one can impose upon the author the obligation to repeat such explanation with every use of the term. Precisely so, in the first passage where the servant of Yahweh is mentioned, in 41:8, Deutero-Isaiah has explained the appellation by "Israel" and "Jacob," and by reference to Abraham's calling

is determined to ignore the fact that Deutero-Isaiah in his speeches sometimes draws a distinction between the servant and the people, then it simply shows how blind one can be made by preconceived opinions." He interprets the verse, "Ye [my people] and my servant [the single great individual who is to spread abroad the knowledge of the thorah] are both my witnesses before the heathen," and thinks that the other interpretation, "Ye [the people] are my witnesses and are my servant whom I have chosen," is nonsense. But it is not nonsense, according to what we have just seen. Chap. 42 tells us that the servant is the one who has been called to work among the heathen. Therefore Israel is primarily Yahweh's witness, that is, *in a position* to support his cause; but, in the next place, Israel is also his servant, that is, *called and obligated* to this mission. The other advocates of the "songs" will scarcely care to avail themselves of this remark by Sellin.

[75] P. 14.

has placed it beyond all doubt that the whole people of Israel as such is meant. If, therefore, he had thereafter used the name without the insertion of such definition, we as readers, should still have been in duty bound to interpret it according to his first explanation. To speak of an anonymous appearing of this servant would, even in this case, have been wide of the mark. But, in fact, Deutero-Isaiah repeats the explanation again and again — in 42:19–22; 43:10;[76] 44:1, 21; 45:4; 48:20 — and thus makes it still more inevitable that we should interpret in the same way the passages which contain no such explanation. Between the first and second passages, which I have just mentioned, and which are not separated by any great interval, comes the first "Ebed-Yahweh song," and right after the last one the second song. How, then, can we speak of an anonymous introduction of the servant? It is simply a case of a *circulus vitiosus:* "We have severed the Ebed-Yahweh songs from the context, and have assigned them to a different author; therefore the explanation given in those passages cannot hold good for him." Even from the point of view of *this* theory it should rather be argued that, since the songs are inserted into the structure of the book, they *ought* to be interpreted, on the strength of 41:8, etc., not as speaking of an individual, but of the people of Israel. This would imply, either that the interpolator — according to this theory — himself conceived them thus, or, at any rate, that he considered this explanation easily possible. Of the two ideas the former is decidedly the more probable. In either case we should have a very old testimony in support of our interpretation of the "songs."

But let us make another and a closer examination of the songs themselves. If any doubt still remained, the wording of 42:1*a* would suffice to prove that the servant of 41:8 is meant, and none other. With בחירי compare אשר בחרתיך in 41:8; with אחזק בו compare תמכתיך in 41:10. In the same way 49:3*a* has a parallel in 41:9*b;* 49:1*b* a parallel in 41:8, 9*a;* and 50:7–9 in 41:10 f. But the explanation itself, the name Israel, also occurs, as we have seen, in 49:3. Its excision from

[76] *Cf.* note 74.

this verse springs from the determination to maintain another explanation. It is true that the text of the LXX in 42:1 is claimed as a basis for this, it being asserted that, as in 42:1 יעקב has crept in before עבדי and ישראל before בחירי, so it has undoubtedly happened in 49:3. If this were the case, we should still have to recognize in these added words a very old exegesis, and that, too, one which can be shown to be, at least essentially, correct. But we have seen that there is every reason to believe that ישראל is genuine in 49:3. And in 42:1 the LXX has just as valid claims to correctness as the massoretic text. On the whole, the vividly individualistic forms of expression in the passages under discussion have led, both in later antiquity and at the present day, much more to the misunderstanding that an individual must be meant, and it is not easy to believe that conversely the text should have been changed in favor of the opposite conception, the collective one. In all probability יעקב and ישראל in 42:1 are genuine. I have no doubt that this will be attacked on metrical grounds, but the excision of ישראל in 49:3 interferes much more seriously with the meter.

Finally, however, the name Israel has been preserved in the fourth song also, fortunately, by corruption or intentional alteration, protected against critical excision. The "song" begins in 52:13 with the words, הנה ישכיל עבדי. No manner of twisting or turning will satisfactorily account for the word ישכיל. After the preceding passage has furnished us with a complete account of all the servant's activity and experience, there remains no room for any other *statement* than that which from ירום on is made no less than three times, namely, that the servant shall be exalted; least of all is there room for anything that could be expressed by ישכיל.[77] Nor can we justify the presence of the three synonymous verbs in any other way than by assuming that ירום forms the conclusion of the first line, and that the other two reiterate the idea in climactic parallel. But with this arrangement, ישכיל becomes entirely impossible,

[77] This disposes also of Sellin's explanation on the basis of Jer. 23:5 (p. 169), although the ישכיל may have been influenced from that source.

a fact which has prompted Duhm simply to strike out the word without giving a second thought to its possible origin.[78] The only thing that could naturally find a place directly before עבדי is a proper name. I venture to propose instead of ישכיל simply ישראל as the original reading of the text: "Behold, Israel my servant shall be exalted, shall rise aloft, and shall stand very high." Then the introduction corresponds to that in 42:1, and the order of words, ישראל עבדי, to that in 44:1; and the placing over against each other of "the nation" and "the nations" at once becomes emphatic. I have not the slightest intention of using this textual emendation in support of the correct interpretation, or of basing anything upon it. But since the reference to the people of Israel has on all sides and in every passage proved to be the essential and only possible one, the probability in favor of this alteration certainly seems unusually strong; nor is it likely that anything simpler or more natural will suggest itself. Here, too, as elsewhere, especially in 53:8, the text has long had to suffer at the hands of those who adhere to a narrower interpretation, and who are willing to admit the possibility of such an exceedingly personal representation only in reference to an individual. This textual improvement, as we have seen, is not necessary to controvert the statement that the servant is nameless. But thereby it becomes probable that the name Israel was not lacking in the two songs in which the servant is introduced in the third person. In the two in which he appears in the first person the absence of the name is natural, and yet the author has in one of these (49:3) introduced the name, so that 50:4 ff. alone does not contain it.

In certain passages in which the servant of Yahweh is introduced in his own proper character, whether in the future, as in 42:1 ff., or in the present, as in 49:1 ff.; 50:4 ff., where he is himself the speaker, or in the past, his work already accomplished, as in 52:13—53:12, the prophet, who is one of the most versatile

[78] He merely establishes the fact that in the LXX the translation for ירום is lacking, and considers it possible that originally ישכיל may have been lacking instead, and that only through corrections has *συνήσει* come to take the place of the word for ירום. It is altogether more probable that of these three entirely synonymous words one was from the beginning left untranslated.

and vivid of prophetic writers, employs a manner of representation of which he is particularly fond. In the very first chapter there are several examples of it side by side. In 40:3 the command is already given for the construction of the miraculous pathway through the desert; in vs. 9 Zion, the bearer of glad tidings, already sees the approach, under Yahweh's guidance, of the caravan which, according to 52:7 ff., still lies in the future. Again and again the prophet presents to the mind such vivid and strikingly realistic pictures of the salvation to come, only to turn again to the present, and by instruction, argument, and consolation to renew the tedious work of overcoming the opposition of the faint-hearted and to lift up the community with which he has to deal to the heights of knowledge and of faith which in those vivid pictures of the future he has presented as already attained. And in this way, as Wellhausen[79] correctly says, Deutero-Isaiah uses the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" as themes for his sermons. But to see anything exceptional in this circumstance, and on that account to attribute these themes to a different author, simply means that one of the fundamental laws of Deutero-Isaiah's rhetoric has been misunderstood. Not only are the sermons his own production, but often the themes also are his own.

An insight into this relation of the "songs" to the context, especially to the passages which follow them, disposes also of another supposed proof against their composition by Deutero-Isaiah—the proof based upon metrical considerations. In no case can any importance be attached to it. Sellin passes it by without further comment, because frequent changes of meter occur also in Deutero-Isaiah's other lyric passages.[80] Schian thinks that Duhm himself is not inclined to claim the change of meter as an argument for separating the first song from its context, particularly since he draws no conclusions from the same

[79] *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, erste Auflage, p. 117; *cf.* also CHEYNE, *Introduction*, p. 307.

[80] SELLIN, p. 97.

circumstance in 42:10 ff. and 44:23 ff.[81] Nevertheless, Kittel[82] mentions the rhythm as one of the grounds for assigning the songs to another author. This is without warrant, for, in the first place, the change from the lyrical form to the sermon, with its longer lines, is in Deutero-Isaiah almost invariably accompanied by a change of the rhythm. Duhm himself has proved this to be true for 40:1–11. Furthermore, the four "Ebed-Yahweh songs" are by no means all written in the same measure; on the contrary, the parallel lines of the trimeter movement, which are typical of the other three songs, are in 50:4 ff. replaced, according to Duhm's own evidence, by *Langverse*, or halting Kina-verses, of which Deutero-Isaiah is so fond. Finally, it may be mentioned that the meter of those other three songs is found a number of times in other parts also of Deutero-Isaiah. By way of illustration, 41:17–20, in close proximity to 42:1–4, will suffice. There Duhm himself acknowledges that the four-line stanza and the trimeter movement recur as regularly as in any one of the "songs."

Is it necessary still to discuss the linguistic characteristics of the songs? In this direction Schian has conducted a somewhat detailed investigation, which has been criticised and supplemented by Sellin.[83] The result in no wise favors the excision of the four songs and their assignment to a single author. For in regard to the first three Schian admits that the use of language is identical with that of Deutero-Isaiah,[84] while in the fourth, with H. Ewald, he believes that he has proved that there is an entirely different style. This, of course, leads him to assign 53:2 ff. to a third author, a view which, if correct, overthrows Duhm's entire theory. Sellin, on the contrary, correctly maintains that, in view of the great divergency of contents, the language of 52:13—53:12 also exhibits as close a correspondence with that of the rest of the book as could be expected. The reader who has once been convinced of the correct

[81] Pp. 4 f.

[82] *Commentar*, p. 379.

[83] Pp. 111 f.

[84] So also LAUE, p. 7.

interpretation of the servant will no longer be misled by the first somewhat strange impression made by the passage. It goes without saying that on the first and only occasion on which the author introduces the heathen and assigns a long speech to them, he should, to the utmost extent of his ability, give a special coloring to his forms of expression.

I think I have now adequately considered and controverted all, or nearly all, individual arguments in favor of the isolation of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs," and against their interpretation in accordance with and as a part of the entire book, and in harmony with it. I do not flatter myself that I have thereby succeeded in convincing my opponents. When the mind has once become thoroughly permeated with the idea that a first impression is correct, the mental vision becomes so acute that it sees a thousand different arguments in support of that first impression. But, for the most part, these arguments are so imponderable that they cannot be submitted to the test of logical reasoning. This is true alike when the initial observation is unquestionably correct and when it is utterly false. Of all the prophetic books, Isa., chaps. 40–55, is probably the most unified, and the one which contains the best arrangement of subjects and climax of ideas. But under the influence of the preconceived opinion which I have been opposing, it has become customary to demand a consistency, a transparency and unity of ideas, which is nothing less than unreasonable to demand in a prophetical book. The writer, who is suffered to retain the name Deutero-Isaiah, is finally pinned down to a single thought in a single form of expression, which he must repeat everywhere, and beyond which he must nowhere venture. As a matter of fact, when along with the "songs" everything has been removed that has any connection with them, there remains scarcely a shadow of that former creation, sparkling and overflowing with vitality, which we have before us in Isa., chaps. 40–55; and when we take a second look at the fragments which have been cut out on the ground that they are patches, we find superb passages altogether in Deutero-Isaiah's characteristic style, beautiful in freshness and fluency. Is it not a marvelous thing that they should

have come forth in such perfection, at second and third hand, from so involved a process? I can only state my well-assured conviction to the contrary, namely, that though there are in Isa., chaps. 40–55, many textual errors, no doubt, and many short interpolations, yet no extended passages from the pen of another author; and, furthermore, that in point of time everything in this book seems to occur before the expected homecoming, or, if this never came to pass, as Kosters and his followers judge, then before the time at which the prophet expected the *joyeuse rentrée*. As respects chaps. 52 f. and chaps. 54 f., all the fulness of the expected glory, as well as all the depth of the final disappointment, still lies in the future.[85]

But, on the other hand, it is only fair to show how little evidence has been demanded of the "Ebed-Yahweh songs" that they had a separate existence before being received into our book. It is only a matter of four songs, of which none but the last reaches any considerable length. Now, it is certainly not incredible that a grateful nation or community might have sought to honor one of its heroes by dedicating to him a number of songs, but in that case we should expect this community to be in them all the speaker, and give direct expression to its feelings. Instead of that, however, when we consider their brevity, we find in the songs an astonishing variety. In the first God is the speaker, in the second and third it is the martyr himself, and only in the fourth does the community, which is supposed to be doing him honor throughout all the songs, take up the address. It surely cannot be the opinion of Duhm and his successors that the second and third songs were actually sung by the martyr himself. So that, by his introduction as the speaker, the scene of these two songs is manifestly laid antecedent to his death, while in the fourth he has already been raised from the dead. Now, in 50:4–9 the hero of the songs is already able to tell of grievous sufferings which he has had to endure in the performance of his mission. Nevertheless, he counts on Yahweh's assistance, and hopes to overcome all his

[85] This is directed especially against the first part of Kosters' treatise, and also against Cheyne's latest view.

enemies. In this hope he must have been disappointed, for, as we know from chap. 53, he afterward suffered martyrdom. His first period of suffering must have been followed by a second, which resulted in his death. Now, it is scarcely conceivable that just at this time, after his first and before his second experience of suffering, the grateful community should put the words of the song 50: 4 ff. into his mouth ;[86] on the contrary, the only natural supposition, it seems to me, is that the whole cycle of songs was sung, if not after his resurrection, at least not until after his death. In that case we are dealing with entirely dramatic scenes, between which, however, important links are missing. The same applies to the second song, 49: 1 ff. Here we are looking back upon long periods of patient and impatient waiting, but as yet there is no mention of actual suffering. But now we come to the first song, 42: 1 ff., in which Yahweh himself becomes the speaker. This is not in itself unprecedented in a song, unless, however, it occurs, as here, without any introduction whatever. We have, therefore, to suppose that this introduction has disappeared, and with it no doubt the revelation of all the circumstances bearing on the case, which would also have given us definite information as to the identity of the martyr and the conditions of his times. Thus the four songs, when once they have been severed from their connection with the context and attributed to one source, permit of interpretation only as isolated fragments of a very elaborate and extensive composition, which must have been cast in a more or less dramatic form. Now, this situation presents not the slightest difficulty to the adherents of this theory, because the imaginative faculty has unbounded play, and is able immediately to satisfy all further requirements the moment they make their appearance. But at least this one fact should be recognized and borne in mind that, when the songs are thus severed from their connection, the problem has by no means been solved, but only propounded.

For this side of the question we have hitherto presupposed only the most uniform and undivided view, that is, the individualistic interpretation of all the four songs. How a still smaller

[86] And yet Sellin, p. 153, presupposes this as Duhm's self-evident view.

number — according to Schian, for example, three, or even, according to Laue, only two — should exhibit such marked differences is still more difficult to understand. Still less am I able to comprehend how Kosters and Bertholet can deny the fundamental feature of the entire theory, the individualistic interpretation of the servant, and yet accept all its remaining conclusions. Equally incomprehensible is the reverse method of procedure adopted by Sellin, who entirely sanctions the individualistic interpretation, and, in fact, considerably enlarges its scope, while he refuses to assent to any of the other conclusions, and not only attributes the songs to Deutero-Isaiah, but is also able to harmonize them with the passages in which the servant has an altogether different significance.

In whatever form or adaptation we may consider it, Duhm's theory has not tended to remove existing difficulties, but constantly to create new ones. When we have once arrived at a conviction, which is not only possible, but even imperative, that the individualistic interpretation is unfounded and impracticable, and that the explanation of the conception of the servant expressly furnished by the author himself holds good for all passages, we must at once cast aside all those confusing auxiliary hypotheses which have their origin and justification only in that false interpretation. We must rather learn to understand his figures from the author's originality. As respects the isolated difficulties which then remain, we must recollect that the conflict of interpretations is a very old one, so ancient, in fact, that false interpretation has here and there actually influenced the form of the text. Various opinions may exist as to how many places show such influence; but however this question may be decided, we have no right on the strength of a word like the עבי in 53:8, or of what some may consider the only possible explanation of 49:5 f., to reject the interpretation of the servant of Yahweh which is fully confirmed by its relation to the whole context. Only by holding fast to this interpretation shall we be able to arrive again at a right appreciation of this "evangelist of the Old Covenant," who occupies an incomparably important position in preparing the way for the revelation of the New Covenant.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

THE DOUBLE TEXT OF TOBIT.

CONTRIBUTION TOWARD A CRITICAL INQUIRY.

THE recent publication of the various texts of the apocryphal story of Aḥiḳar has brought once more into relief the duality that characterizes the tradition of so many of the books of the Old Testament in the Septuagint version. For it was not only found that Aḥiḳar was a companion volume to Tobit, whose author had derived certain details in the story and teaching of his afflicted righteous man from another story of long-suffering virtue, but it was also found that the coincidence between the two works was greater or less according to the recension of the book of Tobit that was consulted. It was less in comparison with the Vatican text than it was with the Sinaitic. And this fact alone arouses the suspicion that the Sinaitic text of Tobit has in some respects priority, critically, over the text of the Vatican MS.; and it invites us to reëxamine the divergent texts of the book of Tobit and find, if possible, a reason for their divergence. Suppose, for instance, that in editing the story of A ḥiḳar, from which Tobit can be shown to have borrowed, we find the names of certain famous Assyrian kings, and that these names appear also in the book of Tobit, but in a variety of spellings, it might reasonably be held that those texts of Tobit which give the names of the kings in the earliest form — that, viz., which is nearest to the Assyrian — have some sort of priority over those texts which exhibit a later spelling. It is true that this may only be a suspicion, but it is a suspicion that may set us on track of a demonstration.

Take, for example, the name of Esarhaddon; it appears in the Vatican text of Tobit as Σαχερδονός, which is generally the spelling of the Sinaitic, except that the text betrays the existence of an earlier spelling Σαχερδών, for we have the expression, ἐπὶ Σαρχεδόνος βασιλέως, and this spelling is confirmed in one case by the Alexandrian MS., which reads Σαχερδάν. So far as this name goes, the evidence which it furnishes is against the superior antiquity of the Vatican text of Tobit, which has Græcized the name of the Assyrian king.

The same thing appears in the spelling of the name of Aḥiḳar, to

whom Tobit frequently refers. There can be little doubt that the form Ἀχιάχαρος which is in the Vatican text is again a Græcized form, for we find in the Sinaitic text a form Ἀχεικάρ actually existing along with other intermediate spellings. That is, we begin to suspect that an earlier form has been edited away, and that the change has been more effectually made in the Vatican than in the Sinaitic text.

When we pass from the spelling of the names to the actual texts, we find traces of similar phenomena. In the fourteenth chapter of Tobit we have the most famous of all the references to Aḥiḳar, which was until recently quite inexplicable, and precisely in this passage the variation between the Vatican and the Sinaitic texts is conspicuous. We have to compare:

(B)

τέκνον, ἴδε τί ἐποίησεν Ἀδάμ Ἀχιαχάρῳ τῷ θρέψαντι αὐτόν, ὡς ἐκ τοῦ φωτὸς ἤγαγεν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ σκότος καὶ ὅσα ἀνταπέδωκεν αὐτῷ· καὶ Ἀχιάχαρον μὲν ἔσωσεν, ἐκείνῳ δὲ τὸ ἀνταπόδομα ἀπεδόθη, καὶ αὐτὸς κατέβη εἰς τὸ σκότος· Μανασσῆς ἐποίησεν ἐλεημοσύνην, καὶ ἐσώθη ἐκ παγίδος θανάτου ἧς ἔπηξεν αὐτῷ, Ἀδὰμ δὲ ἐνέπεσεν εἰς τὴν παγίδα καὶ ἀπώλετο.

(ℵ)

ἴδε, παιδίον, ὅσα Ναδὰβ ἐποίησεν Ἀχεικάρῳ τῷ ἐκθρέψαντι αὐτόν, οὐχί ζῶν κατηνέχθη εἰς τὴν γῆν; καὶ ἀπέδωκεν ὁ θεὸς τὴν ἀτιμίαν κατὰ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἐξῆλθεν εἰς τὸ φῶς Ἀχίκαρος, καὶ Ναδὰβ εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸ σκότος τοῦ αἰῶνος ὅτι ἐζήτησεν ἀποκτεῖναι Ἀχείκαρον. ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι με ἐλεημοσύνην ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς παγίδος τοῦ θανάτου ἧς ἔπηξεν αὐτῷ Ναδάβ, καὶ Ναδάβ ἔπεσεν εἰς τὴν παγίδα τοῦ θανάτου καὶ ἀπώλεσεν.

Now, without going over the differences in detail, and correcting the individual errors, we may say that there are expansions in the Sinaitic text, which are explained by the actual story of Aḥiḳar, with regard to his quasi-sepulture under his own house, and these expansions could not easily have been made without a direct dependence upon the text of Aḥiḳar. There is thus a good probability that they are primitive features of the book of Tobit, the author of which has been shown to know and use that earlier legend. But if this be the case, we are face to face again with the problem as to the relative value of the two divergent recensions of Tobit, and we start upon an inquiry into the relative merits of the two recensions with something of a predilection for the Sinaitic form of telling the story.

But here we must move very cautiously, for a little further examination shows that it is not a very simple problem, nor is the evidence all one way. For instance, in Tobit, chap. 4, after the old man has given instructions to his son to bury him, he proceeds with a short discourse on ethics, which ought to be headed "The Teaching of Tobit," for it is a veritable Διδαχή and may be compared with that which is named after the apostles. The antiquity of this inserted tract is evident from the close parallelism between itself and the Teaching of Aḥiḳar, whole sentences of which it incorporates. That which is borrowed by Tobit trom Aḥiḳar ought certainly to be a part of the original draft of Tobit; but the curious thing is that the whole, or almost the whole, of the Teaching is absent from the Sinaitic recension. Fortunately there are opening and closing fragments of the Teaching still existing, which show that it must once have stood in the Sinaiticus; such sentences as

Tob. 4:5, *πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας σου, παιδίον, τοῦ κυρίου μνημόνευε,*
Tob. 4:19, *καὶ νῦν, παιδίον, μνημόνευε τὰς ἐντολὰς ταύτας, καὶ μὴ ἐξαλειφθήτωσαν ἐκ τῆς καρδίας σου,*

are sufficient to show that a series of ethical instructions once stood in the Sinaitic text, and such ethical matter must have been parallel in some points with that we find in the Vatican. If the Sinaitic text had not presented the broken fragments which betray excision, we should have been tempted seriously to lower the value of that recension on account of the omission of matter which was clearly of the earliest type. But as the omission was deliberate, the value of the recension in what was not omitted is not necessarily lowered. We can, however, see how complicated a matter the tradition of these early documents often becomes, and how careful one has to be not to draw too rapid conclusions.

Another reason for caution lies in the consideration that, even if the Sinaitic recension has certain suggestive signs of superior antiquity, it does not follow that these are in evidence as regards the excellence of the whole of the text. It might, for example, be the result of the revision of the Greek text by a Hebrew (or Aramaic) original, and in that case the revision would be redolent of antiquity, although made upon a possibly inferior Greek base. Something of this kind occurs in the book of Esther, and in many other parts of the Septuagint, where the readings of Aquila's translation have been imported into either the margin or the text. They can generally be recognized either by the fact that they conform the text to the Hebrew, or by their

betraying peculiarities which are characteristic of Aquila.[1] Wherever such a Septuagint text has been revised into greater agreement with the Hebrew by means of Aquila's version, the recension produced will have marks of superior antiquity, which may, however, be quite fallacious as far as the editing of the text of the Septuagint goes; for the archaic features may not be a part of the true Septuagint.

These considerations may suffice to suggest to us the care with which it is necessary to proceed in estimating the value of the recensions of the book of Tobit. In fact, the recensions cannot be really evaluated until we have some idea of the causes which have led to their existence.

We may confine ourselves, then, at first to the following statement: The book of Tobit, like so many other books of the Septuagint, exists in what appears to be a pair of distinct recensions, and in Tobit itself the recensions are so distinct that the editors are constrained to print one beneath the other, taking the Vatican text as the standard, and giving the Sinaitic text the alternative place. Certain peculiarities, to which we have drawn attention, suggest that the greater antiquity lies with the Sinaitic text; but whether this justifies us in giving it the place of honor, or in erecting it into a standard of reference, we must not too hastily decide.

The problem is one which meets us elsewhere, and we need to know more about the meaning and causes of the divergence before we commit ourselves to the special patronage of one or the other of the involved forms.

Now, instead of beginning, as might seem most natural, with the printed texts of Tobit, and reading them side by side, in order to determine how they stand in order of time and historical development, with a view to the further determination of the causes which produced recension B out of recension A, or the converse, or which produced them both from a lost type, I propose to try an independent method of inquiry somewhat less mechanical than that which is involved in the collation *inter se* of divergent types of text.

We shall ask the question whether any earlier extracts exist from the book of Tobit which may be capable of identification with one of the published recensions rather than with the other.

[1] For example, when in Esther 6:1 the corrector $\aleph^{c.a}$ adds λόγων to μνημόσυνα, this is because the Hebrew has דברי; when in 6:2 the same corrector in the margin restores γραφέντα for a missing τὰ γραφέντα, he does this for a Hebrew כתוב; when in 6:10 he adds on the margin ταχεως λαβε συν το ενδυμα κτέ, the inserted συν shows that he is revising from Aquila; etc.

We begin with the simplest possible case, viz., the well-known dictum of Tobit with regard to the saving virtue of alms. This passage, "alms doth deliver from death," is one that occurs twice in the Vatican recension of the book of Tobit, first in the ethical tract which we have called the Teaching of Tobit (Tob. 4:10), and again in what may perhaps be called the Teaching of Raphael (Tob. 12:8), when that mendacious angel gives the family of Tobit a farewell lecture on truth and charity. In the Sinaitic text the Teaching of Tobit is, as we have shown above, excised. Now, we have also shown that this sentence has a peculiar value in the text of Tobit, inasmuch as it is not merely a résumé of Tobit's own personal virtue, but is also an epitome of the ethical excellence of Aḥikar; and we have pointed out that the famous dictum about salvation by almsgiving was, in the first instance, deduced from the supposed historical adventures of the Sage of Nineveh. This is admitted in the dying words of Tobit (Tob. 14:10), that "Manasses (*i.e.*, Aḥikar) gave alms and was saved from the snare of death. . . . . Consider, my son, how almsgiving . . . . delivereth." It is certain, then, that the sections on almsgiving belong to the first form of Tobit. If the Sinaitic recension has failed to present the words in Tob. 4:10, it is because a deliberate abbreviation has been made at this point of the book, an abbreviation which, as we have shown above, is betrayed by the fragments which the excisor did not completely cut away.

Let us now consider one or two authorities who quote the famous dictum. We begin with the last chapter of the epistle of Polycarp (extant only in Latin). Polyc. 10: ". . . . mansuetudinem domini alterutri præstolantes, nullum despicientes. Cum possitis benefacere, nolite differre quia eleemosyna de morte liberat." A comparison of this with the Tobit passages shows that it is taken, not from the Teaching of Raphael, but from the Teaching of Tobit (Tob. 4:10). For in this section we have the parallel instructions to despise and overlook no one (*μὴ φθονεσάτω σου ὁ ὀφθαλμὸς ἐν τῷ ποιεῖν σε ἐλεημοσύνην· καὶ μὴ ἀποστράψῃς τὸ πρόσωπόν σου ἀπὸ παντὸς πτωχοῦ*): to do good according to our ability (*ὡς σοὶ ὑπάρχει κατὰ τὸ πλῆθος ποίησον ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐλεημοσύνην*), which latter instruction refers, at first sight, rather to the extent of gifts than to the time of bestowing them; as if it were merely a repetition of *ἐκ τῶν ὑπαρχόντων σου* in vs. 7. On turning, however, to Gal. 6:10, we suspect that St. Paul has been at work on the same ethical rule, for he says: *ὡς καιρὸν ἔχομεν*, which interprets *ὡς σοὶ ὑπάρχει* in a temporal sense, adds a qualifying clause, "but especially to the household of

faith," which suggests that he is modifying a previously existing rule; and significantly omits the statement about the saving power of almsgiving, which would have vitiated the whole of his argument to the Galatians.

If, then, Polycarp has been quoting Tobit, as is undoubtedly the case, the balance of the argument is in favor of a quotation from the Teaching of Tobit, and not from the Teaching of Raphael. And if there is any ground for our suspicion that St. Paul has also been using Tobit (which must certainly have been a part of his library), it is to the earlier chapters of Tobit that his loan must be referred, and not to the later.

Unfortunately, even if the argument were better reinforced than it is (for there is still something to be desired in that direction), we are not much farther on in the criticism of the Tobit texts. We cannot say much in favor of the Vatican text, in view of the evident excision of the corresponding matter in the Sinaitic recension.

Let us turn, in the next place, to the second epistle of Clement, where in the sixteenth chapter we find as follows: 2 Clem., *ad Cor.*, 16: καλὸν οὖν ἐλεημοσύνη ὡς μετάνοια ἁμαρτίας· κρείσσων νηστεία προσευχῆς, ἐλεημοσύνη δὲ ἀμφοτέρων· ἀγάπη δὲ καλύπτει πλῆθος ἁμαρτιῶν, προσευχὴ δὲ ἐκ καλῆς συνειδήσεως ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται. μακάριος πᾶς ὁ εὑρεθεὶς ἐν τούτοις πλήρης· ἐλεημοσύνη γὰρ κούφισμα ἁμαρτίας γίνεται. In this Clement is clearly following Tobit, for all the key-words of the Tobit teaching are here. We catch at once the refrain of ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, although the writer has evaded the statement and corrected it. He has substituted "prayer" for "alms," and has made an apologetic modification that "alms" is an alleviation of "sin," though not exactly its ransom. He has, however, left uncorrected or half-corrected a statement of the relative rank (speaking soteriologically) of prayer, fasting, and alms. It is clear that they came to him in the order (reckoned from greatest to least): alms, fast, and prayer.

Without any reference to the actual sources from which he derives, we might infer that he was using a doctrine that prayer is good, but fasting is better, and alms is best of all; for alms doth deliver from death. He corrects this (1) by exchanging "prayer" and "alms" in the opening and closing sentences, but still leaves the uncorrected middle statement that "alms is best of all;" and, to avoid further misunderstanding, he adds the precept that it is love which is the real atonement. This last sentence was almost certainly not in his sources.

Now let us turn to his sources in the book of Tobit. A moment's investigation will show that it is not from the Teaching of Tobit, which is only ethical, and, except in a historical sense, is not soteriological. Turning to the Teaching of Raphael, we find the very same attempt to estimate the relative value of prayer, fast, and alms. The two recensions stand as follows:

TOB. 12:8.

Vatican text.	*Sinaitic text.*
ἀγαθὸν προσευχὴ μετὰ νηστείας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης· ἀγαθὸν τὸ ὀλίγον μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ἢ πολὺ μετὰ ἀδικίας· καλὸν ποιῆσαι ἐλεημοσύνην ἢ θησαυρίσαι χρυσίον. ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, καὶ αὕτη ἀποκαθαριεῖ πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν· οἱ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύνας πλησθήσονται ζωῆς.	ἀγαθὸν προσευχὴ μετὰ ἀληθείας καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη μετὰ δικαιοσύνης μᾶλλον ἢ πλοῦτος μετὰ ἀδικίας· καλὸν ποιῆσαι ἐλεημοσύνην μᾶλλον ἢ θησαυρίσαι χρυσίον. ἐλεημοσύνη ἐκ θανάτου ῥύεται, καὶ αὕτη ἀποκαθαίρει πᾶσαν ἁμαρτίαν. οἱ ποιοῦντες ἐλεημοσύνην χορτασθήσονται ζωῆς.

Here, then, we have a concrete instance of the variation in the two recensions, which we are able to test by reference to a second-century quotation. And we notice (1) that the quotation in Clement is not to be dismissed with the word *memoriter*, for there is matter in it which has disappeared from both the Vatican and Sinaitic recensions, but was once a part of the text of Tobit. We turn to Holmes and Parsons, and find that the Zittau Codex (No. 44), with its companion, the Ferrara Codex (No. 106), have the reading: καὶ ἐλεημοσύνη μετὰ δικαιοσύνης ὑπὲρ ἀμφότερα· κρεῖσσον ποιεῖν ἐλεημοσύνην ἢ θησαυρίζειν χρυσίον. Here we have the missing words of Clement [ἐλεημοσύνη] δὲ ἀμφοτέρων. They have been suspected by us to be primitive, independently of MSS. authority, and here is the attestation. These words, then, are not due to Clement quoting from memory, and expanding and modifying his quotation, but to the text that Clement quotes. Behind the second epistle of Clement there lies a text of the Septuagint of an earlier type than that of either the Vatican or the Sinaitic codex. (2) Our next observation is that the pseudo-Clementine quotation invites us to restore the virtues in the upward order: prayer, fast, alms, so as to affirm that

Prayer is a good thing;

Fasting is better than prayer;

Almsgiving is better than both.

This shows that we must correct away the refinement of ἀληθείας

in the Sinaitic recension; the Vatican text is here the better, and is supported by Clement of Alexandria, who quotes the opening sentence with the slight variation: *νηστεία μετὰ προσευχῆς* (Clem. Alex., p. 791).

Beyond this I do not know that we can affirm much with regard to the relative value of the recensions. It appears that a primitive Hebrew or Aramaic צדקה has been translated doubly by *ἐλεημοσύνη καὶ δικαιοσύνη*. If this be primitive, then the expression, *ἐλεημοσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης*, of the Vatican text is earlier than *ἐλεημοσύνη μετὰ δικαιοσύνης* of the Sinaitic text, which is a modification of it, whose motive is found in the previous *προσευχὴ μετὰ νηστείας*. Lower down the Sinaitic recension has the simple rendering, *ἐλεημοσύνην* for *ἐλεημοσύνας καὶ δικαιοσύνας*. This may be a later correction, though the matter is far from certain.

Both the texts are strikingly Hebraistic in their use of the positive *καλὸν* and *ἀγαθὸν* for the Hebrew טוב, where the proper translation was *κρείσσων*. Clement's epistle has the opening *καλόν*, but changes to *κρείσσων* later on; he may, however, have simply improved the language of his text, and we must not infer that the primitive translation had anything except a positive adjective.[2]

So far, then, as the study of the single instance has taken us, we may say that the Vatican and Sinaitic recensions are closely connected *inter se*, with perhaps a slight presumption in favor of the superior antiquity of the former; but both of them appear to fall short of an accurate presentation of the text of the Septuagint.

We have devoted a good deal of attention to this passage from Pseudo-Clement, because of the importance of its evidence. The writer is certainly working from a Greek text, and therefore his evidence is valuable for the LXX. If the results are not very striking, they are not wholly valueless. We shall now turn to a much more remarkable case, which involves an extended quotation between Tobit and an early Hebrew or Aramaic writer, which will verify completely for us the suggestions as to the Semitic origin of the book of Tobit, and throw light upon the character of its primitive text.

The book of Jubilees has come down to us in Latin and in Ethiopic, both of which are derived from a lost Greek text; but behind the lost

[2] As long as modern revisers are allowed to present us in the New Testament with Hebraizing logia in such words as, "He will say, the old is good," and modern divines preach sermons on the text thus emended, we must not be surprised at the roughness of early texts of the LXX.

Greek text there lies a lost Hebrew original, of which fragments have come down to us in the Midrashim. This lost Hebrew book was a "haggadic commentary on Genesis, important as being the chief and practically sole monument of legalistic pharisaism belonging to the century immediately preceding the Christian era."[3]

In the twenty-seventh chapter of the book of Jubilees we find the account of the departure of Jacob for Mesopotamia. The domestic scene is presented to us by the commentator, who dilates upon the tears of Rebecca at the loss of her son. Isaac comforts her with arguments of masculine wisdom, and Jacob is sent away with an abundance of paternal benedictions.

Now, there is nothing unnatural in such a piece of haggada at such a point; it is the common ground for story-tellers, whether in the East or West, an obvious expansion for which Shakespeare furnishes an agreeable and playful imitation in Launce's soliloquy on leaving home.[4] But obvious though the haggada may be — for Rebecca with dry eyes or untold tears is not to be thought of — it is by no means an obvious thing that the departure of Jacob for Mesopotamia should be told in precisely the same terms as the departure of Tobias for Media; and we proceed to draw out the coincidences between the two accounts and to explain, if possible, their interdependence.

The following is the Latin text of the passage in question: "Et emisit Isac Jacob, et abiit in Mesopotamiam ad Laban filium Bathuel Syri, fratrem Rebeccæ matris Jacob. Et factum est quando abiit in Mesopotamiam, contristatus est spiritus Rebeccæ post Jacob filium suum et flevit. Et dixit Isac ad Rebeccam, Soror, noli flere Jacob filium meum, quoniam in pace ibit et in pace rediet. Et Deus excelsus custodiet eum ab omni malo et erit cum ipso et non derelinquet eum omnibus diebus. Quoniam scio ego quod dirigentur omnes viæ ejus in omnibus, in quibus iter faciet, quousque revertatur ad nos in pace, et videbimus eum cum pace. Noli ergo timere de illo, soror mea, quoniam in via recta est et erit perfectus vir [et] verax et non derelinquetur: noli flere! Et consolabatur Isac Rebeccam pro Jacob filio suo et benedixit eum."

We will now examine the parallel passages in Tobit, premising that the wailing of Anna and consolation of Tobit occur twice over, once

[3] CHARLES, *Book of Jubilees*, p. ix.

[4] "My mother weeping, my father wailing, my sister crying, our maid howling, our cat wringing her hands, and all our house in a great perplexity."
— "Two Gentlemen of Verona," Act II, sc. 3.

when Tobias departs and later on in the story when his mother suggests that he will never return:

TOB. 5:18—6:1*a*.

Vatican Text.

ἔκλαυσεν δὲ Ἄννα ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Τωβείτ . . . . . καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Τωβείτ Μὴ λόγον ἔχε, ἀδελφή· ὑγιαίνων ἐλεύσεται, καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται αὐτόν· ἄγγελος γὰρ ἀγαθὸς συνπορεύσεται αὐτῷ καὶ εὐοδωθήσεται ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποστρέψει ὑγιαίνων. καὶ ἐπαύσατο κλαίουσα.

Sinaitic Text.

καὶ ἔκλαυσεν ἡ μήτηρ αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Τωβείθ . . . . . καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Μὴ λόγον ἔχε, ὑγιαίνων πορεύσεται τὸ παιδίον ἡμῶν καὶ ὑγιαίνων ἐλεύσεται πρὸς ἡμᾶς καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἂν ἔλθῃ, προς σὲ ὑγιαίνων· μὴ λόγον ἔχε, μὴ φοβοῦ περὶ αὐτῶν, ἀδελφή· ἄγγελος γὰρ ἀγαθὸς συνελεύσεται αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐοδωθήσεται ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ὑποστρέψει ὑγιαίνων. καὶ ἐσίγησεν κλαίουσα.

TOB. 10:4–6.

Vatican Text.

εἶπεν δὲ αὐτῷ ἡ γυνή, Ἀπώλετο τὸ παιδίον, διότι κεχρόνικεν· καὶ ἤρξατο θρηνεῖν αὐτὸν καὶ εἶπεν Οὐ μέλει μοι, τέκνον, ὅτι ἀφῆκά σε τὸ φῶς τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου; καὶ Τωβεὶτ λέγει αὐτῇ Σίγα, μὴ λόγον ἔχε, ὑγιαίνει. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Σίγα, μή πλάνα με· ἀπώλετο τὸ παιδίον μου.

Sinaitic Text.

καὶ Ἄννα ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ λέγει Ἀπώλετο τὸ παιδίον μου καὶ οὐκέτι ὑπάρχει ἐν τοῖς ζῶσιν. καὶ ἤρξατο κλαίειν καὶ θρηνεῖν περὶ τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτῆς καὶ εἶπεν Οὐαί μοι, τέκνον, ὅτι ἀφῆκα σε πορευθῆναι τὸ φῶς τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν μου. καὶ Τωβεὶθ ἔλεγεν αὐτῇ Σίγα, μὴ λόγον ἔχε, ἀδελφή, ὑγιαίνει· καὶ μάλα περισπασμὸς αὐτοῖς ἐγένετο ἐκεῖ, καὶ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ πορευθεὶς μετ' αὐτοῦ πιστός ἐστιν καὶ εἷς τῶν ἀδελφῶν ἡμῶν· μὴ λυποῦ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀδελφή, ἤδη παρέσται.

And to these two accounts of Anna's laments over her son must be added a previous sentence relating to the farewell of Tobias:

TOB. 5:16, 17.

Vatican Text.

καὶ ἔτι προσθήσω σοι ἐπὶ τὸν μισθόν, ἐαν ὑγιαίνοντες ἐπιστρέψητε. εὐδόκησαν οὕτως· καὶ εἶπεν πρὸς Τωβίαν Ἕτοιμος γίνου πρὸς τὴν ὁδόν· καὶ εὐοδωθείητε.

Sinaitic Text.

καὶ ἐπιπροσθήσω σοι τῷ μισθῷ. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ ὅτι Πορεύσομαι μετ' αὐτοῦ καὶ μὴ φοβηθῇς· ὑγιαίνοντες ἀπελεύσομεθα καὶ ὑγιαίνοντες ἐπιστρέψομεν

καὶ ἡτοίμασεν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ τὰ πρὸς τὴν ὁδόν· καὶ εἶπεν ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ Πορεύου μετὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. ὁ δὲ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ οἰκῶν θεὸς εὐοδώσει τὴν ὁδὸν ὑμῶν, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ συνπορευθήτω ὑμῖν.

πρός σε, διότι ἡ ὁδὸς ἀσφαλής. καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Εὐλογία σοι γένοιτο, ἀδελφέ. καὶ ἐκάλεσεν τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῷ Παιδίον, ἑτοίμασον τὰ πρὸς τὴν ὁδὸν καὶ ἔξελθε μετὰ τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ σου, καὶ ὁ θεὸς ὁ ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ διασώσαι ὑμᾶς ἐκεῖ καὶ ἀποκαταστήσαι ὑμᾶς πρὸς ἐμὲ ὑγιαίνοντας, καὶ ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ συνοδεύσαι ὑμῖν μετὰ σωτηρίας, παιδιόν.

Comparing the lamentation in Tobit with that in the book of Jubilees, we are struck with the similarity of the language. Each of the old gentlemen addresses his wife as sister; each of them enjoins his companion not to weep, predicts going in peace and returning in peace, promises that her eyes shall see him again. This general resemblance is so conspicuous that we can pick up for almost every word in the Vatican text of Tob. 5:18 ff., printed above, an exact parallel in the Latin of Jubilees, as follows:

ἔκλαυσεν δὲ Ἄννα	= *et flevit*
καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Τωβεὶτ Μὴ λόγον ἔχε, ἀδελφή. ὑγιαίνων ἐλεύσεται	= *et dixit Isac ad Rebeccam: noli flere, soror, quoniam in pace ibit*
καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται αὐτὸν	= *et videbimus eum cum pace*
καὶ εὐοδωθήσεται ἡ ὁδὸς αὐτοῦ	= *dirigentur omnes viæ ejus*
καὶ ὑποστρέψει ὑγιαίνωι	= *in pace rediet*

The coincidence between the two accounts is so striking that they can hardly be regarded as independent. But if this be so for the text as it occurs in the Vatican Codex, the coincidence is much more strongly brought out in the Sinaitic text. Here we have for ὑγιαίνων ἐλεύσεται the more correct ὑγιαίνων πορεύσεται (= *in pace ibit*), the addition τὸ παιδίον ἡμῶν which stands for *filium meum* in Jubilees, and the parallels:

καὶ οἱ ὀφθαλμοί σου ὄψονται ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ᾗ ἂν ἔλθῃ πρός σε ὑγιαίνων	= *quousque revertatur ad nos in pace et videbimus eum cum pace*
μὴ φοβοῦ περὶ αὐτοῦ, ἀδελφή	= *noli ergo timere de illo, soror mea*

Moreover, it is the Sinaitic text that explains some of the perplexing sentences in Jubilees. Tobit says: "Quoniam in via recta est et erit perfectus vir [et] verax et non derelinquetur; noli flere." The meaning of this is obscure; Tobias is said to be in the right way, which

presumably means a safe way; but what is meant by saying that he is to be a perfect man, true, and not forsaken, is not clear. When, however, we find that in Tob. 5:16 the angel says, "We shall go in peace and return in peace, ὅτι ἡ ὁδὸς ἀσφαλής," we catch the meaning of Tobias' being in the right way. And when in Tob. 10:4 ff. we find Tobit arguing that "the man who has gone with him is πιστὸς and is one of our brethren; therefore do not grieve," we have the key to the words "*vir verax* et non derelinquetur; *noli flere.*"

Enough has been said to show the close connection between the Sinaitic Tobit and the text of Jubilees; they cannot any longer be regarded as independent. One of them has been borrowing from the other. Now, whichever way the dependence is, whether of Tobit on Jubilees or of Jubilees on Tobit, we are almost forced to admit that the loan was made in Hebrew or Aramaic; for the common matter belongs to the book of Jubilees in the original, and therefore, if borrowed by Jubilees, was borrowed in Hebrew or Aramaic; or, if it was borrowed by Tobit, the loan would have to be referred to the earliest stage of the textual history, since it has affected both the leading recensions, though one of them does not show the same phenomenal coincidences as the other; that is, it is the underlying Hebrew Tobit that is responsible for the peculiar expressions in the Vatican and Sinaitic texts.

The question, then, is: Which author (Tobit or Jubilees) borrowed the terms of the other? There is nothing *a priori* against literary imitations of a previous author by Tobit; rather, we have shown how ready the writer of Tobit was to appropriate incidents and ideas in the tale of Aḥiḳar. And certainly the situation of Tobit going to Media is so like that of Jacob leaving for Mesopotamia that, if the writer of Tobit had known the haggadic expansion in Jubilees, he might very well have turned it to a useful literary end by working the separate sentences into the framework of his book.

It seems, however, pretty clear that the borrowing is the other way; for many of the expressions which constitute the borrowed matter are characteristic of Tobit. When Tobit calls his wife sister, we find Raguel in Tob. 8:16 using the same term of endearment to his wife Edna; and when Tobias prays for Sara and himself, he calls her "this my sister," and addresses her in a similar manner. The peculiar address comes, then, from the novelist, and not from the commentator.

The same thing might almost have been inferred from the way in which the perfectly natural statement of Tobit that Azarias is "a trusty

man" appears in the book of Jubilees in the form that Jacob is *vir verax* (ἄνθρωπος πιστός). The point of the remark is that Azarias is able to take care of Tobias, and not that Jacob is able to take care of himself. We infer, then, that Jubilees has expanded from the Hebrew (or Aramaic) Tobit.

From this there follows at once a number of important conclusions.

First of all it follows that either the Sinaitic Tobit is nearer to the original Hebrew, and so is the better recension, or else it has been corrected from the Hebrew (or some version depending on the Hebrew) so as to present a better text than that of the Vatican text, though not necessarily a better text *of the Septuagint*. It is difficult to believe that the Vatican recension is a mere abbreviation of the Sinaitic, yet the continual agreements in rendering are such as to require a common Greek original; so it seems almost necessary to infer that the Sinaitic version of Tobit is a reconstruction of an existing text into closer harmony with the Hebrew.

Neither of the two recensions, however, preserves the Hebrew (or Aramaic) form in such a case as we discussed above with regard to the relative merit of prayer, fasting, and alms.

It follows, in the next place, that if we have rightly convicted the haggadist of Jubilees of expanding his text of Genesis from current literature of his own day, the chances are that he has done the same thing elsewhere, and this consideration may help to explain the presence at the end of the book of Jubilees of a document dealing with the death of Moses (which has commonly been isolated and printed as the lost Assumption of Moses).

We are now in a position to go back to the two parallel texts of Tobit, as existing in the Sinaitic and Vatican codices, and test them more particularly in the light of the conclusions that have been reached; and some very important points will immediately become clear with regard to the two companion stories (Aḥiḳar and Tobit) and the two companion texts of Tobit, viz., the Sinaitic and Vatican MSS.

Let us take an instance: the reader of Aḥiḳar will have been struck with the remarkable terms that are used to describe the king of Assyria, who is spoken of as king of *Assyria and Nineveh*.[5] The appellation is so peculiar that the biblical student will readily concede it to be the primitive form. How is it, then, that in the opening sentences of Tobit, which are the literary parallel to the opening sentences of

[5] *E. g.*, Aḥiḳar, p. 58; king of Assyria and Nineveh *bis*, p. 67; *bis*, foster-child of Assyria and Nineveh, p. 69, etc.

Ahikar, we find no such expression, but only the expression "king of the Assyrians;" nor do we find the country spoken of, at least in the Vatican text, by the curious double title? When, however, we begin to examine the Sinaitic text, we find traces of the very same expression; thus:

Tob. 14:4, *καὶ ἀπαντήσει ἐπὶ Ἀθὴρ καὶ Νινευή*

Tob. 14:14, *ἐν πᾶσιν οἷς ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τοὺς υἱοὺς Νινευὴ καὶ Ἀθουρείας*, which shows that the Sinaitic text is derived from one which described the empire as it is described in Ahikar.

Probably this is also the explanation of the peculiar Vatican reading of Tob. 14:4,

τὴν ἀπωλίαν Νινευὴ [ἣν ἠχμαλώτισεν Ναβουχοδονοσὸρ] καὶ Ἀσύηρος,

where *Ἀσύηρος* looks very like a corruption of *Ἀθὺρ* or *Ἀθυρείας*, and the bracketed words are either a gloss or a displacement. Next turn to Tob. 14:4 and observe how, in the context, the Sinaitic text has preserved another original trait in the expression: *τῷ ῥήματι τοῦ θεοῦ ἐπὶ Νινευή, ἃ ἐλάλησεν Ναούμ, ὅτι πάντα ἔσται καὶ ἀπαντήσει ἐπὶ Ἀθὴρ καὶ Νινευή*. It has long been recognized that *Ναούμ* and not *Ἰωνᾶς* is the true reading in this place. The Sinaitic, then, is the better text, and it either represents the original Semitic more closely than does the Vatican text, or has been corrected from the original Semitic.

But what Semitic text was it? Hebrew or Aramaic? There can only be one answer in view of the forms *Ἀθὺρ* and *Ἀθουρεία*. They are not Hebrew, but Aramaic.

We have thus arrived at a fairly conclusive demonstration of the superiority of the Sinaitic Tobit, and of the existence in it of elements derived from the Aramaic. And we have obtained further evidence of the close literary parallelism of the two stories, Ahikar and Tobit.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

CLAIRE COLLEGE,
Cambridge, Eng.

THE EDICT OF TOLERANCE OF LOUIS XVI. (1787) AND ITS AMERICAN PROMOTERS.

THE war of the Camisards had shown that the Huguenots in France were unconquerable by brute force The most powerful king of Europe must use persuasion and bribery in order to bring about the pacification of the Cevenol mountaineers. Besides, Antoine Court, Benjamin du Plan, Jacques Roger, and their coadjutors in the work of the restoration of the Protestant church had proved by their steadfastness that the fear of the galleys, or even of death, could never force

them to give up their right to public worship. During sixty years they had performed divine service every Sunday and holiday in the Desert and in private houses, and had held their synods and "colloques" in spite of bloody edicts. And, in fact, the governors of Languedoc after Lamoignon de Basville and the judges in the courts of parliament (except that of Toulouse), under the influence of public opinion, had adopted more humane ways of dealing with the Protestants (as we have seen from Paulmy's meeting with Paul Rabaut, the apostle of the Desert), and the barbarous ordinances of 1715, 1724, and 1745 were maintained only to frighten them. However, while in fact the position of the Huguenots had improved somewhat, legally it remained still intolerable. In the eyes of the law they were considered as outlaws. Their marriages, unless they had been celebrated by the Roman Catholic priests of the parish, were regarded as concubinages, and their children as bastards, and hence unable to inherit, so that not seldom avaricious collateral relatives claimed the heritage of the Huguenot father at his death, and tried, in pursuance of the law, to rob his widow and orphans. Moreover, it sometimes happened that unfaithful husbands left their wives under the pretense that they had been married only by Protestant ministers in the Desert, and refused to give any support to them and to their children. Such was the case of Marie Robequin, of Grenoble, who was abandoned with her children, and for whom Attorney-General Servan made such an eloquent speech. Let us say, however, in honor of the French magistrates, that, generally speaking, except in the parliament of Toulouse, they showed themselves more tolerant than the laws, and that they rendered sentence rather according to their natural sense of justice than according to the edicts. Gilbert de Voisin, Malesherbes, and Baron de Breteuil in his memoirs on *Marriages among the Protestants*, were perfectly aware of the injustice of the legal position of the Huguenots in France, which, after 1746, induced so many to emigrate.

Rupert de Montclar, attorney-general at the parliament of Aix, in a remarkable pamphlet of 1755, after having explained all evils brought about by the "clandestine marriages" of the Huguenots and the loss suffered by the kingdom of France in consequence of emigration, made the following exclamation: "In spite of all the hardships they endure, the Protestants work with one hand for the prosperity of France, while with the other they are wiping away the tears which persecution draws from their eyes. How long, then, shall we molest a great people whose labor is so useful to us, whose industry is so valuable,

whose faithfulness so well tried? Is it not time to stop this kind of captivity under which they have been groaning for seventy years in their own country? That is what every good Frenchman expects from our gracious majesty! But somebody will object that they are stray sheep. Astray indeed; but they are good citizens, and for that reason alone the government ought to esteem them and to win them back. Astray; but they are secure in their belief, and we ought the more to be convinced of this, as the severity of the laws could not sever them from their religion. Astray; but their errors are in their minds only, not in their hearts, and they violate neither the right of the king nor the duties of society. Astray; but why should we not now try with them the ways of gentleness? Astray; but do you think that the persecuting which Europe attributes to our religion gives it much credit? Astray; but let us cease to be inconsistent in praying to God for their conversion, while with the same breath we invoke against them the sharpness of the civil power."

This eloquent plea for toleration was not heeded till thirty-two years afterward. We may say about the foundation of religious liberty in France what Virgil has said of the foundation of Rome:

Tantæ molis erat Romanam condere gentem.

It required the greater part of the eighteenth century to rebuild what the genius of Henry IV. had established in twelve years of wise government, and what Louis XIV. had pulled down in thirty-four years. Let us see now who were the makers of the Edict of Toleration. There were three principal agencies: (1) the leaders of the Protestant congregations and their addresses; (2) the demands of public opinion; (3) the help given by the leaders of the American revolution to the Huguenots.

The first use that the Protestant congregations, restored and reorganized by Antoine Court, made of their recovered synods was to ask from the king the reëstablishment of their former liberty. On disobeying the royal edicts which forbade any form of worship, any preaching, the leaders felt bound, like the early Christians under the Roman emperors, to apologize for their behavior and to explain that, nevertheless, they ought not to be mistaken for rebels, since they meant to remain loyal to their king. For instance, in 1746 Antoine Court, by order of the synod of 1746, composed a great apology, which was revised by the ministers of the refugees in Holland. In this he asserted, not only the loyalty, but the love, of the Huguenots for the king of France. The same synod ordered all churches to keep

a fast and to say prayers for the recovery of Louis XV., then severely ill. In 1747 another memoir of their claims was sent to the court of Versailles, but it was not answered. After 1755, besides the deputy-general, du Plan, who lived at London and interceded through the Protestant powers, the French Protestants had in Paris a secret agent, who was very probably helped by a committee of influential persons, and who applied to Count St. Florentin, the minister intrusted with Huguenot affairs, to redress the most crying injustices, and secure, for instance, the deliverance of the Huguenot galley slaves. The office was held by Leconte de Marcillac, an officer of the Conti regiment, who procured the interview between the prince of Conti and Paul Rabaut in April, 1755, and afterward by Court de Gébelin, the son of Antoine Court, who, by his reputation as a philologist and his connection with all the learned men of Paris, was able frequently to procure the pardon of condemned Huguenots.

In 1774 the Protestant churches, on Gébelin's suggestion, sent a new request to the king, in which, after having recalled the loyalty of their fathers to Henry IV., then to Louis XIII. during the civil war of the Fronde, and, lastly, to Louis XV. during the war of 1746, they added these touching words: "The only fault we are guilty of is to celebrate our worship of God despite the edicts forbidding it. However, can this disobedience, which seems to us legitimate, appear as a crime in your eyes? Nothing is purer than our purpose. We should like to reconcile what we are responsible for to our conscience with what we are responsible for to your authority."

But none of these requests moved the corrupt heart of Louis XV. The resolutions of the assemblies of the Gallican church succeeded in checking all the efforts of the synods and of the leaders of our churches. They had to wait for another and more humane king.

Fortunately, they were not alone in that hard struggle for religious liberty. The spirit of all Europe worked to the same end, and we shall now see how they found powerful allies in France, too, in the so-called "philosophers." Montesquieu and Voltaire were in the eighteenth century the two foremost champions of toleration. The former, in his *Lettres Persanes* (1728), having quoted the example of Persia, which, by proscribing Guebras and Armenians, caused its agriculture and industry to be ruined, says: "Reasoning without prejudice, I do not know that it would not be better that there should be several religions in a kingdom. It has been observed that people following religions only tolerated prove more useful to their country than those belonging

to the church of the majority; because, being excluded from public charges, they perform the most difficult duties of society." Is not this a clear allusion to the condition of the Huguenots?

Voltaire was the most obstinate advocate of toleration in that time. As a young man he extolled Admiral Coligny's heroism in his poem of *Henriade* (1722), and stigmatized the fanatical policy of Catherine de Medici, which brought on the massacre of St. Bartholomew forty years afterward. When an old man he pleaded with juvenile vigor the cause of Calas's memory and of the exiled Sirven, two Protestants unjustly condemned to death by the parliament of Toulouse, and secured from the parliament of Paris and from the government the reversal of the verdicts. One must read his Letters to his Friends to understand how near to his heart lay the cause of the oppressed French Protestants. Here are some extracts: "We must absolutely draw the truth from that Toulousian well! We ought to rouse all Europe, in order that its shouts of indignation may strike like thunder the ears of the judges. I will give up this cause only on dying." And after the private council had quashed the verdict at the court at Toulouse, he cried: "The family of Calas will get justice. As for the galley slaves, it will require a little more time and skill. I am always working for liberty of conscience and liberty of trade, two things which, in my opinion, ought never to be separated. The revision of the Calas suit will procure to you Huguenots a toleration which you have never enjoyed since the revocation of the edict of Nantes. I know, indeed, that you will be damned in the future world, but it does not seem to me right that you be persecuted in the present."

The economists and the contributors to the "Encyclopedia" were no less in favor of the repeal of the Edict of *Revocat*, because, like Vauban and Count de Boulainvillers, they knew what heavy losses the emigration, caused by that act and by the later complementary edicts, had inflicted on the public wealth of France. One above all, Turgot, is worth quoting, because he proclaimed the maxims of liberty with a clearness and fulness that have not been surpassed even by the champions of the French Revolution. In his "Letters on Toleration" in the *Conciliator* he started from Christ's toleration and from the maxims of the holy Fathers, and severed at once, sharply, all civil questions from matters concerning conscience. "Every civil meeting which is seditious should be forbidden. On the contrary, every religious assembly should be permitted. Every man is able to discern the truth of religion. Did Louis XIV. know more about these matters

than Le Clerc or Grotius? No religion has the right to require any other protection than that of liberty; moreover, a religion loses all its privileges when its dogmas or rights are contrary to the interests of the state. It is most dangerous to rally all men to the defense of the rights of conscience. No religion can claim anything more than the submission of the conscience. The state has no right to establish a religion as official, because religion is founded only on personal persuasion. The old maxim 'One land, one faith, one tongue,' has brought about only curses, like the crusade against the Albigenses, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, and the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. Whosoever will make religion a persecutor abuses it, because the characteristics of Christ's religion are gentleness and charity."

Consequently, when Turgot became minister of Louis XVI., he supported all measures in favor of the Protestants; for instance, he signed the acts to release the two Protestant galley slaves who were left on the king's galley (1774). Another class besides the philosophers and economists were, too, in favor of the improvement of the civic position of the Huguenots. They were the best men among lawyers and statesmen. I have already quoted the generous pleas of Servan and Rupert de Montclar in favor of the restitution of civil rights to the Huguenots. The proposal of Montclar dated from 1750, seventeen years after Gilbert de Voisin, attorney-general at the parliament of Paris, had composed two memoirs on the means of providing the Huguenots of France with the registration of their births, marriages, and deaths. In concluding, he asked for them two more privileges: (1) that they might be permitted to pray together with a few relatives, friends, and servants; and (2) that the governors should give to some trustworthy ministers safe conduct to perform their ministerial duties among private persons (1768). Lamoignon de Malesherbes, the grandson of the cruel Basville who persecuted the Huguenots in Languedoc, a friend of Turgot and of Dr. Benjamin Franklin, who became minister to Louis XVI.'s court in 1774, shared these views. He could not admit as compatible with justice or reason that a whole people should be condemned to see their children branded as bastards in order to punish them for the heresy of their fathers; and he wrote two memoirs on the marriages of Protestants, in which, although trying to save Louis XIV.'s memory from the reproach of injustice, he showed that the state of things in his reign was unworthy of a Christian nation (1785).

Baron de Breteuil, minister of the royal house, and De Vergennes, the able minister of foreign affairs, were of the same opinion. The

former presented to the king, Louis XVI., a memoir on the position of the Calvinists in France, the causes of their sufferings, and the remedies which should be employed.

As for Gravier de Vergennes, although brought up, like Voltaire, by the Jesuits, and a zealous Roman Catholic, he resolutely pleaded the cause of the Huguenots at the private council. "He persistently urged," says M. de Hennin, "the necessity of amending the mistakes made by Louis XIV., which had brought so much suffering upon France. He took so much interest in the question of procuring civic rights for the non-Catholics that he conceived the worst opinion of those who tried to thwart the fatherly purpose of the king in this matter. He did not believe that one could be a Christian and a Frenchman without wishing that so large a part of our people should no longer have the choice between humiliation at home and exile."

Is not this a beautiful testimony of a contemporary both to his patriotism and to his liberal ideas? You will not wonder that such a man was the minister who signed the treaty of friendship between France and the rising republic of the United States of North America.

But all these efforts would not have succeeded, perhaps, if the friendly intercourse between America and France had not brought to Paris men who knew the value of religious liberty, and how worthy of it were the French Huguenots. I refer, of course, to Benjamin Franklin and the later delegates who came to conclude the treaty with England. Franklin very soon became at Paris a great favorite, not only among scholars — he had been elected a member of our Academy of Sciences for his researches in electricity — but also among the students and other young Frenchmen. His house at Passy was the rendezvous of all people who were concerned with the advancement of science or the improvement of the moral conditions of mankind. His personal appearance added to the influence exerted by his superior mind. He was the first gentleman who wore no wig, and everybody, especially the young men, greatly admired his flowing white hair. It is a characteristic feature of that great citizen that, in addition to the questions he had to deal with, he pleaded for that miserable people of outlaws, the Huguenots, and interceded on their behalf with the ministers of Louis XVI. "The Protestants," so writes Bachaumont in his diary, on the 24th of November, 1778, "are expecting a settlement of their legal condition. The parliament [of Paris] is dealing with this matter, the ministers have won over some Roman Catholic prelates, and the influence which Necker enjoys [he was then secretary of the treasury],

joined to Dr. Franklin's solicitations, will be sufficient to silence the cries of the Roman Catholic clergy." From another document we know that Dr. Franklin received a Protestant minister of Poitou, Jarousseau, and introduced him, for a similar purpose, to Malesherbes, and perhaps to the king himself.[1]

Four years later came the four American delegates who were commissioned to arrange the terms of the treaty with England. Two of them, Jay and Laurens, were descendants of Huguenot refugees, and although we find no documentary evidence, it is yet very probable that they were not inactive in the matter in which their French coreligionists were so much concerned. As for Jay, we will soon give an indirect proof of this assumption. But the man who, although not acting openly, was directing the whole negotiation was none less than George Washington, and here we have direct proof from Lafayette's memoirs and letters. Every American knows the true friendship which had sprung up between these two men so different as to age and character. One thing united their hearts: a common love for liberty and justice. Therefore their private conversation — especially during the visit which Lafayette made at Mount Vernon, in the autumn of 1784 — must often have turned on the "great French injustice," viz., the persecution of the Huguenots; and Washington had no difficulty in persuading his young friend that it would be an act worthy of his name to rescue them from this kind of captivity. Lafayette, indeed, directly after he came back, set to work, and on May 11, 1788, was able to write to Washington: "The French Protestants are oppressed by an intolerable despotism. Although there is at present no open persecution, they are yet at the mercy of every whim of the king, of the queen, of the parliament, or of a minister of state. Their marriages are not legal; their wills without legal validity; their children branded as bastards; their persons only worthy of the halter. I should like to bring about a change in their condition, and for that purpose I will, under some pretense, with the permission of M. de Castries and of another (probably Malesherbes), visit their principal seats. Afterward I will try to get the support of M. de Vergennes and of the parliament, together with the help of the lord chancellor. This work requires much time, and is not without trouble for me, because nobody would give me a written command or support me openly. Nevertheless I will venture it.

"Do not reply to me in this matter, except to say that you have received my letter in cipher, brought by Mr. Adams. But when, in

[1] See PELLETOUX, *Le pasteur du désert.*

the course of the autumn or the winter, you hear that something has been done, I wish you to know that I shared in the work."

Is it not thus evident that Washington was much concerned in the condition of the Huguenots in France? Lafayette, indeed, during the summer of 1785, made a journey to Montpellier, where he made the acquaintance of M. de Poitevin, a Protestant astronomer, and to Nismes. In the latter place he had an interview with Paul Rabaut and his son, Rabaut Saint Étienne, to whom he suggested to go to Paris and see Malesherbes, who was preparing the bill for the civic rights of the Protestants. We are told that Lafayette even attended a meeting at the Desert, and was so much delighted by all that he saw and heard that he kissed the venerable M. Paul. He then forwarded the news to Washington, who gave him the following advice: "My most ardent wishes attend your enterprise. But do remember, my dear friend, that it is a part of the strategic art to reconnoiter the field before advancing too far ahead. One has often done more in making progressive trenches than with an assault by open force." In October, 1786, Lafayette wrote to his wise adviser: "You will be pleased to hear that I expect confidently to see the condition of the Huguenots much improved. Not, indeed, as much as it ought to be, but, at least, the cruel laws of Louis XIV. will be greatly amended." Three months afterward Lafayette wrote again to Washington: "It is not probable that the matter concerning the Huguenots will be put before the Assembly of Notables, because it might be checked there by the claim of the clergy and of a bigoted party. We shall reach our aim by some means, and soon, as I hope. Nothing prevents the king, if he disdains the complaints of the opposing members, from solving that important problem himself. Since we have the disadvantage of the royal power, let us at least use it for our purpose. It would be the easier, as the Roman Catholic clergy, if not consulted, would not try to oppose, and as a more liberal system would promote the public welfare."

And, at last, on May 3, 1787, Lafayette wrote to John Jay, then secretary of state: "On the last day of our session (of the Assembly of Notables) I was fortunate in making in my committee (*bureau*) two motions which were almost unanimously voted: the one for the sake of the French Protestant citizens and the other for the revision of our criminal laws. I send you the resolution voted by our board, as it was presented by our president, Count d'Artois, to the king, who accepted it kindly. I was the more glad, as a similar proposition

concerning the position of the Protestants had been checked in the parliament. We are so far from religious liberty that, even when we speak about toleration, we must be careful of our words. I was generously supported by a learned and virtuous Roman Catholic prelate, the bishop of Langres." Here is an abstract of the latter's speech: "I support General Lafayette's motion with other reasons than his own. He spoke as a philosopher; I shall speak as a bishop. Now, I say that I like Protestant services in churches more than in camp-meetings, and ordained ministers more than lay exhorters."

As Lafayette said that the victory was won only after a long struggle, we have, now, to go back some ten years in order to explain the preparation for the Edict of Tolerance. The question of the civic rights of the Protestant citizens had been put almost at the same time under consideration of the privy council and of the parliament of Paris. Legouvé, a barrister, presented a request on their behalf before the former; and councilor de Bretignères before the latter. We do not know the result of Legouvé's request; but as for the parliament, which for twenty years had settled as a rule of jurisprudence that whosoever would contest the legitimacy of children the issue of Protestant marriages was not to be heard, it gave a favorable ear to Bretignère's speech. Consequently, it expressed to the king the wish that the births, marriages, and deaths of the non-Catholics should be registered by other officers than the Roman Catholic. But in vain. The influence of the Roman Catholic clergy, which was very rich, especially at a time when the civic power wanted money in order to cover the deficit, was still powerful, and, in spite of the efforts of Franklin, Bretignère, Lacretelle, and others, the king sent an order to the parliament to deal no more with this matter (December 3, 1778). The Roman Catholic clergy were exulting over their adversaries, and through the medium of Mgr. Dulau, archbishop of Arles, presented to the king a memoir thundering forth against what they called the "bold enterprises of the Huguenots," and they drew from the weak Louis XVI. the promise that "he would always oppose the establishment of any other than the Roman Catholic worship." Nevertheless, under the pressure of public opinion and of the continued efforts of the American delegates, the matter was again taken under consideration before the parliament of Paris by Robert de Saint Vincent, a chancellor of the grand chamber. Referring to the wishes of an Assembly of Notables (1626) and to the royal declarations of Louis XIII. (1627), he asked that the government should resume that equitable position toward the Calvinists and, according

to Louis XIV.'s promise, should solve the question of the civic registration of their marriages and births. After a short deliberation, parliament decided that St. Vincent's speech should be spread upon the records of parliament, and that the first president should call upon the king and entreat him to grant civic rights to the Protestants. At the same time, Louis XVI. had received from Baron de Breteuil and Malesherbes, then ministers of state, reports with full information concerning the matter. You know the rest. A motion similar to that brought before parliament was proposed by Lafayette, and carried by the Assembly of Notables (May 24), and on November 19, 1787—a memorable day in Huguenot history—Louis XVI., attended by the princes and peers of the kingdom of France, came to the court of parliament to present the Edict on the Civic Rights of Protestants, which had been prepared by Baron de Breteuil and Lamoignon de Malesherbes. What a significant circumstance it was that the Act of Toleration and Justice was for a great part the work of the grandson of that cruel Lamoignon de Basville who for thirty years had been the implacable persecutor of the Huguenots in Languedoc! As his Roman Catholic friends rebuked him for being too much in favor of the Protestants, Malesherbes answered, smiling: "My grandfather did so much harm to them. May I not be allowed to be kind to them?" And on the same day he had as guests at his house Rabaut St. Étienne, the young Protestant minister, and General Lafayette.

The edict of 1787 consisted of thirty-seven articles. Of the most important ones we mention: Art. I, which runs as follows: "The Roman Catholic apostolic religion will continue to enjoy alone the privilege of public worship in our kingdom. The births, marriages, and deaths of our subjects who belong to it can, in no case, be registered otherwise than according to the rites and usages of said religion."

As for the Protestants, they obtained four concessions, viz.:

(1) They were permitted to live in France and to practice trades or industries, without being troubled for the sake of their religion.

(2) They were allowed to celebrate legal marriages before certain officers of justice.

(3) The births of their children must be registered by the royal judges.

(4) Measures were taken for the burial of those who could not be buried according to the Roman Catholic rite.

The parliament of Paris not only voted the edict, but also made some useful additions to it, viz.: (1) It revoked the barbarous laws which had been made against the Protestant ministers and the so-called "relapsed

heretics." (2) It provided ways for the restitution to Huguenots of possessions and property unjustly forfeited. (3) It provided that the Huguenots should be no more required to show the certificates of Roman Catholics for the practice of trades; but, strangely enough, they were excluded from all appointments as judges, teachers, or aldermen.

On the whole, the edict of November 19, 1787, was a great act of justice and of good-will toward the Protestant dissenters, who had been treated so long as outlaws and rebels. It reflects great credit on the king and on the queen, Marie Antoinette, who had shown interest in the condition of the Protestants as the worthy sister of Emperor Joseph II. of Austria, and on the ministers of state and the councilors of parliament who had shared in its preparation. It was highly approved on both sides of the Atlantic, in France and America, and indeed everywhere where hearts could beat for liberty and humanity; and, shame to say! was criticised only by an assembly of Roman Catholic clergy (1788). A prelate, the bishop of La Rochelle, through a circular letter, even advised his clergy to disobey the edict. It was, of course, among the Protestants that the edict was received with shouts of applause, because it opened to them a new era of liberty and justice, after a long period of injustice and oppression. The things foretold by the Cevenol prophets were realized. From the remotest parts of southern France you could see Protestant families, sometimes old, white-haired men and women, coming with their children and grandchildren to the royal judge, in order to have their marriages and those of their sons and daughters registered. The joy overflowed all hearts. Rabaut St. Étienne thought it necessary to send a circular letter to eighty ministers or elders in the Languedoc, advising them to refrain from public signs of rejoicing, lest they should offend their Roman Catholic neighbors and lead to riots. The old Huguenot ministers, who had for a long time preached in the Desert secretly, the venerable Paul Rabaut, Vernezobre, and others, who had escaped the sword hanging over their head, could now sing Simeon's hymn, "*Nunc demitte servum tuum!*" But certainly, in their thanksgiving, they did not forget the powerful support given to them by their American brethren in the most fitting way. Another link of friendship had been made between France and America. While the Americans owed their political liberty partly to the assistance of France, the French nation in turn owed religious freedom chiefly to the efforts of the leaders of the American revolution.

GASTON BONET-MAURY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF PARIS,
France.

THE ESSAY "CONTRA NOVATIANUM."

As is well known, it was necessary for Harnack, in preparing his great History of Doctrine, to examine the single authors in a most exact manner. Of course, Novatian came in for his share of observation, and on this occasion Harnack was led to pay especial attention to the essay against Novatian that is contained in the "Quæstiones Veteris et Novi Testamenti" which have been preserved for us in the works of Augustine. Harnack has lately taken up the whole subject of this essay and its surroundings.[1]

We have a very valuable commentary on the Pauline epistles, which has for centuries been passed along in the works of Ambrosius, so that the author, who cannot be Ambrosius himself, has received, by way of preëminence, the name Pseudo-Ambrosius, or rather Ambrosiaster. Now, the "Questions upon the Old and New Testament" seem to be from this Ambrosiaster, and the place where they were written is Rome. The time of the composition can be fixed quite nearly by the circumstance that Eusebius is dead, but that Arianism is still the chief heresy for the author; that Christmas already falls on December 25; that the heathen are called "pagani;" that the presbyters and deacons are no longer supposed to live as married men, and that it is about three hundred years since the fall of Jerusalem. The heathen are not very far below the Christians, for the author once names them "Romani" and elsewhere shows that they are not under the deepest ban. It is, then, possible to date this work after the death of Julian and, say, between the years 370 and 380 A. D. The author must have been a presbyter at Rome, and there are even signs that seem to point to his having the rank of senator.

Some of the "Questions" were undoubtedly written by other authors, and it is of peculiar interest to ask whether the treatise "Contra Novatianum," which is numbered "Question 102" (pp. 458–72), is from that Roman presbyter, or whether it is by an older or by a younger hand.

Harnack first gives a summary of the essay, really almost a translation of it, dividing it into thirteen chapters. The last two chapters, which are especially important, he translates exactly. He then observes that, although some points, like the references to persecutions and the

[1] In the *Abhandlungen Alexander von Oettingen zum siebensigsten Geburtstag gewidmet*, von Freunden u. Schülern (München: Beck, 1898); the remainder of which was reviewed in this JOURNAL, October, 1898, pp. 863–5. Harnack's essay is also reprinted separately.

direct address used toward Novatian, look like a book from the time of Novatian, yet this essay is by the same Roman presbyter from the last third of the fourth century who wrote the rest of the "Questions." In order to prove this he brings forward a number of interesting correspondences. For example, we find in this essay and in two others of the "Questions" the critical remark that the third psalm is later than the fiftieth psalm; the fact that a man in high position should keep himself free from business and its questionable practices is referred to here and in other of the "Questions;" and among other curious coincidences is one that apparently offers to us the first case of the use of the term "ecclesiastical law" (*jus ecclesiasticum*). On p. 77 (p. 24 of the reprint), in a note that is continued from the preceding page, Harnack gives all the Scripture citations in this essay "Contra Novatianum;" he also remarks that the author does not cite the epistle to the Hebrews and does not know that the Novatians appealed to that epistle.

Harnack then points to the fact that this tract presents us with one of the two most impartial accounts of Novatianism, the other being that of the Novatian Sympronianus. The picture is also a complete one. The essence of the Novatian doctrine is the following: The church is the body of Christ, and must therefore be kept holy as Christ is holy. Baptism, in which all sins are forgiven, makes each single member a member of Christ; all together form the body of Christ. The church has, upon repentance, forgiveness for all sins that are committed after baptism—even for murder; for two sins alone can no forgiveness be found here on earth, since they are, in the strict sense, the sins against God: these are idolatry and whoredom. For idolatry there is no forgiveness, because Christ said squarely and without limitation: "Who denies me, him will I also deny." The necessary consequence of this is that this sin, however different its sources and its accompaniments at various times may be, is identical with the sin against the Holy Ghost. Of this sin alone is it declared that it can be forgiven neither in this world nor in the future world. In baptism we have, after the forgiveness of all our sins, received the Holy Ghost, and we should, from this time onward, not sin against the Holy Ghost. If we do it, do sin thus, we lose in fact the Holy Ghost that we received in the act of baptism. There is, however, only one baptism. And whoredom is also not to be forgiven upon earth. For, according to the apostle, all other sins are outside of the body, but the whoremonger sins against the body. The body that the apostle means here

is the body of Christ. Therefore whoredom is equivalent to sacrilege and is precisely the same as the denying Christ by idolatry. Hence the church cannot again receive into her communion either an idolater or a whoremonger. For these have committed the sin against God, which the church can in a logical way have no power to loose. She must, nevertheless, preach to these sinners repentance, and they must continue in repentance until their end, for the call to repentance is unlimited in Scripture, although the announcement of the fruit of repentance, of remission, is not unlimited. That is, God can accept these sinners again, but we men know nothing about it. The Scripture proofs for this doctrine are Matt. 10 : 33; Paul's command to put away the evil ones from among us, 1 Cor. 5 : 1 ff.; 6 : 18, and, a favorite passage of Novatian's, Peter's doubting answer to Simon Magus, Acts 8 : 22. The call to repentance in the letters in the book of Revelation, and 2 Tim. 2 : 20 f., do not count here, because they refer, not to Christians, but to the unbaptized; not to the church, but to the world. In spite of the clear commands of the Scriptures, the great church (the church in general) receives again idolaters and whoremongers. That is her total self-destruction. For in the church all form one body, namely the body of Christ, and therefore the evil ones contaminate the good ones, and the whole body is destroyed. Even though they have the correct "professio" and "traditio," they have really lost their salvation, and they wear the name of Christian without any right, seeing that it only belongs to the true church. They cannot have any communion with the true church. True Christians are only to be found in Novatian's society, and the Christians should call themselves, not only Christians, but also Novatians, so as to distinguish themselves from the false Christians. Novatian led the pure church out from the false one, and gathered the true Christians together. Besides, in the false church they give the body of Christ to open sinners, and they endure priests who lead a repulsive life. How can the ministrations of such priests be effectual? In the true church, on the contrary, all the members are "pure ones," or "holy."

This portrayal of the doctrine of Novatian is a welcome addition to the corresponding sections in the Histories of Doctrine. At the same time Harnack raises the question whether this picture from the essay "Contra Novatianum" is altogether correct for Novatian himself, whether there be not points that arose in the society after Novatian's death. He thinks that there can be doubt only upon four points: (1) Did Novatian put whoredom on a level with idolatry, and therefore say

that it was not to be forgiven on earth? This question he answers in the affirmative, with all probability on his side. Not only was the conjunction of whoredom with idolatry a common thing in the Old Testament and in the older church, but also in one passage in Quæst. 50 (of Part I) we find the severe treatment of whoredom referred to Novatian himself. Of course, it would not be at the first moment that this question came up, but only after a certain time of peace in the church had placed the apostates in the background. (2) Did Novatian identify the denial of Christ with the sin against the Holy Ghost? This question Harnack is unwilling to decide. The difficulty lies in the fact that Novatian clearly leaves the possibility open that the sin of idolatry be forgiven even after baptism, that is to say, by God in the other world, whereas the sin against the Holy Ghost in the gospel is declared to be altogether unforgivable. Perhaps the solution is to be found in the possibility that Novatian did not consider the sin against the Holy Ghost as absolutely unforgivable, in that he did not take the "in futurum" as more than relative. (3) Did Novatian object to the bestowing of the Lord's supper on the sinners? No doubt, answers Harnack. To give the body of the Lord to those who had soiled themselves with idolatry was the abomination of desolation. The least that could be demanded of the church was that the communion of the Lord's supper should represent the communion of the saints. This demand has ever since continued to be made in the history of the church, down to the schismatical movements in Dutch Calvinism and in the Calvinism of the lower Rhine in modern times. (4) Did Novatian consider the ministrations of unworthy priests as inefficient? This is the most important of these four questions. It has been supposed that this question did not come up until Donatism. After a discussion of all the evidence, Harnack thinks that Novatian doubtless insisted upon it that both the "professio" and the "conversatio" of the priest must be Christian. The Donatistic crisis did not bring this question into the church for the first time; it only addressed itself to a particular mode of putting this question which for three generations had stirred the western church, partly in secret and partly openly.

In order to gain a vantage-ground for the last determination touching the author of the essay "Contra Novatianum," Harnack writes a page that I must reproduce intact:

> The fundamental question of the history of religion in the West — in a certain manner of all religious history of a higher class — was discussed in the Montanistic, Hippolytistic, Novatian, and Donatistic conflicts in the course of two centuries. Does

in religion personal inspiration and a holiness of life that corresponds to that inspiration express the essence of the thing, or is that essence to be found in a "saving good" and in the "faith" directed toward that good? The latter conviction was victorious, and with it a certain second-class religion — we might call it the ecclesiastical religion — was established, in which, nevertheless, the warmth and independence of religion can grow in a peculiar way. The question that pends between Catholicism and Protestantism is in certain respects only a subsidiary question. For both stand upon the ground measured off by Augustine after denying the claims of Novatianism and of Donatism. The distinction that has arisen within the ecclesiastical religion results from the different conception of the "saving good" (either as more objective and magical or as forming the basis of a personal relation), and of "faith" (as obedience or as confidence). That distinction results also further from the bold stroke of Catholicism in recognizing the "original religion" in spite of all, and in incorporating the "religiosi" into itself under the point of view of higher piety, while Protestantism exerts itself to reach the higher aim of unfolding the "original religion" out of "faith" and "regeneration" itself. In Augustine's theses the struggle between the original religion, which in truth only held fast to a very small portion of its claims, and the ecclesiastical religion reached its temporary conclusion. The universality of this great thinker showed itself in the fact that he so sketched the ecclesiastical religion that even then alongside of the Catholic peculiarity the peculiarities of the Evangelical (Protestant) religion announced themselves, and that the rights of the original religion are to be expressed both in the form of the recognized monasticism and in the deeper conception of the "fides."

With this as a basis Harnack then shows that Augustine not only owed much to other predecessors, but also to this Roman presbyter, the author of this essay. In closing Harnack alludes to the curious fact that the writer avowedly writes in the *defensive*. This adds new light for the position of the Novatian church at Rome in the year, let us say, 370. The Novatian bishop received Symmachus the fugitive and had influence enough to secure his pardon from Theodosius. And our orthodox presbyter, in Rome itself, writes not aggressively, but apologetically.

CASPAR RENÉ GREGORY.
THE UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG,
Germany.

SOME ASPECTS OF PAUL'S THEOLOGY IN THE PHILIPPIAN EPISTLE.

II.[1]

M. MÉNÉGOZ, in his treatise *Le péché et la rédemption*, says that Phil. 3 : 8–10 contains the most precise statement of the Pauline doctrine of justification by faith. It seems to me that this opinion is just. The passage does not contradict any previous utterance of Paul, nor

[1] See the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, Vol. III, pp. 107–16.

does it present any new feature; but it exhibits as a single conception what are commonly regarded as two distinct elements of the righteousness of faith. These two elements are assumed to be separately treated in the epistle to the Romans. They are the initial, objective judicial act of declaring righteous, whereby a believer is placed in a state of reconciliation with God, and the establishment through faith of a vital union with Christ. I purposely use the words "regarded" and "assumed," because, both on the ground of this passage and of the epistle to the Romans, I do not regard this separation as justifiable. These two elements are inseparably interlocked in the apostle's conception of righteousness by faith. The distinction between justification and santification is largely technical. They represent, it is true, respectively, the initiation and the consummation of the work of righteousness; but Paul uses ἁγιασμός both of the state and of the process of santification; and that word in Rom. 6:19 is associated with the "walk in newness of life" rather than with the consummation of subjection to righteousness. Having become servants of righteousness, the readers stand committed to an *economy* of sanctification, in which they are to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord. The point is well stated by Liddon: "The δικαιοσύνη which God gives includes these two elements — acquittal of the guilt of sin, or justification in the narrower sense of the word, and the communication of a new moral life, 'that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us.' These two sides of the gift of δικαιοσύνη can only be separated in thought: in fact they are inseparable. . . . . The true righteousness is one, not two or more. The maxim, '*justitia alia justificationis, santificationis alia*,' is not Paul's. Paul knows nothing of an external righteousness which is reckoned without being given to man; and the righteousness which faith receives is not external only, but internal; not imputed only, but imparted to the believer. Justification and sanctification may be distinguished by the student as are the arterial and nervous systems in the human body; but in the living body they are coincident and inseparable" (*Analysis of Romans*, pp. 17 f.).

Justification, so far as it is an act following upon repentance and faith, is regarded by Paul as the initial stage of a condition of *actual* inward righteousness, which is to develop itself in the believer's experience as fruit from seed. I differ with Professor Bruce (*St. Paul's Conception of Christianity*, pp. 158 ff.), who claims that the two aspects of justification are separately treated by Paul in Romans. He says: "He (Paul) does not refer to the subjective aspect of faith as a renewing

power, till he has finished his exposition of the doctrine of justification. He takes up faith's function in establishing a vital union with Christ in the sixth chapter. . . . . Does not this amount to the exclusion of faith's sanctifying function from the grounds of justification?" I think not; for, as Dr. Bruce admits, Paul already alludes to the subjective aspect of justification in the opening of the fifth chapter. Being justified, we have (or let us have) peace with God, joy in the hope of glory and in tribulation and in God himself.

But, what is more to the point, Paul, in chaps. 3 and 4, does not treat of the *operation* of justification, but of the *essential quality* of justification, as being by faith and not by the law. When he does take up the operation of justification in chap. 6, he treats the two aspects in combination. He does not confine himself to what follows justification. He begins with the death to sin. With Christ we die to sin; we are raised up with him into a walk in newness of life. Union with him by the likeness of his death implies union with him by the likeness of his resurrection. Our old man was crucified with him that the body of sin might be done away, that so we should no longer be in bondage to sin. If we be dead with Christ, we shall also live with him; etc.

1. In our passage Paul represents the righteousness of faith as a *real* righteousness *in* the believer. It is not founded upon human merit. It is not a righteousness of legal obedience. It proceeds from God and comes to man through faith in Christ (vs. 9). It is not perfect (vss. 12–14). None the less, it is an actual righteousness in the man. Justification contemplates rightness — right feeling, thinking, and living. Faith is not a substitute for such rightness. It is its generative principle, its informing quality. God's plan of salvation is not intended to effect, by a mere legal adjustment, something which cannot be an actual fact. It is not true that God practically gives up the possibility of righteous men and allows the perfect righteousness of Jesus Christ to stand for it. God's intent is to make men personally righteous. Paul does not teach, nor does Scripture anywhere teach, that the requirement of personal righteousness is fulfilled for man by someone else, and that he has only to accept this substitute by faith. Rather Paul explicitly declares that God predestined his children "to be conformed to the image of his Son" (Rom. 8 : 29).

It is not necessary to discuss the meaning of δικαιοῦν, since the question does not turn upon that. It may perhaps be conceded that the *dominant* sense of that word is forensic, "to declare or pronounce

righteous." That that sense can be vindicated in every instance is questionable. But that question apart, it should be noted that the sense of a declared or imputed righteousness, if it belongs to δικαιοσύνη at all, is peculiar to Paul. Elsewhere it has the meaning of personal rightness or righteous quality. In the Septuagint it occurs in nine instances as the translation of חֶסֶד "kindness;" while צְדָקָה "justice" usually translated by δικαιοσύνη is, in nine cases, rendered by ἐλεημοσύνη and three times by ἔλεος.

2. This conception of a real righteousness in the believer is contrary to the familiar dogmatic explanation that δικαιοσύνη πίστεως is not a personal, but an imputed quality. According to this, the righteousness is not in the man, but in Christ, and Christ's righteousness is imputed or reckoned or set down to his account through his faith. This imputation works no subjective change in the man. It merely places to his account the righteousness of another. He is, though not actually righteous, judicially declared to be righteous. Thus Dr. Hodge: The imputation of the righteousness of Christ to a believer for his justification "does not and cannot mean that the righteousness of Christ is infused into the believer, or in any way so imparted to him as to change or constitute his moral character. Imputation never changes the inward subjective state of the person to whom the imputation is made. . . . .When righteousness is imputed to the believer, he does not thereby become subjectively righteous" (*Systematic Theology*, III, pp. 144 ff.). Thus justification, having its foundation in the imputation of Christ's righteousness, is only a declarative act whereby a man is pronounced righteous without any actual righteousness in him answering to the declaration, but solely on the ground of another's righteousness which, in some inexplicable way, is transferred to his credit. This is simply a legal fiction which reflects upon the truthfulness of God. God declares a man righteous when he is not righteous. "To Paul," says Sabatier, "the word of God is always creative and full of power. It always produces an actual effect. In declaring a man justified, therefore, it actually and directly creates in him a new beginning of righteousness" (*Apostle Paul*, p. 300).

3. This is clearly not the conception embodied in this passage. The righteousness of faith which Paul here desires for himself is a winning Christ and a being in Christ. This righteousness is first described generally as knowing Christ, and then, more specifically, as knowing the power of his resurrection and the fellowship of his sufferings, and being made conformable to his death. That is to say, the

righteousness of God by faith is a being and dwelling in Christ in such wise as that his resurrection, his sufferings, his death, become actual parts of Paul's experience and active forces in it. Christ is not apprehended merely as an object of trust. He is not known merely as an objective personality. The believer is taken up into his life, and his life possesses the believer, and becomes the prime motor and the informing principle of his being.

In short, the conception of the righteousness of faith here presented is not that of an external righteousness made over to the believer by a legal declaration, but a righteousness which is a real fact in the man, and which springs from union with the personal Christ. In this mystical union the life and power of Christ are transfused into the believer, so that, in a sense, the personality of Christ becomes his, and he can say, "For me to live is Christ," and "Not I live, but Christ liveth in me." The "old man," the natural *ego*, is crucified with Christ; the new man is raised up, and in the power of Christ's risen life walks in newness of life, in fellowship with the Father and with his son Jesus Christ. All the righteousness which inheres in that perfect personality becomes potentially his, from the moment that faith puts him into living connection with it. All the experience of Christ's life becomes a fact and a power in his experience. Did Christ die to sin? He also dies to sin. Was Christ justified from sin by death? So likewise is he. Did Christ rise from the dead? He rises from the death of sin, besides sharing finally in Christ's physical resurrection. The knowledge of Christ's death and resurrection is not merely an insight into the historical meaning of those facts. Did Christ suffer? The heavenly nature which he receives from Christ insures for him, as it did for Christ, the contradiction of sinners against himself. Was Christ perfected through suffering? He attains perfection by the same road. Does Christ live unto God? He is alive unto God through Jesus Christ, and all the powers of that divine life descend upon him and work in him to conform him to the image of the Son of God.

Says Calvin: "First it is to be held that, so long as Christ is outside of us and we are separated from him, whatever he has suffered and done for the salvation of the human race is useless and without significance to us. Therefore, in order that he may communicate to us what he has received from the Father, he must become ours and dwell in us. Hence he is called our 'Head,' and 'the first-born among many brethren;' while we in turn are said to be ingrafted into him and to put him on, because whatever he possesses is nothing to us until we coalesce

into one with him" (*Institutes*, III, 1). And again: "Christ, having become ours, makes us partakers of the gifts with which he is endowed. *We do not, therefore, view him as outside of us, so that his righteousness is imputed to us, but because we put on himself and are ingrafted into his body, he has deigned to make us one with himself. Therefore we boast that we have his righteousness*" (*Inst.*, III, 11). Similarly Luther: "Christ is God's grace, mercy, wisdom, strength, comfort, and blessedness. I say not as some *causaliter*, that is, that he gives righteousness and remains without. For in that case righteousness is dead, nay, it is never given. *Christ is there himself*, like the light and heat of the fire, which are not where the sun and fire are not" (*Werke*, Erlang. Ausg., Vol. XXXVII, 441).

4. This passage presents a conception of faith different from that implied in the imputative theory. According to that, faith is merely a medium by which the man is put in contact with something outside of himself—"a mere hand," as Professor Bruce puts it, "to lay hold of an external righteousness." According to Paul's teaching here, an ethical quality inheres in faith. Faith is a moral energy. It works by love. Righteousness, as already remarked, is effected in a believer by the transfusion into him of Christ's life and character; not by Christ's righteousness being placed to his account. To assert the latter is to fall back from the gospel upon the law. Paul says: "*Not* having a righteousness of my own which is *of the law;*" but if the righteousness of faith is legally and forensically imputed, it *is* of the law. Righteousness has its roots in personal relation to God. Sin is more than bad conduct. Bad conduct is the result of personal separation and estrangement from the Father, God. The terrible significance of sin lies in the break between a human life and its divine source; and the attainment of righteousness is possible only through the reëstablishment of the original birth-relation, as Christ declared in the words: "Ye must be born anew." The mere genealogical fact of sonship must be translated into a living, personal relation.

This is possible only through faith. A handbook of laws will not effect it. Rules will not establish personal relations. Precepts will not put a son's heart into a man. He will not love to order, nor obey because he is bidden, nor trust because a trustworthy object appeals to him, nor be meek and merciful because it is right to be so. Being righteous is not a matter of assent to a proposition. It is a matter of surrender to a person. Such surrender comes about only through faith, because only faith has in it that element which draws personalities,

lives, hearts together. Saving faith is an act of personal surrender. Hence faith does not count *instead of* righteousness. It counts as *making for* (εἰς) righteousness; with a view to righteousness, as tending to righteousness, as standing for righteousness in the sense in which the corn of wheat stands for the full corn in the ear, or the babe for the man. Therein is the value of faith. It is counted for what it is, not for what it is not. It is the prime agent in righteousness. The righteousness which is of God becomes in man the righteousness of faith, because in faith, which initiates the personal union of the man with Christ, lie enfolded all the possibilities of righteousness. All righteousness is possible to one whose personality is identified with Christ's. Faith is potential righteousness. Righteousness is begun, continued, and ended in the living contact of the man with the personal source of all righteousness; in the self-surrender which makes possible the inpouring and the appropriation of all heavenly forces.

"He hath made him to be sin for us who knew no sin, that we might *become* the righteousness of God in him." "Faith is that temper of sympathetic and immediate response to another's will which belongs to a recognized relation of vital communion. It is the spirit of confident surrender which can only be justified by an inner identification of life. Faith is the power by which the conscious life attaches itself to God; it is an apprehensive motion of the living spirit by which it intensifies its touch on God; it is an instinct of surrender by which it gives itself up to the fuller handling of God; it is an affection of the will by which it presses up against God, and drinks in divine vitality with quickened receptivity" (Henry Scott Holland in *Lux Mundi*, pp. 17, 18). There is no true faith in Christ without the indwelling of Christ. Paul makes the latter the criterion of the former (2 Cor. 13:5).

This is the conception of the righteousness of faith set forth in the Philippian epistle. It does not differ from the conception exhibited in Romans. Only the method of presentation is different. In neither epistle does Paul teach an imputed as distinct from an imparted righteousness. The dogma of imputed righteousness as commonly taught is not found in the New Testament. The righteousness which Paul sets forth is of God. It rests upon faith, and not upon works. It excludes human merit. It is not the man's own, but is all of Christ. The man has it only as he gets it from and through Christ. None the less it is a real righteousness in the man, and not another's righteousness set down to his account by a process of forensic bookkeeping. It

becomes his through that oneness with Christ which puts him in possession of all that there is in Christ. All things are his because he is Christ's. The act of faith places him in Christ, who was made unto him wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption. Justification is not a legal technicality; it is not a mere proclamation of forgiveness; it is not a mere judicial declaration that accounts are squared with the law. It is the act of the eternal divine life taking a poor, sinful human life up into itself and enfolding it, and throwing open to it all the riches of its own strength and sweetness and righteousness and immortality. It is justification of *life* in being justification by faith, for the just shall *live* by his faith. Christ is the life. The power of his resurrection is the power of his risen life; and so, to know Christ and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, is to be found in Christ, having the righteousness which is of God and which rests upon faith.

MARVIN R. VINCENT.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.
New York, N. Y.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

LEIBNIZ: THE MONADOLOGY AND OTHER WRITINGS. Translated with Introduction and Notes by ROBERT LATTA, M.A., D.PHIL. (Edin.), Lecturer in Logic and Metaphysics at the University of St. Andrews. Oxford: The Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde, 1898. Pp. xi + 437. $2.10.

ARE there signs of a return to Leibniz, of a revival of his philosophy? It would not be quite safe to say at once that there are, for only prejudice may incline one to think so. Indeed, if translations and doctors' theses, not to mention other works, more or less pretentious than these, which show the spirit, although not always the letter, nor even the name, of a particular philosophy, are the signs of revival, Leibniz can hardly be said to stand alone in the interest of the day. Historical study in philosophy, as in other branches, is reviving the past all along the lines. Leibniz, however, offers a great deal that is peculiarly satisfying to the large number of present-day thinkers who are in the reaction against both Kant and Hegel. In his conceptions of individuality, of the relation between consciousness and life, and of infinity and continuity in things both physical and spiritual, he is especially attractive. It cannot, then, be extravagant to imagine that something like a revival of his philosophy, a *specially* keen interest in his way of thinking, is under way.

And, in any case, a careful, appreciative study like that now before us cannot fail to awaken interest. Students of Leibniz will look far for a better book, and just because it is so much more than a mere translation with the conventional introduction. Dr. Latta's introduction (pp. 1–211), including a thesis (Parts II and III) that was accepted by the University of Edinburgh for the degree of doctor of philosophy, has in all four parts, as follows: I, "Life and Works;" II, "General Principles of the Philosophy;" III, "Detailed Statement," and IV, "Historical and Critical Estimate;" and it is a genuine contribution to the interpretation of Leibniz. It is true that in places, notably in his treatment of the preëstablished harmony (pp. 43 f.) and of the optimism (pp. 65 f.), he is not sufficiently critical. In these two doctrines

Leibniz is particularly vulnerable. They show a failure to realize all that was best in the system, being a sort of tribute to the traditional view of things, and they should accordingly have been examined most critically. Criticism is quite as important to understanding as exposition. Sympathy is not the only duty, even of friendship. But in the discussion of Leibniz' mathematics (pp. 74–86) Dr. Latta is very happy and, in spite of his brevity, very satisfactory. Not only does he here show an insight that has been lacking in others who have undertaken to expound Leibniz' philosophy, but also more or less directly he has cast light on the general philosophy of mathematics. Of course, as regards Leibniz, the concept of the infinitesimal is the most direct entrance to the monad. The monad has the old inscription over its door: "Let none but mathematicians enter here."

The historical and critical estimate (pp. 151–200) is too much like a series of notes. To set terms against each other that often are, but really ought not to be, opposed, is more historical than critical. True, the Peripatetics and the Atomists, Descartes and Spinoza, Kant and Fichte, Schopenhauer, Herbart, Hegel, and Lotze are all of them related philosophically to Leibniz, but, somehow, in this part of his work Dr. Latta can hardly be said to succeed in getting very much above his material. He does not succeed in showing a living and truly organic unity in the different systems with which he deals. His separate discussions, however, are all of them excellent in themselves. In what he has to say of Wolff, he makes very clear the inadequacy of Wolff's rendering of Leibnizianism, and so helps once for all to blast what has been almost an academic tradition.

Giving the same impression as these historical discussions are numerous appendices—five to the introduction and four more to the translations; all of them valuable in themselves, but still making the book suggest too strongly the shop in which it was made. With a certain method of work, perhaps the method prevailing today, notes and appendices may be necessary, but a reviewer can at least be forgiven the thought that they are not ideal. Indeed, it is to be said that, in Dr. Latta's case, the very ideal from which we are criticising him is really of his own making. His own book suggests or exemplifies in a very positive way what it does not always realize. Of the appendices the following should be mentioned: (A) "Formation of the Idea of Space" (p. 202); (D) "Leibniz's Logic" (p. 206); (F) "Leibniz and Bayle on the Multiplicity in the Monad" (p. 208);

and (I) "Growth of Leibniz's Theories regarding Force and Motion" (p. 351).

The translations (pp. 215–425), although not at all times smooth or free from foreign idiom, are careful and thoughtful. They include, besides the "Monadology," these other writings: "On the Notions of Right and Justice," "New System of the Nature of Substances and of the Communication between Them," "Explanation of the New System," "Third Explanation, etc.," "On the Ultimate Origin of Things," "New Essays on the Human Understanding — Introduction," and "Principles of Nature and of Grace." Thus, with Langley's translation of the "New Essays concerning the Human Understanding" and with the work of Duncan, English students are now in possession of a ready and almost complete presentation of Leibniz' work in philosophy.

ALFRED H. LLOYD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

STUDIES OF GOOD AND EVIL. A Series of Essays upon Problems of Philosophy and Life. By JOSIAH ROYCE, Professor of the History of Philosophy in Harvard University. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1898. Pp. xvii + 384. $1.50.

IN *Studies of Good and Evil* Professor Royce has brought together a number of papers written at different times and for various purposes, but bound together into a unity by the spirit in which they are conceived and the view of the world which they serve to illustrate. This view, well known under the name of ethical idealism, the author describes as "an interpretation of the universe as a realm whose significance lies in the ethical ideals that its processes realize." Such a doctrine, of course, involves a belief in the spiritual nature of reality, and to the exposition and defense of his faith in this matter four of the essays may be said to be devoted. Starting from an examination of the nature of consciousness, the conclusion is reached that the finite self is but a fragment of, or, better, an organic element in, a larger self or person, who includes within himself all conscious life, and who at the same time is the reality at the foundation of what we call the phenomena of nature. But this admitted, what shall we make of the presence of evil in such a world? This central mystery is faced in the opening paper, entitled "The Problem of Job." God is not to be thought of as looking down upon our conflicts from a height; our life is a part of his, and he therefore literally suffers in

us. The true problem, therefore, is, Why does God suffer? The answer given is that the highest good is the perfection of the personality, and this necessarily involves, from the very nature of the case, conflict and possible defeat, the struggle with pain, disappointment, and temptation. Our author then reviews the various other solutions that have been attempted, most elaborately, in "Tennyson and Pessimism," that of the first "Locksley Hall," which, sixty years later, it will be remembered, the poet repudiated with much bitterness.

Further papers introduce us to two teachers who represent points of view in many respects quite different from the writer's, but who are at one with him in the vital matter of the acceptance of the idealistic creed. They are Meister Eckhart, the thirteenth-century mystic, and Jean Marie Guyau, the gifted author of the *Non-Religion of the Future*. Finally the list is concluded by papers on Mr. Huxley's now famous *Romanes Lecture*, on the relation between intellectual development and perfection of character, on the conflict between the forces of good and evil in the breast of John Bunyan as made known to us in that wonderful bit of autobiography *Grace Abounding to the Chief of Sinners*, and on a different phase of the same conflict as illustrated in the "squatter riot" of 1850 in Sacramento.

The reader who has no time to become a specialist in philosophy, but who is interested in its problems, will demand of such a book as this that it bring him face to face with fundamental questions; that the exposition be clear, and that the author's knowledge of the subject be complete. The volume before us more than meets all these requirements. Of the importance of the problems discussed nothing need be said. The exposition is not only clear, but brilliant; while the range and accuracy of Professor Royce's knowledge are unexcelled among students of philosophy in America. We commend this collection of essays to the attention of all those who are interested in metaphysics and ethics.

FRANK CHAPMAN SHARP.

THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN.

THE PREPARATION FOR CHRISTIANITY IN THE ANCIENT WORLD. A Study of the History of Moral Development. By R. M. WENLEY, Sc.D., PH.D., Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Chicago: F. H. Revell Co., 1898. Pp. 194. $0.75.

THE non-professional student of Christianity has not had easy access to careful and discriminating information regarding the world

preparation for the gospel, so that this small book should be of service to many. It is a serial, belonging to the "Guild Textbooks of the Church of Scotland." The aim of the series is praiseworthy, "to deepen the intelligent interest of the laity in all questions connected with the origin, nature, history, and extension of the Christian religion." Professor Wenley's contribution to this end is to explain the successive stages of development through which the human race passed in its moral, social, and religious preparation for Christianity; and to show when, by what peoples, and how the various elements of life which produced this development came to humanity.

The book is written from the modern philosophical point of view. The author has already published several works treating of philosophy and religion, and here again we observe the scholarship, the clear thinking, the skill in expression, and the religious earnestness of the earlier works. Perhaps the strongest portion of the book is the first half of it, in which the spirit, motive, and content of the Greek philosophy are presented. With striking effect the value, and at the same time the limitations, of the Greek contribution to moral development are shown. The supplemental contribution came from Judaism, whose "eternal message was the unity of God and the oneness of real manhood in him" (p. 105). He finds, and truly, the uniqueness of Israel in her prophets and their utterances. The contribution of Rome to the preparation for Christianity was the political unification of man, with its consequent development and interchange of ideas, which opened the way for a universal religion and a universal brotherhood under one supreme God.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LIFE, DEATH, AND IMMORTALITY. With Kindred Essays. By WILLIAM M. BRYANT, M.A., LL.D., Instructor in Psychology and Ethics, St. Louis Normal and High School. New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1898. Pp. viii + 442. $1.75.

THESE essays are an outgrowth of a desire on the part of the author to interpret by means of modern scientific thought the fundamental conceptions constituting the core of Christian doctrine. The following subjects are treated: "Life, Death, and Immortality," "Oriental Religions," "Buddhism and Christianity," "Christianity and Mohamedanism," "The Natural History of Church Organizations," "The Heresy of Non-Progressive Orthodoxy," "Miracles," "Christian Ethics as Contrasted with the Ethics of Other Religions," "Eternity."

These topics are far too vast to admit of very satisfactory discussion in so short a space. The rationalistic point of view is maintained with rare consistency throughout the work. One wishes that the study had been made rather more intensive, especially in the treatment of Buddhism and Mohamedanism. The author claims that Buddhism is based on superstition. Christianity is the absolute religion, because it is the religion of reason, the abiding principle of the universe. The soul of man is immortal "because of the highly complex character of its essential life." Church organization in its various forms is both natural and necessary, as the outworking of certain dominating ideas or types of mind. Miracles are essentially psychical, and are only in appearance physical. The resurrection of Lazarus was his conversion. The resurrection of Jesus was a spiritual effect produced upon the minds of the disciples by meditating upon the life and words of the Master. The essay on "Eternity," the least satisfactory of any, is a personal review of the author's experience in arriving at his present stage of liberal views on religious doctrine.

ELIPHALET A. READ.

KALAMAZOO COLLEGE,
Kalamazoo, Mich.

THE PROBLEMS OF PHILOSOPHY. An Introduction to the Study of Philosophy. By JOHN GRIER HIBBEN, PH.D., Stuart Professor of Logic in Princeton University. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. 204. $1.

THIS work aims "to give a simple statement of the various schools of philosophy, with the salient features of their teachings, and to indicate the chief points at issue in reference to controverted questions." That which it attempts it achieves. It is accurate, clear, comprehensive; has in it no fog, dust, or darkness; hides nothing away in technicalities; and is just fitted for one who is about to enter upon a study of philosophy, or of its history, and wishes first for a general view of philosophical questions. The first chapter is "A Plea for Philosophy." The second states concisely the eight problems which are presented more fully successively in the remaining eight chapters. They are, in their order, as follows: the problems of being; of the world; of mind; of knowledge; of reason; of conscience; of political obligation; and of beauty. In the "Plea for Philosophy" the position is well taken and maintained that philosophy is not to be limited to an elect few, but that it is the common property and business of all; that, as reason is a universal human endowment, so

its exercise belongs to all. We know things only when we know the reason for things and the reason in things. A life, to be rational, must therefore be truly philosophical, whether it has to do with the ordinary industries, with poetry, with art, with religion, or whatsoever else. The elaboration of philosophical systems is only a more developed form of the same sort of rational thought that attends all rational activity. For this reason a current system of philosophy, if essentially false, speedily works mischief in the life and practice of a people, as in the days of the French Revolution; but if essentially true, it tends powerfully to keep men to safe and wise living. Thus "the problems of philosophy are practical questions of the day."

The chapter on "The Problem of Being" naturally occupies more space than any other. Of the three general theories, pluralism, dualism, and monism, the exposition of the latter is by far the most ample. The author takes up successively its three forms of materialism, spiritualism, and identity. We find here as elsewhere that he aims to do more than to set forth the problems and the main arguments by which they are supported or combated. He makes clear what is his own conviction. This is most noticeable in his treatment of materialism. There he not only argues against the doctrine as false, but condemns it as immoral in influence. One may cordially agree with him in this and yet hold that the avowed purpose of his book would rather forbid him either to advocate or to attempt to refute a doctrine; would require him only to exhibit the problems, state clearly the various attempted solutions, and perhaps indicate the lines of support or of opposition. The volume is too small for more than this. Even in a history of philosophy, that historian is most to be admired who best succeeds in presenting each philosophy in the light of its own ablest advocates, acting as their expositor. This feature is one among the many marked excellences of Falkenberg's *History of Modern Philosophy*. Our author, however, has not so far been drawn into a defense of his own views as to fail in giving an admirably clear summary of the main questions that have emerged under each of the great problems, a discriminating, helpful statement of the answers given by the different schools of thinkers, and the main grounds for those answers. He has also called attention throughout to the relations of the positions taken in solving one problem to those taken in the solution of others. The logical demand for system is thus emphasized. A careful study of this work will be of great use to one who is about to enter upon a course of philosophical study, or even to one who must

content himself with nothing further than this work itself. There is, perhaps, no other work that covers the ground so completely, and yet brings out so justly and concisely the great questions of philosophy and the answers thus far given them. GEO. D. B. PEPPER.

COLBY UNIVERSITY,
Waterville, Me.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF SACRED THEOLOGY. ITS PRINCIPLES. By ABRAHAM KUYPER, D.D., Free University, Amsterdam. Translated from the Dutch by Rev. J. Hendrik De Vries, M.A. With an Introduction by Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., of Princeton Theological Seminary. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. xxv + 683. $4.

THIS volume contains only about one-third of the original work from which it is translated, and if it is sufficiently well received, it may perhaps be followed by another. The original work is in every sense a *magnum opus*, and the same description may fairly be applied even to this portion of it. The introductory sketch of the author sets before us a most interesting personality, a man of varied gifts and accomplishments and of boundless activity. Dr. Kuyper is editor of a political daily and of a religious weekly paper in Holland; he is a member of the legislature, a political leader, and an advocate of religious and educational freedom; he is the virtual founder of a university and an influential professor in it; and he is a prolific writer, both for scholars and for the common people. In all these fields of labor he is a man of vast ability — so the brief biography affirms; and after reading the book one can well believe it.

Several characteristics immediately impress the reader. In style the author is exact, clear, ample, and sometimes eloquent. In use of terms he is mercilessly technical. In largeness of grasp upon his subject he is most remarkable. In spiritual feeling he is warm and earnest, and no one can fail to find his religious suggestions inspiring and helpful. In thought he is astonishingly abundant, making a book unusually full of matter. He seems to have thought of everything, and if his condensed arguments were all expanded, the book would almost make a library. Few persons will read it through, and the majority even of intelligent students will call it hard reading. Nevertheless the reading would be a profitable gymnastic to many, and the presentation of the subject, whether it proves

convincing or not, is in a high degree powerful and impressive. The work is marked by immense learning and ability, and by masterly grouping of material, and yet by qualities that will insure the deepest skepticism as to its conclusions, wherever these conclusions do not command complete assent.

The present volume "discusses all those questions which concern the place of theology among the sciences, and the nature of theology as a science with a 'principium' of its own." The author defines science, marks out the entire field of science, and exhibits the various departments of science in their organic and necessary relation among themselves; and he shows how theology as a science is related to all the others. The theology that he holds, defends, and represents as exclusively true is the Calvinistic theology of the reformers. This he frankly avows in his preface. He does not specify what particular form of this theology he holds, but he refers to "the theologians," "our theologians," and "the early theologians," evidently regarding the Reformed theology as essentially one, and as satisfactory in the mass. He rarely quotes or refers to any one, and, except in a single section, he cites little Scripture. To the theology which he thus adopts he is unflinchingly and heroically consistent. Probably a more thoroughly consistent theological treatise than this, from any point of view, has not appeared in our time. Such a treatise, indeed, it is hard to imagine.

Theology deals, not with religion, but with the knowledge of God. It seeks ultimately to conceive God as known to himself: this would be archetypal theology. But, of course, only ectypal theology is possible, dealing with such knowledge of God as he has given to men. Thus revelation is all that gives material to theology. Revelation has been given to man as sinful, and comes with remedial intent; therefore it brings a different knowledge of God from that which would have been given but for sin — different also from the knowledge that will exist hereafter, when the work of revelation, and of redemption, shall have been finished. Christian theology deals exclusively with this special knowledge of God, conditioned by sin. The "principium," or means of knowing, of theology is the self-revelation of God to the sinner. This self-revelation of God comes to us exclusively in the Scriptures; and "the substance of the knowledge of God, which comes to us from the special principium, is identical with the Holy Scripture." This identity is elaborately defended, and is firmly held throughout. The books of the Bible were made to be what they are,

both in substance and in writing, by the inspiration of God, and the canon of Scripture was made up by the same inspiration, so that the whole is divinely constructed as well as divinely breathed, and is exactly what God predestined it to be. All parts of it are to be regarded as alike in this respect, and all parts are hence available, after their kind, for the purposes of theology. Thus theology handles the knowledge of God that the Scriptures bring, and nothing else, save as this material is extended and re-presented in history and experience. It should be added that this result is not reached by way of a rigid and mechanical idea of inspiration. Rarely are strict results concerning inspiration reached by so comprehensive a discussion.

The "subject," or conceiving mind, in any science whatever, is not the individual scientist, but "the consciousness of humanity." In theology the subject is the consciousness of renewed humanity. Indeed, renewed humanity alone can be the true subject, whose conclusions are trustworthy, in any science; only through palingenesis can humanity become adequate to full discovery of truth in any field. "The only subject of *all* science is the consciousness of regenerated or re-created humanity; and that so large a part of scientific study can be furnished equally well by those who stand outside of this is simply because this building also admits a vast amount of hod-carrier service which is entirely different from the higher architecture." There are functions of our minds, the author affirms, that are uninjured by sin—though he does not draw the line between these and our other faculties, or show how these escaped contamination—and as long as men do not go beyond the use of these they can do trustworthy work in science. But, of course, in theology there is no room for such work, and God cannot be validly known at all except within the circle of palingenesis. Here alone does theology have place, and here alone can the ideas that are essential to it be at all apprehended.

These are some of the main positions that give character to the book. The applications of them are, of course, too many and various to be mentioned in a brief review. In some respects the author's attitude of mind is extremely unusual. His interest in universal science is broad and sincere, and yet all readers who do not occupy his doctrinal point of view are certain to shiver at his declarations of the impossibility of valid knowledge outside the regenerate life. These declarations are limited, it is true, and yet they are so strong and sweeping as to challenge instant rejection. In the modern forms of scientific thought the author takes little interest. To the doctrine of evolution

he gives only a few sentences, in which he waves aside the whole conception as inconsistent with that which is known in the realm of palingenesis. The drawing of philosophical and cosmological inferences he expressly reserves as the function of the regenerate alone. To the work of biblical criticism he is equally indifferent. He would not prohibit it, but it is impossible that he should regard it as a work to be favored and encouraged within the world of palingenesis. Himself a man of boundless intellectual activity and of vast acquirements, he would virtually close certain large fields of inquiry, declaring research in them to be at once inferior and untrustworthy. His attitude toward the world's learning and its intellectual work generally is certainly an unusual one, for so learned a man and so energetic a thinker.

The author, however, would doubtless accept the situation that is thus suggested. He would expect his view to be rejected by all the unrenewed, and by such among the regenerate as are Christian in heart but not in head, of whom he speaks. He anticipates such rejection and is not troubled, save as he is troubled by all the harm that sin has done. He feels that the claims of modern thought and the strict and consistent Reformed theology cannot both stand. Many will agree with him in this, but not all readers will agree with him as to which of the two claims it is that the book refutes.

The additional volume that is conditionally promised by the translator will present the author's discussion of the various departments of theology, which he likes to call bibliological, ecclesiological, dogmatological, and diaconiological. It is to be hoped that it may appear, for it cannot fail to be fresh and powerful.

WILLIAM N. CLARKE.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
Hamilton, N. Y.

BIBLICAL APOCALYPTICS: A Study of the Most Notable Revelations of God and of Christ in the Canonical Scriptures. By MILTON S. TERRY, D.D., Professor in the Garrett Biblical Institute. New York: Eaton & Mains; Cincinnati: Curts & Jennings, 1898. Pp. 510. $3.

THIS is an able and noteworthy volume. It attempts by sound methods of exegesis to give an interpretation of the apocalyptic portions of the Bible. The author treats them successively, apart from other Scripture, and thus seeks to discover the secret of their symbolism. Such treatment in English has long been a desideratum. Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos* partially supplies the need in German,

but the two books are written from widely different points of view: Gunkel seeks to explain the origin of the imagery, while Professor Terry seeks to solve its prophetic meaning. Such prophetic meaning as he discovers is of a healthy nature. The book is designed to correct that morbid brooding of sensitive minds over the "last things" which has been characteristic of much of the exegesis of the past, and which is exemplified in so much of the popular Christianity of the present day.

The book is also noteworthy in consequence of its open-minded attitude toward biblical criticism. The author has been won over to many of the positions established by modern criticism, and is generous toward the conclusions commonly classed as "critical," even when he does not hold them.

The book opens with a valuable introduction defining biblical apocalyptics. Next following this are brief chapters on "Apocalyptic Elements in Hebrew Song," the "Apocalypse of Creation," "Edenic Apocalypse of Sin and Judgment," "Apocalypse of the Antediluvian World," "Apocalypse of Noah and the Flood," "Apocalypse of the Dispersion of the Nations," "Apocalyptic Symbolism of the Tabernacle," etc., occupying some sixty-five pages of the book in all. Most of these chapters detract from the value of the work. There is included here much material which, it is assumed, was written to symbolize ideals, when, in fact, the interpreter has no adequate reason for thinking that the writers were conscious of doing anything else than narrating fact. The narratives of creation and the fall bear every evidence that to their authors they represented reality, not symbolism. The same may be said of most of the other portions. In Hebrew poetry there are doubtless symbolic elements, but most of this material is not apocalyptic, and to treat it as such creates confusion of thought. It may help the timid to accept scientific results to treat these narratives as symbolic for a time, but even for this purpose the process is of doubtful utility. Had this part of the book been omitted, with the exception of the introduction, and a treatment of the apocalyptic portions of the epistles of Paul introduced in the proper place, the value of the work would have been greatly increased.

Following this portion of the book some eighty pages are devoted to the apocalyptic portions of Isaiah, Ezekiel, Zecheriah, and Joel. The treatment which this material receives is to be commended. That these prophets consciously used highly wrought symbolism through which to express thair ideals there can be no doubt. The book then takes up the first of the real apocalypses, the book of Daniel. Professor

Terry holds to the unity of Daniel, and to its Maccabean date. Its main purpose is, he thinks, to set forth the great doctrine of God's dominion over all the kingdoms of the world. The great world-powers of Babylonia, Media, Persia, and Greece, he holds, are taken into account by the author. Dan. 7:13, 14 is made to speak, not of "the Son of man," but of "one like unto a son of man." This "one" is held, on the basis of vs. 27, to be personified Israel, virtually equivalent to Isaiah's "my servant Israel." This statement of the spirit and scope of Daniel is thoroughly sound and admirable. The interpretation is scholarly and consistent with Professor Terry's point of view. In some details the interpretation could, in my judgment, be improved, if more than one author were recognized in Daniel and the details of one part were not so freely read into another part; but this criticism applies to comparatively unimportant matters.

The most successful part of Professor Terry's book is its treatment of the "Apocalypse of the Synoptic Gospels," or the apocalyptic discourse of Jesus. This discourse, he believes, refers to one subject, not to two, and that one is the entrance of the Christ, through his church, upon the heavenly career of control in the crises of the world's affairs, of which the destruction of Jerusalem was the first. The literal meaning of "this generation" (Matt. 24:34; Mark 13:30) is insisted on, and the "all nations" (Mark 13:10) is understood to refer to the Roman empire. This is an interpretation which can be successfully defended on many grounds.

The treatment of the "Apocalypse of John" covers 230 pages of the book. It is acute and able, and merits the careful study of anyone who would understand this enigmatical apocalypse. Professor Terry's main thesis is that the prophetic visions of this book, like the prophecies of the discourse of Jesus, are being fulfilled by the gradual establishment of the kingdom of God in the world through the Christian church. The first marked event affecting this conquest was, he holds, the destruction of Jerusalem. This is an interpretation exegetically sound and spiritually healthy. Unfortunately, in the work before us it is coupled with an attempt to prove the unity of the Apocalypse, its Johannine authorship, and a date for it prior to the destruction of Jerusalem. This position leads the learned exegete into some palpable absurdities. He is compelled to assume that this apocalyptist, with all his literary power, untrammeled by finding any of his material in literary form, freely began his description of the "bride, the lamb's wife," by representing her as at birth a male

child (!) (*υἱὸν ἄρσεν*, Rev. 12:5). He is forced to hold, with the Muratorian Fragment, that John preceded Paul as a pioneer in founding the churches in Asia, notwithstanding that Paul was so careful not to build upon another man's foundation (Rom. 15:20), and in spite of the fact that Acts 19:1–7 tells us that the pre-Pauline church at Ephesus was a John-the-Baptist church! To explain, as he does, the harlot Babylon of chaps. 17 and 18 to mean Jerusalem is, I also think, untenable.

Professor Terry's attempt to interpret the book so as to vindicate its unity is inadequate, and his reasons for an early date are not convincing. His treatment, notwithstanding its unfortunate weaknesses in these respects, admirably makes application of the book as a whole to that in which its ideals are undoubtedly to be realized, viz., the gradual conquest of the world by Christ. This legitimate application of the general scope of the Apocalypse is really much more independent of any theory of authorship and date than Professor Terry's book would lead us to suppose.

The volume concludes with an appendix, in which brief but excellent notices are given of the principal extra-canonical apocalypses.

The work is characterized by much learning, ability, and candor. The writer exhibits a knowledge of most of the modern literature on the subject, even when it does not influence him, and has produced a work which no student of biblical apocalyptics can afford to ignore, and from which all may learn much.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

THE PROBLEMS OF JOB. By REV. GEO. V. GARLAND, M.A. London: James Nisbet & Co., 1898. Pp. xii + 366. 7s. 6d.

HAS the age been wrong these later years in making more room for the human element in its view of inspiration? This is the question which, though not directly relevant, it would seem, to an analytical study of the problems of Job, is rather insistently urged upon us in this book, both by numerous hints scattered through the main argument and by two supplementary chapters. And we have only to note the kind of product that the author's idea of its origin makes of the book of Job to get all the data we need for the answer; though it may turn out not to be the answer that the author seeks. If we will participate with him in his study, we must with him understand that the

whole action of the book of Job, including the initial scene in heaven and the theophany at the end, was literal history, and that the words of Job and his friends, essentially as we read them, are the faithful transcript of an actual discussion. Our one alternative to this is to deny the inspiration of Job altogether; for the Holy Spirit must not be supposed to have revealed truth through the medium of mere human invention or imagination, or to have represented that anything is true which is not objective fact. To this view we are not disposed here to say either no or yes. Our remark is that from it the literary element, in any free originative sense, is ruled out. It does not seem to have occurred to our author that the book of Job is poetry; nay, we believe we are doing him no wrong in thinking that he would resent calling it literature at all, except in such rudimental sense as we attribute to the minutes of a parliament or a debate.

The book before us has the interest of one virtue — consistency. It is true to its emphasized idea of the agency of inspiration from beginning to end; we are compelled to say also it is color-blind to whatever lies out of the track of that view, so that, in fact, we are unable to accord it the final word even in its specific analysis of the problems. There is interest for us also in seeing the logical consequences of the idea so naïvely accepted: we of the broader view are saved the trouble of urging them; while also without abettal of ours, and not without sadness, we behold that monumental book which we had come to reckon among the supreme works of human literature translated, whether in spite or in consequence of the divine agency postulated for it, from poetry into prose — nay, beyond that, into prosaism.

The manner in which, pursuant to our author's theory, the book of Job was most probably originated, reveals — when we consider the result as we have come to estimate it — the most wonderful day's achievement of which the world holds record. We may describe it somehow thus: On the last day of Job's extended period of suffering, when the spiritual fruits of his hard experience were all ready to gather, when the friends, each with a name etymologically significant of his character and hailing from a place named for his spiritual attitude (such is the remarkable way in which the Spirit draws the lines of history and allegory together), were all in place as the ordained foils to Job's complaints and questionings, the great discussion was held; and from morn till dewy eve the personages of the history rehearsed their speeches, while an unknown reporter, presumably the same to whom had already been (or was to be) revealed the vision or

account of the prologue in heaven, took down the record for providential transmission to posterity. Here, then, we have the book of Job as it may conceivably have been at once acted and composed. The contemplation of it provokes some very baffling questions; which, however, our author would not like us to cherish, lest thereby our human reason strike out too venturesomely for itself. We hope it is not irreverent to prefer the modern idea of its genuinely human and genuinely literary origin; or to deem that the endowing of one human soul with spiritual insight and poetic skill to put the mind of God into living words would have been as truly divine as to have got up a kind of stage-play in which the inspired thought is filtered through the speech of a miscellaneous company.

This account of the memorable discussion is not intended as a travesty, but as an honest attempt to put into concrete form what is at once the logical involvement of our author's view and a main datum from which he handles the Job problems. Through all the perusal of his analysis and paraphrase runs, in the reader's mind, a haunting sense of automatism, as if actors and speakers were not genuinely themselves, but manipulated; or, to use a comparison more admissive of personality, as if they were speaking into a phonograph, and producing therefore what is essentially phonographic thought, with its unhappy suggestion of rehearsal and performance. Of course, no such conscious feeling as this is to be attributed to the author; but we cannot help wishing that a saving sense of humor, which seems to have been denied him, had brought it enough into his consciousness to give buoyancy and everyday interest to his study. For now the unperceived automatism is transmuted into a kind of pervading one-sidedness of effect, as if the author's mind had become so subdued to the merely theological color as to have atrophied the warm, palpitating, natural literary sense. This, we suspect, is actually the case, and this is our main criticism of the book. The problems here raised do not seem to be the frank problems of the man Job, with his bewildered human cry, his sturdy honesty with himself, his fearless remonstrance against the iron mystery that surrounds him; and in following the writer's analysis we are stranded wholly outside of the tides of poetic feeling, imagination, lyric intensity, and insight that so thrill us in the book of Job. In place of this we are mere auditors at a dogmatic debate. To say this is not to remonstrate against treating the problems of Job for what they yield of dogma; that is entirely legitimate; it is merely to express regret that the really vitalizing data are so ignored. If ever a

seeker after God existed of whom the old adage was true, *pectus est quod theologum facit*, it was the patriarch of Uz. To get at the deep problems of his soul, therefore, and to solve them, we must take note, not of the intellect alone, but of all the powers of life, in their free play and expression, and of all the feelings that wreak themselves in poetic thought and image. Short of this the true coloring, the vital emphasis, the key-word, are not found.

Among the charisms enumerated by St. Paul was one with the very interesting name, "the discerning of spirits." It is a charism much needed by any whose interpretative study leads them to those regions of thought and experience where the deep heart of man and the chastening spirit of God meet. We accord hearty acknowledgment to the labor and the conscientious care that have gone to the making of this book; we cannot speak so highly of the tissue of the thought, which seems to us lacking in clear-cut definition and focus; gravest fault of all, it is only in very imperfect degree that the author has discerned the vital spirit of the book of Job.

JOHN FRANKLIN GENUNG.

AMHERST COLLEGE,
Amherst, Mass.

DAS BIBLISCHE "IM NAMEN": Eine sprachwissenschaftliche Untersuchung über das hebraische בְּשֵׁם und seine griechischen Äquivalente (im besonderen Hinblick auf den Taufbefehl, Matth. 28:19). Von JUL. BOEHMER. Giessen: J. Rickersche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898. Pp. 88.

THE author of this monograph is stirred up to investigate the exact meaning of the baptismal command given in Matt. 28:19, because from the beginning this passage has been the subject of different translations and explanations. Tertullian rendered it *in nomen;* Cyprian, followed by the Vulgate, *in nomine;* Luther, "in Namen;" Weizsäcker, "für den Namen;" others, "auf den Namen." In view of this variety of rendering it was worth while to ascertain precisely what the formula was intended to signify. The author rightly takes it for granted that the original form of the command was Aramaic, and, accordingly, that its significance can only be seen in the light of its antecedents in the Old Testament. He, therefore, makes an inductive study of the various uses of בְּשֵׁם and kindred expressions throughout the Hebrew text of the Old Testament, and traces these uses in their Greek forms in the LXX. The equivalent of בְּשֵׁם in the LXX he finds to be ἐν τῷ

This, he further discovers, is true of the New Testament usage, with the exception of Paul's letters, and of Matthew. These writers make use of the phrase εἰς τὸ ὄνομα, but this is taken to be only an individual peculiarity. The two expressions are equivalent and interchangeable. The result of the author's inductive study is that the phrase "in the name of" signifies not "into the fellowship of," nor "into a peculiar relation to," but simply "in the presence of." Hence, his paraphrase of the baptismal command would run as follows: "Make all the nations my disciples, in that ye shall baptize them in the presence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit; that is, *ye* shall baptize who hold as a personal possession the essence of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, ye who are also in the inmost fellowship with the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit." This conclusion the author then defends against rival views presented by Althaus, by J. Weiss (*Die Nachfolge Christi und die Predigt der Gegenwart*), and by Brandt (*Theologische Zeitschrift*, 1891, pp. 565, 610), who hold that the command was given in a rather more mystical and sacramental sense, as implying the establishment of the relation of fellowship between the subjects of baptism and the Trinity. The essay purports to be purely scientific and inductive. And as far as the collection and examination of the linguistic facts are concerned, the author is certainly entitled to the credit of having done his work in a truly scientific manner. But the question which he undertakes to answer is not purely linguistic. As shown by the far-reaching conclusion reached, it involves a broad generalization; and at the point of passage from the facts to the generalization the author, all unconsciously to himself, introduces the very idea into the facts which he later deduces from them. Accordingly, to those who have reached a different conclusion from the same facts his generalization will appear wide of the mark.

A. C. ZENOS.

McCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

GESCHICHTE DES JÜDISCHEN VOLKES IM ZEITALTER JESU CHRISTI. Von PROFESSOR EMIL SCHÜRER. 3. Auflage, Band II und III.[1] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. M. 24; bound, M. 28.

THE first edition of this book, though under another title and in a single volume, appeared in 1874; the second was published in two

[1] Vol. II, *Die inneren Zustände*; pp. vi + 584. Vol. III, *Das Judenthum in der Zerstreuung und die jüdische Literatur*; pp. v + 562.

volumes in 1886. After an interval of twelve years a third edition has become necessary, embracing three volumes, the second and third of which have appeared.

In Germany this fact itself is sufficient proof that we are dealing with a book of mark. And, indeed, Schürer's work is absolutely indispensable, not only for a specialist working in any of the departments covered by it, but for everyone who wishes to gain a scientific understanding of the New Testament. These excellencies — as well as certain defects — are too well known to demand any mention here.

A review such as this will simply have to mention and pass judgment on the points in which this new edition departs from the second, which served also as the basis of the English translation. And even this can apply only to the more extensive additions; that mention has everywhere been made of the newer literature of any importance goes without saying with a man like Schürer.

Such extensive additions are found, then, first, at the beginning of the second volume, where the proposition is maintained that at the beginning of the Maccabean period a compact Jewish population existed only in Judea proper; further, at the beginning of the third volume, where the Jews of the dispersion are treated in 135 pages, as compared with eighty-three pages in the former edition. Aside from these I can undertake a detailed mention only of the additions to §§ 32 and 33, which have been necessitated by the later discoveries in the department of Palestinian and Hellenistic Jewish literature.

We find first a mention, not only of the Ethiopic book of Enoch, part of which has now been discovered in Greek too, and a small fragment even in Latin, but also of the Slavonic Enoch, published in English by Morfill and Charles. Schürer regards it as of Jewish origin, but possibly, or even probably, revised by a Christian hand, and written not later than the end of the first or the beginning of the second century of our era. He refuses to recognize any use of the book by the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, though at least Test. Dan. 5 (*ἀνέγνων γὰρ ἐν βίβλῳ Ἐνὼχ τοῦ δικαίου, ὅτι ὁ ἄρχων ὑμῶν ἐστὶν ὁ Σατανᾶς*) may very well have its origin in 18:3 of the book of Enoch. While I am not able to follow Schürer entirely on this point, I am the more in accord with him in his judgment concerning the apocalypse and the testament of Abraham; concerning the former he holds the same opinion as concerning the Slavonic Enoch; the latter he regards as a late Christian legend.

What he says concerning the apocalypses of Elijah and Zephania

has in the main been transferred from the second edition. It might have been supposed that it was out of date almost as soon as it appeared, owing to the publication in the *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. XVII, 3*a*, of Steindorff's researches on "the apocalypse of Elijah, an unknown apocalypse and fragments of the Sophonias apocalypse." But Schürer immediately showed (in his review published in the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1899, No. 1) that the first of these three writings could not be the book of the same title mentioned by the Fathers. For Origen regards it as a Jewish book, while the one printed by Steindorff is Christian. And yet it is not only conceivable, as Schürer said, but certain, that it is based on a Jewish writing, because in one passage, at least according to the Sahidic recension (Steindorff, pp. 120 f.), the Messiah is still to come. It is true, it will be difficult to show what else belonged to this original writing; and it will also be subject to doubt whether it was an apocalypse of *Elijah*. But the single fact that Elijah must have been mentioned in it in the third person does not, to my mind, make that impossible; such a *lapsus memoriæ* could easily happen to a pseudonymous writer. So that we probably know a little more about the apocalypse of Elijah than we find in Schürer; and still more about the apocalypse of Zephania, to which Schürer traces not only one, but *both* of the other fragments published by Steindorff. Of course, in that case not even this apocalypse has been preserved to us in its original Jewish form; the passage at the bottom of the first page can hardly be understood except in accordance with Matt. 24:40 f. For the original union of the three documents I find no convincing proof.

Schürer has further expanded especially the section treating of incantations and necromantic books, the *Sibyllines* and Philo. The paragraphs concerning Thallus (a chronographer, probably from Samaria), concerning Menander (or rather concerning the Jewish proverbs passing under the name of the Attic comic poet) and concerning Cæcilius of Calacte (a rhetor, probably a Jew, living at Rome under Augustus), are entirely new. Most of the questions treated by Schürer in the second edition receive similar answers in this, though they are not always given with the same assurance. For instance, he does not seem to be quite as certain as he was that Philo's *De Vita Contemplativa* is spurious; on the other hand, he is as confident as formerly that the commentary on the Pentateuch by Aristobulus is genuine. The origin of the Ethiopic Enoch and of the *Ascensio Jesaiæ* is explained as it was in the second edition; the Christian origin of the so-called apocalypse of Moses is not even questioned, in spite of W. Meyer,

Everling, and Jagić. Here I think we shall have to go beyond Schürer, however willing one may otherwise be to yield to his judgment.

The page numbers of the second edition are added in the third, so that older citations of Schürer can be found as readily as ever.

CARL CLEMEN.

HALLE, AN DER S.,
Germany.

THE COPTIC VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, IN THE NORTHERN DIALECT, otherwise called Memphitic or Bohairic. With Introduction, Critical Apparatus, and Literal English Translation. 2 vols., 8vo. Vol. I, Matthew and Mark; pp. cxlviii + 484. Vol II, Luke and John; pp. 584. Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: H. Frowde, 1898. 42s.

THE Bohairic version, as its name shows, was originally the version of the northern province of Egypt, which extends from Alexandria to Cairo, with Alexandria, or rather the neighboring monasteries of Nitria, as a center of radiation; for there was the residence of the patriarchs of Alexandria until the tenth century, when, for political reasons, it was removed to Cairo. South of Cairo other versions obtained, called Sahidic, Middle Egyptian, etc., from the respective dialects in which they were written. These versions were apparently made from Greek recensions, different from that which underlies the Bohairic version. Here we are concerned with the latter only. The others have not yet received much attention on the part of New Testament critics, chiefly owing to their fragmentary condition, as also to the fact that they have not yet been critically edited. The importance of the Bohairic version of the gospels for textual criticism has long been recognized; its presumed high antiquity and its relative purity having early attracted attention to it.

From Mill to Tischendorf and Gregory, textual critics have gathered carefully what they could of the variant readings of the Bohairic version, and given them a prominent part in the critical apparatus of their editions; the task, however, was arduous, owing to the scarcity of Coptic scholars in the theological schools. The best critics were all ignorant of the Coptic language, and had to depend on occasional private information furnished them by Coptic scholars, or on the two rather unsatisfactory editions of Wilkins and Schwarze. Wilkins omitted to give us the variant readings of the many manuscripts from which he obtained his text, while Schwarze limited himself to one good manuscript

and two valueless transcripts by a European hand; apparently not caring what text he gave us. Furthermore, both Wilkins and Schwarze, the latter especially, indulged in disproportionate comparison of their text with the Greek; a task of secondary importance, which they discharged, moreover, in a most uncritical manner. What the textual critic expected from the Coptic scholar was, first, a Coptic text with full critical apparatus embracing the variant readings of all the best Coptic manuscripts previously described and classified; and, secondly, a faithful translation of that text; as for the comparison with the Greek, he could do it himself, although short references to the critical apparatus of a standard Greek edition would have been of no little assistance to him. Imperfect as these two editions were, they nevertheless furnished the textual critic with a number of interesting variant readings, which confirmed scholars in their appreciation of the Bohairic rendering of the gospels, and made them long for a third and better edition that would acquaint them accurately with all its peculiarities. That edition we are glad to welcome in the two volumes just edited by Rev. G. Horner.

The editor adopted the text of Codex Huntington 17 of the Bodleian Library, Oxford (A), without attempt at emendation, which, as he modestly puts it, he did in deference to the opinions of Professors Ignazio Guidi, Ludwig Stern, and the late Professor de Lagarde, who considered that manuscript as the best and most authoritative witness of the ancient Bohairic text;[1] the last-mentioned scholar even deprecated as useless the expenditure of time in the collation of other manuscripts. Yet, to preclude every possible doubt on the part of those for whose profit his publication was intended, Mr. Horner bravely undertook to gather all the variant readings he could from the other manuscripts — forty-six in all — a most delicate and difficult task, if we consider that those manuscripts are scattered all over Europe, while some are preserved in the distant churches and monasteries of Egypt. This thorough collation, we are glad to say, showed more than a purely negative result; it brought to light the fact "that the printed Bodleian text is not alone in its purity, but, while exhibiting more important omissions than other manuscripts, contains additions absent from two others (C & H) which may be classed with it." It furthermore enables us to trace to their origin most of the corruptions and corrections of the Bohairic version, not to mention the light it casts on the character of the Arabic versions, or, rather, versions to be found in

[1] This MS., dated A. D. 1174, is the oldest known MS. of the Bohairic version.

many manuscripts along with the Coptic text, of which they seem to be entirely independent. The comparison between the Coptic and the Greek has been brought in only in the measure necessary to guide scholars by referring them briefly to different groups of Greek manuscripts, as marked in the standard eighth edition of Tischendorf. Here, however, we must observe that Mr. Horner's apparatus is practically of no use to scholars who have not at least an elementary knowledge of Coptic. It would have taken but very little to make it available even to those (and they are, unfortunately, too many) who are entirely ignorant of that language. Let us take an example. Matt. 14:16*a* reads thus: *ⲛ̀ⲑⲟf de pejaf je seerxria an ⲛ̀touše nⲇou* (text), *and he said they have not need to go* (translation). The apparatus has: *ⲛ̀ⲑⲟf de*] conforming to Greek ℵ* D 61 syr^{cu}, etc.: om. *de* F1. 2*; translation of E1 has وانّه *and he indeed* and gloss الرومي وان يسوع *the Greek has "and Jesus indeed." Pejaf*] A B C ς H ⊛ J L N O conforming to a b ff^{2} k q arm: + *nⲇou*, Γ D1–2 Δ E F G1 K conforming to Greek. One who knows Coptic has no trouble at all in understanding the apparatus, provided, of course, he has before him a copy of Gregory's edition. Not so the layman; it is only by long and careful comparison between the apparatus of Mr. Horner and that of Tischendorf-Gregory that he will be able to make out that *ⲛ̀ⲑⲟf* must correspond to ὁ, *pejaf* to εἶπεν, *nⲇou* to αὐτοῖς, etc., a difficulty which would have been avoided by inserting the Greek equivalent after the Coptic word on which the apparatus bears. We may further observe that it would have greatly relieved the memory of the reader, or at any rate spared him considerable loss of time, to find a summary of the *sigla* or letters of the Coptic MSS., similar to the one printed in Gregory's work immediately before the gospel of Matthew, along with a copy of that same summary of Gregory, for the *sigla* of the Greek MSS. occurring in Mr. Horner's own apparatus. One could thus easily find one's way through the labyrinth of the apparatus without having to refer to the lengthy descriptions of the MSS. in Mr. Horner's work, or to the standard Greek edition.

The description of the MSS. is one of the best features of Mr. Horner's work; at any rate it is *unique* in the history of Coptic biblical criticism. Not only does it contain everything that is necessary to acquaint us with the origin, age, school of every one of the MSS., but from a palæographical point of view it is so exhaustive and detailed that anyone who has ever so little knowledge of the Coptic script

gains the impression of seeing with his own eyes and handling with his own hands the manuscripts themselves. It is one of the best contributions ever made to Coptic palæography.

"The object of the translation," says Mr. Horner, "is to supply the English reader with some knowledge of the Greek text which was translated by the Egyptians of the northwestern province,,whose dialect has survived to the present day in the liturgical books of the Coptic church. This being the main object, it is also intended by literal treatment to give an idea of the peculiarities of the language and the method of the version." To fulfil this double object Mr. Horner took a great deal of pains and followed a strictly consistent method, endeavoring to use constantly the same English rendering for the same Greek word, and to maintain the Coptic order of words. In this attempt he has been successful, we are glad to say, in so far at least as the very different genius of the Coptic and English languages permitted; and there is no doubt that his translation will prove interesting, nay useful, to the average intelligent clergyman who wants to know what the general drift of the Coptic version is, and consequently is satisfied with a literal rendering of the text of the chief manuscript.

It seems to me, however, that the same object could have been attained more fully by adopting the Greek language instead of the English. Greek is known to all scholars interested in New Testament criticism, and it has long been demonstrated that no language is more fit to render Coptic than Greek, the latter having so strongly influenced the syntax of the former. With a Greek translation and the Greek equivalent of the Coptic word, to which the apparatus refers, as we said above, this whole apparatus would have been serviceable to all scholars, whether acquainted with Coptic or not.

This, however, and other similar remarks I have made in criticism of the book are intended to guide the student in his use of this valuable book, not to lessen his confidence in it. The book was written primarily for the professional textual critics, who are not afraid of purchasing independence at the cost of having to master a few oriental languages, and these, I think, can find with the book no fault which they cannot remedy themselves with but little trouble. As for the others — well, it may be they are not as exacting as I suppose they might be; they must know that they have no right to expect others to do more than to facilitate their own work.

In closing we heartily congratulate Mr. Horner on his conscientious and scholarly work, and also thank the delegates of the

Clarendon Press for that new token of their well-known traditional zeal for the furtherance of the study of the Coptic versions. We hope they will hasten the publication of the rest of that Bohairic version of the New Testament, and intrust it to the same hand which so ably edited the gospels.

H. HYVERNAT.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C.

DIE PARUSIE CHRISTI. Von HEINRICH DIECKMANN, Pastor. Geestemünde: J. H. Henke, 1898. Pp. vi + 78. M. 1.20.

THE book leaves a favorable impression by its fulness, conciseness, and candor. It discusses first the apostolic views concerning the parousia, and then works back to the teachings of Jesus. In the apostolic literature, not excluding the Johannean books, the hope of Christ's personal return is universal; the day of the coming is everywhere conceived as a single and definite point of time that is near at hand; almost everywhere it is apparent that this day was expected during the life of that generation, though a definite fixing of the time was regarded as impossible and unwarranted. With the query whether this universal belief of the church could have been based on a universal misunderstanding of Jesus, the author passes to the main portion of his investigation, the teaching of Jesus concerning the purpose, manner, and time of his coming. The last point is, of course, the most difficult one. His results on the bulk of the passages are as follows: (1) Jesus neither identifies nor combines his parousia with the destruction of Jerusalem; (2) for the latter catastrophe he fixes a definite term, the life of that generation; (3) concerning the time of the parousia Jesus denies that he has any knowledge; (4) he repeatedly and emphatically contradicts the lively expectation of the people and the disciples that the kingdom would shortly be set up; (5) he teaches an era of development which presupposes a long space of time before the parousia. The author frankly acknowledges that there are a few passages which do not harmonize with the first three statements, but fix the parousia in the near future. He refuses to believe in the errancy of Christ, and explains the difficulty by the supposition that the disciples did not fully understand Jesus, but under the pressure of contemporary eschatological expectations transferred to the parousia what Jesus said of the near destruction of Jerusalem. They changed

the "sudden and unexpected" coming foretold by Jesus into an "early and speedy" coming.

The proof-reading, especially of the Greek quotations, is often faulty.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

SKIZZEN AUS DEM LEBEN DER ALTEN KIRCHE. Von THEODOR ZAHN, Dr. und Prof. der Theologie in Erlangen. Zweite vermehrte und verbesserte Auflage. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (G. Böhme), 1898. Pp. viii + 392. M. 5.25; bound, M. 6.25.

THE book contains eight addresses, delivered between 1876 and 1889. They merit their preservation and collection. There is nothing fugitive about them. "Fugitive" is almost a ludicrous word when applied to work so solid and replete with learning. To anchor them more surely yet, we have sixty-two pages of notes and references in fine print at the close, besides an appendix with a number of Christian prayers of 90–170 A. D., and an address of the fourth century on "Sunday rest." But it would be a mistake to suppose the book ponderous or dull. The style is vivacious; the material is handled and arranged with the ease of familiarity; there is everywhere a practical outlook on present-day questions; the whole is the modest and conscientious offering of a learned man who feels that he stands apart from the practical work of his time, but who wishes to contribute the results of his special labors for the assistance of the practical workers. The titles of the essays are as follows: (1) "The Traffic of the World in the First Three Centuries in Relation to the Growth and Life of the Church;" (2) "Missionary Methods in the Apostolic Age;" (3) "The Social Question and Home Missions according to the Epistle of James;" (4) "Slavery and Christianity in the Ancient World;" (5) "The History of Sunday, especially in the Ancient Church;" (6) "Constantine the Great and the Church;" (7) "The Rule of Faith and the Baptismal Confession in the Ancient Church;" (8) "The Adoration of Jesus in the Apostolic Age." It is impossible to summarize such a variety of material, or even to indicate some of the interesting tracks of thought on which light is shed in passing. The first two addresses would prove suggestive to pastors in their discussion of foreign missions. The second gives a fine summary of the facts that

can be gleaned from the New Testament concerning the activity of the Judaizers. Zahn is one of the most conservative German theologians. For instance, he places the epistle of James before 50 A. D. In speaking of Rom., chap. 16, he does not mention the possibility of its being a fragment originally addressed to Ephesus, but bases his argument on the fact that Paul knew so many people at Rome, though he had never been there. He proves that James did not contemplate a change of social conditions by Christianity, but only a Christian life within given conditions, and concludes that, therefore, Christianity as such never has any business to look farther.

WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

ROCHESTER, N. Y.

A THOUSAND YEARS OF ENGLISH CHURCH HISTORY. From the Earliest Times to the Death of Queen Elizabeth. By L. O. ASPLEN. London: George Bell & Sons, 1898. Pp. xii + 372. 4s., *net.*

OUR author sees his "country torn with conflicting sects." "Many are straying away in the manifold paths of modern schism." Deeply deploring this dissent, he hopes so to tell the story of Christianity in England as to win back "the more orthodox among the dissenters" to the national church, "which some of them too hastily forsook, and many of them too often ignorantly assail." Perhaps, if these schismatics could be made acquainted with a thousand years of English church history, they would abandon their "present rampant sectarianism."

Mr. Asplen undertakes to furnish this needed information. He begins by assuring his readers that infant baptism, baptismal regeneration, confirmation, Christ's real objective presence in the eucharist, the threefold ministry, and kindred Church of England tenets are all plainly taught in the Holy Scriptures. It is by a divine arrangement that the government of the church inheres in the bishop, and its unity centers in the episcopate. "To this carefully maintained succession of bishops belongs the recognized duty of holding fast the *traditions* and handing faithfully down the '*deposit*' of the Christian faith through all the raging storms of false doctrine, heresy, and schism." The bishops, who are in this "silver line of sweet continuity," ordained custodians of the *traditions*, can easily enough tell the dissenters what is heretical and schismatical. They can point out "the unbroken continuity of the Church of England before and after the Reformation,"

and so demonstrate that all who are outside the established fold are in open and dreadful schism.

In the course of his narrative our author makes all this very evident. The church to which he belongs "holds fast the traditions," and to this church has been "handed faithfully down the original deposit;" all the other so-called churches are merely sects. This their history shows conclusively.

Take, for instance, the Church of Rome. "Pope Pius V. broke off communion with England and founded the Roman Catholic sect in this land in A. D. 1570. A few thought themselves obliged to obey the papal mandate and commence the Roman Catholic schism. The new-born sect, known then as Papists, the Romanists or Roman Catholics as they are now termed, have no continuity with the national church which they forsook. In the present century they have received, like the other sects, permission to do much as they like."

The Puritans who withdrew from the church are as schismatical as the Romanists. Some of them stigmatized "the ceremonies of the church" as "relics of popery," while the "extremer spirits" among them actually advocated the "abolition of episcopacy and the adoption of the presbyterian system." Bishop Whitgift, "one of the worthiest men that ever the English hierarchy did enjoy," "was a man of mild and merciful disposition," who succeeded somewhat in restraining their impetuosity. Note in Scotland what would have been the result in England, had the Puritan faction triumphed. "Through the harsh and narrow doctrinal teaching" of John Knox "the rule of the Scottish bishops" was overthrown, and "in its stead was set up the new-fangled presbyterian system."

The Independents, somewhat numerous in England today, were originally called "Brownists," after Robert Brown, "who suffered frequent imprisonments for violent and seditious language." They were then called "Barrowists" after Barrow, "who was hanged under the libel law." "During the great civil war they became notorious under the name of Congregationalists." In Elizabeth's reign "there was nothing as yet to show the gigantic mischief which they were one day to work."

The Baptists, once called Anabaptists, were guilty of rejecting part of "the original deposit" which the Savior handed down through the bishops. They refused to see that the Scriptures teach the baptism of "whole families" "down to the youngest infant," and that all who accept Christ "are first washed from the stains of sin in the laver of

regeneration." Of course, they drew upon themselves "severe punishment for their wild socialistic and revolutionary tenets."

This thousand-year history shows plainly that the Church of England is apostolic and catholic, and that "the phrase 'free churches,' of which we hear so much nowadays, is unscriptural and a ridiculous misnomer for the English sects." It shows further that "the spirit of nonconformity is a thing to be rebuked, a carnal sin, a childish petulance, one among the manifest works of the flesh."

After reading Mr. Asplen's unbigoted and non-partisan Church of England plea, if English sectarians do not at once return to the calm, harmonious bosom of Mother Church, they will exhibit even a superfluity of naughtiness.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE LIFE OF HENRY DRUMMOND. By GEORGE ADAM SMITH. With Portrait. Second edition. New York: Doubleday & McClure Co., 1898. Pp. 541. $3, *net.*

THAT the life of Henry Drummond was worthy of being commemorated in a biography no one will question. Though not fairly to be reckoned among the great men of the centuries, he yet left an impress on his generation worthy to be emphasized and perpetuated in a fitting biography. And certainly no more suitable biographer could be found than his friend George Adam Smith. If any American readers who gained their first knowledge of Drummond in connection with the publication of his *Natural Law in the Spiritual World* have thought of him as a man of science who was interested also, and increasingly in the latter years of his life, in religion, they will be surprised to learn that he was educated for the Christian ministry, engaged actively and most successfully in evangelistic work, served as pastor of a church — all these before *Natural Law* was published — that he was ordained as a minister, and that his professorship of science was in a theological school. Witn all the versatility of his mind, and the variety of his experience as evangelist, pastor, professor, scientist, lecturer, traveler, the motives of Drummond's life were distinctly and definitely religious, and even evangelistic in the aggressive sense. His one aim in life was to save men; and the strongest impression with which one rises from the reading of his life is that of his personal character.

As a thinker, keen and original rather than either profound or

exact, gifted with a most admirable power of clear and graceful expression, he exercised a wide and most stimulating influence by his books and lectures. Most attractive in form, face, and manner, and endowed with a remarkable sympathy with his fellows and power over them, he drew men and women of all classes to him, impelling them even against his wish to open their hearts to him. Possessed of an intellectual openness and honesty of mind which are reflected both in his gradual change from a traditional conservatism to a more modern and more rational conception of the Bible and religion, and in his retraction in later works of opinions defended in his earlier books, the most noteworthy fact, after all, about Drummond, that which made his life most significant and which makes his biography most instructive and stimulating, is the singular purity of his character and life, the freedom alike from cant and from selfish ambition, the beautiful unworldliness of this thorough man of the world. Professor Smith has told the story with a charm of style which well fits the attractiveness of his subject. No one who is interested in the portrayal of noble character, and of an active life governed by the highest motives, can fail to find the book interesting. No one who is susceptible to the ennobling influence of such a life can fail to be helped by it. Drummond represents a type of man and scholar of which we have in our seminaries and colleges all too few. If the wide reading of the book will tend to the multiplication of the type, it ought to have such a reading.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CHRISTIANITY AND IDEALISM; the Christian Ideal of Life in its Relations to the Greek and Jewish Ideals and to Modern Philosophy. By JOHN WATSON, LL.D., Professor of Moral Philosophy in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. New edition, with additions. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1897. Pp. xxxviii + 292. $2.25.

THE new edition of Professor Watson's latest work contains more extensive alterations than the preface indicates. The treatise, as many will remember, took origin in a series of lectures delivered before the Philosophical Union of the University of California, and was published in due time under the auspices of this organization. Following the example set in the first volume of the series — Professor Royce's *Conception of God*, which was issued in tentative form when Professor Watson's volume

originally appeared — Professor Howison, as editor, contributed an introductory note containing controversial matter, to which the author might conceivably have taken exception. In the edition now issued this disappears, and no comment on the fact occurs in the preface; moreover, the book no longer bears the imprint of the series to which it belongs. The body of the work remains unaltered in greater part. Of the two divisions into which the exposition falls the first — on "The Christian Ideal of Life in Relation to the Greek and Jewish Ideals" — has not been touched. Important alterations have been made in the second section — on "Modern Idealism in its Relation to the Christian Ideal of Life." The number of chapters is doubled. The exposition of idealism itself, and of its relations to agnosticism and the special sciences, and to Christianity, respectively, has received most valuable reinforcement by the insertion of three chapters entitled: "The Failure of Materialism," "The Idealistic Interpretation of Natural Evolution," and "Idealism and Human Progress;" while the concluding chapter of the first edition — "Idealism and Christianity" — has been enriched by an expanded exposition of the "conception of the absolute" in several of its relations. This last alteration, and the chapter on "The Idealistic Interpretation of Natural Evolution," seem to me to enhance the value of the work very considerably. Both are eminently suggestive.

As is to be expected, the treatment is stimulating rather than informing. The space at disposal is too small to admit of detailed consideration of the several highly complicated problems involved. No room remains for the discussion of such movements as those incident to the first century of the Christian era, or to the Middle Ages. The large sweep of the entire evolution is brought before one in outline, and all the perplexing problems which surround the connecting links in a number of crucial periods do not appear to disturb the calm surface of the argument. This undoubtedly is an advantage — one, too, which nobody knows better how to profit by than Professor Watson. As a result, the work is much stronger on the speculative than on the historical side. Indeed, I cannot think of any discussion of similar compass which puts more powerfully the difficulties inseparably connected with the dualistic assumptions of modern science. Were it only for this, Professor Watson would have deserved well of theologians. But this is not all. The book is written in a clear and often fascinating style. The craft of simple statement of the most complicated problems in nervous, pictorial, and limpid English seems somehow or other to be a species of family affair with the Glasgow men. It has descended

from John Caird, through Edward Caird and Nichol and Professor Watson, down to their later coworkers, such as Professors Jones, MacCunn, and J. S. Mackenzie, to mention no others. In *Christianity and Idealism* Professor Watson occasionally excels his masters and colleagues in this respect. Accordant with the clearness of the style is the force of the argument. It is best described by the word "cumulative." Everything appears to be pressed, and naturally pressed, into the service of the central theme. As a consequence, the book appeals to one as a closely welded whole, and as an organic statement which grows so inevitably, from page to page, as to dispel all idea of artificial construction. The same quality also imparts a feeling of confidence to the reader; he is persuaded immediately that his author is a thorough master, one who does not carry any load, notwithstanding the vast range traversed by the argument.

Of course, a book of the kind might easily be criticised from the historical side. One might say, for example, that it was all perspective and no filling in. But this would be distinctly unfair. When the essence has been extracted from several thousand years of history, objection, if objection there be, must be taken chiefly with respect to point of view. While there are important details incident to Professor Watson's position that do not commend themselves to me, I cannot refrain from warmly approving his determination to treat the universe in one piece. He attacks the central problem, not upon a side issue, but fully aware of its difficulties, and in a manner which forces him to meet these difficulties in their acutest form. For this he deserves the most unreserved praise. No one can peruse his book without becoming conscious that, if the problems incident to modern ways of viewing the world and man are to be successfully solved, they must be faced without anything in the nature of half-hearted reservation. This is but another way of saying that Professor Watson is a philosopher, one who will abate the stress of the contemporary situation not a single jot, but who knows that only thus can all these things — in the matter of explanation — be fulfilled. Meantime, I would venture to offer but a single criticism. I do not think that the author altogether realizes the full extent of the problems that lie very near to us today in connection with historical Christianity. The most recent results of New Testament criticism seem to me to make it quite obvious that a merely speculative interpretation will never be completely satisfactory. Despite this, however, Professor Watson lays firm hold upon the ultimate question — how to reconcile the facts of the Christian revelation with an

explanation of the universe which is at once unitary, in the sense of monistic, and rational, in the sense of spiritual. No recent work on similar lines contains so much matter which the clergy ought to ponder.

R. M. WENLEY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

THE CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF LIFE, AND OTHER ESSAYS. By W. T. DAVISON, M.A., D.D., Handsworth College, Birmingham. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1898. Pp. 335. 4s. 6d.

THIS volume consists of ten essays, of which six are in review of books that have already been before the public a considerable time; yet the discussions even in these reviews are of such a character as to have permanent interest and value, and many of the papers are of unusual worth. The title essay is the only one that is published now for the first time. It presents the claims of religion to the allegiance of man by exhibiting the interpretation of life which is implicit in religious teaching, the power which a religion possesses adequately to explain and interpret the history of the world as it unfolds itself before the fullest and best knowledge of succeeding generations. As man comes to an understanding of himself, and can explain and unify in his thought the genesis, history, and manifest purpose of the universe with his own relation thereto as interpreted through his religion, that religion must commend itself and succeed in perpetuating its own life in succeeding generations and successive epochs. And as it fails to do this, it passes into sure, though it may be gradual, decay. Christianity is the one religion of man that has met this test successfully. The views of life, its origin, nature, scope, and meaning, have been almost revolutionized within the century by a renascence of thought, until the "modern" view of God and the world has seemed to many to be inconsistent with distinctively Christian teaching. But in the view of the writer no such opinion can be held. He traverses the relations between Christianity properly conceived and science, and distinguishes between science itself and the philosophy to which the reasonings of physical science have been supposed to lead, and he claims that such philosophy lies outside of the realm of science, and that with science itself Christianity does not and cannot have any quarrel. Instead, it casts light upon the problems of the physical world, and interprets them to the mind, as agnosticism, positivism,

deism, and pantheism have conspicuously failed to do. The discussion proceeds with lucidity and convincing power, and ends with the belief that already in the New Testament the final harmony toward which all things tend appears, and that it is inevitable that at last "Christ shall be king in all worlds, and that a God of flawless righteousness and eternal love shall at last be all in all," in whom the Christian interpretation of life will be perfectly justified. The second essay considers questions called forth by such books as W. R. Greg's *Enigmas of Life*, published many years ago, and W. S. Lilly's *The Great Enigma*, which appeared in 1892, but it is evident that Dr. Davison has not seen Professor James' paper, *Is Life Worth Living?* Without taking space to discuss the papers upon later books, all of which are familiar to American as well as English readers, it need only be said that the whole collection will repay perusal, and is abundantly suggestive of themes for thought and discourse, while the style in which the essays are written, graceful and vigorous, is what might have been expected from what we have already known of the writer of *The Wisdom Literature of the Old Testament* and *The Christian Conscience.*

GEO. E. MERRILL.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY.

THE MAKING AND THE UNMAKING OF THE PREACHER. Lectures on the Lyman Beecher Foundation, Yale University, 1898. By WILLIAM JEWETT TUCKER, President of Dartmouth College. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898. Pp. iv + 224. $1.50.

UNDER a not very felicitous title, Dr. Tucker has given us a book which will materially add to the reputation of the Yale lectureship on preaching. His purpose is to deal with the preacher, rather than with his sermon. This helps him to keep clear of the tendency to invade the province of the professor of homiletics, while at the same time it allows him to say a great many excellent things as to the sermon itself. Dr. Tucker's is emphatically a serious book of high ideals. His style shows traces of the influence of New England writers, especially of Emerson; and occasionally, as for instance in Lecture IV, the speaker makes such ample use of literature that one appreciates all the more highly the self-denial enforced upon him by the range of his theme and the limits of his space. While philosophical rather than practical in its treatment, *The Making and the Unmaking of the Preacher* is

evidently the work of a man who looks on the pulpit from the point of view of his own experience. The freshest and most valuable of these lectures seem to us to be those in which Dr. Tucker discusses "Preaching under Modern Conditions," "The Unmaking Process," "What the Preacher Owes to Men," and "The Pulpit and the Church." In the last of these, which is the seventh lecture of the course, the speaker enters a plea, for which there may just now be some need, on behalf of the church, insisting that the preacher should work from within the church, through the church, and to the church: "From it, in acknowledgment of its position; through it, in acknowledgment of its available power; to it, in acknowledgment of its right to its own increase." The concluding lecture is on "The Optimism of Christianity." While not blind to the perils which beset religious life today, not less than at any previous time, Dr. Tucker cherishes a cheerful and wholesome optimism. We thank him for his book, eminently sane and wise as it is; but chiefly, we think, is it worthy of praise for adopting and maintaining throughout the hopeful tone which alone can help our young preachers to do justice to the genius of Christianity.

T. HARWOOD PATTISON.

ROCHESTER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Rochester, N. Y.

THE MAKING OF THE SERMON; for the Class-Room and the Study. By T. HARWOOD PATTISON, Professor of Homiletics and Pastoral Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary, Author of *The History of the English Bible*, etc. Philadelphia: The American Baptist Publication Society, 1898. Pp. x+352. $1.50.

THIS book of twenty-three chapters, with a copious index, is made up of the lectures of the author, delivered in his class-room, but in some measure recast, so that they are of genuine interest, not only to pastors, but also to any intelligent reader, to the hearer as well as to the maker and deliverer of sermons. The style, with an occasional infelicity of expression, is very clear, simple, and direct. The author faithfully presents all the essential doctrines of homiletics. His fundamental position is that the message of the preacher is found in the Bible, and that his supreme work is to unfold the truth of God's word, and to apply that truth to men in all the relations that they sustain to God and to one another. He, therefore, treats at length the text and the theme of the sermon. He next considers the parts of the sermon

and its rhetorical elements, and closes the volume with a suggestive treatment of the delivery and the hearing of sermons.

The book has so high a degree of excellence that it seems almost ungracious to offer adverse criticism. But we find some deficiencies. At all events, it occurs to us that either in the discussion of the theme or of the parts of the sermon the proposition should have received special and thorough treatment, and since the use of arguments in sermons is discussed, we cannot but wish that this important topic had been more perfectly unfolded. Moreover, just why the author should treat the subject of imagination only in connection with the discussion of illustration is not clear to us, since imagination is such a very important factor in relation to every part and every element of the sermon. In his treatment of the delivery of a sermon he has failed to set forth the real philosophy of speaking with ease, clearness, and force without committing the discourse to memory and without the use of the manuscript. This was admirably done, many years ago, by Bautain, in his subtle, yet lucid, treatise on *Extempore Speaking*, and needs to be understood by those who wish to acquire the incomparable art of speaking with perspicuity, energy, and elegance from neither memory nor manuscript.

In several chapters of this volume the element of illustration strikes us as excessive. For example, in the discussion of the text, each principle enunciated is followed by numerous anecdotes, some of which detail the acts of ignorant or eccentric preachers, and a part of which have been so often told that, to say the least, they are far from being fresh.

But what we have pointed out in these friendly criticisms are but slight blemishes. The book as a whole is both a thorough and popular exposition of a great theme, and while homiletical treatises are legion, this will take rank among the best.

GALUSHA ANDERSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

RENASCENT CHRISTIANITY: A Forecast of the Twentieth Century in the Light of Higher Criticism of the Bible, Study of Comparative Religion, and of the Universal Prayer for Religious Unity. By a Clergyman, author of the *Ancient Scriptures of the World*, etc. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898. Pp. xxxiii + 392. $2.50.

THERE is much in this volume which every intelligent Christian ought to appreciate and commend. The author does not aim to please

or conciliate any person or class of persons. The time-serving and money-loving tendencies of the times meet with deserved rebuke. The reversions and degeneration traceable in historical Christianity are pointed out, and the necessity of turning aside from many of the "traditions of the elders" and of inquiring after the essentials of original Christianity is emphasized.

The book as a whole may be welcomed by not a few serious souls who would fain see a revival of primitive Christianity, divested of those unnecessary and unfortunate accretions which obscure its divine original. But it is not adapted to convert to its peculiar positions any large number of readers. Its style and method must condemn it with scholarly seekers after truth. A large proportion of its contents consists of excerpts from many different authors, whose names are withheld from the reader in order "that the thought may not be hidden behind the thinker, and that Truth may be all in all." The result is a compilation of paragraphs strung loosely together, without any logical connection. What comes first might as well have been put last. The idea that Jesus is authority and example for anonymous putting forth of thoughts, or for "hiding self behind the truth," is as groundless as the statement that he instructed his disciples "to forbear adding their own names as biographers or as authors" (p. 53). Whatever may have been the reason or excuse for anonymity in ancient writings, it has no justification in these times, and is disrespectful to the rights of modern criticism. There is not an anonymous book or fragment of the Bible that could possibly lose any of its value for us by reason of our knowing the authorship. Critics of every school would consider it incalculable gain to know the whole truth about any treasure of literature. They will be slow to regard the want of such knowledge a thankworthy dispensation of divine providence.

The reference to Balaam's ass (p. 384) is particularly unfortunate. With most right-minded people it makes all the difference in the world whether a given thought were first brayed by an ass, or sounded by a ram's horn, or spoken by a well-known holy man of God. Especially is this the case when citations are put forward as so many "witnesses to the new interpretations of Christianity" (p. xv). We have a right to know the name and reputation of witnesses, and our conviction of their real worth is not likely to be deepened by a withholding of their names.

MILTON S. TERRY.

GARRETT BIBLICAL INSTITUTE,
Evanston, Ill.

DIRECTOIRE PRATIQUE DU JEUNE CONFESSEUR. Par ALEXANDRE CIOLLI. Paris: Victor Rétaux, 1898. 2 vols. Pp. xvi + 404 and 386. Fr. 7.

THIS work is a translation from the Italian, leaving in Latin such passages as the author did not wish to expose to popular gaze. It is called "Practical Directory of the Young Confessor," but its scope is far wider. It is, from the Catholic point of view, a compendium of rules for the guidance of the young priest. It contains a treaty of ethics, the questions to be addressed to those who go to confession, and elaborate instructions as to the relations which he should sustain to all sorts and conditions of men. There are also in it forms of petitions to the higher authorities. It is, therefore, a work of great interest for those who would like to find out the ethical teachings of the Roman Catholic clergy, especially as it has the approval of the Vatican. An adequate review of such a work would entail the discussion of almost all the principles which are assumed by Canon Ciolli, and that we cannot undertake. Were we to do it, such discussions have ceased to interest Protestant readers. We can only indicate what is the value of the book for us. For instance, what is the conception that most Catholic priests have of their office? What is the attitude of the church toward Protestants? The book does not hesitate to say that priests must have a kindlier attitude toward freethinkers and skeptics than toward heretics. This we knew before, but we had no documentary authority for our knowledge. Never before have the ethical externalism, the formal and external attempts to make men good, and the religious legalism of the Catholic church been so apparent to us. At the same time the spirit of faith in a system, of loyalty to everything connected with it, and the enthusiasm of Roman Catholic consecration are equally manifest. The reading of this book by a Protestant pastor would certainly be profitable. The many pages of Latin in it should not stagger the ordinary Latinist, and their omission would not be a great loss to the reader. J. C. BRACQ.

DER BEGRIFF DES CHARISMA und seine Bedeutung für die praktische Theologie. Von LIC. THEOL. MORITZ LAUTERBURG, Pfarrer in Stettlen bei Bern. (= Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie, herausg. von A. Schlatter und H. Cremer, Vol. II, Heft 1.) Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898. Pp. vi + 141. M. 2.40.

IN this study the author undertakes an investigation of the conception of the charisma, in the first place as it appears in Paul. Minor

details aside, his main thesis is this: That which chiefly characterizes the charisma as over against the other phenomena of the Christian life is not its origin, but its connection with the life and edification of the church. This thesis appears to me indefensible, as does also the further statement, based on 1 Cor. 12:3, that every direct testimony to the "lordship" of Jesus is, in contrast with other testimonies, to be understood as "spiritual," that is, as charismatic. This seems to me a logical error quite like that which the author incidentally attributes to Sohm. From the fact that only those expressions of the Spirit are to be recognized as really such which contain a confession of Jesus as Lord, it by no means follows that every such confession is to be accepted as coming from the Spirit. So, also, though the charismata are for the service of the church, yet they obtain this name, not from this fact, but because of their origin. Lauterburg himself says later that in these charismata the πνεῦμα τοῦ θεοῦ attests itself as a power in the sphere of nature, *i. e.*, as a power controlling the members of the church preëminently in the realm of feeling and perception. The apostle is concerned, however, that the Holy Spirit shall be effective in the churches as an ethical power of God also, to the end that the Christians may, with steady upward movement, rise to the maturity of "men in Christ," and thus be πνευματικοί, not only in the sense of 1 Cor., chaps. 12 and 14, but also in that of Rom. 8:5 ff.; 1 Cor. 3:1; Gal. 6:1. Thus Lauterburg comes around, eventually, to the opinion of Gunkel (*Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes*, 1888), whose book unfortunately he does not seem to have known.

But if this opinion is correct, then the later conception of the charisma, which Lauterburg treats in the second place, is not so different from the earlier as he would maintain. At the same time it is true that the relation of charisma and office was later — in my opinion, even in the pastoral epistles — reversed, so that the office was supposed to carry with it the charisma, not the converse. Even to this day the Lutheran church has not restored the charisma to its ancient rights, while the Reformed church from the first emphasized the inner call. Only in the most recent times have special gifts of all kinds been brought into demand for the work of evangelization and home and city missions.

Finally, as concerns the significance of the charisma for practical theology, Lauterburg follows Vinet, van Oosterzee, and especially C. F. Nitzsch, in demanding, as absolutely necessary for the student looking forward to the ministry, an inner capacity for his work. The question

arises, to be sure, when it is to be determined whether one possesses this capacity. For if the test be made at the end of the student's theological course, it is both too late and too early. Too late because of the difficulty of choosing another occupation; too early because there has been, as yet, no opportunity for a test in actual practice. Lauterburg therefore urges the preëminent importance of self-examination on the part of the young man looking forward to the ministry, though even this will not always attain the end sought. How these difficulties are overcome in North America I do not need to inform the readers of this JOURNAL. For Germany, at any rate, Lauterburg has rendered a valuable service in calling fresh attention to the necessity, to a Christian minister, of a special call to his work. At the same time I doubt whether his conclusions respecting the significance of the charisma for determining the scientific basis of practical theology will win general acceptance. The conception seems to me too general and indefinite for this purpose, even granting that it is to be understood historically, as Lauterburg interprets it. He has fallen into the obvious danger of regarding that particular term which one is investigating as the central one of the discipline or science in question.

His study is, nevertheless, one of the most valuable of the pamphlets which have yet appeared in this series.

CARL CLEMEN.

HALLE AN DER SAALE.

CATHOLICISME ET DÉMOCRATIE. Par GEORGES FONSEGRIVE. Paris: Victor Lecoffre, 1898. Pp. v + 283. Fr. 3.50.

IN France it has long been the custom to consider Catholicism and democracy as opposite and inimical powers. The tendency of French democracy has from the beginning been anti-religious. The Revolution was a revolt against the existing social order of the eighteenth century, political and religious. It was a denial, not only of the rights of kings, but of the rights of God. It shattered the throne and desecrated the altar. Its work was looked upon with horror, not by Catholics alone, but by all believers in Christianity; and the taint of atheism has never been eradicated from French democracy. The attitude of the church toward it has, therefore, naturally been one of hostility. In recent years, however, especially since the encyclical of Leo XIII. on the subject, French Catholics have shown a disposition to accept frankly the republican form of government, believing that monarchy

and imperialism are no longer possible in France. They feel it, therefore, to be their duty to rally to the support of the republic, though it is little more than a republic in name, and continues to be most unjust to Catholics. M. Fonsegrive, in the book which we are reviewing, undertakes to explain and defend this new departure. The book itself is but a popular treatise, and its chief interest lies in the evidence it gives of the zeal and earnestness with which a considerable party of French Catholics have thrown themselves into the work of strengthening and reforming the republic. It is a favorable omen both for the nation and the church. The three characteristics of the present age, according to M. Fonsegrive, are the progress of science, the growth of democracy, and the struggle for social justice; and these forces are so blended and intermingled that it is not possible to separate them. Hence one cannot be a republican or a democrat and be a foe of scientific development, or oppose the struggle for social justice. A true democrat must labor to increase justice, to augment and diffuse truth, and to further the advance of the race. A democracy implies a state of mind different from that which prevails in a monarchy or an empire. Its laws should be the expression of the conscience of the whole people. Instead of attempting the impossible task of reëstablishing the throne, M. Fonsegrive thinks that it is the duty of French Catholics to strive to bring democracy back to its origins, to respect for justice and the rights of conscience. What must be restored is the French soul. Without this no government can do good or be durable. The work must be begun from within, since a transformation of soul cannot be imposed. An education must be given which will form the national conscience in that of the individual. But when there is question of educating, of instilling new principles of conduct, we turn to the young, since the mature are more or less impervious to new ideas. Moreover, the people will listen only to those who believe in life, consequently in progress, in the possibility of better things. M. Fonsegrive therefore addresses his words chiefly to young men, who are optimists, who have generous hearts, and feel that God has made the nations curable. They can learn to put away aristocratic prejudice and to enter with sympathy into the thoughts and aspirations of the multitude. There is an aristocratic love and a democratic love of the people. The former is a kind of condescension, the latter is the giving of what is felt to be due; it is Christian, humble, patient, and helpful.

The Catholics of France must undertake the civic education of the

people. They must go into the midst of them, live with them, speak to them, without flattery or insult. But to do this successfully they must have a democratic soul, must not only love the people, but must understand the meaning of democracy, and realize in themselves its manly and austere virtues. The Catholic congresses of young men, which have come into vogue in France, offer excellent opportunities for diffusing right ideas on this subject. These noble voices appeal to young hearts, to fill them with holy enthusiasm, to kindle within them the flame of the ideal, the light of truth and justice; they teach them how to become sober, chaste, serious, and disinterested.

M. Fonsegrive has also a chapter in which he considers the rôle of woman in reconciling the church with French democracy, and in which he says many wise and excellent things. He then enters upon a criticism of French education, which, in his opinion, is almost wholly verbal and rhetorical. The teachers deal in mere verbiage, the soul evaporates in hollow words, and the pupils learn for the school, not for life.

The result is that the young are uprooted, and find it impossible to draw spiritual nourishment either from the state or the church. The end of education is to learn how to live, not how to speak, or write, or draw, or calculate. If there is to be a new development of religion and patriotism in France, a new education must be given. M. Fonsegrive thinks that Frenchmen may, in this matter, learn much from Englishmen and Americans. He finds the secret of our greater success in our practical faith in individuality, in our striving to cultivate habits of self-control and self-help. Social as well as individual salvation is a personal affair; the primary aim of education, therefore, should be to make the pupil a living soul, with a mind and a will of his own, not merely to fit him to be a support to existing institutions.

J. L. SPALDING,
Bishop of Peoria.

PEORIA, ILL.

SOCIAL ELEMENTS. Institutions, Character, Progress. By CHARLES RICHMOND HENDERSON. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. ix + 405. $1.50, *net.*

PROFESSOR HENDERSON wants the volume to be "a study of social elements." He discusses facts of everyday life, and aims to stimulate and direct investigation "rather than to furnish ready-made and dogmatic opinions." He has desired "to be constructive and hope-inspiring rather than discouraging and destructive. . . . . Controversy is avoided

as barren." In an appendix directions are given for local studies, containing suggestions for the study of a town, and topics for papers and discussions. In this way a practical application is made of the contents of the volume. The readers are advised to draw maps in studying communities, and nine are given of Kalamazoo, Mich., and of Franklin, Ind., as samples.

The title, *Social Elements*, is taken in the general sense of social factors. The author does not propose to give the primitive elements out of which society is evolved, nor does he propose to give an analysis of society in order to find its constituent parts which are then to be constructed into a social system.

For our purpose the author's attitude toward religion is of special interest. Every sociologist recognizes religion as a powerful social factor, but some treat it as a product of naturalism, while others view it from the standpoint of the agnostic. This volume is reverent throughout and accepts a positive basis of religious faith. It maintains "that at the heart of the universe is everlasting rectitude, goodness, and veracity," and this conviction is made essential for hope in future progress. Religion is, of course, viewed from the social, not from the theological or dogmatic, standpoint. "The social function of religious institutions is the unification of mankind on the most exalted levels; or rather the unification of mankind in an upward movement, in which the divine attractions of the perfect life are at once the bond of affection, the object of faith, and the inspiration to unceasing creative energy of goodness." Public worship is regarded "as the socialized act of approach to God, a united effort of men to assist each other to realize worthy thoughts of the divine."

No more for the church than for society is perfection claimed; but the existing good is recognized, and the outlook is hopeful. Not revolution, but evolution, is needed. Everywhere this evolution is in progress, and to its gradual processes we must look for individual and social melioration.

The tone of the book in general is what may be called healthy. The physical basis of society is emphasized, but man is not lost in nature. Society is regarded as a reality and a unit, yet the individual is preserved, and the fiction of a common mind aside from the individuals in society is rejected. Great stress is laid on the higher social interests, such as education, morals, and religion in the social structure, the social forces, and the social functions.

But the book attempts too much for the adequate treatment of any

of its multitudinous subjects. Especially is this seen in the chapters which treat of the burning social problems of the day; most of all in the one on "Tendency toward Economic Betterment." It will be regarded by many as optimistic, with the emphasis too much on the favorable side of the social problem. When it is shown that in 1870 32.43 per cent. of our population were bread-winners, but in 1890 36.31 per cent., it does not prove betterment, but it does suggest whether homes are not being destroyed by taking women and children into factories. Our social problem is not confined to the question whether the condition of laborers has improved; it also involves the question whether that condition has improved in proportion to that of the general improvement of the country. Mr. C. D. Wright twice says "No" in an official report. Immigration has increased the competition of laborers, and non-employment is often a serious problem. Land could formerly be had for the taking; now, as Mr. C. D. Wright shows, three-fifths is gone, much held by corporations and syndicates, and the other two-fifths largely unavailable for culture. With the present business methods it may require many thousands of dollars for an employé to become an employer, where formerly a few hundred sufficed. For a full view of the situation these facts ought not to be omitted. The growing contrast between the rich and the poor adds much to the gravity of the situation, and it seems strange that our author can say: "Admitting the charge that the rich are growing richer, and even more rapidly than the rest of society — what of it?" When discussing the great accumulation of wealth, the favorable side of the process is given in a long quotation, and this note: "There are two points of view to this question. Mr. Lloyd's *Wealth against Commonwealth* and Mr. H. George's *Progress and Poverty* may be consulted for the other side." But why not give both sides in the text for a full view of the subject? For such a view the two chapters which follow must be consulted. They are on "The Social Movement of Economic Betterment" and "Social Misery, Pauperism, and Crime." But on the points named we fail to find adequate discussion for a correct view of the actual social condition.

The criticism here made does not affect the general character of the book. The volume is well calculated to introduce intelligent readers into the momentous social discussions of the day, and to interest and instruct them in the great problems involved.

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF SOCIOLOGY. By J. H. W. STUCKENBERG. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 1898. Pp. xii + 336. $1.50.

UNDER this modest title a considerable range of subjects is covered. We find "The Genesis of the Idea of Society," "Definition and Scope of Sociology," "The Relation of Sociology to Other Social Disciplines," "Division of Sociology," "The Principles of Society *per se*," "The Historical Evolution of the Principles of Society," "Sociological Ethics, or the Progress of Society," "The Method in the Study of Sociology," "Is Sociology a Science?" "The Sociological Study of the Age." Upon these subjects Dr. Stuckenberg has done some hard, straightforward thinking. Much of the writing is in good, vigorous English. The method of the book is excellent. Each chapter begins with a statement of the problem to be solved in the chapter, and ends with a paragraph of "reflections" for "review and aids to original research." The literature of the subject is copiously cited. The teaching is balanced and sound.

Dr. Stuckenberg has a wholly admirable way of stating a position. In "The Genesis of the Idea of Society" we get a fine illustration. "The definite advance made in social thinking during the eighteenth and the beginning of the nineteenth century consists in this: society itself is apprehended and made a specific object of thought; its study is treated as a separate discipline, just as politics or economics; consequently the social thoughts, formerly scattered, are now concentrated; they are developed, are augmented by the study of history, of ethnology, of institutions, of the actual societies of the present in the various stages of culture; and the result of the total inquiry is used to find the principles, the laws, and the system of society." Distinguishing carefully between social and sociological, "We designate as social whatever pertains to society; but as sociological only that which pertains to the science of society." "The student can therefore study societies and yet miss the idea of society; he can study social sciences and have no conception of *the* social science." Speaking of the relation of sociology, "It is an interesting and instructive fact that each class and profession is strongly inclined to make its particular view normative for society. The statesman emphasizes the state; the lawyer the law; the theologian the church; the economist political economy; the capitalist capital; the laborer labor; the aristocracy and nobility the circle they constitute. Hence the inability of each to put himself in the place of another or to take a comprehensive view. What an

argument in favor of the sociological standpoint, which views society as a totality, and gives each particular class and its peculiar view the right place in the social organism!"

Safe ground is taken in the chapter "Is Sociology a Science?", at once rejecting the extravagant claims of many self-styled leaders of sociological investigation and yet claiming its due for what has been accomplished and what constitutes the ideal of sane and brave-hearted students of sociology everywhere. "While not subject to the same exactness as the natural sciences, we are justified in speaking of sociology as a science in the sense of *systematized knowledge*." "Sociology as the *philosophy* of society may be less liable to misunderstanding; but we must insist on making the study of the social realism and the scientific data within reach the foundation of our philosophy." As leading to the end sought the proper method for the investigator is emphasized: "An entirely different method is the truly scientific one. Rejecting all *a priori* constructions falsely called science, it goes to the subject-matter of sociology, and from the nature of the material learns what methods, what laws, what system are possible. Thus we evolve from society the science it involves, instead of forcing on society a science from a foreign department or from our preconceived notion of science."

Here one would choose to stop, for one would rather praise than blame. To stop here, however, would be to misrepresent the author and mislead the reader.

With all the clearness and vigor of many passages, there are passages that are neither clear nor vigorous. If political action is worth speaking of at all, it claims a better statement than this: "Political action is always personal, that is, it is the personal action of (or for) the collectivity so far as political." With all the careful analysis one finds in places strange failure to keep together matters which belong together. One cannot help feeling disappointed at finding no better opening to the chapter on "Method" than the suggestion that "by devoting a separate chapter to this important subject we can concentrate, develop, and supplement what was said about method in the preceding chapters." Why not discuss method in one place or the other and be done with it? After the distinct claim that sociology is a science in the sense of systematized knowledge, it is confusing to read almost immediately: "Is sociology a science? Yes and no. It is not a science yet in any sense . . . . Taking all its material into account, we are warranted in saying that it can be made scientific in

the sense of valid and systematized knowledge." While insisting stoutly that his work is an introduction to the study of sociology and not an introduction to sociology, the author more than once or twice leads the way into a field which looks suspiciously like sociology.

The book is not always true to its own design. With emphatic and almost wearying persistence the author insists that the sociological point of view be kept in mind. In spite of this, here and there one finds an informal excursus covering matter not essential to the movement of thought. Under "Definition and Scope of Sociology" there is a treatment of the relation of definition to exposition that would do credit to the best treatise on logic or rhetoric or composition ever written, but a trifle out of place where it stands. Notwithstanding the care taken in most cases to justify positions assumed, we find in "The Genesis of the Idea of Society" a singular exception. "It has been claimed that the notion of the prevalence of law in nature had its origin in the idea of law prevailing in the state. This should be considered by those who seek to make natural law the norm for society." So without a hint as to who has made the claim, the statement that "it has been claimed" is made the foundation of an argument, on which, in its turn, a practical warning is based. Most unfortunate of all, the references to the literature of sociology are, save in a painfully small number of cases, without any hint as to relative importance or proper order of use. Failure of service at this very vital point is all the more noticeable because the author evidently expects that much of the student's work, after the "Introduction," is to be done independently.

A constant source of irritation in reading this book lies in a curious mixture of pedantry and insistence upon distinctions which no one questions. Over and over the subject under discussion is spoken of as a "discipline." Discipline is a good word, but its use in the author's sense is so infrequent that one feels it out of place in such a work. This feeling is deepened when one finds the word used in two senses in the same paragraph. Equally open to question is "realism" as used by the author. "The social realism should be made an object of constant study." By reference to the context one can guess what is meant by "realism," but such reference ought not to be made necessary. Examples abound of distinctions insisted upon as gravely as if without them there was danger of confusion of thought "We distinguish between the genesis and the interpretation of society." "The social actuality is not to be confounded with the full consciousness of that actuality." "The genesis of Comte's sociology must not be

confounded with the genesis of sociology itself." "The subject-matter of sociology is the scope of sociological inquiry." "The student must be a thinker in order to become a sociologist." These are facts that cannot be gainsaid. Might not at least some of them have safely been taken for granted?

The chief objection to Dr. Stuckenberg's book is that it offers either too much or too little. The purpose is "to lay the basis for sociological study, to designate the problems involved, and to aid the beginner in the solution of these problems." Three classes of inquirers were contemplated in the preparation of the volume — "professional men and other persons of culture who have had no instruction in sociology," "students who have no sociology in their collegiate course," and "teachers of social science." These three classes easily merge into two, as the first and second have practically the same needs. Of the two general classes of readers thus formed, the first will with difficulty master the discussion, while the second will inevitably wish it had gone farther. It may be questioned whether a book can be made on a subject as new as the subjects involved in sociological inquiry that will be of great value at once to the general reader, presumed to be a beginner, and the teacher, presumed to be already an advanced student, if not a specialist. When a new edition is called for — and there is every reason to expect that a new edition will be called for — it is to be hoped that the author will aim at one set of needs instead of two, and will bring the less admirable part of his work up to the level of his best. At present that work seems to have produced a splendid book which needs to be rewritten. B. L. WHITMAN.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

A Primer of Psychology. By Edward Bradford Titchener. (New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898; pp. ix + 314; $1.) One test of the progress of a science is the ability to state its principles and results in a form accessible to elementary students; and the writing of an elementary psychology is, as Professor Titchener remarks, no easy matter in the present state of our knowledge. Generally speaking, this task has been well performed in the "first book in psychology." Those of opposite views will doubtless object to the extent to which the atomic view of mind underlies the work, and the rigor and consistency with which it is carried out; and we may even doubt whether it possesses the pedagogic value granted by Professor James.

The method of the present work also accords with the more common view that elementary instruction should be relatively dogmatic and free from the discussion of controverted questions as tending to confusion. But confusion and difficulty are the natural stimulus to thought, and it may be well questioned whether even the elementary student is not helped by the discussion of controverted points, provided the issue be well defined. On the other hand, there is a certain completeness about the "Primer" which distinguishes it from any of its predecessors. The questions and exercises at the end of the chapters will be an invaluable aid to the teacher who has been unable to keep track of the rather scattered literature of the subject. The work abounds with pertinent concrete illustration, and offers in general a wealth of material.— WARNER FITE.

Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion Based on Psychology and History. By Auguste Sabatier.[1] (New York: James Pott & Co., 1897; pp. ix + 348.) This book professes to be a translation of the work of Sabatier reviewed in this JOURNAL of October, 1897. The translator's name is not given. The only indications that the translation is not complete are the presence of asterisks at certain places in the text, and the statement in a footnote (p. 122) that "two nonessential sections have been omitted, one on the sacred history, the other on the nation."

The fact is that, in addition to the "two nonessential sections" specially referred to, no less than eight of the fifty-four sections in the table of contents of the original have been entirely suppressed, the numbers of the remaining sections being altered to cover the fact of the omission. The suppressed sections cover some sixty pages of the 415 of the original, and treat of such subjects as the notion of miracle in the Middle Ages, prophecy, the patriarchal history, the national history of Israel, the origin and history of the word "dogma," the notion of dogma in Catholicism and in Protestantism, the evolution of Christian dogma in history, and the double issue of the present crisis of dogma.

In addition to these there is a large number of smaller omissions, varying in length from a single sentence to several pages. Some of these are indicated by asterisks; others are not (*e. g.*, p. 4, l. 5; *cf.* p. 6 of orig.; p. 103, l. 9; *cf.* p. 121 of orig.). I have noted more than sixty omissions, of which twenty cover a greater length than a page. The latter alone cover more than sixty pages of the original, and with

[1] The work entitled in English *Vitality of Dogma* (London: Black, 1898) is substantially a reproduction of one chapter of this book. — EDITORS.

the omitted sections constitute almost a third of the book (*cf.* especially pp. ix–xv, 3–5, 68–71, 156–61, 187–92 of orig.).

In covering up the omissions all sorts of liberties have been taken with the text. Two, three, and sometimes more paragraphs are compressed into one (*e. g.*, p. 98; *cf.* pp. 116, 117 of orig.). Sentences which in the original are separated by several pages appear side by side (*cf.* especially p. 94 with pp. 106–11 of orig.). Passages are condensed, transposed, and in not a few cases rewritten by the translator. Carefully selected examples are represented by an "etc." (*e. g.*, p. 87; *cf.* p. 98 of orig.). It is not strange that even this heroic treatment should not always have been successful. A single instance must suffice. Thus on p. 68 of the translation the author is made to promise a discussion of the notion of the miracle in mediæval theology. We search for this in vain in the text. The section has been suppressed, but the reference allowed to remain. Enough has been said to show that he who desires to know what Sabatier teaches upon the weighty themes treated in this book must go for himself to the original.—WM. ADAMS BROWN.

La science de la religion. Par R. P. Chabin de la Compagnie de Jésus. (Paris: Librairie Ch. Poussielgue, 1898; pp. vi + 535.) The title suggests a work on the philosophy of religion, but the contents prove to be a dogmatic exposition of the teachings of the Roman Catholic church. To the author, indeed, the two are synonymous. St. Augustine defines the word "religion," and its contents are found in the sole religion established by the Christ, the Catholic, apostolic, Roman. All other religions, Protestant, oriental, modern Jewish, Mohammedan, pagan, are grouped together as founded or modified by men (pp. 140–41). "Les fondateurs des églises luthérienne, calviniste, anglicane, loin d'être des saints, ont été des hommes corrompus, violents, orgueilleux et cruels" (p. 281). Naturally their teachings were like themselves: "Calvin enseignait que Dieu porte l'homme à violer ses commandements. Si l'homme succombe, dit-il, Dieu l'a ainsi ordonné; doctrine fatalistique, impie, désespérante" (p. 282). This, by the way, is the only notice taken of Calvin's "errors," and it gives a fair illustration of the author's method with opponents.

He moves wholly within the circle of the dogmatics of his church. His apologetics belong to the eighteenth century. He never enters into the problems of our own day. He has read some modern books, but dismisses them with a sentence. So far as one can judge, he has

not heard of the higher criticism. His proofs are sentences from the Vulgate, the Fathers, the decrees of the councils, and the papal encyclicals. He will confirm the faith of those who already implicitly believe, and he will convince those who, wishing to believe, are content to take him as authority at once as to the contents and the refutation of all non-Roman systems.

For the rest of us the volume has value as a compact, definite statement of authorized Roman faith in the closing years of the nineteenth century. It is transparently clear in arrangement and style, and as reasonable and moderate as may be when reason is made servant of authority.—GEORGE WM. KNOX.

Les écoles d'Antioche; Essai sur le savoir et l'enseignement en Orient au IV^e^ siècle (après J.-C.). Par Albert Harrent. (Paris: Ancienne Librairie Thorin et Fils, Albert Fontemoing, éditeur, 1898; pp. 288.) This fascinating little volume carries the following matter: chap. 1, the regulation of the schools, including instruction, public and private, the morality, the discipline, the action of the state and of municipalities in regard to the schools; chap. 2, the schedule of studies under the masters of different schools, such as that of the grammarian and of the rhetorician; chap. 3, special studies, such as music, science, law, and philosophy; chap. 4, the family, the teacher, the student, including a study of the character and influences of the home, of the teacher, and of the struggles and triumphs of the student. Chap. 5 deals in detail with the masters in the different departments, their honors, their trials and triumphs. Chap. 6 gathers up interesting facts about rhetoric, rhetoricians, etc., in the fourth century. The author has apparently made large use of original sources, and has put his material into a useful and readable form. This work will appeal with especial force to students of the history of pedagogy, of Cristianity in Asia Minor in the fourth century, and of the influence of Greek thought and literature on the early Christian centuries. With the amount of space at his command, the author has made a valuable contribution to our knowledge of the fourth century.—IRA M. PRICE.

The Hittites and Their Language. By C. R. Conder, Lt.-Col. R.E., LL.D., D.C.L., M.R.A.S. (London: Wm. Blackwood & Sons; New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1898; pp. x + 312, and 16 plates of inscriptions; 7s. 6d.) Colonel Conder published *Altaic Hieroglyphs and Hittite Inscriptions* in 1887. He argued at that time that by the

aid of Mongol speech these inscriptions could be deciphered. By the side of his theories he presented tentative readings. His efforts were so warmly encouraged by some specialists that he has devoted several additional years to the same task. The present volume is the result of his best efforts. It contains chapters on the Egyptian and Assyrian conquests of Syria, the races of western Asia, Mongol gods and beliefs, and Mongol hieroglyphics; and appendices on chronology, the "Akkadian" language, notes on deities and myths, the Hittite syllabary, origin of the alphabet, Hittite texts, Hittite vocabulary, and list of authorities. It represents laborious effort, and extensive research. But we must specify the value of the work to consist only (1) in some undoubted resemblances noted between the languages compared, (2) in valuable hints here and there toward the final solution of a yet wholly unsolved problem, and (3) in the sixteen plates of Hittite inscriptions found at the end of the book. The final solution of the problem of the language of the Hittites must await the discovery of some specific key of adequate range. Until that time all attempts to decipher them must of necessity, as all that have appeared in recent years, be wholly tentative and provisional.— IRA M. PRICE.

Cherubim. Kurze Zusammenstellung der wichtigsten Ansichten und Erklärungen seit Luther. Mit Zusätzen von J. Petersen, Pastor an St. Matthäus in Jersey City. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898; pp. 48; M. 0.80.) A strange pamphlet. Nothing new, nothing original; the whole consisting mainly of page-long citations from Seiss (Philadelphia), Oehler, Delitzsch, *Psalmen* (3d edition!, in 1898!); Kübel, Keil, and one or two other, lesser lights. Of the really critical difficulties no idea; no knowledge of what Riehm and Kamphausen, Schultz and Dillmann have done. Lenormant's theories should have been known to the author, as well as Jensen's and Teloni's articles in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. I, pp. 68 ff.; Vol. VI, p. 124. Bertin's contribution in *Babyl. and Oriental Record*, Vol. III, pp. 145–9, as well as Budge's articles in *Expositor*, 1885, Vol. I, pp. 320 ff., 400 ff., should have been consulted. Karppe's renewed combination of Assyrian kurūbu and כרוב, *Journal asiatique*, July–August, 1897, pp. 91–3, as well as the literature cited in Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch* [12] (now [13]), and Brown-Gesenius, *Hebrew and English Lexicon of the Old Testament*, should have been known to the author, for these authorities are as good as, if not better than, Seiss and others. See also Cremer in the third edition of the *Realencyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*.—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Die Psalmen, übersetzt und erklärt. (Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, II. Abtheilung: "Die poetischen Bücher," 2. Band.) Von D. Friedrich Baethgen, ord. Prof. d. Theol. in Berlin. Zweite neubearbeitete Auflage. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; pp. iv, xliii + 436; M. 8.) The first edition of this commentary appeared in 1892. Its compact, comprehensive, and conservative character, together with the reputation of its author, soon commanded for it large attention. The rapidity with which that first edition disappeared soon set the author to work on the second. In spite of a serious illness which delayed the work several months, this new edition appeared on time. The principles and methods adopted by the author in the first edition remain unchanged. Although severely criticised by many reviewers, the author has stood firmly by his former purpose not to use his valuable space for encyclopædic references to other works. This compact and condensed form of a commentary cannot be too strongly recommended. On text-critical questions the position is conservative. The over-production, within a few years, of opinions and pamphlets on the personal and national character of the Psalter receives slight attention. As a matter of course, and wisely, he does not attempt to meet all of the objections of the critics of the first edition. By careful elimination and condensation Professor Baethgen has reduced the volume seventeen pages. This book, with the aim in view, is the leader in Germany as a conservative commentary on the Psalter, and deserves larger recognition than it has yet received in other Bible-studying lands.— *The Parallel Psalter:* being the Prayer-Book Version of the Psalms and a New Version, arranged on opposite pages. By S. R. Driver, D.D., Litt.D. (Oxford: Clarendon Press; New York: Henry Frowde, 1898; pp. xliv + 488; $1.50.) The prayer-book version of the Psalms is about 360 years old. It naturally contains archaisms, translations erroneous in view of modern research, and some lack of precision in the rendering of tenses. Dr. Driver has undertaken, not to displace the prayer-book version, but to set face to face with it a translation of his own based on his broad, special, and general scholarship. The reader of the prayer-book now has before him both that sacred document and a modern translation and interpretation of the same text. This handy little volume has an introduction that recites the history of the prayer-book version, the author's methods of procedure, and a list of the principal authorities consulted in doing this practical piece of work. The new translation is a choice rendering into idiomatic and strong English of the Hebrew Psalter.

Its arrangement into stanzas, according to the parallelism, adds distinctly to its appearance and its effectiveness. It is evident that the translator endeavored to hold as closely as his scholastic conscience would permit him to the phraseology of the prayer-book version. He has carefully discarded archaisms that must be explained, and has come down into modern times, except that he retains *th* of the verb in third person singular instead of using the everyday *s, e. g.*, "hath," "doeth," "driveth," "seeth." An extensive glossary of "archaisms," and another of "characteristic or otherwise noteworthy expressions occurring in the Psalms," conclude this exceedingly valuable little book. If the church is ready to follow the clearest light, it will not be many years before the left-hand page of this volume will be merely a saintly relic of the past, and the right-hand page the treasured new edition of the "little Bible."— *Das Psalter-Ego in den Ich-Psalmen.* Beitrag zur wissenschaftlichen Psalmenforschung. Von Dr. D. Leimdörfer. Mit einem Vorwort von Dr. C. H. Cornill. (Hamburg: Verlag von G. Fritzsche, 1898; pp. 121; M. 3.) Dr. Cornill in his *Vorwort* wisely says that the boundary line between the individual and national psalms is not fixed, but depends largely on the subjectivism of the writer. Our author finds in the Psalter 101 *ego*-psalms. Dropping out five duplicates, he concludes that of the remainder fifty-five are national, thirty-six individual, and five doubtful. His methods are, in the main, sound, and his points of view, varying somewhat from those of other workers in the same field, naturally lead to correspondingly different results. The work is faithfully done, and contributes something to this at present much discussed problem.— *Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter.* Von H. Roy. (In Kommission bei der Unitätsbuchhandlung in Gnadau, Prov. Sachsen, 1897; pp. 74; M. 1.50.) Through a careful study of the Psalter the author concludes that there is a close connection between the national psalms and the songs of the guild of the devout. This guild or society of the pious among Israel was the preserver and the perpetuator of the prophetic religion of Yahweh. A distinction, too, must be made between the nation as a whole and the pious of the nation, even if at times they may seem to be synonymous. This core of the devout was the permanent, the steadfast, section of Israel, upon which depended their present power and their future hopes. The discussion, particularly of individual psalms, is replete with references to substantiate the positions taken. It is a fair contribution to the study of the religious life of the Psalter. — IRA M. PRICE.

The Psalms in Three Collections. Translated with Notes by E. G. King, D.D. Part I, First Collection (Pss. i–xli). With Preface by the Bishop of Durham. (Cambridge: Deighton, Bell & Co.; London: George Bell & Sons, 1898; 6s.) The form of this work attracts immediate attention, and affords ground for criticism. A book intended "for the devotional use of the educated English reader and for such of the clergy as are not afraid of reverent criticism" defeats its intent by appearing in an unbound quarto issued in parts. Further, the constant effort to combine liturgical suggestions with critical analysis mars the unity of the author's plan. A third criticism must be that the author does not adhere to his own method of treatment throughout, as is illustrated by his bringing into this first collection, whose title-page and plan restrict its consideration to Pss. i–xli, the acrostic psalms of the later Jehovistic collection; the author thus announces his purpose to consider the psalms in their ancient groups, but varies between a chronological and a topical consideration, even where there is no occasion to doubt what consistency should lead him to do. A fourth criticism is that the author's attempt to place the psalms in their historic setting cannot be held to accord with the best results of recent investigation, nor does it conform to older and commonly accepted opinion. It is difficult to determine his basis of classification. His conclusions are often too sweeping and his processes too subjective for the reader to follow. The book is reverent and earnest, and represents faithful work on the part of the author, no doubt to the edification of his own parish; but it is too technical to be of great service to laymen, and not scholarly enough to be of great value to special students.—WILLIAM E. BARTON.

Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der jüdischen Gemeinde und der griechischen Kirche. Von Lic. Wilhelm Riedel, Privatdocent der Theologie in Kiel. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898; pp. 120; M. 2.40.) This little volume is a valuable addition to the critical apparatus of this "puzzling book." The author holds that there are no references to the "Song" in the Old or the New Testament; and when it is first mentioned in the Mishna, and in Fourth Ezra, it has already been allegorized. This allegorical interpretation probably originated in the desire to prevent the exclusion of this book from the canon, for there are indications in the Mishna, and in the notes in some manuscripts of the Greek versions of the song, that at an earlier period a simpler and more natural interpretation was given

to it. Once adopted, this allegorical interpretation became the prevailing one in the synagogue and in the church. The view of the synagogue is illustrated from the Targum, of which an excellent translation is given, and from the Midrash Rabba; while the interpretation of the Greek church is traced from Hippolytus to the catenæ. This investigation shows that, with the single exception of Theodore of Mopsuestia, whose views of the song were prominent among the heresies for which he was excommunicated, all the leaders of the Greek church allegorized the book.—WALTER R. BETTERIDGE.

"Do This in Remembrance of Me": Should it be "Offer This"? By T. K. Abbott, B.D., D.Litt. (London and New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898; pp. viii + 53; 1s.) Under this infelicitous title Professor Abbott presents an expansion of his essay entitled, "Has ποιεῖν in the New Testament a Sacrificial Meaning?" which appeared in his *Essays chiefly on the Original Texts of the Old and New Testaments*. The sacrificial interpretation has of late been finding some advocates among clergymen in Great Britain, and this Professor Abbott overthrows by a thoroughgoing study of the Septuagint uses of ποιέω and ἀνάμνησις. Symmetry and constructiveness would have been more nearly attained, had the New Testament passages in which ποιέω occurs in the sense which Professor Abbott advocates been collected and exhibited; and the argument would have lost nothing in cogency by a more judicial presentation. The appendix contains a summary of the history of the interpretation of τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, and notes on the words τράπεξα, 1 Cor. 10:21, and ἱερουργεῖν, Rom. 15:16. A curious misprint—not the only one—is "alone" for "alms," p. 34, l. 9.—EDGAR J. GOODSPEED.

Der irdische Besitz im Neuen Testament. Seine Beurteilung und Wertschätzung durch Christus und die Apostel. Von Christian Rogge, Marine-Station-Pfarrer in Kiel. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1897; pp. 120.) This is by all means the best work we have yet seen on this subject. The author accounts for the Ebionitic tendencies of Luke by saying that Luke had a Palestinian document in which the poor people had preserved Christ's most socialistic teachings.

He does not believe that Jesus' teachings were in any sense revolutionary. There is, he asserts, absolutely no ground for the view that Jesus taught the sinfulness of wealth. He taught the impossibility of worshiping it and at the same time worshiping God.

The second half deals with the teachings of the apostles. James, he declares, was an Ebionite. Paul has most truly preserved the spirit of Jesus. The account in the early part of Acts is highly colored.

Though we take exception to some of the interpretations, the book is the sanest and most scholarly on this topic that we have ever laid hands on.—G. D. HEUVER.

Die Christenverfolgungen im Römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen. Von Dr. Max Conrat (Cohn). (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1897; pp. 79; M. 2). This interesting essay discusses the question what legal basis existed for the criminal prosecutions of Christians in the Roman empire. The author confines himself to official proceedings, leaving aside mob persecutions, to which legal principles would, of course, be inapplicable. The author contends that Christianity as a religion or belief was never punishable, but that the Roman law treated apostasy on the part of Romans and missionary propaganda on the part of Christians as public and in a manner political offenses. The profession of Christianity fell under the cognizance of the law only in so far as it involved criminal conduct; and it is shown that there were two distinct grounds on which charges were preferred: certain practices popularly believed to accompany Christian worship, especially child murder and incest; and the violation of the majesty of the Roman state by refusing reverence to the Roman gods and to the genius of the emperor, which was demanded irrespective of belief, especially in connection with official and military service. It is intimated that in addition to regular criminal prosecutions a considerable restrictive police control was exercised over assemblies of Christians for worship. In support of his views the author brings together a very considerable amount of material, chiefly from the writings of early church historians, and the accounts of different trials which he gives are extremely interesting and instructive. The student of the Roman law cannot fail to be impressed with the remarkable difference of spirit between the civil and criminal law of Rome, and especially with the essentially arbitrary, if not barbarous, character of the Roman criminal procedure.—ERNST FREUND.

Beleuchtung der neuesten Controversen über die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen. Von Dr. Wilhelm Martens. (München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898; pp. vi + 158; M. 3.50.) The "Roman question" to which the author refers is

the alleged cession of the Pentapolis and other territory in Italy by Pippin to the popes as a temporal possession, which grant Karl the Great should afterward have confirmed, a statement which first appears in the *Vita Hadriani I.* by an unknown biographer. Dr. Martens affirms that the three chapters (41, 42, and 43) of the *Vita Hadriani I.* which contain this statement are not genuine, but later additions. It is not the first time that the author has made this assertion; twice before, once in 1881 and again in 1886, has he done so, has published his proofs, and has had the satisfaction that they have been accepted by historians like Heinrich von Sybel, Leopold von Ranke, and others. In the book under review Martens furnishes additional proofs for his former assertions. He first gives a succinct and lucid account of the true relation existing between the popes and the Frank kings between the years 754 and 814. This account is based upon the original sources, large extracts of which are quoted. The characters of Karl the Great, Hadrian I., and Leo III. are described. The crowning of Karl the Great by Leo III., Dr. Martens thinks, was not a piece of stage performance, as is held by some historians; he grants, however, that neither Karl nor Leo III. attached any political significance to it. The second division of the book is given up to a minute, comprehensive, and searching criticism of the three non-genuine chapters of the *Vita Hadriani I.* The biographer of this pope states that Karl the Great had had several copies of the solemn compact drawn up, according to which Karl was to deliver up to St. Peter the territory in question, and still no copy of this compact has ever been found, nor has the biographer been corroborated by any annalist or historian of the eighth or ninth century. Then, too, no pope before the tenth century appealed to this alleged solemn agreement. The language, Dr. Martens holds, is suspicious and contradicts all the other contemporaneous sources, Roman and Frank, in their description of the relation between the popes and Karl the Great. In the last division of the book the author gives an extended criticism of all the works that have appeared for or against this question since 1883.—A. J. RAMAKER.

Kämpfe und Siege des Christentums in der germanischen Welt. Von Dr. theol. Gerhard Uhlhorn. (Stuttgart: D. Gundert, 1898; pp. 346; M. 3.) This is not the first book Dr. Uhlhorn has written on a subject in direct connection with Christian history. While his three books on Christian charity supply a real want in that department of literature, he is perhaps best known by his *Conflict of Christianity with*

Heathenism, a book which, although written more than twenty years ago, is still regarded as a standard work. The book under review may be looked upon as a continuation of this last-named book. Indeed, the author tells us in the introduction that his latest book is the fulfilment of a desire on his own part, as also of a wish often expressed to him by his friends, that he might continue to treat other periods of church history as he had treated the first three centuries. The subject he has chosen allows him to touch upon all of the important movements of mediæval Christianity, in so far as they have a bearing on the German people, and so the book might with equal propriety be called a history of German Christianity during the Middle Ages. To write a book of less than 350 pages on so vast a subject, giving due emphasis to movements that are of particular importance, noticing others but slightly that are of secondary worth, and leaving out altogether such as are not needful for a condensed historical survey, this is certainly a difficult task. Dr. Uhlhorn has done this, and has done it admirably. Subjects like the following are treated at some length: "The Introduction of Christianity into Germany;" "The Organization of the Roman Church;" "The Conflict of the German Emperor with the Papacy;" "The Doctrinal Errors of the Roman Church;" "Evangelical Protests and German Mysticism." The clear and simple style of the book will add much to its popularity, and the careful, discriminating statements in the treatment of great Catholic teachers will please both Protestant and Catholic readers.—A. J. RAMAKER.

Geschichte und Dogmatik. Eine erkenntnistheoretische Untersuchung. Von Dr. Ernst Vowinckel. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898; pp. 111; M. 1.60.) In five short chapters the author discusses "the foundation of the mental sciences," "the analysis of the perceiving subject," "the apprehension of history," "theological thinking," and "idea and history"—in difficult German and without the usual German coherency of thought. He considers that the effort for "unitariness" of knowledge (*Erkennen*) is more strenuous than ever, and that this is grounded in the nature of mind and its history (one might reply to him that philosophic interest has passed away from the epistemological problem), and makes the claim that this "unitariness" of knowledge begins in theology. Add to this his other thought, theology mediates between the ideal and the historical, and one has his point of view.—*Christ the Vitalizing Principle of Christian Theology.* An Address delivered upon the occasion of his inauguration

as Roosevelt Professor of Systematic Theology in the Union Theological Seminary, New York. By Rev. William Adams Brown, M.A. (New York: Wm. C. Martin Printing House, 1898; pp. 40.) A system of theology is not a "law-regulating belief," but a "confession of faith." This is not to make doctrine subjective and arbitrary, for Christian experience has its origin in objective Christian revelation. But if theology represents Christian experience and confesses the Christian faith, its center must be Christ. There are three different senses in which the word "Christ" may be used: first, the risen Christ, as distinct from the historic Jesus; second, the historic Jesus; the third "refuses to choose between the historic Jesus and the living Christ." Each of these positions is unfolded, and the truth and error in each suggestively pointed out. The author makes an able plea for the application of the christological principle, not only in a system as a whole, but in each individual doctrine. "To see in Christ the key to all truth, present as well as past, to grasp him in his relation, not to the historic creed alone, but to the great ideas of *our* time; to use these ideas, not as masters, but as servants, not conforming Christ to them, but transforming them by Christ; and so to make confession of him in words which all men can understand — this is surely to realize the ideal of Christian theology, to render highest service both to the church and to the world." The author's ability and scholarship, together with his spirit and point of view, promise much for the advancement of theology in our time. — *Christian Rationalism.* Essays on Matters in Debate between Faith and Unbelief. By J. H. Rylance, D.D. (Published at the Bible House, New York: Thomas Whittaker, 1898; pp. 220.) This book is written in an untechnical and homiletical style. There are six of these essays, treating of free thought, reason and faith, inspiration and infallibility, the racking doubt, existing dissensions between science and religion, and a historic foothold for faith. The author is "liberal," without any marked departure from orthodoxy. Indeed, the traditional and the independent are suggestively combined in his thought. The point of view of the book may be inferred from his quotation from Bishop Butler: "Reason is the only faculty we have wherewith to judge of anything, even revelation itself." The book may be profitably read by anyone who seeks a popular presentation of the old, yet ever new, problem of the relation between knowledge and faith, science and religion, philosophy and theology. — GEORGE B. FOSTER.

The Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial. By Henry John Feasey. (London: Thomas Baker, 1897; pp. 247.) In the English church prior to the Reformation, Palm Sunday was celebrated with processions, in which palm branches, or substitutes for them, were carried about in memory of Christ's entry into Jerusalem. Other ceremonies accompanied this. The stories of the Passion were sung on four of the days of Holy Week, probably a remnant of the mystery play. The *Tenebræ* was sung Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday evenings, originally at midnight. Certain psalms were sung, while the lights were gradually put out except one, which was hid away and then restored amid noisy demonstrations.

On Thursday penitents under Lenten discipline were restored, the chrism was consecrated, the altars were stripped and washed, and the feet of the poor were ceremonially washed.

On Good Friday, after none, came the Creeping to the Cross, in which the cross was reverenced with genuflections and kissings. This was followed by a Burial of the Cross (the consecrated host being also buried from the thirteenth century) in what was called the Easter sepulcher, whence it was joyfully taken on Easter morning.

On Easter eve the great paschal candle was blessed, the new fire with which it was lighted having been previously blessed. This paschal candle was often of vast size, and so elevated as to tower toward the roof. It was kept burning at all services in Easter week, and on Sundays and great days until Ascension Day. After the blessing of the candle, the baptismal font was blessed in anticipation of the Easter Baptisms.

These ceremonies and related matters are described in this work, with many interesting details. Abundant evidence is given for each assertion, and the writer has produced a most scholarly work, one which will delight all ecclesiologists and antiquarians. It is free from polemical matter.—FRANCIS J. HALL.

La religion et la culture moderne. Conférence faite au Congrès des sciences religieuses de Stockholm le 2 Septembre 1897. Par Auguste Sabatier, professeur de l'université de Paris, doyen de la faculté de théologie protestante. (Paris: Librairie Fischbacher, 1897; pp. 43; fr. 1.) The address considers the problem under these main heads: (1) The central principle of modern culture, which is autonomy or self-government. (2) The relation of modern culture to Catholicism, whose central principle is heteronomy, or dependence upon an

external authority. Between this principle and that of modern culture the conflict seems irreconcilable. (3) The relation of modern culture to Protestantism. The evolution of Protestant religious thought having been toward the authority of the individual conscience, its relation to culture is that of *infiltration*, of possible complete interpenetration. (4) The problem now lies, not in the outer world of institutions and formal dogma, but in each man's consciousness. Its solution consists in adjusting the diverse claims of our interests, in satisfying equally our mystical faculties, which call for belief, and our theoretical or rational faculties, which call for knowledge.

The address is a satisfying and solving statement of the present state of the problem, and of the appropriate attitude toward it of religious and philosophical thought. It is enriched by reflections of recent thinking in many directions, and made practical by a many-sided and enthusiastic application of the results to science, life, and art.—W. D. MacClintock.

Thomas von Aquino's Stellung zum Wirtschaftsleben seiner Zeit. Untersucht von Max Maurenbrecher, Dr. phil. I. Heft. (Leipzig: Verlag von J. J. Weber, 1898; pp. 112; M. 3.) The social writings of Aquinas are invested with great interest because they are so strongly recommended to the Roman Catholic priests of our day by papal authority. The present pamphlet is part of a doctor's dissertation. The sources are critically examined, and a sketch of the political and economic doctrines of Thomas Aquinas relating to cities, labor, and property is presented.—*The Twentieth Century City.* By Josiah Strong. (New York: The Baker & Taylor Co., 1898; pp. 181; $0.50.) The author of *Our Country* and *The New Era* here discusses problems of urban life as they affect the church. He draws a rather dark picture of "materialism" as indicated by progress in the use of machinery. The familiar tendency to congestion of population is illustrated. The menace of materialism in urban and national life is discussed. This statement of the moral and religious peril is followed by a suggestion of remedies: the cultivation of a social spirit in and by means of the church; the circulation of ethical and social tracts by young people's societies; censorship of councils and legislatures by Christian men of special training; and concentration of enlightened public sentiment on evils. While an adequate and comprehensive treatment is impossible in so small a treatise, the suggestions made deserve the attention of all Christian leaders of thought and conduct.—*Socialism and the Social*

Movement in the Nineteenth Century. By Werner Sombart, Professor in the University of Breslau. Translated by Anson P. Alterburg. (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1898; pp. xvii + 199; $1.25.) This book contains a series of popular lectures which set free the essential and real factors of the social movement from entangled and confused details of theories. Socialism is regarded as the movement of the "possessionless class" in all modern countries. The class itself is a necessary product of the capitalistic system of production. Lassalle and Marx have helped to clarify conceptions and unify the class for action, but the distinct interests of the proletariat are essentially marked out by historic causes independent of agitators. Socialism has been identified with rebellion against authority, because hitherto the ruling class has prevented the wage-workers from securing proper representation in the councils of state. Socialism has opposed itself to religion, because the church has used its machinery to uphold the political power which oppressed the ambitious workingmen. When the wage-earning classes come to have a share in government and church, they will be free from the temptation to hate both. The synchronistic table of the social movement from 1750 to 1896 is very instructive and convenient.— *The New Citizenship*. By Samuel Zane Batten. (Philadelphia: The American Sunday-School Union, 1898; pp. vi, 306; $1.) This book is typical of the kind of sermons which seem to respond to a contemporary need. Not all sermons should be like these. We do not go to any volume of pulpit discourses for systematic treatment of social science. But in this book we are shown how one may, in most impassioned and evangelical utterance, kindle humane sentiment, awaken thought upon social relations and duties, and send men to the best sources of scientific discussion. The ideal presented is at once social and Christian. The Bible, evangelical doctrine, prayer, habit, amusements, industrial conduct, political duty, the church, are all treated in the light of their relations to the growing kingdom of God on earth.— C. R. HENDERSON.

THE AMERICAN

JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY

Volume III OCTOBER, 1899 Number 4

THE PROPER USE OF SCIENCE BY THE PULPIT.

By JOHN MERLE COULTER,
The University of Chicago.

THE writer feels great hesitation in discussing such a subject, as he is entirely unfamiliar with the details of instruction in our theological schools. His observation of ministers in active service has been somewhat extensive, but they must represent the theological training of a decade or more ago. Since that time the methods of training may have been revolutionized, for it is within that period that the most evident need of changed methods has developed. It is frankly conceded in the outset, therefore, that many of the needs herein suggested may have been provided for already; but it may be of some service for a representative of those whom the pulpit is intended to influence to speak of some of his impressions of pulpit training as exemplified by those now in active service. It must not be supposed that any criticism that may be ventured upon is directed against ministers indiscriminately, for, as in every other learned profession, there are those who pass beyond their formal training and do not retain its distinctive marks. The suggestions offered are based upon the average product of theological training, to be observed in the majority of pulpits today.

A proper preparation for the pulpit has become almost

overwhelming in its demands. With the advance of knowledge every teacher is called upon to carry an increasing burden, and no preparation has become so vast and varied as that of him who teaches from the pulpit. It is not within the power of a man to compass all the traditional training for the pulpit, and also the vast new body of truth that can be made of prominent service. In the selection which must result it would seem wise to reduce the speculative parts of preparation to a minimum, and to put emphasis upon things that are known.

No region of human knowledge confronts the pulpit with greater menace, if neglected, or with greater promise of help, if cultivated, than that included under the general name of science; and yet, in this form of training the pulpit is glaringly deficient. The conflict between science and theology, which once was made so prominent an issue, was kept alive by theologians who had no conception of the purpose and methods of science, and by scientific men who confused theology with religion. The two parties to the conflict each stood for a great body of truth, concerning both of which speculations differed; but speculations are not vital.

In the present discussion it is proposed to suggest the possible service of science to the pulpit, restricting the term science to that part of it popularly known as "natural science." This special field of human knowledge has recently developed so enormously and has entered so intimately into the interests of mankind that the present period is often spoken of as the "age of science." Whether the phrase be just or not, it serves to emphasize the fact that science is a very prominent factor in modern life.

With the development of science has come the development of the scientific spirit, involving a point of view and a method totally different from those of a century ago. This scientific spirit, chiefly through the influence of educational institutions, is taking possession of mankind, and it would seem to be a necessity for the pulpit to understand and use it. If the pulpit is to retain dominant influence over educated men and women, it must enter into their thoughts, and approve itself in method and material.

It is claimed here that natural science may be of immense service to the pulpit both in training and in material.

I. TRAINING.—It is necessary to discover the peculiar results of scientific training before the claim can be made clear that it may be of service to the pulpit. Contact with the so-called "humanities" cultivates the power of appreciation, the ability to recognize what is best in human thought and conduct. The power of appreciation involves both the injection of self and an artificial standard. Self-injection means the ability to read between the lines, to put into them a meaning which is suggested rather than stated, and which is in the main a subjective result, dependent upon the individual and not upon inherent truth. The standard of appreciation for most persons is conventional, for a few individual, in all cases subject to wide variation. This simply means that there is no standard of appreciation fixed in the nature of things, and that this process does not necessarily bring the mind into contact with essential truth. The pulpit has largely developed the ability to read between the lines, and self-injection is a conspicuous feature of pulpit utterances. This power is admirable and must be cultivated, but runs to dangerous extremes unless checked by a complementary power.

The complement to the habit of self-injection is most definitely developed by scientific training. In obtaining results from the study of the phenomena of science, their value is in proportion to the power of self-elimination possessed by the trained observer. Any self-injection introduces error and vitiates the result. The standard in this case is not a conventional or variable one, but is absolute truth.

Both kinds of training are essential to those who would attack the largest problems, and who would wield the greatest influence. Unchecked self-injection may lead to mysticism; unrelieved self-elimination may lead to a rejection of everything that is not material. The best training has been obtained when these powers are well balanced.

It should be remarked, for fear of misunderstanding, that reading about science is not scientific training, any more than

reading about righteousness is training in righteousness. There is vastly too much reading about subjects which goes by the name of training. It is the atmosphere of work, rather than the stated results of work, that brings real knowledge, and the atmosphere of science is found only in the laboratory, which simply means direct contact with the subject-matter.

It may be well to state more in detail certain specific results of scientific training which may be of value to the pulpit, broadly included in the general effect already presented.

Such training results in an *increased power to recognize the essential relation between cause and effect;* to know what a demonstration involves. Speaking very frankly, I am bound to confess that my most painful experience in connection with pulpit utterances is the frequently recurring hiatus between cause and effect; the evident inability to recognize the inadequacy of testimony; the triumphant and confident statement of a conclusion which is far from proved. It is by no means claimed that rash conclusions are in any way peculiar to the pulpit, but that the pulpit, dealing as it does with such essential truths, should be peculiarly free from them. In very many cases supposed connections between cause and effect are believed through inheritance rather than investigation. Conclusions of former generations are accepted rather than questioned. In such cases severe scientific training is necessary to eliminate the hereditary element in belief, and to compel an open and judicial attitude toward testimony. Many assumed connections between cause and effect command reverence on account of their age, and it seems like sacrilege to question them. Such ill-considered reverence, however, is a hindrance to progress, for it confounds crude thinking with essential truth. That belief which prides itself upon a blind acceptance of all the consequences that follow some unproved premise seems to the scientific mind a stultification of the human intellect, and represents a mental attitude that cannot exist for a day in the laboratory. It is bad enough for anyone to have such an attitude, but when he is a public teacher, he compels belief on the part of those not trained to think for themselves, and compels disgust on the part of those who have been

trained to think. The serious, as well as the hopeful, feature of the situation is that the latter class is rapidly increasing.

Scientific training also results in an *increased power of analysis.* In the laboratory, when a phenomenon is under observation, it is generally recognized as a composite result obtained from several factors. It is the duty of the student to discover all possible factors, to distinguish the more important from the less important, to be absolutely sure that no factor is lurking unseen. In the early progress of science the discovery of a single factor which contributed to the explanation of a phenomenon was deemed adequate, but presently it was found that numerous explanations did not explain, and a keener analysis of phenomena was developed.

In such vast and vital phenomena as those which form the subject-matter of pulpit teaching the keenest analysis is demanded. It is demanded not only on account of the complexity of the subject-matter, but also because, from its very nature, it is completely enveloped by the husks of human opinion. It needs training in analysis to strip off these unessential husks and to discover the kernels of essential truth. There is no field of human inquiry which has inherited a greater mixture of essentials and nonessentials than the general field of religion; and there is no field in which sharper distinction should be made between what is known and what is inferred, between what must be and what may be. There is no field in which dogmatic assertions are so out of place, and in which the mind should be kept so open and receptive.

Since the civilized world has become somewhat trained in habits of analysis, nonessentials are becoming widely recognized, and he who proclaims them in the same assured way that he may well assume when proclaiming essential truth runs the serious risk of having both disbelieved. It would seem to be a very serious matter to imperil truth through lack of power to distinguish between it and a mass of inferences which hang about it like ill-assorted trappings. Truth has suffered more from being dressed up by its friends than from being attacked by its enemies, and the intelligent world today is loud in its demands for naked

truth. The vast inheritance of fact and opinion which is the possession of the pulpit demands the sharpest analysis. This is equally true of law, of medicine, and of ordinary teaching, as we are free to acknowledge; and no criticism of this sort can be directed against the pulpit in which the other learned professions do not share, but the overwhelming importance of the interests represented by the former justify us in making greater and more insistent demands upon it.

The chief end of scientific training, however, is to increase *the power of synthesis*. The accumulation of data and the patient analysis are regarded as sterile unless they lead to synthesis, for the purpose of science is to reach laws through the observation of results. It is true that a vast amount of scientific work consists of the dreary drudgery of accumulating facts, but it is simply the accumulation of material to be used in construction. This training in the use of material for construction would seem to be a very important one for the pulpit. No profession is called upon to deal with a wider range of material, and in no profession is the work of synthesis so difficult. The important generalizations connected with religion demand the highest development of the synthetic power, or they will be worse than useless. The tendency to organize theories without adequate training in the use of material is peculiarly rampant in all matters which have to do with the general interests of mankind. Most of these theories would never have been proposed had their authors been somewhat trained in synthesis, even a casual examination showing that the facts cited are not only few, but with no essential relation to the conclusions.

II. MATERIALS.—The proper use of the materials of science in the pulpit depends upon scientific training, rather than upon information about science. For this reason I have dwelt somewhat at length upon the results of scientific training. The actual material of science that might be available to the pulpit for illustrative purposes is too vast to come within the knowledge of the pulpit teacher. It is a captious spirit which would criticise such a speaker for evident lack of information as to the details of some natural phenomenon he is using as an illustration. An

illustration may be useful whether the details given are literally true or not. Criticism of this character is unjust, for it asks too much. Familiarity with the details of science should not be demanded, but familiarity with the methods and spirit of scientific work may be. Two men may be ignorant alike of the details of certain phenomena, but they may differ widely in the method of handling them, revealing in the one case the scientific point of view, in the other no point of view at all. But these are trivial matters when compared with the great fundamental truths of science, concerning which trained religious teachers should have some real knowledge. I propose to give some reasons for this statement.

a) The pulpit establishes itself upon the claim that man has received a revelation from God in the Holy Scriptures, and that these Scriptures contain the best guide to belief and conduct. Very properly, therefore, attention is focused upon the Scriptures, and every glimpse of truth discovered in them is treasured. So long as the Book is not made a fetish, its details are regarded as matters of secondary importance, and the chief endeavor is to discover its general purpose and principles, which the details may serve to illustrate. As a revelation of God, rather than of men's thoughts concerning God, this general view is necessary. It is readily acknowledged that if the pulpit has any claim upon our attention at all, this sort of study is fundamental.

But the pulpit also claims that God has revealed himself to man, not merely in the words of Scripture, but also in the works of nature. This would suggest that nature should at least be a minor study. Accepting both claims, it would seem likely that the revelation of Scripture is supplementary to that of nature, containing further, but not contradictory, revelation. From the point of view of the scientific man, therefore, it would seem more logical to read our knowledge of nature into our interpretation of Scripture, than to interpret nature by our conceptions of Scripture. There are certain things about nature that we can know in a way that Scripture teaching can never be known. All this is but another way of saying that the scientific habit of mind will be likely to obtain more clearly the essential truths of

Scripture than the one without such training. To say that a scientifically trained mind is not one adapted to the investigation of the Scripture revelation is too dangerous a claim to press.

The frequent attempts to interpret natural phenomena by conceptions derived from the Scripture revelation have so often ended disastrously that a reversal of the process might be suggested. That these disasters do not involve the Scriptures simply demonstrates that the conclusions were unessential. As an illustration it might be cited how common and painful were the efforts to show the perfect adaptation of everything in nature. The most trivial anatomical parts of plants and animals were held to be perfect, in the sense that they could not be better adapted to the work immediately at hand. Since it has been found that there is no such thing as perfect adaptation among organisms, and, furthermore, that perfect adaptation means stagnation, for it removes an essential factor in progress, not only have old views been corrected, but a very large new thought has been introduced.

Again, the argument from immediate design was once very strongly urged, but when it was discovered that the vast majority of so-called "designs," so far as plants and animals are concerned, are failures, the old argument was dropped, but in its place there came evidence of a design so noble and far-reaching that those once cited seemed trivial.

The gross mediæval conceptions of God, most of which seem horrible now, were derived from the Scriptures by those who were densely ignorant of nature, and to whom such conceptions seemed not at all incongruous. The development of knowledge of the laws of nature, more than anything else, gradually eliminated the grossest absurdities, and today the conception of God is a fair index of our progress. Better acquaintance with the laws of nature has brought a majesty into those phenomena once attributed to direct divine interposition that makes them seem far more worthy of such reference. That old conception of God which made him a huge magician outside of the universe—a conception far enough removed from that of the New Testament revelation, and to this day so hard to eradicate—was abandoned largely on

account of the discoveries of science. The orderly and invariable operations of law, which became more and more evident, demanded either an abandonment of the idea of a "providence," or the claim that these laws were but his methods of working. In this way science may be said to have restored God to the universe. The further contributions of science to this interesting field of speculation remain to be seen, but that conceptions of God will change with increasing knowledge seems evident, and in so far as he is claimed to have any connection with the phenomena of nature will science necessarily contribute toward this change of conception.

These are but a few illustrations of the attempt to read Scripture into nature, rather than nature into Scripture, and the claim is advanced that the pulpit would be tremendously strengthened if it should cultivate the scientific point of view just enough to use it as a check.

b) Aside from any claim that nature is a partial revelation of God, and so deserves the attention of the professional teacher of religion, it is even more fundamentally important in revealing certain facts in reference to man. After all, the great problems of religion center about man, his origin, his conduct, his destiny. Anything which contributes to a knowledge of these great fundamental subjects is not merely worthy of cultivation by the pulpit, but essential.

In the very nature of things, science touches the human problem only in its present aspects. The origin and destiny of man are interesting, but hardly vital questions as compared with his present structure and tendencies. I presume it is the man of today, with his good and evil impulses, that represents the field of the pulpit teacher, and that his purpose is to strengthen the good impulses and to check the evil ones. At least this is the workable field, and it would seem to be a waste of energy to dwell too much upon such speculations as origin and destiny.

It is in this very field of man's present structure and tendencies that science can be of the greatest service. Three great problems may be used as illustrations of this point.

1. *Heredity.*— The problems of heredity are at present attracting the widest attention among students of biology. Enough has been discovered already to be of service, and to assure us that the problem its probably not an insoluble one. The influence of various factors in determining the nature of offspring is recognized, and the influence of ancestry is becoming more definitely known.

In formulating any movements for the interest of mankind, if the laws of heredity be taken into account it becomes at once evident that the same treatment is not applicable to all cases. The habit of analysis, which studies men, and groups them according to their hereditary tendencies, is essential to one who would help them most effectively.

The whole subject, however, is perhaps too indefinite as yet to be of any great service, but it is full of promise.

2. *Environment.*—The influence of environment is a much more definite thing, and is of immense importance in the human problem, as in all regions of biology. Nothing is more clearly known than the effect of environment upon the structure and tendencies of all organisms, and these facts find direct application in the moral structure and tendencies of men. In a blind way this has been long recognized, and movements based upon it have been organized, but they have never yet been adequately adopted by the pulpit.

To speak in a very general way, environment is so variable a thing that it results in numerous groups of men. Any single method of approach can be adapted to but few of these groups at most, and does not reach the others. In the formal organization of the church and its pulpit the contact with groups is narrow, and the majority of men are untouched. I only speak of a well-known and much-lamented fact.

An illustration may be taken from plants. The surface of the earth is not covered by vegetation at random, but plants are organized into definite societies, dependent upon environment. In some of these societies there is deficient water supply, in others excessive water supply, in others a lack of special soil constituents, in others a lack of light, in others too intense light,

in others excessive heat, and in still others a great lack of heat, etc., etc.; and all of these conditions have developed peculiar plant types. It is evident that if one studied only the group with deficient water supply, he might reach the conclusion that water is the panacea for all unfavorable plant conditions, and that to bring them all to one common level of vegetative power they should be treated with water. The folly of such a conclusion is apparent upon the statement; for it is evident that such treatment would result in improving one or two groups, would have no effect upon certain other groups, and might seriously injure still others.

A study of the laws of environment must result in demonstrating to the formal church organization its own inadequacy, and in suggesting a reason for it, as well as a possible remedy.

3. *Evolution.*—This is at present a great working hypothesis of biology, and it has permeated every department of thought. It is a recognized law, although opinions may vary widely as to the extent of its application. Quite apart from its possible explanation of the origin of man, it finds large application in his present affairs. I know of nothing more helpful to the student and leader of men than a clear appreciation of the workings of evolution as exemplified in plants and animals. Aside from correcting gross current misapprehensions, which are so common and suicidal in pulpit utterances, the law is suggestive and encouraging to all helpers of mankind.

Evolution teaches that progress is gradual, that a better is progress toward the best, that sudden radical changes are not to be expected, that the future has its roots in the present. It teaches that revolutions are not the ordinary way of working, and that reformation may be very slow. It forbids unreasonable demands upon the individual or upon society, and discountenances the usual type of reformer. It shows that there have been no universal catastrophes and new creations, but that the present has gradually evolved from the past, and that the future will appear in the same gradual way.

Furthermore, it shows that advance in a certain direction may not be uniform, for there are periods of apparent recession,

as well as those of more rapid advance. The results are only apparent in the large view over long periods of time, when the tossing back and forth of surface waves disappears, and the steady advance of the slow-moving current becomes apparent.

Perhaps most important of all, it teaches that man is a poor interpreter of individual events, and has no means of deciding whether they contribute to advance or not. Hence it must lead to cautious and charitable judgments, but at the same time it supplies a strong ground of confidence that there must be eventual progress. Some of the minor details of evolution are useful to the pessimist, but its whole sweep justifies the broadest optimism.

I have written the above with the fullest appreciation of the herculean task laid upon the pulpit today. In fact, it is so great that to me it seems appalling and even impossible. The body of knowledge is becoming so vast and so specialized that the pulpit dares not handle it freely, lest it display its ignorance; and yet it dares not ignore it. With a rich heritage of abstractions the preacher is compelled to face a very concrete world, and finds the adjustment hard.

I venture to suggest that there are certain essentials which belong to the pulpit teacher, essentials in which he must be a specialist. These essentials are few and simple and very effective, as was clearly shown by the founder of Christianity. Whenever the pulpit is led away from these essentials into metaphysical tangles, it ceases to be effective in a world not given to metaphysics. Or when it abandons the essentials to pronounce in *ex cathedra* fashion upon movements in other departments of thought and work, it also ceases to be effective, for the thoughtful world recognizes that it speaks without adequate knowledge.

In spite of all this, to recognize essentials and to enforce them effectively under the present conditions demands some modification of the preparation useful a half century ago. It is the glory of the gospel that it remains the same through all changes of human thought. If its claims are true, nothing can

be taken from it or added to it. But it is also true that its presentation must be adapted to current knowledge and current habits of thought. No more illustrious examples of this can be cited than the founder of Christianity and his most successful messengers. All of these adapted the message to those to whom it was given. It had acquired no formal, hereditary dress, but dwelt among men as it found them. The message is never changing, but its presentation must be ever changing.

The great body of thinking men want the gospel from the pulpit, but they want its presentation to have something in common with their knowledge and their habits of thought. The most conspicuous additions to knowledge, and the almost complete transformation of habits of thought, have come from the development of science. It would seem essential, therefore, for the pulpit teacher of today to enter the laboratories of science, in order that he may secure at least two things: (1) the scientific attitude of mind, which can only be obtained in an atmosphere of actual work; (2) some knowledge of the great underlying principles of science.

These suggestions are offered with no thought of enfeebling the message, but with the earnest longing that the messenger may become more powerful, by being trained to utilize all that is most serviceable in materials and methods.

ETHICAL POSTULATES IN THEOLOGY.

By W. RUPP,
Lancaster, Pa.

THE sciences of theology and ethics may be said generally to be related as are religion and morality. These, while distinct, are not separate. They mutually interpenetrate and condition each other. A sound state of morality presupposes a healthy form of religion; and, on the other hand, true religion can flourish only in connection with a sound and vigorous moral life. Moreover, moral and religious ideas mutually affect and modify each other. For example, a true Christian's moral sentiments would not permit him to commit murder or theft in the service of religion; nor would a Christian's religious principles suffer him to deny Christ or to profess atheism for the benefit of his country or for the advantage of the poor.

In like manner the sciences of theology and ethics mutually affect and condition each other. The fundamental principles of the one are presupposed in the other. Ethics makes use of ideas which, in their developed form at least, it derives from theology. For instance, the very foundation principle of ethics, namely, the principle of moral obligation, or of the moral law, is a theological idea. No system of ethics, and certainly no system of Christian ethics, can have a secure basis that does not start from the principle of the idea of God;[1] but the idea

[1] In taking this position we do not mean to deny that there may be morality without religion. Man is constitutionally a moral as well as religious being; and it is possible that one side of his nature may be developed, while the other side may remain comparatively latent. We hold, however, that this is an abnormal condition, and that morality cannot maintain itself long in purity and vigor without some development, at least, of the religious nature, which implies a conscious apprehension of an essential relation to God. Nor do we mean to deny that there may be a science of ethics without a formal recognition of the idea of God as the principle of moral obligation. Ethics may be treated merely as a branch of physics, or of biology, as Herbert Spencer, for instance, has treated it. The phenomena of moral life, or of conduct, may be regarded merely as effects of the process of natural evolution. As such they may be investigated, collected, classified. The product of such an operation is

of God is logically formulated in dogmatic theology, and accepted in ethics as its starting-point. At least this is the usual method. It is possible, of course, for the Christian moralist to develop the idea of God for himself in an *a priori* way; as, for instance, Rothe does, who starts for this purpose from the notion of absolute pure being; but in treatises on ethics this is not usually considered either convenient or necessary, as it would tend to confuse the two sciences of dogmatics and ethics. It is the business of dogmatic theology to develop and state in logical forms the ideas of the nature and attributes of God, which are given immediately in the Christian consciousness. But this very development of the idea of God involves the evolution also of ethical ideas; for God is the primary moral being, and the religious conception of God must necessarily awaken the ethical ideas or principles which are latent in the human mind in consequence of its essential relation to God, who is the source of its existence. And the logical treatment of these ethical ideas gives us the science of ethics in its Christian form. Thus the science of ethics arises by the side of dogmatics, and claims a relatively independent position. It does not, however, sunder its connection with dogmatics. It admits dogmatic or theological

sometimes called *scientific ethics*. It is, however, in fact, rather a *natural history* of ethics than a *science* in the proper sense of the term. Science, especially moral science, has to do not merely with facts or phenomena, but with principles. It asks not merely *what*, but *why*. In ethics we have to do not merely with what is, but with what ought to be, and with the reason why it ought to be. We have, for instance, not understood the fact of conscience when we have enumerated what things it enjoins or forbids. We want to know *why* it enjoins or forbids — we want to know what is the source of its authority. Now, the conscience, by its very inability to grant any dispensation from its behests, proves that it is not itself the source of the authority which it exercises. That source must be without itself. What, then, is it? A blind process of evolution, some may say; the Christian theist will say, it is God, the holy and righteous author of our being. This is the point at which even philosophical, or truly scientific, ethics must at last arrive. All intuitional ethics must posit a moral principle outside of the individual personality as the ground of the sense of moral obligation. And this is the point from which Christian or theological ethics will start. It will assume that the primordial moral principle is one with the personal God of Christian faith, the complete idea of whom is formulated in Christian theology. The Christian moralist and the Christian theologian, accordingly, start from the same point; and it is the purpose of this paper to discuss the relation which they sustain to each other and the mutual respect which they owe to each other.

postulates within its own domain, and allows them, to some extent at least, to exercise a determinative influence over the treatment of its own material. This view will be generally accepted, at least so far as Christian ethics is concerned.

But may it be demanded, now, that this relation should be reciprocal? May it be required that dogmatic theology also should admit ethical postulates within its sphere, and give them a decisive voice in the formulation of its doctrines? Or may theology in its formulation of doctrine violate the clear dictates of the moral reason even in its Christian form, as if theology and ethics, or religion and morality, had no relation to each other? Does the authority of the church, or the supposed authority of Scripture, absolve the theologian from the necessity of compliance with recognized ethical ideas and postulates? There is difference of opinion in regard to these questions; and the practice of theology has largely proceeded on the assumption that dogmatics is superior to ethics, and needs to take no advice from it. That theological doctrines often do conflict with current ethical principles and sentiments is a fact with which intelligent Christians are familiar. Not only dogmatics, but exegesis too, has at times contradicted the best and surest utterances of the moral reason, not only of individual Christians, but of Christendom. We need here only to refer to the ideas which exegetical theology once entertained in regard to the rights of civil rulers, and in regard to the lawfulness of human slavery. Subjects have been declared to have no rights which rulers are bound to respect, and slavery has been justified, on the authority of Scripture, in spite of the dictates of the moral sense and reason.

But to any objections to doctrinal propositions on ethical grounds the usual reply has been that the utterances of the moral reason cannot be weighed against the statements of revelation, because the reason is relative and imperfect, while revelation is absolute and infallible. The moral reason is, in its own nature, finite, and therefore progressive. But that which is capable of progress and change is at no stage of its development perfect. In regard to this position, however, it may be

remarked, in passing, that it is well understood now that theology is progressive, too, and that its results must, therefore, also be imperfect at any period of time. But it is alleged, further, that the moral reason has been weakened and perverted by the fall, and that its evidence, therefore, cannot be received as trustworthy. Revelation, on the other hand, it is said, gives us the absolute teaching of God. In revelation God speaks; and where God speaks it is the duty of the reason, in its practical as well as in its theoretical function, and in its regenerate as well as in its unregenerate state, to be silent. This is doubtless true; where God speaks, man's duty is to hear. But this reasoning forgets that in estimating theological doctrines we have to do with something more than the teaching of God in revelation: we have to do also with the service performed by the human reason in the interpretation of revelation. And when any theological doctrine conflicts with moral sense or feeling, the question is whether this conflict is to be set to the account of the revelation, or to the account of the interpretation. The idea, therefore, that theological dogmas are clothed with divine authority, because they are supposed to be derived from divine revelation, is, to say the least, rather naïve than conclusive. This idea has, however, been held by many in good faith; and when the theoretical reason, in its interpretation and elaboration of Scripture, has reached results which are repugnant to the moral sentiments, it has been cooly affirmed that where God speaks the moral sentiments are bound to be silent. Who art thou, O man, that repliest against God? This was Calvin's resort when he confessed that the decree of reprobation which his own logic had created, and which, according to his own definition, "involves so many nations, with their infants, in eternal death," is a horrible decree—*decretum quidem horribile, fateor*—but one that must nevertheless be believed on the authority of God and of Holy Scripture. To the argument that doctrines which violate the moral sentiments of men cannot be just and in harmony with the moral character of God, the usual answer has been that "the divine justice is too high to be measured by a human standard, or comprehended by the

littleness of the human mind." That was Calvin's answer to all such "quibbles," and means that God's justice is different from our justice — God's morality different from human morality, not merely in degree, but in kind, and that, therefore, it may very well happen that there may be revealed dogmas that shall contradict our moral sentiments. This gives a relative and contingent character to all human morality, and would, in the end, involve its total destruction.

It will be observed, then, that the question of the validity of ethical postulates in theology, upon which depends in fact the very existence of morality, is one which involves the further question as to the authority of our moral ideas and principles universally. What authority belongs to our moral ideas? Are they merely subjective conceptions, or do they correspond to an objective reality in the universe, as is supposed to be the case with our rational ideas by all who are not subjective idealists? The correct answer to this question, we believe, can best be reached by a brief inquiry into the origin and nature of our moral ideas. To such an inquiry we, therefore, now address ourselves. And as we are here writing mainly for theologians, who admit the general principles of theism, we need not spend any time in refuting the current theories of sensational or naturalistic ethics. The fact that our ethical ideas are gradually developed in connection with experience does not prove that they have their source in experience, or that they are derived from sensation. The origin and development of the moral ideas must be supposed to be analogous to the origin and development of the rational ideas in general; which, though conditioned by sensation, have not their origin in sensation, but in the nature and activity of the mind itself. To the old aphorism, "*In intellectu nihil est, quod non prius fuerit in sensu*," Leibniz, as is well known, added the words, "*nisi intellectus ipse*," implying that the mind itself is constitutionally a source of knowledge. So, we may say, there is nothing in our moral ideas, or in our moral knowledge, that was not previously in our moral experience, except the moral nature or conscience itself. The moral nature contains, in its constitution, principles which are developed

and brought into the light of consciousness by experience; and thus moral ideas are formed. Moral ideas, as such, are not innate any more than rational ideas are innate; but neither are they merely adventitious, that is, put into the mind from without by sensation. They are formed by the mind itself; but this is possible only because the mind is constitutionally endowed with moral principles capable of being developed.

But now, these moral principles, or primordial moral elements, the mind has not given to itself; and, therefore, the authority which belongs to them is not derived from the conscience which recognizes and enforces them. The conscience is not autonomic, or self-legislative, in the sense that its authority has its foundation merely in itself, but only in the sense that its mandates are formulated within itself and are not foreign to its own nature. The conscience is the witness of an authority which, though making itself heard in its own voice, is nevertheless objective. The law to which the conscience binds the will is recognized as a force established and maintained by an authority other than the subjective conscience. The law written in the heart, which it is the business of conscience to read and interpret to the reason and the will, was not written there by the conscience itself; it is the enactment and the writing of an authority that is superior to the conscience, and superior to the heart also, of the human subject. The conscience cannot recognize the validity of any legislation that contradicts this fundamental legislation impressed upon its own constitution; and in so far it is autonomic; but it is not autonomic in the sense of being the ultimate source of the authority which it proclaims. And it has no power ever to release the will from the obligation of that authority. The conscience, therefore, is the clearest evidence of the existence of a power that makes for righteousness, which is other than man, and upon which man's existence and nature are dependent. Our moral constitution, then, containing those principles out of which our moral ideas are developed, is the gift of the Being that has made us.

And what is the relation of this gift to the nature and character of that Being? Is it an arbitrary, an accidental gift,

determined by a groundless volition of the giver, or is it a gift necessarily determined by the character of the giver? In other words, what is it in God that forms the ground of moral obligation, and consequently of morality? Is it his will, or is it his nature? Is the moral law an arbitrary enactment of God that might have been otherwise than it is, or is it rational and necessary? There can be no doubt as to the answer which the Christian consciousness will give to this question. According to the Christian conception, man is the offspring of God, and therefore, in nature, akin to God. This thought is expressed on the very first page of the Bible in the proposition that God made man in his own image. The moral nature of man is a reflection of the nature of God; and the nature of God must, accordingly, be the ultimate principle of morality. To suppose that God determines what is good and what is evil by a mere act of arbitrary volition, which might be different from what it is, is to suppose that God himself is without moral character. But against such a supposition both Scripture and the moral consciousness agree in protesting. God is good, God is holy, God is righteous, God is love: these are propositions which the moral consciousness, in its Christian form at least, affirms no less decidedly than does Scripture. And here is the answer to the question which is sometimes asked so triumphantly: What is it that determines the nature of morality, if it is not the will of God? Surely, it cannot be anything outside of God! No, certainly not; but it is something in God—it is God's character. God wills the good, because he is himself good. The character of God is the standard of his will; and his will can, therefore, never be contrary to his nature, nor to the principles of the moral reason in man, which is a reflection of the moral nature of God. In other words, that which is right for man cannot be different from that which is right for God, nor that which is wrong for man different from that which is wrong for God.

But to this view, that morality is something objective in the nature of God, the objection is sometimes made that if God is not good, or does not make the good, by his volition, then he is not good freely, and thus morality after all disappears. This

objection involves a misconception of the nature of moral freedom. Moral freedom, in its perfect state, is not inconsistent with necessity. In the case of a finite moral being we may distinguish three stages in the development of freedom: first, the stage of *essential* freedom, before the awakening of the consciousness to the reality of the moral law, when the process of the moral life is spontaneous; secondly, the stage of *formal* freedom, commencing with the distinct presentation of the law in the conscience, which gives rise to the power of choice; and, thirdly, *real* freedom, when the good, or the necessity of the law, has, by a series of volitions, become the character of the person, and when the choice of evil has become an impossibility. In the case of a created being moral goodness can only be brought to pass by a process which involves the exercise of free choice; but when the process is completed and the character fully formed, the element of choice must fall away, and freedom must become one with necessity. In the case of God, however, who is eternal, no such process is either necessary or possible. We cannot conceive of God as passing eternally from a non-moral into a moral condition. He is unchangeably and eternally moral. But his morality is not for that reason unfree. He is not moral by compulsion, or by force of any necessity outside of him, but by the necessity of his own nature, which to obey is his highest freedom. There is thus a formal difference in the processes by which morality is realized in God and man; but that does not imply a difference in the contents of divine and human morality, or in the moral ideas and sentiments which are peculiar respectively to God and man.

The notion that the nature of God is indifferent to good and evil, and that this distinction is established merely by an arbitrary enactment of his will, "his good and sovereign pleasure," is, in fact, destructive of morality. If God is not what he requires the moral creature to be, on what ground can he make this requirement? If, for example, he hates his enemies, and can never forgive them until the debt which they owe is fully paid, on what ground can we be asked to love our enemies and do good to those who persecute us? An authority that

issues commands without cause or reason, and that does not in itself realize the character which it demands in others, could not be respected, though it should be the sovereign authority of the universe. It is a totally unethical and false conception, begotten of abnormal states of human society, that sovereignty raises a being above the conditions, or above the sphere, of ethical determinations. God's sovereignty does not consist in being above the ethical requirements which he makes of the creature; and the creature can be moral only so long as it believes the Creator to be moral. Doubt of the moral character of the Creator would lead to moral skepticism on the part of the creature. Men will be moral only so long as they believe in the moral character of God. God's commands and the imperatives of the moral reason will be respected only so long as men are convinced of the truth of the saying, "Ye shall be holy, for I, the Lord your God, am holy;" or, in other words, so long as men are convinced that the character which the highest Christian conscience demands of them is the character eternally realized in God.

And what is the essential nature of the ethical character eternally realized in God may be inferred from the ethical ideal of the Christian consciousness: *it is love.* Men reared under the influence of Christianity, however far they may be from realizing the ideal of love in their life and conduct, will yet agree in affirming that that is the ideal which ought to be realized; it is the inmost core or principle of the divine law as it reveals itself in the conscience, and must therefore be the essential determination of the ethical character of God. And this is in agreement, certainly, with the teaching of the New Testament, according to which charity or love is the highest of all virtues, and the very essence of the life of God. "God is love," says the apostle who was nearest to the heart of Jesus, and penetrated most profoundly into the mystery of the divine life. The essence of love may be said to consist of self-communication and self-participation between personal beings, under certain limitations and conditions. God as love communicates himself with all his riches and gifts to the personal creature—a process which has its goal in the personal oneness of God and man in Christ, and in the

kingdom founded by Christ. The limitations necessarily belonging to this process are determined by the respect which the divine love owes to itself, on the one hand, and to its object, on the other. The divine love is bound to respect its own dignity and worth, and can, therefore, not communicate itself in blessing to one who is unwilling to receive it. This self-respect of the divine love may be defined as the *holiness* of God. But the divine love is bound also to respect the dignity and worth, or the rights, of its personal object. Now, the fundamental right of a personal being is the right to be itself and determine itself, or the right of freedom; and this right the divine love may not ignore or overthrow. A person who wills to reject the divine love, and suffer the consequent loss and pain, must be allowed to do so. This is his right, which God is bound to respect; and this respect of the divine love for the right of its object constitutes the divine *righteousness*. Righteousness, according to the old definition, is that quality of mind which gives to each one his due—*justitia animi affectio suum cuique tribuens*—and which may be punitive as well as benedictive, according to the attitude of its object. The divine righteousness, then, is not a quality in God standing over against his love and hindering its realization, but a determination of love itself, and adjusting the manner of its manifestation to that which is due to its object. Love is primary in God; and the first object of his desire, therefore, is not his own glory, but the actualization of his love in the blessedness of personal beings. In a world of sin, even, in which the divine love has been rejected and grieved, God cannot cease to love; for to do that would be to deny himself; but here the divine love can be realized only in the way of suffering and sacrifice on its own part, or in the way of atonement which abolishes sin and makes one the created with the creative will, thus realizing the eternal idea of love. It is, therefore, not true that "God *may* be merciful, but *must* be just." Mercy is as much a necessity for God as is justice, and has, in fact, a deeper root in his moral nature.

The essence of divine morality, or of the ethical character of God, then, consists in holy and righteous love. This, accordingly, must be the essence also of human morality, and the

truly moral and Christian man cannot consistently admit anything either in thought or action that contradicts the fundamental principle of his Christian character. The moral nature of man is designed to be a copy of the moral nature of God. In whatever way we may suppose the human soul to be derived from God, it must reflect in the essential features of its moral nature the character of its divine original. The biblical statement that man was made in the image of God can signify no less than that. But that statement must not be supposed to mean that man, as he comes from the hands of his Creator, is at once a *finished moral being*. That is not the case with man as he is born now, nor could it have been the case with the first man as he was created. A finished moral being cannot be created off-hand. Only *things* can be created in that way. The necessary form of morality is freedom, and moral character—a good conscience and a good will—can, therefore, not be given in creation, but can only be acquired by a process of free personal activity. The ethical character of God, for which human nature is preconstituted, can only become a personal possession by personal volition and effort. This proposition, indeed, may be regarded as one of those moral postulates which theology is bound to accept from ethics, and the non-acceptance of which brings confusion into much of our theological thought. We know how the older theology, which assumed that Adam was created in the full possession of righteousness and true holiness, was tormented by the problem of the fall. Here was a being made but little short of God—made in perfect wisdom, righteousness, and holiness—suddenly turned into a demon of total depravity. How could a being so highly endowed ever come to sin? That was the question; and we had doctrines of foreordination, of covenants, and of supernatural gifts, all alike unethical, to answer it. But no being could ever *be made* perfect in wisdom, and righteousness, and holiness; and consequently there could have been no such fall as the older theology imagined. A state of moral perfection is a state that can only be self-acquired. A moral being must be the architect of its own character. And this is a truth whose bearing must extend to

our conception of the end of human life, as well as to our conception of its beginning. In the light of this truth, what becomes of the familiar conceit that converted but unsanctified sinners are suddenly made perfect, when they die, by an operation of divine grace? Of course, however "comforting" such a doctrine may be supposed to be, it must be given up as contradicting the very fundamental conception of a moral being.

Moral character can only be built upon the basis of a nature, or of faculties, constitutionally predisposed to morality, by the exercise of personal freedom or exertion. But a moral nature is not of itself sufficient to develop into a state of actual morality, any more than an intellectual nature can, without any influence or stimulation from beyond itself, develop into a state of intelligence. Without experience the intellectual principles of the mind could at most develop into empty forms of thought, if any development at all were possible. And the same is true of the religious and moral nature. No moral ideas and sentiments could be developed without moral experience. Without experience such ideas and sentiments could have no contents. And the moral experience which makes possible the development of true moral ideas must consist essentially in vital contact of the human spirit with the spirit of its divine author. By an immediate touch of the infinite moral spirit the finite human spirit is quickened into an activity corresponding to the aptitudes of its nature, and to the character of the eternal source from which it came. And its subsequent development, the formation of moral ideas and the cultivation and growth of moral sentiments, must go forward under the same conditions. The moral life of a human individual, as well as the moral life of the race collectively, must be conceived as a discipline under the leading and stimulating influence of the divine spirit. And this stimulating influence universally we may call *divine revelation;* whose reality we must assume in order to the development of morality as well as of religion. Consequently, the developed moral condition of a human being—the existing state of his conscience and of his will—may be said to be the product of an objective divine and of a subjective personal factor. God and

man work together in the development of moral as well as religious life. And the result of this co-working of the divine spirit with the spirit of man in the depths of his soul is the reproduction of the moral character of God in the human personality in the degree of the voluntary receptivity of the latter. In this way the mind of God comes gradually to be the mind of man. This must be supposed to be the case relatively in all religious systems, for God has nowhere left himself without witness; but it must be the case most especially within Christianity. Here at least we are bound to assume that the moral ideas and judgments which are in man, and the moral sentiments which he entertains, are a reproduction of the moral disposition of God, and must, therefore, be of supreme validity for the regulation of thought as well as for the conduct of life. Certainly Christianity can teach no doctrines and require no actions that contradict the utterances of the conscience which it has itself created.

The conscience, it has been said, is the voice of God in man. This implies not merely that man knows his moral acts in relation to a divine rule or law, or that he knows them conjointly with God the supreme judge, but that the moral knowledge which at any time illuminates his conscience is a light derived from the eternal source of morality in God. But if this be so, why then, it may be asked, does the conscience not always and everywhere utter precisely the same judgments? Why does one man's conscience condemn what another's may seem to approve? The answer is, because man is a finite and progressive being, and can only appropriate progressively and freely the moral light which shines into his soul from the absolute source of light in God. His moral knowledge, like his rational knowledge, must be self-acquired. But this implies differences arising out of the action of the will, as well as out of the general stage of development of the individual and of the race. Subjective and objective influences may cause defect and error in the acquisition of moral knowledge. A man's conscience, or moral reason, is not infallible, any more than is his theoretical reason. The principles involved in the constitution of our moral nature and the moral impressions received from contact with the absolute moral

Being, as well as the moral teaching of history, may be misread and misinterpreted; and so we may get error in moral knowledge, just as we may have error in rational and religious knowledge. It is to be observed, however, that the danger of error seems to be far less great in moral than in rational and religious thinking; for men differ far less in regard to ethical than in regard to philosophical and theological questions. The moral ideas and sentiments of mankind are very much the same everywhere. Still, however, the possibility of error in the formation of our moral knowledge must always be recognized. Man is not infallible in any department of his being. But this fact does not discredit our moral knowledge. The conscience, though in regard to concrete questions of right and wrong capable of erring, is still the only light which a man has to guide him in the conduct of his moral life. A man is bound to follow the dictates of his conscience in preference to any laws or rules coming to him from any external source. No man can accept the teaching of any outward authority until such authority has approved itself to the judgment of his own reason and conscience. Even when in error the conscience can be corrected only by an appeal to its own judgment. But in this way it can always be corrected. Even in the case of the most degraded of men, whose conscience may seem to sanction the most atrocious crimes, there is always hope that their minds may be brought into a better state by an appeal to the deeper moral nature within them. The erring prodigal may "come to himself;" and when he has done so, he finds within himself a light that is divine and capable of rightly directing his moral understanding. But whether right or wrong, no man can ever have any other guide to direct him in the conduct of his moral life than his own conscience; and no one can rightly accept for truth anything that does not authenticate itself to his moral as well as theoretical reason.

This is especially true of the Christian, and most especially of the Protestant Christian. The Protestant Christian who believes in justification by faith—and faith that is *his own* and not another's—cannot allow himself to be governed either in his

moral or religious thinking by any authority that contradicts his Christian conscience. The Christian's conscience may in a special sense be said to be the product of Christianity; and if Christianity is from God, then the common Christian conscience, or consciousness, of an age must ever be an essentially true reflection of the ethical nature of God; and this must, therefore, be the supreme criterion of judgment in regard to doctrinal as well as practical questions. Questions which may once have become *live* questions to the Christian conscience, and which have received a decisive answer in the forum of the same, can no longer be uncertain questions for any Christian mind. In regard to things which have not yet come really under the illuminating influence of the Christian spirit there may be doubt, and even error. The Christian conscience is progressive in its development, and, in contact with the advancing life of the world, extends its interest to an ever-enlarging circle of things, in regard to which it formulates judgments; and these judgments, then, cannot be ignored or set aside by any formal authority. There may be current in any age ideas and practices upon which the light of the Christian spirit has not yet been shed, and these may not reflect the absolute moral spirit. But ideas which have been formed under the direct influence of the Christian spirit, and which have become an essential part of the Christian consciousness, cannot be reckoned in this category. Their validity cannot be questioned by any individual Christian, nor impeached by any authority. They must be accepted as divine truth. Though one may be aware that God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, and God's ways not as our ways, so far as degrees of perfection are concerned, yet in regard to ideas and sentiments which have become part of the fixed contents of the collective Christian conscience, no one can have any doubt that they reflect the ideas and sentiments of God. Thus the Christian conscience may bear witness to a man that he has "the mind of the Lord;" and then no authority of state, or church, or Scripture could move him to renounce his convictions, either in regard to questions of doctrine or practice. Conflicts between the ethical determinations of the Christian conscience and the teaching of

outward authority have from time to time arisen; and then it seemed as if the human mind had come to stand in opposition to Christianity itself, and as if a deadly war had come to exist between reason and revelation. But by and by the conflict ceases, the Christian moral reason triumphs; and when the smoke of battle has cleared away, it is found that Christianity, instead of being injured, has actually been benefited by what has occurred. The conflict was really not with Christianity itself, but with some pseudo-authority parading in its name.

The subject of slavery has already been mentioned as affording an illustration of a supposed conflict between the moral sentiment of mankind and the authority of divine revelation. There was a time, as is well known, when theology proved the lawfulness of slavery by the authority of Scripture. The argument seemed to be strong. Noah, it was said, predicted the eternal servitude of the descendants of Ham, that is, the negroes; and prophecy must be fulfilled. The patriarchs, moreover, were all slave-owners; and there is not a word of disapprobation of the institution in the Old Testament. Indeed, slavery existed by divine law in the Hebrew commonwealth. There were certain mitigations of the institution in favor of Hebrew slaves, but these were not applicable to foreigners. But the New Testament is as decidedly in favor of the institution as the Old. Slavery existed in the time of our Lord and his apostles, and they never uttered a word of condemnation against it. On the contrary, Paul even goes so far as to urge Christian slaves, if they had a chance of becoming free, to prefer remaining in a state of bondage (1 Cor. 7:21). Moreover, he sent back the fugitive Onesimus to his master, showing that he regarded a master's right of property as more sacred than a soul's right of freedom. Slavery, therefore, exists by the authority of divine revelation; and what is human sentiment that it should set itself in opposition to this authority? Where God speaks, let all the earth keep silence before him. So the argument ran during the second quarter of the present century, and was proclaimed from many a pulpit both North and South. But the time came when Christian men could be no longer satisfied with this argument. It

involved a violation of their moral sentiments and of the clearest dictates of their moral reason. It was against the principles of love and justice. The voice of God which was supposed to be heard in Scripture jarred painfully with the voice of God in their consciences. Which of these voices was to be obeyed? The conflict was long and sharp; but at last, in spite of the powerful influence of selfishness and passion, supported by what many believed to be the authority of divine revelation, the voice of humanity prevailed; as it always must prevail in similar cases, if its origin and nature be such as we have already seen. Albert Barnes is said once to have remarked that he did not believe the doctrine of slavery to be in the Bible, but if it was there, then so much the worse for the Bible. At this, of course, men held up their hands and shouted *infidelity!* But they did it for the most part only in a half-hearted way, for the conscience of the age, their own included, was against their theology. And now the conscience has completely triumphed, and no one would pretend to defend the institution of slavery by the authority of the Bible. But the Bible, meanwhile, has not lost anything in authority and in the respect of mankind. The divinity of the Christian consciousness has triumphed over the divinity, not of the Bible, but of exegesis. The Bible was not used as it is intended to be used, when men got from it propositions which contradicted the best moral sense of mankind. We now understand that the Bible interpreted "according to the proportion of faith," as St. Paul says that prophets should speak (Rom 12:6), does by no means favor any institution by which men are deprived of the rights of their personality and degraded to the condition of chattels held merely for the profit and gratification of their fellows. Whatever the Bible may say in single passages, in which it merely reflects the temporary conditions and opinions of the age in which it originated, the general spirit of its teaching, and especially its exalted view of the dignity and value of the human soul, are utterly inconsistent with the doctrine of slavery. Christ's conception of human personality is not reconcilable with any theory, either in politics or theology, that would reduce man merely to the condition of a thing. And

so God's speaking in the Bible does not, on this point, contradict his speaking in the Christian conscience.

But dogmatic theology especially affords illustrations of the antagonism between theological definition and ethical principles, of which we are now speaking. Such antagonisms have appeared especially in the doctrine of sin, and in the doctrine of soteriology. Here the ethical character which dogmatics itself, in its doctrine of God, attributes to him, is often utterly forgotten, and he is represented as violating the commonest ethical principles in his dealings with men. For instance, outside of theology, it is a universally recognized principle that personal freedom and responsibility are correlative. No person can be morally responsible for acts and states which he has not himself voluntarily caused, either directly or indirectly. One person cannot be held guilty of another person's sins, nor can the punishment deserved by one be justly inflicted upon another. And conversely, the merits or moral worth of one person cannot be set to the account of another of unlike moral character. No moral principle is regarded as more immutably fixed than that. It is the principle of the *suum cuique*—the principle that every moral being must be free to be himself, and to enjoy the fruits of his own conduct, if good; and the penalty, if evil. But now this fundamental principle of justice has been violated by a whole series of dogmatic definitions, about some of which a fierce battle is still raging. It is violated, for instance, by the doctrine of absolute predestination, according to which the eternal weal or woe of men is determined, not by their own freedom, but by the absolute and causeless pleasure of the Creator. To the objection that it is unjust for God to doom some men to destruction without any fault of theirs, while others, no better than these, may be saved, the reply has sometimes been made that this is not unjust, because God would have had the right to damn all as having sinned in Adam; and if he chooses to forego this right in relation to some, that is a matter of his sovereignty, which puts him above all consideration of such moral principles as those by which we are bound. On the same ground the doctrine has been defended that the very first sin, the fall itself, came to pass in consequence

of a divine foreordination, in order that God might have objects of wrath to punish for the manifestation of his most glorious justice, and objects of love to save for the manifestation of his mercy. And that is the doctrine which has so often been commended for its complete logical consistency. But what are mercy and justice according to this conception? Manifestly they are not the ethical qualities which we understand by these terms, but mere arbitrary determinations. And this is virtually admitted when it is maintained that God is not bound by the claims of justice, because he is the sovereign creator of justice. But that means, if it means anything, that God himself is without moral character; and that supposition, if taken in real earnest, would, as we have already seen, mean the death of all morality among men. What, then, shall we say to this doctrine of predestination? Shall we say that it is a mystery of revelation, which we are bound to accept on the authority of Scripture and the church, though we cannot reconcile it with the principles of our moral nature? We cannot do that, because, as we have before seen, we are bound to hold that the essential principles of our moral nature, especially as the latter has been developed under Christian influences, reflect the ethical character of God. If that be true, then it is simply impossible that God can deal with men as this doctrine teaches. The doctrine is unethical, and can therefore not be true. And if we believe that the Bible is the record of a true revelation of God, then we must believe that this doctrine cannot be in the Bible. We know what may be said in opposition to this position; it may be said that this is exalting faith above the Scriptures — it is making the moral reason the judge of Scripture teaching. But, after all, the objection is not as serious as it may at first appear to be; for what do those do who take the opposite view? They virtually assume the infallibility, not only of the Bible, but of the theoretical reason by which the Bible is interpreted. We prefer the authority of the moral sense of Christendom to the authority of the theoretical understanding of the individual theologian; and in the case of the individual theologian we prefer the authority of his heart to the authority of his head,

where these fail to coincide. This is not touching the honor or authority of the Bible. In fact, the Bible gains in influence and in respect by being freed from responsibility for a doctrine which contradicts the profoundest sentiment of the Christian heart, and robs God of the most essential attribute of his being, namely, that of holy and righteous love. The rejection of this doctrine may leave some unsolved difficulties. There may be mysteries in God's plan and government of the world, in regard to which we may have to plead ignorance. But it is important that this ignorance should be rightly located. If we are sure that "God is love indeed, and love creation's final law," then we can afford to be ignorant in regard to some of the ways in which that divine love is realized in the world.

Again, the ethical principle of justice has been violated by some of the definitions which have been put forward in creeds and dogmatic systems concerning what is called original or hereditary sin. Manifestly, if sin be a determination of freedom, then it cannot be propagated as such by the mere process of natural generation; nor can its universality be accounted for on the realistic theory of the inclusion of the persons of all men in the person of Adam. To say that *mankind* sinned when Adam sinned may be correct as a logical statement, but it contains what has been called the fallacy of the universal, and, in fact, means nothing. The usual refuge of the dogmatist has, therefore, been in the theory of *imputation.* God made Adam the federal head of the race by a covenantal arrangement, with the adoption of which neither he nor his posterity had anything to do. And, when Adam sinned, God, in agreement with the terms of the covenant, imputed the guilt of his sin to his posterity; and so it comes to pass now that, in consequence of that divine judgment, not only are all men born with a vitiated nature which deserves the divine wrath, but also under actual condemnation on account of Adam's sin. This may be logical, but it is not ethical. If men were merely impersonal things, then any disposition might be made of them, or any imaginary qualities might be attributed to them, or fictions adopted in regard to them, without doing them any wrong; as it is doing

no wrong to a block of wood moving on a chess-board to regard it and treat it as a bishop or a pawn, and not as a queen. But as personal beings men have rights which even their Creator is bound to respect; and the fundamental right of personality is *to be itself*, and to determine its own character and destiny, and to be responsible for itself and for nothing more. The fact that in consequence of the solidarity of human life in this world, especially on its physical side, all men are profoundly affected by the actions of all, and some frequently suffer for the sins of others, while it may create difficulties in our theodicy, does not prove that ethical qualities, with their merits and demerits, may by a divine fiat be transferred from one person to another. It only proves that our natural life is not yet completely ethicized; and that there may be in it wrongs which hereafter must be made right; but not at all that those wrongs may really be forms of a higher justice, which is to us incomprehensible. Our moral reason may not forbid our admitting that, in a world of development and change, injustice in particular parts may be permitted temporarily for the greater good of the whole; but our moral reason does protest against the idea of making this temporary injustice eternal, and of supposing it to have its basis in an arbitrary fiat of the sovereign Creator of the world.

But this idea of making right and wrong, or innocence and guilt, dependent upon a divine fiat has found still wider application in the sphere of soteriology. Both the doctrines of the atonement and of justification have been explained on this principle, namely, the principle that moral qualities may, by an act of the divine will, be imputed from one subject to another. Thus God is said to have imputed to Christ the sins of men, or at least those of the elect; then Christ suffered the penalty which was due to them, and the merit thus acquired is now imputed to believers for their justification. Christ has paid the debt, which sinners could not pay, by undergoing the penalty which their sins deserved, and has thus made it possible for the sinners themselves to go clear. Such is the theory which has been adopted in creeds and dogmatic systems, stripped of all unnecessary verbiage designed to disguise its unethical

character. The whole thing is a commercial, not an ethical, transaction. As one man may pay another's debt in bank, so the innocent may suffer the punishment of the guilty, and then justice will be satisfied, and the guilty may escape. Such a conception is possible so long as the notions of sin, and guilt, and punishment are supposed to stand merely for commercial, or, at most, legal entities, but must break down so soon as they are perceived to represent ethical realities. One man may pay another man's debt, if he has the means to do it, but one man may not bear the penalty of another's sin in such a way as to discharge the latter's guilt. In the one case we have to do with a commercial, in the other with an ethical, relation. No tribunal of justice may punish one man for another man's crime, or acquit a criminal in consideration of another man's merit. Against such a proceeding the moral sense of all mankind would cry out with indignation. But can we suppose that God may rightly do what it would not be right for man to do? "Shall mortal man be more just than God? Shall a man be more pure than his Maker?" "Shall not the judge of all the earth do right?"

But this theory of moral substitution sometimes puts on the airs of an ethical necessity, and parades in the guise of an advocate of absolute justice. It says that sins can be forgiven and salvation accomplished only in the way of strict righteousness. But righteousness demands strict reciprocity or equivalence. God's justice requires inexorably that the penalty of sin be paid. He cannot relinquish or relax anything of his claims. His justice must be satisfied, either by the suffering of the sinner or by the suffering of someone in his stead, before any mercy can be shown. Thus justice, instead of being a quality of love, becomes an absolute tyrant in the nature of God. But, it may be asked, whence comes this idea of justice, which leaves no room for forgiveness? It certainly does not come from the moral sense of mankind in its best and highest condition. The Christian conscience does not pronounce the idea of forgiveness irreconcilable with the conception of justice. So far is this from being the case that forgiveness is regarded as an exercise of the

highest virtue. *To forgive is divine.* Nor does this idea of unforgiving justice come from Scripture. Scripture does not teach that forgiveness is a violation of righteousness, and that the idea of justice requires that every sin be strictly punished before it can be forgiven. And, besides, what sort of justice is that which is so intent upon punishment that it cares not upon whom this may fall, whether upon the innocent or upon the guilty? What sort of justice is that which can be appeased by the suffering of an innocent person instead of the sinner? How can such justice commend itself to the moral sense of mankind? But here, again, we may be met with the answer that God's justice is too deep for our comprehension. The whole thing, it may be said, is a mystery which we cannot penetrate with our finite understanding. That may be; but, if so, what right have we to set up definitions about it? If we cannot understand how the justice of God may be satisfied by the suffering of the innocent for the guilty, how, then, can we say that this is the divine method of the atonement? Would it not be more reasonable to confess total ignorance than to attribute to God principles and motives which we would not dare to entertain ourselves? At the risk of prolixity, we repeat: If we cannot know how God could consistently with justice punish the innocent Christ for the sins of guilty men, how can we know that he has done it? But what else, it may be replied, could the passion of Christ have been, if it was not the penalty of the sins of the world? Well, that is the question; and it is not our purpose in this paper to furnish the answer. Our purpose is to insist that whatever answer may be given must be consistent with sound ethical principles. That the suffering of Christ was vicarious suffering, of course, admits of no doubt; but there is much vicarious suffering in the world that is not punitive, and that discharges no guilt. For instance, the child of an intemperate parent may be suffering the consequences of that parent's sin; but that does not make the guilt of the parent any less, and can therefore not be *penal* in its character. But what, then, does this vicarious suffering mean? We know not; perhaps we cannot know at present. There may be mysteries which we cannot

understand until the plan of the moral universe shall lie fully wrought out before us. We may have to confess ignorance in regard to many things which we have heretofore thought ourselves fully able to explain. But, if we take this ground, our compensation will be that we shall have a God whose moral nature is akin to ours, and whom, therefore, we can love, and that we shall have *doctrines that can be preached* to nineteenth-century audiences.

Is it not a fact that some of the central dogmas of theology are of such a character now that they cannot be preached to common Christian people? They are either not understood at all, or, where understood, they awaken only surprise and opposition. They meet with no response on the part of the common ethical spirit of the age. What meaning, for instance, can this age see in the doctrine of total depravity? Men feel that they are bad enough, but they know, too, that they are not totally bad. And if they were, what use would there be, then, in preaching to them? And, then, what sentiments are awakened by telling people that their little children are under sentence of damnation because of the sin committed by the first man? The reality and universality of sin are everywhere felt to be sad and painful facts; but to be told that this is all the consequence of an arbitrary decree and covenant of Almighty God, and that we and our children are being punished for sins which we have never committed, does not tend to awaken in us sentiments either of penitence or piety. We simply feel that such a doctrine contradicts the teaching of our ethical nature and cannot be true. And so we also feel when salvation is declared to be the result either of a series of formal ceremonies imposed by the church, or of a series of legal fictions floating in the mind of God. There is about all this an air of arbitrariness and of unreality that cannot fail to render it suspicious. It does not commend itself to the deepest wants of men's moral nature; and they cannot be willing to trust their salvation to a gospel that comes to them in such doubtful terms. Men want a real gospel, a gospel that shall bring to them a real, rational God—a God who, though holy and righteous, can forgive their sins—and a real Savior, who shall

heal the infirmities of their souls, and help them to overcome the tendencies to sin in their nature. In a word, men want an ethical gospel, a gospel that shall harmonize with the fundamental ethical principles of their nature, which, with all its corruption, is still the essential reflection of the moral nature of God. Such a gospel will not be rejected. The present widespread disaffection of the masses toward the church, we verily believe, has not its cause so much in the native depravity of the human heart, or in the prevailing influence of "infidel science which denies the supernatural," as in the unethical form in which the gospel has been so generally presented. And this unethical presentation of the gospel, we hold, has not been true to Christ and the New Testament, and was, therefore, *bound to fail.* Let the ethical teaching of Christ — the ethical teaching of the New Testament, which is in harmony with the ethical postulates of the moral nature of man — be cordially recognized in the formulation of Christian doctrine and duty, and then the gospel will again be everywhere joyfully received as the power of God and the wisdom of God.

THE ELIZABETHAN SETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

By JOHN F. HURST,
Washington, D. C.

WHEN Elizabeth came to the throne, in 1558, it was uncertain what course she would pursue—whether that of her half-brother, Edward, or that of her half-sister, Mary. During the reign of the latter she had conformed to the Roman Catholic religion. She still heard mass, and was crowned with all the old Roman Catholic ceremonial. Bishop Bonner, however, was immediately imprisoned in the Marshalsea, London, where he was kept until his death, in 1569; the queen forbade the elevation of the host in her presence; eight men of reforming views were added to the council; and the queen entertained a petition, or paper, from one of the councilors recommending (1) the restoration of the Church of England to its former purity; (2) the gradual abasement of those favorable to the late queen; (3) the giving over to the crown of the wealth of those bishops and clergy who had enriched themselves in the late reign, this to be secured by the pressure of the Præmunire statute; (4) the disregard of those who wished to carry reform farther; (5) the revision of the English Prayer Book; and (6) until this revision was accomplished the prohibition of all innovation. It was evident, therefore, that with all of Elizabeth's Roman Catholic views she had no intention whatever of keeping England in unity with the pope. Or, as Canon Perry comments on these proposals: "The main body of the nation, indifferent to the form of religion, was to be bribed by the spoil of the church, and the restoration to the crown of those sources of revenue, the alienation of which they had so grudgingly conceded in the late reign; while the lovers of the Reformation were to be propitiated by the restoration of the reformed worship, changed, however, in some particulars to conciliate and attract the more moderate of the Romanists."[1]

[1] *History of the Church of England*, "Students' Series," London, 1887, 6th ed., 1894, Vol. II, p. 255.

I. THE RESETTLEMENT OF THE CHURCH.

In 1548 Edward VI. published a new communion service in English, the same substantially as that now used.[2] In 1549 the first Prayer Book came forth from a committee of divines. It was based primarily on the old Latin service-books, and secondarily on Archbishop Hermann's Consultation, which was drawn up by Melanchthon and Bucer on the basis of Luther's Nuremberg services.[3] This book was too Roman Catholic to suit Edward and some of the council; it was therefore subjected to a revision.[4] The new book was published in 1552. It was more Protestant than the other, thus sacrificing much, says Perry, that succeeding generations of churchmen would have gladly retained.[5] In the book of 1549 the direction in the delivery of the bread in the sacrament was: "And when he delivereth the sacrament of the body of Christ he shall say to everyone these words: 'The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.'" In the book of 1552 the words were: "And when he delivereth the bread he shall say: 'Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.'"[6] Protestants, however, considered even the second book of Edward as too Catholic. Calvin called it "intolerable stuff" and "tolerable fooleries." It was this book which Elizabeth

[2] This service is given in full in appendix to CARDWELL, *Two Liturgies of Edward VI. Compared*, pp. 425 ff.

[3] The divines who did most of the work were Cranmer (chief); Ridley; Goodryke, bishop of Ely; Holbeach, bishop of Lincoln; May, dean of St. Paul's; Dr. John Taylor, dean (afterward bishop) of Lincoln; Haynes, dean of Exeter; and Cox, the king's almoner, afterward bishop of Ely. See PROCTER, *History of Book of Common Prayer, with the Sources and Rationale of its Offices*, ed. of 1892, p. 268, note 4. Francis Procter was the vicar of a village in Norfolk, and this modest, but scholarly book, first printed in 1855, is an illustration of how good work makes for itself a perennial life.

[4] The chief revisers were Cox, Taylor, Cranmer, and Ridley.

[5] *Loc. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 212.

[6] The two Prayer Books are reprinted in full in parallel columns, with a valuable introduction by E. CARDWELL, Oxford, 3d ed., 1852. The words quoted from the second book were taken from the Liturgy of John à Lasco, a Polish nobleman and clergyman, who had established, in 1549, a foreign Protestant congregation in London. See CARDWELL, p. xxviii, note q.

ordered revised in 1558,[7] and, for fear that in the meantime her subjects would worship God according to the dictates of their own consciences, she put out this proclamation: She "charges and commands all manner of her subjects, as well those called to the ministry of the church as all others, that they do forbear to teach and preach, or to give audience to any manner of teaching or preaching, other than to the gospel and epistle of the day, and to the Ten Commandments, in the vulgar tongue, without exposition of any manner, sense, or meaning to be applied and added; or to use any other manner of public prayer, rite, or ceremony in the church but that which is already used, and by law received as the common litany, used at this present in her majesty's own chapel, and the Lord's Prayer and the Creed in English, until consultation may be had by Parliament, by her majesty, and her three estates of this realm, for the better conciliation and accord of such cases as at this present are moved in matters and ceremonies of religion."[8]

This proclamation, which ended by promising punishment to all who disobeyed, assured both Protestants and Catholics that the Church of England was to be restored according to Henry's plan, and that they should govern themselves accordingly—an assurance that was backed up by the declaration of the lord chancellor at the opening of Parliament in January, 1559.

The Prayer Book committee was anxious to conciliate the Protestant element, while Elizabeth was thinking of the Roman Catholics. She had Cecil, therefore, deliver to the revisers a paper asking them whether they could not provide for the retention of the image of the cross, of processions, of copes for holy communion, of the presence of non-communicants at that sacrament, of prayers for the dead, of the prayer of consecration of the elements in the supper, of the placing of the elements in the mouth, and of kneeling at reception.

[7] The committee of revision was Parker, Pilkington, Bill, May, Cox, Grindal, and Whitehead, supervised by Cecil, the new premier, with the assistance of Guest. Parker was prevented by illness, and Guest, afterward bishop of Rochester, seems to have been the dominating mind on the committee.

[8] This interesting document is given in full by CARDWELL, *Documentary Annals of the Church of England*, Vol. I, pp. 176–7 (Oxford, 1839).

These requests were not granted, and Guest, the principal reviser, wrote a letter to Cecil giving reasons. "Ceremonies once taken away as ill-used should not be taken again. No image should be used in the church. Procession is superfluous; it is better to pray in the church. Because it is sufficient to use but a surplice in baptizing, reading, preaching, and praying, therefore it is enough also for the communion. Non-communicants should be dismissed before the consecration, and (as it seems) after the offertory. The Creed is ordained to be said only of the communicants. Prayer for the dead is not used, because it seems to make for sacrifice; as used in the first Book it makes some of the faithful to be in heaven and to need no mercy, and some of them to be in another place and to lack help and mercy. The prayer in the first Book for consecration of elements, beginning 'O Merciful Father,' is to be disliked because it is taken to be so needful to the consecration that the consecration is not thought to be without it; Christ, in ordaining the sacrament, made no petition, but a thanksgiving. The sacrament is to be received in our hands. The old use of the church was to communicate standing; yet, because it is taken of some by itself to be a sin to receive kneeling, whereas of itself it is lawful, it is left indifferent to every man's choice to follow the one way or the other, and to teach men that it is lawful to receive either standing or kneeling."[9]

It was, therefore, the second Prayer Book of Edward, rather than the first, which the Elizabethan divines, in the hope of conciliating the Protestant — soon to be called Puritan — party, revived. In the delivery of the elements the words of the first and second books were united. With some slight additions made by the queen, this Prayer Book was enforced on the nation by the parliament of 1559 in the Act of Uniformity.[10] The penalty for the first offense was a fine of 100 marks, for the second 400, and for the third confiscation of goods and life imprisonment. Many of the bishops, however, and nine temporal lords opposed the bill

[9] STRYPE, *Annals*, Vol. I, app. xiv; PROCTER, p. 57, note 4.

[10] This act is printed in full in GEE and HARDY, *Documents Illustrative of English Church History*, pp. 458 ff.

in the Upper House, and it passed by a majority of only three. But the Prayer Book was at once received and used everywhere.[11]

Immediately before this Uniformity Act was passed Parliament restored to the crown its spiritual headship in an act, January, 1559, so stringent and sweeping that it would have delighted Henry's own heart. It empowered the queen to give commissions to such persons as she thought fit to "visit, reform, redress, order, correct, and amend all such errors, heresies, schisms, abuses, offenses, contempts, and enormities which by any manner of spiritual or ecclesiastical power, authority, or jurisdiction can or may lawfully be reformed, ordered, redressed, corrected, or amended."[12] It makes a limitation, however, to irresponsible judgments in that it says that nothing shall be adjudged heresy which has not already been so adjudged by the Scriptures, or by the first four councils, or by any other council which judged according to the Scriptures, or in the future by the Parliament and Convocation. This, in reality, was no safeguard to the rights of conscience, because it left the determination of what was thus condemned to the court and not to the "heretic." But it clearly showed what has already been proven, namely, the intermediate position of the Church of England, holding aloft both the Scriptures and the *acta concilia* as tests of orthodoxy, with final appeal, with true Erastian instinct, to Parliament. The act also changed the title of the queen from "supreme head" to "supreme governor"—a distinction without a difference. Elizabeth abated her authority not one jot.

Injunctions were also issued forbidding, among other things, the extolling of images, clerical marriages without the permission of the bishop and two justices of the peace, the wearing of vestments, except those in use under Edward, and the taking away of altars, except under the supervision of the curate and church wardens, in which case the place of the altar is to be taken by a table. Although the injunctions did not command the removal of images, it appears that in some places these, with

[11] Parkhurst to Bullinger, May, 1559: "The book set forth in time of King Edward is now in general use throughout England." (*Zürich Letters*, Vol. I, pp. 29, 31.)

[12] For the text of this act see GEE and HARDY, pp. 442 ff.

other objects of veneration, were both removed and burned.[13] Matthew Parker was consecrated archbishop of Canterbury in the chapel of Lambeth Palace, December 17, 1559. The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion were published in 1563. Some efforts toward making the church more Protestant were thwarted. For instance, a petition of the Lower House of Convocation to the Upper House was drawn up embodying the following reforms: (1) only Sundays to be kept as holy days; (2) in church the minister to read the service with his face to the congregation, and distinctly; (3) the sign of the cross in baptism to be disused; (4) kneeling at the communion not to be obligatory; (5) a surplice is sufficient vestment for all occasions; (6) let organs be prohibited. These salutary provisions were rejected, but only by a majority of one. Another attempt toward Protestantism was the catechism of Dean Nowell, accepted by Parker and, with alterations, by the Lower House of Convocation; but for some reason it failed to get through the Upper House, to the joy of all Anglicans since. The catechism was of a Calvinistic and Puritan cast. "It would have proved a serious burden to the Church of England," says Canon Perry.[14] "We may be satisfied," says Dean Hook, "with expressing our deep sense of gratitude to the merciful Providence which has exonerated us from a burden which it would be difficult to sustain."[15]

A second Book of Homilies was published in 1563, intended especially for the use of ignorant and otherwise incompetent clergy, of whom the Church of England was then full. Ministers held a plurality of livings; they were non-graduates and illiterate; very few had real capacity; many parishes were without priests at all; and a contemporary remark on the clergy of Hereford seems applicable over a wide area: "The clergy of the cathedral are said to be disreputable as well as ignorant."[16]

The consecration of Parker as bishop has been made the subject of fierce controversy, because on it turns the validity of the

[13] HEYLIN, *History of Elizabeth*, p. 118; *Zürich Letters*, Vol. I, p. 74.

[14] *History of the Church of England*, "Students' Series," Vol. II, p. 280.

[15] *Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury*, Vol. IX, p. 354.

[16] *State Papers of Elizabeth* (Domestic), Vol. XVII, p. 32.

orders, in the Catholic sense, of the Church of England. Various objections have been made to it:

1. The Nag's Head fable was set forth in 1603, and is to the effect that at Nag's Head Tavern, at Cheapside, Parker and other bishops were ordained in a hasty and indifferent manner, namely, by Scory placing a Bible on their heads or shoulders and saying, "Take the authority to preach the word of God sincerely."[17] This fable is now recognized as such by even Roman controversialists.

2. The fact of the consecration in Lambeth Chapel has been denied by some on the ground of alleged irregularities in the Lambeth episcopal register. These irregularities, if they exist, can be explained by the methods of the copyists. Cooke says that there were those at the time who denied the existence of the register,[18] but the only one he quotes is Harding, the Roman Catholic antagonist of Jewel, who says: "We say to you, Mr. Jewel, show us the register of your bishop." But on turning to the original of this quotation — Cooke does not give the place — we find that Harding does not refer to the Parker register at all, and never mentions Parker, but is quoting Tertullian in a free translation for the purpose of impugning the apostolic succession of the Church of England: "Tell us the original and first spring of your church. Show us the register (*ordinem*) of your bishops continually succeeding one another from the beginning, so that the first bishop have some one of the apostles or apostolic men for his author and predecessor."[19]

Harding argues against the English hierarchy on the ground that they had separated from Catholic belief, that their bishops did not have confirmation of the bishop of Rome, and that, even if they received consecration, those conferring it had no authority, and therefore the ceremony was invalid. Jewel replies that he (Jewel) was consecrated by three bishops and the metropolitan,

[17] TIERNEY'S *Dodd*, Vol. II, appendix xlii; PERRY, Vol. II, p. 282.

[18] COOKE, *Historic Episcopate*, New York, 1896, p. 47.

[19] "*Edant ergo origines ecclesiarum suarum; evolvant ordinem episcoporum suorum, ita per successiones ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille episcopus aliquem ex apostolis.*" (TERTULLIAN, *De Prescript. Hær.*, xxxii.) See Harding, in JEWEL, *Works*, Vol. III, p. 321 (Parker Soc.).

but challenges Harding to bring a canon making a confirmation by the pope necessary. He also quotes canonists to prove that a consecration by even one bishop is valid. Jewel says again: "Our bishops are made in form and order, as they have been ever, by free election of the chapter; by consecration of the archbishop and three other bishops; and by the admission of the prince."[20] In addition to this it is a fact that for forty-four years every Roman writer in England proceeds on the assumption of the actual ordination of Parker, as commonly held, and that not one of them ever denied it.[21]

There are, indeed, few events in history up to that time more certainly and amply attested by contemporaneous evidence than the consecration of Parker, and the methods of reasoning adopted by its impugners would lead to universal skepticism. "Of this consecration there remains a long and minute detailed account in the register of Lambeth, and a contemporaneous transcript of the consecration part of it in the library of Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. There are notices of it also in a great number of diocesan registers; in the registers of the Prerogative Court of Canterbury; in thirty or forty documents in the Rolls; in a large mass of contemporary letters and documents preserved in Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; in papers preserved in Zürich, and not known in England until 1685; in Parker's own book, *De Antiquitate Britanniæ Ecclesiæ*, printed in 1572; and in many other places."[22] The fact of the consecration, therefore, is indisputable, and in Leo XIII.'s bull "Apostolicæ Curæ" (1896) against Anglican orders he omits entirely mention of defects of this nature.

3. It has been said that the consecration is invalid because Barlow, the chief consecrator, was himself not consecrated. Even if this were true of Barlow, the conclusion would not follow, if the other consecrators were ordained. But there is not the slightest evidence for it, except the loss of the certificate of

[20] *Works*, Vol. III, pp. 330, 334.

[21] HADDAN, *Apostolic Succession in the Church of England*, London, 1869, pp. 181, 201.

[22] PERRY, *History of the English Church*, London, Murray, 1887, Vol. II, p. 270.

Barlow's consecration, which is no evidence that the consecration did not take place, because the registers of men concerning whose ordination as bishops there has never been a dispute, like Gardiner of Winchester, are irrevocably lost. Even the Roman Catholic historian Lingard says: "When we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a bishop with the other consecrated bishops, discharging with them all the duties, both spiritual and secular, of a consecrated bishop, summoned equally with them to Parliament and Convocation, taking his seat among them according to his seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose, without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both church and state, he could not have become a member of the episcopal body."[83] It is said by Cooke that in the making of a bishop ordination was not considered necessary in Reformation England, appointment by the sovereign being all that was required.[84] Passages that look that way in the writings of the times refer to what was absolutely requisite to the existence of the church of Christ, and not to what was ordinarily requisite to the well-being of the church. Why were all the English bishops ordained in the usual way? As a matter of fact, both Henry and Elizabeth were Catholic in their conceptions of church order, and would have regarded with horror an unordained priest or bishop officiating in the sacred service. Cooke says also that the Edwardine Ordinal recognizes no distinction in order between a bishop and a presbyter.[85] It is true that the ordinal (not of 1549, as Cooke calls it, when no ordinal existed, but the ordinal of 1550, as afterward revised and published first in the Prayer Book of 1552) does not use the word "order" or "ordering" in its "Form of consecrating an Archbishop or Bishop," but has a separate service for the consecration of a bishop, a service which makes it in effect a third order. At the bottom, and according to the apostolic church, the mediæval canonists freely acknowledged

[83] *History of England*, 6th rev. ed., Vol. VI, app. DD.

[84] *Historic Episcopate*, pp. 49, 52.

[85] *Ibid.*, p. 69.

the identity of priest and bishop. Could the Anglicans do less? But both churches held to the necessity of episcopal ordination for the due and safe constituting of a church. This the ordinal assumes throughout.[26]

4. A defect in the form of ordination, the words used being: "Take the Holy Ghost, and remember that thou stir up," as in 2 Tim. 1:6, 7. Whereas it is claimed that the name of the office or order to which the person ordained is admitted should be part of the form. But this is the exact form used in some of the Latin services of the old church, and never questioned. The essence of ordination in the Catholic sense is prayer and imposition of hands, and the form of words is indifferent.[27]

5. A defect in intention. Did the English ordinal intend to consecrate a priest or bishop in the Catholic sense? This is the gravamen of the Roman objections. Leo XIII. says, "No," because a Catholic intention in ordination points to one who is to sacrifice the unbloody offering of the mass, and not to a minister or priest who is to consecrate elements which are sacramentally the body and blood of Christ and to be received spiritually. Everything that sets forth the "dignity and office of the priesthood in the Catholic rite has been deliberately removed from the Anglican ordinal.[28] In the whole ordinal not only is there no clear mention of the sacrifice, of consecration, of the sacerdotium, and of the power of consecrating and offering sacrifice, but every trace of these things" in the Latin rites was purposely struck out.[29] This is the vital point, and from the Roman point of view it completely vitiates English orders. The only reply from the Anglican side is to say: We intend to do what the ancient church intended to do in conferring orders, and if you require more than that, so much the worse for you. Then Rome could say: The Catholic church is a living organism, and to be part of it you must be in harmony with mediæval and

[26] For the text of the Edwardine Ordinal see CARDWELL, *The Two Liturgies of Edward VI.*, pp. 398 ff.

[27] See BRIGHTMAN, "What Objections have been Made to English Orders," London, 1897, in *Publications of Church Historical Society*, Vol. I, pp. 153 ff.

[28] LEO'S "Bull on English Orders," § 7.

[29] *Ibid.*, § 8.

present Christendom as well as with what you think was the ancient teaching.

II. THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD CATHOLICS.

If 286 people (including 46 women) perished for Protestantism under Mary — not including those who died in prison, computed at 68 — 204 perished for Catholicism under Elizabeth.[30] Of these latter 15 are said by Milner to have died for denying the queen's spiritual supremacy, 126 for exercising the priesthood, and the others for returning to the old church or for succoring priests. This does not include those who died for real or imaginary plots, nor the 90 who died in prison, nor the 105 who were banished. "I say nothing," says Milner, "of many more who were whipped, fined (the fine for recusancy — not attending church — was £20 a month), or stripped of their property to the utter ruin of their families. In one night 50 Catholic gentlemen in the county of Lancaster were suddenly seized and committed to prison, on account of their non-attendance at church. At the same time I find an equal number of Yorkshire gentlemen lying prisoners in York castle, on the same account, most of whom perished there. These were every week, for a twelve-month together, dragged by main force to hear the established service performed in the castle chapel." Under the pretext of treason, to which, of course, they made themselves liable for refusing to acknowledge the queen as the religious dictator of England, many of them were put to death with the horrible barbarity which the laws sanctioned, namely, hung, cut down alive, disemboweled, and beheaded. Tudor history has made us familiar with all this, and it is not necessary to dwell upon it; but there was one peculiarity of the penal processes under Elizabeth which gives her reign a bad preëminence — the universal use of torture. This was employed occasionally by her predecessors, but in her reign this

[30] See full table of Marian martyrs in PERRY, Vol. II, p. 251. For Elizabethan martyrs see BUTLER, *Memoirs of English, Irish, and Scottish Catholics*, Vol. I, pp. 176 ff.; LEE, *Church under Queen Elizabeth*, Vol. I, pp. 140 ff.; Vol. II, *passim;* BRADY, *Annals of the Catholic Hierarchy in England and Scotland*, Rome, 1877, pp. 37–60; MILNER, *Letters to a Prebendary*, 1st ed., of ten reprinted.

horrible method of eliciting the desired information or confessions was employed by wholesale.[31]

For this persecution it cannot be denied that there was provocation.

1. Pius V., a pope of austere morals and profound convictions of duty, but without statesmanship or insight — still acting as though the world was yet in the twelfth century — issued a bull of excommunication against Elizabeth, February 25, 1570, in which she is deprived of her crown and her subjects absolved from allegiance.[32] Although this bull fell absolutely flat, and was either practically or expressly repudiated by almost every responsible Catholic in England, yet it gave occasion for untold suffering.

2. This bull gave excuse to Philip of Spain to fit out his Invincible Armada, 1588, as the Spaniards foolishly called it — *armada* being the Spanish name for any armed fleet. How this great enterprise of one hundred and twenty ships went to pieces against the better ships, the heavier guns, and the more trained marksmanship and seamanship of the English sailors — helped by adverse winds and storms — is a familiar story. The victory of 1588 was repeated for exactly the same reasons — barring storms — by the American victories of Manila and Santiago in 1898. Here again the loyalty of the Catholics was unimpeachable. The admiral of the English fleet was himself a Catholic — Lord Howard of Effingham — and Catholics freely offered themselves for their country. "The very presence of such a man as Admiral Howard," says the historian Gardiner, "was a token of patriotic fervor of which Philip and the Jesuits had taken no

[31] For full details see BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 180 ff.; BURKE, *Historical Portraits of the Tudor Dynasty*, Vol. IV, pp. 97 ff.; LEE, Vol. II, pp. 279 ff., and elsewhere.

[32] For the text of this bull in Latin and English see SANDERS, *De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis Anglicani*, lib. iv, c. 8 (tr. by Lewis, London, 1877), first published 1585; TIERNEY, *Dodd's Church History of England*, Vol. III, p. ii; W. E. COLLINS, *The English Reformation and its Consequences*, London, 1898, pp. 242 ff. The bull was rescinded by Gregory XIII., April 5, 1580, so far as it bound English Catholics in their present circumstances, but was renewed by Sixtus V. on condition of the success of the Armada. For Sixtus' bull see BUTLER, Vol. I, p. 197, and for his interest in the Armada see HÜBNER, *Sixtus V.*, Vol. I, pp. 352 ff.

account, but which made the great majority of Catholics draw their sword for their queen and country." [33]

3. The establishment of a seminary for the education of English priests at Douai in Flanders in 1568, and the mission of these priests for the reconversion of England. The missioners were bent on religious work only, refrained from political intrigue, and rejoiced in martyrdom for their faith. No doubt they would have welcomed the succession of a Catholic, and some of them may have been parties to plots, but it is incontestable that the missioners as a class confined themselves to ministering in spiritual things in furtive ways and in constant dread of death. The assertion of some Anglican historians [34] that these priests were traitors seems absolutely without warrant. The facts are that of the two hundred Catholics, more or less, who were executed under Elizabeth, only one impugned her right to the throne; that the priests persisted to the moment of death in denying their guilt, except in matters of faith and their mission as priests; and that no treason was proved. Although the trials were, as usual in those days, conducted with barbarous disregard for justice, there is not an instance in which the tortures on which their judges depended produced a confession of guilt—even if a confession extorted by torture is valueless as evidence. One of the most pious and heroic of these priests, Edmund Campion, spoke for his brethren as well as himself in his trial. "You refuse," said the persecutor, "to swear to the oath of supremacy." "I acknowledge," answers Campion, "her highness as my governor and sovereign. I acknowledged before the commissioners her majesty to be my queen both *de facto et de jure*." When the question was put to him whether a papal excommunication of a sovereign absolved him from allegiance, he answered that, though he could not admit that it would, yet the question was a scholastic one, in dispute among theologians, and, as it formed no part of the indictment, it ought not to be asked. At his execution he again protested his innocence of offense against the queen. "In this I am innocent; this is my last breath;

[33] *Student's History of England*, p. 460.

[34] For instance, PERRY, Vol. II, p. 357.

in this give me credit. I have, and I do pray for her." Lord Charles Howard asked him for which queen he prayed; for Elizabeth, the queen? Campion replied: "Yes, for Elizabeth, your queen and my queen." [35]

4. Plots. This was an age of assassination, and there is no wonder if plots were hatched to make away with Elizabeth. Nor can there be any doubt that at that time both Protestants and Catholics believed that the sudden and violent taking off of a ruler who to them was a tyrant and persecutor was considered perfectly justifiable.

Lord Acton says: "Melancthon prayed for a brave man to dispatch Henry VIII.; the brave man who dispatched the duke of Guise was praised by Beza to the skies; Knox wished the doom of Rizzio to be inflicted on every Catholic; the Swedish bishops recommended that a dose of poison should be mixed with the king's food." [36] A fanatical Dominican stabbed Henry III. of France in 1598, and Henry IV. was put to death in the same way by Ravaillac in 1610, the king's life having been attempted nineteen times. Gerrards, in 1584, shot William of Orange. The wonder is that more plots were not the outcome of the horrible dealings of this reign, for, as Hallam says, the disaffection of Catholics, so far as it existed, was due to their unjust persecution.[37] (*a*) The insurrection of the earls of Northumberland and Westmoreland in 1569, though in the Catholic interest, was left in the lurch by the Catholics. (*b*) The supposed plot of Throgmorton in connection with the duke of Guise, 1583, rests on no substantial basis. When racked he protested innocence; then, on further racking, he confessed,

[35] BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 190, 191, 239, 240. See the remarkable testimony of Plowden, remarks on a book entitled *Memoirs of Gregorio Pansain*, 1794, quoted by BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 200–206. In view of the facts stated above notice such a statement as this: "It is probable that at no time during the reign of Elizabeth would a Romanist priest who was ready to disclaim the deposing power of the pope, and to profess his loyal allegiance to the queen, have incurred sentence of death." (PERRY, Vol. II, p. 357.)

[36] *Quarterly Review*, London, January, 1887, art. I.

[37] *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. I, pp. 160, 161. He attributes the "whole, or nearly the whole, of their disaffection to her unjust aggressions on the liberty of conscience."

afterward retracted his confession, and died asserting innocence. (*c*) Parry, first a Protestant spy employed by the queen's ministers, then a Catholic and a member of Parliament, where he used his influence for toleration, was arrested on a charge of a plot to assassinate the queen, wrote a confession of it — perhaps with a view to pardon — and afterward, when condemned, retracted his confession, saying it was extorted from him by dread of torture, and cried out that he "never meant to kill the queen, and that he would lay his blood upon her and his judges before God and the world;" and to this he adhered till his execution, March, 1585. It is no wonder that Hallam refuses to pronounce on his guilt.[38] (*d*) John Somerville, a son-in-law of Edward Arden, a relative of Mary (Arden) Shakespeare, the mother of the dramatist, was convicted of conspiracy with his father-in-law. The plot was probably the invention of Leicester, the enemy of the Ardens.[39] (*e*) The only plot that is well on the field of history is that of Babington, in which Mary, queen of Scots, then a prisoner at Fotheringhay, nine miles from Peterboro, was implicated. Even of the genuineness of this plot there are grave doubts, and historians are hopelessly divided. Walsingham, one of the great men that survived Elizabeth, had reduced deception to an exact science, and it is impossible to say that the whole business was not an invention of his. A recent writer says that the "real fountain head of Babington's, or, as some have called it, Walsingham's conspiracy, and the chief confederates, were spies in the pay of Walsingham, and all the correspondence of Mary and her friends passed through his hands." Mary charged him with having forged the correspondence against her. "His administration of foreign affairs was founded on a system of bribery, espionage, and deception. He is said to have had in his pay fifty-three agents and eighteen spies in various countries.[40] In an age when diplomacy was universally tainted with intrigue and lies, the astute Walsingham

[38] *Constitutional History of England*, Vol. I, p. 161, note. See BUTLER, Vol. I, pp. 249–54.

[39] BUTLER, Vol. I, p. 254; BAYNES, "Shakespeare," in *Encycl. Brit.*, 9th ed., Vol. XXI, p. 790. Hallam calls Somerville a half-lunatic.

[40] Art. "Walsingham, Sir Francis," in *Chambers' Encycl.*, ed. 1893, Vol. X, p. 540.

would, no doubt, have considered that he was doing God's service in encompassing the death of one who, he must have believed, endangered England while she lived. The trial of Mary was, as Hallam says, an illustration of that "shameful breach of legal rules almost universal in trials of high treason during the reign of Elizabeth."[41]

Such are the palliations of the restored church-state's persecutions of the Catholics. When we consider the splendid loyalty of the Roman Catholics in the face of unparalleled provocation, the murderous venom of her tortures and hangings stains the history of the Church of England in her hour of triumph with ineffaceable dishonor and reproach.

[41] *Loc. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 164.

RESCH'S "LOGIA."[1]

DR. RESCH's arduous labors have now culminated in this handsome volume, in which he gives in parallel columns of Greek and Hebrew what he conceives to be the original gospel. That gospel, according to his now well-known theory, was called "the Logia." It was composed in Hebrew by Matthew shortly after the death of Christ, was the main source of the three synoptic gospels, was used by Paul and John, and continued for many centuries to be known to the church writers. To varying translations from it are due not only the variations of the synoptic evangelists, but also many of the countless variant readings which crowd the *apparatus criticus* of the New Testament—especially those of the "western text" and of the early Fathers. To reconstruct it "all Hebraizing texts which point to a Hebrew original" may be used from the synoptists, also the "Agrapha," besides many passages which Dr. Resch's criteria enable him to select from the gospel of John and the epistles of the New Testament.

The evidence for this comprehensive and imposing theory, of which the foregoing brief summary can pretend to give but an imperfect account, has appeared insufficient to nearly all New Testament scholars, and criticisms already made over and over again by competent reviewers need not here be repeated. The present volume is simply the practical working out of the theory in detail. In reconstructing the "Logia" the first two chapters of Matthew and of Luke are disregarded, as they were derived from the Βίβλος Γενέσεως Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, published elsewhere by Dr. Resch; of the other chapters there is included more than four-fifths of Matthew (out of 1023 vss. 813 vss. and 19 parts of vss.) and nearly six-sevenths of Luke (out of 1019 vss. 855 vss. and 17 parts of vss.); together with two-thirds of Mark (out of 678 vss. 448 vss. and 18 parts of vss.).[2] There is also some material suggested by John, the epistles, and the Apocalypse, or

[1] *Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt.* Ein Versuch. Von ALFRED RESCH. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xxxiv + 302. M. 10.

[2] According to the view of Bernhard Weiss, to which Resch's theory is in some respects akin, but thirty-two passages of Mark, comprising only 262 verses, are dependent on the "Apostolic Source" or "Logia."

taken from apocryphal or patristic sources. The whole is carefully arranged in orderly chapters and sections, each with its heading.

Unfortunately the work itself is done with a fanciful arbitrariness which the following characteristic example, taken at random, fairly illustrates. Mark 4:26–29 has appeared to many scholars to be a secondary form of the parable more accurately represented by Matt. 13:24–30, and has been, for that reason, ascribed by Weiss to the "Logia." Resch denies the identity of the two parables, but, although thus deprived of the main support for Weiss' view, holds fast to the idea that Mark's parable came from the "Logia." The evidence consists in the fact that John 12:24 and 1 Cor. 15:36 f. contain references to a grain of wheat, and that a number of early writers use not quite exactly one or another of the three passages, or develop in their own way a similar line of thought; and further in a reading of Codex Colbertinus. This twelfth-century MS. of the Old Latin (as edited by Belsheim, whose editions have, at best, to be used with caution) reads, namely, at Mark 4:27, quite unsupported and, one would say, by an obvious scribal transposition: "et dormiat et *semen* surgat diem et noctem et germinet et crescat, dum nescit ille." Out of this material Dr. Resch constructs the following, which he asks us to accept as a Greek representation of the original of Mark's parable. I give the ordinary text of Mark in a parallel column:

Mark 4:26–29.	*Resch, Logia viii, 18–20.*
(26) καὶ ἔλεγεν· οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ ὡς ἄνθρωπος βάλῃ τὸν σπόρον ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς	(18) καὶ ἔλεγεν· οὕτως ἐστὶν ἡ βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ, ὡς κόκκος σίτου
(27) καὶ καθεύδῃ καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν, καὶ ὁ σπόρος βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνηται ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν αὐτός.	(19) καὶ καθεύδῃ ὁ σπόρος καὶ ἐγείρηται νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν καὶ βλαστᾷ καὶ μηκύνηται, ὡς οὐκ οἶδεν.
(28) αὐτομάτη ἡ γῆ καρποφορεῖ, πρῶτον χόρτον, εἶτεν στάχυν, εἶτεν πλήρη σῖτον ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ.	(20) καὶ γίνεται πρῶτον χόρτος, εἶτεν στάχυς, εἶτεν πλήρης σῖτος ἐν τῷ στάχυϊ· ὅταν δὲ ἡ γ
(29) ὅταν δὲ παραδοῖ ὁ καρπός, εὐθὺς ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ	ἀποστέλλει τὸ δρέπανον, ὅτι παρέστηκεν ὁ θερισμός.

It should be added that Dr. Resch's three verses are marked with a dagger, to indicate that their "original verbal form is especially uncertain," and that for eight words (here underlined) variant readings of equal value (*gleichwertige Varianten*) are given in footnotes.

Comment on all this is unnecessary, especially when the following amazing sentences, relating to the matter, are quoted from the *Paralleltexte zu Matthäus und Marcus:* "The radical kinship between John 12 : 24 and Mark 4 : 26 ff. is shown in the differing words for the seed: σπόρος (Mark 4 : 26) = σπέρμα (Clem. Rom.) = κόκκος σίτου (Theophil., Iren., John, Paul, also Aphraates) = גַּרְגַּר, which is used in Targum and Mishna in the sense 'granum' (Fürst, I, 271)" (p. 154); and, "The kinship between Mark 4 : 26 ff. and 1 Cor. 15 : 37 and John 12 : 24, which appears prominently in the extra-canonical parallels, can only be explained by a text of the pre-canonical source in which the sleep or death of the grain of seed thrown into the earth was declared to be necessary in order that it might awake and fructify" (p. 156).

The companion parable, Matt. 13 : 24–30, Dr. Resch also ascribes to the "Logia." As evidence he uses the fact that Epiphanius gives a very free reproduction of it, probably derived from a Manichæan source. He says (*Paralleltexte zu Matthäus und Marcus*, p. 145): "The divergences [between Matthew and Epiphanius] are of such a character that they are explicable only as differences of version and redaction, and thus bear witness to the fact that the parable and its interpretation are derived from the Source." In fact, he is inclined to think that the Manichee had preserved our Lord's words in some respects better than the gospel of Matthew. As to this argument it can only be said that the passage in Epiphanius is interesting and worth investigating, but that it is certainly founded on the canonical Matthew, and does not prove anything whatever about the "Logia." The volume before us is the product of an interminable series of similar examples of the fallacy *non sequitur*.

Dr. Resch has several startling bits of historical construction relating to his "Logia." He says that it was signed at the end by its author Matthew, and he makes this out by putting at the end of the book the list of apostles, closing with καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν Ἰσκαριώτην, καὶ ἐμὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον. This is based on a fragment of the Jewish-Christian *Gospel according to Matthew* known to Epiphanius, in which our Lord names the apostles: ἐξελεξάμην Ἰωάννην . . . . καὶ Ἰούδαν τὸν καὶ σὲ τὸν Ματθαῖον καθεζόμενον ἐπὶ τοῦ τελωνίου ἐκάλεσα, καὶ ; μοι. But the whole passage quoted by Epiphanius is obviously founded on our canonical gospels and sheds no light on their sources.

Another discovery is that the originator of the "western text" of the gospels was the same as the originator of the canon of four gospels,

and was the Jewish-Christian "presbyter Aristo of Pella" (*Theologische Studien B. Weiss dargebracht*, p. 110). Further, it appears that the MS. of the Logia in Hebrew was kept in the library at Cæsarea, and read there (with some difficulty, as Dr. Resch suggests) by the redactor of the pseudo-Ignatian epistles and the Apostolic Constitutions, who refers to it by its title of τὰ λόγια (*Paralleltexte zu Lucas*, pp. 810 ff.). This last point deserves a word. The passage in question is *Ps.-Ign. ad Smyrn.*, iii, which quotes verbatim Acts 1 : 11,[3] introducing it by φασὶ γὰρ τὰ λόγια. Dr. Resch appears to be ignorant of the fact that τὰ λόγια was commonly used in the early centuries to designate the Holy Scriptures, a usage of which Lightfoot, *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, pp. 172 ff., gives copious examples. We may add, in passing, that when Dr. Resch finds in the occasional Old Testament use of the Hebrew דִּבְרֵי (*e. g.*, 1 Kings 11 : 41) as a book-title to mean "acts" a justification for his title, Τὰ Λόγια Ἰησοῦ = דִּבְרֵי יֵשׁוּעַ, it would have been better to mention that in those cases no Greek version translates דִּבְרֵי by λόγια.

The collections of material which Dr. Resch has published in the *Agrapha*, and especially in the *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*, have permanent usefulness, but his strange inability to see what does and what does not constitute reasonable proof renders worthless all his results. The present book contains results, with little or no new material, and its value is proportionally slight.

JAMES HARDY ROPES.

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL,
Cambridge.

RESCH has given us the prolegomena to his Hebrew "Logia" in his *Paralleltexte*, I, 83–152, where his arguments regarding the language of the primitive gospel are set forth, and his views as to the character of the various Greek translations which he assumes, and their relation to the original, are expressed at some length. What he says respecting the nature of the Hebrew of his reconstructed gospel is merely this, that it is "the idiom used by Delitzsch, Dalman, and Salkinson in their translations of the New Testament" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 107 f.). This is rather indefinite, to be sure. The translations of Salkinson and Delitzsch (or Delitzsch-Dalman) differ widely from each other at just this point,

[3] Dr. Resch has wrongly omitted the article ὁ before ἀναλημφθείς in printing the passage from Pseudo-Ignatius.

the kind of Hebrew in which they are made.[4] The former strove to imitate the classical language, with the result that its renderings were often either hopelessly awkward or else untrue to the original. Delitzsch's New Testament employed a curious artificial idiom of its own, constructed partly from the Old Testament Hebrew, partly from the Hebrew of the Mishna, with the principal aim of following the Greek as closely as possible. His translation, finally revised by Dalman in 1892, was well suited to its purposes; it is hardly necessary to say, however, that those who believe in a primitive Hebrew gospel could not look here for the idiom which they suppose to underlie our Greek texts. It is, therefore, to be regretted that Resch has not expressed himself more definitely. It is very likely the fact that his aim is not so much to reconstruct the "original Hebrew" as to furnish an objective demonstration of the theories advanced in his exhaustive *Aussercanonische Paralleltexte*. If this is the case, the question of the type of Hebrew employed by him loses somewhat in importance; but it is far from being a matter of comparative indifference, for in numerous places the success or failure of his demonstration depends on this very question of the idiom postulated; moreover, he proceeds everywhere on the tacit assumption that at least one of the several translators followed *closely* a text resembling the one which he presents.

Comparison of the other Hebrew versions of the New Testament shows that Resch's translation is based chiefly on Delitzsch-Dalman. This version is often reproduced without change, or nearly unchanged, as, for example, in Log. xxii, 34–43 = Luke 16:1–8; sometimes it is abandoned in favor of Salkinson; again, in many places Resch goes his own way. As a rule, however, from which deviations are only occasional, his Hebrew is the result of an extensive, though superficial, revision of Delitzsch; the chief purpose of the revision being to imitate more closely the wording and order of the Greek. It must be borne in mind that the text which he translates is very frequently a mixed text which he himself has constructed, and that his theory requires him to take into account a multitude of variant readings, and provide for them, so far as possible, in the Hebrew. This being the case, it is plain that the task of remodeling was no easy one, but that a great amount of labor must have been expended on it.

As to the merits of the Hebrew version which he has thus made,

[4] See DALMAN in *Hebraica* (= *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*), Vol. IX, pp. 228 ff.

the verdict must be decidedly unfavorable. It is a success neither on the linguistic nor on the critical side. So far as it is his own work, it is clumsy and inaccurate, and, in every way, most unpleasant reading. In the first place, his attempt to model the Hebrew closely on the Greek of our gospels (a very dubious undertaking, even in the hands of an expert) has resulted disastrously. The following examples may serve to illustrate this: viii, 5, ויקו ויאמר לא באתי כי אם אל צאן אבדת בת ישראל (*εἰ μὴ εἰς τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα οἴκου Ἰσραηλ*). This is impossible Hebrew. xxxii, 40, וְיִהְיֶה נָכוֹן הַתַּלְמִיד פְּרִבּוֹ = *κατηρτισμένος δὲ ἔσται ὁ μαθητὴς ὡς ὁ διδάσκαλος αὐτοῦ*. xxxiii, 27, ויתפלל כדבר הזה לאמר = *προσηύξατο, τὸν αὐτὸν λόγον εἰπών*. There are a good many such passages, in which the translation is made to fit the Greek exactly, but with a total sacrifice of Hebrew idiom. An illustration of the way in which the attempt to follow the Greek tenses results in confusion is afforded by xxviii, 47. The Greek (Luke 14 : 9, Cod. D) reads: *καὶ προσελθὼν ὁ δειπνοκλήτωρ εἴπῃ* ("var." *ἐρεῖ*) *σοι· κτλ.* This was rendered by Delitzsch: ובא הקרא ..... ואמר אליך. In Resch the reading is: ויאמר אליך ..... ובא הקרא, which is strange Hebrew, to say the least. In iv, 4, by simply transposing into the Greek order Hebrew clauses which in another order (as, *e. g.*, in Delitzsch) would be unobjectionable, mere nonsense is obtained. This is, perhaps, the most striking example of utter disregard of Hebrew syntax to be found in the book. The danger of this method of tinkering the translation of another, without paying due heed to rules of grammar, is particularly well illustrated in xi, 55–57, the denunciation of Capernaum. In 55 the city is first masculine (אַתָּה, and masculine adjective), then feminine (תֵּרְדִי, also footnote, תּוּרְדִי); in 56 it is feminine (בְּתוֹכֵכִי); in 57 it is again masculine (מְמֻקָּךְ). *Cf.* the versions of Delitzsch and Salkinson, and Resch's *Paralleltexte*, III, 187! Another illustration is xiii, 11 (*cf.* Delitzsch), which, in the form given by Resch, defies construction.

It is to be noticed that, in spite of this mechanical method of fitting translation to text, there are many passages in which Resch has not followed his own Greek. Such, for example, are iv, 2 (*cf.* Delitzsch-Dalman); iv, 8 (the word וישכם taken from Delitzsch, where it is in place); vii, 37; ix, 6, 40, where עטופים is not a translation of *ἐσκυλμένοι*, but of *ἐκλελυμένοι* (here Resch really had an opportunity to make a plausible correction of the received text, but did not take it); x, 7; xi, 42; xxiii, 9; xxvii, 41; etc. See also ii, 13, 16; both quotations

from the Old Testament, where his Hebrew neither corresponds to his own Greek nor follows the Old Testament reading; iii, 9, where for three lines his Hebrew (quoted from Isa. 61 : 1 f.) does not at any point correspond to his Greek.

In other respects, also, Resch's Hebrew is not above reproach. In v, 7, for example, the perfect tense בקש is out of place. In vi, 21, the adjective אטם is used in a way that is not permissible. In viii, 19, he has misunderstood his Greek; hence the strange כְּאֵלּוּ. ix, 40, read אישׁ instead of אנשׁים. xv, 26–30, the genders are sorely confused; see especially 29! In xxiii, 28, כאשׁר is used in a false way. Notice also ii, 11, ואחרי האלה; vii, 40, השׁית לבו = "he repented;" xiii, 10, וישׁליכוהו אותו, etc. In vi, 40; ix, 26; xi, 55 (note); xv, 30; xvi, 31; xxxv, 9, he has constructed forms which the Hebrew grammarians would not recognize. xxiv, 1, 2, he renders *τὰ ἀγαθὰ ἐλθεῖν δεῖ* by הַטּוֹבוֹת צְרִיכִין לָבוֹא, and *τὰ κακὰ ἀνάγκη ἐλθεῖν* by הָרָעוֹת צְרִיכִין לָבוֹא; ־ִין being apparently intended as feminine plural ending. For an example of a rendering that is mere nonsense, see ii, 4, where John the Baptist is made to decline the honor of baptizing Jesus in the words: לא אוכל לקחת את השׂלשׁ. Resch evidently supposes this to be a translation of *οὐ δυνατόν ἐστιν ὅτι τὸν ἁρπαγμὸν*[5] *παραλαμβάνω*, adopted by him from an extra-canonical source.

The point of chief interest in Resch's new version, and that which he had principally in view in preparing it, is the attempted demonstration of an original Hebrew source, which was used by those who compiled our Greek gospels. Students of the New Testament will turn first of all to the evidence of this nature presented in the book before us; for it is to be presumed that one who has gone over the whole ground so thoroughly will have found and set forth whatever proof is to be had. But here, again, the reader is doomed to disappointment. The book is even weaker on the critical than on the philological side.

On every page "variant readings" are recorded; very often the attempt is made, with evident painstaking, to explain two or more Greek words of different signification by a single Hebrew word; in a few cases the attempt is made to show that one of the Greek translators misunderstood the original, or translated from a corrupt text. But, aside from the fact that the underlying theory of manifold translation breaks down completely, again and again (as in vi, 34, 36, 39, 42; vii,

[5] In his *Paralleltexte*, II, 58, Resch speaks of this word *ἁρπαγμὸν* = *rapinam* as "dunkel." Can there be any doubt that it owes its origin to the *ἁρπαγμός*, *rapina*, of Phil. 2:6?

37; ix, 6, 15; xii, 32; xvi, 38; xvii, 23, 25; xviii, 6; xxxiv, 48), the way in which Resch deals with the evidence before him in single cases destroys at the start all confidence in his work. The reader can hardly believe his eyes, for example, when he sees Resch emend *ἔνδυμα γάμου*, xxviii, 66, to *ἐνδύματά μου* (!), and translate by בִּגְדֵי, in the face of external evidence, common sense, and his own text in 64 and 65.

In his *Paralleltexte*, *loc. cit.*, p. 108, Resch has remarked that the LXX translation "offers many and instructive analogies, which may aid in the reconstruction of the original Hebrew text in the New Testament." But in his use of these "analogies" Resch shows a most complete absence of critical judgment, as well as a surprising lack of acquaintance with the Hebrew language. Take, for a striking example, his reconstruction (viii, 22) of the clause of Matt. 13:44 reading: *ὃν εὑρὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔκρυψεν*, "[treasure] which a man found, and hid." The footnote reads: "Tatian, *ὀρύττειν*, Mt. *κρύπτειν*. Vgl. Amos ix. 2: אם יחתרו = LXX: *ἐὰν κατακρυβῶσιν*, al. *κατορυγῶσιν*." Accordingly (?) the Greek is restored as follows: *ὃν εὑρών τις ὤρυξεν καὶ ἔκρυψεν*, and the Hebrew original is given as אשר מצאו איש ויַחְתְּרֵהוּ ויטמנהו. Passing over the fact that the assumption on which the argument is based, namely, that the context in which the one Greek "variant" is found closely resembles that containing the other, is not true, what could ויחתרהו possibly mean here? The verb is not used in this way either in classical or in late Hebrew, and the form given is grammatically impossible in the present context.

A fair sample of the "parallel translations" in our gospels is found in xi, 55: "And thou, Capernaum, who hast been exalted to heaven." As is well known, the best-attested Greek reading (Matt. 11:23; Luke 10:15) is *μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ*, which must then be interpreted, not without difficulty, as a question. Other MSS. offer *ἡ ὑψωθεῖσα*, the reading of the received text. Resch explains these two readings as derived, respectively, from הֲמִרוֹמִם (*sic*) and הֲמִרוֹמִם. Passing over the obvious fact that the first letter of this *μὴ* was derived, by a copyist's error, from the preceding *Καφαρναουμ* (*cf.* the Lewis Syriac in Matthew), the clause המרומם עד השמים, in which ה is regarded as the interrogative particle, would be lame at best; and that a Greek translator who knew even a little of the Hebrew language could render it by *μὴ ὑψωθήσῃ* (!) is quite beyond belief.

In most of the cases of double translation adduced by Resch, this mechanical treatment of the Greek texts is combined with disregard of the actual meaning and use of the Hebrew word; as, for example, in

xxxv, 48, where *καὶ μαρτυρίᾳ πνεύματος παρακλήτου* is rendered רוּחַ הַנְּבוּאָה. Perhaps the extreme example of this sort is to be found in xxxi, 34, where the word חבל (left unpointed) is made to explain the words *ὠδίν* and *παγίς*, respectively, in the "parallel passages" (!) Luke 21 : 34 and 1 Thess. 5 : 3. Equally striking for its disregard of Hebrew usage is xxxii, 5, where the first word of John 13 : 1, *πρὸ δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς*, is said to be a translation of מִקֶּדֶם; while the reading of Matt. 26 : 17, *τῇ δὲ πρώτῃ τῶν ἀζύμων*, is explained as the same word read בַּקֹּדֶם! In xii, 20, "Whoever gives a cup of water . . . . shall by no means lose his reward," there are two readings: *ἀπολέσῃ* (transitive) and *ἀπόληται* (intransitive; *μισθός* being the subject). Resch explains that the latter is a translation of יֹאבַד; the former, of יְאַבֵּד. But acquaintance with Hebrew usage would have shown him that this is impossible. אבד is a causative piel, meaning, in the first instance, "to destroy." In such a passage as xxvii, 8 ("gaining the whole world and losing his soul"), where Resch also employs it, it is quite in place as the translation of *ἀπολέσῃ*; but in the context before us it could not possibly be used. Even worse is vi, 34 (נְשֹׂא, נְשֹׂא), where the only possible translation of Resch's Hebrew is: "Do not hide yourself from your creditor"! The three or four other instances of the kind upon which Resch bases his argument have even less claim to serious attention than those already mentioned.

In conclusion, it must be said that, so far as this translation is concerned, Resch has contributed nothing of value to the discussion as to the origin of the gospels. He has not, in this book, pointed out any characteristic Hebrew idioms or constructions, or succeeded at any point in making his claim of a primitive Hebrew gospel seem plausible. And if the possibility of the existence of such a gospel were admitted, there could certainly be no reason for supposing that the peculiar product before us bears any close resemblance to it. It is a pity that a scholar of so great industry and wide learning as Resch should have wasted his time on this version, which has no redeeming features.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

ANDOVER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Andover, Mass.

DOCUMENTS.

A HITHERTO UNPUBLISHED TREATISE AGAINST THE ITALIAN MANICHEANS.

Edited by

FRED. C. CONYBEARE,
University College, Oxford, England.

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION.

THE following treatise against the Italian Manicheans of the twelfth century has never been edited. At least, there is no mention of it in Döllinger's great work, *Zur Sectengeschichte des Mittelalters*, nor is there any record in the Laurentian Library, where the MS. which contains it is preserved, of its having ever been consulted. Nevertheless, it is of interest; for it throws much light upon the religious condition of Italy, and especially of Lombardy, between the years 1100 and 1250 A. D. The reference on fol. 70 *ro.*, col. 2, to a possible visit of the emperor to Lombardy can only refer to Frederick II., and indicates that the document was written about 1180 A. D.

A discussion of the contents must be left to another time. It may be noticed, however, in how many points the heretics who are here controverted anticipated the Reformation. In their condemnation of indulgences, and rejection of the prayers and masses of priests living in mortal sin, they resembled the Lollards. The prayer of such a priest was, they held, *execrabilis non impetrabilis* (to be avoided as a curse, and not sought after as a blessing). In their prejudice against oaths and disuse of water-baptism they resembled the Society of Friends. In their dualism, their docetism, asceticism, and rejection of the Old Testament, their descent from the Manicheans of the fourth century is apparent; and their arguments are frequently identical with those of Faustus, the opponent of Augustine.

Another category of heretics is also noticed, who retained water-baptism, but rejected infant baptism on exactly the same grounds as the Anabaptists of later days and the Paulicians of the East.

This treatise is contained in a parchment codex of the Laurentian Library, Bibl. Ædilium, cod. 37, in which it fills fol. 70 *ro.*–fol. 75 *vo.*,

col. 1. In Bandini's catalogue the codex is ascribed to the twelfth century, but Signor Rostagno, for palæographic reasons, would date it in the thirteenth. The handwriting is small, neat, in double columns, and full of contractions. Damp or some other influence has so blurred many passages that they are legible only with difficulty. Some bigoted monk has long ago removed with a knife the folio 69 which contained the beginning of the treatise; and we are, therefore, in want of the information, which the title no doubt contained, as to the exact authorship and date of the treatise, and as to the circumstances under which it was written. The excision must have been motived by some frank statement of the heretical positions to be combated. This treatise is succeeded in the MS. by a *Summa contra Patarenos*, evidently from the same pen, and which, as it is unedited, I hope to be able to communicate at another time.

The main interest of such treatises consists in the insight they furnish into the character of the religious dissent of the Middle Ages. I have, therefore, frequently omitted the arguments of the Catholic where they are merely scholastic and tedious, and in no way help us to such an insight. I have, as a rule, reproduced the punctuation and paragraphing of the MS., and in a very few cases its contractions, chiefly where they are ambiguous.

Folio 70, recto, col. 1. infinita et illa ab aliquo. non enim a malo principio. ergo duo sunt principia. Item in genesi: et tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi.[2] dicit hereticus: ibi fuit principium creationis a tenebris. sed principium lucis est deus. ergo aliquid est principium tenebrarum. ergo duo sunt principia. Item dicit dominus in euangelio: Uenit princeps huius mundi et in me non habet quicquam etc.[3] Hic deus appellat principem mundi diabolum. Sed non poterat esse princeps nisi per creationem. ergo duo sunt principia. Item nemo potest duobus dominis seruire.[4] Unde uersus: Uitet quisque probus dominis seruire duobus. Se appellat dominum per creationem. ergo et illum similiter per creationem. ergo duo sunt principia.

Item dicit dominus: uos ex patre diabolo estis.[5] sed non nisi per creationem. ergo adminus creauit corpus. Item ad rom. c. vii: Iam non operor illud. sed quod habitat in me peccatum.[6] ergo corpus est

[1] The first folio of the treatise has been cut out.

[2] Gen. 1:2. [3] John 14:30. [4] Luke 16:13. [5] John 8:44. [6] Rom. 7:20.

habitaculum peccati. ergo non est sine illo. et ita a malo principio omne creatum corpus. Item idem: Uideo aliam legem in membris meis repugnantem legi mentis meæ.[7] hæc lex non est nisi peccatum quod habitat in membris et repugnat legi mentis. sed cum mens sit facta a deo, ergo membrum a diabolo.

Item indirecto. Si deus creauit hæc corporalia. aut potuit ea facere incorruptibilia aut non potuit. Si potuit et non fecit. ergo habuit inuidentiam. quia melius potuit creatis prouidere quam prouiderit. Sed inuidentia non cadit in deum. ergo ea non creauit. ergo aliud est principium a quo sunt. ergo duo sunt principia. Si non potuit. ergo deus est impotens. quod falsum est.

Et regula est: Si causa est immutabilis et causatum est immutabile. et e contrario: Ista corporalia sunt causatum a deo qui est causa efficiens eorum. Sed ipse est immutabilis. ergo et ista. quod falsum est. ergo non sunt a deo condita. ergo ab alio. non enim[8] a principe tenebrarum. ergo sunt principia. uel si ab eo. ergo ipse mutabilis. quod manifeste falsum est.

Cath.

Auctoritatibus et rationibus ab hereticis propositis sic est respondendum. et primo huic: Non per arborem bonam fructus malus facitur neque arbor mala fructum bonum etc.[9] Tu heretice per bonam arborem intelligis Christum. per malam diabolum. dico quod aperte mentiris. Sed per arborem intelligo hominis intentionem. quæ si bona fuerit, bonum fructum facit. si mala, e contrario. Et non quod habet dictio malum. quandoque supponit actionem. quandoque malitiam inficientem actionem. actionem.[10] Supponit ut ibi: Non est malum in ciuitate quod deus non faciat .i. non est mala actio in ciuitate quam deus non permittit fieri. malitiam inficientem actionem supponit. Ut ibi: Hic facit deus quod malum non est. Sed secundum quod malum supponit actionem, dicimus quod malum aliquid est et a deo est. quia omnis actio secundum actio a deo est. Sed prout supponit malitiam inficientem actionem. dicimus quod malum nichil est. nec a deo nec ab aliquo processit.

Ad id quod dicitur: tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi.[11] per quod intendit probare hereticus quod mundus inchoauit a tenebris. et sic per consequens a diabolo. dicimus manifeste falsum esse. quia habet dictio tenebræ. quandoque ponitur positiue. quandoque priuatiue. et hic ponitur priuatiue. quia non significat alicuius rei existentiam. sed lucis carentiam. Et sic est sensus: tenebræ erant super faciem abyssi. i. non erat lux. tum uenit princeps huius mundi. et in me non

[7] Rom. 7:23. [8] *Cf.* Luke 6:43.

[9] The sense seems to require *autem* rather than *enim*.

[10] *Actionem* seems to be a dittology. [11] Gen. 1:2.

habet quicquam.[12] per mundum uis intelligere machinam mundialem. quod falsum est. Sed per mundum intelligo amatores mundi quorum princeps diabolus est per appetitum terrenorum. et quod ita sit audi Iohannem dicentem: mundus eum non cognouit.[13] i. amatores mundi. Et alibi: Regnum meum non est de hoc mundo.[14] i. amatores mundi. non sunt regnum dei. quia deus non regnat in eis per gratiam. Item: uos ex patre diabolo estis.[15] hic non appellat eum patrem eorum ratione creationis. sed ratione imitationis. quia pater est eorum qui eum imitantur. Unde cuius opera facis ipsius filius appellaris. Item ad hanc auctoritatem sic respondendum est: Iam non ego operor illud, sed quod habitat in me peccatum.[16] Si peccatum habitat in carne. ergo caro mala. non sequitur. quia per peccatum intelligo fomitem qui appellatur carnalitas. et concupiscentia. tyrannus et langor naturæ. uel stimulus carnis. uel etiam titillatio. et quod dicitur habitare in carne non ratione substantiæ uel naturæ. sed ratione circumstantiæ quam contraximus a primo parente. post cuius peccatum caro nostra facta est uitiata sed non uitiosa. et licet sit vitiata, tamen prout est caro a deo est. sed prout est uitiata, non. *Quod* est uideri in aliquo egrotanti qui quamuis infirmetur. tamen prout est homo a deo est. sed secundum quod talis, non a deo. Item uideo aliam legem in membris meis repugnantem legi mentis meæ.[17] ergo lex carnis contradicit legi spiritus et sic mala est caro. non sequitur: quia quod tu appellas legem carnis ego fomes peccati. quo uitiata membra repugnant spiritui. et licet sic sint uitiata. tamen a deo sunt in quantum membra. sed in quantum sic uitiata, non. Item caro concupiscit aduersus spiritum. spiritus aduersus carnem.[18] et sic duo in homine attenduntur quæ sibi in uicem contradicunt .s. caro quodam modo[19] et spiritus fiunt id quod appellas carnem. dico concupiscentiam esse. et eadem erit solutio cum precedenti. et erit sensus: caro concupiscit aduersus spiritus .i. carnalitas appetit contraria spiritui. nec ideo caro uel spiritus est malus. immo bonus ratione naturæ et creationis.[20]

Folio 70, recto, col. 2.

Solutio.

Ad predictum dicimus quod bene potuit facere mundum incorruptibilem si uoluisset. et non fuit inuidentia sed summa sapientia quod fecit corruptibilem. quia per mundum corruptibilem inuitat nos ad incorruptionem. Nam omne corruptibile insinuat incorruptibile, et omne mobile insinuat immobile.

Ad id quod dicunt. Si causa est immutabilis, et ejus effectus debet esse immutabilis. Unde concludit mundana propter mutabilitatem

[12] John 14:30. [13] John 1:10. [14] John 18:36. [15] John 8:44. [16] Rom. 7:20. [17] Rom. 7:23. [18] Gal. 5:17. [19] MS. *quam̊* (*sic*). [20] MS. *cationis* (*sic*).

non esse a deo facta. ad quod dicimus quod duplex est causa. efficiens et formalis. causa efficiens est illa motu cuius aliquis mouetur ad aliquid faciendam. Ut est uideri in artifice qui mouetur ad domum faciendam. Unde non sequitur quod quicquid predicatur de effectu predicetur de causa ipsius. Nam de effectu potest predicari diuturnitas. quia potest esse diuturnum. Sed de opifice non. quia pluribus diebus uixit. Unde non sequitur si causa est immutabilis, et eius effectus. Sed quod dicis intelligendum est de causa formali. quia si causa formalis est mutabilis, et eius effectus. et exemplo : quia albedo est mutabilis et albere uel album facere est mutabile. Deus uero non est causa formalis sed efficiens. non sequitur ergo quod quicquid predicatur de causa predicetur de eius effectu. quia ipsa causa est immutabilis et eius effectus mutabilis. concluditur ergo quod unum tantum est omnium principium. et quod deus qui est causa efficiens creauit omnia uisibilia et inuisibilia, superiora et inferiora. *Hic intendit hereticus probare humanum genus et uetus testamentum a diabolo esse creata.* Adhuc instad hereticus uolens probare humanum genus et uetus testamentum creata esse a principe tenebrarum et dicens : legitur in genesi quod dominus ille qui creauit hominem. dixit penitet me fecisse hominem[21] tactus dolore cordis dixit p. m. f. ho. ergo penitentia cadit in eum. Sed omnis penitentia dolor est et passio. et si dolor in eo fuit ergo transmutatio et uicissitudinis obumbratio. Et sic non est ille deus de quo dicit Iacobus in nouo testamento : Omne datum optimum et omne donum perfectum desursum est descendens a patre etc.[22] Relinquitur ergo quod sit deus tenebrarum qui uetus testamentum et hominem creauit.

Solutio contra hereticum.

Solutio. o heretice ignoras figuram quæ ibi est. Scilicet. antropospatos .i. humana propassio. quia quod est creaturæ attribuitur creatori. uel quod consequentis attribuitur antecedenti. Ut est uideri in scriptore qui postquam fecerit litteram destruit. et talis destructio est signum doloris. Unde talis est sensus. penitet me fecisse hominem .i. ego destruam hominem. et hoc erit signum penitentiæ secundum cursum inferiorum. et sic penitet notat destructionem et non penitentiam. Uel secundum beatum Ber.[23] qui sic dicit. penitet me fecisse hominem .i. pena mortis. passionis et doloris detinebit me in cruce secundum humanitatem.

Contra hereticum.

Eadem ratione potest probari quod dubitatio cadat in deum. N. T. legitur in euangelio quod paterfamilias locauit uineam suam agricolis.[24]

[21] Gen. 6 : 7.

[22] James 1 : 17. MS. reads thus : *per desursum est de quod pat.* (*sic*).

[23] ? Bernardum. [24] Matt. 21 : 33.

Deinde misit seruos suos et occiderunt eos. Sic demum uolens mittere filium suum dixit: forsitan uerebuntur filium meum.[85] Ille paterfamilias non est nisi deus. Serui sunt prophetæ. filius est christus. uinea ecclesia iudeorum, quia boni erant quidam ex illis. agricolæ iudei. ergo deus dicens forte uel forsitan, dubitauit. ergo dubitatio cadat in deum noui .t. secundum quod penitentia in deum u. t. ergo nec deus ueteris .t. nec deus noui .t. est deus lucis. et sic nullum habemus deum. ergo nec ueteri .t. nec nouo .t. credere debemus. quod nephas est dicere. Ad quod notandum quod habet dictio forsitan. quandoque est nota dubitationis. ut si dicas; hoc anno forsitan ueniet imperator in lombardiam. Quandoque est nota irrisionis. ut hic. forsitan ue. fi. meum. quasi deus irridendo iudeos dicit. secundum quod carnalis dominus iratus dicit seruo suo: forsitan dominus tuus sum. cum sciat pro certo se esse dominum. Quandoque est nota liberi arbitrii sub hoc sensu. forsitan ue. f. m. i. de arbitrio iudeorum pendet utrum mittant manum in filium meum uel non. Et sic non cadit dubitatio hic in deum. nec ibi penitentia. sed habet se hic ad modum dubitandi. et ibi ad modum penitendi . . . . Quia uidit deus quod filii dei accedebant ad filias hominum quod erat peccatum. et ideo dixit penitet me f. ho. et sic per hoc ostendit quod peccatum non placebat sibi sed equitas. Sic ergo deus est equitatis et non iniquitatis.

Folio 70, verso, col. 1.

Hic nititur probare hereticus quod uetus .t. factum sit a deo tenebrarum.

Item adhuc nititur probare hereticus quod uetus .t. factum sit a deo tenebrarum sic dicens: Audias dominum in euangelio dicentem. Quotquot ante me uenerunt fures fuerunt et latrones.[86] Sed constat quot Moyses Ysaias et Ieremias et alii prophetæ ante ipsum uenerunt. ergo fuerunt fures et latrones. ergo mali. Sic ergo dicta eorum uel facta sunt reprobanda. quia a deo tenebrarum processerunt.

Solutio contra hereticum.

Sol. Tu heretice non attendis uim huius uerbi uenerunt. quia ibi est nota presumptionis. Unde quotquot ante me uenerunt propria auctoritate et non auctoritate mittentis. Ut pseudoprophetæ s. Balaam et Caypha. et alii fures fuerunt et latrones. Sed Moyses et Ysaias et Ieremias et alii prophetæ non uenerunt sua auctoritate sed domini mittentis. Et quod sint missi audi in eodem euangelio: Ierusalem Ierusalem quæ occidis prophetas et lapidas eos qui ad te missi sunt.[87] et quod isti sunt iusti. Audi in eodem euangelio: Veh uobis scribæ et Pharisæi hypocritæ, qui ædificatis sepulchra prophetarum et ornatis monumenta iustorum. et ibidem dicunt pharisæi: Si fuissemus in diebus patrum nostrorum non essemus socii eorum in sanguine prophetarum.[88] .i. non tractauissemus prophetas sicut illi tractauerunt. ergo prophetæ iusti. et eorum scripturæ et uetus .t. a deo fuerunt.

[85] *Ibid.*, vs. 37. [86] John 10:8. [87] Luke 13:34. [88] Matt. 23:29, 30.

Hereticus.

Adhuc instat hereticus uolens probare quod uetus .t. sit a diabolo et non a deo. Et dicit sic. Ille deus fuit sanguinareus et homicida immo super omnes homines homicidas. Quia quandoque una die interfecit .xxiii. millia. quandoque plures. quandoque pauciores. ergo fuit malus. Sic ergo restat quod uetus .t. non fuit nisi a malo deo

Catholicus.

Sol. tu non attendis causam occisionis et ideo non intelligis . . . . causa occisionis fuit peccatum. et sic ostenditur quod fuit iustus quia displicet ei iniquitas et placet equitas. ergo fuit bonus.

Catholicus.

Si causa occisionis dicis ipsum esse iniquum. probo tibi quod deus noui .ti. est iniquissimus. Ille deus ueteris .ti. non interficiebat nisi corpus. sed iste corpus et animam perdit[29] ipso testante in euangelio. . . . .

Hereticus.

Adhuc nititur infamare hereticus deum uet. ti. dicens: confiteor quod bonus erat in eo quod malos occidebat. sed ipse simul occidebat bonos et malos. ergo iniquus. ergo uetus .t. non fuit nisi a deo tenebrarum.

Solutio Catholici.

So. dicimus quod falsum est. quia bonos non occidebat sed malos. et quod hoc sit uerum audi quid dixit Abraham domino cui reuelatum fuit per spm sanctorum de destructione Sodome et Gomorre. Domine si fuerint ibi . . . . sic ergo saluauit iustos et dampnauit malos. ergo fuit bonus.

Folio 70, verso, col. 2. Sed quid dices de pueris quos interfecit in deserto qui nullam commiserant culpam propter quam deberent mori? ergo fuit iniquus quia interfecit innocentes.

Solutio.

So. quamuis illi pueri non haberent peccatum actuale. tamen habebant culpam originalem propter quam eis debebatur temporalis pena. i. mors. Unde apostolus. originalis peccati stipendium mors.[30] Et eterna.[31] s. carentia uisionis dei. Sed dominus presciuerat eos deteriores si uixissent. et ideo uoluit eos mori ne deteriores fierent. Sic ergo fuit pius et misericors.

Hereticus.

Item adhuc nititur probare hereticus quod uet. t. sit a diabolo. dicit enim Iacob in epistola cam.[32] quod deus neminem temptat et deus intemptator malorum est.[33] Sed legitur in genesi quod temptauit deus abraham ut ymolaret sibi filium unigenitum. ergo impulit patriarcham ad homicidium perpetrandum. Sed occidere peccatum mortale est et

[29] Matt. 10:28. [31] MS. *etna.* [33] James 1:13.

[30] Rom. 6:23. [32] *? causam.*

uelle occidere. Et sic impellebat eum ad peccandum. Restat ergo uet. t. esse factum a diabolo.

Solutio.

So. occidere nichil est quia non fuit. Uelle occidere aliquid fuit. quia a fonte bonitatis processit. et nichil est ita de genere malorum quod non fiat bonum si auctoritate dei fiat. Ergo non peccauit Habraham uolendo ymolare filium. Immo sibi meritorium fuit. et quod sic fuerit audi apostolum ad Hebreos. Fide obtulit Habraham filium suum Ysaac.[34] . . . .

Catholicus.

Superius conatus est hereticus probare quod uet. t. sit a diabolo quod nephas est. Modo quod sit a deo multis probatur auctoritatibus. Dicitur enim in euangelio mathei. quod cum dominus temptatus est a diabolo dicente. Si filius dei es. dic ut lapides isti panes fiant. cui respondit ihs. Scriptum est enim. non in solo pane uiuit homo sed in omni uerbo quod progreditur de ore dei.[35] Item habet: omnia tibi dabo. Item. Si filius dei es . . . . (cites passages from N. T. where V. T. is used: *e. g.*, Matt., *Nolite putare*,[36] etc., and Paul's use of Isaiah, and *Ecce homo in Syon lapidem*).[37] . . . .

Hereticus.

Sicut superius nitebatur hereticus uet. t. diffamare dicens quod est a diabolo et non a deo. suis rationibus et auctoritatibus. Sic nititur ut possit matrimonium diffamare dicens quod non sit a deo. et suam argumentationem trahens ab auctoritate apostoli dicentis: Dispondi enim uos uni uiro uirginem castam exibere christo.[38] Unde dicit quod apostolus loquitur ibi in persona generalis ecclesie. Sic ergo uult eam esse castam. ergo uir et mulier in matrimonio non deo placere possunt et sic sequitur quod non sit a deo. . . . .

Solutio.

Quod aperte mentiatur potest probari auctoritate mathei dicentis: Dictum est antiquis. Quicunque dimiserit uxorem suam det ei libellum repudii.[39] . . . . Item dicitur in eodem euangelio. Et accesserunt ad eum pharisei temptantes eum et dicentes: Si licet homini dimittere uxorem suam[40] . . . .

Catholicus.

Item potest probari quod matrimonium sit bonum et a deo concessum auctoritate mathei dicentis: quod pharisei dixerunt domino: Quid ergo moyses mandauit dare libellum repudii et dimittere?[41] . . . .

Catholicus.

Item probatur auctoritate Iohannis dicentis: Et nuptiæ factæ sunt in

[34] Heb. 11 : 17.
[35] Matt. 4 : 3.
[36] Matt. 5 : 13.
[37] 1 Pet. 2 : 6.
[38] 2 Cor. 11 : 2.
[39] Matt. 5 : 31.
[40] Matt. 19 : 3.
[41] *Ibid.*, vs. 7.

Chana.[42] . . . . Item dicit apostolus: De quibus autem scripsistis in me. bonum est homini mulierem non tangere propter fornicationem[43] autem uitandam uel committendam. committendam non dices. ergo uitandam. Sic ergo bonum est matrimonium. deinde sequitur. Unusquisque suam uxorem habeat. et nota quod dicit suam non alienam. ergo matrimonium bonum est.

Catholicus.

Contra manicheum qui matrimonium detestatur sic obicitur. dicit enim apostolus in epistola ad cor. prima c.vii: Uxori uir debitum reddat. similiter et uxor uiro.[44] . . . . Item dicitur in eodem .c. dico autem non nuptis et uiduis bonum est illis si sic permaneant. sicut et ego.[45] . . . . Item in eodem .c. Alligatus es uxori? noli quærere solutionem.[46] Sed forsitan dices quod apostolus ibi intelligit de spirituali sic dicens. Alli .e. uxori .i. ecclesie. noli querere solutionem quia bonum est in ecclesia esse. erit ne sic intelligendum quod sequitur? Solutus es ab uxore .i. ab ecclesia. noli querere uxorem .i. noli querere ecclesiam. Deinde sequitur: Si autem acceperis uxorem, non peccasti. et si nupserit uirgo non peccabit uel uir. Item in fine eiusdem .c. igitur qui matrimonio.[47] . . . .

Catholicus.

Item contra illos qui detestantur matrimonium dicit Paulus ad Cor. prima in fine .vii.c. mulier alligata est legi quanto tempore uir eius uiuit. . . . . cui uult nubat. tantum in domino.[48] Sed quia totum hoc de spirituali posset intelligi. addit: beatior autem erit si sic permanserit secundum meum consilium. puto autem quod et ego spm̄ dei habeam. Item ad Timotheum prima .c.v. Volo ergo iuniores nubere. filios procreare.[49] . . . . Item ad hebreos .c. ultimo: honorabile connubium in omnibus. Et thorus immaculatus. fornicatores enim et adulteros iudicabit deus.[50] Sic ergo restat quod matrimonium sit res honesta, sancta et laudabilis.

Folio 72, recto, col. 2.

Hereticus contra matrimonium spirituale.

Sicut hereticus detestatur matrimonium carnale. Sic et spirituale quod fuit inter uerbum et humanam naturam dicens quod non fuit natura coniunctio sine unio. et quod non sit natura. nititur probare suis rationibus et auctoritatibus. sic dicens: Omne corpus est a diabolo. quod si ita est. deus non sumpsisset corpus humanum compactum a diabolo. ergo non nostrum habuit corpus sed fantasticum. Et similiter legitur in euangelio. quod apparuit discipulis suis in alia effigie.[51]

[42] John 2 : 1.
[43] 1 Cor. 7 : 1, 2.
[44] 1 Cor. 7 : 3. *d.*, vs. 8.
[45] *Ibid.*, vss. 27, 28.
[46] *Ibid.*, 7 : 38.
[47] *Ibid.*, vss. 39, 40.
[48] 1 Tim. 5 : 14.
[49] Heb. 13 : 4.
[50] Mark 16 : 12.

Item legitur in evangelio. quod ipse transfigurauit se coram discipulis suis in monte thabor ut ostenderet eis dotem glorificati corporis quam non habebant. et sic diuersimode suis discipulis apparuit. per quod ostendebat se non unum corpus habere. ergo ipse non sumpsit corpus humanum uere. Sed ostendebat umbram corporis humani.

Hereticus quod n(on).

Adhuc nititur probare hereticus quod uero non habuerit corpus uerum rationibus et auctoritatibus sic dicens. Si christus uerum habuit corpus. ergo habuit dimensitatem,[52] s. longitudinem. latitudinem et spissitudinem. Et si habuerit corporum dimensitates. ergo impossibile fuit quod egrederetur de utero uirginali quin corrumperetur. Sed uirgo fuit porta clausa de qua dicitur in ezechiele. Quid uides? Portam clausam quam nemo apperuit. quam solus dominus introiuit et egressus est.[53] preterea si uerum corpus habuisset. non siccis pedibus super aquas ambulasset. quod ipse fecit. ergo non[54] uerum habuit corpus sed umbram. Item dicit Ylarius tuus quod in christo non fuit dolor neque tristitia. ergo non habuit uerum corpus. Vel uis tu quod ego contra dicam auctori tuo cui non est contra dicendum.
Item apostolus dicit. habitu inuentus ut homo.[55] Nota quod dicit ut homo. et non dicit in habitu inventus est homo. et quando loquitur de deo. non dicit ut deus. sed dicit deus. ad declarandam ueritatem ipsius dei. Sed hic dicit ut homo. ad designandum quod non nostram assumpsit humanitatem. ergo non uerum habuit corpus. eodem modo dicimus quod non bibit neque comedit. neque mortuus est neque resurrexit.

Solutio.

Ad predicta respondendum est per ordinem. et primo huic quod dominus suis discipulis apparuit in alia effigie. et dicimus quod falsum est. quod non apparuit in alia effigie. sed ita uidebatur eis. quia posset esse quod detinebantur uertigine uel alia egritudine. Quod dicis quod transfigurauit se coram discipulis in monte thabor. dicimus quod uerum est. quoniam uolebat eis ostendere dotem glorificati corporis. et etiam secundum illos qui dicunt ipsum accepisse indumentum corporis glorificati. quod accepit non deposito indumento mortalitatis. et hoc factum est miraculose. Sed tu existens circa fecem naturæ et non potens natura naturam? queris naturam. dico non inuenitur in cursu inferioris naturæ sed in superiori. quoniam qui est natura naturans utramque naturam habet superiorem et inferiorem. Et ideo non debes mirari si supra cursum naturæ inferioris aliqua quæcunque fecerit euenirent.[56] Sic ergo

[52] Ducange omits this word.

[53] Ezek. 44 : 2 ? *libere.*

[54] *Non* is a conjecture. The MS. seems to read *si*, which is inept.

[55] Phil. 2 : 7.

[56] *Aliqua* and *euenirent* are doubtful. The scribe seems to have written *euenire.*

per hoc solutum est quod dicebas de utero uirginali et quod super aquas siccis pedibus ambulauit. Ad auctoritatem Ylarii introductam sic respondeo: quomodo introducis testem Ylarium cui non credis? Sed ut tibi satisfiat dicimus quod Ylarius non intellexit de effectu sed de causa. Unde sic est disponenda auctoritas: In Christo non fuit dolor neque passio .i. in Christo non fuit causa passionis neque doloris. quia in se non habuit peccatum. quod est causa doloris. quod ipse passus sit audi Iacobum.[57] $\overline{\text{xpc}}$ passus est pro nobis, uobis relinquens exemplum ut se. u. e. Item apostolus. si compatimur et conregnabimus.[58] Ue! possumus dicere quod in hac parte non bene dixit. unde Claudianus in libro de anima: Dicimus Ylarium pictauiensem inter nobilissima suarum disputationum genera in hoc uno errasse cum dixit. $\overline{\text{xpm}}$ non dolorem neque passionem sustinuisse.

Catholicus.

Ad auctoritatem apostoli qua uolebas probare quod non habuerit uerum corpus sed umbram. sic respondimus dicentes quod ista coniunctio. ut. quandoque est nota improprietatis. quandoque similitudinis. quandoque expressiua unitatis. Sic hic. et in euangelio. Ut putabatur filius Iosep. Similiter habet coniunctio. . . . . Ut exprimit ueritatem in hac auctoritate. et erit sensus habitu inuentus ut homo .i. in habitu humanitatis
Folio 71, verso, col. 1. inuentus est uerus homo. Ad hoc quod dicebas quod neque bibit neque comedit neque passus est. Secundo monebaris quia ut tibi uidetur non decet deum ad secreta naturæ accedere. Sed nos dicimus quod ipse bibit còmedit et ad secreta naturæ accessit. et ipse tanquam bonus physicus dixit: Omne quod intrat in os per secessum emittitur.[59] Item[60] dicam cum Iero. Malo esse agrestis catholicus quam curialis hereticus.

Catholicus.

(The Catholic adduces texts of N. T. to prove that J. C. was born with real flesh, that he slept, ate; then as follows:)

Item quod Christus ueram carnem assumpsit rationabiliter potest probari in eo quod apparuit in humana natura in eo redemit humanam naturam. Sed redemptio fuit uera. ergo et apparitio. logo ueram assumpsit carnem. præterea sicut per uerum hominem facta est huius generis deperditio. sic oportuit ut per uerum hominem eiusdem fieret redemptio. quod non potuit fieri per purum hominem. quia si purus homo fuisset. labe originalis peccati infectus fuisset. et ideo diuinitatem sibi adiunxit ut a labe peccati originalis purificaretur. præterea sicut animam assumpsit. ita et corpus. quia utrumque susceptibile. Et quod animam assumpsit bene probatur per id quod dicitur in euangelio. potestatem habeo animam ponere et iterum eam

[57] 1 Pet. 2:21. . . . *ut sequamini uestigia eius.*

[58] 2 Tim. 2:12. Vulg.: *si sustinebimus*, etc.

[59] Matt. 15:17.

[60] *Apud MS. sic ī.*

suscipere.[61] Item in euangelio. tristis est anima mea.[62] Item inclinato capite emisit spm̄.[63] Item si ueram non assumpsit carnem non ratione[64] resurrexit. et sic omnia sunt fantastica et non uera. Unde apostolus ad hebros: si Christus non resurrexit nec nos resurgemus.[65]

Catholicus.

Item adhuc potest probari quod filius dei ueram carnem assumpsit et comedit et bibit. legiture in matheo: Uenit eum Iohannes non manducans neque bibens.[66] et dicunt demonium habet. Uenit filius hominis et manducans et bibens . . . . (other texts from N. T. are cited to prove that J. C. really ate) . . . .

Folio 72, verso, col. 2.

Hereticus nititur adnichillare resurrectionem generalem.

Sicut conantur heretici extinguere incarnationem ihū christi. sic conantur adnichillare resurrectionem generalem. dicentes quod caro ista non resurget. Et quod hoc sit uerum introducunt ad probandum .iiii. testimonia. dicentes. legit ad cor. prima .c. penultimo: hoc autem dico. fratres: quia caro et sanguis regnum dei possidere non possunt: neque corruptio incorruptelam.[67] possidebit. sic ergo relinquitur quod caro ista non resurget. ergo nichil est resurrectio tua. Item legitur in apocalypsi quod Iohannes dixit. Ecce noua facio omnia.[68] Si noua faciet. ergo ista uetusta caro tracta ab adam non resurget. Ergo non erit resurrectio. Item dominus dixit in euangelio. celum et terra transibunt. uerba autem mea non transient.[69] si quod solidius est et firmius transibit. multo fortius quod minus solidum. Sed solidius et firmius est celum et terra quam caro nostra. et illa transibunt. ergo et caro nostra transibit. ergo non resurget. Item adhuc ipse dominus hoc articulum eliminat cum saduceis satisfaciens dixit: In resurrectione enim neque nubent neque nubentur: sed erunt sicut angeli in celo.[70] Nota quod dicit sicut angeli quia caro ista non resurget. sed erunt spirituales. ergo corpus non resurget. ergo nichil est resurrectio.

Hereticus.

Sicut nituntur auctoritatibus hoc articulum criminare sic et rationibus. introducentes quadruplicem rationem. Scilicet appetitus carnis. Incinerationis.[71] Desitionis. Similitudinis. Ratione appetitus carnis sic: Caro naturaliter appetit malum. quomodo ergo dominus glorificaret carnem quæ semper appetit malum? At si dicat, impossibile est. Ratione incinerationis. corpus nostrum incinerabitur. et quod incineratur per infinitas partes diuiditur. quomodo ergo reintegrabitur? Sic ergo non resurget. Ratione desitionis sic. corpus istud desinet esse

[61] John 10 : 18. [62] Mat. 26 : 38. [63] John 19 : 30. [64] *An compendium apud MS.* = *realitate?* [65] *Cf.* 1 Cor. 15 : 14 ff. [66] Matt. 11 : 18. [67] 1 Cor. 15 : 50. [68] Apoc. 21 : 5. [69] Matt. 24 : 35. [70] Matt. 22 : 30. [71] MS. *incinationis* (*sic*).

.i. est et non erit. Sic ergo corpus istud nunquam resurget. Similiter sicut corpus desinit esse. sic et eius proprietas. S. corporeitas quæ si desinit esse nunquam ulterius erit. Item albedo id est huic corpori quod postea desinet esse album. uerum cras[72] incipiet albere. dices tu quod habet sit eadem cum priori? nunquam eadem erit numero. Item ratione similitudinis. Apostolus uolens probare corporum resurrectionem dicit. Insipiens tu quod seminas non uiuificatur nisi moriatur.[73] et quod seminas non corpus. sed quod futurum est seminas. Sed nudum granum. sic ergo non istud corpus resurget sed spirituale.

Respondet Catholicus.

Folio 72, recto, col. 1. (The reply throws no further light on the Manichean's view.)

Hereticus.

Preter. insaniam precedentium hereticorum. Sunt adhuc quidam qui dicunt non solum corpus perire. sed etiam animam cum corpore. et ad suum errorem confirmandum introducunt auctoritates Sanctorum patrum et suas rationes. et primo auctoritatem Salomonis dicentis: Quod idem est interitus hominis et bestiarum et æqua est conditio utriusque. Si hoc est uerum ergo sicut spiritus bestiæ desinet esse cum corpore. sic et spiritus hominis desinit esse cum corpore.[74] ergo nec spŝ nec corpus resurget. Item Moyses dicit quod anima est in sanguine. et etiam uestri naturales[75] dicunt sanguinem sedem esse animæ .i. uidentur uelle quod existentia sanguinis. sit existentia animæ. Ergo deficiente sanguine deficit et anima. hoc idem uidetur uelle auctoritas prophetæ dicentis: Spŝ est uadens et non rediens.[76] i. spŝ est uadens ad mortem et non rediens ad uitam. Sic ergo spŝ cum ipsa carne desinit esse.

Hereticus.

Sicut nituntur heretici probare auctoritatibus animam desinere cum corpore. sic et rationibus. et primo quadam subtili ratione dicentes. Spŝ enim hominis aut est corporeus aut incorporeus. Si incorporeus sicut bene probamus. q·iero rationem quare spŝ bruti animalis desinit esse cum corpore et non spŝ hominis. et similiter quero quare uis incorporea quæ est in spū bruti animalis non conseruat ipsum spiritum in esse cum corpore. sicut uis incorporea quæ est in spū hominis conseruat ipsum in esse. Quod autem sit incorporeus sic probatur: hoc genus substantia diuiditur in corporeum et incorporeum. quia secundum dialeticum. Substantia alia est corporea alia incorporea. et hæc differentia corporea iuncta huic generi substantia facit aliud genus

[72] Should we not read: *quod hodie desinet e. album, iterum cras?*

[73] 1 Cor. 15:36, 37.

[74] Eccles. 3:19. Vulgate: *unus int. est hominis et iumentorum.*

[75] MS. *nr̃i ñales.* [76] Ps. 77:39.

subalternum .s. corpus. differentia nostra incorporea iuncta huic generi substantia facit aliud genus subalternum .s. spŝ. sub quo continetur spiritus bruti. uel non est spŝ quod falsum est. ergo spŝ bruti est incorporeus. ergo a simili: sicut perit spŝ bruti animalis cum corpore. ita et rationalis. uel neuter.

Hereticus.

Sicut probauit quod spiritus bruti animalis sit incorporeus. ita uult probare quod sit spŝ dicens: Spŝ bruti animalis habet in se quasdam potentias suī[77] uires quas habet spŝ rationalis. quia habet potentiam sentiendi ista sensibilia. et potentiam ymaginandi inuisibilia. Sic ergo spŝ bruti rationalis sicut hominis. Item[78] dicit bœtius: Spirituum alius est rationalis. alius irrationalis. Irrationalem appellat spm̄ bruti animalis. ergo spŝ bruti animalis est species. et quælibet species predicatur de genere. Sic ergo spŝ bruti animalis est spŝ. Item probat alia ratione quod spŝ desinat esse cum corpore. Sicut post mortem bruti animalis nulla relinquuntur uestigia spŝ in bruto animali. ita post mortem hominis nulla relinquuntur uestigia animæ. ergo simul desinit esse cum corpore. uel reddant rationem quare[79] non.

Respondet Catholicus.

(The Catholic argues at great length, both on philosophical grounds and from the Bible, that man's soul is — what an animal's is not — immortal and incorruptible. He takes up the double ground of its being incorporeal and the mainspring of human action.)

Folio 72, verso, col. 2. . . . . Sic ergo patet quod resurrectio generalis. et hæc sufficiant de resurrectione et animarum incorporeitate.

Hereticus.

Predictis erroribus adiciunt alium errorem dicentes quod non est uescendum carnibus. et quod hoc sit uerum probare nituntur. auctoritate. rationibus et exemplis: primo auctoritate illa qua legitur in genesi quod dominus maledixit omnibus animalibus de terra uiuentibus. Si maledixit. ergo sunt immunda. et immundis non est utendum. ergo carnibus non est uescendum. propter earum immunditiam. Preterea ratione deductionis. quia sommario modo deducuntur in quo attenditur luxuria. Ergo ibi est *luxuria*[80] immunditia. Sic ergo non eis est utendum. Item ratione incitationis. quia plus prouocant ad luxuriam quam aliqui cibi. ergo non est eis uescendum. Item exemplo christi magistri tui qui nunquam commedit. et omnis eius actio tua est instructio. Ergo nec tu debes suo exemplo comedere. Preterea Paulus dicit: Non comedam carnem in eternum.[81] Item sancti patres. hermite et cenobite. abstinent a carnibus. non nisi propter earum

[77] So MS. *Summi* is not good sense. [79] MS. q̃r. [81] 1 Cor. 8:13.

[78] *Apud MS. compendium hoc: t̄.* [80] *prima manus uult delere luxuria.*

immunditiam. Ergo non est eis uescendum. et sic restat quod non potest quis uesci carnibus sine criminali peccato.

Catholicus.

Ad predicta respondendum est per ordinem . . . . Si ideo abstinendum est a carnibus quia maledixit terræ, multo fortius abstinendum est a fructibus et aliis cibariis quæ de terra oriuntur. Ad rationem deductionis. dicimus quod uerum est quod ducuntur per pruritum. non idcirco sunt immunda. quia licet sit ibi pruritus. non tamen est ibi culpa. sed pena est eis. nec sunt immundæ quo ad esum et quo ad dominum. Ad id quod dicitis quod ratione incitationis abstinendum est. dicimus quod pari ratione abstinendum est a ciceribus. et fabis quæ quandoque multo fortius prouocant ad libidinem. Ad id quod dicitis quod sancti patres abstinent ratione incitationis: concedimus quod uerum est. Ad id quod dicitis quod Christus nunquam comedit carnes. dicimus quod non inuenitur quod ipse comederit nisi semel. quando comedit agnum cum discipulis. legitur enim in euangelio quod discipuli interrogauerunt ipsum. ubi uis paremus tibi pasca? Et per pasca intellegitur agnus pascalis. quem cum discipulis comedit cum latucis agrestibus. et licet non inueniatur scriptum quod ihs comederit carnes. non ideo dicendum quod non comederit. quia testante Iohanne: multa fecit ihs quæ non sunt scripta in libro hoc. Ad id quod Paulus dixit: Non com. c. in e. dicimus quod non recte intelligitis. quia ibi apostolus intellexit de cibo unde frater scandalizaretur . . . .

Catholicus.

Contra predictam heresim probandum est quod sit uescendum carnibus auctoritate et ratione. Et probatum est superius quod deus creauit uisibilia et inuisibilia. Sed de is nichil creauit immundum. Sic ergo carnes non sunt immundæ. ergo immunditia non est in eis per quam a carnibus sit abstinendum. Preterea ratione sic: Si ea ratione abstinendum est a carnibus quia incitant libidinem. multo fortius abstinendum est ab ouis. quæ fortius prouocant libidinem ut tradunt naturales. et a piscibus. quia quidam pisces ualde prouocant. et a leguminibus. Item probatur auctoritatibus in actibus apostolorum legitur quod Petro apparuerunt in linteo repentia terræ . . . . Item apostoli ad Timotheum ubi hereticos uitare qui cauterizatam habent conscientiam suam prohibentes nubere abstinere a carnibus quo deus creavit.[82]

Fol. 73, recto, col. 1. Adhuc potest probari contra dictum hereticum quod carnibus est uescendum auctoritatibus domini et apostoli. Dominus enim uolens mittere suos discipulos ad predicandum dixit eis: in quamcunque domum intraueritis[83] sedete et manete cum eis edentes et bibentes quæ apud illos sunt. Tunc dominus nichil excepit. Et sic nos suo exemplo nichil excipere debemus. Sic ergo carnes non sunt excipiendæ.

[82] 1 Tim. 4 : 2. Vulgate reads: *a cibis quos Deus.* [83] Matt. 10 : 11.

Preterea ipse qui bene nouit utramque naturam[84] dicit: Omne quod in os intrat non coinquinat hominem. sed quæ procedunt de corde.[85] sed carnes intrant in os et per os in uentrem. ergo carnes non coinquinant homines. ergo eis est utendum. Item dicit apostolus: omne quod in macello uenit manducate nichil interrogantes. propter conscientiam[86] astantium. Sed in macello non uenit nisi caro et piscis. Ergo carnes sunt comedendæ. Si obiciat de cornibus uel corio dicendum est quod non est intelligendum nisi de his quæ humano usui deputantur. Item apostolus. omnis creatura dei bona est et nichil reiciendum est quod cum gratiarum actione percipitur. Sanctificatur enim per uerbum et orationem.[87] Item apostolus: omnia munda mundis. coinquinatis autem et infidelibus nichil est mundum.[88] ergo carnes non sunt immundæ fidelibus. Sed ipsi obiciunt illud quod dicit apostolus: bonum est non comedere carnem[89] et non bibere uinum. Dicimus quod non præcipit sed consilium dat. et in hoc casu uitandi scandalum. et quod ita sit per litteram sequentem perpendi potest ubi dicit: neque frater tuus offenditur aut scandalizatur. De hac materia hæc sufficiant.

Her. nititur probare quod non potest aliquis iurare sine mortali peccato.

Præter predictas uesanias adhuc addiciunt aliam. dicentes quod non potest aliquis iurare sine criminali peccato. In hac autem parte ualde sunt egeni et pauperes. quia paucas inueniunt auctoritates pro eis facientes. Primo uero introducunt auctoritates domini. Sit sermo noster ēē nn̄.[90] ac si dicat de re quæ est dicas ē. De re quæ non est dicas non. Ecce magister ille qui dixit: discite a me quia mitis sum et humilis corde. inuitat nos ad simplicem locutionem præcipiendo. ergo si quis ultra procedit constituitur transgressor mandati. ergo quicunque iurat peccat mortaliter. et sic nullo modo iurare debet aliquis. præterea ibidem dicit: Nolite iurare omnino.[91] nichil expressius. Sic ergo non debemus iurare. Et ne aliquis diceret quod si non licet per creatorem tamen per creaturam. addit neque per celum quia. thronus dei est. neque per terram quia scabellum pedum eius est neque per hierusalem quia ciuitas regis magni est. Sic ergo nec per creatorem nec per creaturam possumus iurare sine peccato mortali. Ergo numquam debemus iurare.

Catholicus.

Ad precedentia respondendum est hereticis. Dicimus quod iurare non est bonum nec est malum per se. Sed est quiddam indifferens. Huic autem indifferenti esse bonum uel malum, est accidens. ubi gratia.[92] Iuratio siue iuramentum est malum accidentibus. Sed si aliquis iurat

[84] *nât* in mg.
[85] Matt. 15 : 20.
[86] 1 Cor 10 : 25.
[87] 1 Tim. 4 : 4.
[88] Tit. 7 : 15.
[89] Rom. 14 : 21.
[90] Matt. 5 : 37.
[91] *Ibid.*, vs. 34.
[92] MS. *gr̃a.*

sine necessitate et falsum. et sic istius duobus accidentibus iuratio fit mala. Sed bona fit iuratio tribus accidentibus. ut si aliquis iuraret pro asserenda innocentia alicuius moſ charitatis et ad pacis fedra conseruandi similiter moſ charitatis. et ad confirmandum hominibus incredulis quod eis utile est ad uitam eternam. . . . .

(There follows a long disquisition in which Augustine is quoted on the several circumstances which render swearing right or wrong.)

Folio 73, recto, col. 2. Uidimus superius quot modis fit periurium et quibus de causis iuramentum fit illicitum. Nunc uidendum est quibus auctoritatibus sit probandum quod iuramentum sit faciendum. Dicit apostolus ad hebreos. homines enim per maiorem suum iurant. et omnis controversiæ eorum finis ad confirmationem est iuramentum.[93] Si iuramentum esset malum, non sic commendasset apostolus. Sed dixisset peruersum esse. Ergo auctoritate apostoli licitum est iurare in necessariis. Preterea loquimur de aliquo detento crimine. necesse est ut purgetur. quia non creditur uerbo eius simplici. Sic ergo purgabitur. uel per ferrum candens. uel aquam frigidam. uel iuramentum. Sed duo precedentia iudicia inhibita sunt ab ecclesia. nichil ergo restat nisi quod purgetur per iuramentum. Item dicit apostolus ad hebreos. quod faciens promissiones habrahæ quoniam neminem habuit maiorem se per quem iuraret. iurauit per sanctuarium dicens.[94] Nisi benedicens benedicam te. et multiplicans multiplicabo te . . . . Sic ergo auctoritate domini licitum est nobis iurare.

Folio 73, verso, col. 1.

Catholicus.

Adhuc potest probari quod licet iurare in necessariis auctoritatibus. Dicit apostolus ad hebreos. Uolens deus ostendere pollicitationes. . . . .

(Other testimonia follow from Isaiah, Psalms, Apocalypse, and Paul; then this new rubric:)

Utrumque aliquis possit iurare per creaturam.

Sic præter predicta queritur utrum aliquis possit iurare per creaturam. sine conscientiæ lesione. quod autem non liceat probatur triplici testimonio. S. domini. legis. et cuiusdam consilii arrhaginensis.[95] Dicit enim dominus. Noli iurare omnino etc. . . . . habet generaliter domini prohibitio. non prohibet enim peccatum. ergo peccatum est iurare per creaturam. Sic ergo qui per creaturam iurat mortaliter peccat. Item in lege dicitur reddes iuramentum domino deo tuo. . . . . Item in concilio cartaginensi. Si uideris clericum iurare per creaturam, obiurgandum et excommunicandum. Sed nullus

[93] Heb. 6 : 16.

[94] Heb. 6 : 13, 14. For *sanctuarium* of MS. the Vulgate has *semet ipsum*. Below the MS. has *benedicat*, which I correct to *benedicam*.

[95] So the MS. Below *cartaginensis*.

excommunicatur nisi per mortale peccatum. ergo non debemus iurare per creaturam. Quod autem liceat iurare per creaturam potest probari auctoritate apostoli dicentis ad cor. per gloriam iuraui.[96] gloria corinthiorum est creatura. ergo exemplo apostoli qui iurauit per gloriam corinthiorum. possumus iurare per creaturam. Item Iosep. per salutem pharaonis. nunquid sic et possumus nos possumus.[97] iurare per creaturam. Præterea ecclesia mater nostra hanc consuetudinem affirmat. quia precipit iurare per sancta euangelia. per reliquias sanctorum. et per crucem domini. Sic ergo iurare per creaturam non est peccatum.

Ad predicta respondeo quod nullum peccatum est iurare per creaturam si necessitas intercedit. sicut iurauit apostolus per gloriam . . . . testante Augusto qui dicit. qui iurat per creaturam iurat per creatorem. . . . .

Post predicta queritur utrum aliquis obligetur per simplex iuramentum. Sicut per sollempne . . . .

(Further argument, in course of which Johannes Grisostomus (*sic*) is cited.)

Folio 73, verso, col. 2. . . . . ad quod dicendum quod alia fuit forma iurandi in ueteri testamento et alia in primitiua ecclessia. et alia modo. sicut supradictum est. Ad hoc signum exprimitur ꝯ.

Hic hereticus nititur probare quod remissiones quæ fuerunt ab episcopis uel presbyteris uel ab aliquibus sacerdotibus nichil ualent.

Præter predictas insanias adhuc nituntur heretici seminare zizanias in agro domini uolentes extinguere granum ueritatis et indulgentiæ .i dicentes quod remissiones istæ quæ fiunt ab episcopis uel presbyteris uel aliquibus sacerdotibus nulli momenti uel ualoris sunt. et quod hoc sit uerum intendunt quibusdam suis rationibus probare. Ponatur quod aliquis episcopus faciat remissionem in consecratione alicuius ecclesiæ unius anni. et alius episcopus in alia ecclesia similiter. et tertius in alia ecclesia similiter faciat remissionem unius anni sub hac forma: quicunque huic ecclesiæ de suo obtulerit consequetur suorum peccatorum remissionem de quibus confessus fuerit unius anni. Et aliquis peccator sit cui iniunctam fuerit peccatorum suorum penitentiam trium annorum. Unde accedet iste peccator ad ecclesiam ubi fuerit facta indulgentia. et offert in utraque unum obulum uel unum ouum. et sic pro tribus obulis uel tribus ouis consequitur iste suorum peccatorum remissionem. et sic patet quod nullius ualoris sit uel momenti, cum pro tam uili re consequatur. Uel sic. Aliquis episcopus facit remissionem .vii. partis pro aliquo ponte uel ospitali. sub hac forma: Quicunque obtulerit de suo huic loco consequetur suorum peccatorum remissionem .vii. partis. Sed si sint duo homines, quorum uni

[96] The reference is obscure. [97] The first *possumus* should be omitted.

iniuncta sit penitentia .vii. dierum et alteri .vii. annorum, et ambo uadant ad locum. et tantum offerat unus quantum alter. Sic ergo quantum accipit unus, tantum accipit alter. Sed unus accipit tantum indulgentiam unius diei. et alter indulgentiam unius anni. ergo nullius ualoris est ecclesie indulgentia. uel nimis stricte agit cum isto uel nimis laxe cum illo. et sic bene sequitur quod nullius sit ualoris uel momenti.

Hereticus.

Adhuc probare nituntur heretici quod indulgentia episcopalis siue papalis nullius ualoris sit quadruplici inconuenientia. Ponatur quod aliquis pauper qui non habeat nisi unicum denarium uadat ad remissionem factam ab episcopo, et offerat denarium. et aliquis diues qui habeat mille marcas offerat alium denarium. isti pariter offerunt. ergo pariter accipient. sed pauper obtulit quicquid habuit. et diues non obtulit millesimum millesimæ partis. numquid tantum accipiet diues quantum pauper? quod absurdum est dicere. . . . .

(The heretic advances two other objections similar in character, and then the Catholic replies.)

Respondet Catholicus.

Probauerat superius hereticus quod indulgentia facta ab episcopo uel papa nullius ualoris est ratione absurditatis. quia absurdum est dicere quod pro modica pecunia relaxetur maxima culpa. Ad quod dicendum quod aut datur habenti karitatem. aut non habenti. Si non habenti, dicimus quod nichil ualet ad suorum peccatorum remissionem. Si habenti. et karitas dictet in conscientia sua quod bene adimplebit penitentiam iniunctam. et si solum iniunctam. sed etiam grauiorem si sibi iniunctum fuisset. dicimus quod si accedat et offerat, non intentione ut remittatur sibi penitentiam iniunctam sed feruore karitatis,
Folio 74, recto, col. 1. quod ualet sibi quoad penam purgatorii, quia relaxatur ei de penitentia iniuncta quantum episcopus indulsit si tunc decederet.

Catholicus.

quia relaxatur ei de penitentia iniuncta quantum episcopus indulsit si tunc decederet.

Catholicus.

Item ad id quod dixit superius hereticus de duobus hominibus quorum unus accipit indulgentiam unius diei et alter unius anni . . . . dicimus quod falsum est. et hoc probatur per hoc simile. Ecce aliquis dicit. Quicunque uult ire ad nemus comitatis dabitur sibi plaustrum pro denario. quo audito duo homines uadunt pariter. quorum unus ducit boues robustissimos et fortes. alius habet uaccas macillentas. Uterque quantum deferre potest accipit. Sed ille qui habet bonos boues defert in triplo quam ille alius. Non tamen sequitur quod sit culpa dantis, sed accipientis. Sic ergo probatur quod indulgentia ualet ad remissionem peccatorum.

Catholicus.

Item ad id quod dicit quod remittantur .xl. secundum quos debebat soluere in .iiii. locis pro .iiii. denariis dicimus quod falsum est. quia non est talis intentio remittentis. quia non fuit eius intentio ut remitterentur sed peccata.

Catholicus.

Ad id quod dictum est de usurario de plano concedimus quod nichil impetrat. quia quod restituere debet non est suum.

Catholicus.

Ad id quod dicitur de diuite et paupere dicimus quod tantum impetrat diues quantum pauper. quia deus non attendit quantum sed ex quanto. . . .

Catholicus.

Posita solutione illorum qui dicunt quod ualent quantum ad penam purgatorii consequentur uidendum est quid alii sentiunt. Sunt enim quidam qui dicunt quod ualet etiam ad pœnæ presentis remissionem, si fiat sub hac forma: Quicunque obtulerit huic ponti de suo proprio secundum suam facultatem, remittetur ei. aliter non ualet quod iam cessauit ab aula.

Alii dicunt quod quocunque modo fiat, tamen ualet ad remissionem pœnæ presentis et purgatorii. Sed non ualet nisi infirmis et impotentibus penitentiam adimplere. Quod autem ualeat probatur multiplici auctoritate.

Primo auctoritate ecclesiæ . . . .

Secundo auctoritate Gregorii. qui adinuenit remissiones in stationibus suis.

Tertio auctoritate pontificum. qui adhuc faciunt remissiones, et hoc modo. Anglicis trium annorum. Gallis duorum. Ytalicis unius.

Quinto auctoritate ecclesiæ quæ tanquam imperatrix adinuenit indulgencias et auget et diminuit. quia sicut imperator leges auget et diminuit. sic ecclesia indulgentias. Auctoritatibus ergo istis constat quod indulgentia facta ab ecclesia uel ecclesiasticis uiris ualet ad peccatorum remissionem.

Post predicta notandum quod .vii. de causis imponitur penitentia . . . . (the seven causes are then enumerated) . . . .

Hereticus.

Post predicta dicit hereticus quod orationes et suffragia sacerdotis existentis in mortali peccato non prosunt illis pro quibus fiunt sed obsunt. ad hoc probandum mouentur ratione et auctoritatibus: primo sic: Ecce aliquis sacerdos existens in mortali peccato non potest sibi prodesse in orationibus suis. quomodo ergo proderit defunctis pro quibus facit? Ac si dicat, nunquam proderit. Preterea oratio existentis in mortali peccato uertitur ei non in suffragium sed in perniciem.

Folio 74, recto, col. 2.

multo fortius aliis. Sic ergo oratio existentis in mortali est execrabilis non impetrabilis. Auctoritatibus sic legitur in decreto: Quod si is qui displicet mittatur ad intercedendum irati animam ad deteriora prouocat. Si ad deteriora prouocat, ergo oratio non est facienda ab existenti in mortali. Et huic auctoritati consonat psalmista dicens Iniquitatem si aspexi in corde meo non exaudiet me dominus.[98] Sed existens in mortali aspicit iniquitatem in corde suo. ergo non exaudietur a domino. Et alibi. Qui indeuotus erit[99] iudicium sibi postulat. Si iudicium, ergo non prodest sed obest. Item psalm: oratio eius fiet in peccatum.[100] Item dicit dominus peccatori: Quare tu enarras iusticiam meam et asu. te. m. per hos .t.?[101] dicit ibi glossa per os tuum pollutum. Sic ergo quod oratio siue suffragium existentis in mortali non prosunt sed obsunt. ergo sacerdotes existentes in mortali peccato non debent orare pro mortuis, quia non exaudiuntur.

Hereticus.

Item adhuc fortius et subtilius uidetur hereticus probare. quod suffragia siue orationes existentium in mortali non prosunt sed obsunt. Ecce aliquis sacerdos in mortali existens orat. Actio huius sacerdotis uertitur in perniciem. quia mortaliter peccat. Sicsic celebrando. et quod ita sit audi apostolum dicentem: Qui enim manducat et bibit indigne. iudicium sibi manducat et bibit[102] .i. ad iudicium penæ eternæ. quia culpa precis sit. sed tu dicis quod oratio eius siue suffragia ualent ad uitam eternam. et absolutionem defunctorum. ergo eadem oratio est acceptabilis et non acceptabilis. quod est impossibile. Item dicit decretum. Nemo illius sacerdotis missam audiat quem sciat concubinam habere indubitanter. ergo missæ talium nullius sunt ualoris. Item dicit quidam sanctus quod qui est in mortali non debet orare nec sacrificare nec predicare. omnibus his premissis probatur quod oratio sacrificium et suffragia malorum sacerdotum nullius ualoris sunt.

Respondit Catholicus.

. . . . Unde dicendum est cum summa quod oratio ualet non quantum ad actionem orantis. sed quantum ad uim et efficaciam ecclessiæ instituentis.

Catholicus.

Ad id quod dicunt heretici: qui indeuotus orat iudicium sibi postulat, dicimus quod deuotio duplex est. est enim deuotio naturalis et gratuita. . . . .

Catholicus.

Ad id quod dicunt: quare tu euarras. iu. m. dicimus quod intelligendum est de illo qui est in notorio peccato et nullum habet colorem

[98] Ps. 65 : 14.

[99] MS. *erat.* The citation is not from the Vulgate.

[100] Ps. 108 : 6. [101] Ps. 49 : 16. [102] 1 Cor. 11 : 29.

excusandi conuictus est et confessus in iure et talis peccat in deum .i. contra deum. . . . .

. . . . Secus est de heretico. quia si hereticus orat siue celebrat, mortaliter peccat et nichil ualet oratio sua. quia precisus est ab ecclesia. et ideo quia non orat in persona ecclesiæ nichil prodest eius oratio. . . .

(More reasoning follows of same character; then:)

Hereticus.

Folio 74, verso, col. 1. Præter predictum adhuc obuiant heretici quibusdam articulis ecclesiæ et primo illo articulo qui est ianua nostræ fidei .s. baptismo. dicentes baptismum paruulis non prodesse. Sed inter se diuersimodo sentiunt. Quia quidam dicunt quod paruuli nullum habent peccatum et ideo non prodest eis.

Alii dicunt quod habent originale. sed nichil ualet eis quia non habent fidem. testante domino: qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit etc. Unde non ualet eis qui non credunt nec credere possunt.

Pan . . . . (illegible) . . . . ad hoc probandum assumunt disputationem Iuliani contra Augustinum super hoc articulo. Dicit Iulianus: Iste puer si contraxerit maculam, non nisi a creatore aut a parentibus aut a seipso. A creatore non, quia ipse nichil creat immundum. A parentibus non, quia ponatur quod ambo parentes sint in charitate cum ad generationem conueniunt et sic ab eis nulla procedet macula. A seipso non, quia nullum peccatum fecit. Quero igitur per quas rimulas peccatum in hunc puerum intrauit. Si nulla alia omnino inuenitur, ergo frustra puer baptizatur. Item penes uelle et penes nolle est omne uitium.[103] Sed in isto puero non est uelle gratiæ neque nolle uitii. ergo nec est bonus neque malus. Si non est malus ad quid ergo baptizatur?

Hereticus.

Item ubi est necessitas ibi non est libertas. Sed in huius pueri conceptione fuit necessitas concupiscentia parentum. ergo non fuit ibi libertas. et si non libertas. ergo non peccatum. cum peccatum prouenire habeat ex libero arbitrio. Si ergo baptizatur, de superfluo est et nichil ei prodest.

Hereticus.

Item quod baptismus non ualeat adhuc dicit Iulianus. Si anima concepti[104] pueri habet immunditiam, aut habet a creatore aut a seipsa aut aliunde. A creatore non. quia quicquid creat . . . . (illegible) . . . . creat. A seipsa non. quia de purissima materia est creata. Aliunde non, nisi ex coniunctione carnis. Si ex coniunctione carnis. ergo immunditia carnis est sibi pœna. ergo pœna alterius punitur. quod est inconueniens, quod aliquis alterius pœna puniatur. Item

[103] Perhaps *meritum*. The MS. is barely legible.

[104] *Concepti* is a conjecture; only *ti* can be read.

si habet immunditiam. Aut contraxit a creatore. aut a parentibus. aut corpore. a creatore non. a parentibus non. quia cum anima infundetur .xlvi. die, nichil tunc parentes operantur circa hunc fetum. et dc̄ quod tunc decessit alter parentum. A corpore non. quia illud corpus non est rationale. nec susceptibile contrariorum, uitii. S. et uirtutis. Sic ergo si baptizatur, nichil potest prodesse.

Respondet Catholicus.

(The Catholic in his answer cites Augustine, and proves from the Bible the existence of original sin in infants.)

Hereticus.

Posita sententia illorum qui dicunt quod originale non contrahitur a puero et reprobata. Consequenter ponenda est illorum qui dicunt quod contrahitur sed non deletur per baptismum. Et hoc intendunt probare subiectis testimoniis.

Et primo auctoritate domini dicentes: Qui crediderit et baptizatus fuerit saluus erit. Et qui non crediderit condemnabitur.[105] Per hoc uidetur innui quod fides sine baptismo et baptismus sine fide nichil ualet. quoniam puer non credit nec credere potest.

Etsi [106] aliquis gentilis adultus et fatuus baptizaretur nunquam peccatorum remissionem consequeretur? uidetur quod non.

Tertio ratione aliorum sacramentorum. quia si alia sacramenta ei darentur. nichil conferrent. Sic et istud ultimum.

Quarto ratione institutionis: quia cum institutum est non baptizabantur nisi adulti. nec legitur quod pueri baptizarentur.

Quinto. exemplo christi: quia non baptizatus est in ætate puerili. sed in iuuenili ætate.

Sexto. ratione ordinis: quia primo fit catechismus. Secundo baptizatur. Sic ergo prius debet quis instrui .i. instructionibus.[107] postea baptizari.

Solutio Catholici.

(The Catholic answers that Jesus Christ in the text, *qui crediderit*, etc., was only thinking of adults and did not mean to exclude infants. He admits that other sacraments are for adults, but denies that this rule extends to baptism, which)

generale est et pro paruulis et pro magnis.

Catholicus.

Folio 75, recto, col. 1. Ad id quod dicis ratione institutionis: quia tunc non baptizabantur nisi adulti. dicimus quod ideo factum est ne simul duo sacramenta concurrissent .s. circumcisio et baptismus. quoniam tunc dabatur paruulis circumcisio quæ ualebat ad peccatorum remissionem. Ad id quod dicis quod christus non baptizatus est in ætate puerili sed adulta.

[105] Mark 16 : 16.

[106] ? *Nisi.* Text is nearly illegible.

[107] *Instructionibus* is added in margin.

dicimus quod ideo fecit ut ostenderet quod nullus ad baptismum accedat, nisi sit discretus. excepto casu necessitatis, ut in paruulis cotidie fit. . . . .

(The Catholic in four succeeding chapters justifies infant baptism; then:)

Hereticus.

Folio 75, recto, col. 2. Sicut predicti dicunt quod baptismus non ualet paruulis. ita sunt quidam dicentes quod nec adultis. Et hoc intendunt probare quadam inductione et auctoritate et rationibus. Primo sic: Iste adultus cum baptizatur, aut penitet, aut non penitet. ergo non contritus si non conteritur. Ergo nichil impetrat per baptismum. ergo baptismus nichil ualet. Si penitet ergo conteritur. Si conteritur ergo impetrat et uirtus confertur. Sic ergo per contritionem et non per baptismum impetrat. ergo non est baptizandus. Sic ergo sacramentum baptismi non est tenendum. Item apostolus dicit: neque qui baptizat neque qui rigat est aliquid.[108] Sed qui plantat est predicator, et qui rigat est baptizator. Si igitur neque predicator neque baptizator aliquid impetrat, ergo baptismus est cassandus. Item si per hoc sacramentum remittitur originale ut tu dicis, cur ergo dominus. cum tanta pietate sit. non instituit hoc sacramentum a principio mundi, ut peccatores qui precesserunt per huius sacramenti perceptionem saluarentur? Sed constat quod per hoc sacramentum nulla fit remissio. ergo non est tenendum. Item cum aliquis baptizatur. corpus extrinsecus lauatur. quomodo ergo per corporis extrinseci contactum ad elementum. mundatur anima intrinseca et inuisibilis per uisibile? dic rationem. Sed non est inueniri. ergo hoc sacramentum non est tenendum. immo sepeliendum.

Respondet Catholicus.

Ad predicta per ordinem singulis respondendum est. Et primo ad id quod dicit quod si accedat non contritus, non ei remittitur. De plano concedimus hoc. Sed quod dicit: ergo baptismus est euacuandus, dicimus quod non sequitur. quoniam licet[109] . . . . baptismus propter astantem malitiam illius tamen consequetur effectus tamen recedente malitia illius consequetur.[110]

Catholicus.

Ad id quod dicit quod si accedat iustificatus non ei aliquid confertur dicimus quod falsum est. . . . .

(The Catholic replies at length to the other objections; then:)

Hereticus.

Folio 75, verso, col. 1. Ad predicta dicunt heretici quod christus non fuit baptizatus. et hoc intendunt probare duplici ratione. primo quia ipse non indiguerit.

[108] 1 Cor. 3 : 7.

[109] Here a word which is illegible.

[110] Omit the second *tamen* and the last words, *illius consequetur*.

Secundo quia Iohannes peccasset mortaliter si presumpsisset eum baptizare.

Solutio.

Ad id quod dicit non indiguit, de plano concedimus. nec hac de causa baptizatus est. sed quadruplici ratione baptizatus est. primo ut daret uim regenerationem aquis quæ prius non habebant. Secundo ut daret nobis exemplum baptizandi. Tertio: Ut adimpleret omnem gradum humilitatis. quia aliter non poterat se subicere minori. Quarto: Ideo baptizatus est baptismo Iohannis, ut ostenderet se immunem ab omni peccato. quoniam baptismus Iohannis corpora mundabat et non mentem, ipso testante qui dixit: Ego uos baptizo aqua. post me ueniet qui uos baptizabit aqua et spiritu sancto.

Ad id quod dicunt quod Iohannes mortaliter peccasset si presumpsisset eum baptizare, quia indecens erat quod Creator a creatura baptizaretur. dicimus quod Iohannes non præsumpsit. . . . .

(The Catholic then cites the gospel accounts of Christ's baptism, and concludes:)

patet ergo quod Christus baptizatus fuit. et eius exemplo et precepto immo preceptis, tam paruulos quam adultos esse baptizandos.

FINIS.

CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL NOTES.

THE MARTYRDOM OF ST. JOHN.

ONE of the most startling of recent German discoveries in the region of theology has passed almost unnoticed outside the Fatherland—the fact, brought to light some years ago by Dr. C. de Boor,[1] that Papias, the Father above all others qualified to throw light on the intricate Johannine problem, used words implying that John the son of Zebedee did not die in Ephesus at all, but was martyred in Jerusalem: "Papias in his second book says that John the divine and James his brother were slain by the Jews."[2]

Scientific theologians have, of course, noted Dr. de Boor's discovery, but, even in Germany, until the publication within the last few months of Zahn's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, Vol. II, no attempt has been made either to refute or substantiate the conclusion to which it apparently points; and in recent utterances on the Johannine problem the new Papias text is not even mentioned. Besides this discovery of Dr. de Boor's, new texts, throwing indirect light on the subject, have recently been published by M. Max Bonnet[3] and Dr. Corssen. And there are other texts, not noticed since Tübingen days, or never noticed at all, which now acquire fresh importance. It is under these circumstances that the present review of the situation is attempted.

In the first place, it is generally admitted that de Boor's whole statement of the case does not leave much room for doubt as to textual authenticity. Among other things, he notices a reëcho of the above-quoted passage, which Tübingen research unearthed nearly forty years ago, in Georgius Hamartolus, "Ἰωάννης μαρτυρίου κατηξίωται" (*Tübinger Quartalschrift*, 1862, pp. 466 ff.)—a reëcho which, owing to the lateness of Georgius Hamartolus, and the existence of a variant reading,

[1] "Neue Fragmente des Papias, Hegesippus und Pierius in bisher unbekannten Excerpten aus der Kirchengeschichte des Philippus Sidetes," *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. 2, pp. 165–84. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung.)

[2] P. 170: "Παπίας ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ λέγει ὅτι Ἰωάννης ὁ Θεολόγος καὶ Ἰ ἀδελφὸς αὐτοῦ ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων

[3] *Acta apostolorum apocrypha*, Partis II, Vol. I, 1898.

was generally discredited; but which proves now to have been genuine after all. A loophole, however, is still left for attack by the fact that what we have may be taken, not as a direct quotation from Papias, but as a reference; and Zahn has now suggested that a reference of Papias to the martyrdom of John the Baptist may have been misapplied to the apostle. In support of this theory he points to several patristic passages which might, he thinks, occasion such a blunder (*e. g.*, "Joannem interimebant Christum demonstrantem," *Pseudo-Cypr. adv. Jud.*, 2). The possibility of such a blunder, in spite of its grossness, must, of course, be admitted; but its probability depends on two premises, which I shall try to show to be untenable, viz., that this mention of the apostle's martyrdom is unique, and that the contrary evidence is convincing.

We now come to a second piece of evidence as to John the apostle's violent death—that given in the Syriac Martyrology, translated by W. Wright (*Journal of Sacred Literature*, 1866). Here we commence with the name of Stephen, and then we have, "John and James, the apostles, in Jerusalem. Peter and Paul in Rome." Ewald, the only authority, so far as I know, who has noticed and commented on this passage (since his days it seems to have been forgotten), was unaware of any corroborative evidence; and, regarding the statement as quite isolated, he endeavored to explain it away on the hypothesis of the list being one of witnesses in the wider sense, not necessarily martyrs. But the objections to this view are overwhelming. For, in the first place, if mere confessorship were implied, we should expect to find all the apostles named, whereas, very remarkably, in view of the "Acta Apocrypha" of the second and third centuries, we only find those above mentioned. In the second place, there is the emphatic position between the proto-martyr and the great Roman martyrs. In the third place, there is the descriptive title, "The names of our lords the confessors and victors, and their days on which they gained their crowns," "The names of our lords the confessors who were slain in the East." Thus Ewald's explanation proves quite inadequate; and, when this is realized, the value of the Martyrology becomes very great; for, though in its present complete form it may not be earlier than the fourth or fifth century, yet it must represent long preëxistent Syrian custom and tradition. In connection with which may be noted the fact that the Ebionite evangelist, probably a Palestinian, places John and James at the head of his apostolic list (see Hilgenfeld's *Evangelia extra Canonem recepta*, pp. 33, 35). And bearing in mind how strongly established was the belief in John the apostle's demise at Ephesus,

from the beginning of the third century onward, it seems impossible for the notion of his martyrdom at Jerusalem to have crept in at any late date. Additional value is given to the Martyrology by the statement of Heracleon (*circa* 180 A. D.): "For not all the saved have made confession with the voice and so departed, amongst whom were Matthew, Philip, Thomas, Levi" (*Texts and Studies*, Vol. I, 4, p. 102). Surely John, too, would have been mentioned as having died a natural death, if his name were available.

We now come to a third piece of evidence — that furnished in the New Testament itself. Christ is reported as saying to James and John: "Ye shall indeed drink of my cup." If this expression stood alone, as it does in Matthew, one might explain it away in a vague sense; but, when we find it supplemented, as it is in Mark, "And ye shall indeed be baptized with the baptism that I am baptized with," bearing in mind the special significance of this metaphor in Luke 12:50, it seems difficult to avoid the inference that martyrdom in the most real sense is pointed to. Would the second evangelist have used such an expression unless the martyrdom had already taken place? Whether that be so or not, all the Fathers who refer to the passage acknowledge that martyrdom was actually intimated, but one after another they endeavor to escape from the difficulty by appealing to the legend that either at Ephesus or Rome (so variable was the legend) John was thrown into a caldron of boiling oil, and preserved unharmed. And this subterfuge is obviously inadequate; for Christ's words, taken in their natural sense, require John to be martyr in fact as well as intention, and to be baptized with the blood-baptism in the same sense as was James.

Presuming these three pieces of evidence to be valid — if the Apocalypse be taken as apostolic — it would seem, then, that John fell a victim, returning to Judea from Patmos in the midst of the frenzy of 69 A. D. One may notice that the author of the Apocalypse refers to his residence at Patmos in the past tense, as though no longer there at the moment of writing. As to the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse, however, there exists, of course, considerable doubt. The author only reckons himself among "prophets," speaking of the apostolic body rather from the outside (Rev. 22:9; 21:14). Illustrative of which it may be noticed that in one version of the pseudo-Johannine Apocalypse, based in great measure on our canonical book, the recipient of the revelation is distinguished from the apostle: "Hear, O John, I shall sit with the twelve apostles and the

four-and-twenty elders; and thou thyself shalt be an elder on account of thy blameless life" (Tichendorf's *Apocalypses Apocryphæ*, p. 93). If, indeed, in addition to an apostolic origin, we also accept the tradition, first found in the Docetic *Acta Johannis* (*ed.* Max Bonnet), that the exile to Patmos took place in Domitian's persecution, 95 A. D., then the evidence of the Apocalypse would tell against the idea of actual martyrdom. But, as is well known, critics are now generally of opinion that the internal evidence points to 69 A. D.; and the value of the Docetic tradition, such as it is, is quite neutralized by the fact, which seems to have escaped notice, that in other, probably more orthodox, *Acta Johannis*—of much the same date as the Docetic (*circa* 170 A. D.), and best represented at present in the Syriac *History of John*—the apostle's exile to Patmos is attributed, not to Domitian, but to Nero (W. Wright's *Apocryphal Acts*, Vol. II, p. 55). The complete vagueness that existed as to the date of the exile is further illustrated by a subscription to our fourth gospel, that John was in Patmos "under Trajan" (see Alford's Greek Testament, 3d ed., p. 834). In fine, it is only by combining the rather questionable idea of apostolic authorship with the exceedingly doubtful idea of later origin that the Apocalypse can be made evidentiary against the idea of John the apostle's martyrdom in Jerusalem.

But, reverting from this digression about the Apocalypse, we have thus three distinct and powerful pieces of evidence as to the apostle's martyrdom, viz., the statement of Papias, the ancient tradition of the Syrian church, and Mark's implication written just after the time when John's martyrdom took place, if take place it did; and it must be admitted that these authorities, taken together, are sufficiently weighty to warrant our tentatively assuming the fact of John's martyrdom *circa* 70 A. D., and examining the evidence of his later residence at Ephesus from that standpoint. It is, of course, with regard to the authorship of the fourth gospel that the question is so interesting and important.

To begin with, above and beyond the three pieces of positive evidence above given, there are admittedly certain grave difficulties in the way of the current hypothesis—difficulties surmountable by themselves, but which, considered in connection with these three pieces of evidence, acquire a cumulative importance. Would Paul's gloomy presentiments as to the Ephesian church ("I know that after my departure grievous wolves shall enter in," Acts 20:29, 30) have been published quite in this form if the publisher knew that John the

apostle was in Ephesus? Are the epistles to Timothy, presuming them to be in their present shape post-Pauline, compatible with knowledge that John was to arrive soon after Paul's departure? In these two cases our ignorance as to dates leaves any inference precarious, but in the following cases we seem to have a solid basis for argument. The author of the seven Ignatian epistles, addressing the Ephesians (*circa* 150 A. D.), cites only their connection with Paul as proof of their unity with the apostolic church (*Ad. Eph.*, XII). Is this easily reconcilable with the later and lengthier residence among them of another apostle? Would not this tone be still stranger if from the pen of the real Ignatius (107 or 116 A. D.), writing soon after John's death? Again, while tradition is unanimous as to the residence in Ephesus of some celebrated John, tradition is also unanimous as to that John's survival "till the days of Trajan" (98–117 A. D.); and even by taking the date of Trajan's accession as the *terminus ad quem*, and making John the apostle under twenty at the crucifixion (for such supposition of extreme youth, however, there seems to be no foundation except the idea of this late survival), one cannot avoid a figure considerably beyond the ordinary and natural term of life. Again, is the argumentative, expostulatory, yet semi-authoritative tone of Clement's epistle to the Corinthians (96 A. D.) compatible with the fact of an apostle of the first rank being then alive? And does not the same reasoning hold good with regard to the self-justificatory, laboriously critical tone of Luke's address to Theophilus?

Such, then, is the case for John the apostle's comparatively early death. It remains to examine the evidence which points in the opposite direction. Working back from Irenæus I shall endeavor to show that when that Father's testimony has been reduced to its proper level, the remainder of the external evidence as to John the apostle's late residence in Ephesus, and his direct authorship of the fourth gospel, crumbles away almost completely.

Irenæus states, of course, that Papias and Polycarp were disciples of John the apostle; and it is equally a commonplace that Eusebius brought forward grave reasons to suppose that, with regard to Papias, Irenæus had made a mistake (Eusebius, *H. E.*, III, 39). Over this well-trodden ground let us hasten. But three remarks must be made in passing:

1. Eusebius did not carry his argument to its obviously necessary conclusion, viz., that Irenæus was equally mistaken with regard to Polycarp. Every scrap of evidence forthcoming shows that Papias

and Polycarp were contemporaries and associates, so that if, as Eusebius suggests, it was some "John the elder," not John the apostle, to whom Papias was disciple, then the same conclusion is almost inevitable with regard to Polycarp. To this conclusion Eusebius did not press, for the very obvious reason that he had a powerful doctrinal motive for discrediting Papias, and none for discrediting Polycarp.

2. Eusebius' argument is commonly cited as though it depended entirely on his quotation from Papias, in which the name "John," after occurring in an apostolic list, is repeated with the distinctive title "elder." This argument by itself is indeed strong, for, by rejecting Eusebius' distinction between the two Johns, Papias is made to say in one and the same breath that he derived information from John directly, and also made diligent inquiry as to John's remarks from any stray-comers who had seen John! And further, Papias is made to represent himself at one and the same moment as the disciple of an apostle, and also as a painstaking gleaner, gleaning and sifting when Christ's words had become rare and precious. But what is much more significant is the fact that Eusebius, having the whole of Papias' writings before him, with their numerous citations from "John the elder," felt himself able to state most emphatically that Papias nowhere claimed to have anything more than second-hand information—whereas it would naturally seem that the overwhelming fact of having familiarly known such an apostle as John would have stamped itself on his writings unmistakably. Eusebius' distinction of the "elder" has often been disparaged as though only paralleled in a somewhat vague statement by Dionysius of Alexandria. But such objection is unreasonable. He was able to refer to the testimony of more than one previous writer as to the separate personality of "the elder." And one may compare *Apost. Const.*, VII, 46, "bishop of Ephesus, John, ordained by me, John;" also *Book of the Bee*, ed. Budge, p. 104: "John, and John his disciple."[4]

3. Irenæus considerably discredits himself by adding that, besides an apostle, Polycarp met *many* who had seen Christ. Such an idea is absolutely incredible in the case of a person born fifty-two years after the crucifixion.[5] But what is of far more importance is the form in which Irenæus gives the following citation: "The elders who saw John

[4] Dr. J. Rendel Harris, to whom I am indebted for this reference, points out that, though the *Book of the Bee* is late, it incorporates material that is very early.

[5] 167 A. D. being the date usually given for Polycarp's martyrdom, and his age being eighty-six, he would seem to have been born 81 A. D.

remembered to have heard from him how the Lord used to teach and say, 'The days shall come when vines shall spring up, etc.' Papias, a hearer of John, bears testimony to these things in writing" (*Adv. Hær.*, V, 33). For it is fairly evident from such form of citation that Papias did not tell about the vines on direct apostolic authority, but said that he had it from the elders who had seen John; and this clearly implies that he had not seen the apostle himself.

But is it necessary to carry these inferences about Papias farther? We now have his direct evidence that John, like James, was "slain by the Jews;" and this being so, it is only by the highly unnatural hypothesis of martyrdom by Ephesian Jews — thus separating his case from that of James and ignoring the Syrian martyrology — that any room is left for Papias and the apostle to have come into contact.

More valuable than the evidence of Irenæus is that of his contemporary, Polycrates of Ephesus, for Irenæus had left Asia Minor in boyhood, and, as already seen, his recollections were not altogether reliable: "Philip, one of the twelve apostles, sleeps in Hierapolis, and his two aged virgin daughters. Another of his daughters, who lived in the Holy Spirit, sleeps in Ephesus. Moreover, John who rested on the bosom of our Lord, who was a priest bearing the πέταλον, and martyr and teacher, he also rests at Ephesus" (Eus., *H. E.*, III, 31). Polycrates' words, taken literally, seem to imply that the beloved disciple was not one of the Twelve, but belonged to the order of διδάσκαλοι. This distinction of the beloved disciple from John the apostle, strange as it must now appear, would be quite natural on the part of one who, while accepting the fourth gospel, was also acquainted with the evidence of Papias as to the apostle's martyrdom by the Jews. But perhaps this is pressing Polycrates' words unduly. He may have shared Irenæus' error, just as, by all appearances in this passage before us, he confounds the two Philips; and this view is somewhat supported by his use of the word "μαρτύς."

When we get behind Irenæus and Polycrates, the next authority that meets us is those orthodox *Acta Johannis* before mentioned, the source probably of the boiling-oil story, from which the Muratorian writer drew his famous description of the origin of the fourth gospel. That description, in the abbreviated form in which the Muratorian writer gives it, has only passed muster as credible owing to the obscurity of some of its phrases. When we give those phrases their proper significance — and this can be done by reconstructing the lost *Acta* at this point by means of the quotations given below, the first

and most important of which has strangely escaped notice—then the character of the description as purely fictitious and not at all traditional reveals itself plainly.[6]

"Cohortantibus condiscipulis," as we now see, means that *John went to Ephesus not late in life, but soon after the ascension, and that he wrote at the exhortation of Peter and Paul who came there to visit him, and of Andrew who had accompanied him!* Understood in this connection, "*ut recognoscentibus cunctis Johannes cuncta describeret*" is obviously a mere inference from our fourth evangelist's use of the first person plural (John 1 : 14; 21 : 24). What these *Acta*, with their notion of an apostolic congress at Ephesus, prove indisputably is this, that the author had a *tabula rasa* to write upon.

The Docetic *Acta Johannis*, referred to above (p. 732), contain nothing as to the origin of the fourth gospel, but it is interesting to notice, taking them in conjunction with the *Acta Andreæ*, that the author, like the author of the orthodox *Acta Johannis*, brought John to Ephesus early in life. There is something noteworthy in this. If either of the hagiologists had brought John to Ephesus late in life,

[6] "And they wrote and sent word to John that he too should write. But the holy man did not wish to write. . . . . Then Cephas arose and took Paul with him, and they came to Ephesus unto John. And for five days they were persuading him to compose a gospel, but he was not willing, saying, 'When the Spirit of Holiness wills it I will write.' And at night the apostles slumbered. And the Spirit of Holiness descended. And John took paper and wrote his gospel in one hour and gave it to Paul and Peter" (WRIGHT, *Aprocryphal Acts of the Apostles*, Vol. II, pp. 58, 59).

"Andrew with John tarried in the city of Ephesus. . . . . And the Lord appeared to Andrew in a vision . . . . and after relating the vision to John, etc." (MAX BONNET, *Acta Andreæ*, p. 15).

"John, being exhorted by his acquaintances and urged by the Spirit, wrote a spiritual [=inspired] gospel" (Clem. of Alexandria in EUSEBIUS, *H. E.*, Vol. III, p. 14).

"John was compelled by almost all the bishops then in Asia and by legations of many churches to write concerning the Savior's divinity . . . . and ecclesiastical history relates that when he was pressed by the brethren to write, he replied that he would do so if they all supplicated God in a set fast; which being done *saturatus revelatione*, he burst into that prologue 'In the beginning,' etc." (JEROME'S Pref. to *Comment. on St. Matt.*).

John fasts three days and, falling into a divine rapture at the close, dictates the gospel to Prochorus (PROCHORUS, *Acta Johannis*).

"The fourth gospel is by John, one of the disciples. When his fellow-disciples and bishops exhorted him he said, 'Fast with me three days, and let us relate to one another the revelation which we receive.' In the same night it was revealed to Andrew, one of the apostles, that John should write all things in his own name with the corroboration of them all" (*Muratorian Fragment*).

subsequent to Paul's last visit, then one might imagine that amid all their mass of fiction there was some glimmer of genuine tradition. But no. Neither here nor anywhere else is there the slightest account of John's coming to Ephesus otherwise than as Paul's predecessor. And it is an impressive fact that so firmly did this notion of the apostle's early residence in Ephesus root itself that the author of the *Transitus Mariæ* reconciled it with the equally firm fact of the Virgin's decease in Jerusalem by suggesting that John forgot all about the charge he received at the cross (Tischendorf's *Apocalypses*, pp. 97, 115, 116, 122, 126)!

The next authority that presents itself is the corrupt ninth-century note cited by Westcott (*Canon*, p. 77), in which Papias is reported as stating that he wrote the gospel himself, John dictating "recte." But this passage can be cited no longer. Corssen has recently pointed out irrefutably its explanation by the following parallel in a Greek catena: "Ἰωάννης . . . . ὡς παρέδοσαν ἡμῖν ὅ τε Εἰρεναῖος καὶ Εὐσέβιος καὶ ἄλλοι πιστοὶ κατὰ διαδοχὴν γεγονότες ἱστορικοί . . . . ὑπηγόρευσε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον τῷ ἑαυτοῦ μαθητῇ Παπίᾳ." The scribe evidently drew his knowledge, not from Papias direct, but partly from Eusebius' statement about Papias writing down accounts received from "John the elder," and partly from a very late and palpably fictitious statement that Prochorus, disciple of John, wrote down the gospel, John dictating in an erect attitude (="recte"). (See Corssen, *Monarchianische Prologe*, pp. 114–17.)

Together with this note of Dr. Westcott's we must also abandon the idea that Papias gave any description at all of the composition of the fourth gospel. If he or any other early writer of standing had done so, we should surely find traces in later writers; whereas all we get is, with one remarkable exception, parrot-like reiteration of the almost worthless authorities already mentioned. Writers of the third and fourth centuries seem to have been in nearly the same destitute condition as ourselves. The one exception is as to the place where the fourth gospel was written. In Ephraem (see Moesinger, p. 286), and other authorities who probably reproduced a very early tradition, it is stated that "John wrote at Antioch," just before leaving that place for Rome. The prevalence of such an idea suggests forcibly the absence of any clear evidence connecting the gospel with Ephesus.

Lastly, there are the references to authorship in the gospel itself; and although it is outside the scope of this article to touch on internal evidence, yet these references are too intimately connected with the external to be passed over altogether. If Papias and Polycarp knew

that John the apostle perished in Jesusalem *circa* 70 A. D., could they have accepted the fourth gospel? It seems to me that the generation next to Papias and Polycarp could have accepted it easily, believing that the apostle had written it at Antioch previous to 70 A. D. (see above), or, as some authorities, misunderstanding Rev. 1 : 2, state, during his exile in Patmos (see Alford's Greek Testament, 3d ed., I, 834; *Apost. Const.*, VIII, 16; Hippolytus, *De XII Apostolis*). Papias and Polycarp, however, must have known the real facts of the case, one would think, disciples as they were of "John the elder;" and if they accepted the fourth gospel, as their use of the first Johannine epistle gives reason to suppose that in some measure they did, then surely they must have accepted it, not as a forgery, but as a genuine, honest work of "John the elder." It is of great importance, then, to ascertain whether the author of the fourth gospel really claims to be John the apostle. I submit that the references to authorship do not at all prove such a claim.

With regard to the first of these references (John 19 : 35) it has been often noticed that the author seems rather to distinguish himself from the beloved disciple: "He that saw hath borne witness, and his witness is true, and he knoweth that he saith true." Besides the fact that the idea of a man bearing such witness to his own veracity is in itself unnatural, there is also a slight implication in the use of the past tense (*μεμαρτύρηκεν*) that the evangelist regarded the evidence of the lance wound as belonging to the past. Now, the author of the Revelation had spoken of Christ being pierced, strengthening his statement with *ναὶ ἀμήν*; and several times through the book he asseverates that his words are "true and faithful." He had also spoken of himself as having borne "witness to all those things which he saw." May we not thus explain, "he knoweth that he saith true"?

In the second of these references (John 21 : 24) it is said of the beloved disciple: "Οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ μαθητὴς ὁ μαρτυρῶν περὶ τούτων καὶ γράψας ταῦτα, καὶ οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἀληθὴς αὐτοῦ ἡ μαρτυρία ἐστίν." Here again one notices the suggestive use of the past tense. Might not *γράψας* be another reference to the Revelation? Seeing that that book had described Christ as the Eternal, the Logos, and the Lamb, and that these are leading ideas of the gospel, might not the evangelist, combining the evidence of the Revelation with his own recollections of the beloved disciple's words, speak of the latter as having written some of those things that are found in the gospel, and, through his representative, bearing witness concerning others? All the more might he do so if,

like those interpreters before mentioned, he understood Rev. 1 : 2 as referring to some writing of the apostle's other than the Revelation. Believing Christ's promise that the Spirit of Truth would teach all things and bring what was forgotten to the disciples' remembrance, "saturatus revelatione," he might feel himself empowered and commissioned to restore the apostle's missing testimony. If it is urged that even so there is still a *suggestio falsi* in γράψας ταῦτα, this is surely taken away by the next clause: "We know that his witness is true." For as the evangelist several times uses such a plural (John 3 : 11), and as οἴδαμεν is quite Johannine (*cf.* 1 John 5 : 18, 19, 20), there seems to be no good ground for transferring these words, as is usually done, to a group of attesting elders. It may be added that the laudatory mode of reference, five times repeated, "whom Jesus loved," while quite understandable in the mouth of John the elder, referring to the apostle, sounds thoroughly unnatural from the lips of the apostle himself.

There remains that most important, but, on all grounds, most perplexing passage, "If I will that he tarry till I come," together with the consequent misunderstanding "that that disciple should not die," commonly taken as implying that the beloved disciple attained some advanced age which gave rise to expectations not fulfilled. Is this inference at all necessary? Christ had promised, according to the synoptists, that "some of those standing here shall in no wise taste of death until they see the Son of Man coming;" and however inadequate be the explanation that some of those whom he addressed were to witness the downfall of Jerusalem, the same objection does not apply to the words of an evangelist writing a couple of decades or so after the events of 70 A. D. Taken thus, ἕως ἔρχομαι would simply imply that John, perhaps alone of the apostles, would survive till the siege of Jerusalem; and it is probable that the expression would be specially related to, and corrective or explanatory of, his ardent expectation expressed so emphatically at the close of the Revelation: "He that spake these things said, 'Surely I come quickly.' Even so come." The fact that the second advent is kept out of sight in the fourth gospel, apparently by design, or rather is replaced by the idea of a continuously repeated advent (John 14 : 3, 18, 19, 23, 28), strengthens such an interpretation of ἕως ἔρχομαι. And the fact that in John 21 : 19, 20, when Peter is told to follow, the beloved disciple follows too, points rather to some interval between than to an essential difference in their fates.

One thing, at any rate, is clearly unsatisfactory, and that is to combine, as is usually done, this fall-of-Jerusalem interpretation of ἕως

the longevity interpretation. This would force us to understand Christ's words as equivalent to "Until I come, and thirty years afterward." And further, we should be obliged to suppose that, long after the ἕως ἔρχομαι was fulfilled, John was still doubtful as to its meaning. No! If the fall-of-Jerusalem interpretation be adopted, then it most naturally follows that John did not survive that catastrophe (*cf.* Matt. 22 : 6).

There remains the alternative of some less personal and wider spiritual suggestion in this idea of the beloved disciple tarrying (*cf.* 1 John 2 : 17, "He who doeth the will of God tarrieth forever"). But to go farther into the several possible explanations of ἕως ἔρχομαι would lead too far afield. The object of this article was, in the light of recent publications, simply to review the external evidence for and against the idea of John the apostle's death in Ephesus *circa* 100 A. D. On the one side we have little more than the belief of Irenæus, who, owing to homonymy, may easily have been mistaken (just as Hegesippus, Polycrates, etc., were in similar cases), and the statements in *Acta Johannis*, which are in a high degree fictitious. On the other side we have early historical evidence, which it is most difficult or impossible to set aside or explain away.

F. P. BADHAM.

LONDON, E. C.,
England.

THE BEARING OF THE COMPOSITION OF THE PSALTER ON THE DATE OF THE FORTY-FOURTH PSALM.

THE church fathers of the school of Antioch—Theodore of Mopsuestia, Chrysostom, and Theodoret—held that this psalm was spoken prophetically of the age of the Maccabees. In this opinion Calvin concurred. Many recent interpreters have held that it is one of the few, the internal evidence of which makes a Maccabæan origin practically certain. Such is the opinion of von Lengerke, Hitzig, Hupfeld, Nowack, Perowne, Driver, Cornill, Cheyne, Baethgen, Wellhausen, and Kautzsch—a formidable list. W. R. Smith in the first edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church* inclined to this view,[1] but in the second edition he recedes from it, holding that it was composed in the time of Artaxerxes Ochus and the persecution of Bagoses.[2] Some eminent names may be cited as authorities for other dates, thus: de Wette assigned it to the reign of Jehoiakim; Kösters and Ewald to the sad

[1] *Cf.* pp. 196, 197.

[2] *Cf. ibid.*, pp. 207, 208.

times soon after the exile, about the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century; Lagarde to the invasion of Sennacherib; while Delitzsch held that it is Davidic, and was composed at the time of his Syrian and Ammonitish wars. Such opinions make but little impression in comparison with the consensus in favor of a Maccabæan origin.

Before one decides in favor of that date, however, the history of the compilation of the Psalter, as it can be deduced from the titles of psalms and colophons of books, should be considered. Many commentators have called attention to the fact that the fivefold division of our Psalter points to a gradual collection of the Psalms, and that this view is strengthened (1) by the fact that some of these collections rest on previous collections; (2) that the colophon at the end of Ps. 72 indicates that when it was written no other Davidic psalms were known than those which preceded it, while several more occur in later parts of our present Psalter; and (3) that the musical names and directions in Books I–III of the Psalter had become obsolete when Books IV and V were written.[3] The steps of the process by which our psalm-book was collected have been generally recognized to be the following: (1) the formation of the first Davidic collection, Pss. 3–41; (2) the collection of the Korahitic, Asaphic, and second Davidic psalters; (3) the union of these into one collection, when they underwent an Elohistic editing; (4) the addition of the Yahwistic appendix to this collection (Pss. 84–89); (5) the formation of other small collections, such as the "Songs of Ascent" (Pss. 120–134); (6) the collection of Books IV and V, which were at the first one collection, but which was based in part on previous collections; (7) the possible addition of some later psalms (such as 135–150) at the end of the Psalter; (8) the division of the last collection into two books, so that the Psalter, like the Pentateuch, should consist of five books; and (9) the prefixing of Pss. 2 and 1 to the whole. These several steps may not have occurred in this exact order, but they are to be recognized. Of these several stages in the process three stand out prominently:

[3] *Cf.* VON LENGERKE, *Die fünf Bücher der Psalmen*, 1847, pp. xxxi ff.; EWALD, *Die Dichter des Alten Bundes*, 2. Aufl., 1866, pp. 242–67; W. R. SMITH, *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, 1st ed., 1881, pp. 183–205; 2d ed., 1892, pp. 195–214; BLEEK, *Introduction to the Old Testament*, London, 1888, Vol. II, pp. 239–41; PEROWNE, *The Psalms*, 1890, Vol. I, pp. 70–83; CORNILL, *Einleitung in das Alte Test.*, 1891, pp. 215 ff.; PETERS, "The Development of the Psalter," *New World*, 1893, pp. 285–312; KÖNIG, *Einleitung in das Alte Test.*, 1893, pp. 404 ff.; SANDAY, *Inspiration*, 1893, pp. 271–3; KIRKPATRICK, "The Psalms," in *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, 1892, pp. xxxix ff.; KAUTZSCH, *The Literature of the Old Testament*, 1899, pp. 141–8.

the formation of Book I, the first Yahwistic collection; the formation of the Elohistic collection (Books II and III); and the formation of Books IV and V, the second Yahwistic collection. As to the dates when these collections were completed scholars are not agreed. Von Lengerke thought Nehemiah might have been the collector of Book I; that the Elohistic portion must have been collected in the early Maccabæan time; and that the last collection was made in the time of Simon or John Hyrcanus.[4] Ewald thought[5] that the first collection was made from the tenth century to the deuteronomic period in the seventh; that the Elohistic part was formed in Nehemiah's time; and, on the basis of the composite psalm in 1 Chron. 16 : 8–36, that the Psalter was completed by the time of the chronicler in the last of the Persian or the beginning of the Greek period. W. R. Smith seemed inclined in the first edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*[6] to refer Books IV and V to the Greek and probably to the Maccabæan period; the Korahitic and Asaphic collections to the times subsequent to Ezra and Nehemiah, admitting Pss. 44, 74, and 79 as Maccabæan; and the Davidic collections to earlier times. In the second edition he held that the inferior limit of the date of the Psalter is fixed by the Greek version which was current in Egypt about 130 B. C.[7] He also in this edition recognized that it is difficult, on account of the literary history of the Psalter, to assign any psalm in Books II and III to a later time than the Persian period.[8] Cornill holds (or held in 1891[9]) that the first book was not collected before 400 B. C., because the term רָקִיעַ in Ps. 19 : 2 shows dependence on the P document. He further holds that the *terminus ad quem* for the collection of the Psalter is to be found in the hymn of 1 Chron. 16 : 8–36, though four psalms (44, 74, 79, and 83) are Maccabæan in origin and were inserted later. He holds that the quotation of Ps. 79 : 2–3 as Scripture in 1 Macc. 7 : 17 proves the Psalter as a whole to be considerably older than the Maccabæan period. Kirkpatrick[10] holds that the first of these collections may have been begun by Solomon, and was certainly formed before the exile; that the second was completed about the time of the return; and that the third may be placed in the time of Ezra and Nehemiah. Dr. Peters holds[11] that the chronicler's psalm already referred to shows that about 330 B. C. the Psalter existed in its

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. xxxii, xxxiii.
[5] *Op. cit.*, pp. 256, 261–5.
[6] Pp. 188 ff.
[7] P. 201.
[8] Pp. 207 ff., 437 ff.
[9] *Einleitung*, pp. 216–18.
[10] *Op. cit.*, pp. xliii, xliv.
[11] *New World*, June, 1893, p. 299.

present fivefold division, but that it terminated at Ps. 134. Pss. 135–150, he holds, were added later, because they quote from psalms now contained in Books IV and V. The Yahwistic appendix to the Elohistic portion of the Psalter indicates, he thinks, that Books II and III were collected between 500 and 450 B. C., while the first collection was probably made during the exile.[12] Kautzsch[13] holds that the first collection (Pss. 3–41) was arranged about the time of Ezra. Toward the end of the Persian age the main body of Books II and III was collected, to which Pss. 83–89 were added as later gleanings. The third collection must, he thinks, have been made considerably later, and contains almost exclusively the later and latest psalms down to Simon, the founder of the Asmonæan dynasty (142 ff. B. C.). Baethgen recognizes these well-defined stages in the composition of the Psalter, but thinks that their dates cannot be determined in detail. He holds that the superior limit of time is the exile and the inferior the date of the Greek version.

It will be seen from this glance at scholarly opinion that much would be gained if we could determine the condition of the Psalter in the time of the chronicler. Ewald, Cornill, and Peters have held that the greater part of it had then been collected, and that its main divisions were then in existence. On the other hand, W. R. Smith held that "though 1 Chron., chap. 16, and 2 Chron. 6:41–42 contain a series of passages from psalms of the third collection, there is no proof that the chronicler read these hymns in their place in the present Psalter, or even that in his days Ps. 106 existed in its present form."[14] Reuss[15] held and Stade[16] holds that the hymn in 1 Chron., chap. 16, is a late addition to Chronicles, and that, therefore, nothing can be argued from it as to the date of the Psalter.

If we view the matter in the light of historical probability, we should represent the course of the collection of the Psalter somewhat as follows: This collection is palpably the hymnal of the second temple; there is, therefore, a presumption in favor of the view that it was begun in the early days of the history of that temple. Psalm-books may have existed before the exile, and may have furnished some hymns to this early post-exilic collection, but in such an intellectually vigorous and creative period as that which produced the book of Job, the priestly legislation, and completed the Pentateuch, it is hardly

[12] *New World*, June, 1893, p. 306. [14] *Op. cit.*, 2d ed., p. 202. [15] § 474.

[13] *The Literature of the Old Testament*, London and New York, 1899, p. 145.

[16] *Geschichte Israel's*, Vol. II, p. 215, n. 1.

likely that a pre-exilian psalter would be adopted without revision. The presence in Book I of such psalms as 16, 17, and 22, which can hardly have originated before the exile, points definitely to a post-exilian origin for this collection. The recent investigations of Van Hoonacker, Kosters, Cheyne, and Torrey in early post-exilian history make it improbable that such a collection would be made before the days of Ezra and Nehemiah. We are thus led to accept, on this point, the conclusion of von Lengerke, Cornill, and Kautzsch. The lapse of time necessary for the various steps of the process by which Books II and III were collected would occupy, one would think, most of the remaining years of the Persian period. When Books IV and V were formed, the musical terms employed in Books II and III were mostly obsolete; a further considerable lapse of time is necessary to account for this. Thus we are brought well into the Greek period, in which no time appears so probable for such a collection as the period of the revival of national feeling under the Maccabees. This conclusion coincides with that of W. R. Smith and Kautzsch.

On this view our inferior limit for the date of the Psalter is to be sought, not by the evidence of the book of Chronicles, but in the Greek version. W. R. Smith, reasoning from the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, held that a Greek version of the Psalms was in existence by 130 B. C.[17] Professor Sanday[18] places the limit about 100 B. C., while Baethgen[19] now places it about 140 B. C.

If now we come back to Ps. 44 and seek to determine its date, its position in the Psalter renders the Maccabæan origin of the psalm highly improbable. If we apply to it the considerations which Sanday has applied to Ps. 79,[20] we must suppose that after its composition and before the making of the Greek version the following steps intervened: (1) the superscription "sons of Korah" was attached, and this was probably not immediately; (2) its inclusion in the Korahitic collection; (3) the combination of the Korahitic, Asaphic, and Davidic collections into one; (4) their division into Books II and III; (5) the lapse of sufficient time for the musical terms in them to be forgotten; (6) the collection of Books IV and V; (7) the omission of this collection after Ps. 106, so that the Psalter should consist of five books; (8) the lapse of some time during which the variation of the titles of the psalms in the LXX from those of the Massoretic text arose. Now, if we suppose that Ps. 44 was composed during the earliest years of the

[17] *Op. cit.*, p. 201.
[18] *Inspiration*, p. 272.
[19] *Psalmen*, 2d ed.
[20] *Op. cit.*, p. 271.

persecution of Antiochus, say about 168 B. C., even if we date the Greek version as late as 100 B. C., the time is far too limited for all the steps of this process.

This fact W. R. Smith recognized in the second edition of his *Old Testament in the Jewish Church*, where he complains that Cornill, Driver, and Cheyne do "not give sufficient weight to the only sound principle for the historical study of the Psalter, viz., that the discussion of the age of the individual psalm must be preceded by an inquiry into the date of the several collections."[21] We might now include Baethgen and Wellhausen in the same complaint. Smith referred the psalm, as we noted above, to the reign of Artaxerxes Ochus and the widespread insurrection in Syria and Phœnicia which was put down in Judæa, according to Josephus, by Bagoses. Smith did not accept Josephus' account of the matter, but based his theory of the widespread revolt, and the ruthless and sacrilegious method of its suppression — a method which might, he thought, justify the language of this psalm — on the chronicle of Eusebius and the work of Diodorus.[22]

This theory supposes that the psalm originated about 350 B. C., and would fulfil the necessary conditions if (1) we were sure that the circumstances of these times were such as to warrant such language as: כִּי עָלֶיךָ הָרַגְנוּ כָל־הַיּוֹם נֶחְשַׁבְנוּ כְּצֹאן טִבְחָה; and (2) if vss. 2–9 were not, as Peters[23] pointed out, really a song of triumph. Such words as: כִּי הוֹשַׁעְתָּנוּ מִצָּרֵינוּ וּמְשַׂנְאֵינוּ הֶכְיִשׁוֹתָ; which even Wellhausen renders[24] at present,

> Thou helpest us against our foes,
> And humblest those who hate us,

can come neither from the time of Bagoses nor from the times of the Maccabees. As Dr. Peters[23] has pointed out, the original of the psalm must be of comparatively early date, and its sad conclusion must be a later editorial expansion. We know of no period when Israelitish arms triumphed, between the exile and the triumphs of the Maccabees. As this latter period has been shown to be too late, we are forced to consider vss. 1–8 as an ode which celebrates some pre-exilic triumph of the Israelitish arms. This is the less difficult, since the next psalm (45) celebrates the marriage of a pre-exilian king of Israel. This we hold to be self-evident, in spite of the attempt of Cheyne[25] to refer it to the

[21] P. 437.

[22] *Op. cit.*, pp. 438, 439.

[23] *New World*, June, 1893, p. 302.

[24] "Polychrome Bible."

[25] *Origin of the Psalter*, pp. 166–71.

marriage of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and of Olshausen to refer it to the marriage of the Syrian king Alexander to Cleopatra (1 Macc. 10 : 57, 58). It may be urged that the similarity between the opening of Ps. 44 and Pss. 78, 89, and 105, which review the history of Israel, would lead one to suppose that this historical retrospect betrays a post-exilian habit of mind. We might thus argue if we had only Ps. 105, for it is based on the combined narratives of J, E, and P, but surely such psalms might have been written at any time after the J and E documents had been composed. Ps. 78, as Briggs has pointed out,[96] mentions the seven plagues of J, the manna and quails of J, and the miracles of clearing the sea and the water from the rock from E. Since it omits the plagues of E, Briggs concludes that it was written before J and E were united. If, then, we suppose vss. 2–9 of Ps. 44 to be pre-exilic, it is easy to account for the position of the psalm in the Psalter.

We have further to note that vss. 2–9 form about one-third of the psalm, and that they are marked off by the musical direction סֶלָה. Wellhausen divides the remaining portion into two nearly equal parts at vs. 17, so that the poem, as it now stands, consists of three strophes of nearly equal length: the first, this ode of triumph which we have discussed; the second, a complaint called forth by the defeat of the national arms—a complaint couched in such terms that it fits very well an unsuccessful revolt; and the third, a complaint of a religious persecution: "For thy sake we are continually killed off." Now, of these three strophes only the first and second are separated by סֶלָה; it is wanting between the second and third. This difference is as old as the LXX, which writes διάψαλμα after vs. 9, but nowhere else in the psalm. The first strophe fits pre-exilic conditions, the second the conditions of the time of Bagoses, and the third the conditions of the Maccabæan revolt. Now, I would suggest that these facts point to the following history for the psalm, viz.: a pre-exilic ode of triumph was in the days of Bagoses given another strophe to make the psalm express the feelings of the Israel of that period, and the term סֶלָה was then placed between the two strophes. In the time of the Maccabees the third strophe was added, but at this time the term סֶלָה was but little understood, and the expander omitted to insert it.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE,
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

[96] *Hexateuch*, p. 148.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

LECTURES AND ESSAYS ON NATURAL THEOLOGY AND ETHICS. By WILLIAM WALLACE, late Fellow of Merton College, and Whyte's Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Oxford. Edited, with a Biographical Introduction, by Edward Caird, Master of Balliol College, Oxford. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1898. Pp. xl + 556. 12s. 6d.

THIS book being composite in character, it may be well to state its contents at the outset. The master of Balliol contributes a biographical introduction of thirty-four pages. Then follow such of Wallace's "Gifford Lectures" as were found in condition for publication. The Gifford courses, delivered at Glasgow in 1894–5, consisted of twenty-four lectures. Only three of the first course are reproduced. Of the second course we have nine lectures — the first and second, and the sixth to the twelfth inclusive. This portion occupies rather more than one-third of the present volume. A series of nine "Essays in Moral Philosophy" follows. The titles are: "Our Natural Rights;" "Person and Personality;" "Responsibility;" "Duty;" "Hedonism;" "Utilitarianism;" "The Ethics of Socialism;" "The Relations of Fichte and Hegel to Socialism;" "The Legal, Social, and Religious Sanctions of Morality." This is the longest section of the book, and runs to 269 pages. The concluding part, entitled "Critical Essays," consists of a paper on Lotze, and reviews of Nietzsche and the Hegelian dialectic, already familiar to readers of the specialist magazines.

A book constituted thus labors under patent disadvantages. These, indeed, are so obvious that many may be inclined to pass by on the other side. But it ought to be emphasized that, for special reasons peculiar to Wallace's case, these very disadvantages prove a positive gain in the present instance. By temperament Wallace was a reserved and, to mere acquaintances, somewhat uncompanionable Scot. This strain so far reproduced itself in his books that he may be said never to have let himself go. But in these fragments, so far unrevised, the man reveals himself as nowhere else. To be brief, the *Lectures and Essays* take equal rank with the famous elucidations of Hegel, and serve to render us more acutely sensible of the irreparable loss sustained in his tragic and untimely death.

Remembering that he had been in active philosophical service since his twenty-fifth year — 1868 — the mass of Wallace's published work is not great. The translations of Hegel, with the splendid prolegomena; the little books on Epicureanism, Kant, and Schopenhauer, are all that remain. When we think of their quality and learn that Wallace was about to exchange the teacher's for the writer's life, we realize our loss. All his books, the memorial volume possibly most, are marked by those peculiar characteristics which struck one so forcibly in his lecturing. An intense personality, with originality amounting almost to genius and chastened by splendid training, enthralled the hearer. I heard him for the first time in the early eighties, and the impression remains perfectly fresh today. His subject was Boethius. He spoke for considerably over an hour without a single note and without the faintest hesitation, showing marvelous command of the facts and profound insight into the complicated problems connected with his theme. Mr. Caird summarizes the method thus: "He seemed to gain unusual power of putting himself *en rapport* with his audience and of communicating to them, by a kind of infection, his own vivid perception of his subject as it rose before his mind in the moment of delivery. His hearers seemed to be receiving thought in the making, and not as the cut-and-dried product of the study. The play of his mind upon the questions discussed, the strange touches of humor with which his discourse was lighted up, the subtle beauty and conclusiveness of expression which he often attained, and through it all the gravity and earnestness of his manner, produced an impression which was unique of its kind" (p. xxi). Something of this peeps out in all his books, the *Schopenhauer* for example; but in this latest volume there is an intimacy that one misses in the more formal works. Thus its extraordinary suggestiveness need be no surprise. On the whole, nothing has been produced by the British idealistic school in which the essential principle of Plato and Hegel is used in more masterly fashion. Disengaged from the formalism with which Hegel is so commonly and wrongly associated, the moving spirit has refreshing liberty here. This impression of freedom from scholastic trappings is heightened, of course, by Wallace's picturesque style. It must be counted for righteousness to the Scottish idealists that they write well; for this they have to thank their literary interests. No one possessed these more than Wallace, and it is a thousand pities that his projected work on the revolution poets remained a mere project.

Theologians will find a rich harvest in these Gifford Lectures;

preachers can obtain many a hint from these moral essays; and all thoughtful men will be the better for perusal of these pages, in which an intrepid and rarely endowed spirit grapples with the deep things of life.

It ought to be said that Mr. Caird's part is admirably done, as is all work that loving care prompts. The single improvement we demand is an index.

R. M. WENLEY.

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

DIE GOTTESBEWEISE BEI THOMAS VON AQUIN UND ARISTOTELES. Erklärt und vertheidigt von DR. EUGEN ROLFES. Köln: Verlag und Druck von J. P. Bachem, 1898. Pp. viii + 305. M. 5.

THIS learned work on theism bears the *imprimatur* of the vicar-general of the archbishopric of Cologne, and may be taken to represent well the current Catholic apologetics. The author's object appears to be, first of all, to set forth effectively, for the guidance of his readers, the time-tested arguments for the existence of God; secondly, to defend these arguments against the attacks that have been made upon them from various quarters; and, thirdly, to promote the study of the writings of Thomas Aquinas, the greatest of the scholastic theologians, and of Aristotle, the supreme authority of scholasticism in dialectics, philosophy, and science. The chief value of the work seems to me to consist in the author's demonstration of the fact that Thomas Aquinas drew his arguments for the existence of God directly or indirectly from the great Greek philosopher. He has taken great pains to gather the passages from Aristotle upon which Thomas' arguments are based, giving carefully the sources of the passages cited. The arguments on which the author collates the statements of Thomas and Aristotle are (1) that from change in cosmic things: whatever is moved is moved by something else. The first mover is God. This physical principle is applied to the movement of the spheres: everything moved is divisible; the movement of the whole depends upon the movement of the parts; the activity and the wisdom of God are proved by the cosmic movement and order. (2 and 3) The arguments from the activity of cosmic things and from their rise and passing away: there must be an eternal subsistence back of this activity, this rise and passing away of finite things, and such eternal

subsistence is God. (4) Argument from the stages to perfection: the *ne plus ultra* is God. (5) The argument from design in nature. Each of these arguments the author discusses with remarkable fulness of learning, pointing out the objections that have been raised, and the modifications suggested by the great thinkers of ancient, mediæval, and modern times. The final division of the work is devoted to the refutation of the objections of Kant and Trendelenburg to these arguments for the existence of God. The arguments of Thomas Aquinas derived from Aristotle are, it need scarcely be said, the commonplaces of modern theistic discussion, and are usually designated "cosmological," "ontological," and "teleological." It does not appear to the reviewer that the author has made any important contribution to the argument for the existence of God, but he has given a clear and concise statement of the original forms in which these arguments were presented, and has sought to show their continued validity. Though written by a Roman Catholic, the work contains little or nothing that Protestants of the more conservative type would find objectionable.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Canada.

GESCHICHTE DER NEUEREN DEUTSCHEN PHILOSOPHIE SEIT HEGEL. Ein Handbuch zur Einführung in das philosophische Studium der neuesten Zeit. Von OTTO SIEBERT, Ph.D. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. vii + 496. M. 7.50.

DR. SIEBERT'S history is stimulating to the imagination. A picture comes to us. A pedagogue is in his chair, and his class in "German philosophy since Hegel" is seated before him in the best of order. The lesson begins. First question: "Who was Bobrik?" Answer: "He was one of the 'other Herbartians.'" Second question: "When was he born?" Answer: "The text does not say." Third question: "What did he write?" Answer: "*De ideis innatis sive puris pro principiis habitis; Freie Vorträge über Aesthetik*, and one other work which I forget." Fourth question: "To what school did Karl Schwarz belong?" Answer: "To the school of Schleiermacher." And fifth question: "What was his principal work?" But this no one can recall, and with permission from the desk all open their books, and, after finding the school of Schleiermacher, begin to hurry down the paragraph headings, which are alphabetically arranged, searching for Schwarz.

And what they find need not concern us, but that Dr. Siebert has written a book remarkably well adapted for their use does concern us. He has written a book that for completeness of treatment and for mere convenience in use rivals anything of which we have knowledge. Has he left anybody out? Is there any question, except that about the birth of Bobrick and perhaps one or two others, that cannot be answered, so to speak, merely by resort to the alphabet? A conscientious, thoroughly objective, compendious work — that is the best and worst to be said of it; a work which is closely comparable with Ueberweg's history; a very good record, but a most unsatisfactory history; and a very ingenious tool, but inadequate as philosophy.

Besides an introduction and a conclusion, there are three parts. The first has separate chapters for the Hegelian school, the speculative theists, the Herbartians, the schools of Schleiermacher, Fries, Baader, and Beneke, Schopenhauer and his following, Trendelenburg, and the revival of Thomism and other earlier systems; the second, for materialism, the rise of the natural sciences, and positivism; and the third, for neo-Kantianism and the recent efforts of such men as Kirchmann, Sigwart, Fechner, Lotze, Teichmüller, Hermann Siebeck, and Eucken at system-building. As has been intimated, the treatment is mechanical throughout. Records, however well done, cannot be made on any other plan. But accuracy goes with mechanical method, and Dr. Siebert's book is certainly a book to have and use, if not to read. To employ a well-worn antithesis, it is a photograph, not a painting, and its perspective has the distortion of photography instead of the illuminating exaggeration of art.

The "conclusions" of the book are the best witnesses to its character. These amount to three. First — and I give the German in order to hide the commonplaceness, so far as possible: "Ein reiches Geistesleben ist an unserem Auge vorübergezogen, die Anschauungen und Lebensauffassungen der grössten Geister und Denker unseres Jahrhunderts sind uns deutlich geworden. Als die grossen Heroen Kant, Fichte, Schelling und Hegel vom Schauplatz getreten waren, schien es zunächst, als sollte die produktive Kraft der Philosophie erschöpft sein. . . . . Es ist anders gekommen; denn das menschliche Geistesleben fühlt sich nicht an gewisse, ein für alle Mal abgesteckte Bahnen und Geleise gebunden" (p. 470). Then, secondly, there is a rapid review of the contents of the book. This occupies about a dozen pages (471–82) and closes with an interesting estimate of Rudolph Eucken. In the author's opinion Eucken is "the most noteworthy

systematic philosopher of today." And, thirdly, to venture a translation that is free withal: "The business of the philosophy of the future is no abstract metaphysics that loses itself in what is only empty and barren, but extraction of a spiritual life from the inner and outer experiences of humanity. The instability, whether of rationalism or materialism, of realism or positivism, cannot but lead to a spiritual reality back of what appears to the senses; and this reality philosophy has to seek. Using the rich harvest of recent historical study, philosophy must strive for a standpoint that will transcend the detached notions of one time or another, transfiguring the world and bringing new forces into life. But to this end great power of comprehension . . . . and bold leadership are indispensable" (pp. 483–4).

Such "conclusions"—the tribute to what has been, the summary, and the exhortation or prophecy—are eminently respectable, but, without meaning to underrate a book that has cost a great deal of labor and that is very well done so far as it goes, we are bound to say that they do not seem to us to represent very much achievement. They are very near to being conclusions in place and form only, not in substance. But has the historian a right to draw conclusions that are substantial? All depends upon what history is. If it is only objective record, certainly not. Of course, objective records *are* useful, but it is perhaps the chief burden of this review that history, or even *Geschichte*, is a name that calls for other usage in these times.

ALFRED H. LLOYD.

THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN,
Ann Arbor, Mich.

THE DIVINE DRAMA. The Manifestation of God in the Universe. By GRANVILLE ROSS PIKE. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. 378. $1.50.

THIS, which is a thoroughly modern statement of theoretical and practical religion, is such a book as many Christians have declared to be impossible. It is strictly monistic in philosophy and unswervingly evolutionary in theory, while at the same time it is searchingly ethical in effect and profoundly religious in spirit. The doctrine is very simple. God, who is conscious and self-determined love and goodness, is perpetually bringing forth all existence from his own being. All existence is spiritual, since it is the offspring of God and expresses God; and God is moving on through the successive changes of his universe, to the production of what is more and more spiritual and like himself, until,

having produced man, he shall have brought him to his own full fellowship and likeness. To man, therefore, as a spirit, God is true father and natural home; sin is "contrary to the very heart of the universe;" the will and character of God, revealed in Christ most clearly, form the law of living, and fraternal life with his fellows is the only right and normal social life. In this manner the relation of God to his creatures is made the key to the meaning of the unconscious world, the ground of ethics, the inspiration of religion, the basis of society, and the hope of mankind. The author makes the social life of man as important in religion as the personal. He traces out the manifold applications of his one principle in the relations of men, and treats the pressing social problems as elements in the religious life, bringing to them all the one solution.

The book is thus an important sign of the times, and a hopeful one. Perhaps some readers may doubt whether the combination of monism, evolution, ethics, and religion can be consistently held; but the author's main position, stated in the first few pages, should be carefully considered before the possibility is denied. We have no pantheism here: we have a God in whom alone is the perfect personality, acting himself out in the universe, and training human persons, through ethics and religion, for his own fellowship. It is plain that we have here a strong and joyful utterance of ethical fidelity and Christian faith, coming from a realm of thought where such utterances have not generally been expected. In this all Christians should rejoice.

WILLIAM N. CLARKE.

COLGATE UNIVERSITY,
Hamilton, N. Y.

THE RELIGION OF BABYLONIA AND ASSYRIA.[1] By MORRIS JASTROW, JR., PH.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in the University of Pennsylvania. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1898. Pp. xvi + 780. $3.

AS JASTROW remarks in his preface, the time has not yet come for an exhaustive treatise on the religion of Babylonia and Assyria. The time has come, however, for gathering together, arranging, and systematizing the results already obtained, and for giving them to the public in convenient and readable form. Jastrow has attempted to do this, and, in our opinion, he has performed this most difficult task

[1] "Handbooks on the History of Religions."

well. In addition he has given us many valuable original suggestions, and he has offered solutions to several difficult problems.

The author takes up his subject in three main divisions: I, the pantheon on the basis of the historical inscriptions; (1) the old Babylonian period; (2) the middle period, or the pantheon in the days of Hammurabi; (3) the Assyrian pantheon; and (4) the latest, or neo-Babylonian period. II, the religious literature. III, the religious architecture, the history of the temples, and the cult. A general estimate is given in the last chapter, followed by a bibliography* and complete index.

In order to show the scope of the work I give the table of contents in a footnote.[3] The religious element shows itself in all branches of the Babylonio-Assyrian literature, and hence a sketch of Babylonio-Assyrian religion is almost synonymous with a sketch of the literature. A glance at the contents given below will show how true this statement is. This fact renders the subject a most difficult one. It is simply impossible for one man to know all these texts equally well. As in the case of the lexicon, so also in history and religion, it is necessary for different men to specialize in different fields. This has been done, and Jastrow has devoted himself to the task of arranging their results. The method employed by the author seems to be the best one possible for the present. It renders necessary a great amount of repetition. I am inclined to think, however, that by this repetition the author has given us a clearer historical setting than we would have had otherwise.

*Compiled under the following heads: i, (*a*) Excavations and Decipherment, (*b*) History, (*c*) Origin and General Aspects of Babylonian-Assyrian Culture, (*d*) Bibliography; ii, General Works and Articles on the Religion of Babylonia and Assyria; iii, Pantheon, Gods, Spirits, Heroes; iv, Religious Texts; v, Cosmology; vi, The Gilgamesh Epic; vii, Beliefs, Legends, Ethics, and Special Phases of the Religion; viii, Temples and Cults; ix, Bearings on the Old Testament and General Influence.

[3] i, Introduction; ii, The Land and the People; iii, General Traits of the Old Babylonian Pantheon; iv, Babylonian Gods Prior to the Days of Hammurabi; v, The Consorts of the Gods; vi, Gudea's Pantheon; vii, Summary; viii, The Pantheon in the Days of Hammurabi; ix, The Gods in the Temple Lists and in the Legal and Commercial Documents; x, The Minor Gods in the Period of Hammurabi; xi, Survivals of Animism in the Babylonian Religion; xii, The Assyrian Pantheon; xiii, The Triad and the Combined Invocation of Deities; xiv, The Neo-Babylonian Period; xv, The Religious Literature of Babylonia; xvi, The Magical Texts; xvii, The Prayers and Hymns; xviii, Penitential Psalms; xix, Oracles and Omens; xx, Various Classes of Omens; xxi, The Cosmology of the Babylonians; xxii, The Zodiacal System of the Babylonians; xxiii, The Gilgamesh Epic; xxiv, Myths and Legions; xxv, The Views of Life after Death; xxvi, The Temples and the Cult; xxvii, Conclusion; with a map, bibliography, and index.

There is great uncertainty at almost every step. The material at hand for deciding many and important points is often meager and often in a very poor state of preservation. Conjecture — even pure guesswork — is often necessary. Many theories must be built on very unsatisfactory foundations. Hence it is impossible to follow the author in many places. One must, however, admit that he is generally very conservative in his opinions and in the statement of them.

The chapter on "The Temples and the Cult" is very interesting, and the author has given us much new material on the subject. His views on the Gilgamesh epic are well presented in his article on "Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature":[4] "The Gilgamesh epic is, as I trust I have satisfactorily established in my work on *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*, a composite production in which various tales originally independent have been interwoven. The hero of the epic is Gilgamesh, but incidents are introduced into the adventures of Gilgamesh with which originally he had nothing to do, and which formed no part of his career. Gilgamesh becomes a favorite personage to whom floating traditions were attached, in part by popular fancy and in part by the deliberate efforts of literary compilers. In this epic faint historical traditions are introduced, but so blended with nature-myths that Gilgamesh appears now as an earthly ruler and again as a solar deity. That such a personage as Gilgamesh once existed there is every reason to believe. The theory of *creatio ex nihilo* will not suffice for the rise of legendary lore." The amalgamation of the old Bel (En-lil) with Marduk — the transfer of Bel's name and powers as god of Nippur to Marduk, the god of Babylon — is well set forth.

Of great interest to students of the religion of the Old Testament are the author's views (some old, some new) on the following subjects: parallelism between Adam and Eabani and between Adam and Adapa; between Eve and Ukhat;[5] the third chapter of Genesis and the Adapa legend; similarity of creation-epic with the biblical account; Old Testament points of contact with Gilgamesh epic, with deluge story; Parnapishtim bears more resemblance to Lot than to Noah; Gilgamesh and Samson, Ishtar and Delila; Shurippak and Sodom; parallelism between Moses and Sargon I.; Hebrew Shĕôl and Babylonian Shuâlu; Solomon's temple and the sacred quarter in Nippur; "sea" and

[4] *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, Vol. XV, July, 1899, pp. 193–214.

[5] *Cf.* JASTROW, "Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature," *American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures*, July, 1899.

Apsū; Hebrew-Babylonian custom of inquiring of the dead; conceptions of nether-world in Old Testament and Babylonian literature; libations of oil and sacrifices in Old Testament and Babylonian literature; teraphim and Assyrio-Babylonian amulets; Hebrew and Babylonian New Years; Purim and the Babylonian festival of the fifteenth of Adar; Ashera and tree-worship in Babylonia; Dibbarra epic and "The Battles of Yahweh;" influence of Babylonian religion on Judaism, on Christianity; mediation; Hammurabi and the Hebrew-Christian notion of Messianic time; etc., etc.

As stated above, there is much repetition, a great part of which is necessary; there is much uncertainty in many places; there are weak foundations for many theories. On the other hand, the author is the first to discuss scientifically the mass of material at hand. He has edited this material and has made many valuable additions to it. He has placed all students of Assyrio-Babylonian under a deep debt to him, and it is hoped that he will long be spared to carry on his work in this field.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ZOROASTER, THE PROPHET OF ANCIENT IRAN. By A. V. WILLIAMS JACKSON. New York: The Macmillan Co. (for the Columbia University Press), 1899. Pp. xxiv+314, and map. $3.

PROFESSOR JACKSON, who stands as the foremost, or rather the only, Iranian specialist in this country, presents us here with an imposing work designed for a wider circle, rightly counting upon a general interest in the life of the great prophet of Iran. For that Zoroaster was a historical personage, and no mere legendary figure, the author has no doubt. And, indeed, since Darmesteter's death there is probably no scholar of note who would deny that behind the semi-mythical picture of the later literature there looms the outline of an actual reformer, the creator of a new worship. But Professor Jackson goes much farther. He believes that the traditional accounts of Zoroaster's life, however much overlaid with legend, contain enough of truth to give us a fair idea of his career, and, accordingly, what he offers us is, as he explains in the preface, "a biographical study based on tradition."

Zoroaster is represented as born in the seventh century B. C. in Media. His ancestry is given to the fourteenth generation, also his

wives and children. The prophecies, the miracles before and at his birth, the stories of his childhood and youth, are recounted. At thirty begins the period of his ministry. The revelation on the banks of the Dāitī, the visions, the earliest preachings and pilgrimages are brought before us. Then follow the events leading up to the conversion of King Vishtāspa (Gushtāsp), destined to become the "Constantine of Zoroastrianism." The establishment of the new religion throughout Iran is followed by the holy wars waged against the infidel Turanians. These are described in detail, with accompanying plans of the arrangements of the troops in the various battles. Finally are given the accounts of Zoroaster's death, the Iranian tradition representing him as perishing at Balkh by the hand of a Turanian, in his seventy-seventh year.

All this is narrated in an enviable style, and with such vividness that one might seem to be reading a life of Mohammed. The inevitable criticism, and one which the author has himself foreseen, is that the picture is too realistic. Not but that such an accurate account of the traditional conception of Zoroaster's life is well worthy of presentation for its own sake and a welcome contribution. But this is not, we believe, what will be expected by the general reader or the student of religious history, and if taken as anything more than this will be misleading. There is much, it is true, that is subjective in our individual attitude toward tradition, but certainly the reviewer is not alone in feeling that, as is the case with so many of the great figures of antiquity, any attempt to reconstruct the personal events of Zoroaster's life beyond the vaguest outlines is absolutely hopeless. The Pahlavi, Persian, and Arabian chronicles from the ninth to the thirteenth century are no better sources for the life of Zoroaster than the Shāh Nāmah for the history of ancient Iran. It is the legendary Iran, and it is the legendary Zoroaster. All that we can hope to know of the real Zoroaster is what we can surmise from the history of the religion which he founded and the meager personal information to be gleaned from the earliest portions of the sacred writings. No one is more competent than Professor Jackson to discuss the history of Zoroastrianism, but in the work before us he touches this but lightly, reserving it for treatment elsewhere, doubtless referring to his forthcoming article on the Iranian religion in the *Grundriss der iranischen Philologie*. So on p. 12 he says: "The question of his religious beliefs, teaching, and philosophy can be dealt with only incidentally, as this is reserved for treatment in another work;" p. 83: "The problem of the exact lands

and territories concerned, and at how early a period Persia proper is to be included, requires discussion elsewhere;" similarly pp. 141, 177. We venture the opinion that his treatment of "Zoroastrianism" will present a much truer picture of its founder, and one of far greater interest and importance to the general student, than the present work on "Zoroaster."

The second half of the volume is devoted to a series of appendices of a more technical nature, some of them being reprints of articles by the author published in the *Journal of the American Oriental Society* and elsewhere. The subjects dealt with are: "Suggested Explanations of Zoroaster's Name," "On the Date of Zoroaster," "Dr. West's Tables of Zoroastrian Chronology," "Zoroaster's Native Place and the Scene of his Ministry," "Classical Passages Mentioning Zoroaster's Name," "Allusions to Zoroaster in Various Other Older Literatures," "Notes on Sculptures Purported to Represent Zoroaster." It is of the greatest value to have all this material brought together in convenient form. No collection of anything like the same fulness is to be found elsewhere, and whether or not one agree with all the conclusions deduced from it, everyone will welcome and profit by such a store-house of information. The questions of the most vital interest are those of Zoroaster's date and the scene of his activity, and we may speak here briefly of the former.

One set of traditions, chiefly classical, place Zoroaster's date at 6000 B. C., which simply means that he was thought of as antedating any known historical period. The Iranian tradition, on the other hand, represents him as living about three hundred years before Alexander, or more exactly, according to West's corrected chronology, as born 660 B. C. Until recent years scholars have paid no serious attention to either tradition, and have set an approximate date which seemed best fitted to what was known or believed as to the rise and spread of the religion. Many, among them Geldner and Jackson, have hit upon 1000 B. C. as a fair approximation. But recently Geldner has expressed the opinion that Vishtāspa, the patron of Zoroaster, might well be identical with the historical Vishtāspa (Hystaspes), the father of Darius. And now Jackson, though opposed to this identification, is strongly inclined to trust the traditional date and place Zoroaster's activity in the second half of the seventh century. As to the connection with the father of Darius, if anything is clear as to the scene of Zoroaster's activity and the home of the earliest Zoroastrian writings, it is that it was not Persia. Nor, indeed, does the tradition make any such

identification. But even as late a date as the second half of the seventh century brings us into serious difficulties, if not to a veritable paradox. In the incriptions of Darius the Auramazda worship appears as the established state religion. There is nothing to indicate that it is of recent origin. On the contrary it is generally assumed that, in so far as it differs from the religion of the Avesta, this is due to an independent development of the oldest type. Our author, to be sure, defers the consideration of the problems regarding the Zoroastrianism of the Achæmenian kings (p. 177), but we do not understand that he is one of the few who regard the Auramazda worship, as seen in the old Persian inscriptions, as wholly independent of Zoroastrianism. Moreover, the language of the Gāthās is certainly on a more primitive stage of development than the Old Persian, and, again, the use of the two names in either order (*Mazda Ahura* or *Ahura Mazda*), or of one alone, is earlier than the Old Persian *Aʰuramazdāʰ*. Now, it is objected that we have no means of measuring accurately the rapidity of either religious or linguistic development, and this is true. But the fact remains that we should naturally assume a longer period than is admissible if we accept the traditional date for Zoroaster. Another consideration is the probable Zoroastrianism of the Median dynasty, coupled with the fact that here, too, it would have to be an importation, if we locate the scene of Zoroaster's activity in the East, as does the author, rightfully we think.

It will not be impossible for Professor Jackson in his history of the religion to present these various problems in a way not inconsistent with his notion of Zoroaster's date, but it will be a forced process, and the question arises whether the tradition is of sufficient value to make this course desirable. In our opinion it is not, and we note with interest that in two recent works which are mentioned by the author in the bibliography, but which arrived too late to be used in the body of the work, the older date is retained. So Tiele in his *Religion bei den iranischen Völkern*, p. 49, thinks that the oldest parts of the Young Avesta cannot be much later than 800 B. C., the Gāthās a couple of centuries earlier. And Oldenberg in a popular article on Zoroaster gives his date as about 900–800.

CARL DARLING BUCK.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SETHIANISCHE VERFLUCHUNGSTAFELN AUS ROM. Herausgegeben von RICHARD WÜNSCH. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1898. Pp. v + 123. M. 5.

WÜNSCH's monograph is based on certain imprecatory inscriptions, which are preserved in the Museo Kircheriano in Rome. The inscriptions in question are scratched, more or less roughly, on sheets of lead which where found about fifty years ago in a columbarium on the Appian Way. The largest of the sheets, when unrolled, measure about fifteen by ten centimeters, but many of them are preserved in such a fragmentary form that they cannot be restored. It is difficult even to determine their number, but Wünsch thinks there are forty-eight. Five of the inscriptions are in Latin and the rest in Greek, while almost all of them contain many symbolical characters. About a third of the book is taken up with the inscriptions, some of which are reproduced in facsimile, and the author's comments on them. The rest of the work contains a discussion by the author of such points in palæography, orthography, and religious history as are suggested by the tablets. A safe basis for the discussion of these questions is secured by establishing the fact that the inscriptions belong to the early part of the fifth century A. D. To the palæographist these specimens of cursive writing will be of very lively interest, and those in Latin will invite comparison with the Pompeian writing of four centuries earlier. The student of popular Latin and Greek will also find a great deal of valuable material in them. Some of the points of interest in this field, but not all of them, are noted by the author in the commentary and index. A discussion of this portion of the monograph would, however, hardly be in place here. The readers of this JOURNAL will probably turn with the greatest interest to chap. v, in which the religious side of these inscriptions is treated. In this chapter the practice of invoking the wrath of the gods of the lower world on specified individuals by setting down imprecations on leaden sheets is traced from its earliest appearance in the Græco-Roman world, in the fifth century B. C., down to the period of the leaden sheets found on the Appian Way. A study of the symbols found on the sheets makes it apparent that the writers of these imprecations belonged to a sect of Gnostics, who tried to bring down on the heads of their enemies, who were in most cases rival charioteers, the wrath of the god Seth (Egypt. *Set*). The figure of this god with the head of an ass, which characterizes him, appears on many of the sheets. Seth is the antithesis of Osiris, and represents the principle of evil. Later on there arose

a confusion between him and Seth, the son of Adam. Since Abel and the descendants of Cain perished, the human race can be traced to Seth, the son of Adam, or the "son of man," as he was thought of. Now, the application of this title to both Seth and Christ brought with it the danger of confusion. Such a confusion the author thinks took place, with the resulting amalgamation of the symbols of the cross and the head of the ass. In this way Wünsch throws a new light on the celebrated *graffitto* of the Palatine, and makes it highly probable that that figure was not intended to deride a Christian comrade, but was the appropriate symbol of a particular religious sect. This brief outline may give some little idea of the rich material and the scholarly discussions which Wünsch's monograph contains.

FRANK F. ABBOTT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

RÂMAKRISHNA: His Life and Sayings. By RIGHT HON. F. MAX MÜLLER. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899. Pp. x + 200. $1.50.

PROFESSOR MAX MÜLLER has in his recent articles, "My Indian Friends" (*Cosmopolis*, June, August, and September, 1898) and "A Prime Minister and a Child-wife" (*Fortnightly Review*, February, 1899), sought to secure in the West a better appreciation of Hindu ideals. The book before us is of distinct value in this regard and deserves to be read widely.

Râmakrishna's life and teachings drew to him a large number of seekers after spiritual enlightenment. The well-known reformers Keshub Chunder Sen and Mozoomdar were among those who came under his influence. Vivekânanda was his zealous disciple. But the master's manner of living was not new in India, nor were his teachings novel; for that reason they are perhaps more significant.

Vivekânanda has brought together some four hundred sayings of Râmakrishna, treasured by his followers, and has prepared a brief account of his life for western readers. Read in the light of Max Müller's introductory remark, it cannot fail to suggest thoughts of the difficulty which a disciple finds in seeking to tell the simple truth of a revered master.

Some of the sayings may at first sound strange, but these are natural to a Hindu. On the other hand, Râmakrishna wished to learn from all teachers what he could, and many an expression that he uses has a Christian source. There is a great temptation to quote at length

from the sayings. The following will show something of the teacher's spirit and manner:

So long as the bee is outside the petals of the lotus, and has not tasted its honey, it hovers round the flower emitting its buzzing sound; but when it is inside of the flower, it drinks its nectar noiselessly. So long as a man quarrels and disputes about doctrines and dogmas, he has not tasted the nectar of true faith; when he has tasted it, he becomes still.

He who has faith has all, and he who wants faith wants all.

Be not like the frog in the well. The frog in the well knows nothing bigger and grander than its well. So are all bigots: they do not see anything better than their own creeds.

The vanities of all others may gradually die out, but the vanity of a saint as regards his sainthood is hard indeed to wear away.

The pearl-oyster that contains the precious pearl is in itself of very little value, but it is essential for the growth of the pearl. The shell itself is of no use to the man who has got the pearl, neither are ceremonies and rites necessary for him who has attained the Highest Truth — God.

A. W. STRATTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THEOLOGICAL ENCYCLOPÆDIA AND METHODOLOGY. By REVERE FRANKLIN WEIDNER. Part I: *Introduction and Exegetical Theology*. Second edition, entirely rewritten. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Co., 1898. Pp. 296. $1.50.

THE well-known theological conservatism of the author characterizes the whole of this book. With very few exceptions we see everything "critical" weighed and found wanting. The author out-Zöcklers Zöckler and goes beyond Oehler in his extreme conservatism. To students preferring a conservative treatise this book will be very welcome, notwithstanding some rather awkward statements and significant omissions. We hope that another edition will quote the well-known Breslau theologian as Räbiger, not Räbinger, as is stated in seven different cases. The titles of books either German or Latin, etc., should be given with exact minuteness in a book such as Weidner's; this is not always the case.[1] Of course, we cannot argue with the author concerning the distribution and arrangement of his material. The

[1] Of Hagenbach (p. 25) a thirteenth edition has appeared; and Kuyper's book should find a place on pp. 28, 29. In the section "Books on Bibliography" we miss the *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, the *Beweis des Glaubens*, the *Theologiæ novitates*, etc. The *Theologische Jahresbericht* (p. 31, no. 10) has been edited for a number of years by HOLTZMANN and KRÜGER.

whole work, consisting of three volumes, of which this is the first, is planned to cover the whole field of theological science, and much that we should expect to find in the volume on "Practical Theology" we find in the introductory chapters of Vol. I. We deal here only with the literature. Among dictionaries of the Bible (p. 119) we miss Riehm[a], Zeller's *Calwer Bibel-Lexikon*, and a reference to Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*. We meet with a great deal of theorizing in the sections devoted to the languages of the Old and New Testaments.[a]

[a] On p. 131 we sadly miss the names of Lagarde, König, Kautzsch, and Geo. F. Moore. P. 133, no. 7, should rather be the "Babylonian" instead of Assyrian. No Semitic scholar has ever had the hardiness to say that Ethiopic was "easy of acquisition" (p. 133), nor will a Sanskritist of today maintain that Sanskrit was the "oldest in the great family of Indo-European languages" (pp. 133–4). Modern philology speaks not of "Chaldee" (p. 134), but of Aramaic. Some very remarkable omissions are found in the list of Hebrew grammars, *e. g.*, EWALD'S *Ausführliches Lehrbuch*, the grammars of Stade, Olshausen, etc.; KÖNIG'S third volume (II, 2: *Syntax*) appeared before this second edition was on the market. P. 137, 2) no. 8, read Pirke Aboth. I hope Weidner does not consider "The *Ethics* of the Fathers" as a translation of this Hebrew title; 4) no. 15 (p. 137), SOCIN'S third edition should have been mentioned (the fourth is just out); and certainly the third edition of WRIGHT'S grammar, differing so much from the second, quoted by the author. P. 138, 7) DELITZSCH'S *Handwörterbuch* should have found a place, and 8) no. 25, BREASTED'S English translation of Erman should be recommended to readers of the *Encyclopædia*. 9) We miss sadly the works of Lagarde and Barth, both more important than even Wright.—P. 143, 2, we miss BLASS, *Grammatik des Neutestamentl. Griechisch* (1896; Engl. transl., 1898), and VITEAU'S books; p. 144, 3, no. 1, CREMER, seventh edition, 1893; the eighth edition, which Weidner describes in 1898 as announced to appear, was published in 1895.—SCHIRLITZ-EGER, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 5te Aufl., Giessen, 1893, should be added. Of THAYER-GRIMM the 1897 edition should be cited. No. 4, 3, readers of Weidner will be interested to know that Hatch-Redpath was completed in 1897 (Weidner says in 1898: "to be issued in parts"); the very important and useful *Concordance of the Greek Testament*, by MOULTON and GEDEN (1897; second edition, 1899) should be recommended by all means. P. 145, no. 5, is a very meager list, omitting some of the most important books; these, for instance: THAYER'S *Books and their Use* (1893); VINCENT'S *Students' New Testament Handbook* (1893); NESTLE'S small, but important work, *Einführung in das griechische Neue Testament* (1897).—P. 153, § 63, 1, 1, add now HASTINGS, *A Dictionary of the Bible* (in 4 vols.; Vol. I, 1898; Vol. II, 1899); 154, 2, 5, the *new* edition of RIEHM'S *Handwörterbuch* was completed in 1894. SCHENKEL'S *Bibel-Lexikon* and ZELLER'S *Calwer Bibel-Lexikon* are to be added to the list. The works on archæology, mentioned on pp. 154–5, are all superseded by NOWACK, *Hebräische Archaeologie* (1894) and BENZINGER'S *Hebr. Archaeologie* (1894); nos. 4 and 5 (p. 155) should mention *e. g.* the series of *By-Paths of Bible Knowledge*, BUHL'S *Geographie Palästina's* (1896), etc.—P. 157, 7, 1, read Benzinger; 158, no. 7, Ramsay; SCHRADER'S *Cuneiform Inscriptions and the Old Testament* (Engl. transl.); EVETTS, *New Light on the*

It is not quite clear to my mind why Weidner has added such a long treatise (pp. 212–66) on "A Brief System of General Biblical Hermeneutics;" its compass is entirely out of harmony with the other portions of his subject, some of them so scantily treated.[3]

A number of typographical errors are to be corrected (pp. 144, 3, no. 4; 172, l. 16; 173, l. 5; 187, l. 12; 199, l. 6 from below; 209, no. 7, etc.).

W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE OLD TESTAMENT. *The Canon.* By W. H. GREEN, D.D., LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. xvii + 209. $1.50.

DR. GREEN is a theologian, a scholar, and a writer of acknowledged merit. He is also an uncompromising advocate of views

Bible and the Holy Land (New York, no date), should be added to p. 158, no. 8.—P. 171, ll. 8 ff., we miss such names as Reuss, Graf, Vatke, DeWette, certainly of equal importance with those mentioned.—P. 177, 2, read Cornill; his *Introduction* appeared in third and fourth edition some years ago; of DRIVER'S *Introduction* a sixth edition appeared in 1897; of STRACK, a fifth, Jan., 1898; of WRIGHT'S *Introduction* a second in 1895.—Pp. 178–9, no. 3, we should note as a serious omission JÜLICHER'S *Neutestamentl. Einleitung* (1894); GODET, *Introduction to the New Testament* (1894–), and ZAHN'S *Einleitung in das Neue Testament* (2 vols., 1897, 1898); WEISS' *Introduction* (German original) was published in a third edition in 1897; no. 4, 1, Buhl's first name is Fran*ts;* p. 180, no. 12, reference should be made to ZAHN, *Forschungen zur Gesch. des neutestamentl. Kanons* (5 vols.), and to Harnack's great work (1893–); WELLHAUSEN'S *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (6 Hefte) and his *Prolegomena* (third edition) should be added on p. 180, 5*a;* why no mention of T. W. Chambers' contributions on p. 181?—Pp. 201–2, no. 1, attention should be called to Haupt's edition of the *Sacred Books of the Old Testament in Hebrew*, and the English translation, as well as to Ginsburg's edition of the text and his introduction; no. 3, add Lagarde's edition of the Septuagint and his other contributions to the same subject, as well as those of Nestle, and especially Field's edition of ORIGEN'S *Hexapla* (2 vols.).

[3] Pp. 273–4 every student will miss the *Expositor's Bible*, a most important commentary in English on the Old and New Testaments. P. 275, 2, we should certainly expect mention of both the *Handkommentar zum Alten Testament* (herausgeg. v. W. NOWACK), as well as the *Kurze Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament* (herausgeg. v. K. MARTI), to say nothing of HITZIG'S *Exegetisches Handbuch zum Alten Testament* (in its latest editions), that standard series. In the list of commentaries on the whole of the New Testament we again miss the HOLTZMANN-SCHMIEDEL *Handkommentar*, and a reference to the German edition of MEYER'S *Critical and Exegetical Commentary*, which in its latest editions is an entirely new work, greatly to be commended. A great deal more could be said of these lists published on pp. 273–84, but we refrain.

respecting the Bible which are, rightly or wrongly, frequently associated with defective learning in biblical matters. Dr. Green, as his grammars and other works testify, is beyond suspicion in the matter of biblical, and especially Old Testament, scholarship. In the works of Briggs, Ryle, and Wildeboer the canon of the Old Testament has been ably dealt with from the point of view of the "higher criticism." It is well that the other side should be represented, and it would be hard to find one more competent to represent it than Dr. Green, who might be called the nestor of Old Testament critics.

It is a pity that the author allows himself to speak unkindly, if not unjustly, of those from whom he differs, and it is a greater pity that he should give place in the opening of the volume to the "History of Introduction" by the late Dr. J. Addison Alexander. Had Dr. Alexander written in 1898, and not in 1843, he would not have described German exegesis as having an infidel character, nor would he have spoken of the general principles of unbelief as taught with great skill and talent by De Wette. Green approves, of course, and he himself gives it to be clearly understood, that the principal factor in the denial of the unity of Isaiah and the literal historicity of Daniel is the disbelief in prediction and in miracles, though he knows well that among the advocates of "critical" views on these points are some of the strongest believers in inspiration and miracles. Taking Isaiah for example, the question is not whether, under divine influence, the prophet of the eighth century B. C. *could* foretell the events of a century and a half later, but whether he *did* utter such predictions. The *data* for determining the question are historical and linguistic, and not doctrinal.

At pp. 10 and 158 our author gives his definition of "canonical" when applied to the Scriptures. "Canonic books," he says, meant in early Christian writings, and means still, "books inspired of God, which were given to the church as her rule of faith and life." This definition is based on what the Westminster Confession says:[1] "The books commonly called apocrypha, not being of divine inspiration, are no part of the canon of Scripture." Assuming the accuracy of this definition, who was it that determined what books were inspired? Was it not the Jewish community, or some of its leaders, in the first instance, and the Christian church, or some of its representatives, in the next place? Was there infallible guidance given, and, if so, where

[1] Chap. 1, § 5.

is the proof, and what was the method of it? If no such guidance is claimed, may we not today reject books reckoned canonical in early times, and accept books excluded? In this last case we are no better off than if we accept the ecclesiastical meaning of "canonical," which is that books so called were judged by the church to be authoritative in matters of faith and practice.

Green accepts as correct the statement of Josephus that the books in the canon were written between the time of Moses and the reign of Artaxerxes I. of Persia, and he adduces with approval the talmudic passage: "After the latter prophets, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, the Holy Spirit departed from Israel."

In order to hold this he has to maintain that every book in the canon was written before, say, 400 B. C. He tries to meet Driver's arguments for the late dates of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ecclesiastes, Esther, and Daniel; but the evidence against him is so clear and unanswerable, and is so varied in kind — historical, religious, philological, and literary — that nearly all scholars at the present day defend the late origin of these books. If, however, these books, or some of them, were written after 400 B. C., the leading contention of the present work falls to the ground. It is unfortunate that Green connects faith in the authority of the Old Testament books with his contentions regarding their date; so I think he is to be understood (see p. 75 and often). But faith in God and his Son Jesus Christ is not conditioned by acceptance of certain literary facts. Thank God, our faith rests not in the wisdom of man, but in the power of God.

The author seems to think that his views of inspiration as applied to the Scriptures were held by Ezra and his contemporaries, and by the early Christians. His definition of "canonical" implies this; but he is certainly wrong, for such views are due to papal ideas of infallibility, and owe their rise to the time of the Reformation.

It is now most commonly believed that the three divisions of the Hebrew Bible — law, prophets, and writings — arose in succession at different periods. Dr. Green, on the other hand, maintains that the arrangement was made at one time and upon one plan. He makes a gallant attempt to meet objections to his view, such as that David ought to be among the prophets, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles among the historical books, etc. But the gradual formation of the canon is certainly more in accordance with the facts, and it can be held in perfect harmony with that faith in the religion of the Bible which Green values so highly; to deny this is to do a great injustice

to the Christian faith, and, from the Christian point of view, to commit a tactical blunder.

The author is often very inexact in his use of terms. On pp. 15 f. he speaks as if "law" meant invariably in the Old Testament the five existing books of Moses. If it does not mean that, his argumentation is worthless; yet he must know that in the Old Testament it has rarely, if at all, that meaning, which, however, in rabbinical Hebrew is the prevailing sense. Indeed, further on, when it suits his purposes, he argues for a vaguer meaning of the word.

On p. 88 the author repeats the orthodox opinion that the Mishna was reduced to writing in its present form by R. Judah the holy. There is no proof of this. On the contrary, in the Talmud, whenever the Mishna is cited, nothing is hinted as to its having been written; the words are quoted as *spoken*. In the various Jewish schools of Palestine and Babylon different men were appointed to commit to memory, and recite when required, the various sections of the Mishna.

Green gives less weight than is due to the divergences among Jews and Christians of the early time as to the extent of the canon. The Old Testament used largely by Christ and his apostles, by New Testament writers, and exclusively by the author of Hebrews, contained the apocrypha, and that uncompromising champion of orthodoxy, Augustine, stoutly defended this enlargement of the Bible. Surely "Sirach" is as worthy of respect and of being considered inspired as "Esther." Is it not significant that Christ ignores, or rather condemns, the teaching in the Levitical parts of the Old Testament, and associates himself with the prophets? If the Old Testament canon were all equally authoritative, why should he make this distinction? Whence were the beliefs about life after death, about demonology, etc., obtained? Not from the Old Testament, but from books excluded from the Old Testament canon in the narrow sense; and yet these views are not condemned by Jesus Christ himself. Paul, in Galatians, shows himself to have been a student of rabbinical teachers, and Jude quotes from the book of Enoch.

Dr. Green's work has, however, great value as containing the best that can be said for traditional views concerning the Old Testament, and there is no denying the ability and force with which he meets his opponents.

T. WITTON DAVIES.

BANGOR,
North Wales, England.

GENERAL INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF HOLY SCRIPTURE; The Principles, Methods, History, and Results of its Several Departments and of the Whole. By CHARLES AUGUSTUS BRIGGS, D.D., Edward Robinson Professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York City. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899. Pp. xxii + 688. $3.

THIS is the author's earlier work, *Biblical Study*, rewritten and greatly enlarged, especially by the introduction of new chapters on the Holy Scriptures as literature and on biblical history. One misses, however, the very valuable list of works on biblical study given in the original volume. The present one is, indeed, a veritable introduction, traversing the whole field of questions raised in respect to the Old and New Testaments, concerning their languages, canons, texts, translations, composition, literary character and form, interpretation, historicity, truthfulness and credibility, and value as a means of grace. These topics are treated quite fully not only according to present knowledge and opinion, but the views of the Jewish and Christian churches concerning them from the earliest times are given. This historical matter is exceedingly valuable. Methods and results of investigation are also abundantly illustrated, and many examples of criticism are introduced. For the best effect as a text-book, however, this work is too voluminous, too rhetorical, and too polemic; yet it is so written that any intelligent person can read it with enjoyment and profit. Like its predecessor, its great object is to vindicate the positions of modern scholarship and to show just what they are. Its scope, however, is far different from an introduction to the books of the Bible. It treats of the writings only as a whole. Attention is paid to their forms, especially to Hebrew poetry. All methods of biblical study, whether textual, literary, historical, exegetical, doctrinal, or practical, are defined.

We turn now to some of the author's views. No one has done more valiant service to, or suffered more for the sake of, biblical truth in this country than Dr. Briggs. Seeing clearly some twenty years ago that the non-Mosaic authorship and the documentary composition of the Pentateuch, and other results of the higher criticism, must be accepted, he has ever striven in receiving these results to show how the Holy Scriptures, as the Word of God, speaking to the moral and religious nature, remain unimpaired. This has led him to be conservative and given him a strong bias for retaining old conceptions of the contents of the Bible. He thus adheres, in many instances, to notions of the

past, and does not accept consequences of critical positions as given by others. This appears especially in this work in views respecting the historical character of the earlier books of the Bible. On p. 539 it is said: "We have to give up the traditional theory of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, but we gain four writers in the place of Moses; *and the history of Moses and the establishment of his covenant gains in strength by the testimony of four witnesses instead of one.*"[1] This statement is difficult to receive. Moses, a cotemporary of the events described, could have furnished real history. The authors of the four documents, living centuries later, are not properly witnesses. Their writings have no historical value such as those of a cotemporary would have. Speaking of "the legends which lie at the basis of the historical books of the Old Testament," our author says: "These are simply highly coloured and richly ornamented stories of *actual events which happenea in the primitive times.* They were handed down from father to son in many generations of popular narrative, passing through many minds and over many tongues, receiving in this way colouring, increment, condensations, changes of many kinds, which do not, however, destroy the essential truth or fact" (p. 335). Thus is retained the traditional notion of the Old Testament containing the history of primitive antiquity preserved by oral transmission. In many instances this is true, but critics usually hold that many stories of early times are imaginary explanations of customs, names, and other historical facts of later periods. Of Gen. 6:1–4 it is remarked: "It is not necessary to deny that there was such *a real union of angels with mankind*" (p. 333). The reliability of the story of the water from the rock (Exod., chap. 17; Numb., chap. 20) is urged on the ground that it is related in two documents (p. 529). Under the topic of the theophanic presence (pp. 542 ff.) the full reliability of the Old Testament narratives of special divine manifestations during the period of the antediluvians, of the patriarchs, of the exodus, and of Elijah and Elisha, is apparently assumed. A "canon" earlier than the time of Josiah is found in the "Ten Words" "given by the theophanic voice of God to Israel on Mount Horeb" (p. 118). Dr. Briggs' position, then, on the historical value of the Old Testament narratives is one of unique conservatism. Like all signers of the Westminster Confession, Dr. Briggs holds that the religious teachings of the Bible are infallible. This, of course, can be done when all parts of the Bible are rectified by the teachings of Christ, his words being their supreme test; but here we are told that the Old

[1] The italics here and elsewhere are ours.

Testament worthies in their discourses and dialogues were "restrained from error in all matters in which they were called to give religious instruction" (p. 337). This view is hard to maintain, and does not seem consistent with the theory of the gradual development of morality and of the indefensibleness of the morality of the Old Testament taught on other pages of this book (pp. 643ff.).

We mention an error: footnote No. 1, on p. 514, should be substituted for the footnote on p. 512.

EDWARD L. CURTIS.

YALE DIVINITY SCHOOL,
New Haven, Conn.

ALTISRAELITISCHE KULTSTÄTTEN (Beiheft III zu *Zeitschrift für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, herausg. v. Bernhard Stade). Von AUG. FREIHERRN VON GALL, Lic. theol. Giessen: J. Ricker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898. Pp. viii + 156. M. 5.

THIS third monograph in an important series is devoted to an interesting theme — the sanctuaries of ancient Israel as evidenced in the Old Testament records. One hundred and six are enumerated and discussed, some few having been omitted as hardly deserving attention. They are classified by localities, the "oak of Moreh," for instance, being discussed under Shechem (pp. 110–16).

The author aims to discuss in reference to each sanctuary the sources of information regarding it, its locality, the history of its use as a sacred place, and other sanctuaries allied to it in situation or in religious usage. Of many sacred sites but little can be said; some identifications made with considerable assurance, as in the case of Elim with its "twelve springs of water and threescore and ten palm trees," are really conjectural. That Hormah (Chormah) and (Mt.) Hermon are sacred places is a mere etymological inference and not absolutely certain.

Where there is really something to be said, the discussion is satisfying. The author has spared no pains in collecting data, and seems familiar with a wide range of literature. He begins by discussing Sinai and Horeb. Both are recognized in Scripture as abodes of God. It is often thought that the two names designate one and the same mountain, E and D preferring the term Horeb, while J and P use Sinai. Von Gall thinks that originally there were two sacred mountains, the true Sinai being located southeast of Edom, while Horeb was doubtless the peak now known as Serbal in the Sinaitic peninsula.

When they became identified in the popular mind cannot be determined.

Beersheba, Hebron, Bethel, Shiloh, and Shechem were notable Hebrew sanctuaries. The question of their origin and the reason for their sacred character are matters of great interest to the Old Testament scholar. On such questions the monograph is least satisfactory, since it assumes without discussion a number of debatable positions. The sacred well of Beersheba was long before the times of the Hebrews the supposed abode of a deity named Isaac, while at Hebron in the sacred grove or tree dwelt a divinity named Abraham, and in the sacred cave of Machpelah dwelt one known as Sarah. Bethel had a sacred stone whose deity was Jacob; Shechem was consecrated to Joseph. That there are other ways of accounting for the connection of the patriarchs with these shrines the writer does not hint.

Despite the meagerness and one-sidedness of the discussions, the pamphlet is of great value as a book of reference. It calls attention to many data, apparently insignificant, and puts them into interesting relation with the main theme. One only regrets that the author did not carry his work to completion. A moderate index would have increased the value of the work. F. K. SANDERS.

YALE UNIVERSITY,
New Haven, Conn.

REICH GOTTES UND MENSCHENSOHN IM BUCHE DANIEL. Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis seines Grundgedankens. Von LIC. DR. JULIUS BOEHMER, Pfarrer in Raben. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachfolger (Geo. Böhme), 1898. Pp. vii + 216. M. 3.60.

BOEHMER writes with the earnestness and conviction of a man who believes he has made a discovery, and is sure that his view is right. That discovery relates to the fundamental thought of the book of Daniel which runs, he thinks, through the entire work, and demonstrates its unity, explains its bi-lingual character, gives mystic meanings to the dates of its various visions, and explains its enigmatical numbers.

After a brief introduction, pp. 11–30 are devoted to a discussion of the date of composition, which is conceded to belong to the reign of Antiochus IV.; pp. 30–55, to the person of the author, who, it is thought, was a scribe, and at the same time a transmitter of real revelations of God. Then follows a sketch of the fundamental thought of Daniel (pp. 56–60). This is stated thus (p. 60):

Der erste Teil des Buches Daniel (Kap. 1–6) weist die Unmöglichkeit nach, dass das Universalreich, wenn es auch bisher so geschienen sei, auf die Dauer den Heiden zugehören könne; auch sei jenes ja nur durch Israels Hilfe und um Israels willen, zur Vorbereitung auf die Zukunft, die Israel allein gehöre, möglich gewesen. Der zweite Teil (Kap. 7–12) zeigt, dass vielmehr Israel in dem längst im himmlischen Hintergrund vorhandenen Menschensohn prädestiniert sei, Träger der Weltherrschaft zu werden, und ein ewiges Königtum Gottes auf Erden zu verwirklichen.

The remainder of the book is devoted to an endeavor to establish this position exegetically. It is held (p. 65) that chap. 1 shows how Daniel the Jew is prepared by his renunciation to take up, through God-given wisdom, the task of managing the heathen rulers of the world and thus of taking the reins of government. Chap. 2 shows how God made Nebuchadnezzar recognize for a moment his sovereignty, but taught him that it would be intrusted to different men only for a little time, until God, having permitted kings of less and less glory to possess it, should himself set up an eternal kingdom (pp. 71–87). Chap. 3, a supplement to chap. 2, shows that the knowledge of the kingdom of God remained only in the background of Nebuchadnezzar's thought, and that God was known to him only through his power. Chap. 4 tells how Nebuchadnezzar learned, through a personal experience, of the heavy justice of God, and of the nature of his kingdom, and was in consequence full of praise and thanks. Chap. 5 relates how Belshazzar failed to recognize the sovereignty of God and lost his kingdom. This is introduced, Boehmer thinks, so that a still greater advance may be made in chap. 6, where Daniel is set over the whole world-kingdom and the authority of Israel's God acknowledged. Thus he holds that these chapters demonstrate that the real power of the kingdom of God — the universal monarchy — was with Israel, even while the heathen appeared to rule. He believes that the formula in 2:37 and 7:14 proves that the kingdom of God and the world-empire are really one, and are not, as most interpreters hold, set in opposition to one another.

As the first part of Daniel on this view demonstrates the real inability of the heathen to rule, so, Boehmer holds, the second part (chaps. 7–12) is devoted to Israel's future and good fortune. This is outlined in chap. 7, the center of the whole book, where the kingdom of God and the Son of Man are especially treated. The kingdom of God — a world-wide dominion — is to be given to Israel (pp. 125 ff., 132). Ignoring the particle of comparison before the term "son of man" (7:13), and comparing the use of the term in Enoch, Boehmer sees

in the expression a reference to the personal Messiah (pp. 189–92). These thoughts, which are presented in broad outline in chap. 7, are worked out in more detail in chaps. 8–12, which present a closer exhibition of the way this future of Israel is to be realized. Boehmer endeavors (pp. 181–7) to identify the "son of man" of 7 : 13 with the owner of the "man's voice" of 8 : 13, the one from whom the "commandment went forth," 9 : 23, and the transcendent person of the vision of 10 : 5, 6. On this view, what he regards as the fundamental thought of the book is to its close worked out in a variety of ways.[1] He scouts Cornill's statement that Daniel is composed in a "Holzschnittmanerei," and declares (p. 207) that it is not only a unity, but a carefully elaborated work, whose thoughts and words must have cost arduous toil, and which is as well planned as the New Testament Apocalypse.

Boehmer's whole structure must be pronounced fanciful and unsound. The kingdom of God cannot be identified with the world-dominion of the heathen, but is, as in all apocalypses, in opposition to it. The "son of man" (7 : 13) is not yet a personal Messiah. His unity of plan in Daniel is obtained by ignoring differences much more obtrusive than the likenesses to which he calls attention. As a learned and thoughtful argument it is interesting, but it is in too great conflict with palpable facts in Daniel, and the analogy of other apocalypses, to be convincing.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE.
Bryn Mawr, Pa.

[1] On some special points the author's views are curiously interesting. He holds (pp. 152 ff.) that the bi-lingual character of the book is due to the fact that those portions of it which exhibit the transitory character of the world-empire of the heathen, and which exhibit in broad outline the glorious destiny of Israel, are purposely written in the Aramaic, so that the heathen could understand them, while the details by which Israel is to realize her destiny are concealed in the sacred Hebrew understood by Israel alone. The dates in the different parts of the book are, he believes (pp. 157 ff.), used as a cipher to express the gradually approaching realization of Israel's hopes. The enigmatical numbers 1150 (8 : 14), 1290, and 1335 of chap. 12, the 3½ times of chaps. 7 and 12, and the broken week of chap. 9, he uses as means of dating by month and day different periods of advance in the introduction of the kingdom (pp. 195–206).

GRAMMAR OF NEW TESTAMENT GREEK. By FRIEDRICH BLASS, Dr.Ph., Dr.Th., LL.D. Translated by Henry St. John Thackeray, M.A. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. vi + 340. $4.50.

THE appearance of this work in an English translation calls not so much for a discussion of its merits in detail — the German original was reviewed by Professor T. D. Seymour in the issue of this JOURNAL for January, 1898 (Vol. II, pp. 155–61) — as for announcement, and the consideration of the question whether it is fitted to displace the works of Buttmann and Winer as a book for the class-room or on the study tables of students. That it will take its place alongside of these volumes in the libraries of those who aim to have all the first-rate tools of New Testament interpretation need hardly be said. Ought it to take the place of them for those who can have but one such book? In number of pages it is considerably smaller than either Buttmann or Winer, having but 340 as against 474 in the former and 848 in the Moulton edition of the latter. This diminution in size is due chiefly to the omission of extended discussion of the views of other grammarians, a gain rather than a loss, since these views have for the most part long ago ceased to be significant, and by substitution of a compact style for a discursive one. The discussion of the forms is quite full enough for practical purposes. The syntax is treated from a decidedly more modern and intelligent point of view, especially in respect to the verb. Such statements, *e. g.*, as that of Winer that "the present participle sometimes, when combined with a preterite, represents the imperfect tense," are not to be found in Blass. On the other hand, in important respects the work is capable of improvement. The treatment of the article is by no means satisfactory. The syntax of the verb, though manifestly an improvement on the older grammars, is as manifestly short of what it should be. How unsatisfactory, for example, is the definition of the aorist tense as denoting "completed action," and of the perfect as expressing "the continuance of a completed action"! Not less disappointing is the inadequate treatment of concessive clauses and of clauses introduced by final particles. In general it must be said of the syntactical treatment that too little use has been made of the results of comparative syntax as set forth in the works of such men as Brugmann and Delbrück, and that too often the author has contented himself with a classification of the functions of a form, with little attempt, apparently, at exact and illuminating definition of the function. To say that it is not the duty of a grammar to do the work of the interpreter

does not meet the case; the interpretation of particular passages is not indeed the grammarian's work, but no function of the syntactician is more important than the clear definition of the various functions of the several forms and constructions. Despite these defects, however, the English translation of Blass is to be recommended as an excellent book, on the whole better adapted than any other to the use of most students. This being the case, it is the more to be regretted that the publishers have seen fit by the expedient of printing it on very heavy paper to make it a large book and put upon it a high price. The paper and the price ought to be reduced by one-half.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE WORTE JESU, mit Berücksichtigung des nachcanonischen jüdischen Schrifttums und der aramäischen Sprache erörtert. Von GUSTAF DALMAN, a. o. Professor der Theologie in Leipzig. Band I, *Einleitung und wichtige Begriffe*, nebst Anhang: *Messianische Texte*.[1] Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. xvi + 320. M. 8.50.

THE author is well known as a specialist in the post-biblical literature of the Jews. In the book before us he attacks the problem of the original form of Jesus' sayings. There are, in fact, two problems. One concerns the teachings of Jesus as he himself uttered them; the other concerns the form in which these teachings first obtained written currency. The answer to one question does not necessarily determine the other. Probably it is now agreed that Jesus spoke Aramaic, which was the language of his province and his age. But this being conceded, it does not necessarily follow that the first written logia were in this language. The literary language of the Jews was Hebrew, even after Aramaic had become the language of common life. The first oral preaching of the apostles was indeed in the current tongue. But as a mediæval writer, even when speaking Italian, could conceive of no literature except in Latin, so the first Christian writers might regard Hebrew as the only fit vehicle for their written account. The words of Jesus in the gospels do show undoubted analogies to the literary forms of the Old Testament. This has been pointed out by Professor Briggs, whose work does not seem to be known to our author.

On the other hand, Hebrew was not the exclusive literary language

[1] For the use of students the *Messianische Texte aus der nachkanonischen Litteratur* are also sold separately (pp. 31; M. 0.50).

of the Jews. Before our era there were Aramaic books in circulation — the Aramaic sections of the Old Testament are sufficient evidence. We have reason to suppose that the earliest gospels were not intentional literary efforts, but rather the record of apostolic tradition as it had already received oral fixation. It would be rather surprising that the first reporters of this oral teaching should feel constrained to translate it into Hebrew. Into the details of the argument we cannot here enter. The position of our author is this: An Aramaic original is incontrovertible for the words of Jesus, but for these alone; this fact, however, implies the right and the duty of inquiring for the exact form of these words, and for the exact sense which in this (Aramaic) form they conveyed to the Jewish hearers.

The plan of the work is easily developed from this intention of the author. After an introduction which discusses the prevalence of Aramaic as the language of the time of Christ, the author takes up the important conceptions of the New Testament. Such conceptions are expressed in the terms "kingdom of heaven," "the coming age," "eternal life," "the son of man," "the Messiah." In regard to each of these the author gives us Jewish usage, as it is illustrated in the apocrypha, the Targums, and the talmudic literature. This usage is then compared with what we find in the New Testament. Critical comparison of the data of the different gospels is often necessary, and there can be no doubt that Jewish usage will often help us to decide the original form of a *logion* which is variously reported.

It has been supposed that the variants in the gospel accounts would enable us to determine the language of the original logia. That would be original which would in translation give both Greek readings. In the near relation of Hebrew and Aramaic, however, it is extremely difficult to find cases that argue positively for one as against the other. The author's discussion shows but two instances where the Greek phrase comes from an Aramaic more naturally than from a Hebrew source. These are both found in the gospel of Mark. Curiously enough we find that some expressions in the gospel of Luke can be more readily accounted for by supposing a Hebrew original. We are tempted to suppose that Mark drew from Aramaic tradition, while among the numerous sources which Luke mentions some were Hebrew accounts of the life of Jesus.

The book contains much interesting material. I may refer to the discussion of the phrase "kingdom of heaven," and also to the treatment of the title "son of man." The latter has occasioned a new

investigation of the subject by Wellhausen,[8] with serious modification of his formerly published theory. The indebtedness of Wellhausen is rather negative than positive, and he now avows that Jesus could not have applied the title to himself either with or without Messianic intention.

The Messianic texts of which a separate edition is announced embrace selections from the Sibylline books, the Psalms of Solomon, Enoch (in translation), Baruch, Fourth Ezra, the *Shmonê Esrê*, and other liturgical texts.

HENRY PRESERVED SMITH.

AMHERST COLLEGE,
Amherst, Mass.

KRITISCH-EXEGETISCHER KOMMENTAR ÜBER DAS NEUE TESTAMENT. Begründet von H. A. W. MEYER. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

ABTHEILUNG I, 1. *Das Matthäus-Evangelium.* Von der 7. Auflage an neu bearbeitet von DR. BERNHARD WEISS. 9. Auflage, 1898. M. 7; bound, M. 8.50.

ABTHEILUNG IV. *Der Brief an die Römer.* Von der 6. Auflage an neu bearbeitet von DR. BERNHARD WEISS. 9. Auflage, 1899. Pp. iv + 614. M. 8; bound, M. 9.50.

ABTHEILUNG VII. *Der Brief an die Galater.* Von der 6. Auflage an neu bearbeitet von DR. FRIEDR. SIEFFERT. 9. Auflage, 1899. Pp. x + 366. M. 5; bound, M. 6.50.

THE second edition of Weiss' revision of Meyer's commentary on the gospel of Matthew (eighth of Meyer), published in 1890, exhibited many striking modifications of the old master's work, in the way of typographical arrangement and excision of material which was either obsolete or more properly belonged to books on dogmatics and the life of Jesus, as well as in a fresh handling of exegetical questions involving the synoptic problem. In Weiss' new and third edition of Meyer we have what is confessedly little more than a reprint of the edition of 1890. He stays his hand from any further pruning, and emphasizes in a new preface his high appreciation of Meyer's rich contributions, not only to linguistic and grammatical interpretation, but especially to the history of the exegesis of this gospel, which often enough is flippantly characterized as mere ballast.

[8] See the sixth part of the *Skizzen und Vorarbeiten* (Berlin, 1899), and the review by Schürer in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, June 10, 1899.

Though three commentaries on the first gospel have been published since his edition of 1890, Weiss finds nothing in either of them to change essentially any of his positions. He criticises Kübel's work, in contrast with Meyer's, as lacking in sound, continuous, and comprehensive exegesis, and as biased by harmonistic, dogmatic, and homiletic interests. Many of the most difficult questions of exegesis, Weiss declares, he quietly ignores. In Nösgen's new edition he finds no improvement either over Kübel or its own earlier form. There reappears the same domination of exegesis by the requirements of an artificial and mechanical harmonistic theory and by dogmatic prepossessions.

To Holtzmann's commentary on the synoptic gospels he accords, by way of contrast to Kübel and Nösgen, the merit of sane and thorough exegesis, besides phenomenal skill in combining with his exegesis the results of synoptic criticism, though of course he dissents from Holtzmann's negative views of gospel tradition. His attempt to combine discussions of literary and historical questions arising from the synoptic problem with detailed exegesis falls under Weiss' censure, however, as seriously diverting the student's attention from the contextual meaning of the evangelist's material and causing him to miss the idiosyncrasies of the latter. It is significant that Dr. Holtzmann himself, in a review of this very commentary of Weiss, virtually admits that the reading public has confirmed this unfavorable opinion concerning his method.

A commentary on Matthew, abreast of contemporary knowledge of the synoptic question, is much needed for the use of English readers. Unless such a commentary is to appear in the "International Critical Series" sooner than now seems likely to be the case, it would be very desirable that the commentary here noticed, uniting as it does the ripest learning of two such eminent representatives of German evangelical scholarship, should be translated into English.

M. D. BUELL.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY.

THE industry and faithfulness with which, by the coöperation of editors and publishers, the commentaries of this series are from time to time revised and kept up to date, is occasion for congratulation on the part of all New Testament scholars. The volume on Romans, as revised by Weiss, belongs in the first rank of modern commentaries on this book. The last preceding edition of it, reckoned as the eighth of Meyer, appeared in 1891. In the present edition account

has been taken of Lipsius' second edition in the "Handkommentar," of the articles of Hilgenfeld in the *Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie*, and of the Sanday-Headlam commentary. There has, however, been no material change either in the positions maintained or in the general character of the work.

The Sieffert edition of Meyer on Galatians appeared first in 1880, was republished in revised form in 1886, and reprinted unchanged in 1894. The present edition, reckoned as the ninth of Meyer, differs from the seventh and eighth of 1886 and 1894, not in any material alteration of the views advocated nor in the general character of the commentary, but in numerous and not unimportant matters of detail. In the introduction the south Galatian — called in Germany the new Galatian — theory, as advocated by Ramsay and Zahn, is discussed and rejected; the arguments of Steck, Loman, and others against the genuineness of the letter are examined and refuted, and the views of Clemen concerning place and time of the letter are discussed. In the commentary proper, consistently with the general method of Meyer himself, account is taken of the views of the expositors who have written on Galatians since the previous edition appeared, notably of Lipsius, Zöckler, Weiss, and Dalmer; additional emphasis has been laid upon the exposition of the course of argument, questions of biblical theology have received fresh attention, and the whole work has been subjected to a careful literary revision. The result is a book which, while true to the general ideas of Meyer, retains very little indeed of the original Meyer. Taken as it stands, it is one of the ablest, perhaps on the whole the ablest, modern commentary on Galatians.

ERNEST D. BURTON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE GOSPEL ACCORDING TO ST. MARK. The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes, and Indices. By HENRY BARCLAY SWETE, D.D., Professor of Divinity and Fellow of Gonville and Caius College, Cambridge. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. cx+412. $3.75.

THE chief feature of this work is its extensive contribution to the linguistic study of the gospel of Mark, and, through that, of the gospel literature in general. With surpassing completeness the author has brought to bear upon this portion of the New Testament the data of

linguistic usage from the Septuagint, Josephus, Philo, contemporaneous Greek, classical Greek, and later Greek. Vocabulary, etymology, history and development of words, linguistic style—all are exhibited, with references. And not only is the text of Mark fully treated, but the parallel narratives in Matthew and Luke are constantly noted and discussed in their variations from the Mark form.

The text which forms the basis of the commentary is that of Westcott and Hort, except for a few bracketed modifications which seemed necessary. In conjunction with this appears a copious critical apparatus, simplified from Tischendorf's eighth major edition, revised and supplemented by the readings of the Sinaitic Syriac, and by other textual evidence recently acquired.

The interpretation of the gospel is of the minute sort, dealing with details briefly and incompletely. There is no attempt at comprehensive views or treatment of the history, no consideration of its philosophy, no presentation of the biblical theology of the book. For example, the comment on the term "son of man" consists of just four sentences, p. 35; and the number is the same for the term "kingdom of heaven," p. 13; but some references are given to recent discussions of the terms. There are many concise archæological notes. The variations of reading in the important English versions are often stated, and patristic interpretation is frequently given by citation and references. Modern interpretation also is regularly noted, but fragmentarily. The pages give one the impression of being packed with references to the linguistic, grammatical, exegetical, literary, historical, and theological treatises on the New Testament.

The introduction to the commentary, extending over 110 pages, contains valuable material. It has, perhaps, the best account of Mark himself and the fullest report of the history of the second gospel in the early church. Here also is an exhaustive study of the vocabulary, grammar, and style of the gospel; an examination of its contents, plan, and sources singly and relatively to the other synoptics; an exhibit of the Old Testament quotations found in Mark; a detailed account of the witnesses to the text, and a long discussion of the ending of the gospel. Two sections go beyond the ordinary limits of introduction, that on the external conditions of the life of Christ as depicted by Mark, and that on Mark's conception of the person and office of our Lord. It had been Dr. Swete's intention to "discuss in additional notes and dissertations some of the points raised by this gospel which seemed to require fuller investigation" (p. v). But the limits of the

work were already reached, and the hope is held out that a future volume may give this further material.

The mechanical features and appearance of the commentary are exactly those of the Lightfoot and Westcott commentaries on the Pauline and general epistles respectively. It will be recalled that Drs. Hort, Lightfoot, and Westcott at one time partitioned among themselves the New Testament for the purpose of writing commentaries on the whole. To Dr. Hort were assigned the gospels, and unfortunately he was the only one of the trio who did not accomplish some part of this plan. It was of course too great an undertaking for any one person. Dr. Swete has made a worthy beginning; may others carry forward this vitally important work.

The painstaking and prodigious labor which has been put into this commentary on Mark, its accurate and devoted scholarship, its sense of the present need and opportunity, have combined to produce a book to which every thorough student of the New Testament will be indebted for a generation to come. It does not supersede other commentaries on this gospel, but it supplements them in an indispensable way.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE PARALLELEN IN DEN WORTEN JESU BEI JOHANNES UND MATTHAEUS. Von A. SCHLATTER. (="Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," Vol. II, Heft. 5.) Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898. Pp. 72. M. 1.

PROFESSOR SCHLATTER'S pamphlet aims to show the fundamental agreement between Christ's teachings in the synoptists and in John. Of the synoptists Matthew is chosen as the basis for comparison, because his gospel contains the largest number of discourses. About one hundred alleged parallels are discussed. Some are parallels in phraseology or figure, *e. g.*, John 3 : 29 = Matt. 9 : 15; John 4 : 35 = Matt. 9 : 37. Some concern more fundamental conceptions, *e. g.*, John 5 : 22 = Matt. 7 : 23; 25 : 12; John 7 : 28, 29 and 8 : 19 and 17 : 3, 25 = Matt. 11 : 27.

Apart from these and similar well-known instances, there is a large number of parallels given which are not at all conclusive. When John 5 : 17 ff. and Matt. 12 : 8 are paralleled on the supposition that Son of God and Son of Man are both conceptions of Christ's Messianic self-consciousness and, since one can have but a single self-consciousness,

therefore the terms must be equivalent, such an application of psychology to exegesis is somewhat startling. John 6 : 50, which tells the believer that he will not die, is made parallel to Matt. 16 : 18, which exhibits the church as escaped from death and destined to enjoy the resurrection life.

John 15 : 5 = Matt. 24 : 48. Both passages are warnings against a false independence of Christ.

These instances fairly illustrate much of the author's exegesis, by which he seems able to make his parallels meet only after running them out into the infinity of general religious truth.

KEMPER FULLERTON.

LANE THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Cincinnati, O.

DIE JOHANNEISCHE ANSCHAUUNG VOM LEBEN, mit Berücksichtigung ihrer Vorgeschichte, untersucht von ERICH VON SCHRENCK. Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1898. Pp. vi + 189. M. 3.

THIS monograph has the merit of being clearly a contribution to the subject with which it deals. The correlative conceptions of life and death in the Johannine thought have proved a fruitful field for many students, but this is the first published attempt to trace possible antecedents of these conceptions historically, with any degree of completeness. One could wish, however, for this very reason, that the work had been much more exhaustive in the studies upon the previous history of the Johannine ideas. The treatment of Greek thought is limited to one or two meager references, while the study of Philo is, as acknowledged in the preface, second-hand, and, it must be said, by no means complete. If anywhere in previous writings outside the New Testament one can discover clear approaches to the thought of John, it is unquestionably in Philo, Teichmüller's claim of a direct descent of the Johannine thought from Aristotle notwithstanding. Hence first-hand and more thorough work with Philo was desirable in such a publication. It is true that the author, for self-protection, deprecates at the outset any intention of exhaustiveness in this part of his task, but the demand for exhaustiveness seems none the less reasonable.

The latter portion of the work, dealing with the Johannine thought itself, is tolerably full, and the discussion is in the main frank, though theological predispositions at times seem to affect the treatment. An example is to be found in the vital position assigned to baptism. On

the whole, however, the work is an interesting and thankworthy presentation of a subject always attractive from whatever side approached, and by no means unpractical.

EDGAR D. VARNEY.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

COMMENTAIRE SUR LES ACTES DES APÔTRES. Par ED. BARDE, Professeur à l'École de Théologie de la Société évangélique à Genève. Lausanne: Bridel & C^ie^, 1898. Pp. 592. Fr. 12.

THE author states that in the French language there is no "special and complete" commentary on the book of Acts, and it is this lack which he undertakes to supply. His aim seems to have been: (1) to defend the traditional conception of Acts, (2) to give a general exposition of the book passage by passage, (3) to emphasize the transcendent and religious features of the history.

The most conspicuous characteristic of the work is its constant statement of critical views, with attempted refutation. His ever-present antagonist is Zeller, and H. J. Holtzmann is a close second. His chief associates in the defense are Baumgarten and Godet. The first pair are never right in their interpretation of Acts; the second pair are never wrong. He refers occasionally to the works of Renan, Weizsäcker, Wendt, Pfleiderer, and McGiffert, of the modern critical school, but his main engagement is with the old Tübingen foes. Calvin, for national reasons, is often quoted. Some of the foremost scholars in Germany and England are not referred to.

As a matter of fact, Professor Barde does not see or feel historical and literary difficulties in Acts. Criticism is to him entirely unnecessary and harmful. The innocent confidence which he has in the Acts narrative, and the facility with which he removes all problems in the history, should comfort and reassure the advocates of the traditional view of the book. The purpose of the Acts, as he understands it, was simply and solely to record the continued work of Christ by the Holy Spirit through the apostles, and the fulfilment of his last command (Acts 1:8). He finds no apologetic purpose in the book, no conciliatory purpose or smoothing-over process, no undue authority or significance of Peter or other Jerusalem apostles in the history, no historical inconsistencies with the Pauline epistles, no difficulties in the speeches, the miracles, the angel-narratives, the visions; in short, there are no perplexing features, no problems. All these questions which

have been raised are the faithless imaginings of irreligious critics, who are bent on tearing away the foundations of the Christian religion.

The author regards it as incontestable that the book of Acts was written by Luke, and at the time to which the final verse of the book brings us; the work was not finished, but interrupted by the outbreak of the Neronian persecution. The material of the book was derived, in the main orally, from his own knowledge and from Paul for chaps. 13–28, and from Peter, Barnabas, Philip, and Mark for chaps. 1–12. He had some written accounts of the earlier speeches. The source theories—he cites Spitta's and Clemen's—are pronounced microscopic, artificial, and undeserving of consideration. The chief and all-sufficient source of Luke's work was the Holy Spirit, which makes these critical inquiries impertinent.

The problem of the text of Acts is readily solved by adopting in general the text of the modern editors, which is treated, however, with some independence. The "Western text" receives some attention—the "we-passage" at 11:27, 28 is viewed favorably, but otherwise the Western readings are rejected. His decisions as to readings are generally good; sometimes questionable, as on 11:20; 20:28.

The scheme of chronology which Professor Barde uses for the history is an uncritical one: crucifixion in 33, conversion of Paul in 37, first missionary journey in 45–7, Jerusalem conference in 50, Paul's arrest in 58. There is no discussion of the dates, and no mention of Paul or other apostles after the point at which the book of Acts closes. He finds no discrepancies of any kind between Acts, chaps. 9 and 15, and Gal., chaps. 1 and 2. He adheres to the north-Galatian hypothesis.

Conspicuously absent from the book is any discussion or description of the teaching of the apostles doctrinally viewed; of the institutions of Christianity, baptism, the Lord's Supper, Sabbath and Sunday observance, public worship; of the organization of the Christians, officers and discipline. That is, Professor Barde gives no comprehensive, unifying picture of primitive Christianity. He makes no attempt, either, to read between the lines of the Acts narrative, or to compare the other New Testament literature in detail. He deals with the matter easily, disconnectedly, and superficially.

The book is more attractive for reading than commentaries usually are. The material is not divided up in the usual fashion, and no text is given. Instead, the chapter and verse numbers only appear, and one reads right along as though the work were a history. There are

some notes, but not many. The pages are frequently disfigured with wrong spelling, and wrong accents and breathings upon the Greek words and phrases; errors appear also in the occasional Hebrew.

Professor Barde's book is an excellent commentary on Acts for popular, uncritical use, and will undoubtedly perform an excellent service for French-using people. It is earnest, devout, and positive, with more scholarship in it than usually falls to the lot of popular books on the Bible. Scientifically judged, it has unfortunate limitations which withhold it from a place among works of first rank. It does not belong in the same class with Wendt's new commentary on Acts.

C. W. VOTAW.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

PAUL THE MAN, THE MISSIONARY, AND THE TEACHER. By ORELLO CONE, D.D., author of *Gospel Criticism and Historical Christianity*, *The Gospel and its Earliest Interpretations*, etc. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898. Pp. xii + 475. $2.

DR. CONE in the present volume has given professional students a book that deserves serious consideration. It is gratifying to find that it is written from the point of view of the modern historian, and is characterized by patient and exhaustive study. It is, of course, to a considerable degree dependent upon Weizsäcker, but at the same time is marked by a gratifying originality in thought and conclusion. Its general critical position is to be seen in its distrust of Acts and its insistence that Paul's gospel is not that of the original apostles. As regards both these positions, we feel serious doubts. After all allowance is made for the true character of the book of Acts, an exhaustive criticism will be far less likely to discredit the component elements of the book than is Dr. Cone's. Nor is it by any means clear that the fundamentals of Paul are not those of the original church. Both alike believe that Jesus was the Christ, that he was to come to establish a kingdom of God, and that it was the duty of all to prepare for that coming kingdom. The great difference between the Jerusalem group and the Pauline group of Christians consisted in that the former believed that this preparation was to be through law, while Paul held that it was to be by the indwelling Spirit. But it is a far cry from this difference to a different gospel. And why, in the light of statements on p. 81 as to the need of the Jewish element in Paul's Gentile mission, should Dr. Cone be so hostile to Acts?

The volume as a whole is not strictly a biography, but rather a

study of the doctrine or teaching of Paul. The first portion, which deals with Paul as a man, lacks in human touch. Paul is hardly more than a name, a thought, while in the discussion of Paul's journeys Dr. Cone has omitted reference to the work of Ramsay, and practically is oblivious to the entire question as to Galatia. At the same time his treatment of Pauline thought, though too often unsympathetic, at points is admirable, and, while we should be tempted to dissent most strongly from some of the conclusions which Dr. Cone has reached from his data, we are glad to recognize the completeness with which his material has been gathered. Had the book been written with a little more historical imagination, or had it been frankly called the Teaching of Paul, it would have gained in effectiveness. As it is, it is a book to be studied by every man who wishes to understand Paulinism.

SHAILER MATHEWS.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

KOMMENTAR ZUM ERSTEN BRIEFE DES APOSTELS PAULUS AN DIE THESSALONICHER. Von DR. ADOLPH JOHANNES. Dillingen, a. D.: Verlag von Paul Tabor, 1898. Pp. x + 357. M. 6.

IT is not necessary that a commentary on 1 Thessalonians should take a conservative or a radical view of the questions involved. For some of the most judicious among the critical commentators still class this with the four great epistles, Philippians, and Philemon as a genuine Pauline epistle. But it is necessary that any commentator seriously consider the grave questions out of which doubt of the epistle has arisen, and have some sense of the comparative value of arguments *pro* and *con*. It is not the position, but the adequacy, of the commentary that is open to criticism.

There are two of these main questions: first, the relation of this epistle to the account of the founding of the church in the Acts of the apostles; and, second, the authenticity of the epistle. To the first there is only one answer; the differences between this epistle and the account in the Acts are quite irreconcilable. The contradictions between the letter and Acts, too familiar to require detailed mention here, are stated in this commentary without any sufficient explanation, and yet no attention is drawn to the bearing that they have on the relation of the Acts to the epistle.

The second question, as to the Pauline authorship, is one about which it is impossible to speak so decisively. There is very much of the Pauline flavor, style, and personnel about the epistle. The

difficulty is with the doctrine. It must be remembered that the church at Thessalonica was founded during the so-called second missionary journey, and that the controversy between Paul and the Jewish party in the church began during the interval between the first and second journeys. It is impossible to suppose that the church at Thessalonica was outside the sphere of this controversy, and yet there is no trace of it, nor of the distinctive Pauline doctrine which grew out of it, in the epistle. The doctrine is a reproduction, line for line, of the teaching of the Twelve in the period immediately following the ascension. The epistle belongs, therefore, doctrinally, with the discourses in the early part of the Acts, and not with the Pauline epistles. It must be remembered that there is no undoubted Pauline epistle which is not stamped with this peculiar doctrine, and that St. Paul styles this peculiar teaching his gospel, meaning that that contains within itself his conception of Christ's work, which he preached everywhere. It is not a light matter, therefore, to find an epistle supposed to be Pauline without that Pauline stamp; and yet this difficulty is treated as a matter of no consequence in the commentary.

It is another instance of the inconsiderate conservatism of this commentary that it treats the only other controversial matter in the epistle with no discernment of the real point. The writer speaks of the exaggerated and unjustifiable expectation of the nearness of our Lord's coming entertained by the Thessalonians. They would be justified, he thinks, in expecting that return during their lifetime as a possible thing, but not at all as a certain thing, whereas everything in the epistle itself and in St. Paul's ordinary teaching goes to show that he was not sure that it would take place within his lifetime, but was sure that it would take place within the life of that generation.

The commentary has a good deal of a certain kind of erudition which is available for the use of other people in both introduction and exegesis, but the author himself furnishes little that is valuable in either department.

E. P. GOULD.
BROOKLYN, N. Y.

ANECDOTA OXONIENSIA. Classical Series, Part VIII. *The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchæus and of Timothy and Aquila.* Edited, with Prolegomena and Facsimiles, by FRED. C. CONYBEARE, M.A. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1898. Pp. lix + 104. 7s. 6d.

THIS is the promised edition of the "new second-century Christian dialogue" (under a safer name), which was already known through an

Armenian version published at San Lazaro, and more widely through the English translation of the Armenian which Mr. Conybeare published in *The Expositor* for April and June, 1897. The Greek text is now critically edited from a twelfth-century manuscript in Vienna, and along with it appears another similar work, the *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila*, edited from a Vatican manuscript which Stevenson's catalogue dates also in the twelfth century. This second document forms the appendix to the book before us. It has an independent interest on account of the peculiar form of some of its New Testament citations, and because of its apparent literary connection with Epiphanius' treatise, *περὶ μέτρων καὶ σταθμῶν*. But the reason for publishing it here is its resemblance to the *Dialogue of Athanasius and Zacchæus*, which is so close as to make the theory of independent origin impossible.

These two dialogues belong to a somewhat large class of apologies, beginning in the second century and continuing through the Middle Ages. In form they are question and answer, statement and counter-statement, put into the mouths of a Christian and a Jew, who pose as champions of their respective faiths. The line of argument, alike in all, is from fulfilled Messianic prophecy. Often the Jew is hardly more than a foil for his antagonist's argument to strike against. Occasionally, as in both the cases before us, he frankly admits his defeat and accepts the Christian faith. This form of apology is so common that the first question with reference to a new specimen of the species is, What is its date? If it be not early, it can have little interest or value.

In the present instance the first dialogue demands attention because of the very early date assigned to it by Mr. Conybeare in *The Expositor*. He observed that it contained references to the destruction of Jerusalem under Hadrian, represented as recent. He noticed that the argument from prophecy was handled in a way similar to that employed by Justin in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. He found other resemblances to Justin in style, general treatment of the subject, and Christology. For these and other reasons he concluded that the newly discovered dialogue was written in the second century. Moreover, a comparison with Tertullian's *Adversus Judæos*, with the *Altercatio Simonis et Theophili* of Evagrius, and with one or two still later works dependent upon these, led Mr. Conybeare to carry out a little further a theory propounded by Harnack in 1883 (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. I, p. 3), and to maintain that this new work is nothing less than a version of the long-lost *Antilogia of Jason and Papiscus*, attributed to

Aristo of Pella, and now, "in part at least," recovered. (Incidentally it may be remarked that our editor rejects the commonly received opinion that Aristo was the author of the *Antilogia*.)

But it is surprising that an apology of the second century should omit all reference to the stock charges against the Christians, which recur so often in other writings of that period; that it should be silent concerning the demoniacal counterfeits of Christian facts, with which profane history was held to abound; that there should be nothing said about the second advent or the thousand-years' reign of Christ, of which Justin and others made so much; and, finally, that the great error of the day, gnosticism, should receive no attention whatever. This last omission is particularly striking, for a contemporary of Justin could hardly have failed to indicate some acquaintance with the gnostic doctrine of sexual polarity in § 10 of *Athanasius and Zacchæus*, where a statement of the Christian about personal distinctions in the Godhead leads the Jew to ask: "Is Christ, then, a goddess?" The reply is: "Do not, like a Jew (!), suppose that 'male' and 'female' can be predicated of incorporeal, as they can of corporeal beings." The *Altercatio Simonis* has the same expression, "loqueris quasi Judæus." But would not a second-century writer have said: "like a follower of Valentinus"?

There are, however, several positive considerations which tell against the theory of an early date for the *Athanasius and Zacchæus* in its present form, and make it necessary for us to place it in the fourth century. Such are the references to "the gospels" as a body of collected writings to which an authoritative appeal may be taken (§§ 64, 71, 75); the casual employment of the phrase "Old Testament" instead of "Scriptures," which is what we should expect (§ 37; *cf. Timothy and Aquila*, fol. 93 r.); the further anachronism of describing Jerusalem as a μοναζόντων οἰκητήριον (§ 70), which is not relieved by the irrelevant citations from Justin (*Apol.*, 1, 15, and 29) and Tertullian (*De Cult. Fem.*, II, 9) in the notes; the description of the contents of the book of Jeremiah (§ 25), which finds its precise counterpart in the real Athanasius' thirty-ninth *Festal Epistle;* and, lastly, the employment of doctrinal terms belonging more appropriately to the Nicene age than to the second century (§§ 9, 20 f., 98).

Mr. Conybeare's theory regarding the original document, upon which our two dialogues are based, is briefly this: The common basis was the lost *Dialogue of Jason and Papiscus*. From this were constructed, probably by an Egyptian in Alexandria, the two dialogues

from which our recensions come. The text was submitted to interpolations and revisions of a dogmatic character, to harmonize it with the teaching of a later time. Our recension of *Athanasius and Zacchæus* was made about 300 A. D., in the school of Lucian the Martyr (who, by the way, appears on p. xlvii as "Lucius"). The *Dialogue of Timothy and Aquila* is an independent recension of the same original. This hypothesis is sufficiently safeguarded to make it difficult to contradict, but it is equally difficult to prove, or even to render highly probable. The editor has wisely concluded to take a more conservative position than it seemed likely he would two years ago, and we cheerfully acquiesce in his judgment that, so long as we know so little about the contents of *Papiscus and Jason*, the theory he has broached "must remain a mere surmise" (p. lv). As a "surmise" one can hardly object to it very seriously.

It is a pity that the book contains no index of the Greek words. There are a few misprints in the references. The language is sometimes careless. The learned editor's jaunty way of discussing weighty topics will occasion mild surprise among some readers. So, for example, in the following passage: "In the East, when a new religion is founded, the descendants and kinsmen of the founder usually preside over the faithful for a few generations," etc. (p. xlii). Is the East, then, such a religion-factory?

J. WINTHROP PLATNER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass.

DIE BRIEFE DES BISCHOFS SYNESIUS VON KYRENE. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Attizismus im IV. und V. Jahrhundert. Von DR. WILHELM FRITZ, Kgl. Gymnasiallehrer in Ansbach. Leipzig: Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, 1898. Pp. iv+230. M. 8.

UNDER this title Dr. Fritz has published studies in the grammar and style of Synesius, as exhibited in his letters, which have secured to the African bishop his position as an Atticist. This has, indeed, been accorded him heretofore, but only on a traditional, not a scientific, basis. The author hopes to follow these studies with a new edition of the letters of Synesius.

The short introduction makes us acquainted, in a concise but satisfying manner, with the life and times of Synesius. The book is divided into three chapters: chap. 1, text and manuscripts; chap. 2, the language of Synesius, (1) etymology, un-Attic forms, (*a*) the noun, (*b*)

the verb; (2) syntax, (*a*) the noun, (*b*) the verb, (*c*) negatives, (*d*) sentence formation, (*e*) prepositions, (*f*) particles; and an excursus on the hiatus; chap. 3, special passages.

There have been five printed editions of the letters, the last of which edited by Rudolph Herscher, appeared in 1873 and was accompanied by a critical apparatus. This apparatus was, however, meager and defective. For his work Dr. Fritz has used three manuscripts, viz., Parisinus 1039, Monacensis 490, and Monacensis 481, which he describes somewhat at length, laying most weight on the first. Living in troublous times at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth century A. D., Synesius yet found time and desire to cultivate a fine Greek style, and succeeded to such an extent that he has not only been imitated by stylists since, but is the last author considered in the history of Atticism. Some of the letters, which were evidently intended to be handed about among friends, are written with more care than others of a more private character, and yet in all the κοινή shines through, and those tendencies to which even the strictest Atticism could not set bounds, and which have resulted in the Greek of today, may here be recognized. Among such tendencies are: in the realm of the verb, confusion of the aorist and perfect, the imperfect as the universal preterite, the perfect for the present, the pluperfect for the imperfect, and increased use of the periphrastic forms both in the indicative and in the dependent moods; in the realm of prepositions, the increasing frequency of certain ones which absorb the functions of others, which latter finally disappear from use.

In these studies Dr. Fritz has added a stone to that perfect understanding of the Greek language which all students of that beautiful tongue are striving together to build. HAMILTON FORD ALLEN.

LEIPZIG,
Germany.

KYNEWULF, DER BISCHOF UND DICHTER; Untersuchungen über seine Werke und sein Leben. Von DR. MORITZ TRAUTMANN, ord. Professor an der Universität Bonn. Bonn: P. Hanstein's Verlag, 1898. (Heft I of the "Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik.") Pp. viii+123. M. 3.60.

PROFESSOR TRAUTMANN'S study of Kynewulf treats four topics: the works of Kynewulf, the interpretation of the passages containing the runes that spell the author's name, Kynewulf's language, and Kynewulf's life. Under each head is a clear statement of the work and conclusions of previous investigators, followed by the author's opinions and his reasons

for holding them. The whole is clear and in many points conclusive, and is a very valuable monograph.

We possess four poems in which by a peculiar device the name of Kynewulf has been inserted, and it is universally assumed that this is the name of the author. The question whether other Old English works, not signed in this way, could be ascribed to the same writer has been the subject of many investigations, and is treated by Trautmann in the first section of his book. He makes a careful comparison of language and meter, and reaches the conclusion that only the four poems thus signed are certainly his, but that three others are probably so. The argument from language seems to be carried too far; that from meter is much more conclusive, and it is not easy to see how it can be answered.

Part II treats of the runic passages. It must be admitted that new light has been thrown on some parts of these peculiarly difficult passages, but on the whole they still remain obscure. Trautmann's theory that the runes stand always for nouns to which they are initial, but not necessarily for the rune-name itself, gives a chance for a host of conjectures, but takes away the certainty that any one is correct.

Part III is a contribution to the study of the dialect of Kynewulf, but only a contribution. It is yet too early to decide in all cases whether a peculiarity belongs to the dialect of the author or to that of his transcriber, who turned the works into West Saxon.

Most of the fourth part is taken up with arguments to prove the identity of the poet with Kynewulf, bishop of Lindisfarne, who died at an advanced age about A. D. 780. Our author is rather more dogmatic here than the facts warrant; the proofs that he brings, even if accepted without question, show only that Kynewulf the poet was probably an ecclesiastic and may well have lived in the eighth century. The conclusion that he was the same person as the bishop rests on the implied assumption that there was only one ecclesiastic of that name at that date. But against this identification there is no argument at all, and the conclusion may well be accepted, at least provisionally.

If all the "Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik" are as good as Heft I, they will prove a valuable contribution to the study of English.[1]

F. A. BLACKBURN.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

[1] Since writing this review Heft II of the *Beiträge* has been received (Bonn, 1899; pp. 192; M. 4.80), containing four articles on Old English literature, two of which will prove of interest to the readers of Heft I, viz.: TRAUTMANN'S note on "Cynewulf's Runenstellen" (pp. 118–20) and GERHARD MÜRKENS' study on the "Old English Exodus" (pp. 62–117).

THE LIFE OF OUR LORD IN ART. With some Account of the Artistic Treatment of the Life of St. John the Baptist. By ESTELLE M. HURLL, Editor of Mrs. Jameson's *Sacred and Legendary Art.* Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co.; Cambridge: The Riverside Press, 1898. Pp. xxii + 370. $1.

THE author has turned aside from the ordinary field occupied by writers on Christ in art, who give only a few illustrations of each feature of the narrative, and produce parlor-books of more or less beauty and value. She has divided the life of Christ into 114 sections, and has given a complete list of the principal works of art which refer to each, with statements concerning artists and places, with descriptions, and frequently with brief criticisms. There are more than a hundred illustrations reproducing the best pictures and sculptures in which our Lord is set forth. These illustrations vary in excellence from fine photogravure to coarse pen-and-ink work. The indexes are admirable. The book will hold a useful position in the history of Christian art, and, as a book of reference, will largely supersede the well-known books of Lindsay, Jameson, and Farrar.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

LEZIONE DI ARCHEOLOGIA CRISTIANA. Di MARIANO ARMELLINI. Opera postuma. Roma: Tipografia della Pace di Filippo Cuggiani, 1898. Pp. xxix + 653. L. 8.

DEATH has been busy of late years among the Christian archæologists of Rome. In 1894 the greatest of them all, G. B. de Rossi, then two years later Mariano Armellini, and in the past summer Enrico Stevenson and Michele de Rossi, have all been taken. Of the men whose names but a short time since appeared on the title-page of the *Bulletino* and the *Nuovo Bulletino di Archeologia Cristiana* but one remains, Marucchi. This book of Armellini's published posthumously has an interesting introduction by Stevenson, who died before the work appeared.

Posthumous publications rarely increase the esteem in which an author is held, and in this case it cannot be said that the general rule is violated. We have in this volume the lectures delivered for many years to the students in the Roman seminaries and the College of the Propaganda. The editor, Signor Giovanni Asproni, has not altered

the original manuscript, preferring to let the text stand as the author left it, even when it hardly rises above the form of notes.

The work is divided into five parts, of very unequal length and merit. The first treats of early Christianity and the society of the empire. Making all due allowance for the fact that the author was addressing a somewhat immature body of students, and that he had no opportunity to correct his work, it must be said that he shows neither familiarity with the sources nor mastery of his subject. Some acquaintance with his Greek Testament would have saved him such an egregious blunder as (p. 18) the statement that "Luke asserts that the apostle was accompanied to Berea by the flower of the Thessalonican nobility" ("*Luca accena che il Apostolo fu accompagnato a Berea dal fiore della nobilitá Tessalonicense : Hi autem erant nobiliores eorum qui sunt Thessalonicæ*," Act. 17:11). In this case not only has the Vulgate led him astray by its genitive reproducing the Greek genitive of comparison, but other evident misconceptions of the passage are introduced. The evidence from Christian inscriptions is, however, well handled.

The second part devotes 129 pages to a description of the different catacombs, preceded by a short general introduction. The catacombs are described in the order in which they lie along the different roads leading from the city, beginning with the Via Appia and circling around to the Via Latina. This is distinctly the best portion of the volume, and is a decided contribution to the literature of the subject. The same information is to be had elsewhere, but it must be sought in costly and large volumes and the extensive periodical literature. This part will be found the most convenient guide to the catacombs for the student who knows Italian and wishes a more scientific manual than the ordinary guide-book, but who does not care to go into the detailed study of the subject.

The third part treats of art in the catacombs. While it adds practically nothing to previous work, and the lack of illustrations is decidedly felt, it contains good lists of the subjects depicted and carved, and a fair discussion of symbolism from the Catholic point of view.

In the fourth part "disciplina ecclesiastica" is discussed under its various forms of initiation, baptism, confirmation, the eucharist (including the Eastern and Egyptian liturgies), holy oil, ordination, etc., etc. While the author evidently uses the more modern works as his sources, the treatment is unscientific, and of course intensely Roman. An exhaustive and scientific treatise on this subject could hardly have been

expected in such a book, yet we could have hoped for a better handling of the voluminous material than we have here.

Christian epigraphy, with nearly 200 pages, comprises the last division. It opens with a careful introduction on the Roman name, with a study of the names of slaves and freedmen, and in the next two chapters gives the criteria for assigning dates to epitaphs. The writer then goes on to discuss variants from the ordinary epigraphic forms, the Damasene inscriptions, those having historical and dogmatic importance, and finally those which bear on the subject of the orders of the ecclesiastical hierarchy. The work is well done, and is by far the most convenient and accessible treatment of a somewhat obscure but most important subject. Nothing short of the two great volumes of de Rossi equals it, and much new material has appeared since the publication of the first part of the *Inscriptiones Christianæ Urbis Romæ.*

A short biography and a list of the author's publications follow, and an exceptionally full and good index completes the work.

While it cannot be said that this book is a contribution of new materials or treatment to the various subjects discussed in it, it is a convenient manual for students. It is unfortunately marred throughout by a lack of scientific criticism of sources and by looseness of statement. It is perhaps of unusual interest as showing the type of instruction which has been afforded to the pupils of the Propaganda in Rome, and, if not all that could be desired, will probably compare favorably with most text-books — and perhaps courses of lectures — on the general subject.

One cannot read the very warm and almost tender preface and introduction without feeling that the author must have been a very lovable and a deeply religious man. And the lectures themselves show a loving regard for the subjects treated, which, even if it may occasionally blind the critical insight, wins our hearty admiration and sympathy.

WM. WARNER BISHOP.

ROME, ITALY.

THE POST-APOSTOLIC AGE. By LUCIUS WATERMAN, D.D. With an Introduction by Bishop Henry Codman Potter, D.D., LL.D. (= Vol. II of "Ten Epochs of Church History," edited by John Fulton.) New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1898. Pp. xviii + 1505. $2.

THE establishment of the historic episcopate is the definite end that Dr. Waterman has in view from the beginning. The author's

interest is conspicuous in the preface, in all the intervening pages, and in the conclusion. Evidently he is not fully conscious of how firmly he is set for the maintenance of his thesis.

Bishop Potter finds the book very much to his liking, and in his introduction says: "An element in the present situation which makes such a work as this a timely one is the emancipation of scholarship from the domination of mere ecclesiasticism." We must not, therefore, imagine that we are about to read a history. We are rather to read another contribution to one side of a question that has divided earnest and able scholars for many centuries. Having made up our minds, then, that we are to hear an advocate who will do the best that in him lies for his side, we shall be much interested. Dr. Waterman is entirely sincere, genial, persuasive, and fair—remembering always that he is an advocate. Now, the one who wants a good, popular presentation of the Episcopalian side of the question will find satisfaction in this volume. And what large-minded Christian today does not want to know the best arguments that all communions have to offer for their existence?

The book closes with the following sentences: "Yet, whatever the faults, the failures, the mistakes of the church of Christ may be, it is always his mystical body here on earth, deeply one with the Savior himself, one with the great church of the heavenly paradise, and instinct with the heavenly life, which is the leaven that changes the character of the world. The more the believer studies the history of that wonderful church, even in its worst days, the more reason he will have to be thankful for the coming into this world's low life of Jesus Christ who *is* our life."

In literary style and cogency of argument this book will suffer by comparison with Allen's *Christian Institutions* and Bright's *Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life*, both of which are written from the same point of view as *The Post-Apostolic Age*.

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SOME ASPECTS OF PRIMITIVE CHURCH LIFE. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, D.D. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898. Pp. vii + 268. $1.75.

DR. BRIGHT is Regius professor of ecclesiastical history in Oxford, and the five addresses contained in this volume were originally delivered at a "summer meeting of clergy." A history of the primitive

church is not attempted; only "certain aspects" of that history are brought under review. Some of these "aspects" are of interest to Christians in general, and some are of almost exclusive interest to members of the Church of England, since they raise questions over which churchmen themselves are sharply divided. The addresses which treat of the characteristic excellencies of the Christian life in primitive times in contrast with "the huge encircling masses of non-Christian social life," of the persecution and martyrdom to which the saints were subjected under "mob fury" and under governmental sanction, of the early apologists and the defects and special merits of their apologies, will commend themselves to the Christian public as fresh and learned dissertations on matters unfolded more or less fully in general histories of the Christian church. But the first and second addresses and part of the third, which discuss the external and visible church, the apostolate, the episcopate, the rank and functions of the laity, the sacramental principles involved in baptism, confirmation, and the eucharist, will elicit criticism from churchmen not members of Dr. Bright's school or party scarcely less emphatic than from Nonconformists themselves. Until such leaders as Lightfoot, Hatch, Moberly, Hort, Bright, and others can give less conflicting accounts of the inception of the institutions of their "church by law established," and of the historic grounds on which these institutions rest and are to be vindicated, some doubt of their divine origin will still linger in non-Episcopal minds. In the meantime, every candid and thoughtful study of the early records, like that now under review, will help to bring "some aspect of primitive church life" into greater clearness, and thus contribute to the final discovery of the exact truth. The day when Christians will see eye to eye concerning the organization and government of the church, its officers and their functions, its ordinances and their meaning and uses, may be far distant, but every fresh study of the original documents will help to hasten that day.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

ENTHUSIASMUS UND BUSSGEWALT BEIM GRIECHISCHEN MÖNCHTUM. Eine Studie zu Symeon dem neuen Theologen. Von LIC. DR. KARL HOLL, Privatdozent in Berlin. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung. Pp. vi + 332. M. 10.

THIS is a book to be cordially welcomed by scholars. Ever since Ritschl published his *Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche* there has

been no cessation of interest in the study of the problem there propounded, namely: How did the Catholic church develop out of primitive Christianity? An important part of the investigation has been to trace the process by which regularly appointed officers came to replace the recipients of "spiritual gifts," as leaders of the church, for this better than almost anything else illustrates the far-reaching character of the change which came over Christianity during the latter half of the second century. Bonwetsch contributed much to the proper understanding of this change in his *Geschichte des Montanismus*. The recovery of the *Didache* directed especial attention to the rôle played by the "prophets" in the early church, which was already winning fuller recognition with our advancing knowledge of the value of Hermas' testimony. Fresh light has recently been shed upon the subject by one of the Oxyrhyncus papyri, whose significance was overlooked by the editors, Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt, but which has been brought into notice by Professor Harnack in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy (1898, No. xxxvi). This evidence goes to prove that the "prophets" were the most important "order" of the Christian church in the latter part of the second century.

It has long been known that the bishops finally assumed the teaching function at first exercised by the prophets, and that along with their enlarged duties there went a corresponding enlargement of the dogmatic conception of the episcopate. By virtue of their office the bishops came to be regarded as channels of divine revelation, or, more exactly, divinely authorized interpreters of the revelation already received. But this seemed to cut off the possibility of those special revelations which had been so common in the apostolic age. The divine Spirit could no longer be thought of as working directly upon the Christian believer. This was a great deal to surrender, it is true, but it was part of the price which Christianity paid for that organization without which it could not so well have maintained its existence in the empire or conquered the world.

One question, however, remained to be asked, and that was whether the free spirit of prophecy surrendered without a protest; whether its vitality was not, after all, too great to be thus extinguished. It has usually been thought enough to say that ecstatic prophecy did make its protest in the person of Montanus, but that, when this movement was suppressed, the phenomenon finally disappeared from the Catholic church. This question has, however, been recently approached from a different point of view by Professor A. V. G. Allen, in his book on

Christian Institutions. In advocating his interesting theory that the principal Protestant churches reproduced types of thought which characterized the great monastic orders of the Middle Ages, he bases his argument upon the hypothesis that the monks were themselves in a sense the successors of the early Christian prophets. This idea, which Professor Allen treated incidentally, has now been brought into prominence by a German scholar, Dr. Karl Holl, of Berlin, in the book before us, *Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum.*

The problems treated in this book were suggested to the author's mind in the course of his study of the *Sacra Parallela* of John of Damascus (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. XVI, Pt. 1). In his latest work the text is furnished by an epistle of Symeon, known as "the new theologian," which treats of the power of absolution, and of where it resides. This document has usually, but wrongly, been attributed to John of Damascus. Symeon was a Paphlagonian by birth, a resident at the court of Constantinople in the latter part of the tenth century, when the Byzantine empire was at the height of its splendor. But he grew weary of court life, and, at an early age, sought a more congenial home in a monastery. Here it soon became apparent that the young monk was possessed of the "apostolic gift of the Spirit," and that he received direct revelations from heaven. Never did he officiate at the eucharist, so he tells us, without beholding the Holy Ghost descend before his eyes upon the consecrated elements. The consciousness of being favored with direct communion with Christ took full possession of Symeon's mind, and became the ruling force of his life and thought. By this charismatic gift he tested all things. It supplied him with the criterion for all his theological and ecclesiastical judgments. It underlies the whole argument of his *Epistola de Confessione*, in which he attempts to answer affirmatively the question whether monks who are laymen may pronounce absolution. Symeon himself was not only a monk, but also a priest, yet he argues that the power to bind and to loose depends, not upon ordination, but upon personal character. Monks may rightfully exercise the "power of the keys," because this necessarily follows, in his view, from the possession of a spiritual gift. To have that gift is itself evidence of personal worth, and no priestly ordination can add anything to the qualification already present. Only persons thus divinely endowed are worthy to absolve others from sin. But it seemed to Symeon that neither bishops nor priests were so well qualified to receive revelations from heaven as were the holy monks, who stood apart from the world,

and were (or should be) engrossed in the contemplation of divine things.

It will be seen that Dr. Holl has used Symeon's letter as the starting-point from which to treat a much larger subject. He has found that ecstasy, or enthusiasm, was not uncommon in the eastern church of the tenth century. He accordingly proceeds to discuss its influence upon penitential discipline, especially when this religious individualism came into conflict with the regular ecclesiastical machinery. He shows that mystic rapture did not rule uninterruptedly in the East, but that the importance which it gained in the time of Symeon was sufficient to produce a new outburst of vigorous life in the fourteenth century, in the Hesychastæ. Their theology was in the main merely "a recapitulation of Symeon's thought." And the controversy which they aroused in the eastern church was, in fact, a renewal, under different conditions, of the old strife over the authority of prophetic revelation, as against the established church order.

The book before us has, then, a threefold value. In the first place, it adds to our knowledge of a comparatively neglected field of patristic literature, by restoring to its rightful author and critically editing a valuable document. In the second place, it makes a solid contribution to the history of monasticism. Lastly, and, in the opinion of the author, most important of all, it shows how the spirit of prophecy survived all the paralyzing tendencies of ecclesiastical organization, and repeatedly asserted its independent divine authority. To quote:

"Der Gegensatz zwischen Amt und Geist ist nicht verschwunden, als sich die festen Formen einer Verfassung in der Kirche herausbildeten. Das Mönchtum hat ihn neu belebt, und die Kirche hat ihn verewigt, indem sie das Mönchtum anerkannte."

It is to be hoped that Dr. Holl will carry out his design of editing the *Life of Symeon* (written by Niketas Stethatos), which he regards as worthy to compare with the famous *Vita Antonii*.

J. WINTHROP PLATNER.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY,
Cambridge, Mass.

THE CHURCH OF THE WEST IN THE MIDDLE AGES. By H. B. WORKMAN, M.A. London: Charles H. Kelley, 1898. Pp. xii + 316. 2s. 6d.

THIS little volume comes in the series of "Books for Bible Students." It is popular and attractive in style, and at the same time as

accurate as a book of its kind could be expected to be. This is only the first volume, which brings the subject from Gregory the Great down to St. Bernard. The second volume will bring it down to the dawn of the Reformation.

In this incomplete form some of the subjects, as monasticism and scholasticism, seem to be estimated too favorably, but all this will be corrected in the further treatment to be given them.

The three parts treat of the rise of the papal supremacy, scholasticism, and monasticism. The work is not very systematic, but is rather like a series of elementary, but very interesting, essays on church history, arranged in chronological order. The one who reads so much as has been given will certainly want to learn more, and Mr. Workman has provided at the beginning of each chapter a well-selected biliography, such as can be found in all libraries of moderate pretensions.

In view of the general accuracy of the work, we were not prepared to see the author, on p. 203, refer to "the fatal millennial year (1000), with its dread of the end of all things, etc.," as if taking it without even a grain of salt. If he had not been nodding here and there when he read Rashdall's *Universities in the Middle Ages*, found in his bibliography on the opposite page, he would not have seemed so credulous as he does in the above quotation.

However, there are not many cases of this kind, and the book is to be heartily recommended to all readers who would like a rapid survey of mediæval church history, and there can be no doubt that the second volume will be eagerly awaited by many readers of the first.

J. W. MONCRIEF.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE LIFE OF SAINT HUGH OF LINCOLN. Translated from the French Carthusian Life and edited with Large Additions. By HERBERT THURSTON, S.J. London: Burns & Oates, Limited; New York, Cincinnati, Chicago: Benziger Bros. Pp. xxvi + 650. 10s. 6d.

THIS biography of a commanding and attractive personality is, for the most part, a translation of the French *Vie de St. Hugues de Lincoln*, which was published by a monk of the Grande Chartreuse in 1890. The name of the English translator does not appear. The editor has allowed himself considerable latitude, and even increased the original material by more than one-third. He has supplemented the information given by the French biographer, principally in those

features of the life which have special bearing upon English history and English institutions.

Father Thurston believes that the authorship of the great Latin life of the saint, commonly known as the *Magna Vita S. Hugonis*, which is the one record of supreme importance, has been correctly assigned to Abbot Adam, the chaplain of the saint, and later abbot of Eynsham. Of the absolute sincerity and truthfulness of this writer he has no doubt. But Father Thurston by no means succeeds in establishing a case of mistaken identity, in answer to the charge that this was the abbot Adam who was deposed from his office "as a prejudiced person and a manifest dilapidator of the goods of the abbey."

To Ruskin's mind St. Hugh of Lincoln is the most beautiful sacerdotal figure known to him in history. Like all Roman Catholic biographies, this work contains numerous tales of dreams, visions, and miracles, which will impress the reader as the products of gross superstition or as evidences of supernatural power, according to his intellectual sympathies and religious convictions. But waiving these extraordinary details, the life introduces us to a singularly pure and heroic character, a man untiring in devotion to his church, fearless before princes and diseases, chivalrous in his defense of the weak and the poor, an honest, earnest, and unselfish soul.

St. Hugh lived between the years 1140 and 1200 A. D. He joined the Carthusian order at twenty-three. He was successively a common monk, a priest, the procurator of the Grande Chartreuse, and abbot of Witham Monastery, England; and was elected bishop of Lincoln in 1186. He remained to the close of his active life a firm believer in asceticism. With the exception of the robes of ceremony which he wore in public as a sign of his dignity, he retained the white habit of his order, and never put off the Carthusian hair-shirt. He was no less faithful to his old penances and mortifications, and spent his vacations in his former monastic cell at Witham. He was tireless in his attentions to the sick, the poor, and the bereaved. In spite of much murmuring and strong opposition, backed by high civil dignitaries, he carried out many radical reformatory measures and corrected many abuses among the clergy. Several times he clashed with Henry II. and with his successor, Richard of the Lion Heart. The story of the conflict between church and state for the supremacy contains a great deal of valuable material for those interested in that memorable contest. St. Hugh was evidently a masterly diplomat and an experienced ecclesiastical lawyer. He was frequently appealed to by all sorts of

plaintiffs, who were confident that the bishop's perspicacity would frustrate the snares of their adversaries, and that his unshaken determination to support the church at all hazards would triumphantly vindicate their rights.

The English origin of pure Gothic architecture is assigned to Hugh of Lincoln. "What Diocletian did at Spoleto for the round arch, St. Hugh did at Lincoln for the pointed arch." The editor's notes on this subject are of real interest, and some useful details are presented which are not easily accessible to the average student. Father Thurston concedes the claim of English authorities that the extraordinary architectural development which marked the period was of spontaneous and native growth. While the enlightenment and energy of the Burgundian bishop gave the necessary stimulus to architectural construction along lines unfamiliar to England, yet the architect and workmen of Lincoln's cathedral were English, and the distinctive beauties of the style which they inaugurated were not copied by them from abroad.

The French biographer tells several stories illustrating the confidence that the kings of France and England had in the power of the monks' prayers. On two occasions terrible storms at sea ceased suddenly, as prayer was offered urging God to look upon the merits and intercession of the monks. This observation follows: "A generation which despises and neglects this means of salvation exposes itself to the danger of a terrible shipwreck." A modern thinker is quoted as saying: "I think that those who pray do more for the world than those who fight; and if it is true that the world is going from bad to worse, it is because there are more battles than prayers."

Father Thurston discusses the subject of miracles at some length. He stoutly maintains that the facts have been, in the main, truthfully reported. Many of the Lord's miracles, he holds, are susceptible of a rationalistic explanation, though, being wrought at the command of him who raised the dead to life, it seems simpler to regard all indifferently as manifestations of his preternatural power. He is inclined to adopt a somewhat similar attitude toward the miracles of the saints in general and of St. Hugh in particular. In arguing for the facts he has recourse to the reports of the Society for Psychical Research and to many medical authorities. He urges "that our Lord's promises to ardent faith seem to point to some necessary causation in the psychic or moral order, preternatural at least in the sense that it overrides physical laws, and that these promises find their adequate realization in Catholic miracles and in Catholic miracles alone." He admits the cures wrought

by scientific experts, but argues that these cures are only "partial, temporary, and gradual," while the cures of Catholic miracles are "complete, permanent, and instantaneous." The limitation of cures to certain classes of diseases seems to stagger him somewhat, but, he says, "we cannot fathom the mysteries of His wisdom."

ALFRED WESLEY WISHART.

TRENTON, N. J.

FÜRSTBISCHOF MARTIN BRENNER: Ein Characterbild aus der steirischen Reformations-Geschichte. Von DR. LEOPOLD SCHUSTER, Fürstbischof von Seckau. Mit dem Porträte Brenners und einer Karte von Steiermark. Graz und Leipzig: Verlag von Ulrich Mosers Buchhandlung (J. Meyerhoff), 1898. Pp. xvi + 912 and 16. M. 14.

THE author of this copious and well-written biography entered upon his task while filling a professorial chair in the university of Graz, whence he was called to the episcopal throne of Seckau in 1894. He was led to choose Martin Brenner as a subject for local research, because he was the most noted of the early prèlates of this diocese, and because his life had never been exhaustively studied. The position that Brenner occupies in the minds of the Roman Catholics of this region is indicated by the cognominations that he bears: "the apostle of Styria," and the "malleus hereticorum."

Dr. Schuster is a thoroughgoing Jesuit in training and in spirit, if not by profession. He is otherwise known in literary circles as the author of a work on Johann Kepler, the Lutheran astronomer, the aim of which is to show that Kepler, whom he declares to have been "a great scholar, a noble character, no Catholic, to be sure, but yet a profoundly believing Christian," was persecuted by his Lutheran brethren, but befriended by the Catholics, especially the Jesuits. This Kepler study professes to be a purely objective performance; but its *Tendenz* is easily discernible. The author aims to show that, so far from deserving the reputation of being the enemy of scientific research, the Catholic church has been far more cordial in its encouragement of science than Protestantism. He also, in the work before us, seeks to show that superstition was far more gross among the Lutherans than among the Catholics, and that its presence in Styria was due to Lutheran influence.

In the introduction we have a historical sketch of the diocese of Seckau and, indeed, of the first introduction of Christianity into

Styria. The diocese of Seckau is an offshoot from that of Salzburg, which, with a change of name, dates from the latter part of the sixth century. The first bishop of Seckau was appointed in 1219, and Martin Brenner occupies the thirty-first place in the episcopal calendar, having been appointed to this position in 1585.

The minutest details regarding the early life of Brenner (b. 1548) are given, so far as materials exist, and the author manages, even in the absence of biographical data, to throw a halo over every period of his life. Of special interest is the account of his studies, first in the Jesuit college at Dillingen (1566–71) and then at Ingolstadt (1571–81, with two short intervals of study in the university of Padua, whither he went as tutor to the sons of a nobleman). The author gives us a most satisfactory account of the personnel of the faculties and the methods of work pursued in these institutions. When Brenner entered the university of Ingolstadt as a well-educated young man of twenty-three, the Jesuits, who had already mastered the Bavarian princes, had secured a predominant influence in the institution, and by reason of their zeal, their pedagogical skill, and their learning were drawing large numbers of students from Bavaria and the neighboring countries and were winning to the enthusiastic support of the counter-Reformation many of the ablest young men of the time. They made a special point of attaching to themselves the sons of noblemen, and no effort was spared in gaining the adherence of the most promising scholars. The marked ability of the Jesuit teachers, their unsurpassed knowledge of human nature, their affability of manners, and their remarkable adaptability to the idiosyncrasies and circumstances of each individual, made them practicably irresistible when once they came into close relations with susceptible youth. Their proselyting zeal led them to go forth into the surrounding regions and by personal effort to win back to the faith those that had become involved in heresy. Whole communities were often reconverted in an incredibly short time. They made the services of the churches in which they ministered as attractive as possible, providing the best music that could be secured and rivaling the best Protestant preachers in the eloquence and the fervor of their sermons. They were able to instill into the minds of those who came under their influence the profoundest hatred of Protestantism in every form and the profoundest love of the Catholic church, and to convince their adherents that the supreme end of life was the destruction of heresy. It is probable that at this period the Jesuit professors, man for man, surpassed the Protestant professors of Germany in learning and in

zeal. Lutheranism was being wrecked and ruined by controversy. The Jesuits made the most of their advantages, and the success of their propaganda was astonishing.

In 1585 Brenner, after a few years of service as counselor to the archbishop of Salzburg, as rector of the seminary for priests, and in other responsible capacities, now fully equipped with the Jesuit learning, methods of propagandism, and zeal for the restoration of church unity, and with practical experience in the administration of ecclesiastical affairs, entered upon his work as bishop of Seckau.

He found his diocese, from the Catholic point of view, in a lamentable state. The great majority of the nobles, burghers, and peasants were Lutherans. Anabaptism, that had been widely disseminated from 1527 onward, had been almost exterminated; but medical missionaries from Moravia frequently gained entrance by their surgical skill into the homes of the people and won them to their heresy. Since the peace of Augsburg (1555) the Protestantism of the Augsburg Confession had been tolerated by the emperors and had covered the Austrian provinces with its influence. The archduke Karl II. of Styria had, a few years before Brenner entered upon his work, felt constrained to grant to his Lutheran nobles freedom of worship (the Bruck Pacification, 1577). The zealous Lutheran nobles had exerted themselves to the utmost to convert their Catholic subjects, or to exclude them from their lands, and Lutheran preachers were violent in their denunciations of the corruptions of the Catholic clergy. Through the prolonged residence at Graz of a papal envoy, and the influence of his wife, the Bavarian princess Marie, mother of the emperor Ferdinand II. (of Thirty-Years'-War fame), reinforced by that of the able and aggressive young bishop and by the exhortations of the pope and of his Jesuitized Bavarian and Austrian kinsmen, the archduke was led to establish at Graz a Jesuit school and to introduce in all of its features the counter-Reformation. The author relates, with entire moral approval and with seeming relish, the history of the withdrawal one by one of all the privileges of the Protestants and of the exterminating measures that were at last employed. After 1592 Brenner was made vicar-general of Styria, and he took a leading part in the movement by which the entire Protestant population of all the Upper Austrian provinces was forcibly converted or driven from the country. The author is concerned to show how persevering, single-minded, and remorseless Brenner was in this terrible work. Ferdinand (afterward emperor) succeeded to the archduchy in 1590. He had been trained in the

principles of Jesuitism and preferred to rule a wilderness rather than a country filled with heretics. Brenner and Ferdinand wrought hand in hand until the death of the latter in 1616. Nothing would have pleased Brenner better than the part taken by Ferdinand in the Thirty-Years' War and the almost complete destruction of Protestantism in the Austrian domains.

The literary activity of Brenner was very considerable, and we are supplied with copious extracts from his writings. But it is as a *malleus hereticorum*, as the great leader of the Jesuit movement for the re-Catholization of Austria, that he deserves to be remembered.

In this large volume I have failed to find a single note of disapproval in respect to the atrocious work of Brenner and Ferdinand. The violation of the Bruck Pacification by the archduke Karl is heartily commended by the author. In this work we see Roman Catholicism as it is, and not as American prelates would have us think it has become. The goal of the Roman Catholic church is today, as it has been for more than a thousand years, universal dominion and the complete subjection of the consciences of all men to the will of the hierarchy. Whatever ministers to this end is not only allowable, but praiseworthy.

In an appendix of sixteen pages the author has reproduced in its original Latin the "Instruction" given by Pope Clement VII., in 1592, to the nuncio Count Hieronymus of Portia, regarding the reëstablishment of the Catholic religion in Styria, Carinthia, and Carniola, and regarding the claims of the people to liberty of conscience, etc. Of the cold-blooded disregard of human rights and moral obligations that dominated the papacy at the time, this document furnishes a striking illustration, and it has the merit of unimpeachable genuineness. The candor with which the pope describes the morals of the Catholic clergy that were so largely responsible for the rise and growth of heresy, and with which the present author reproduces these damaging statements, is surprising. An American prelate would be far from parading the vices of the clergy, even in a sixteenth-century sketch. A few sentences may be quoted in the original:

Primum studium atque adeo prima majorque in tota visitatione difficultas circa Ecclesiasticorum *concubinatum* atque utinam etiam non *putativa matrimonia* versabitur. Paucissimi enim maxime inter minores presbyteros cælibes invenientur. Hoc morbo laborant parochi, laborant monachi et abbates multi, estque is omnium malorum fomes. Offenduntur enim et scandalizantur boni atque mali; nec non monasteriorum ac alia ecclesiastica bona dilapidantur, ut concubinis et liberis de præsenti futuraque

sustentatione quomodocunque provideatur. . . . . Remedia ad mala hæc iam inveterata haud quidem facilia. . . . . At si concubinarii omnes pellendi sint, verendum esset, ne quam paucissimi relinquantur in tota provincia pastores.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Can.

THE ELIZABETHAN CLERGY AND THE SETTLEMENT OF RELIGION 1558–1564. With Illustrative Documents and Lists. By HENRY GEE. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1898. Pp. xx + 326.

WE have here a piece of research work of the highest order. When Elizabeth succeeded Mary, the Anglican church replaced the papal. Mr. Gee sets himself the task of determining how severe were the measures against the clerical adherents of the old religion during the first six years of Elizabeth's reign. English church writers vary in their estimates of the actual numbers of those deprived — "between one hundred and eighty-nine and four hundred." Catholic authorities have insisted, on the other hand, that "the better part of the clergy followed in the footsteps of their prelates." Finding the lists of both Anglicans and Romanists "inaccurate and misleading," Mr. Gee "set to work to discover what there might be in the way of strictly coeval and official sources of information." His conclusion is that the number of clergymen deprived "cannot have greatly exceeded two hundred."

His "research gradually brought to light many facts" regarding the settlement of religion in the opening of Elizabeth's reign, which earlier investigators "had not been in a position to see so clearly." Accordingly, we have in this volume an account, drawn from original sources, of the successive steps by which the Supremacy Act and the Uniformity Act passed through Elizabeth's first parliament, 1559; of the royal visitation of the northern and of the southern province, and of the universities; of the ecclesiastical commissions of 1559 and 1562; of the penal laws of Elizabeth's second parliament, 1563–4; and of the deprived clergy, as the evidence is furnished by the diocesan registers.

At the end of each chapter are the original documents illustrative of the text. Among them are the Supremacy Act, the Uniformity Act, the royal injunctions of 1559, the articles of inquiry, 1559, letters patent directing the northern visitation, the writ of visitation for Cambridge and Eaton, the writ for the issue of the Permanent

Commission, and many others. Appendices contain the names of all clergymen deprived for any reason whatever during the six years 1558–64. The names are copied from extant episcopal registers and other contemporary official documents.

The conclusions reached are that the Court of High Commission does "not appear to have carried out its powers of punishment and deprivation with much rigor;" "no great diligence was used to enforce subscription" by the Royal Visitation Commission; "even the severe penal laws of 1563 were not rigorously pressed;" not many more than two hundred of the entire clergy of England were actually deprived in the six years under review. If one is disposed to dispute these conclusions, he must make his reckoning with the contemporary official records.

ERI B. HULBERT.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

SOCINIANEN EN DOOPSGEZINDEN. Doopsgezinde Historiën uit de jaren 1559–1626. Door W. J. VAN DOUWEN. Leiden: S. C. Van Doesburgh, 1898. Pp. iv+188. Fl. 1.50.

THIS is a contribution to the church history chiefly of certain portions of the Netherlands during the years mentioned. The past contains the germs of the present. Present facts and conditions are the outgrowth of facts and conditions in the far-distant past. The enlightenment and toleration of our age are not isolated, unconnected phenomena, which have sprung up and come to light suddenly, without proper antecedents. They are plants of slow growth that have their roots in the past. They have grown up in the midst of turmoil and conflict. We shall appreciate them better if we know something of the destructive influences and unfavorable circumstances with which these plants have had to struggle. To indicate something of the history of that conflict in which bigotry and intolerance and persecution have gradually yielded to reason and light and toleration is the purpose of this little book.

The history and doctrinal teachings of the Socinians are sympathetically delineated. Standing alone, hunted, persecuted by Romanists and Lutherans and Calvinistic Protestants alike, they turned pathetically in the only direction in which appreciation and the comfort of human companionship and coöperation seemed to be possible for them — to the Baptists of Holland. Something of the history of the Baptists in Holland is then given — the various disputes and contentions by which

this little sect was torn, and the result of the overtures made to them by the Socinians.

Deep religious feeling there was doubtless in those days; the earnestness and intensity that made men willing to die for the faith. But at the same time there were narrowness, bigotry, and a pettiness and quarrelsomeness which vented itself on the most absurdly inadequate causes. The spirit of the times showed itself especially in the fierceness and fanaticism with which church discipline was exercised, especially in the communion of the Baptists. To this fierceness and fanaticism modern laxness forms a somewhat regrettable, but perfectly natural, contrast.

As we read of the troubles of both Socinians and Baptists, we cannot help feeling how lamentable in those days was the condition of those who happened to differ with their neighbors on religious questions, how pathetic was the sense of theological isolation with which they had to contend, and how much the present world with its freedom, and its sympathetic coöperation for practical ends of even widely separated creeds, owes to the pioneers of liberty of thought and toleration of religious belief in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

ABEL H. HUIZINGA.

FISHKILL, N. Y.

MARTIN VON GERSTMANN, Bischof von Breslau: Ein Zeit- und Lebensbild aus der schlesischen Kirchengeschichte des XVI. Jahrhunderts. Von DR. J. JUNGNITZ, geistlicher Rat und Direktor des fürstbischöflichen Diözesanarchivs in Breslau. Mit einem Bilde Gerstmanns. Breslau: G. P. Aderholz' Buchhandlung, 1898. Pp. viii + 535. M. 5.60.

DR. JUNGNITZ is director of the diocesan archives at Breslau. That there is a congruity between his station and his genius his publications attest. These, by their frequency, show his pleasure in antiquarian research, and by their vivid accuracy his ability to combine facts extracted from dusty corners into living pictures.

Silesia has long been a "debatable land." Breslau, since the middle of the eleventh century the seat of an important bishopric, has been the center of its eventful history. Here, in the sixteenth century, within the shadow of its venerable cathedral, Lutheran and Romanist strove under such conditions that the issue was a long, a doubtful, and in the end a drawn battle. Where a struggle thus 'stands upon razor's edge," the temper of the contestants is revealed.

And there did "Dominus Martinus Gerstmannus, Dei gratia episcopus Wratislaviensis, supremus per utramque Silesiam cæsareus capitaneus," show what manner of man he was. To reproduce this great and wise churchman for us in a "Zeit- und Lebensbild" is the purpose of this octavo of more than five hundred pages.

Into the making of this volume have come all that was reliable in previous publications, and a vast addition of material obtained from the three great collections of archives in Breslau itself, and from similar collections at Ober-Glogau, Neisse, Dresden, Heidelberg, Lemberg, Cracow, Prague, Vienna, and Rome. These facts, from such diverse sources, are presented in a style without literary beauty, but in a combination so excellent that their *tout ensemble* is a definite and powerful presentation of the personality around which they gather. The "Bild," thus, is not a painting, but a mosaic.

There are twenty-one chapters in the book: one-third biographical, the remainder detailed description.

The biography is interesting. In his student life our youth had a "stipendium" from his native town, and this was afterward supplemented by the munificence of the wealthy scholar-merchant, Ulrich Fugger. He completed the curriculum of the university of Frankfort on the Oder, near his home. He then went to Padua to continue his studies; and there he took his doctor's degree. He then hesitated between two pleasant alternatives: a visit to Rome to see Scipio's library, recommended by Dr. Simon Schardius; or a visit to Constantinople, where a little Byzantine culture still lingered, with mayhap a trip to the peninsula of Athos, afterward Tischendorf's Athos, recommended by Demetrius, the Wallachian. But our ambitious graduate, like Buridan's ass, accepted neither alternative, but resigned his Protestantism, which had fulfilled its purpose with Fugger, returned to Breslau, and addressed himself to the ladder of church preferment. He worked himself up honestly by superabundantly filling each office which he received, so that his competency for a higher one was suggested, till from an ordinary "custodian" of his cathedral he became its prince-bishop. His consuming zeal was rendered all the more consuming because of the prudential restraints under which it was forced to operate. He was too wise to carry on his opposition to Lutheranism by the always vulgar and not always possible persecution of his antagonists, and he undertook to strengthen his church by reforming it. In a brief decade he was worn out by his "sad," we might almost say his "grim," "sincerity."

Such is an outline of the narrative on which the larger part of the book is strung. Every office Gerstmann held, every function he performed, every building where he ministered, every event of which he was a part, every dignity and every emolument which he enjoyed, all are treated in a detailed discussion. By the multiplication of such excursus the biography becomes a thesaurus of mediæval information. To such a thesaurus the index, though by no means scanty, is not sufficient.

Gerstmann's connection with Poland, both at the convention of Lubin and at the elections which raised respectively Henry of Valois and, two years afterward, Stephen Batory to its throne, has furnished Dr. Jungnitz with opportunity to make valuable contributions to its complicated story.

The chapters on the Breslau cathedral, its suburbs and services; on the chapter, the diocesan synod, the religious bodies, and the state of religion in the jurisdiction generally, are choice reading for students of the Reformation era.

The chapter on the clerical seminary, though interesting, disappoints by the slightness of its notice of the curriculum. The notices of secular education are more satisfactory.

In conclusion we present an extract or two as specimens of the interesting lore obtainable in this laborious compilation. In the chapter on "Liturgies" Dr. Jungnitz tells us that in a "Liber Agendarum," compiled at the beginning of the fourteenth century, "the baptismal rite was the same for infants and adults, and it only recognized immersion; in the case of children too delicate to be brought to church for baptism, a shorter formulary was allowed, but even in this case immersion was prescribed." With this "Agenda" the "Book of Ritual" published in 1499 essentially agreed. "In the baptismal service, however, infusio is already prescribed, and in a concluding note appears the beginning of the gospel of John, and this rubric, 'Place the gospel before the face of the child, as if to make it kiss it.'"

In the chapter on Gerstmann's temporal authority we are told: "It was his duty not to permit in the neighborhood the existence of the two recognized confessions of people who professed and propagated other than Catholic doctrines, and to uproot all sectaries, Anabaptists, Schwenkfelders, and Calvinists. This made frequent calls upon him, for Anabaptist ideas had found a congenial soil in Silesia, and held their ground in spite of persecuting legislation. Even Rudolph II. found it necessarry to issue a further edict against 'this damnable sect

who had secretly crept in numbers into Silesia.' He enacted that its adherents should be proceeded against vigorously in the courts of the locality where they should be arrested, brought thence to the part from whence they came, admonished to an obedient and Christian behavior, and, if need be, submitted to some punishment by dipping [mit gesenklicher Straff belegt werden solten]. If a man should obstinately cling to this sect, or exile himself on its account, his property was to be alienated to the advantage of his children, or, if there were no children, or if these should also be Anabaptists, the property should pass in usufruct to the next of kin until the sectary renounced his errors. Only those who were generally reputed Anabaptists should be so treated."

R. KERR ECCLES.

BOWLING GREEN,
Ohio.

DEUTSCHE GESCHICHTE IM ZEITALTER DER GEGENREFORMATION. Von GUSTAV WOLF. I. Band. Berlin: Oswald Seehagen's Verlag, 1898, 1899. Pp. xvi + 789. M. 26.

AS THIS is only the first volume of a series, and as it deals chiefly with the history of Germany at the beginning of the period which is to be studied in the later portions, I cannot judge of the entire work.

The volume is divided into three parts. The author calls the first part "general." It seems to me somewhat too general. The author says that he has thought it well to avoid details, and make a critical portraiture of the earlier period in its broader outlines only. He has carried out his design, but the design itself leaves something to be desired.

The first part of the volume falls into three sections. The first section treats of the constitution of the German empire in the period of the Reformation; the second, of the Catholic church before the council of Trent; and the third, of the evangelical church of Germany at the death of Luther. The first section contains much more of new material than the others. In the second and third the tendency of the author to indulge in rather vague generalizations, without illustrative examples, is strongly marked; but it is far too conspicuous even in the first, where the best work is done. Not a few important questions are left unanswered. How many German states were there? How many free imperial cities? What differences of authority are represented by the various titles of archduke, grand duke, margrave, landgrave, and palatine? What proportion of the

land was under the control of bishops and abbots? What proportion of the ecclesiastical lands belonged strictly to the church, and what proportion strictly to the empire under the feudal system? Had the emperor, or the emperor and diet, a legal right to bestow territories on new bishops under the feudal system, or the right to secularize territories once ruled by bishops? Just how far did the "right of protection" extend which was exercised by certain princes over certain bishoprics? How much of the income of these territories went to the secular lord in return for the protection which he gave? There are scores of such questions which our author does not answer. Yet upon the answers to some of them must depend our judgment concerning the morality or the immorality of the German princes, Catholic and Protestant, in seizing the bishoprics and secularizing them. But, while I regret this lack of detail, I am thankful for the very valuable contribution which the author makes to our knowledge of the constitution of the empire. He is especially helpful in his discussion of the diet, the imperial chamber, and the various conventions which represented the interests of limited classes, as the princes, the lesser nobles, the knights, and the free cities. He answers many of our questions, and he renders us a service in suggesting many others, even if he does not answer them.

The second part of the volume has for its title "Charles V. at the Summit of his Power." In this part, therefore, we expect a narrative of the Smalcald War. But we do not find it. The author assumes that the reader already knows the war as a series of events, and limits himself to a discussion of the motives of the chief actors on one side and the other, to the diplomatic negotiations which preceded and followed it, and to its results. His discussion of the working of the interim in the various German states is of special value.

The third part is entitled "The Revolution," and has to do with the successful treachery of Maurice of Saxony. Yet it contains scarcely a page of narrative, and the reader hardly perceives that the action of Maurice was essentially military.

Moreover, one finds it difficult to agree with the author that the emperor was perfectly well aware of the plans of Maurice in advance, and made such preparations to thwart them as he could. He does not seem to have made any at all. It would be easier to accept the theory of Froude, that he secretly arranged with Maurice beforehand to drive him out of the Tyrol, in order, at the same time, to disperse the council of Trent, with which he was disgusted, but with which he could not

afford to quarrel. Both theories seem to me incredible, and it is better to believe that the emperor was completely surprised. Wolf proves only, what has long been known, that he was warned, but not that he heeded the warning which he received.

From what I have said it is evident that the work of Wolf is not a history in the ordinary sense. It contains little or no narrative. Its personages do not act. Their motives are laid bare, as their conflicting interests are presented, but we do not see their differing characters. Hence the work is destitute of dramatic interest.

The history of the Counter-Reformation as a world-wide movement has not yet been produced, but the materials for it are accumulating rapidly in such forms as this, and it is to be hoped that some competent writer will soon make use of them. When such a historian shall undertake the task, he will derive much assistance at certain points from Wolf, though at others he will not find so much light as he will expect.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

A HISTORY OF THE PARISH OF TRINITY CHURCH IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK. Compiled by Order of the Corporation, and edited by MORGAN DIX, S.T.D., D.C.L., Ninth Rector. Part I, "To the Close of the Rectorship of Dr. Inglis, A. D. 1783." New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, The Knickerbocker Press, 1898. Pp. xvi + 506. $5.

IN outward appearance this history is a work of art. The volume now before me is from the letter-press edition, which is limited to 750 copies. The paper and binding are sumptuous. The illustrations are numerous, and consist of portraits of the various rectors, views of the church, and facsimiles of many important documents. The volume will be welcomed by the lovers of luxurious book-making.

The work of the author, on the whole, is as well done as that of the publisher. Dr. Dix seems to have omitted nothing. He gives good reasons for not beginning his narrative with the creation of the world, notwithstanding the example of various other chroniclers whom he mentions. He then begins as near the creation as possible by recording the discovery of North America. His view gradually narrows to the territory of Manhattan Island, and, after seventy-five quarto pages, to the parish of Trinity Church. But no reader will regret this command of unlimited space, for the lengthy sketch forms a good, though not a necessary, vestibule to the principal building, and is well done.

Dr. Dix is a racy writer, and no one will grow weary over his pages. Perhaps he is sometimes too racy, and indulges in linguistic capers not quite in keeping with the solemn picture in clerical robes which one always sees when one thinks of him. Thus he tells us that after 1526 English navigators "came to the front," that Colden "made no figure," and that on the accession of Governor Coot to office in 1697, "as a seaman might have expressed it, the wind had now come out dead ahead, and was kicking up a deadly sea." But these excentricities of expression are not frequent, and they may be overlooked as indications of a keen sense of humor which it is difficult always to keep within bounds, and for which the reader is grateful, notwithstanding its transgressions. Dr. Dix enlivens his pages also with abundant extracts from letters, newspapers, and parish records of the colonial period, and has been careful to preserve intact the amusing spelling and punctuation.

Though his style is thus racy, and though the reader is lured from chapter to chapter by its easy flow, the substance of the history is not very important. Though pleased with the story, one cannot easily convince himself that it is worth while, unless for the purpose of recreation, to spend his time over a lengthy record of the squabbles of the first rector with the successive English governors, of a service attended by the Free Masons, or of the several dates when the steeple was struck by lightning. But if one has leisure for such events, he will find an abundance of them here.

If Dr. Dix sometimes descends from the heights of classical expression to the level of popular speech, he does not leave us in doubt that he is fully conscious of his dignity as a representative of "the church." He frequently speaks of the Protestant denominations other than his own as "sects." Is it worthy of a Christian gentleman to do so? Is it wise for an Episcopal minister to do so? This tone of feeling does not attract people to the church where it prevails. Even the Roman Catholics are learning its offensive and dangerous character, and are abandoning it.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE LIFE OF FATHER HECKER. By WALTER ELLIOTT. Introduction by Most Rev. John Ireland, D.D., Archbishop of St. Paul, Minn. Fourth edition. New York: The Columbus Press, 1898. Pp. xvii + 428. $1.

ARCHBISHOP IRELAND'S commendation of Father Hecker and of this account of his life does not spring, it is probable, from any very

profound sympathy with Hecker's mystical piety and evangelical zeal, but rather from his agreement with Hecker in maintaining that Roman Catholicism, if it would succeed in America, must accept American ideas of liberty, and in general adapt itself to American conditions. The biography is the work of an astute churchman, who loses no opportunity to emphasize the failings of Protestantism, and who so marshals his materials as to seem to show that, given a man profoundly moved by the Spirit of God and submissive to his influence, the acceptance of the Roman Catholic church as the only authoritative and valid form of Christianity and expression of the divine will is inevitable. The facts of Hecker's life are so represented as to make the impression that divine providence was leading him step by step and preparing him for his career, which he would have us believe was of momentous importance for the advancement of the kingdom of God. Son of a pious German Methodist widow, Hecker was placed early at work in a small bakery with his elder brothers. When about fifteen years of age, although his educational advantages had been slight, we find him deeply interested, with his brothers, in a socialistic propaganda that was being carried on in New York, and addressing the workingmen on socialistic themes. A few years later he became deeply interested in the Transcendental movement, chiefly through O. A. Brownson, who passed through several denominations and various phases of thought, and became a Roman Catholic shortly before Hecker. An effort to grapple with the great mysteries of religion and philosophy without adequate preparatory studies made him morbid and incapacitated him for business. Some months at Brook Farm, where he formed the acquaintance and enjoyed the instruction of G. Ripley, G. W. Curtis, C. A. Dana, Emerson, and other Transcendentalists, completed his alienation from evangelical Christianity, but left him in a state of utter bewilderment. His diaries and letters written at this time are full of earnest longings after perfection, but are often incoherent and sometimes full of despair. A short residence at Fruitlands convinced him of the inadequacy of Alcott's philosophizings. He had adopted vegetarian diet, and injured his health at this time by extreme asceticism. Returning to New York, he resumed his physical labors, but soon found this life unendurable, and again and again withdrew for study and meditation. High-Church Anglicanism, to which his attention had been directed, failed to satisfy him. What he knew of the corruptions of Catholicism made him extremely reluctant to seek relief in its bosom; but he was at last led to confer with various

priests and prelates, and to suppose that he found in this great organization precisely what was necessary for his peace of mind. After much consultation with his superiors, he sought admission to the Redemptorist Order, and was sent to Belgium for training. He proved utterly unequal to the mastery of any course of study, and was regarded as a fool and treated as a menial; but his profound mysticism and his earnest strivings for perfection impressed some of his teachers, and he was at last ordained to the priesthood. With great difficulty he mastered enough Latin for his purposes and became skilled in public speaking. Along with several other converts with whom he had from the first been associated, he returned to the United States in 1851, now thirty-one years of age, and began holding revival services in various localities. Adopting with modifications the methods that were being successfully employed by evangelical denominations, the fervor of their preaching led to many apparent conversions. Trouble arose between the missioners and the Redemptorist authorities (1857). Hecker went to Rome and was there expelled from the order by the general; but he gained the friendship of several of the cardinals, and at last of Pius IX., and, after seven months of patient effort, succeeded in getting for himself and his associates honorable release from the order and permission to form a new community for evangelistic effort. In this he was supported by several of the leading American prelates, who believed that these men were faithful Catholics and that their methods were calculated to win multitudes of Protestants to the faith. The new community is popularly known as the Paulist Fathers. His position is well defined by himself as follows: "A Paulist, as a distinct species of a religious man, is one who is alive to the pressing needs of the church at the present time, and feels called to labor specially with the means fitted to supply them. And what a member of another religious community might do from that divine guidance which is external, the Paulist does from the promptings of the indwelling Holy Spirit." He laid great stress on individuality as "an integral and conspicuous element in the life of the Paulist." No Protestant could preach with more insistent earnestness the doctrine of regeneration by the Holy Spirit without the mediation of anything human.

That such teaching should have been tolerated by the hierarchy was due to the fact that the Paulists professed absolute obedience to the pope and accepted his infallibility. The pope, under Jesuit influence, was ready to employ any loyal agency that would win favor for the church in republican America.

Early austerities and excessive labors made of Hecker a physical wreck when little more than fifty years of age, and the last years of his life were full of weakness and suffering. Space does not permit any account of his important literary labors or of his popular lecturing against Protestantism. That he was deeply in earnest it is difficult to doubt. He did not apparently feel the incongruity of his evangelical preaching with his profession of subjection to a corrupt hierarchy. The writer of this biography no doubt counts upon finding many confused and perplexed minds that will be led by his narrative to ignore or accept the papal system, with all its tyranny and corruption, for the sake of the evangelical zeal of the Paulists. ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Canada.

DE GRATIA CHRISTI ET DE LIBERO ARBITRIO. Sancti Thomæ Aquinitatis Doctrinam breviter exposuit atque cum doctrina definita et cum sententiis protestantium comparavit DR. K. KROGH-TÖNNING. Christianiæ: apud Jacob Dybwad, A. W. Brögger, 1898. Pp. 87. Kr. 2.40. [Videnskabsselsk. Skrifter, II, Hist-filos. Kl., 1898, 2.]

THIS dissertation was read before the Christiania society of sciences, and is handsomely printed as part of the proceedings of this body. The author apologizes for his imperfect Latinity, due to absolute lack of experience in writing the language; but it seems to the reviewer to be very passable. One might read half through the dissertation before making up his mind whether the author is a Lutheran or a Catholic. He seems to be a nominal Lutheran, but, like English High-Church men, he has become enamored of Roman Catholic theology, and repudiates the distinctive teachings of Luther. The purpose of the writer is to demonstrate the absolute falsity of the vulgar opinion that "the Christian church itself of the Middle Ages, and likewise the Roman church of the following centuries, succumbed to semi-Pelagian errors." The author scouts the "miserable opinions" to which Luther gave currency, that St. Thomas is "the reservoir and depository of all heresy, error, and obliteration of the gospel," and maintains that he and the Roman church, whose recognized "doctor" he has long been, represent the true evangelical teaching regarding grace and free will, intermediate between semi-Pelagianism and the extravagant exaggerations of Augustinianism set forth by Luther and some of his followers.

After elaborately demonstrating the position of authority occupied by St. Thomas in the Roman Catholic church, he proceeds under seven questions, concerning "the necessity of grace," "the essence of grace," "the division of grace," "the cause of grace," "the effects of grace," "the remission of sins," "justifying faith," and "merit," to set forth in his own language Thomas' teachings, to show how the Roman Catholic church has confirmed these teachings, and, by citing his most extravagant expressions, to show that Luther fell very far short of the moderate evangelical teachings of Thomas and the Roman Catholic church. The author reaches the conclusion that "the Protestant theologians of our time, not being fettered by deterministic and pantheistic opinions, speak of merit and reward as good works," and show a strong inclination to return to the teachings of the church of all ages, unwarrantably interrupted by Luther. He believes that "a silent reformation," involving a return "to the principles of the church of the ancient and mediæval time, especially through the restoration of the ethical principles to which the Reformation of the sixteenth century . . . . did not concede a sufficiently ample place," is in progress, and in this he rejoices.

ALBERT HENRY NEWMAN.

McMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto, Canada.

DIE ANSCHAUUNG VOM HEILIGEN GEISTE BEI LUTHER. Eine historisch-dogmatische Untersuchung. Von LIC. RUDOLF OTTO, Privatdozent der Theologie an der Universität Göttingen. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898. Pp. 106. M. 2.80.

LUTHER always held the traditional doctrine of the trinity, as it had been set forth by Augustine, and as it was taught in the Roman Catholic church. Hence his doctrine of the Holy Spirit was the traditional western doctrine. Yet in the earlier period of his ministry he sometimes used language which seemed to make the Spirit subordinate to the Father and the Son, quite contrary to the thought of Augustine, which he accepted. He did not intend to do this, however, and indulged in such expressions inadvertently, and because he was not a systematic thinker.

Moreover, while he accepted the traditional dogma concerning the Holy Spirit, he departed from it in his doctrine concerning the Scriptures and in his doctrine concerning faith, and thus there arose certain

antinomies between his doctrine of the Holy Spirit and his doctrines of the Scriptures and of faith. The antinomies are these: "The new life of the Christian is wrought by the Holy Spirit. The new life of the Christian is wrought by the word of God. The new life of the Christian is wrought by faith." Here is a great advance beyond the Roman Catholic theology, according to which the new life is wrought by the Spirit, but not necessarily by the word of God, or by the personal faith of the recipient. It was necessary, therefore, for Luther to adjust the second and third of these statements to the first. The manner in which he did so is carefully traced by the author of this treatise, who also passes beyond the province of the mere historian, and subjects the teachings of Luther to an intelligent and candid criticism.

FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DIE DOGMATIK ALBRECHT RITSCHL'S. Apologie und Polemik. Von C. W. VON KÜGELGEN. Leipzig: Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchh. Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1898. Pp. vii + 125. M. 1.80.

THIS work, which confesses itself to be an "Apologie und Polemik," is written by one of the younger disciples of Ritschl in defense of his master. It is the direct outgrowth of the controversy over the Ritschlian theology which is now of such vital interest in Germany. The bulk of the work consists of a condensed yet clear statement of Ritschl's fundamental positions. For a like statement English readers should consult Stuckenberg's article on "The Theology of Albrecht Ritschl" (THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, April, 1898).

Of especial interest in this book is the writer's study of historical dependence. The following sources are the more important: (1) The Kant-Lotzean influence. This is seen in the theory of knowledge, in the famous value-judgments (*Werturteile*). A careful study is made of Kant's kingdom of God and Ritschl's conception of the same, in which the independence of Ritschl's doctrine of the kingdom as historically revealed through Christ is affirmed. (2) The influence of Schleiermacher. Here is manifested the importance of the Christian community. But Ritschl here shows his independence in repudiating the Moravian mysticism of Schleiermacher. (3) The Luther-Menken influence. The force of this claim is to identify Ritschl with the current of the confessional Lutheran church. In the doctrine of justification the position of Luther is reaffirmed. In the doctrine of atonement

Menken, the popular pastor of Bremen, is the determining factor. The working out of the influence of this man is the principal claim of the author to an original contribution. Thus throughout honorable parentage is found for most of the ideas of Ritschl. The pointed shaft of many an opponent is turned aside. On the whole, the writer has done his work well. The book, apart from its controversial purpose, contributes its portion to understanding the great theologian of our times.

HIRAM VAN KIRK.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

DAS VERHÄLTNIS VON THEOLOGIE UND ERKENNTNIS-THEORIE, erörtert an den theologischen Erkenntnis-Theorien von A. Ritschl und A. Sabatier. Von LIC. JOHANNES STEINBECK. Leipzig: Dörffling & Francke, 1898. Pp. vii + 254. M. 4.

THIS is the author's *Erstlingsarbeit*. It is gratefully dedicated to Frank, the well-known author of *System der christlichen Wahrheit* and *System der christlichen Gewissheit*, translated into English as *System of Christian Certainty*. In fact, Steinbeck everywhere proceeds upon the basis of the presuppositions of the Frankian theology; not slavishly, however, for serious intellectual labor of his own is not wanting. But the book is burdened with Frank's peculiarities, and he nowhere transcends Frank.

In his preface the author claims that his book has grown out of the conviction that the *Gegensätze* in present theology are due not so much to individual differences as to diverse attitude in respect to the *principles* of the science — in which he is in good part in error, for all theology today agrees in seeking to form a higher synthesis of the historical and the personal, to discover a method of reconciliation of the principle of subjective independence and the principle of objective authority.

In the first part (pp. 1–21) the effort is to show that an antecedent philosophical epistemology is not necessary for theology, rather is injurious, because it makes theology, and therewith the knowledge of Christianity, dependent on philosophy. Thus, the science would not yield universally valid results, but only such as are dependent on the subjectively conditioned philosophic judgment of the given theologian. In a second part (pp. 22–209) the epistemology of Ritschl and Sabatier is exhibited and estimated in order. The author distinguishes between Ritschl's religious-theological and his philosophical principles —acknowledging the worth of the former, but rejecting the latter,

pointing out at the same time that the latter have not been consistently carried through in his theology, yet have exercised a deleterious influence on it. Sabatier does not stand in as good grace with Steinbeck as Ritschl even, because he makes the understanding of Christianity rest on a religio-philosophical theory, and in this way ignores the peculiarity of Christianity — that is to say, he much too sharply separates religious (and therewith Christian) knowledge as merely subjective and symbolic from objective scientific knowledge. In a third section (pp. 210–54) the author elaborates his own theory of knowledge — affiliated with the Frankian. Here what one might have expected has certainly happened — the author refutes what he said in the first section against the necessity of undertaking to construct an epistemology, and takes in at the back door what he kicked out at the front, innocently enough, unaware indeed of having fallen into contradiction.

Still, as a first attempt at authorship the book merits much recognition. The exposition is clear and well balanced; the criticism acute and sober. Ritschl's philosophic theory of the thing deserves criticism. Sabatier's exposition sets out from a religio-philosophical theory which fails to do justice both to the object — religions given in history — and to the concrete ideal. It is a real service on the part of Steinbeck to have made this plain.

But his book, taken as a whole, seems to me to be worked out on a wrong basis. Theology arose in the Christian church in interaction with the intellectual collective life of the time, and its very existence depends on this connection, and consequently on that with philosophy also. Let theology be insulated, as Frank wished that it should be, and it is destined to decay. Moreover, if philosophic influence be not assigned its right place in theology, it will put in its appearance where it does not belong. And if the *Auseinandersetzung* of Christianity with philosophy be transferred to epistemological elucidations, the independence of the Christian faith of the changing systems of philosophy is thereby precisely attainable. Following Frank, the author naturally misses the very end he rightly sought. The obverse side of this is that he — again with Frank — holds dogmas, which are a philosophically conditioned expression of the Christian faith, to be the very realities of faith.

But, most important of all, the author, under the influence of Frank, has not made clear that "objective knowledge" may have a twofold signification. Of course, Frank and Steinbeck are both right in urging that what we know in faith is a content of objective realities. To deny

this is to deny the faith itself. But this content, as knowledge which accrues to faith, never ceases to stand in those subjective relations characteristic of faith. To overlook this, and in this sense to seek objective knowledge, is to make the invisible realities of faith objects of a knowledge which is suited only to the finite world. This is what Frank does. He believes that, by reflection on the new birth and its certainty, he can authenticate the entire circle of dogmas. In this way he carries natural-science methods over into an entirely different region of knowledge. This is what Steinbeck does, too. In matters of faith we have to do with objective realities — this is his truth; that he transforms this into something different, affirming that we must employ a method of knowledge divorced from faith, *i. e.*, from the *personal* relation of knowledge — this is his error. It is as if a child thought that it could grow in the knowledge of its father by logically articulating him in a technically correct way in the kingdom of living beings, and explaining this for the father-in-himself; whereas it will grow in the knowledge of its father and attain to its father as he is in himself only in so far as it ever becomes like its father. So, similarly, is it with the knowledge of God. To disengage it from personal relations is to change it in its actuality — μετάβασις εἰς ἄλλο γένος. It is to occupy an *unreligious* relation to its object, opposite in principle to that of faith. For the author to be astray here in theology is to go astray everywhere. For, if one is to succeed in deriving dogmas, having their origin in an entirely different intellectual connection and situation, from the pious experience of the evangelical Christian, the transition must be somehow made from faith to subtile theological-philosophical speculation, without its yet being perceived. This is done with the device of the objectivity of the realities of faith, which is rightly maintained, but is wrongly used as a plea for a mode of knowledge which is opposed to faith.

Space may be claimed only to remark upon the arbitrariness of the method of using the Scriptures, both by Frank and his disciple Steinbeck — the atomistic instead of the organic. GEORGE B. FOSTER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS. By REV. JOHN MACPHERSON, M.A., author of *Commentary on St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, etc. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898; New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. viii+468. $3.

THE publishers have given us a well-made book. The paper, type, and printing are of the best, and the proof-reading has come very close

to infallibility. The author is not a novice in theological writing. In addition to this book and the commentary on Ephesians he has published three smaller volumes, as follows: *The Sum of Saving Knowledge*, *The Confession of Faith*, and *Presbyterianism. Christian Dogmatics* is a notable work, and will easily take and hold a prominent place among works on systematic theology. It is characterized by thorough, exact, comprehensive knowledge of the Bible and of the most significant theological literature of all schools, from the first to the very last; by a rare clearness, precision, fairness, and conciseness in presenting views, whether accepted or rejected; by an admirable perception of the mutual logical relations of Christian doctrines and of their harmonious combination into an organic system; by a complete freedom from all *odium theologicum*, as also by a controlling sense of the supreme value of truth as opposed to error; by such mastery of pure English and such care in its use that one may search in vain for an obscure or slovenly sentence; and by a spirit independent, earnest, calm, kind, reverent, Christ-like.

In construction the book is made for consecutive studious reading rather than for class-room preparation and recitation. Its pages are not broken up, each into a multitude of statements and explanations, distinguished minutely by varied notation and by difference of type, with Scripture and other citations interspersed, and footnotes, like footmen, running all the way through. Its contents, after an introduction of ninety-six pages, are presented under the six following divisions successively: the doctrine of God and the world; of man and sin; of redemption; of the application of redemption; of the means of grace; and of last things. The subdivisions consist of eighty-eight sections, numbered continuously from the beginning. Preceding each section is a carefully selected list of the best reference-books on the subject discussed. These represent divergent schools of thought in all ages, although, properly, the last decade is most amply in evidence. American authorities meet us often, especially Dr. Charles Hodge and President Strong. It would seem that the latter is the author's favorite, which is much to his credit.

In defining Christian dogmatics the author concisely describes his treatise. He says (p. 1): "Christian dogmatics is the science of the Christian faith in which the several dogmas are laid down, classified, and developed." In this statement "faith" denotes the object and not the act of belief, and as "Christian" this object consists of "the spiritual truths revealed by God in the person of Christ," called

"dogmas" because to them "the church has given authoritative sanction." In the Bible Christian dogmatics has its norm; from the church, its form. The Bible, as *fons primarius*, is an ultimate authority. This the author assumes, and hence he does not discuss the doctrine of inspiration as affecting that authority. He accounts himself free to modify, according to his light, ecclesiastical statements, whether ancient or modern, whether of the undivided church or of his own denomination, but not to depart in any point from the teaching of Scripture, rightly interpreted. To the voice of the church he is profoundly respectful; to the voice of revelation, unhesitatingly obedient. One may, many must, think him in some views unscriptural, but even in these all will account him scriptural in intent.

The last section of the introduction (pp. 44–97) is a "history of dogmatics." It is masterly. One wonders how so much could be put into a space so small, and yet without crowding — every important doctrinal development, every significant author, set in clear view, aptly, often elegantly, characterized and properly correlated. One cannot read it through without cherishing the hope that in the near future the author will expand it into one or two volumes which in both extent and merit will serve as fit companions to his Christian Dogmatics.

The author's doctrinal position is that of the "reformed theology," conservatively Presbyterian. He does not, however, regard Adam's headship of the race as being federal and the imputation of his sin to his posterity as due to covenant relationship. He takes the Augustinian view of a purely natural headship and of a realistic union. "Adam is *homo generalis* and our *will* (*voluntas*), if not our person, preëxists in him." Yet he does not accept traducianism pure and simple, but teaches that "in each individual is the appearance of a new efficient force issuing from a new creation, the origination of the individual soul being due to an immediate operation of God, upon which the individual's responsibility to God must rest" (pp. 190, 200). One wonders how "our will, if not our person," can exist before the origination of our soul, and the individual can be responsible for that which had place before the existence of that on which responsibility rests. Or may we explain the doctrine by saying that one's race responsibility rests upon something else than one's soul, but that one's individual responsibility rests upon one's soul; that one's race-will, and perhaps race-personality, is anterior to, and distinct from, one's individual will and personality? Here is a peculiar dualism and a "great mystery." As to this and some other dogmatic deliverances the author seems to recognize that they

explain nothing and that nothing can explain them. He justifies them as affirming in scientific form that which in Scripture is taught in popular form.

The doctrine of the perfections of God, and of his relations to the world, recognizes but rejects the various forms of monism, now or formerly current. With clear discernment it guards the truths and guards against the errors of the various views of God's immanence and of his transcendence. The discussion is judicious, luminous, and well balanced. Equal praise is due to his treatment of redemption and of its application. One may at this or that point be unable to agree with the author, but he cannot but admire the acute, able, and instructive exposition. Indeed, there is scarcely any part of the work of which the same remark may not justly be made. A Baptist might admire his wisdom in saying nothing as to the (so-called) "form of baptism," and next to nothing as to the subjects, on the ground that silence on these points is true prudence in a pedobaptist.

GEO. D. B. PEPPER.

COLBY COLLEGE,
Waterville, Me.

DIE CHRISTLICHE GLAUBENSLEHRE. Gemeinverständlich dargestellt. Von DR. CHR. ERNST LUTHARDT. Leipzig: Dörffling & Francke, 1898. Pp. xvi + 633. M. 9.

THE veteran Luthardt needs no introduction to the theological public. His twelve volumes of sermons; his twenty volumes of theological works, dealing with nearly all aspects of theological thought; his numerous brochures and magazine articles; his lectures in the university of Leipzig, heard by hundreds of pupils now scattered all over the world, have made his name a household word among theologians. Nor does his system of dogmatics need detailed and elaborate presentation. His *Kompendium der Dogmatik* is circulating in the ninth edition in Germany. But that work was intended for students of theology and preachers, or professional theologians. Luthardt does not consider his work done merely in such a presentation. Unlike many theologians of Germany, he has never believed in the complete separation of theology from common life. On the contrary, he has always held that the rank and file of the membership of the Christian church have a right to know fully what is taking place in the world of theological discussion, and that it is the duty of the theologian to impart the information required. The alliance of theology and church

has always seemed to him ideal; and the most attractive duty of the scientific theologian he has regarded as the serving of the church. Accordingly, he restates his theological system in this volume in a simple and popular form. This restatement, of course, carries with it some special features that should not be forgotten in making up an estimate of the book. It necessitates, for instance, the omission of all discussions which involve the history of theological opinion. Much of this discussion would have to be presented in the Greek, Latin, French, and English languages, and it would manifestly be assuming too much to expect the average lay reader to know these languages. Those who are particularly interested in the history of dogma, either ancient or modern, are referred to the author's *Kompendium der Dogmatik* as giving further information and light. Furthermore, all purely scientific modes of reasoning must be avoided, as the balancing of arguments *pro* and *con.* would swell the volume to a size far beyond the capacity of its constituency. Still further, the critical discussions bearing on the Scriptures as a source of theology must not be introduced into it. It is not the Bible that he takes as the basis of his formulation, but the creeds of the church. He gives us himself a clear and succinct statement of his standpoint as follows: "Our relation to Scripture," says he, "is mediated for us through the church and her instruction. For although Scripture is to us the final arbiter in questions of faith and teaching, yet we do not stand related toward it so immediately that we can ignore the centuries which lie between it and our present age. We receive the Scriptures from the hands of the church, and that not without accompanying church guidance as to its meaning and essential content; a chain of witnesses and testimonies to the truth binds us with the original testimony of the apostolic age. With the treasure of Christian thought, which we owe to the church and her teaching, we approach the Scriptures and test, correct, and expand these thoughts only according to the Scriptures" (p. 79). That there are difficulties and objections to this standpoint Luthardt knows, but he does not feel that they are strong enough to lead him to abandon it. On the contrary, he adheres to it with remarkable consistency. Christian doctrine, then, according to him, is the didactic presentation of redemption as it finds a historic actualization in Jesus Christ, a social illustration in the life of the church, and a reality and certitude in the individual Christian through faith. Around this idea of doctrine he builds his system. The preliminary questions of the definition of dogmatics, of religion, of Christianity, and of Protestantism, as

distinguished from Romanism, and the fundamental principles underlying all formulation of doctrine, naturally first occupy his attention. When he has discussed these topics, he finds a center and starting-point in the eternal love of God as the motive of redemption. The first section of the volume thus comes to be devoted to the exposition of the scriptural data regarding the existence and nature of God. More particularly the author endeavors to examine the arguments for the divine existence, the possibility and necessity of supernatural revelation, the relations of reason to revelation, the personality of God, the unity of God, his dominant nature, his holy love, his attributes, his revelation of himself as triune, and his eternal counsel of love. In this last article Luthardt reaches the center of his system; henceforth the love of God is the mainspring and molding principle of his system. Thus in the second section of his treatise he takes up the beginning of the realization of God's plan of love in the creation of the world. In the third he considers the annulling of religious communion with God through sin. In the fourth, the actualization of the redemptive communion with God in the person of the God-man. This is his Christological section. It restates the Christology of the creeds in new language, but not in a new form. Nor does it make any attempt to shed new light on the obscurities of the confessional christology. The incarnation, the constitution of the person of Christ, and his offices of prophet, priest, and king are set forth in the elder evangelical form. In the fifth section the author deals with the appropriation of the communion restored in Christ between God and man. This may be regarded as that part of the system which covers the problems of subjective soteriology. The sixth section treats of ecclesiology under the heading of the actualization of communion with God in the church of Christ, and the seventh section closes the book with the topic of eschatology presented as the completion of the communion with God in eternity. This brief exposition of the content and standpoint of Luthardt's popular treatise on Christian doctrine shows the points at which confessional theology is open, and those at which it is not open, to modification. As far as critical views are concerned, it will not allow them to affect its results. The Bible must be received as the final court of appeal in all matters of dispute in religious thought, and in order that it should thus be received, the older doctrine of inspiration must be presupposed and maintained. Whatever critical theory weakens or invalidates this mode of looking upon the Bible is ruled out of court. Before any modification can be accepted on this

point, it is necessary that the confessional statements as to the nature of Scripture should be amended. Confessional theology would lose its distinctive feature if it were to depart from this inflexible rule. But whenever the study of Scripture, under the light of modern historical and philological investigation, brings into view new phases of thought; whenever it tends to change the emphasis laid upon different parts of the system; whenever it calls for any modification of the content or form of the Christian system, confessional theology easily yields itself to such modification. Perhaps it is unnecessary to add that Professor Luthardt's usually lucid style assumes additional charm through his effort in this book to make the difficult problems of theology intelligible to the average lay reader.

A. C. ZENOS.

THE MCCORMICK THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Chicago, Ill.

THE KENOTIC THEORY, considered with Particular Reference to its Anglican Forms and Arguments. By REV. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Instructor of Dogmatic Theology in the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898. Pp. xviii + 248.

THE publishers have made all readers of this book their debtors. It is in all respects an admirable specimen of book-making. This small book discusses a great subject. The fact of the incarnation presents unsolved and insolvable problems. Possibly the one here discussed may be of this number. There certainly is not agreement as to its true solution.

As the Scriptures are our sole authority for the fact of the incarnation, so also must they be for its doctrine. No view can be valid which they do not justify, and no progress in formulating or establishing a theory can be made save by an ever fresh and faithful interpretation of the Scriptures. Our author, however, holds that one should "appeal to the Scriptures as interpreted by the church." This is to make final the authority of "the church," or "the Fathers," or an ecumenical council — to study the Scriptures, not to ascertain what statement of doctrine they require, but to prove that they require the statement already accepted on other authority. To those not holding this principle its constant application seems greatly to mar the discussion.

The book is a vigorous polemic against kenoticism in general, and more particularly against that form of it which teaches that the relative attributes of the Logos — omnipotence, omniscience, and omnipresence

—were laid aside during the earthly life of Christ, while the essential or ethical attributes were retained. He says (p. 131): "The attributes which are signified by the words referred to [relative attributes] are infinite realities, and are grounded in the internal essence of God. . . . . The existence of created things being presupposed, it is impossible that God should fail to be omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient in any creaturely region without ceasing to be himself." To him, as to most, the opposite view seems to be an absurdity, a contradiction in terms.

His own view is that "in the one person of Christ there have existed from the moment of the incarnation two wills and two consciousnesses, which manifested themselves concurrently in his one earthly life, although mutually distinct—one divine and infinite, the other human and finite" (pp. 50, 51); and also that there have been "two knowledges," separate one from the other—one divine, the other human, so that when Jesus said, "the Son knoweth not," he only meant that as a man he did not know, while as divine he knew as absolutely and with as clear, full consciousness as did the Father.

Now, the question is whether such a statement as this fairly represents the conscious life of our Lord as expressed in his own words and acts. It cannot be very important to show or to know that "the Fathers," or some of them, so held. Any statement which does not leave in its unity and truth the conscious experience of Jesus Christ, as expressed in the four gospels, must be radically wrong. To many of the most profound thinkers and reverent students the logical difficulty of accepting the author's view at this point is not less than that of accepting depotentiation, while the scriptural difficulty is greater. All reverent investigation and discussion of the subject may contribute to a better view and statement than have yet been presented. This little volume, clear, earnest, reverent, able, deserves, and will receive, a cordial welcome and respectful consideration alike from those who do and those who do not in all things hold with its learned author.

G. D. B. PEPPER.

COLBY COLLEGE,
Waterville, Me.

DER URSPRUNG DES HEILIGEN ABENDMAHLS. Von LIC. DR. CARL CLEMEN, Privatdocent in Halle. Freiburg i. B., Leipzig und Tübingen: Verlag von J. C. B. Mohr (Paul Siebeck), 1898. Pp. 36. M. 0.60.

THIS pamphlet (*Hefte zur "Christlichen Welt," No. 37*) is a review of *Das Abendmahl im Neuen Testament*, by Professor Eichorn, of Halle (No.

36 of the same series), in which it was set forth that the four accounts of the institution of the sacred eating are unhistorical and have arisen from Jewish and also Gnostic conceptions.

We are given an argument to set aside Eichorn's view and then a discussion of the meaning of the words of institution. Our author repudiates the idea that there is any significance in the breaking of the bread and the pouring out of the wine; the former being in Jewish usage simply like the cutting of the loaf with us; and he might have added that we are nowhere told that the wine was poured out. He holds that the bread and wine are simply a parable of the food of the soul, that the Lord chose an everyday occurrence constantly to remind his disciples of him. As often as they partook of bread and wine, the material of every Jewish meal, they were to think of him. He thereby placed himself in the center of thought of their natural life. In Corinth and everywhere else the church supper was an actual meal.

Having gone thus far, our author draws back and says that such an observance is under our circumstances not possible. If, however, the Lord commanded his disciples to remember him, not merely once a month, once a week, occasionally, now and then, but whenever they ate bread and drank wine even in their daily meals, we must consider his injunction a wise one and one possible of observance. And, moreover, in quoting Paul's words to the church at Corinth, our author fails to notice that the only thing the apostle condemns is "divisions" among them. He does not find fault with their meal as too sumptuous, but only that it is not shared in love, the poor brother who ought to have received a satisfying repast being left "hungry," while others were surfeited — this, rather than intoxicated, being the meaning of μεθύειν in this connection.

NORMAN FOX.

MORRISTOWN, N. J.

BEITRÄGE ZUR VERSTÄNDIGUNG ÜBER BEGRIFF UND WESEN DER SITTLICH-RELIGIÖSEN ERFAHRUNG. Von ERNST PETRAN. Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898. Pp. viii + 359. M. 5.40; bound, M. 6.

THIS book is the outgrowth of a lecture on the idea of moral-religious experience in modern theology, given by the author before a conference of pastors at Liegnitz in 1897. In the form in which the material is here presented it has swollen to an ample treatise of 359 pages. After an introductory definition of terms, the conception of

religious experience is followed through the writings of Dorner, Frank, Lipsius, Wendt, Köstlin, Reischle, Herrmann, Kähler, and others. The author then develops his own view, and states the conditions, both objective and subjective, upon which the existence of such experience depends. In a concluding section he draws certain practical conclusions for theological method, specially in the department of exegesis.

The most interesting thing about the book is the problem which it raises. After calling attention to the fact that one of the most noticeable features of modern theology in all its forms, liberal and conservative alike, is the stress laid upon religious experience as the *sine qua non* of a sound theology, Petran points out that there is no agreement as to the nature of the experience upon which all insist. It is taken for granted that everyone knows what is meant, and that careful definition is needless. But this is far from being the case. The only modern writer who gives a thorough discussion of the conception of experience is Köstlin, to whose careful books, *Die Begründung unsrer sittlich-religiösen Ueberzeugung*, Berlin, 1893; *Religion und Reich Gottes*, 1894, and *Der Glaube*, 1895, our author pays deserved tribute.

It is in the hope of rectifying this omission that Petran undertakes his book. Starting with our experience of the physical universe, and passing on to our experimental knowledge of our fellow-men, he arrives at last at that form of experience which we designate as distinctly religious. The nature of this he tries to make clear by analogies drawn from the lower realms. He shows that all experience presupposes contact with an object, and that in the case of religion this object is the living God. He traces the means by which God makes himself known to men, laying stress on the part played in his revelation by physical means. God reveals himself through nature, through miracle, through prophecy, and above all through Scripture, which gives us the record of his dealings with men in the past. In opposition to the Ritschlian attempt to confine the conception of revelation to the historic Christ, he argues for the importance of the Old Testament as an indispensable stage in God's historic revelation. But objective revelation, in whatever form, becomes effective only because there is in man a subjective capacity for religion. The organ for the divine communication is the conscience, through which God not only acts upon the feelings and the will, but introduces us into a new world of ideas. Above all the importance of prayer is emphasized as the means of our direct contact with God.

As the above outline shows, there is much that is true and fruitful in this book. Certainly there is room for such a discussion of religious experience as that for which Petran pleads. We cannot but feel, however, that his book would have been more effective if it had been shorter. With characteristic German thoroughness he has gathered together everything that has been said upon his subject in modern German literature, and the freedom of his own treatment is hampered, as proves so often the case in German books otherwise excellent, by the consciousness of the presence of this great cloud of witnesses. Of the English literature on his subject Petran apparently knows nothing, even a book lying so directly in his field as Stearns' *Evidence of Christian Experience* being ignored.

With the practical conclusions of the author we are in hearty sympathy. He pleads for a theology which shall make earnest with that conception of experience which is constantly on its lips. Especially does he contend for an exegesis which shall be not merely a catalogue of the opinions held by the different writers of Scripture, but a study of their spiritual life. For this, as all agree, is the great significance of the Bible, that it is a living book — not a thesaurus of theological doctrines merely, but a record of the life-experiences of men renewed by the Spirit of God and witnessing to others of the new life in which they rejoice. Is it not time, we may well ask, that this point of view, theoretically recognized, shall be more consistently applied in practice then is often the case in our exegesis? WM. ADAMS BROWN.

UNION THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
New York, N. Y.

THE RANGE OF CHRISTIAN EXPERIENCE. Being the Twenty-eighth Fernley Lecture. Delivered in Hull, July, 1898. By RICHARD WADDY MOSS, Classical Tutor, Didsbury College. London: Charles H. Kelly, 1898. Pp. xii + 114.

THE author modestly claims that he has written only a lecture, not a complete and exhaustive treatise, and in a suggestive and practical way pointed out *some* of the experiences of those who accept Christianity with the heart.

The rules and motives which Christianity presents enable one to use his bodily organs and powers so as to avoid over-indulgence and over-restraint, keeping the body in subordination to the mind. To the mind itself Christianity is a coördinating force, which gives to the

reason both its proper scope and restraint, while it prompts to the highest culture, and promotes humility under a consciousness of ignorance. It promotes spiritual health, independently of external conditions, by producing an equilibrium of the instincts, of which the religious instinct in every man is supreme. It harmonizes man with his environment by putting him in right relations with nature, and humanity, and God. Christian faith gives the believer hope for the race, which philosophy cannot do, least of all evolution. The Christian's personal faith delivers him from the tyranny of self, by substituting Christ for self as the supreme object of love and service. Thus perfection of character is finally to be attained through the harmonious coöperation of personal endeavor and divine grace, man working out his own salvation inspired by the assurance that God is working in him.

Rarely are so many practical and suggestive thoughts packed into so little space in so orderly a manner, and expressed with such clearness and force. Passages of Scripture illuminate and confirm the author's ideas. There is no extravagance of thought or language. There is abundant testimony to prove that Christianity can do all that the author claims for it. The book should be read with close attention, and thoughtfulness. Its suggestiveness will compel the reader often to pause and follow out trains of thought started by it in his mind. It is eminently a thought-provoking book, and will richly repay thoughtful reading and re-reading. N. S. BURTON.

ANN ARBOR,
Mich.

THEOLOGIA PECTORIS: Outlines of Religious Faith and Practice, founded on Intuition and Experience. By JAMES MUSCUTT HODGSON, M.A., D.Sc., D.D., Principal of the Theological Hall of the Congregational Churches of Scotland. Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1898; New York: Imported by Charles Scribner's Sons. Pp. 208. $1.40.

Theologia pectoris properly denotes a theology which meets the deepest wants of man's spiritual nature, and so verifies itself in the experience of him who best understands and most thoroughly appropriates that theology. The theology precedes the experience and conditions it, and hence does not arise from the experience as its source. The word of God, his objective revelation to man, coming as it does from the author of our being, finds us and fits us. The

principal title of this work, therefore, is one which sounds very sweetly in the ear of the reverent student of the Bible, and raises the hope that it will bring to the reader a rich feast.

The supplemental title, however, has a somewhat suspicious sound, and hardly seems to be in accord with the main title. It seems to imply that one's own intuitions are the foundations at once of a true system of doctrine and of a right form of practice. And this seems to be the ruling thought of the treatise. It holds that "the essential elements of religion and theology claim our acceptance upon their own intrinsic merits." Every man must construct for himself his own doctrinal system from his own rational insight, and recognize no other authority. Another way of putting it is that for truth there is no authority but just its truthfulness, and this is made to mean that no authority attaches to a teacher, and so to his teaching, because it is his.

We at once, on meeting this thought, ask: How is it as to the teaching of Jesus Christ? We are sure that this view does not hold in ordinary matters. We do and should believe the historian on the authority of the man as one competent and disposed to tell the truth. For the same reason we believe the geographer and the astronomer, and every other man who has knowledge which we do not have. We even take the mathematician's results on trust, on his authority. Why should there be an exception to this plain and general rule in the one matter of religious belief and conduct? It must be because no being has knowledge to communicate to us which we ourselves do not have. So we turn to the chapters in which our author treats of Jesus Christ. We find that Jesus is recognized as "the Son of the Eternal," and the surest ground for this conviction is found in experience. But now that it is so found, one naturally expects that all the teachings of this Son of the Eternal will be recognized as having full authority for us just because they are his. But when we examine what is meant by this title, what is summed up under it, we cease to wonder that we are not allowed to take him as authority. He is found by experience to be: first, "innocent;" second, uniquely gentle; third, remarkably kind and beneficent; fourth, full of love. This is all. But this is not all of which the Savior himself was conscious. This is not all that the apostles believed to be in him, for it is certainly not "all the fulness of the Godhead." The "experience" of believers generally has been determined by a faith in the Savior as being the effulgence of the Father's glory and the very image of his substance. They have accepted him as such, not because of their intuitions, but on the authority of

his own word and works. Their *theologia pectoris* has been determined by the *theologia verbi*, their subjective faith by the objective revelation.

As the revelation of a tendency this work has a certain value. It is not likely, however, to take and hold a prominent place, even among works of a like tendency.

GEO. D. B. PEPPER.

COLBY COLLEGE,
Waterville, Me.

THE CONCEPTION OF PRIESTHOOD IN THE EARLY CHURCH AND IN THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND. By W. SANDAY, D.D., LL.D. London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898. Pp. viii + 128. $1.

CHURCH TROUBLES AND COMMON SENSE, A PLEA FOR REASON AND RESPONSIBILITY. By W. H. CARNEGIE, M.A. London: John Murray, 1899. Pp. xvi + 118. 2s. 6d.

A VINDICATION OF ANGLO-CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES. By Eminent Prelates and Leading Clergy of the Anglican Church. In Defence of her Scriptural and Primitive Doctrines from Perversion, by the Revival of Mediæval and Papal Corruptions of the Truth, Renounced by our Church at the Reformation. A Collection of Original and Selected Treatises, with special Reviews, Comments, and Notes, in Seven separate Parts, forming One Volume. Edited by J. C. SHARPE (retired London Banker). Oxford and London: James Parker & Co., 1898. (In seven separate parts.) 1s. each.

CATHOLICISM: ROMAN AND ANGLICAN. By A. M. FAIRBAIRN, M.A., D.D., LL.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899. Pp. xxiii + 481. $2.

THE Church of England is in great commotion; party spirit is rampant; the "Highs" and the "Lows" are in open conflict. For a long time the "Catholics" have had it mostly their own way, but just now the "Evangelicals" are improving their inning. Parliament, bishops, inferior clergy, and laity are all in evidence. Printer's ink, spread over the pages of newspapers, magazines, and books, serves as an irritant or emollient. Dissenters passively look on or actively participate, as their inclination or interest dictates. The conflicting sects in the established church are laying their several pleas before the bar of public opinion, and no one is wise enough to forecast the final verdict.

Each of the four authors, the titles of whose books appear at the

head of this article, attempts to look the present situation in the face and to utter some word of wisdom concerning it.

Professor Sanday is irenic throughout. He seeks to be a peacemaker and reconciler. In a most lovable and plausible way he tries to make it appear that men who have written on opposite sides of the burning questions which disturb the English church have, after all, entertained essentially the same views. Dr. Moberly, in *Ministerial Priesthood*, thinks that Dr. Hort in *The Christian Ecclesia* is all wrong in his notion of the nature of church unity. But, after all, the chief difference between these two worthy divines is one of method and mode of expression. So again, when Dr. Moberly so severely criticises Bishop Lightfoot for his teachings regarding the origin of the ministry, it is really a difference in process rather than conclusion. Lightfoot and Hort pursue the historical method, arguing inductively from facts to principles, while Moberly pursues the logical method, arguing deductively from principles to facts. Lightfoot believes that the Christian ministry "evolved," in the divine plan, out of ordinary human needs, while Moberly believes it "devolved" directly from above, and that today "uninterrupted transmission" is essential and indispensable. Both men agree in the *fundamental principle* that the ministry must come from God himself, by evolution according to Lightfoot, by devolution according to Moberly. Sanday devotes a chapter to an attempted reduction of the difference between those who advocate sacerdotalism and those who repudiate it, maintaining that even here the difference is largely "one of names rather than of things." He does not try to evade the ugly fact that "there are two extreme sections in the church diametrically opposed to each other," but he trusts that the outcome will be "not compromise for the sake of peace, but comprehension for the sake of truth." His ruling desire is to pour oil on the troubled waters, to exert an influence which shall be healing, reconciling, uniting. He has kind words for the Oxford Movement, the Reformation, and Roman Catholicism, and hopes that through "the cultivation of the spirit of Christ" we shall all learn at last "to speak the same thing."

Rector Carnegie is as much disturbed over the "troublesome state of things which has lately arisen in the church" as is Dr. Sanday. He, too, believes that "the differences which divide churchmen are not fundamental, but are, in the main, differences of interpretation and proportion." Doubtless he has striven honestly to keep himself "as far as possible free from partisan and party bias," but the reader

cannot help surmising that he is following the argument of a High-Churchman who is making a covert plea for the unmolested propagation of High-Church doctrines and practices. Carnegie confesses that there is "restlessness" in the church, but denies that a "crisis" is approaching. The majority of laymen are indifferent to the present agitation, and comparatively few are alarmed over sacerdotalism, which undoubtedly can be vindicated by historical, intellectual, and practical arguments. Indeed, Low-Churchmen themselves practically admit the validity of these arguments. Their real fear is that sacerdotalism will go too far, but these apprehensions are groundless. It cannot be denied that the "official claims" of the sacerdotalist often overtop his "personal character," and that "High-Churchism has peculiar attractions for the weak and hysterical," but these "foolish and effeminate people" with their "fads and fooleries" constitute a very small percentage of the High-Church party, and Low-Churchmen ought not to take their "puerilities and extravagancies" too seriously. The feelings of apprehension and antagonism with which the Low-Church party regards sacerdotalism, sacramentalism, and ritualism are really groundless, for all churchmen, whether High or Low, accept all three, agreeing in principle and only differing in interpretation and proportion. This being so, no attempt should be made to settle this "family quarrel in the church" by "repressive legislation." If Parliament resorts to "strong measures," High-Churchmen will rebel. Nor, on the other hand, ought the bishops to interfere, except with the utmost circumspection. They must not resort to "any rough and ready method." The present distracted condition of the Church of England cannot be remedied by coercion, whether parliamentary or episcopal, much less by "blatant speeches" and "violent letters." The true remedy lies in "wide-mindedness," each party recognizing the truth held by the other, and both recognizing "the underlying unity which connects those truths." Only men of character and capacity can ever rise to this "higher level." Until parents dedicate "the ablest of their sons to the service of the church," and until these sons receive suitable clerical education and adequate financial compensation, there is slight hope that "liberal-minded and far-seeing men" will take the place of "narrow-minded bigots and incompetent blunderers."

Banker Sharpe, the editor of the *Vindication*, is in no mood to parley with the High Anglicans, who, to his mind, are trying to drag the Church of England into Rome. Going back half a century and more, he calls to his aid a long line of deans, bishops, and archbishops who

have sounded the note of alarm, exposed the machinations of the Romanizers, and vindicated the scriptural and primitive doctrine of the church. Against "disturbers in the church, who would remove its very foundations," these men have hurled their arguments and their anathemas. A few titles will reveal the opinions of these "eminent prelates" who have set themselves to stay the Romeward progress of the Church of England: "Denunciation of Papal Presumption," "Assumptions of Anglicans, Perverted to Rome, Exposed and Refuted," "The Baneful Influence of the Romeward Faction during the Last Half Century," "A Review of the Present Crisis in the Church," "The United Testimony of the English, Scottish, and American Churches against the Romeward Party in the Church," "The Doctrine of the 'Real Presence' in the Holy Communion Vindicated from Rome's Perversions of the Truth," "The Anglican Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice," "On Sacramental Confession and Ministerial Absolution," "On the Revived Practices." The authors of these pieces hold sacerdotalists, sacramentalists, and ritualists to be enemies of the Church of England, and essentially and fundamentally at one with the Church of Rome. Compromise and fellowship are not to be dreamed of. Against Romanizers Banker Sharpe has furnished Low-Churchmen with a whole armory of weapons, both for defense and assault.

The last book in our list is by the greatest of living dissenters. For years Principal Fairbairn has been a valiant participant in the ecclesiastical struggle going on in England. He has crossed swords with the champions from Newman down. It is impossible to give an adequate notion of his masterly treatise, *Catholicism: Roman and Anglican*, in the few remaining lines of this review. By "Roman" in this title is not meant the "Church of Rome," but "the Catholicism which grew out of the Anglican revival — the movement, with its Roman affinities and ideals, which began in Oxford, and has so profoundly modified the religious temper and practices of the English church and people." In the ten chapters of which the volume is composed the whole subject of Catholicism, whether Anglican or Roman (in the restricted sense), is handled in the most radical, fundamental, and exhaustive fashion. The discussion goes to the roots of things. Keble, Newman, Pusey, Manning, Lightfoot, Westcott, Hort, Hatch, and Jowett are critically reviewed. Religion is shown to be greater and of greater moment than any church, and Catholicism, while it is churchly, is shown to narrow, harden, and impoverish religion. Catholicism can furnish no adequate apologetic for the Christian faith in this age of

transition, inquiry, doubt, and denial. Newman's legislative and institutional religion abdicates reason and enthrones an infallible church. History shows that Catholicism could never have sprung out of the religion of Christ; how and whence the sacerdotal idea crept into Christianity; how the church became a monarchy; and what were the unifying ideas which organized the Catholic system. Dr. Fairbairn pays his respects to Cardinal Manning; gives a chapter to Anglo-Catholicism, old and new; reviews Balfour's *The Foundations of Belief;* and examines critically the methods and ideas of Lightfoot, Hort, Hatch, Jowett, and other recent Cambridge and Oxford scholars, theologians and churchmen. Whatever else may be said of the present turmoil into which the priests have precipitated the Church of England, he deems it certain that "the English people are, and intend to remain, masters of their own religion in their own churches; and they, and not the clergy, will be the arbiters of our destinies. In religion, as in other things, they are a people who have, when the need arises, a masterful way of settling matters according to their own mind."

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO. ERI B. HULBERT.

MISSIONS AND POLITICS IN ASIA: Studies of the Spirit of the Eastern Peoples, the Present Making of History in Asia, and the Part therein of Christian Missions. By ROBERT E. SPEER. Chicago and New York: Fleming H. Revell & Co., 1898. Pp. 271. $1.

IN 1896–7 the young and vigorous secretary of the Presbyterian Board of Foreign Missions made an extended tour in Asia. On his return he delivered five lectures before the faculty and students of Princeton Theological Seminary, in February, 1898. Printed substantially as they were delivered, these lectures make the book now before us. There are very few works which give in so brief a compass correct and sympathetic views of those Asiatic nations which are now undergoing mental revolution. The countries treated are Persia, China, Japan, Korea, and several others under the head of southern Asia. In the countries governed by the ideas of Muhammed there seems to be very little to suggest hope or possibility of reformation. If these countries are ever to be resuscitated, so as to have even that measure of life which their admirers imagined they once had during the first half of the Middle Ages, it will be, as Renan has said of that period, not by reason, but in spite, of Islam. Mr. Speer sees that India has no

unity. It contains not one people, but a heterogeneous mass that is less one than are the peoples of Europe. Great Britain is now making a nation of the former agglomerate. He pays a merited high compliment to the work of the late Professor J. R. Seeley, whose books plowed a furrow beam-deep through British conceptions in theology and politics. Despite the selfishness and disobedience of this world-dominating race, God is using it in a way unique and supreme. Paying a high tribute to Chinese industry and character, Mr. Speer shows that the Chinese people is literally perishing from lack of knowledge. Incredible as it may seem, the overwhelming majority of China's millions are not only not acquainted with what Europeans have done in the way of invasion, seizure of territory, and humiliation of the Peking government, but they do not even believe that these things ever took place. Clear and luminous is his sketch of the Japan of this latest semi-decade of the century — the Japan that changes like a kaleidoscopic picture. Evidently this ultra-patriotic Japanese people — there is none with so strong a sense of nationality in Asia — will never embrace Christianity of the types known in Europe, but will, we doubt not, accept Christ as Lord and King by coming to him direct, without making much use of European culture in order to know him. On p. 189 we should add the name Yuri to that of Yokoi, and correct some minor errors, but in the main the picture is very true to facts. The sketch of Korea and the national movement, accurate and informing, seems especially to confirm the author's conviction, vindicated by the obvious facts of history and of life, that Christ is their certain goal. Altogether, this is a very bright and suggestive book which will help one to discern, not only the movement, but also the direction of those forces which are breaking up that old Asia of many systems of thought and life, and out of many are bringing forth one new civilization, that is, the Christian.

WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

ITHACA, N. Y.

CHRISTIANITY AND THE SOCIAL STATE. By GEORGE C. LORIMER, Minister at Tremont Temple. Philadelphia: A. J. Rowland; Copyright by the American Baptist Publication Society, 1898. Pp. xix + 488. $2.

THIS volume is the result of more than thirty-five years of reading and study, of observation and experience, both in this country and in Europe. It is written with the heart as well as with the intellect. Its

idealism is a marked feature. Throughout, the aim to model this earthly life after the divine pattern is manifest. "From the title of my book it will be inferred that I have derived the essential features of my idealism from the teachings of Jesus Christ. This, at least, has been my aim, and I trust that I have not failed to understand aright the mind of the Master." The exact aim of the book is indicated by the author in these words: "To me the prime mistake of Christianity has been in attempting to shape life itself exclusively in ecclesiastical organisms, instead of unfolding its meaning and exercising its functions in the social life of the world. It is in the hope of discrediting to some extent this fatal error that I have written."

In order to apply Christianity to the existing social system, Dr. Lorimer gives an account of the actual situation and its needs; he discusses the remedies proposed by the various schools of social reform; he defines the Christian method of solution, and pleads for the introduction of Christian principles into social relations and social practices.

The whole discussion is made to bear on the interpretation of the social state which is the author's ideal, and on the means of its establishment. While emphasizing the importance of Christianity, there is a recognition of the value of sociology, of economics, and of political science. Indeed, the volume aims to correlate Christianity with these and with other departments of human thought. It is shown that religion as isolated is unhealthy; it is complete only when brought into the right relation with the individual and society, and with all human affairs and interests.

Principles are discussed; but the volume is too full of facts and illustrations to be dull or heavy. Dr. Lorimer has gleaned from many fields, yet has done his own thinking. The book is thoughtful; the various subjects are treated frankly and sympathetically; the style is varied and popular; the contents are timely and living. Parties and measures are criticised, and amid the prevailing prejudices and passions respecting the social problems of the day, some, perhaps even Christians among them, will dissent from certain conclusions; but the work is healthful, avoids extremes, and honestly strives at impartiality and justice to the different classes. The true social state cannot be a class institution, but must be based on just economic, political, and social conditions permeated by the spirit and teaching of the gospel. As the classes are to be united on a basis of Christian equity, so is there to be a union of all the good elements in individualism and

socialism, in corporations and in organizations, in church and state, while the existing evils are to be eradicated. The author is conservative, yet eminently progressive. He sees that the present social condition is intolerable, but he favors gradual evolution instead of sudden and violent revolution. Amid the one-sided and destructive tendencies of the day it is cheering to find a writer who sees the hope of reform and regeneration in a union of all the good social forces, with Christianity as the chief, and who makes criticism the means for substantial and abiding constructions.

The place of *Christianity and the Social State* is in the front rank of the extensive literature which discusses social conditions and social reforms from the Christian point of view.

J. H. W. STUCKENBERG.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

An Outline Introductory to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. By R. M. Wenley, Professor of Philosophy in the University of Michigan. (New York: Henry Holt & Co., 1897; pp. vi + 95; 0.75.) This book aims to meet the wants of beginners in the study of the Kantian philosophy by giving them a general conspectus of its contents. It is not a short-cut to Kant — it does not go far enough to be regarded as that. Wenley seeks to furnish, in the simplest form, an outline of the contents of the *Critique of Pure Reason*, and to show, with similar generality, how the book came to be written at all. There is room for such a help as this, room not hitherto exactly occupied. The author has taken pains to eliminate technicalities, and to confine the use of philosophic terms so far as may be to those explained in the course of the outline. The book is to be earnestly commended to all who wish to take up the study of Germany's greatest thinker.— *Outline of the History of Ethics.* For English Readers. By Henry Sidgwick. Fourth edition. (London: Macmillan & Co.; New York: The Macmillan Co., 1898; pp. 288; $1.50.) It is not the purpose to review this book, but to call attention to the fourth edition into which it has entered. It may be mentioned that it is of special value to the theological student because of the fulness of the treatment of the relation of ethics to theology in the mediæval period. In the fourth edition the author has made only verbal alterations. The great merit of the book — especially to the student of all ethics aside from the French and the German — is well known, and need not be examined here.— GEO. B. FOSTER.

Magic, Divination and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbours, including an Examination of Biblical References and the Biblical Terms. By T. Witton Davies, B.A. (Lond.), Ph.D. (Leip.). (London: James Clarke & Co.; Leipzig: M. Spirgatis, 1898; pp. xvi+ 132; 3s. 6d.) This little work opens with an introduction which defines magic, and considers its relation to divination, necromancy, demonology, religion, etc. The author does not regard magic and religion as divorced — the former man's relation with unfriendly powers; the latter, with friendly — but as originating in the same impulse. "Magic in its crudest form involves religion in its purest, and is, in fact, on the way to being the perfect religion. . . . . Since magic is a low form of religion, it may precede the full realization of religion, or it may follow upon this last, and so be in that case a degeneration of religion" (p. 24).

The use of magic arts by the Hebrews in the Old Testament and in post-biblical Judaism is discussed, with illustrations drawn from Babylon and Egypt. Each term applied to magic in the Old Testament is carefully considered, and many suggestive conclusions are reached. Frequently throughout the book the author joins issue with Wellhausen and W. Robertson Smith as to the meaning of terms. He maintains (p. 44), for example, that קֶסֶם originally was a term of magic and not of divination, though he admits that the latter use of the word almost eclipsed the other. *Mot*, which the present reviewer showed some years since to have been a deity (*Oriental Studies of the Oriental Club of Phila.*, pp. 110 ff.), is regarded as a demon — a personification of death (p. 97). So Shĕôl is said to have been a demon among the Hebrews (p. 98). The denial of Peter before the crowing of the cock is connected with the idea that demons fled at cock crow (p. 106). Some sensible remarks are made on demoniacal possession in the New Testament (p. 103). Imperfect type has disfigured pp. 49 and 69. We have noticed but one misprint: "the" for "in" on p. 57, l. 16. — GEORGE A. BARTON.

Palästina, Land und Leute. Reiseschilderungen von W. Bambus. (Berlin: Siegfried Cronbach, 1898; pp. 175; M. 3.) There is not a very urgent need, at the present time, of another book of travels through the Holy Land, but the one under review is a unique one and will surely find an appreciative circle of readers. The author, as he himself informs us, is an orthodox Jew, and the journey to the Holy Land was undertaken to study the economic conditions of the Jews in

Egypt and Palestine, especially that of the newly planted Jewish colonies in Palestine. The author describes what he had himself seen and heard. With the results of the Jewish colonies he is highly pleased, and his contact in Palestine with the men who further this movement has made him an enthusiastic Zionist. The only things Palestine needs at present, he says, are money and Jewish agriculturists. He places the total number of Jews in Palestine at the present time at about 50,000, an incredibly small number. The book has scarcely a reference to Jewish or Christian history, while trade statistics and notes on education are plentiful and suggestive. The book might have been made more serviceable by the addition of a table of contents.—*Lex Mosaica, oder das mosaische Gesetz und die neuere Kritik.* Aus dem Englischen von Th. A. Fischer. (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1898; pp. vi+508; M. 10.) The translation into German of this well-known English book is a tribute to the erudition of the English scholars from whom the different parts of the book emanated, and surely their conservative position in questions of the higher criticism of the Old Testament will have a wholesome effect upon German readers. The translation has omitted some small portions of the original where the English Bible is mainly concerned and larger portions from the ninth essay, Dr. Alexander Stuart's. The polemical tone of the original has completely vanished in the translation, certainly a gratifying change.—A. J. RAMAKER.

Biblical Antiquities: A Description of the Exhibit at the Cotton States' International Exposition, Atlanta, 1895. By Cyrus Adler, Ph.D., Custodian, Section of Historic Religious Ceremonials, and I. M. Casanowicz, Ph.D., Aid, Division of Historic Archæology, U. S. National Museum. (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1898; pp. 943–1023 of "Report of the U. S. National Museum" for 1896.) This pamphlet is one of the good results of recent expositions, and will prove a great help to visitors to the U. S. National Museum, and students of the Old and New Testaments. The authors are well-known Semitic scholars and thoroughly at home in the subjects discussed and described. In addition to the great mass of descriptive material we have forty-six plates.[1]—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

[1] The subjects treated are: the land of the Bible; geology; flora; fauna (mammals, birds, reptiles, insects); Palestinian antiquities; musical instruments; precious stones; coins of Bible lands; dress, ornaments, and household utensils; Jewish religious ceremonial; antiquities: Egypt, Assyria, and Babylonia, Hittites; collection of Bibles; ancient versions and modern translations of the Bible.

Die Geschichte Jesu, erzählt von Dr. Paul Wilhelm Schmidt, ord. Professor der Theologie an der Universität Basel. (Freiburg i. B.: J. C. B. Mohr, 1899; pp. viii + 175; M. 3.) The title of this book is rather misleading. It deals quite as much with the teaching of Jesus as with his life, and it is not based on the whole of the evidence at our disposal, the gospel of John being virtually disregarded. It is evidently intended for the general public rather than for scholars, and is, therefore, without references except to passages of Scripture, and without explanatory notes. As the fourth gospel is practically left out of account, the ministry is regarded as extending over one year only; and the institution of the eucharist is referred to the fourteenth of Nisan. The early life of Jesus is scarcely touched. The four chapters in the gospels which refer to it seem to be mainly rejected as unhistorical. Other notable omissions are the three raisings of the dead and the story of the resurrection. Whatever the author's opinion, he was not justified in dropping these narratives from his "history" without a word of explanation. They must be dealt with in some way, or the hardest part of the problem is unsolved. Jesus is said to have claimed no dignity for himself except that of a plenipotentiary of the divine love. And yet Professor Schmidt believes that Jesus said: "All things have been delivered to me of my Father." The "history" is clever and suggestive, as far as it goes, but it is woefully incomplete. It leaves the origin of Jesus and the existence of Christianity wholly unexplained.—W. TAYLOR SMITH.

Les Paroles de Jésus, récemment découvertes en Egypte, et Remarques sur le texte du fragment de l'Évangile de Pierre. Par C. Bruston, Doyen de la Faculté de Théologie de l'Université de Toulouse. (Paris: Fischbacher, 1898; pp. 19.) In these few pages Professor Bruston has stated his understanding of the Oxyrhynchus fragment. For the most part his views were previously known from an article published in *La Vie nouvelle*, October 30, 1897. Against the prevailing opinion, but in accord with that of M. Batiffol (*Revue biblique internationale*, October, 1897), he holds that the *recto* is the page which begins with [τ]ὴν πτωχίαν. This gives him two sayings not preceded by "Jesus says," and instead put into the mouth of God. The first he restores to: [*Je t'ordonne*] *que tu* [*préfères*] *la pauvreté*, [*là*] *où* [*les im*]*pies sont* [*très puissants*] *et* [*dans*] *la* [*gloire*]. The second refers to the omnipresence of God (*cf.* Ps. 139). The five sayings attributed to Jesus are not to be understood as spoken by him as they stand. All

seven sayings come from a book which contained moral maxims, derived from various sources, these drawn, perhaps, from the apocryphal Gospel of Peter, or the Gospel of the Egyptians, or some other such writing. Our fragment was probably written in the first part of the second century. A page at the end of the pamphlet suggests corrections in the reading of three passages (vss. 1, 18, 41–42) in the Gospel of Peter.— C. W. VOTAW.

The Life and Letters of Paul the Apostle. By Lyman Abbott. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898; pp. xii+332; $1.50.) This volume of Dr. Abbott is marked by the excellencies of a nervous, earnest, clear style, a determination to plunge to the heart of things, and a conviction that the essence of Paulinism does not lie in its Judaistic form, but in its formulation of a magnificent Christian experience. It makes no serious pretension of great scholarship, but is none the less in touch with scholarly work. It mediates most admirably between the student and the general reader, and thus does for Paul something that was needed. The man who can read this book without being converted to the main positions of Paulinism will be obliged to combat his better judgment on nearly every page.— SHAILER MATHEWS.

St. Pauli Brief an die Galater in Bibelstunden für die Gemeinde ausgelegt. Von W. F. Besser. Zweite Auflage. (Halle a. S.: Richard Mühlmann's Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898; pp. 387; M. 3.) Besser's *Bibelstunden* are well known in Germany. They are practically a series of popular expository commentaries, in which the prime aim is spiritual instruction and edification. But they are solid; they are based on ripe exegetical study and are guided by the tact of the true interpreter; and they weave in a great deal even of critical material. This is the second edition of the exposition on Galatians; some of the other volumes have run up to the seventh and ninth edition.— WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

The Kingdom (Basileia). An Exegetical Study. By George Dana Boardman. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899; pp. x+348; $2.) During his long ministerial life Dr. Boardman has been a devout and devoted student of the Bible, and a most apt and attractive teacher of it, as his previously published books show. This work on the kingdom of God, prepared since his retirement from the pastorate, indicates that his love for his favorite pursuit has suffered no abatement. While

the present work is scholarly, and will delight all devout scholars, "the common people" will read it "gladly," and with great profit.

The kingdom of God, or kingdom of heaven, as proclaimed by the Baptist and by Christ and his apostles, does not readily yield itself to be defined in words. It is within men, for it is the reign of Christ in men's hearts, and it is in the world, because they are in the world. But no one, after reading Dr. Boardman's *Basileia* with attention, can fail to have a very distinct and quite adequate conception of the kingdom of God, which, it is to be feared, too many Christian people have not.

The author makes large use of Scripture, and the reverent and scholarly way in which he combines Scripture with Scripture is one of the chief charms of the book. While he is thoroughly loyal to the Scriptures, his keen and profound spiritual insight and his unfailing common sense in the interpretation of them save him from bondage to the letter and keep him true to the spirit.

Dr. Boardman is master of a style of remarkable expressiveness and impressiveness. The words he needs to give exact expression to his thought come to him in troops, and he marshals them in orderly array, and like well-drilled soldiers they do the bidding of his thought. Some slight mannerisms remind one of the conference-room, but do not strike us unpleasantly. Of course, not all his readers will accept all his interpretations of Scripture or his deductions therefrom, especially on points on which the scholarship of the age is not agreed, as the second coming of the King, or the precise attitude of the subjects of the kingdom on the question of war; but it may be said without qualification that all pious people who will give an attentive perusal to Dr. Boardman's *Basileia* will become more heartily loyal and intelligent citizens of the kingdom of God.—N. S. BURTON.

De Græcitate Patrum apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Testamenti quæstiones grammaticæ, scripsit Henricus Reinhold. (Halis Saxonum: Max Niemeyer, 1898; pp. 115; M. 2.80.) (="Dissertationes philologicæ Halenses," Vol. XIV, pars 1.) We welcome most heartily this dissertation and hope that it is only the beginning of more work along the same lines. It is written strictly from the philological point of view, forms a good supplement to the works of Schmiedel and Blass, and ranks with Deissmann's *Bibelstudien*. To a philologian the author's intimate knowledge of the great Cobet's works is most gratifying. After a brief description and enumeration of the writers and books

which the author has studied for his purpose, he discusses in four chapters: (1) topics of phonology and morphology; (2) nouns; (3) verbs; (4) moods and tenses. Constant reference is made to Schmiedel, Blass, Gustav Meyer, Schmid, *Atticismus*, and other standard works. Of special interest are §10, on metaplasm; §13, on the augment and reduplication in verbs; §19, de nonnullis verbis memorabilibus; new forms are ἐπίπεσον (Proch. 92, 8), p. 79, and ἀγάγαι, p. 80. Pp. 101–13 contain a chapter of a syntax which the author promises in the near future. The whole work is characterized by carefulness and painstaking minuteness.— *Der Aufbau der altchristlichen Literatur.* Eine kritische Untersuchung nebst Studien zu Cyprian, Victorinus und Augustin. Von Dr. Johannes Haussleiter, ord. Prof. der Theologie in Greifswald. (Berlin: Weidmann'sche Buchhandlung, 1898; pp. 45; M. 1.) This is a reprint of a review of Bardenhewer's *Patrologie* (Freiburg: Herder, 1894) and of Krüger's *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten* (Freiburg: Mohr, 1895), written by one of the best authorities on the literature of the early church, and will prove of great interest to students using either Bardenhewer or Krüger. Haussleiter, while appreciating the merits of the two books, draws attention to some mistakes and errors found in both. Of great interest are the independent remarks of the author on Cyprian, with special reference to his letters (pp. 14–35), Victorinus (pp. 35–7), and Augustine (pp. 37–45).—*Patrum Nicænorum Nomina* latine, græce, coptice, syriace, arabice, armeniace, sociata opera ediderunt Henricus Gelzer, Henricus Hilgenfeld, Otto Cuntz. (Lipsiæ: B. G. Teubner, 1898; pp. lxxiv + 266; M. 6.) (= Scriptores sacri et profani, Fasciculus II, Bibliotheca Teubneriana.) The proceedings of the council at Nice were soon lost in the troubles resulting from its decisions. Our knowledge of this first church assembly is, therefore, very limited, and the attempt of the authors to fill at least one gap is most welcome. We have here, at last, as a result of most arduous labor, crowded in very limited space, an almost complete list of the Nicene Fathers, collected from forty MSS., belonging to twenty-three libraries of Europe and the Orient. The lists, as appears from comparison, fall into two classes. The index of the Nicene Fathers can, however, only serve as an indirect proof of the acts of the council. The number 318 is justly declared spurious by Gelzer, it having been interpolated into the letter of Athanasius *ad Afros*, as well as in Theodoret's letter of Athanasius to Jovianus. The lists now published furnish some 280 names; Eusebius had 250. The archetype of all our indices seems to

go back to the *Synodicon* of Athanasius, a collection similar to the *Synagoge* of Sabinus, and dating forty years after the Acta Nicæna. The names of the Fathers are arranged according to provinces, with the name of the metropolitan heading each provincial list. In the acts of the council these names evidently were put according to rank and dignity. On p. lx we have the list of participants at the council, as far as it can be made out at present. A map is added for easier orientation, and five exhaustive indices complete this excellent work, in which philology has anew been of signal service to church history. The prolegomena especially are to be recommended as a splendid basis for critical exercises in our church-history seminars.—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

Altchristliche liturgische Stücke aus der Kirche Aegyptens, nebst einem dogmatischen Brief des Bischofs Serapion von Thmuis.[1] Von Georg Wobbermin, Ph.D., Lic. Theol. (Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs'sche Buchhandlung, 1898; pp. 36; M. 2.) This pamphlet makes accessible for the first time the text of part of a MS. found at Mt. Athos, presumably of the eleventh century, together with a brief critical dissertation upon it. The text consists of a collection of thirty prayers, with the first and fifteenth of which the name of Bishop Serapion is mentioned, and a tract Περὶ πατρὸς καὶ υἱοῦ. The editor's contention is that these all belong to the middle of the fourth century, and that the prayers give trustworthy light upon liturgical practice in the Egyptian church at that time. The attribution of the whole collection in some way to Serapion he makes very plausible, though not irresistible; but at all events we have here some important liturgical remains. The question as to their freedom from interpolation and rearrangement under unknown influences, however, is still open for discussion.

The collection of prayers somewhat closely resembles portions of the Apostolic Constitutions, though the succession of parts is not that of an orderly service. First we have a beautiful form of the eucharistic preface, ascription, and invocation, which is followed by brief formulæ relating to the distribution to clergy and laity. Prayers 5–11 have to do with baptism; 12–14 with the ordination of deacons, presbyters, and bishops; 14–16 with the use of oil in baptism; 17–18 with the sick or the dead; while 19–30 are parts of a full Lord's day service, including

[1] *Texte und Untersuchungen* zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur. Herausgegeben von OSCAR VON GEBHARDT und ADOLF HARNACK. Neue Folge. Band II, No. 3*b*.

an introductory prayer, prayers at the hearing of the homily, for catechumens, for the church, etc. These latter are explicitly described (in a note) as offered before the eucharistic prayer.

If there were space, it would be worth while to discuss somewhat many interesting questions concerning this collection — the general impression of authenticity and purity in the text as it stands; its relation to other extant literature, as the Didache, the Apostolic Constitutions, the so-called Liturgies of St. James, St. Mark, etc., to the Te Deum and other hymnic remains, and to the Scriptures as a source of reference and quotation; the implications regarding liturgical usage, ecclesiastical organization, and the growth of dogma; and also the general quality of religious thought and feeling exhibited. The study of these prayers, as of others of the early Greek liturgies, emphasizes anew the peculiar delicacy and beauty of thought in that whole field of liturgical expression. We may, therefore, be grateful to Dr. Wobbermin for laying before us this new material in so clear and serviceable a form. — WALDO S. PRATT.

A Manual of Patrology. Being a Concise Account of the Chief Persons, Sects, Orders, etc., in Christian History from the First Century to the Period of the Reformation. With select Bibliographical References. By Wallace Nelson Stearns, A.M., B.D. With an Introduction by J. H. Thayer, D.D., Litt.D. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1899; pp. xviii + 176, and maps; $1.50 *net.*) We welcome this book as the beginning of a larger work, which we hope the author will undertake with somewhat greater independence. There has been need of a book of this character.[1] The tables added to the book are very acceptable.—W. MUSS-ARNOLT.

St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. By Rev. Bromfield Jackson. (London and New York: Society for the Promotion of Christian Knowledge, 1898; pp. 78; 1s.) (= "Early Church Classics.") English

[1] It is a pity that the author has not made use of periodical literature, which would have enriched the book considerably. We cite a few references here. *Sub* Abercius we should like to have seen a reference to Ficker's article (1894) which started the whole controversy, and others, collected in this JOURNAL, 1898, pp. 949–50; Eustathius (p. 60), 2, *e. g.*, LOOFS' book on *Eustathius von Sebaste*, and his article in *Realencyklopaedie*[3], etc. *Ad* Hippolytus, the Hippolytus Thebanus and Diekamp's contributions toward his better knowledge would be very acceptable; Ficker's important book on Vigilius of Thapsus (1897). For Priscillian (p. 132) see Dierich (1897). Catena (p. 40), see Lietzmann's important book (1897), in addition to Heinrici's article. On Zacchæus (p. 158) recent contributions should have been used; etc.

readers will find much to interest them in this little book. It contains the principal facts that are known about Polycarp; a translation of his one extant letter — to the Philippians; also a translation of the letter to the Smyrneans.—*S. Aurelii Augustini Confessionum Libri Tredecim.* Ex recognitione P. Knöll. (Lipsiæ: in ædibus B. G. Teubner, 1898; pp. iv + 288; M. 2.70.) This volume comes in Teubner's library of Greek and Roman writers. The editor has evidently done faithful work, and his suggestions will be found very valuable.— *The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi.* By Abby Langdon Alger. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1898; $0.50.) About two hundred years after the death of St. Francis all the legends concerning the saint were brought together, and the collection was called *The Little Flowers of St. Francis.* These legends were handed down by tradition, and have the customary legendary value in interpreting the life and character of this remarkable person. *The Little Flowers* have never before been translated into English. This translation seems to have been very well made, and as it stands is a valuable contribution to the literature of St. Francis.— J. W. MONCRIEF.

Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss. Von Rudolph Sohm, Professor der Rechtswissenschaft in Leipzig. Elfte Auflage. (Leipzig: Verlag von E. Ungleich, 1898; pp. viii + 218; M. 3.) The popularity of this brief church history in Germany is manifest in its appearance in an eleventh edition. The author does not seem to have made any changes in it since the eighth edition. The booklet is intended especially for those who wish to possess an outline of German church history, and contains but little of value for others. The first chapter tells of the extension of Christianity throughout Europe, but in the four other chapters the author confines himself almost exclusively to its development in Germany, and seems scarcely to know of its career elsewhere.—*Philip Melanchthon*, the Protestant Preceptor of Germany; 1497–1560. By James William Richard, D.D., Professor of Homiletics, Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa. (New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons; The Knickerbocker Press, 1898; pp. xv + 399; $1.50.) This is the second volume of the series entitled "The Heroes of the Reformation,"[1] and it fully sustains the high reputation established by its predecessor. There is in both the same tendency to hero-worship, and to minimize faults and weaknesses; but there is also the same careful study of the materials, the same accuracy,

[1] See this JOURNAL, Vol. III, April, 1899, p. 427.

and the same success in condensing the narrative without making it dry and uninviting. Perhaps it may be said that Dr. Richard has succeeded better in presenting a complete picture of Melanchthon than Dr. Jacobs has in presenting a complete picture of Luther, for Dr. Jacobs, though he has intended to give us an exact portrait, has dressed Luther up too well, and has missed the passionate, stormy, and coarse features of his subject. Dr. Richard has had the less difficult task of delineating a man uniformly gentle and affectionate. The numerous illustrations scattered through the book constitute a sort of museum of Germany in the sixteenth century. The index is poor, containing only proper names, and hence omitting many things which the reader who consults the book on special topics will not know how to find.—*Liturgical Interpolations.* Alcuin Tracts, III. By Rev. T. A. Lacey, M.A., Vicar of Madingley. (London, New York, and Bombay: Longmans, Green & Co., 1898; pp. 21; 2s.) This tract is a mild protest against the practice of altering the liturgy of the *Anglican Prayer Book* to suit the taste or the doctrinal position of the minister conducting the service. It is interesting chiefly as showing how far such innovations are permitted. "Sixty years ago," the author writes, "there was an order" of worship; now "we can scarcely be said to have any order at all."—*History of Dogma.* By Dr. Adolph Harnack. Translated from the third German edition by Neil Buchanan. Vol. IV. (Boston: Little, Brown & Co., 1898; pp. xi + 353; $2.50.) This volume will be regarded by many as the most important of the series. It embraces the entire controversy concerning the deity of Christ and the trinity, from the beginning to the full formation of the orthodox system of belief.— FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

La fin du paganisme, étude sur les dernières luttes religieuses en occident au quatrième siècle. Par Gaston Boissier. Troisième édition. (Paris: Librairie Hachette et C^ie^, 1898; tome premier, pp. 394; tome second, pp. 452; fr. 7.) The first volume is divided into three books, in which the victory of Christianity, Christianity and Roman education, and the influence of pagan education on Christian authors are treated at length. Separate chapters are given to the conversion of Constantine, the edict of Milan and religious toleration under Constantine and his sons, the emperor Julian, public instruction in the Roman empire, how Christianity accommodated itself to Roman education, and kindred topics. In the second volume the three books discuss Latin Christian poetry, pagan society at the end of the fourth

century, and the final struggle between Christianity and paganism. The most interesting chapters are on the origin of Latin Christian poetry, the literary enemies of the Christian faith, Augustine's *City of God*, and the question of the responsibility of Christianity for the ruin of the empire. Boissier is a member of the French Academy and of the Academy of Inscriptions, and is the author of several works on Roman archæology which have passed through many editions. His previous studies have specially fitted him for this last undertaking. With that orderliness which characterizes the best French writers he traverses the vast field, never going twice over the same ground, and leaving no part of the territory unexplored. With that simplicity and directness for which the French are likewise noted he carries his study through more than 800 pages, from the conversion of Constantine to the final and utter collapse of the empire. The numerous topics are discussed in a spirit of candor and fairness.—*John Wesley and George Whitefield in Scotland*, or, The Influence of the Oxford Methodists on Scottish Religion. By Rev. D. Butler, M.A. (Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood & Sons, 1898; pp. vii + 312; 5s.) Whitefield paid fourteen visits to Scotland and Wesley twenty-two. For these visits their letters and journals are the original sources of information. From these our author has freely drawn, and the consequence is an exceedingly interesting and inspiring volume. The freshness and warmth with which Whitefield and Wesley narrate their convictions compel interest and attention, and fill the reader's own heart with something of the spiritual ardor with which their lives were animated. Incidentally these pages are of great "historical value in casting light upon the Scottish church life in the last century."—*The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, England, Holland, America.* By William Elliot Griffis. (Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1898; pp. ix + 296; $1.25.) Americans will never tire of the story of the pilgrim fathers. Brewster, Winslow, Carver, Bradford, Robinson, Fuller, Standish, and the others are saints and heroes who awaken the most tender and inspiring memories. "Their fame has gone through the world, and their glorious testimony to the ends of the earth." Scrooby, Leyden, Delfshaven, the "Mayflower," and Plymouth Rock are forever linked in the most sacred association with our most exalted conceptions of piety and patriotism. In preparing this narrative of the founders of New Plymouth Dr. Griffis has not permitted himself to take "second-hand opinions and statements from anyone." He has drawn his material directly from Bradford's *History*

of Plimouth Plantation, from the autograph writings of the pilgrim leaders, from the English and Dutch state papers of the pilgrim period, from the "original archives of the city of Leyden," from the trustworthy researches of the most eminent English, Dutch, and American specialists, and from "three leisurely visits to the three homes of the pilgrims." The result is that we have in this small volume an accurate and attractive history of the pilgrims in their cradleland, where Nottinghamshire, Lincolnshire, and Yorkshire "border nearest together;" in their refuge-home in the United States of the Netherlands at Amsterdam and Leyden; and in their New Plymouth home this side the sea. The narrative "depicts them amidst the hopes and fears, the joys and sorrows, of their daily environment in these three homes."—ERI B. HULBERT.

Wilhelm von St. Thierry: ein Repräsentant der mittelalterlichen Frömmigkeit. Von Lic. Hermann Kutter. (Giessen: J. Riecker'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898; pp. iv+205; M. 4.50.) The subject of this monograph was one of the ablest mystics of the mediæval church. Of the facts of his life but little is definitely known. He was the contemporary and lifelong friend of the great Bernard of Clairvaux. About 1119 A. D. he became abbot of the Cistercian monastery of St. Thierry, near Rheims, and died between 1148 and 1153. Like Bernard he was a devout Catholic, and intolerant of any opposition to the accepted doctrines of the church of his day. The author seeks to show that it was William who first began the attacks on Abélard's alleged heresies, and that to him and not to Bernard belonged the honor of having silenced the great scholastic. William was not dependent upon Bernard for his mystical speculations; he even surpassed Bernard in depth of thought and enthusiastic utterance. Both men had much in common, however, which may explain the fact that two of William's writings have actually been attributed to Bernard, and still so appear in Migne's *Patrology*. The best collection of William's writings has been edited by Massuet. In his conception of doctrine William was not in advance of his time, but, like all true mystics, it was not so much the philosophical expression of Christian truths that satisfied him most; his soul cried out after union with God, and to this he attained in spite of his theology. To the teaching of William the author devotes more than one-half of his monograph, giving copious extracts from William's writings. The literary notes at the conclusion of the book show wide reading. Altogether the book

is a very able production.—*Le Marquis Jacques de Rochegude et les Protestants sur les galères.* Par E. Jaccard. (Zürich: Depôt de la Société évangelique, 1898; pp. 111; fr. 2.) The task the author of this book sets before himself is not so much to write a biography of the Marquis de Rochegude, who was a French Huguenot exiled from his native country with many others, after the revocation of the edict of Nantes, but rather to describe the indefatigable labors of Rochegude in his endeavors to ameliorate the condition of the persecuted and exiled French Protestants between 1699 and 1713.—*Georg Müller, Prediger zu Bristol. Ein Abriss seines Lebens und eine Auswahl seiner Reden.* Von Pastor O. Steinecke. (Halle a. S.: Richard Mühlmann's Verlagsbuchhandlung (Max Grosse), 1898; pp. v+151; M. 2.50.) Since the appearance in 1886 of the autobiography of Georg Müller in four volumes a large number of shorter sketches of his life and labors have appeared in English and German. Pastor Steinecke's book is the latest one of these. It is written by a man who has enjoyed Müller's friendship, and who is in deep sympathy with the great work of faith and philanthropy Müller has been able to accomplish. The main facts of Müller's life and his labors in founding and maintaining the Bristol orphanages are told in popular language, and these never fail to interest and stimulate Christian people. The author does not hesitate to call Müller the English "Francke," a comparison which, if not carried too far, is surely appropriate. Like Francke, Müller succeeded in gathering about himself men and women of like faith with himself, a circumstance which added materially to the success of his enterprise. The major part of the book contains extracts of Müller's addresses. There are also illustrations of each of the five orphanages and a facsimile letter written by Müller at the age of eighty-eight.—A. J. RAMAKER.

The English Reformation and its Consequences. By W. E. Collins. (London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1898; pp. 322; 4s.) The book contains four carefully wrought and very able lectures, and an appendix of documents, thirty-two in number. The lectures are on "The Reformation of the English Church," "Romanism," "Puritanism," and "Sectarianism." They are written from the Anglican point of view, in clear, strong, respectful language, with no purpose to wound the feeliugs of opponents, and with no slightest symptom of compromise. Professor Collins has sharp convictions and the courage of them. One sees in his pages the radically dissident

views of the various bodies claiming the Christian name, and their apparently irreconcilable antagonisms. When Anglicans are ready to give up holy orders, and Romanists to abolish the authority of the pope, and Puritans to lay aside their Presbyterian Calvinism, and the sectaries (Independents, Baptist, etc.) to yield their congregationalism, then a few of the more formidable obstacles to Christian union will have been removed. It cannot possibly be that these diverse tenets are warranted by Holy Scripture, and until Anglican interpreters can expound the sacred volume more convincingly, it is probable that Christians of various names will abide in their present churches. The party divisions which are just now agitating the Establishment are not likely to accelerate the movement toward that particular fold. The student who wishes a lucid Anglican exposition of the opinions which divided the religious factions in the period of the English Reformation will do well to consult the pages of Professor Collins.—*The History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland.* By John Knox. Edited for popular use by C. J. Guthrie, Q.C., with notes, glossary, index, and fifty-six illustrations. (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1899; pp. xxvii + 364; $2.50.) The title sufficiently indicates the character of this edition of Knox's *Reformation.* For the first time we have this "hasty and strangely interesting, impressive, and peculiar book" in a single volume, in modern spelling, punctuation, and paragraphing, in division into chapters, with helpful notes, illustrations, glossary, and index, and at a moderate price. Mr. Guthrie is entitled to the gratitude of the public for this most admirable piece of editing.—ERI B. HULBERT.

Introduction à la Dogmatique. Œuvres posthumes de P.-F. Jalaguier. Publiée par Paul Jalaguier, avec une préface de M. le Pasteur A. Decoppet. (Paris: Libiairie Fischbacher, 1897; pp. xxiii + 673; fr. 10.) This introduction to theology by a great French teacher of the last generation is a posthumous work prepared for publication by the author's grandson, as a labor of love, and at the instigation of former devoted students. The titles of its eight chapters will briefly indicate the substance of the book: religion, theology, general revelation, authenticity of the New Testament, Christian revelation, inspiration of the New Testament, use and authority of the Scriptures, principles of theology. Add to this the following from the preface by Decoppet, and the author's point of view can be easily and accurately conjectured by the reader: "He has been in no sense an

innovator. Rather, he has taught the peril of innovation. He has attached his name to a single method, to a particular system. He has not even freshened the formulæ of traditional orthodoxy by personal and original insight into the great Christian doctrines. Essentially conservative, he has given himself to calling back the theology of his time, which had wandered into the dangerous paths of an excessive subjectivism, to the objective and scriptural method of the elder reformers." Accordingly, the work is an able reflection of the polemics and tenets of the orthodoxy of the Reformed church of French Protestantism.—GEORGE B. FOSTER

Religion und Christentum. Von Dr. Paul Ewald. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung Nachf. (Georg Böhme), 1898; pp. 39; M. 0.75.) After an extended examination and criticism of various definitions of religion the author submits his own: that religion is man's affirmation of the supersensuous, and that such affirmation has a potent influence upon his conduct. He maintains that Christianity meets man's requirements fully, that it is not one religion among many, but is the ideal religion founded upon a supernatural divine revelation. The treatment of the subject is technical rather than popular.—A. J. RAMAKER.

Wesen und Wirkung der Taufgnade. Von Dr. Hermann Cremer. (Gütersloh: Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, 1899; pp. 20; M. 0.30.) The tract is a defense and explanation of baptismal regeneration, or rather baptismal grace and forgiveness. The divinely instituted symbol must convey what it symbolizes, the washing away of sins. The author says, if we understand him correctly, that regeneration consists in forgiveness rather than the impartation of the power of a new life. Children need baptism because their human nature is sinful. The fact that they show no signs of faith need not deter, for there is a difference between faith before and faith after baptism. The tract is popular in character, probably intended to allay the feeling that infant baptism is useless.—*Erkennen und Schauen Gottes.* Beitrag zu einer neuen Erkenntnislehre für Theologen und Nichttheologen. Von L. Weis. (Berlin: C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, 1898; pp. xv + 230; M. 3.) (=Heft 4 and 5 of "Beiträge zum Kampf um die Weltanschauung.") The author is not a theologian, but a scientist, who has published a text-book on mineralogy and chemistry. He is impressed with the conviction that the contrast between rich and poor in regard to material goods is paralleled by a similar contrast in regard to the

higher, spiritual goods. The intellectual aristocracy claims philosophy as its heritage, and leaves religion to the ignorant, to women and children. The author desires to show that the God of Christianity is the only God for philosopher and laborer, and that there is no divorce between philosophy and religion. There is a great deal of interesting matter in the book, but one has the impression that on its religious side it is the work of an amateur. — WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Visions of Sin. By James Hope Moulton, Senior Classical Master in the Leys School. (London: Charles H. Kelly, *1898*; pp. *227*; 2s.) This booklet is an admirable example of the ability of a cultivated historical imagination to make effective moral use of biographical material. With a true historical method the author lays hold upon and exhibits those fatal defects and biases in the characters of Achan, Saul, Judas, Caiaphas, Herod Antipas, and Pilate, which led to their final and complete undoing. The two poems appended, however, add neither to the value of the book nor to the writer's reputation *(p. 73).*—HENRY TODD

Kompendium der theologischen Ethik. Von D. Chr. Ernst Luthardt. Zweite verbesserte Auflage. (Leipzig: Dörffling & Francke, 1898; pp. viii + 382; M. 7.) This work, which first appeared in 1896 and now again in a second edition, was written as a companion to the author's well-known *Kompendium der Dogmatik.* This book being a second edition, it is only necessary here to call attention to its merits. The book is characterized by fulness and lucidity of treatment; clearness of analysis; thorough familiarity with the history of ethics, both Greek and Christian; biblical learning, deeply colored, indeed, by Lutheran orthodoxy; and a mature Christian spirit. Each section is in general made up of three parts: a full bibliography of the subject; a brief statement of the writer's own position; quotations from and references to classical authors, the Scriptures, and the writers of various periods, from the earliest down to the present. It is this vast mine of historical reference that constitutes the principal value of the work. The new edition may be confidently expected to serve that practical end for which the first was prepared. Its value would have been enhanced for English and American students if the bibliographical references to modern writers had not been so almost exclusively confined to German writers.— F. C. FRENCH.

Un Catholicisme Américain. Par A.-J. Delattre, S. J. (Namur: Auguste Godenne, imprimeur-éditeur, 1898; pp. xv + 184.) In this

little volume the theories of Father Hecker, one of the founders of the Paulist community, are submitted to a searching examination from the conservative Roman Catholic point of view. Father Hecker advocated the more liberal views held in that branch of the church which has come to be known as American Catholicism.

The author finds that this would-be reformer is very deficient in intellectual preparation — that he cannot read Latin, for instance. As was to be expected, therefore, his expressed views are, in his critic's judgment, full of historical errors, and, consequently, his theories are vitiated at their sources. — J. W. MONCRIEF.

Die Evangelisation mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Heiligungsbewegung. Von Th. Hardeland, Pastor in Lüneburg. (Leipzig: A. Deichert'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1898; pp. 55; M. 0.60.) For some years efforts have been made by Professor Christlieb and others to introduce evangelistic work in Germany. They have tried to increase the number of religious workers, especially among the unchurched masses of the great cities, and to introduce new and more vigorous methods for the conversion of the unsaved. This movement has frequently been in close touch with the holiness or "higher life" movement. This pamphlet is a discussion and condemnation of the whole movement, not only of its extreme sanctification doctrines, but also of its effort to stir the people by vivid appeal and new methods. The author acknowledges the desperate religious condition of the city population in Germany, but maintains that the remedy will have to be brought by the regular clergy, or there will be no remedy. — WALTER RAUSCHENBUSCH.

Die christliche Heidenmission. Ein systematischer Studiengang für Jugend- und Missions-Vereine. Von Albert J. Ramaker, Lehrer am theologischen Seminar der Baptisten zu Rochester, N. Y. (Cleveland, O.: Herausgegeben vom Publikations-Verein der deutschen Baptisten, 1898; pp. 288.) — *Ein Ueberblick über die Geschichte der deutschen Baptisten von Nord-Amerika.* Von Albert J. Ramaker. (Cleveland, O.: *ibid.*, 1897; pp. 63.) The first of these two books, though small, is a comprehensive history of Christian missions in the widest sense. It is divided into twelve lessons. Each lesson contains, first, a list of references for wider reading on the topic; then a brief statement of the history; then a list of references concerning special features of the history; and, last of all, questions for review. The entire work of

missions, whether apostolic, Catholic, or Protestant, from the earliest period to the latest, is presented in epitome. The book might well be translated into English for Christian culture classes and for the missionary concert. By enlarging it somewhat and by introducing a greater number of divisions, it might be adapted to the wants of academies and colleges. — The second of these books is but a brief sketch, yet it presents what the reader interested in the German Baptists of America will most wish to know. — FRANKLIN JOHNSON.

The Sorrow of God, and Other Sermons. By John Oates, North Finchley, author of *The Teaching of Tennyson.* (New York: E. R. Herrick & Co., 1898; pp. 240; $1.) These sermons are so beautiful that one would fain know more of the preacher; but, so far as the present volume is concerned, there is, from preface to finis, no clue as to anything of a purely personal interest, except that he has given to the world a volume of essays on the influence of Tennyson considered as a teacher. The volume is, therefore, as nearly impersonal as it can well be. The sermons, however, speak for themselves. Since reading Phillips Brooks' discourses we have seen no specimens of pulpit eloquence which have captivated us as these have. They are evangelical in doctrine, chaste in diction, fresh and sometimes striking in the treatment of the text, apt in illustration, and abounding in pertinent poetical quotation. They seem to us in style and subject-matter almost faultless, and there can hardly be too many of such published. Especially were we interested by those on "The Gospel of the Glory," "The Program of Christ," "The Crowned Christ," "The Wakeful Souls," and "The Glory of the Cross." The only adverse criticism which occurs to us to make is that, while every sermon in the series is evangelical, there is no one of them which is distinctly evangelistic, addressing the sinner and appealing to him to surrender himself to Jesus Christ. There is no strong and rugged grappling with conscience, nothing to bring one face to face with the judgment of God. Nevertheless, it would be unfair to infer, because this is true of these sermons, that it is true of the author's ministry taken as a whole. — *Christian Truth and Life.* Sermons. By Milton Valentine, D.D., LL.D., ex-President of Pennsylvania College, and Professor of Systematic Theology in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., etc. (Philadelphia: Lutheran Publication Society, 1898; pp. 358; $1.50.) Of the masterly discourses which are here gathered together, several were delivered on baccalaureate occasions, but the

special purpose in their preparation by no means limits their value to the general reader. The particular truth which constitutes what may be called the pith of the text is seized upon and presented, and then illustrated and enforced with a logical directness and a clearness of statement, with an analytical skill, a breadth of view, and a power of spiritual insight, which leave no doubt of the preacher's complete mastery of his subject. Dr. Valentine believes "that Christian truth has been given for Christian life." These sermons discuss, therefore, Christian truth in its practical relations rather than theologically or metaphysically, and the consequence is that the readers would never know from these sermons that their scholarly author was a Lutheran, although they could not fail to recognize that he was a great Christian who lived among the verities of New Testament truths, whose moral and intellectual life was dominated by them, and about which there hovered in his mind no haze of doubt nor misty vagueness of apprehension. The preacher believes with Dean Stanley that "in Christianity nothing is of real concern except that which makes us wiser and better." The sermons expound doctrines as truths, and emphasize duties for Christian men, with a view of making them both "wiser and better." It seems to us that they admirably succeed; or if they fail, success must be impossible — R. E. NEIGHBOR.

Die Verhandlungen des neunten evangelisch-sozialen Kongresses, abgehalten in Berlin am 2. und 3. Juni 1898. (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1898; pp. iv + 165; M. 2.) The series of discussions of the Evangelical Social Congress deserves the attention of all students of the social movement in the Christian church. Some of the strongest men, laymen and theologians, of Germany have contributed discussions and papers. The principal papers in this volume are "Luthers Stellung zu den sozialen Fragen seiner Zeit," by a docent of Greifswald, Licentiat Lezius; "Arbeiterorganisation," by Professor W. Stieda, Leipzig; and "Die religiös-sittliche Gedankenwelt unsrer Industriearbeiter," by Pastor M. Rade, of Frankfort.—C. R. HENDERSON.

THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY has also received books from the following firms:

Charles Scribner's Sons, New York: Sanders, Frank Knight, Ph.D., and Kent, Charles Foster, Ph.D., The Messages of the Earlier Prophets. Arranged in the order of time, analyzed, and freely rendered in paraphrase; 2d edition, 1899; pp. 300; cloth. $1.25 *net.*

Peter Eckler, 35 Fulton Street, New York: Davidson, Samuel, D.D., Canon of the Bible. Its Formation, History and Fluctuations; pp. v + 139; paper. $0.50.

The Macmillan Co., New York: Huddilston, John Homer, A.B., Ph.D., Key to Essentials of New Testament Greek; pp. 20; paper. $0.25. — Douglas, George William, D.D., Sermon Delivered at the Ordination of Charles Augustus Briggs, D.D., and Charles Henry Snedeker at the Pro-Cathedral, New York, Sunday, May 14, 1899; with a Prefatory Note by the Bishop of New York; pp. 32; paper. $0.25.

Cumberland Presbyterian Publishing House, Nashville, Tenn.: Bone, W. P., The Bible in Our Day; pp. 29; paper.

Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House, New York: Huntington, William Reed, D.D., The Talisman of Unity. A sermon in behalf of church consolidation preached in the crypt of the Cathedral of St. John the Divine, Sunday, January 22, 1899; pp. 20; paper.

American Baptist Publication Society, Philadelphia: Lorimer, George C., D.D., LL.D., Christianity as a World-Power. Annual sermon preached before the Baptist Missionary and Publication Societies at San Francisco, May 28, 1899; pp. 44; paper. $0.10.

Caesar Schmidt, Zürich: Goldstein, Dr. Ferdinand, Urchristentum und Sozialdemokratie, 1899; pp. 191; paper. M. 3.

Druck und Verlag von B. G. Teubner, Leipzig: Scala, Rudolph von, Die Staatsverträge des Altertums. Erster Teil, 1898; pp. xiv + 226; paper. M. 5.

Druck und Verlag von C. Bertelsmann, Gütersloh: Dehninger, Friedrich, Christentum und moderne Weltanschauung. Studien und Kritiken. 1899; pp. 127; paper.

Mayer & Mueller, Berlin: Michaelis, Gualtharius, De origine indicis deorum cognominum dissertatio inauguralis philologica quam consensu et auctoritate amplissimi philosophorum ordinis in Alma Litterarum Universitate Friderica Guilelma Berolinensi, ad summos in philosophia honores rite capessandos die XIII M. Augusti A. MDCCCXCVIII. Una cum sententiis controversis publice defendet Scriptor; pp. 91.

H. O. Schulze, Lichtenfels: Schlier, O., Die Thomasianischen Episteln. Ein Beitrag zur Einführung in dieselben, 1899; pp. 420; paper.

C. A. Schwetschke und Sohn, Berlin: Blöhbaum, Emil, Christus redivivus, 1899; pp. 209. M. 3.

Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, London and Edinburgh: Welch, Rev. A., The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews, and Other Papers, 1898; pp. vi + 214.

Publishing House of the M. E. Church, Nashville, Tenn.: Sutherland, Alexander, D.D., The Kingdom of God and Problems of Today. Lectures delivered before the Biblical Department of Vanderbilt University, 1898; pp. xx + 240.

Swan Sonnenschein & Co., London: Balmforth, Ramsden, The Evolution of Christianity, 1898; pp. xiv + 161.

James Parker & Co., London: Parker, Rev. John, M.A., The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite. Part II. The Heavenly Hierarchy and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Now first translated into English, from the original Greek, 1899; pp. xx + 167.

Franz Kirchheim, Mainz: Playfair, S. H., The Nicetical Christ, 1898; pp. 47. 1s.

INDEX.

I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS.

ABBOTT, FRANK F., Review of Wünsch, Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 760

ADENEY, WALTER F., The Transcendental Element in the Consciousness of Christ - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 99

Aḥiḳar story and the book of Tobit - - - - - - - - - - 541

Aleander and Luther at the Diet of Worms - - - - - - - - 187

ALLEN, HAMILTON FORD, Review of: Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien - 162

Fritz, Die Briefe des Bischofs Synesius von Kyrene - - - - - 790

American promoters of the Edict of Tolerance of Louis XVI. (1787) - - 554

ANDERSON, GALUSHA, Review of: Pattison, The Making of the Sermon - 612

van Dyke, Sermons to Young Men - - - - - - - - - 414

ARNOLT, W. MUSS-, Review of: Adler and Casanowicz, Biblical Antiquities 846

Gelzer, Hilgenfeld, Cuntz, Patrum Nicænorum Nomina - - - - 850

Haussleiter, Der Aufbau der altchristlichen Literatur - - - - 850

Petersen, Cherubim - - - - - - - - - - - - - 629

Reinhold, De Græcitate Patrum apostolicorum, etc. - - - - - 849

Stearns, A Manual of Patrology - - - - - - - - - 852

Weidner, Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology - - - 762

Theological and Semitic Literature. Four bibliographical supplements.

Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle - - - - - - 107, 570

Attitude of the Church (of England under Elizabeth) toward Catholics - 689

Authority, Relative, of the Gospels - - - - - - - - - - 275

BADHAM, F. P., The Martyrdom of St. John - - - - - - - - 729

BARBOUR, J. H., Review of Karl, Johanneische Studien - - - - - 373

Barlow, consecration of - - - - - - - - - - - - - 686

BARNES, LEMUEL CALL, Review of Beaton, Selfhood and Culture - - 420

BARTON, GEORGE A., The Bearing of the Composition of the Psalter on the Dâte of the Forty-fourth Psalm - - - - - - - - - - 740

Review of: Boehmer, Reich Gottes und Menschensohn im Buche Daniel 771

Davies, Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbours - - - - - - - - - - - - - 845

Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (articles bearing on "Revelation") 96

Terry, Biblical Apocalyptics - - - - - - - - - - 588

BARTON, WILLIAM E., Review of King, The Psalms in Three Collections - 632

BATTEN, L. W., Review of Mortimer, Jesus and the Resurrection - - - 431

Bearing of the Composition of the Psalter on the Date of the Forty-fourth Psalm, George A. Barton - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 740

BETTERIDGE, WALTER R., Review of: Holzinger, Genesis - - - - 152

BETTERIDGE, WALTER R., Review of: Riedel, Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der jüdischen Gemeinde und der griechischen Kirche - - 632
Steuernagel, Das Deuteronomium - - - - - - - - - 358
Bible Dictionary, The Hastings, Vol. I - - - - - - - - - 84
Bibliography. Four supplements.
BISHOP, WM. WARNER, Review of Armellini, Lezione di Archeologia Cristiana - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 793
BLACKBURN, F. A., Review of Trautmann, Kynewulf, der Bischof und Dichter 791
BLACKMAN, W. F., Review of Bovon, Morale chrétienne - - - - - 212
BONET-MAURY, GASTON, The Edict of Tolerance of Louis XVI. (1787) and its American Promoters - - - - - - - - - - - 554
Book Reviews. See Index II, Recent Theological Literature.
Books Received - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 432, 864
BRACQ, J. C., Review of: Batiffol, Six leçons sur les évangiles - - 424
Ciolli, Directoire pratique du jeune confesseur - - - - - - 615
Guyot, Faut-il une religion ? - - - - - - - - - 224
Perrin, L'évangile et le temps présent - - - - - - - - 224
Romain, L'église catholique et les Protestants - - - - - - 224
BRASTOW, LEWIS O., Review of Gladden, The Christian Pastor and the Working Church - - - - - - - - - - - - 410
BREASTED, JAMES H., Review of Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (Egypt, Kush, Art and Archæology, etc.) - - - - - - - - - 91
BROWN, WM. ADAMS, Review of: Petran, Beiträge zur Verständigung über Begriff und Wesen der sittlich-religiösen Erfahrung - - - - 832
Sabatier, Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion - - - - - - 626
BUCK, CARL DARLING, Review of Jackson, Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 756
BUDDE, KARL, The So-called "Ebed-Yahweh Songs," and the Meaning of the Term "Servant of Yahweh" in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–55 - - - 499
BUELL, M. D., Review of Meyer-Weiss, Das Matthäus-Evangelium - 777
BURNHAM, SYLVESTER, Review of Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (articles on Prophets and Prophetic Books) - - - - - - - - - 89
BURTON, ERNEST DEWITT, Review of: Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 774
Heinecke, Synopse der drei ersten kanonischen Evangelien - - - 164
Huck, Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien - - - - - - - 164
Meyer-Sieffert, Der Brief an die Galater - - - - - - - 777
Meyer-Weiss, Der Brief an die Römer - - - - - - - - 777
Smith, Geo. Adam, The Life of Henry Drummond - - - - - 606
Stählelin, Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater - - - - - 425
Veit, Die synoptischen Parallelen - - - - - - - - 164
BURTON, N. S., Review of: Boardman, The Kingdom (Basileia) - - 848
Moss, The Range of Christian Experience - - - - - - - 834

Calvin's doctrine of predestination - - - - - - - - - - 202
Catholics, attitude of the Church of England, under Elizabeth, toward - 689

CATTERALL, RALPH C. H., Review of Taunton, The English Black Monks of St. Benedict - 183
Christ of History and of Experience - 207
Transcendental Element in the Consciousness of - 99
Christian Theology, An Outline of - 203
Christmas, The History of - 1
Christological passage in Philippians, chap. 2 - 108
Chronicler, the, as the Levitical prophet - 272
Chronicles as an outgrowth of the times - 267
as a piece of religio-historical literature - 251
Church of England, Elizabethan Settlement of the - 679
Church of England's attitude toward Catholics, under Elizabeth - 689
CLARKE, WILLIAM N., Review of: Kuyper, Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles - 585
Lidgett, The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement - 402
Pike, The Divine Drama - 752
Classical poetry and divine revelation - 141
CLEMEN, CARL, Review of: Lauterburg, Der Begriff des Charisma - 615
Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 3. Aufl., Bd. II und III - 595
Composition of the Psalter bearing on the date of the forty-fourth psalm - 740
CONE, ORELLO, Review of Teichmann, Die paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht - 221
Consciousness of Christ, Transcendental Element in the - 99
CONYBEARE, FRED. C., The History of Christmas - 1
A Hitherto Unpublished Treatise against the Italian Manicheans; a document - 704
COULTER, JOHN MERLE, The Proper Use of Science by the Pulpit - 641
Creation and providence, and modern science - 138
Critical and Historical Notes - 99–137, 541–77, 729–46
CROSS, GEORGE, Review of Chapuis, Du surnaturel - 151
Curriculum, theological, shall it be modified, and how? - 45, 324
CURTIS, EDWARD L., Review of: Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures - 768
Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (Hexateuch, etc.) - 85
Cyrus in Isa., chaps. 40–48 - 67

DAVIES, T. WITTON, Review of Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon - 764
Deutero-Isaiah, Servant of Yahweh in - 499
DEWOLFE, H. T., Review of: Farrar, Sin and its Conquerors - 218
Henslow, Four Essays - 218
MacArthur, Current Questions for Thinking Men - 422
Moulton, Visions of Sin - 860
Tupper, Gladstone and Other Addresses - 422
Documents: *A Hitherto Unpublished Treatise against the Italian Manicheans*, Fred. C. Conybeare - 704

Donatist schism - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 182
Donne, John (1621–31) - - - - - - - - - - - - 190
Double Text of Tobit. Contribution toward a Critical Inquiry, J. Rendel Harris - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 541

Ebed-Yahweh songs in Isaiah II - - - - - - - - - - 157
"Ebed-Yahweh Songs," The So-called, and the Meaning of the Term "Servant of Yahweh" in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–55 - - - - - 499
ECCLES, R. KERR, Review of Jungnitz, Martin von Gerstmann - - - 810
Edict of Tolerance of Louis XVI. (1787) and its American Promoters, Gaston Bonet-Maury - - - - - - - - - - - - - 554
ELIOT, CHARLES W., Modifications in the Theological Curriculum - - 331
Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of England, John F. Hurst - - - 679
England, The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of - - - - 679
English Black Monks of St. Benedict - - - - - - - - 183
Essay "Contra Novatianum," Caspar René Gregory - - - - - - 566
Ethical Postulates in Religion, W. Rupp - - - - - - - - 654
EVERETT, WALTER G., Review of Fairbanks, The First Philosophers of Greece 347

FAIRLEY, WILLIAM, Review of Ward, Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman 196
FAUNCE, W. H. P., Review of: Andrews, Christianity and Anti-Christianity, in their Final Conflict - - - - - - - - - - - 354
Hennemann, Die Heiligkeit Jesu - - - - - - - - - - 378
FITE, WARNER, Review of Titchener, A Primer of Psychology - - - 625
FOSTER, GEO. B., Review of: Brown, Christ the Vitalizing Principle of Christian Theology - - - - - - - - - - - - - 636
Jalaguier, Introduction à la Dogmatique - - - - - - - 858
Orr, The Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith - - - 401
Rylance, Christian Rationalism - - - - - - - - - 637
Sidgwick, Outline of the History of Ethics - - - - - - 844
Steinbeck, Das Verhältnis von Theologie und Erkenntnis-Theorie - 822
Vowinckel, Geschichte und Dogmatik - - - - - - - - 636
Wenley, An Outline Introductory to Kant's Theory of Pure Reason - 844
FOSTER, J. M., Review of Carus, Chinese Philosophy - - - - - 148
FOX, NORMAN, Review of Clemen, Der Ursprung des heiligen Abendmahls 831
FRAME, J. E., Review of Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I ("Acts of the Apostles") - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 94
Franklin, Benjamin, and the Edict of Tolerance, 1787 - - - - - 560
FRENCH, F. C., Review of Luthhardt, Kompendium der theologischen Ethik 860
FREUND, ERNST, Review of Conrat, Die Christenverfolgungen im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen - - - - - - 634
Fulfilment of Prediction in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–48, Owen H. Gates - - 67
FULLERTON, KEMPER, Review of Schlatter, Die Parallelen in den Worten Jesu bei Johannes und Matthaeus - - - - - - - - - 781

GATES, OWEN H., Fulfilment of Prediction in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–48 - - 67
GENUNG, GEORGE F., Personality from the Monistic Point of View - - 473
GENUNG, JOHN FRANKLIN, Review of Garland, The Problems of Job - - 591
GERHART, EML. V., Relative Authority of the Gospels - - - - - 275

GERHART, EML. V., Review of: Nösgen, Symbolik - - - - - - 210
Spaeth, Charles Porterfield Krauth - - - - - - - - 396
God, possible personality predicated of - - - - - - - - 475
GOODSPEED, EDGAR JOHNSON, The Newberry Gospels - - - - - 116
Review of Abbott, "Do This in Remembrance of Me": Should it be "Offer This"? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 633
GOODSPEED, GEO. S., Review of: Darmesteter, The Zend-Avesta - - 220
Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (articles on Assyriology, etc.) - - 89
Gospel of the Reformation, has it become antiquated? - - - - - 433
Gospels, Relative Authority of the - - - - - - - - - 275
The Newberry - - - - - - - - - - - - - 116
GOULD, E. P., Review of: Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (articles on Biblical Theology) - - - - - - - - - - - - 96
Johannes, Kommentar zum ersten Briefe des Apostels Paulus an die Thessalonicher - - - - - - - - - - - - 786
Winkler, Der Traditionsbegriff des Urchristenthums bis Tertullian - 200
GOULD, L. A., Review of Stott, Twenty-six Years of Missionary Work in China - - - - - - - - - - - - - 217
GOW, GEO. C., Review of Johnson-Ayres, Sursum Corda - - - - - 214
GREGORY, CASPAR RENÉ, The Essay "Contra Novatianum" - - - - 566
GRIFFIS, WILLIAM ELLIOT, Review of: Bradley, Lectures on Ecclesiastes - 161
Speer, Missions and Politics in Asia - - - - - - - - 841
GUNDERSEN, H., Review of Hansen og Olsen, De danske Baptisters Historie 391

HAIGAZIAN, ARMENAG, Review of Conybeare, The Key of Truth - - 380
HALL, CHARLES CUTHBERT, Modifications in the Theological Curriculum - 335
HALL, FRANCIS J., Review of Feasey, The Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial - - - - - - - - - - - - - 638
HARMON, G. M., Review of Stapfer, La mort et la resurrection de Jésus-Christ 424
HARPER, ROBERT FRANCIS, Review of Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria - - - - - - - - - - - - - 753
HARPER, WILLIAM R., Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How? - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 45
HARRIS, GEORGE, Modifications in the Theological Curriculum - - - 324
HARRIS, J. RENDEL, The Double Text of Tobit. Contribution toward a Critical Inquiry - - - - - - - - - - - - 541
Has the Gospel of the Reformation become Antiquated? Friedrich Loofs - - 433
Hastings Bible Dictionary, The - - - - - - - - - - 84
Hebrew historiography and the place of the Chronicles - - - - 251
tabernacle, history of - - - - - - - - - - - - 158
HENDERSON, C. R., Review of: Batten, The New Citizenship - - - 640
Maurenbrecher, Thomas von Aquino's Stellung zum Wirtschaftsleben seiner Zeit - - - - - - - - - - - - - 639
Sombart, Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century 640
Strong, The Twentieth Century City - - - - - - - - 639
Verhandlungen des neunten evangelisch-sozialen Kongresses - - 863
HEUVER, G. D., Review of Rogge, Der irdische Besitz im Neuen Testament 633
Historical Notes, Critical and - - - - - - - - - 99, 541, 729

Historicity of the Chronicles - - - - - - - - - - - 258
History of Christmas, Fred. C. Conybeare - - - - - - - - 1
Hitherto Unpublished Treatise against the Italian Manicheans, Fred C. Conybeare - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 704
HOVEY, ALVAH, Review of: Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology - 203
Maillet, La création et la providence devant la science moderne - - 138
HUIZINGA, ABEL H., Review of van Douwen, Socinianen en Doopsgezinden 809
HULBERT, ERI B., Review of: Asplen, A Thousand Years of English Church History - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 604
Boissier, La fin du paganisme - - - - - - - - - - 854
Bright, Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life - - - - - - 796
Butler, John Wesley and George Whitefield in Scotland - - - 855
Büttgenbach, Geschichte des Kreuzes vor u. nach Golgotha - - - 171
Carnegie, Church Troubles and Common Sense - - - - - - 837
Collins, The English Reformation and its Consequences - - - 857
Fairbairn, Catholicism: Roman and Anglican - - - - - - 837
Gee, The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558–1564 808
Griffis, The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, England, Holland, America 855
Guthrie, John Knox and John Knox's House - - - - - - 428
Jessopp, John Donne - - - - - - - - - - - - 191
Kinloch, Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical History in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries - - - - - - - - - - 389
Knox, The History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 858
Sanday, The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England - - - - - - - - - - - 837
Seymour, Cross in Tradition, History and Art - - - - - - 171
Sharpe, A Vindication of Anglo-Catholic Principles - - - - 837
Vedder, A History of the Baptists in the Middle States - - - 392
Human personality, redemption of - - - - - - - - - - 490
HURST, JOHN F., The Elizabethan Settlement of the Church of England - 679
HYVERNAT, H., Review of The Coptic Version of the New Testament, in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic or Bohairic - - - 598

Idealization in the Chronicles - - - - - - - - - - - 263
Import of the Chronicles as a Piece of Religio-Historical Evidence, Theodore G. Soares - - - - - - - - - - - - - 251
Isaiah, Chaps. 40–48, Fulfilment of Prediction in - - - - - - 67
Isaiah, Chaps. 40–55, The So-called "Ebed-Yahweh Songs," and the Meaning of the Term "Servant of Yahweh" in - - - - - - - 499
Italian Manicheans, A Hitherto Unpublished Treatise against the - - 704

JACOBUS, M. W., Review of: Beyschlag-Meyer, Brief des Jakobus - - 168
Wandel, Der Brief des Judas - - - - - - - - - 374
Job, The Problems of - - - - - - - - - - - - - 591
John, The Martyrdom of St. - - - - - - - - - - - 729
JOHNSON, FRANKLIN, Review of: Brandenburg, Moritz von Sachsen, I - 385
Clos, Kreuz und Grab Jesu - - - - - - - - - - - 172

JOHNSON, FRANKLIN, Review of: Dix, A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York - - - - - - - - 815
Harnack History of Dogma, Vol. IV - - - - - - - - 854
Hurll, The Life of Our Lord in Art - - - - - - - - 793
Keller, Grundfragen der Reformationsgechichte - - - - - - 186
Lacey, Liturgical Interpolations - - - - - - - - - 854
Otto, Die Anschauung vom heiligen Geiste bei Luther - - - - 820
Ramaker, Die christliche Heidenmission - - - - - - - 861
Ein Ueberblick über die Geschichte der deutschen Baptisten von Nord-Amerika - - - - - - - - - - - 861
Richard, Philip Melanchthon - - - - - - - - - 853
Robertson, The Bible of St. Mark - - - - - - - - 426
Sohm, Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss - - - - - - - 853
Stæhelin, Huldreich Zwingli - - - - - - - - - 189
Wolf, Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation - - 813
JONAS, J. B. E., Review of Hausrath, Aleander und Luther auf dem Reichstag zu Worms - - - - - - - - - - - - 187
Jowett, Life and Letters of Benjamin - - - - - - - - - 394
Justification by faith, Pauline doctrine of - - - - - - - - 570

KENT, CHARLES FOSTER, Review of Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah) - - - - - - - - - 86
KING, HENRY CHURCHILL, Reconstruction in Theology - - - - - 295
KNOX, GEORGE WM., Review of Chabin, La science de la religion - - 627

Lafayette and the Edict of Tolerance, 1787 - - - - - - - 561
Lambeth episcopal register - - - - - - - - - - - 685
Lao-Tze's Tao-Te-King, ed. by Carus - - - - - - - - 218
Literature, Theological and Semitic. Four supplements.
LITTLE, CHARLES J., Modifications in the Theological Curriculum - - 340
LLOYD, ALFRED H., Review of: Grunwald, Spinoza in Deutschland - - 350
Latta, Leibniz: The Monadology and Other Writings - - - - 578
Siebert, Geschichte der neueren deutschen Philosophie seit Hegel - - 750
"Logia," Resch's - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 695
LOOFS, FRIEDRICH, Has the Gospel of the Reformation become Antiquated? 433
Louis XVI. (1787), The Edict of Tolerance of, and its American Promoters - 554
Luther's exposition of the gospel in the present age - - - - - - 433

MACCLINTOCK, W. D., Review of Sabatier, La religion et la culture moderne 638
MACKINTOSH, HUGH R., The Ritschlian Doctrine of Theoretical and Religious Knowledge - - - - - - - - - - - 22
Manicheans, A Hitherto Unpublished Treatise against the Italian - - 704
Martyrdom of St. John, F. P. Badham - - - - - - - - - 729
MATHEWS, SHAILER, Review of: Abbott, The Life and Letters of Paul the Apostle - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 848
Cone, Paul, the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher - - - - 785
Fouard, Saint Paul - - - - - - - - - - - - 167
Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (articles bearing upon Apocrypha and Apocalyptic Literature) - - - - - - - - - - - 92

McClenahan, D. A., Review of Watson, The American Mission in Egypt: 1854 to 1896 - - - - - - - - - - - - - 416
Merrill, Geo. E., Review of Davison, The Christian Interpretation of Life, and Other Essays - - - - - - - - - - - - 610
Messiahship, conception of Christ's - - - - - - - - - - 103
Modification of the theological curriculum - - - - - - - - - 45
Modifications in the Theological Curriculum, George Harris, Augustus H. Strong, Charles W. Eliot, Charles Cuthbert Hall, Charles J. Little - 324
Moncrief, J. W., Review of: Alger, The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 853
Delattre, Un catholicisme américain - - - - - - - - - 860
Jackson, St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna - - - - - - - - 852
Knöll, S. Aurelii Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim - - - 853
Müller, Les origines de la compagnie de Jésus, Ignace et Lainez - - 387
Taylor, Italy and the Italians - - - - - - - - - - 384
Waterman, The Post-Apostolic Age - - - - - - - - - 795
Workman, The Church of the West in the Middle Ages - - - 800
Monistic Point of View, Personality from the - - - - - - - - 473
Monks of Constantinople, the - - - - - - - - - - - - 177
of St. Benedict, The English Black - - - - - - - - - - 183
Moore, Geo. F., Review of: Budde, Das Buch der Richter - - - - 155
Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (Criticism of the Text, Versions) - 84
Morality, Religionless - - - - - - - - - - - - - 225
in Philippians - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 108

Nag's Head fable - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 685
Nash, Henry S., Review of Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians - - - 372
Neighbor, R. E., Review of: Oates, The Sorrow of God, and Other Sermons 862
Valentine, Christian Truth and Life - - - - - - - - - 862
Newberry Gospels, The, Edgar Johnson Goodspeed - - - - - - 116
Newman, Albert Henry, Review of: Elliott, The Life of Father Hecker 816
Krogh-Tönning, De Gratia Christi et de libero arbitrio - - - - 819
Marin, Les moines de Constantinople - - - - - - - - 177
Rolfes, Die Gottesbeweise bei Thomas von Aquin und Aristoteles - - 749
Schuster, Fürstbischof Martin Brenner - - - - - - - - 804
New Testament:
Phil. 3:8–10 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 570
New world, the - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 296
Notes, Critical and Historical - - - - - - - - - - 99, 541, 729
Novatian doctrine - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 567

Old Testament:
Isa. 42:1–7 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 524
49:1–6 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 517
50:4–9 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 514
52:13—53:12 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 502
Origins of religion - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 143

Palladius, Lausiac History of - - - - - - - - - - - - 173
PATON, LEWIS B., Review of Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I ("Asaph," "David," etc.) - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 87
PATTISON, T. HARWOOD, Review of Tucker, The Making and the Unmaking of the Preacher - - - - - - - - - - - - 611
Paulician Church of Armenia, A Manual of the - - - - - - - - 380
Paul's last years - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 167
Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle, Some Aspects of - - - 107, 570
PEPPER, GEO. D. B., Review of: Fulliquet, Essai sur l'obligation morale - 408
Hall, The Kenotic Theory - - - - - - - - - - - 830
Hibben, The Problems of Philosophy - - - - - - - - - 583
Hodgson, Theologia Pectoris - - - - - - - - - 835
Macpherson, Christian Dogmatics - - - - - - - - - 824
Persecution of Catholics under Elizabeth - - - - - - - - - 690
Personality from the Monistic Point of View, George F. Genung - - - 473
Personality predicated of God - - - - - - - - - - - 475
PFLEIDERER, OTTO, Religionless Morality - - - - - - - - - 225
Philippian Epistle, Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the - - - 107, 570
Place of Chronicles in Hebrew historiography - - - - - - - - 251
PLATNER, J. WINTHROP, Review of: Conybeare, The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchæus, and of Timothy and Aquila - - - - - 787
Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum - 797
Plots against Elizabeth's life - - - - - - - - - - - 692
Postulates, Ethical, in Religion - - - - - - - - - - - 654
PRATT, WALDO J., Review of Wobbermin, Altchristliche liturgische Stücke aus der Kirche Aegyptens - - - - - - - - - - 851
Prayer Book, first and second - - - - - - - - - - - 680
Prediction in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–48, Fulfilment of - - - - - - - 67
Pre-Socratic philosophers, fragments of, translated, etc. - - - - - 347
PRICE, IRA M., Review of: Baethgen, Die Psalmen, 2. Aufl. - - - - 630
Conder, The Hittites and their Language - - - - - - - - 628
Driver, The Parallel Psalter - - - - - - - - - - 630
Harrent, Les écoles d'Antioche - - - - - - - - - - 628
Leimdörfer, Das Psalter-Ego in den Ich-Psalmen - - - - - - 631
Roy, Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter - 631
Proper Use of Science by the Pulpit, John Merle Coulter - - - - - 641
Psalm, The Bearing of the Composition of the Psalter on the the Date of the Forty-fourth - - - - - - - - - - - - - 740
Psalter, The Bearing of the Composition of the, on the Date of the Forty-fourth Psalm - - - - - - - - - - - - - 740
Psychic personality or soul - - - - - - - - - - - - 485
Pulpit, The Proper Use of Science by the - - - - - - - - - 641
Pusey, E. B., biography of - - - - - - - - - - - - 191

RAMAKER, A. J., Review of: Bambus, Palästina, Land und Leute - - 845
Bard, Die Wahrheit des Christentums. Glaube und Wissenschaft. Papst oder Bibel ? - - - - - - - - - - - - 223

RAMAKER, A. J., Review of: Erhard, Die Reformation der Kirche in Bamberg unter Bischof Weigand (1522–1566) - - - - - - - 429
Ewald, Religion und Christentum - - - - - - - - - 859
Haack, Christus oder Buddha? - - - - - - - - - - 223
Über den Unterschied der Ritschlschen und der kirchlichen Theologie 223
Hasenclever, Aus Geschichte und Kunst des Christentums - - - 379
Heinrichs, Die Aufhebung des Magdeburger Domschatzes - - - 223
Jaccard, Le Marquis de Rochegude et les Protestants sur les galères - 857
Kutter, Wilhelm von St. Thierry - - - - - - - - - 856
Lex Mosaica, oder das mosaische Gesetz und die neuere Kritik - - 846
Looshorn, Der heilige Märtyrer Josaphat Kuncewicz - - - - 429
Martens, Beleuchtung der neuesten Controversen über die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen - - - - - - 634
Richter, Evangelische Mission im Nyassa-Lande - - - - - 217
Steinecke, Georg Müller, Prediger zu Bristol - - - - - 857
Uhlhorn, Kämpfe und Siege des Christentums in der germanischen Welt - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 635
RAUSCHENBUSCH, WALTER, Review of: Besser, St. Pauli Brief an die Galater 848
Besser, St. Pauli Brief an die Römer - - - - - - - - 221
Cremer, Wesen und Wirken der Taufgnade - - - - - - 859
Dieckmann, Die Parusie Christi - - - - - - - - 602
Gebhardt, Christi Person und Werk in der Predigt - - - - - 430
Hardeland, Die Evangelisation - - - - - - - - - 861
Wacker, Die Heilsordnung - - - - - - - - - - 430
Weis, Erkennen und Schauen Gottes - - - - - - - 859
Zahn, Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche - - - - - 603
Zart, Das menschlich Anziehende in der Erscheinung Jesu Christi - 221
READ, ELIPHALET A., Review of Bryant, Life, Death, and Immortality - 582
Recent Theological Literature, see Index II.
Reconstruction in Theology, Henry Churchill King - - - - - 295
Redemption of the human personality - - - - - - - - 490
Reformation, the gospel of the, has it become antiquated? - - - - 433
Relative Authority of the Gospels, Eml. V. Gerhart - - - - - 275
Religio-Historical Literature, Import of the Chronicles as a Piece of - - 251
Religionless Morality, Otto Pfleiderer - - - - - - - - 225
Religious Knowledge, The Ritschlian Doctrine of Theoretical and - - 22
Resch's "Logia," James Hardy Ropes and Charles C. Torrey - - - 695
Resettlement of the Church of England by Elizabeth - - - - 680
REYNOLDS, P. B., Review of Vincent, The Social Mind and Education - 419
RHEES, RUSH, Review of: Baldensperger, Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 368
Rickaby, Notes on St. Paul: Corinthians, Galatians, Romans - - 371
RICHARDSON, ERNEST CUSHING, Review of: Butler, The Lausiac History of Palladius - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 173
Preuschen, Palladius und Rufinus - - - - - - - - - 175
RIGGS, J. R., Review of: Gautier, Souvenirs de Terre Sainte - - - 363
Schmidt, Die Lehre des Apostels Paulus - - - - - - - 376
Wilkinson, Four Lectures on the Early History of the Gospels - - 366

Righteousness of faith, as set forth in Philippians, chap. 3 - - - - 108
Ritschlian Doctrine of Theoretical and Religious Knowledge, Hugh R. Mackintosh - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 22
ROBINSON, GEORGE L., Review of Laue, Die Ebed-Jahwe Lieder - - 157
ROPES, JAMES HARDY, Resch's "Logia" - - - - - - - - - 695
RUPP, W., Ethical Postulates in Theology - - - - - - - 654

SANDERS, F. K., Review of: Poels, Examen critique de l'histoire du sanctuaire de l'arche - - - - - - - - - - - - 158
von Gall, Altisraelitische Kultstätten - - - - - - - - 770
σχῆμα and μορφή in Philippians - - - - - - - - - - 108
Science, Proper Use of, by the Pulpit - - - - - - - - 641
SCRIPTURE, E. W., Review of Dippel, Der neuere Spiritismus - - - 149
Semitic Literature. Four supplements.
"Servant of Yahweh," meaning of, in Isaiah, chaps. 40–55 - - - 499
Settlement, Elizabethan, of the Church of England - - - - - 679
Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How? William R. Harper 45
SHARP, FRANK CHAPMAN, Review of Royce, Studies of Good and Evil - 580
SLATER, JOHN R., Review of Gindraux, A la suite des Israélites du Sinaï en Canaan - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 220
SMITH, ARTHUR R., Review of Carus, Lao-Tze's Tao-Te-King - - - 218
SMITH, HENRY PRESERVED, Review of: Budde, Bertholet, Wildeboer, Die fünf Megilloth - - - - - - - - - - - - - 356
Dalman, Die Worte Jesu - - - - - - - - - - - 775
Frankenberg, Die Sprüche. Siegfried, Prediger und Hoheslied - - 362
SMITH, W. TAYLOR, Review of Schmidt, Die Geschichte Jesu - - - 847
SOARES, THEODORE G., The Import of the Chronicles as a Piece of Religio-Historical Literature - - - - - - - - - - - 251
So-called "Ebed-Yahweh Songs," The, and the Meaning of the Term "Servant of Yahweh" in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–55, Karl Budde - - - - - 499
Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle, Marvin R. Vincent 107, 570
Soul, or psychic personality - - - - - - - - - - - 485
SPALDING, J. L., Review of Fonsegrive, Catholicisme et démocratie - - 617
STRATTON, A. W., Review of Müller, Râmakrishna, His Life and Sayings - 761
STRONG, AUGUSTUS H., Modifications in the Theological Curriculum - - 326
Review of: Alexander, Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy 344
Disselhoff, Die klassische Poesie und die göttliche Offenbarung - - 141
STUCKENBERG, J. H. W., Review of: Friedrich, Die Weltanschauung eines modernen Christen - - - - - - - - - - - 352
Henderson, Social Elements - - - - - - - - - - 619
Lorimer, Christianity and the Social State - - - - - - - 842

TEN BROEKE, JAMES, Review of Steude, Die monistische Weltanschauung - 423
TERRY, BENJAMIN, Review of Kaemmel, Der Werdegang des deutschen Volkes - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 426
TERRY, MILTON S., Review of "Renascent Christianity" - - - - 613
THAYER, HERBERT F., Review of Jacobs, Martin Luther - - - - 427
Theological and Semitic Literature. Four supplements, W. Muss-Arnolt.

Theological curriculum, shall it be modified, and how? - - - - - 45, 324
Literature, Recent, see Index II.
Theology of the Philippian epistle - - - - - - - - - 107, 570
Ethical Postulates in - - - - - - - - - - - 654
Reconstruction in - - - - - - - - - - - - 295
Theoretical and Religious Knowledge, The Ritschlian Doctrine of - - 22
Thirty-nine Articles of Religion - - - - - - - - - - 684
Tobit, The Double Text of - - - - - - - - - - - 541
Tolerance edict of Louis XVI. (1787) and its American promoters - - 554
TORREY, CHARLES C., Resch's "Logia" - - - - - - - - 695
Tradition in early Christianity down to Tertullian - - - - - - 200
Treatise against the Italian Manicheans, Hitherto Unpublished - - - 704
TRUE, BENJAMIN O., Review of: Abbott and Campbell, Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett - - - - - - - - - - - 394
Liddon, Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey - - - - - - - 191
Truth of the idealization in the Chronicles - - - - - - - - 263
TYLER, C. M., Review of Allen, The Evolution of the Idea of God - - 143

Unpublished treatise against the Italian Manicheans - - - - - - 704

VAN KIRK, HIRAM, Review of Kügelgen, Die Dogmatik Albrecht Ritschl's. Apologie und Polemik - - - - - - - - - - - 821
VAN PELT, J. R., Review of: Berendts, Das Verhaltnis der Römischen Kirche zu den Kleinasiatischen vor dem Nicaenischen Konzil - - - 399
Scheibe, Calvins Prädestinationslehre - - - - - - - - 202
VARNEY, EDGAR D., Review of von Schrenck, Die johanneische Anschauung vom Leben - - - - - - - - - - - - 782
VEDDER, HENRY C., Review of: Ferrère, La situation religieuse de l'Afrique romaine - - - - - - - - - - - - - 181
Mason, Thomas Cranmer - - - - - - - - - - 428
VINCENT, MARVIN R., Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 107, 570
Review of Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I (1, 2 Cor., Coloss., Ephes.) 94
VOTAW, C. W., Review of: Barde, Commentaire sur les Actes des Apôtres - 783
Bruston, Les Paroles de Jésus - - - - - - - - - - 847
Hastings' Bible Dictionary, Vol. I ("Chronology of the New Testament") 92
Swete, The Gospel according to St. Mark - - - - - - - 779
Wenley, The Preparation for Christianity in the Ancient World - - 581

Washington, George, and the Edict of Tolerance, 1787 - - - - - 561
WEISS, BERNHARD, Review of Trenkle, Einleitung in das Neue Testament 364
WENLEY, R. M., Review of: Forrest, The Christ of History and of Experience 207
Frommel, Le danger moral de l'évolutionnisme religieux - - - 423
Wallace, Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics - - 747
Watson, Christianity and Idealism - - - - - - - - 607
WHITMAN, B. L., Review of Stuckenberg, Introduction to the Study of Sociology - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 622
Wiseman, Life and Times of Cardinal - - - - - - - - - 196

WISHART, ALFRED WESLEY, Review of Thurston, The Life of Saint Hugh of Lincoln - - - - - - - - - - - - - 801

ZENOS, A. C., Review of: Boehmer, Das biblische "Im Namen" - - 594
Cremer, Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes - - 405
Kilgenstein, Die Gotteslehre des Hugo von St. Victor - - - 400
Litton, The Church of Christ - - - - - - - - - 406
Luthardt, Die christliche Glaubenslehre - - - - - - - 827
Schlatter, Der Dienst des Christen in der älteren Dogmatik - - - 206
Zwingli, a new biography of - - - - - - - - - - 189

II. RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

Abbott, E., and *Campbell*, Life and Letters of Benjamin Jowett - - - - 394
Abbott, L., The Life and Letters of Paul the Apostle - - - - - - 848
Abbott, T. K., "Do This in Remembrance of Me": Should it be "Offer This"? - 633
Adler, Cyrus, and *Casanowicz*, Biblical Antiquities - - - - - - - 846
"Alcuin Tracts," III - - - - - - - - - - - - - 854
Alexander, Theories of the Will in the History of Philosophy - - - - 344
Alger, The Little Flowers of St. Francis of Assisi - - - - - - 853
Allen, Grant, The Evolution of the Idea of God - - - - - - - 143
Andrews, Christianity and Anti-Christianity, in their Final Conflict - - - 354
Anecdota Oxoniensia, Classical Series, Part VIII - - - - - - - 787
Armellini, Lezione di Archeologia Cristiana - - - - - - - 793
Asplen, A Thousand Years of English Church History - - - - - 604

Baethgen, Die Psalmen, 2. Aufl. - - - - - - - - - - 630
Baldensperger, Der Prolog des vierten Evangeliums - - - - - 368
Bambus, Palästina, Land und Leute - - - - - - - - - 845
Bard, Die Wahrheit des Christentums - - - - - - - - - 223
Glaube und Wissenschaft - - - - - - - - - - - 223
Papst oder Bibel? - - - - - - - - - - - - - 224
Barde, E., Commentaire sur les Actes des Apôtres - - - - - - 783
Batiffol, Six leçons sur les évangiles - - - - - - - - - 424
Batten, S. Z., The New Citizenship - - - - - - - - - 640
Beaton, Selfhood and Service - - - - - - - - - - - 420
"Beiträge zum Kampf um die Weltanschauung," Nos. 4 and 5 - - - - 859
"Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie," I 1; I 4; II 1; II 2; II 5, 206, 376, 405, 615, 781
Berendts, Das Verhältnis der Römischen Kirche zu den Kleinasiatischen vor dem Nicaenischen Konzil - - - - - - - - - - - 399
Besser, St. Pauli Brief an die Galater - - - - - - - - - 848
St. Pauli Brief an die Römer - - - - - - - - - - - 221
Blass, Grammar of New Testament Greek - - - - - - - - 774
Boardman, The Kingdom (Basileia) - - - - - - - - - 848
Boehmer, Das biblische "Im Namen" - - - - - - - - - 594
Reich Gottes und Menschensohn im Buche Daniel - - - - - - 771

Boissier, La fin du paganisme - - - - - - - - - - - 854
"Bonner Beiträge zur Anglistik," 1, 2 - - - - - - - - 791, 792
Bovon, Morale chrétienne - - - - - - - - - - - 212
Bradley, Lectures on Ecclesiastes - - - - - - - - - - 161
Brandenburg, Moritz von Sachsen, I - - - - - - - - - 385
Briggs, General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scriptures - - - 768
Bright, Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life - - - - - - - 796
Brown, W. A., Christ the Vitalizing Principle of Christian Theology - - 636
Bruston, Les Paroles de Jésus, récemment découvertes en Égypte - - - 847
Bryant, Life, Death, and Immortality - - - - - - - - - 582
Budde, Das Buch der Richter - - - - - - - - - - - 155
Budde, Bertholet, Wildeboer, Die fünf Megilloth - - - - - - - 356
Büttgenbach, Geschichte des Kreuzes vor und nach Golgotha - - - - 171
Butler, The Lausiac History of Palladius - - - - - - - - 173
John Wesley and George Whitefield in Scotland - - - - - - - 855

Carnegie, Church Troubles and Common Sense; A Plea for Reason and Responsibility - - - - - - - - - - - - 837
Carus, Chinese Philosophy - - - - - - - - - - - - 148
Lao-Tze's Tao-Te-King - - - - - - - - - - - - 218
Chabin, La science de la religion - - - - - - - - - - 627
Chapuis, Du surnaturel - - - - - - - - - - - - 151
Ciolli, Directoire pratique du jeune confesseur - - - - - - - 614
Clarke, An Outline of Christian Theology - - - - - - - - 203
Clemen, Der Ursprung des heiligen Abendmahls - - - - - - - 831
Clos, Kreuz und Grab Jesu - - - - - - - - - - - 172
Collins, The English Reformation and its Consequences - - - - - 857
Cone, Paul the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher - - - - - 785
Conrat, Die Christenverfolgungen im römischen Reiche vom Standpunkte des Juristen - - - - - - - - - - - - - 634
Conybeare, The Key of Truth - - - - - - - - - - - 380
The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchæus, and of Timothy and Aquila - 787
Cremer, Die christliche Lehre von den Eigenschaften Gottes - - - - 405
Wesen und Wirken der Taufgnade - - - - - - - - - 859

Dalman, Die Worte Jesu, Bd. I - - - - - - - - - - - 775
Darmesteter, The Zend-Avesta - - - - - - - - - - - 220
Davies, Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and their Neighbours - - - - - - - - - - - - - 845
Davison, The Christian Interpretation of Life, and Other Essays - - - 610
Deissmann, Neue Bibelstudien - - - - - - - - - - - 162
Delattre, Un catholicisme américain - - - - - - - - - - 861
Dieckmann, Die Parusie Christi - - - - - - - - - - - 602
Dippel, Der neuere Spiritismus - - - - - - - - - - - 149
Disselhoff, Die klassische Poesie und die göttliche Offenbarung - - - 141
Dix, A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York, Part I 815
Douwen, van, Socinianen en Doopsgezinden - - - - - - - - - 809
Driver, The Parallel Psalter - - - - - - - - - - - 630

Elliott, The Life of Father Hecker - - - - - - - - - - 816
Erhard, Die Reformation der Kirche in Bamberg unter Bischof Weigand, 1522–1556 - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 429
Ewald, Religion und Christentum - - - - - - - - - - 859

Fairbairn, Catholicism: Roman and Anglican - - - - - - 837
Fairbanks, The First Philosophers of Greece - - - - - - - 347
Farrar, Sin and its Conquerors - - - - - - - - - 218
Feasey, The Ancient English Holy Week Ceremonial - - - - - 638
Fernley Lecture, 1897; 1898 - - - - - - - - - - 402, 834
Ferrère, La situation religieuse de l'Afrique romaine - - - - - 181
Fonsegrive, Catholicisme et démocratie - - - - - - - - 617
Forrest, The Christ of History and of Experience - - - - - - 207
Fouard, Saint Paul - - - - - - - - - - - - 167
Frankenberg, Die Sprüche - - - - - - - - - - 362
Friedrich, Die Weltanschauung eines modernen Christen - - - - 352
Fritz, Die Briefe des Bischofs Synesius von Kyrene - - - - - 790
Frommel, Le danger moral de l'évolutionnisme religieux - - - - 423
Fulliquet, Essai sur l'obligation morale - - - - - - - - 408

Gall, von, Altisraelitische Kultstätten - - - - - - - - - 770
Garland, The Problems of Job - - - - - - - - - - 591
Gautier, Souvenirs de Terre Sainte - - - - - - - - - 363
Gebhardt, Christi Person und Werk in der Predigt - - - - - - 430
Gee, The Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558–1564 - 808
Gelzer, Hilgenfeld, Cuntz, Patrum Nicænorum Nomina . . . . ediderunt - - 850
Gindraux, A la suite des Israélites du Sinaï en Canaan - - - - - 220
Gladden, The Christian Pastor and the Working Church - - - - - 410
Gore, Epistle to the Ephesians - - - - - - - - - - 372
Green, General Introduction to the Old Testament: The Canon - - - 764
Griffis, The Pilgrims in their Three Homes, England, Holland, America - 855
Grunwald, Spinoza in Deutschland - - - - - - - - - 350
Guthrie, John Knox and John Knox's House - - - - - - - 428
Guyot, Faut-il une religion? - - - - - - - - - - 224

Haack, Christus oder Buddha? - - - - - - - - - - 223
Über den Unterschied der Ritschlschen und der kirchlichen Theologie - 223
Hall, The Kenotic Theory - - - - - - - - - - - 830
"Handbooks on the History of Religions" - - - - - - - - 753
Handkommentar zum Alten Testament, I 3, 1; II 2; II 3, 1 and 2 358, 630, 362
Hansen og *Olsen*, De danske Baptisters Historie - - - - - - - 391
Hardeland, Die Evangelisation mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Heiligungsbewegung - - - - - - - - - - - - 861
Harnack, Essay on the Treatise "Contra Novatianum" - - - - - 566
History of Dogma, Vol. IV - - - - - - - - - - 854
Hasenclever, Aus Geschichte und Kunst des Christentums - - - - 379
Hastings (editor), A Dictionary of the Bible, Vol. I - - - - - 84
Hausrath, Aleander und Luther auf dem Reichstag zu Worms - - - 187

Haussleiter, Der Aufbau der altchristlichen Literatur - - - - - - 850
"Hefte zur Christlichen Welt," No. 37 - - - - - - - - - 831
Heinecke, Synopse der drei ersten kanonischen Evangelien - - - - 164
Heinrichs, Die Aufhebung des Magdeburger Domschatzes - - - - 223
Henderson, Social Elements - - - - - - - - - - - 619
Hennemann, Die Heiligkeit Jesu - - - - - - - - - - - 378
Henslow, Four Essays - - - - - - - - - - - - - 218
"Heroes of the Reformation" - - - - - - - - - - 427, 853
Herrmann, Die Religion - - - - - - - - - - - - 22
Hibben, The Problems of Philosophy - - - - - - - - - 583
Hodgson, Theologia Pectoris - - - - - - - - - - - 835
Holl, Enthusiasmus und Bussgewalt beim griechischen Mönchtum - - 797
Holzinger, Genesis - - - - - - - - - - - - - 152
Horner (editor), The Coptic Version of the New Testament, in the Northern Dialect, otherwise called Memphitic or Bohairic - - - - - - 598
Huck, Synopse der drei ersten Evangelien, 2. Aufl. - - - - - - 164
Hurll, The Life of Our Lord in Art - - - - - - - - - 793

"International Theological Library" - - - - - - - - - - 410

Jaccard, Le Marquis Jacques de Rochegude et les Protestants sur les galères - 857
Jackson, A. V. W., Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran - - - - - 756
Jackson, B., St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna - - - - - - - - 852
Jacobs, Martin Luther - - - - - - - - - - - - 427
Jalaguier, Introduction à la Dogmatique - - - - - - - - - 858
Jastrow, The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria - - - - - - - 753
Jessopp, John Donne - - - - - - - - - - - - - 190
Johannes, Kommentar zum ersten Briefe des Apostels Paulus an die Thessalonicher - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 786
Johnson-Ayres, Sursum Corda - - - - - - - - - - - 214
Jungnitz, Martin von Gerstmann - - - - - - - - - - - 810

Kaemmel, Der Werdegang des deutschen Volkes - - - - - - - 426
Karl, Johanneische Studien - - - - - - - - - - - 373
Keller, Grundfragen der Reformationsgeschichte - - - - - - - 186
Kerr Lectures for 1897 - - - - - - - - - - - - 207
Kilgenstein, Die Gotteslehre des Hugo von St. Victor - - - - - 400
King, The Psalms in Three Collections - - - - - - - - 632
Kinloch, Studies in Scottish Ecclesiastical History in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries - - - - - - - - - - - - 389
Knöll, S. Aurelii Augustini Confessionum libri tredecim - - - - - 853
Knox, John, History of the Reformation of Religion within the Realm of Scotland, ed. by Guthrie - - - - - - - - - - - - 858
Krogh-Tönning, De Gratia Christi et de libero arbitrio - - - - - 819
Kügelgen, von, Die Dogmatik Albrecht Ritschl's. Apologie und Polemik - 821
"Kurzer Hand-Commentar zum Alten Testament," I, 3, 6 - - 152, 155, 356
Kutter, Wilhelm von St. Thierry, ein Repräsentant der mittelalterlichen Frömmigkeit - - - - - - - - - - - - - - 856
Kuyper, Encyclopædia of Sacred Theology: Its Principles - - - - - 585

Lacey, Liturgical Interpolations - - - - - - - - - - - 854
Latta, Leibniz: The Monadology and Other Writings - - - - - 578
Laue, Die Ebed-Jahwe Lieder - - - - - - - - - - 157
Lauterburg, Der Begriff des Charisma - - - - - - - - - 615
"Leaders of Religion" - - - - - - - - - - - 428
Leimdörfer, Das Psalter-Ego in den Ich-Psalmen - - - - - - 631
Lex Mosaica, oder das mosaische Gesetz und die neuere Kritik - - - 846
Liddon, Life of Edward Bouverie Pusey - - - - - - - - 191
Lidgett, The Spiritual Principle of the Atonement - - - - - - 402
Litton, The Church of Christ - - - - - - - - - - 406
Looshorn, Der heilige Märtyrer Josaphat Kuncewicz - - - - - 429
Lorimer, Christianity and the Social State - - - - - - - - 842
Luthardt, Die christliche Glaubenslehre - - - - - - - - 827
Kompendium der theologischen Ethik - - - - - - - - 860

MacArthur, Current Questions for Thinking Men - - - - - - - 422
Macpherson, Christian Dogmatics - - - - - - - - - 824
Maillet, La création et la providence devant la science moderne - - - 138
Marin, Les moines de Constantinople - - - - - - - - - 177
Martens, Beleuchtung der neuesten Controversen über die römische Frage unter Pippin und Karl dem Grossen - - - - - - - - - 634
Mason, Thomas Cranmer - - - - - - - - - - - 428
Maurenbrecher, Thomas von Aquino's Stellung zum Wirtschaftsleben seiner Zeit - - - - - - - - - - - - - 639
Meyer's "Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar über das Neue Testament" - 168, 777
Mortimer, Jesus and the Resurrection - - - - - - - - - 431
Moss, The Range of Christian Experience - - - - - - - - - 834
Moulton, Visions of Sin - - - - - - - - - - - 860
Muller, F. Max, Râmakrishna: His Life and Sayings - - - - - 761
Müller, H., Les origines de la compagnie de Jésus, Ignace et Lainez - - 387

Nösgen, Symbolik - - - - - - - - - - - - - 210

Oates, The Sorrow of God, and Other Sermons - - - - - - - 862
Orr, The Ritschlian Theology and the Evangelical Faith - - - - 401
Otto, Die Anschauung vom heiligen Geiste bei Luther - - - - - 820

Pattison, The Making of the Sermon - - - - - - - - - 612
Perrin, L'évangile et le temps présent - - - - - - - - - 224
Petersen, Cherubim - - - - - - - - - - - - 629
Petran, Beiträge zur Verständigung über Begriff und Wesen der sittlich-religiösen Erfahrung - - - - - - - - - - - 832
Pike, The Divine Drama - - - - - - - - - - - 752
Poels, Examen critique de l'histoire du sanctuaire de l'arche - - - - 158
Preuschen, Palladius und Rufinus - - - - - - - - - 173

Ramaker, Die christliche Heidenmission - - - - - - - - 861
Ueberblick über die Geschichte der deutschen Baptisten von Nord-Amerika 861

Reinhold, De Græcitate Patrum apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum Novi Testamenti quæstiones grammaticæ - - - - - - - - - 849
Renascent Christianity - - - - - - - - - - - - - 613
Resch, Die Logia Jesu nach dem griechischen und hebräischen Text wiederhergestellt - - - - - - - - - - - - - 695
Richard, Philip Melanchthon - - - - - - - - - - 853
Richter, Evangelische Mission im Nyassa-Lande - - - - - - - 217
Rickaby, Notes on St. Paul: Corinthians, Galatians, Romans - - - - 371
Riedel, Die Auslegung des Hohenliedes in der jüdischen Gemeinde u. der griechischen Kirche - - - - - - - - - - - - - 632
Robertson, The Bible of St. Mark - - - - - - - - - 426
Rogge, Der irdische Besitz im Neuen Testament - - - - - - - 633
Rolfes, Die Gottesbeweise bei Thomas von Aquin und Aristoteles - - - 749
Romain, L'église catholique et les Protestants - - - - - - - 224
Roy, Die Volksgemeinde und die Gemeinde der Frommen im Psalter - - 631
Royce, Studies of Good and Evil - - - - - - - - - - 580
Rylance, Christian Rationalism - - - - - - - - - - 637

Sabatier, Outlines of a Philosophy of Religion, Based on Psychology and History (English translation) - - - - - - - - - - - 626
La religion et la culture moderne - - - - - - - - - - 638
Sanday, The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England - - - - - - - - - - - - - 837
Scheibe, Calvins Prädestinationslehre - - - - - - - - - - 202
Schlatter, Der Dienst des Christen in der älteren Dogmatik - - - 206
Die Parallelen in den Worten Jesu bei Johannes und Matthaeus - - 781
Schmidt, P. W., Die Geschichte Jesu - - - - - - - - - 847
Schmidt, W., Die Lehre des Apostels Paulus - - - - - - - - 376
Schrenck, E. von, Die johanneische Anschauung vom Leben - - - - - 782
Schürer, Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi, 3. Aufl., Bd. II und III - - - - - - - - - - - - - 595
Schuster, Fürstbischof Martin Brenner - - - - - - - - - 804
Seymour, Cross in Tradition, History and Art - - - - - - - 171
Sharpe (editor), A Vindication of Anglo-Catholic Principles - - - - 837
Sidgwick, Outlines of the History of Ethics - - - - - - - - 844
Siebert, Geschichte der neueren deutschen Philosophie seit Hegel - - - 750
Sieffert, Der Brief an die Galater - - - - - - - - - - 777
Siegfried, Prediger und Hoheslied - - - - - - - - - - 362
Smith, Geo. Adam, The Life of Henry Drummond - - - - - - - 606
Sohm, Kirchengeschichte im Grundriss - - - - - - - - - 853
Sombart, Socialism and the Social Movement in the Nineteenth Century - 640
Spaeth, Charles Porterfield Krauth - - - - - - - - - 396
Speer, Missions and Politics in Asia - - - - - - - - - 841
Stähelin, Felix, Geschichte der kleinasiatischen Galater - - - - - 425
Stæhelin, Rudolf, Huldreich Zwingli - - - - - - - - - 189
Stapfer, La mort et la resurrection de Jésus-Christ - - - - - - 424
Stearns, A Manual of Patrology - - - - - - - - - - 852

Steinbeck, Das Verhältnis von Theologie und Erkenntnis-Theorie, erörtert an den theologischen Erkenntnis-Theorien von A. Ritschl und A. Sabatier 822
Steinecke, Georg Müller, Prediger zu Bristol - - - - - - - - 857
Steude, Die monistische Weltanschauung - - - - - - - - 423
Steuernagel, Das Deuteronomium - - - - - - - - - 358
Stott, Twenty-six Years of Missionary Work in China - - - - - 217
Strong, Josiah, The Twentieth Century City - - - - - - - 639
Stuckenberg, Introduction to the Study of Sociology - - - - - 622
"Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche," I, 3 - - - - 399
Swete, The Gospel according to St. Mark - - - - - - - - 779

Taunton, The English Black Monks of St. Benedict - - - - - 183
Taylor, Italy and the Italians - - - - - - - - - - 384
Teichmann, Die paulinischen Vorstellungen von Auferstehung und Gericht - 221
"Ten Epochs of Church History," Vol. II - - - - - - - - 795
Terry, Biblical Apocalyptics - - - - - - - - - - 588
"Texte und Untersuchungen." Neue Folge. Bd. II, 3*b* - - - - - 851
"Texts and Studies," VI, No. 1 - - - - - - - - - - 173
Thurston, The Life of Saint Hugh of Lincoln - - - - - - 801
Titchener, A Primer of Psychology - - - - - - - - - 625
Trautmann, Kynewulf, der Bischof und Dichter - - - - - - 791
Trenkle, Einleitung in das Neue Testament - - - - - - - 364
Tucker, The Making and the Unmaking of the Preacher - - - - 611
Tupper, Gladstone and Other Addresses - - - - - - - - 422

Uhlhorn, Kämpfe und Siege des Christentums in der germanischen Welt - 635

Valentine, Christian Truth and Life - - - - - - - - - 862
van Dyke, Sermons to Young Men - - - - - - - - - 414
Vedder, A History of the Baptists in the Middle States - - - - - 392
Veit, Die synoptischen Parallelen - - - - - - - - - 164
Verhandlungen des neunten evangelisch-sozialen Kongresses - - - 863
Vincent, The Social Mind and Education - - - - - - - - 419
"Vorträge und Aufsätze der Comenius-Gesellschaft" - - - - - 186
Vowinckel, Geschichte und Dogmatik - - - - - - - - - 636

Wacker, Die Heilsordnung - - - - - - - - - - - 430
Wallace, Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics - - - 717
Wandel, Der Brief des Jacobus - - - - - - - - - - 374
Ward, Life and Times of Cardinal Wiseman - - - - - - - - 196
Waterman, The Post-Apostolic Age - - - - - - - - - 795
Watson, Andrew, The American Mission in Egypt: 1854 to 1896 - - - 416
Watson, John, Christianity and Idealism - - - - - - - - 607
Weidner, Theological Encyclopædia and Methodology - - - - - 762
Weis, Erkennen und Schauen Gottes - - - - - - - - - 859
Weiss, Der Brief an die Römer - - - - - - - - - - 777
Das Matthäus-Evangelium - - - - - - - - - - - 777
Wenley, An Outline Introductory to Kant's Critique of Pure Reason - - 844
The Preparation for Christianity in the Ancient World - - - - 581

Wilkinson, Four Lectures on the Early History of the Gospels - - - 366
Winkler, Der Traditionsbegriff des Urchristentums bis Tertullian - - - 200
Wobbermin, Altchristliche liturgische Stücke aus der Kirche Aegyptens - - 851
Wolf, Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation - - - 813
Workman, The Church of the West in the Middle Ages - - - - - 800
Wünsch, Sethianische Verfluchungstafeln aus Rom - - - - - 760

Zahn, Skizzen aus dem Leben der alten Kirche - - - - - - 603
Zart, Das menschlich Anziehende in der Erscheinung Jesu Christi - - - 221
Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, Beiheft III - - - - - 770

THEOLOGICAL AND SEMITIC LITERATURE

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

TO THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, AND THE BIBLICAL WORLD

BY W. MUSS-ARNOLT

I. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

[REMARKS AND LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS, SEE P. XVI.]

GENERAL.

BILLERBECK, A. Das Sandschak Suleimania u. dessen persische Nachbarlandschaften zur babyl. und assyr. Zeit. Geographische Untersuchgn. unter bes. Berücksichtigg. militär. Gesichtspunkte. L.: Pfeiffer, '98; v, 176 pp. M. 12.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Amphores à épigraphes grecques et jarre à épigraphe sémitique provenant d'un sépulcre phénicien. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 521–6.

EERDMANS, B. D. Het verband tusschen de beoefening van de O.-Tsche wetenschap en de Semietische Studiën in het algemeen. Rede uitgesproken bij het aanwaarden van het hoogleeraarsambt in de Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid aan de Rijksuniversiteit te Leiden. Leiden: Brill, '98; 40 pp. f. 0.50.

FRAENKEL, S. Miscellen. *ZA.*, XIII., 122–5.

1. Zu *ZA.*, XII., 240 ff.; 2. Zu dem Verzeichniss der Eigennamen in den "Business Documents of Murashû Sons of Nippur" (ed. Hilprecht); 3. מרדך; 4. Φασάηλος; 5. Zu der Liste d. kanonischen Bücher in Eusebius *Eccles. Hist.*, ed. Wright & McLean, p. 416.

GUNKEL, H. Der Schreiberengel Nabu im A. T. u. Judenthum. *ARW.*, I., 294–300.

HALÉVY, J. Considérations critiques sur quelques points d'histoire ancienne de l'Inde. *RS.*, VI., O., '98, 348–55.

HARTMANN, M. Zur kurd. Literatur. *WZKM.*, XII., 102–12.

HILPRECHT, H. V. Oriental Research. *Sund. School Ti.*, '98, nos. 25, 31, 34, 37.

KOHUT, G. A. Contributed Notes. *AJSL.*, XV., 52–6.

1. Judah Monis; 2. A Persian Custom in the Talmud; 3. A Talmudic Saying in the Qurân.

Mittheilungen d. Seminars f. orientalische Sprachen an d. kön. Friedr. Wilhelms-Universität zu Berlin. Hrsg. von E. SACHAU. Jahrg. 1. B., '98. M. 15.

Orientalische Bibliographie. Hrsg. v. L. SCHERMAN. XI. Jahrgang. 2. Halbjahrsheft. B.: Reuther & Reichard, '98; viii, pp. 153–322. Complete M. 10.

PRAŠEK, J. V. Forschungen zur Gesch. d. Alterthums. II. Kadytis–Sethos–Ušû. L.: Pfeiffer, '98; 39 pp. M. 3.

SCHWAB, M. Manuscrits du supplément hébreu de la Bibliothèque Nationale. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 127–36.

SPIEGELBERG, W. Zu den semitischen Eigennamen in ägypt. Umschrift aus der Zeit des "Neuen Reiches" (um 1500–1000). *ZA.*, XIII., 47–56.

—— Eine *Rŝp* (רשׁף) stele. *Ibid.*, 120–22.

STRECK, M. Das Gebiet der heutigen Landschaften Armenien, Kurdistân u. Westpersien nach d. babylonisch-assyrischen Keilinschriften. *Ibid.*, 57–110.

I. Die Länder Nairi; II. Gebiete westlich u. südwestlich vom Vansee.

ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN.

BASMADJIAN, K. J. A propos des Deux Sceaux Hétéens. *PSBA.*, XX., 230–34.

BASSI, D. Mitologia babilonese-assira. Milano: Hoepli, '98.

BOISSIER, A. Notes d'assyriologie. *RS.*, VI., O., '98, 356–65.

BOUTFLOWER, CH. On the Meaning of the Word Asîtu. *AJSL.*, XV., 49–51.

HALÉVY, J. Notes sumériennes. *RS.*, VI., O., '98, 373–5.

MÜLLER, W. M. Der Chetiterkönig der Amarnatafeln. *OLZ.*, I., 153–5.

—— Ḫinatuni. *Ibid.*, 176–7.

OPPERT, J. Le droit de retrait lignager à Ninive. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 566–92.

PEISER, F. E. Eine Kollation der in Gizeh aufbewahrten Tell el-Amarna Tafeln. *OLZ.*, I., nos. 5, 7, 9 & 10.

PINCHES, T. G. A Babylonian Tablet Referring to the Sharing of Property. *JRAS.*, '98, 876–9.

THUREAU-DANGIN, F. Dun-gi roi d'Ur et ses successeurs. *OLZ.*, I., 161–74.

VOGEL, A. Der Fund von Tell-Amarna und die Bibel. Veröffentlichungen des Bibelbundes no. 4. Braunschw. & L.: Wollermann, '98; 51 pp.

WINCKLER, H. Die südbabylonischen Dynastien. *OLZ.*, I., no. 8.

SYRIAC.

BARHEBRAEUS, GREGORIUS. Nomocanon. Syriace ed. P. Bedjan. L.: Harassowitz, 98; xiii, 551 pp. M. 22.50.

BAUMSTARK, A. Aristoteles περὶ ἑρμηνείας, p. 23*b* 16 ff. Syrisch. *ZA.*, XIII., 116–19.

——— Syrisch-arabische Biographien des Aristoteles. L., '98; 130, ii pp.

FRIEDMANN, I. Aristoteles' Analytica bei den Syrern. *ID.* B., '98; 39 pp.

MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. The Syro-Armenian Dialect. *JRAS.*, '98, 839–62.

NÖLDEKE, TH. Kurzgefasste syrische Grammatik. 2. Aufl. Mit e. Schrifttafel von Jul. Euting. L.: Tauchnitz, '98; xxxiv, 305 pp. M. 12.

PARISOT. Le dialecte de Ma'lula. Suite. *JA.*, '98, XI., My.–Je.; XII., Jl.–Ag.

UHRY, L. Die Scholien des Gregorius Abulfarag Barhebraeus zur Genesis, Kap. 21–50, nach den vier in Deutschland vorhandenen Handschriften herausgeg. *ID.* L., '98; 29 pp.

ARAMAIC.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Observations sur les nouvelles inscriptions nabatéennes de Petra. *JA.*, XI., My.–Jl., '98, 523–35. 1. Inscr. d'El-Mer; 2. Inscr. no. 1 d'El-Madrâs; 3. Inscr. de 'Oneîchou, épitrope de la reine Chouqâilat.

COOK, S. A. A Glossary of the Aramaic Inscriptions. Cambridge: Univ. Press; N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; viii, 127 pp. 7s. 6d.

SAMARITAN.

HILDESHEIMER, M. Des Samaritaners Marqah Buch d. Wunder. Nach einer Berliner Handschr. hrsg., übers. u. m. Noten u. Anmerkungen versehen. B.: Mayer & Müller, '98; 61 pp. M. 2.

PALMYRENIAN.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Sur deux inscriptions funéraires de Palmyre. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 558–61.

ARABIC.

Beiträge z. Gesch. Sprachwissenschaft.

[illegible] über die Sprachfehler des Volkes.

BROCKELMANN, C. Zur Aussprache des arabischen *Gîm*. *ZA.*, XIII., 126.

CASPARI–WRIGHT. A Grammar of the Arabic Language. 3d ed. Vol. II. Cambr.: Univ. Press, '98. 15s.

CAT, E. L'Islamisme et les confréries religieuses au Maroc. *Rev. d. 2 Mondes*, 15 S., '98.

Concordantiæ Corani Arabicæ. Ad literarum ordinem et verborum radices diligenter disposuit GUST. F. FLÜGEL. L.: Bredt, '98; x, 219 pp. M. 15.

DERENBOURG, H. *Livre intitulé Laisa.* Sur les exceptions de la langue arabe, par Ibn Khâloûya, dit Ibn Khâlawaihi; Texte arabe publié d'après le manuscrit unique du British Museum. III. *AJSL.*, XV., 33–41.

FUTÛH EL-HÁBACHA, des conquêtes faites en Abyssinie au 16e siècle par l'Imam Muh-Ahmad dit Gragne. Version française de la chronique arabe du Chahâb ad-dîn Ahmad par A. d'Abbadie et Ph. Paulitschke. P.; L.: Harrassowitz, '98. M. 20.

HARDER, E. Arab. Conversations-Grammatik. Heidelberg: Gross, '98. M. 10.

HELLER, B. La version arabe et le commentaire des Proverbes du Gaon Saadia. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 72–85.

HOROVITZ, J. De Wâqidii liber qui Kitâb al Maġâzî inscribitur. Commentatio critica quam scripsit H. B.: Mayer & Müller, '98; 48 pp. M. 1.50.

KAY, H. C. Arabic Inscription. *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 247.
Squeeze from the mosque of Sheikh Murad, near Jaffa.

KELLER, H. Das Kitâb Baġdâd v. Abu'l Fadl Aḥmad ibn Abî Ṭâhir Ṭaifûr. Folio 1–26. B.: Kober, '98; iv, 60 & 27 pp. M. 3.

MERX, A. Die in der Peschito fehlenden Briefe des Neuen Testamentes in arabischer der Philoxeniana entstammender Uebersetzg. Schluss. *ZA.*, XIII., 1–28.

Mufassal Sarfi 'arabi (Arabic Grammar in Turkish). Stambul, 1314; L.: Harrassowitz, '98, 227 pp. M. 5.

NÖLDEKE, TH. Bemerkungen zu al Kisâî's Schrift über die Sprachfehler des Volkes. *ZA.*, XIII., 111–15.

ROTHSTEIN, G. Die Dynastie der Laḫmiden in al-Ḥîra. Ein Versuch zur arabisch-persischen Geschichte zur Zeit der Sasaniden. B.: Reuther & Reichard, '99; viii, 152 pp. M. 4.50.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. An Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews. I. (cont.). *JQR.* XI. O. '98. 115–40.

(Fortsetzung.) *WZKM.*, XII., 81–101.

PERSIAN.

KEGL, A. VON. Vişâl u. seine Söhne, eine Dichterfamilie des modernen Persiens. *WZKM.*, XII., 113–27.

MÜLLER, F. Kleine Mittheilungen: Neupersisch. *WZKM.*, XII, 153–5.

RODGERS, C. J. Târîkhs or Eastern Chronograms. *JRAS.*, '98, 715–40.

ARMENIAN.

DASHIAN, P. J. Armenische Palaeographie, Studien über die Schreibkunst der alten Armenier, mit 10 Schriftproben aus d. ältesten Zeiten. L.: Harrassowitz, '98; 203 pp. M. 2.50.

ETHIOPIC AND COPTIC.

Coptic Psalter, The earliest known. The Ed. from the Oriental 5000 in the British Museum, by E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. Lo.: Kegan Paul, Trench, etc., '98. 15s.

PERRUCHON, J. Notes pour l'histoire d'Éthiopie. *RS.*, VI., O., '98, 366–72.

Extrait de la vie d'Abba Jean, 74e patriarche d'Alexandrie, relatif à l'Abyssinie. Texte arabe et traduction.

——— Aperçu grammatical de la langue amharique ou amarinna comparée avec l'éthiopien. *M.*, Je.–Ag., '98.

PLEYTE, W., et A. A. BOESER. Manuscrits coptes du musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide. Leiden: Buchh. u. Druckerei vorm. E. J. Brill, '98; vi, 490 pp. M. 42.50.

II. THEOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

Aus Schrift u. Geschichte. Theologische Abhandlungen u. Skizzen, Herrn Prof. D. Conrad von Orelli zur Feier seiner 25-jährigen Lehrthätigkeit in Basel v. Freunden u. Schülern gewidmet. Basel: Reich, '98; v, 457 pp. M. 6.40.

SEIDENBERGER. "Die neue Zeit u. der alte Glaube." *Kath.*, O., '98.

Theologischer Jahresbericht, hrsg. von H. HOLTZMANN u. G. KRÜGER. 17. Bd., enthaltend die Literatur d. Jahres 1897. B.: Schwetschke, '98. Complete M. 20.

4. Praktische Theologie u. kirchl. Kunst. Bearb. v. MARBACH, LÜLMANN, WOLTERSDORF, HERING, EVERLING, HASENCLEVER u. SPITTA. Pp. 677–840. M. 7.

Vierteljahrs-Katalog der Neuigkeiten d. deutschen Buchhandels. Theologie u. Philosophie, 1898. 3. Heft. Jl.–Spt., pp. 49–67. L.: Hinrichs', '98. M. 0.40.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

DAVIES, H. H. Origen's Theory of Knowledge. *AJTh.*, II., '98, 737–62.

FEILNER, T. J. Beiträge z. Geschichte der Kultur u. Kunst. Philosophische Aphorismen. Braunschweig: Sattler, '98; viii, 160 pp. M. 2.40.

GASC-DESFOSSÉS, E. La philosophie de Grzymisch, S. Spinoza's Lehren von d. Ewigkeit u. Unsterblichkeit. *ID.* Br., '98; 32 pp.

HEUMANN, G. Das Verhältniss d. Ewigen und des Historischen in der Religionsphilosophie Kant's und Lotze's. *ID.* Erlangen, '98; viii, 88 pp.

LÜDEMANN, H. Jahresbericht über die Kirchenväter u. ihr Verhältniss z. Philosophie, 1893–96. *AGPh.*, XI., no. 4.

MAURER, TH. Die Religionslehre Spinoza's im theologisch-politischen Traktat. *ID.* Strassb., '98; 69 pp.

MESSER, A. Die Behandlg. des Freiheitsproblems bei John Locke. (Schluss.) *AGPh.*, XI., no. 4.

REINHARDT, E. Lotze's Stellg. z. Offenbarung. *ID.* B., '98; 54 pp.

SCHENDERLEIN, J. Die philosophischen Anschauungen b. Raimund v. Sabunde. *ID.* L., '98; 65 pp.

SCHREIBER, J. Ueber die religiöse und ethische Anschauung Salzmanns, dargestellt mit Beziehg. auf seine Pädagogik. Kaiserslautern: Crusius, '98; 85 pp. M. 1.20.

SIEBECK, H. Die Willenslehre bei Duns Scotus und bei seinen Nachfolgern. *ZPhKr.*, CXII., 2.

SIEBERT, O. Gesch. d. neueren deutschen Philosophie seit Hegel. Ein Handbuch z. Einführg. in d. philos. Studium der neuesten Zeit. G.: Vandenhoeck &

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

MARSHALL, H. R. Instinct and Reason. An essay concerning the relation of

instinct to reason, with some special study of the nature of religion. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xiii, 574 pp. $3.50.

NATORP, P. Ueber die Methode der Chronologie platon. Schriften nach sprachl. Kriterien. *AGPh.*, XI., no. 4.

OPPENHEIM, L. Das Gewissen. Basel: Schwabe, '98; 50 pp. M. 1.20.

VOLKMANN, F. Die Entwicklg. d. Philosophie. B.: Rühe, '98; 31 pp. M. 0.60.

WYNEKEN, G. A. Amor Dei intellectualis. Eine religionsphilosoph. Studie. Greifsw.: Abel, '98; iii, 68 pp. M. 1.20.

ZIEHEN, TH. Psychophysiologische Erkenntnistheorie. Jena: Fischer, '98; v, 105 pp. M. 2.80.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

BETTEX, F. Naturstudium und Christentum. 4. Aufl. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing, '98; 333 pp. Bd. M. 4.

DENIS, L. Christianisme et spiritisme. Les vicissitudes de l'évangile; la doctrine secrète du christianisme; relations avec les esprits des morts; la nouvelle révélation. P.: Leymarie, '98. f. 2.50.

HERING, H. Sittlichkeit und Religion. *DEBl.*, '98, 643–60.

RACCAUD, J. Christianisme et science. *Lib. chrét.*, '98, 455–65.

SABATIER, A. Die Religion u. d. moderne Kultur. Vortrag. Aus d. Franz. v. G. Sterzel. F.: Mohr, '98; 52 pp. M. 0.80.

TAPPENBECK, W. Die Religion d. Schönheit. Ihr Fundament. L.: Haacke, '98; 96 pp. M. 2.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY; RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

BIXBY, J. T. The Buddha's Path of Salvation. *BW.*, N., '98, 307–17.

CHABIN. La science de la religion. P.: Poussielgue, '98; ii, 442 pp.

FABRICIUS, V. De diis, fato Joveque in P. Ovidii Nasonis operibus quæ supersunt. L.: Fock, '98; 58 pp. M. 1.20.

GILBERT, O. Griechische Götterlehre, in ihren Grundzügen dargestellt. L.: Avenarius, '98; iii, 516 pp. M. 10.

HARTMANN, M. Aus dem Religionsleben der libyschen Wüste. *ARW.*, I., 260–74.

HOMMEL, FR. Uralte Parallelen zum Wessobrunner Gebet. *Münch. Neueste Nachr.*, '98, no. 285, p. 3; *cf.* Sepp, *ibid.*, no. 396, p. 7.

JASTROW, MORRIS, JR. The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria. Bo.: Ginn & Co., '98; xi, 780 pp. $3.25
Handbooks on the History of Religions, no. 2.

KLEMENT, K, Arion. Mytholog. Untersuchg. *GPr.* W.: Hölder, '98; 63 pp. M. 1.60.

KRAUSS, FR. S. Der Yoga-Schlaf bei d. Südslaven. *ARW.*, I., 275–93.

LÉVI. La doctrine du sacrifice dans les Brâhmanas. P.: Leroux, '98. f. 6.
Bibliothèque de l'École des hautes études (Sciences religieuses, 11e volume).

LUEKEN, W. Michael. Eine Darstellg. e. Vergleichg. d. jüd. u. morgenländisch-christl. Tradition v. Erzengel Michael. Mit Sachregister, Register d. biblischen u. Register der ausserbiblischen Citate. G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '98; x, 186 pp. M. 4.80.

MICHAELIS, W. De origine indicis deorum cognominum. *ID.* B.: Mayer & Müller, '98; 90 pp. M. 2.

ROUSSEL, A. Cosmologie hindoue, d'après le Bhâgavata Purâna. P.: Maisonneuve, '98. f. 6.

SIECKE, E. Der Gott Rudra im Rig-Veda. Schluss. *ARW.*, I., 209–59.

STAVE, E. Über den Einfluss d. Parsismus auf das Judentum. Ein Versuch. L.: Harrassowitz, '98; v, 280 pp. M. 6.

TIELE, C. P. Geschichte d. Religion im Altertum bis auf Alexander d. Grossen. Deutsch von G. Gehrich. II. Bd.: Die Religion bei den iranischen Völkern. 1. Hälfte. Go.: Perthes, '98; viii, 187 pp. M. 3.60.

VALLÉE POUSSIN, L. DE LA. Bouddhisme Études et matériaux. iv, 417 pp.
Tome LV., 5, of: Mémoires couronnés etc. publiés par l'Académie de Belgique, '98.

B. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BALLING, C. Bibelske Skildringer. Kjøbenhavn, '98; 200 pp. Kr. 2.

BERNFELD, S. Das Buch der Bücher. Populär-wissenschaftl. dargestellt. B.: Cronbach, '98; vii, 298 pp. M. 4.

HITCHCOCK, A. W. Questions and Answers about the Bible: a handbook of Bible study for schools and classes, and for private reading. N. Y.: Whittaker, '98; ii, 153 pp. $0.50.

MOULTON, R. G., BRUCE, A. B., *et al.* The Bible as Literature. Lo.: Service, '98; 394 pp. 6s.

BARTLETT, S. C. Higher Criticism at High-Water Mark. *BS.*, '98, 656–92.

KOESTSVELD, C. E. VAN. Die Frau in der Bibel. Aus d. Holl. von Kohlschmidt. L.: Jansa, '98; 334 pp. Bd. M. 4.

NÖSGEN, C. F. Die Aussagen des Neuen Testaments über d. Pentateuch. B.: Wiegandt & Grieben, '98; iii, 68 pp. M. 0.80.

PETERSEN, J. Cherubim. Kurze Zusammenstellg. d. wichtigsten Ansichten u. Erklärungen seit Luther. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; 48 pp. M. 0.80.

[illegible], J. Geschichte d. jüd. Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi. 3. Aufl. 2. u. 3. Bd. L.: Hinrichs, '98. M. 24.
2. Die innern Zustände, v, 584 pp.; 3. Das Judenthum in der Zerstreuung und die jüdische Literatur, v, 562 pp.

TERRY, M. S. Biblical Apocalyptics: a study of the most notable revelations of God and of Christ in the canonical scriptures. N. Y.: Eaton & Mains, '98; 573 pp. $3.

BLISS, F. J. Excavations at Jerusalem, 1894–1897. Plans and illus. by A. C. DICKIE. Lo.: Palest. Explor. Fund, '98; 390 pp. 12s. 6d.

BÖTTCHER, K. Aus geweihten Landen. Studienfahrten durch Palästina, Syrien und d. Sinai-Halbinsel. L.: Franke, '98; x, 212 pp. M. 3; bd. M. 3.75.

BÜCHLER, A. The Nicanor Gate and the Brass Gate. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 46–63.
a) The Statements of the Mishna; *b*) The Statements of Josephus on the Brass Gate.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Notes on the "Quarterly Statement." *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 250–52.

HANAUER, J. E. Tell er Reesh. *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 244–7.

Jerusalem. Rundblick vom Turme der Erlöserkirche. (Grosse Ausg.) Leporelloformat. 35 × 313 cm. Photogr. Mit Text. Hoch 4to. (1 Blatt.) L.: Hentschel, '98. In Mappe. M. 20.

——— Kleine Ausgabe. 21 × 122 cm. Photogr. Mit Text. 8vo. (3 S.) In Mappe. M. 10.

KIRCHHOFF, A. Palästinakunde z. Erläuterung d. bibl. Geschichte. Leitfaden f. die Vorlesung. Halle: Waisenhaus, '98; iv, 44 pp. M. 0.60

MERRILL, S. "Within Thy Gates, O Jerusalem." *BW.*, N., '98, 293–302.

SCHICK, C. Birket es Sultan. *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 224–30.

——— The Dragon Well. *Ibid.*, 230–31.

——— Hebron and its Neighbourhood. *Ibid.*, 232–8.

——— Wâdy 'Arrûb, the Aruboth of Scripture. *Ibid.*, 238–40.

WALLACE, E. S. Jerusalem the Holy: a brief history of ancient Jerusalem; with an account of the modern city and its conditions, political, religious, and social. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '98; 259 pp., illustr. & maps. $1.50.

WELLNER, M. 25 (farb.) Karten von Palästina, enth. alle in den 4 hl. Evangelien angedeut. Wege unseres Herrn Jesu Christi. Prag: Rivnáč, '98. M. 6.

WRIGHT, TH. F. The Valley Gate *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 261–2.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

GREEN, W. H. General Introduction to the Old Testament. The Canon. N. Y.: Scribner's, '98; xvii, 209 pp. $1.50.

NOORDTZIJ, A. Eene nieuwe vertaling van het Oude Testament. *Ti. v. geref. Theol.*, VI., S., '98, 81–97.

RUPPRECHT, E. Wissenschaftl. Handbuch der Einleitung in das Alte Testament. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; xxiii, 548 pp. M. 7.

STRACK, H. Bibelkritik und jüdische Orthodoxie. *Nath.*, XIV., Heft 5.

LANGUAGE AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

GRAY, G. B. The Meaning of the Hebrew Word דָּגָל. *JQR.*, XI., '98, 92–101.

LAMBERT, M. Notes grammaticales et lexicographiques. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 142–3.
I. Le verbe רוּחַ;

PETERS, N. Die Entstehung [illegible] von Ps. 110, 3. *ThQ.*, '98, 615–17.

TOUZARD, J. De la conservation du texte Hebreu. Étude sur Isaïe, XXXVI–XXXIX. Suite. *RB.*, '98, 511–24.

WEBER, H. J. Material for the Construction of a Grammar of the Book of Job. I. *AJSL.*, XV., 1–32.

KAUTZSCH, E., & OTHERS: Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen d. Alten Testaments übersetzt u. hrsg. Voll-

ständig in 24–30 Lfgn. à M. 0.50. F.: Mohr, '98; Pts. 1–6.

Collaborators: G. BEER, F. BLASS, CLEMEN, DRIESSMANN, FUCHS, GUNKEL, GUTHE, KAMPHAUSEN, KITTEL, LITTMANN, LÖHR, ROTHSTEIN, RYSSEL, SCHNAPP, SIEGFRIED, WENDLAND.

MÉRITAN, J. La version grecque des livres de Samuel, précédée d'une introduction sur la critique textuelle. P.: Maisonneuve, '98; xi, 252 pp.

MONTVAILLANT, A. DE. Poètes bibliques. Le livre de Job; Esaïe, Jérémie; Les lamentat.de Jérémie; Baruch. Mis en vers français. P.: Fischbacher, '98; 589 pp.

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BUHL, F. Die sozialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten. B.: Reuther & Reichard, '99; vi, 130 pp. M. 2.

HORNER, J. Biblical Chronology. *PSBA.*, XX., '98, 235–46.

On OPPERT's contribution, *ibid.*, 11 Jan., '98.

LEHMANN, J. Quelques dates importantes de la chronologie du 2e Temple, à propos d'une page du Talmud. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 1–44.

NIKEL, J. Zerubabel, seine angebliche Erhebung u. sein Sturz. *Kath.*, N., '98.

PICK, B. The Jewish High Priests subsequent to the Return from Babylon. IV. 6 A. D. to 68 A. D. *LChR.*, O., '98, 655–64.

PILCHER, E. J. Herodian Pottery and the Siloam Inscription (3 plates). *PSBA.*, XX., '98, 213–22.

SCHICK, C. Remarks on the Tabernacle Controversy. *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 241–3.

STREANE, A. W. Age of the Maccabees. With special reference to religious literature of the period. Lo.: Eyre, '98; 290 pp. 6s.

YONGE, C. M. The Patriots of Palestine: a story of the Maccabees; ill. by W. S. Stacey. N. Y.: Whittaker, '98; vii, 263 pp. $1.25.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

BLANKENHORN, M. Das tote Meer und der Untergang von Sodom u. Gomorrha. Mit e. Karte u. 18 Bildern. B.: Reimer, '98; 44 pp. M. 1.

CHEYNE, T. K. The Name of Kadesh in the Old Testament. *OLZ.*, 1., no. 6.

DAWSON, J. W. Note on Canon Driver's Article: "Magna est veritas, et prævalet." *Exp.*, O., '98, 306–8.

HILGENFELD, A. Die Himmelfahrt des Moses u. d. Ezra-Prophet. *ZwTh.*, '98, 616–19.

KAUFMANN, D. Errors in the Septuagint and the Vulgate from which Illustrations and Sculptures Derived their Origin. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 163–6.

KUYPER, A. Die 12 Patriarchen. Bibl. Charakterstudien. Deutsch v. E. L.: Sonnenhol, '98; 79 pp. M. 0.80.

SEPP. Esra u. sein Kanon. *IThR.*, O., '98, 750–55.

ZAHN, A. Vorträge üb. kritische Fragen des Alten Testamentes. 1. Vortrag üb. d. Kritik d. Alten Testamentes. 2. Vorträge über das Buch Josua, die Bücher der Könige, die Psalmen u. das Gesetz. L.: Ungleich, '98; xv, 163 pp. M. 2.20.

THEOLOGY.

BOEHMER, J. Reich Gottes und Menschensohn im Buche Daniel. Ein Beitrag z. Verständnis s. Grundgedankens. L.: Deichert, '98; vii, 216 pp. M. 3.60.

FREY, J. Tod, Seelenglaube u. Seelenkult im alten Israel. Eine religionsgesch. Untersuchung. L.: Deichert, '98; viii, 244 pp. M. 3.75.

GOODSPEED, G. S. Israel's Messianic Hopes. *BW.*, D., '98, 400–436.

——— Some Books on Messianic Prophecy. *Ibid.*, 444–7.

JENSEN, P. Light on an Ancient Heathen Deity: the cult of Ashera. *Sund. Sch. Ti.*, '98, no. 36, 570–71.

MATHEWS, S. The Jewish Messianic Expectation in the Time of Jesus. *BW.*, D., '98, 437–43.

ROBERTSON, J. The Poetry and the Religion of the Psalms. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., '98; xvi, 360 pp. $3.50. *The Croall Lectures*, 1893–4.

WHATHAM, A. E. The Early Religion of the Hebrews. *BS.*, '98, 629–55.

See Behrends' criticism, *ibid.*, pp. 742–3; and Whatham's rejoinder, *ibid.*, '99, 168–70.

THE LAW.

HIRSCH, S. R. Der Pentateuch übersetzt u. erläutert. (Hebr. u. Deutsch.) 3. Tl.: Leviticus. 3. Aufl. Fr.: Kauffmann, '98; 648 pp. M. 2.50.

LAGRANGE, J. M. La prophétie de Jacob. Gen. 49:1–28. *RB.*, '98, 525–40.

MÉCHINEAU, L. La thèse de l'origine mosaïque du Pentateuque. *Et.*, 5 N., '98, 289–311.

NEILE, TH. W. Readings from the Pentateuch. Vol. 2: Exodus. Lo.: Bemrose, '98; 398 pp. 5s.

ROBINSON, GEO. L. The Genesis of Deuteronomy. *Exp.*, '98, O., 241–61; N., 351–69.

SIMPSON, P. C. Jabob's Wrestle: a man and his fate. *Exp.*, N., '98, 391–400.

THE PROPHETS.

CHEYNE, T. K. Note on Mr. Gray's Article: "The Alphabetic Poem in Nahum." *Exp.*, O., '98, 304–5.

HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques: L'auteur sacerdotal et les prophètes. (Suite.) *RS.*, VI., O., '98, 289–347.
Les grands prophètes: Jérémie.

HARPER, W. R. The Utterances of Amos Arranged Strophically. *BW.*, '98, O., 251–6; N., 333–8.

HATCH, H. R. The Story of Hosea, the Prophet, as it might have been Told in Contemporary Chronicles. *BW.*, O., '98, 257–65.

HARTUNG, K. Der Prophet Amos nach dem Grundtexte erklärt. F.: Herder, '98; iii, vii, 169 pp. M. 4.60.
Vol. III., Heft 4, of: Biblische Studien, hrsg. v. Bardenhewer.

KÖNIG, E. Zur Literarkrit. d. Prophetenschriften. *Theol. Lztbl.*, '98, no. 46.
On the articles of Cobb & Barton in *JBL.*, XVII., pp. 40–61, 62–86.

KÖNIG. Deuterojesajanisches. *NkZ.*, '98, 895–935.

MEINHOLD, J. Die Jesajaerzählungen, Jesaja 36–39. Eine historisch-kritische Untersuchung. G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '98; iv, 104 pp. M. 3.

POLLARD, E. B. The Prophet as a Poet. *BW.*, N., '98, 327–32.

ROTHSTEIN, J. W. Zur Kritik u. Exegese d. Deuterojesajabuches, Jes. 40: 3–11. *StKr.*, '99, 5–36.

SANDERS, F. K., & KENT, C. F. The Messages of the Earlier Prophets; arranged in the order of time, analyzed, and freely rendered in paraphrase. Ph.: Wattles & Co., '98; xv, 300 pp. $1.

VOILLEREAU, G. La prophétie d'Isaie, ou l'Emmanuel et la vierge mère. *ID.* Chalons-sur-Marne, Martin, '98; 64 pp.

VOS, G. The Modern Hypothesis and Recent Criticism of the Early Prophets. IV. Isaiah. *PRR.*, O., '98, 610–36.

WELLHAUSEN, J. Die kleinen Propheten. Übers. u. erklärt. 3. Ausg. B.: Reimer, '98; 222 pp. M. 7.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BARTON, W. E. The Psalms and Their Story: a study of the Psalms as related to Old Testament history; with a preliminary study of Hebrew poetry and music. In 2 vols. Bo.: Pilgrim Press, '98; xii, 249; ix, 267 pp. $2.50.
Vol. 1: From the Exodus; Vol. 2: From the Exile to the Advent. For Sunday-school teachers, etc.

BUHL, F. The Aid of Criticism in the Interpretation of the Psalms. *AJTh.*, II., '98, 763–75.

CONDER, C. R. Illustrations of the Book of Job. *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 254–61.

DAVID, M. Das Targum Scheni z. Buche Esther nach Hoscher. Hrsg. u. mit einer Einleitg. versehen. *ID.* Krakau, '98; viii, 48 pp.

FIELDING, G. H. Book of Job. Revised text, intro., etc. Lo.: Stock, '98. 3s. 6d.

HENRY, A. B. Les difficultés critiques et historiques du livre de Daniel. *ID.* Cahors: Coueslant, '98; v, 178 pp.

HOGG, H. W. The Genealogy of Benjamin: a criticism of 1 Chron., chap. 8. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 102–14.

KENNEDY, J. The Book of Daniel from the Christian Standpoint. With essay on alleged historical difficulties by editor of the "Babylonian and Oriental Record." Lo.: Eyre, '98; 232 pp. 6s.

KIRCHNER, J. Die Hauptweissagungen des Buches Daniel erläutert u. mit den Weissaggn. d. übrigen Propheten verglichen. *ID.* Treuenbietzen, '98; 47 pp.

KOK, J. Salomo's Spreuken gerangschikt en verklaard. 4e stuk. Kampen: Kok, '98; xiv & pp. 578–826. f. 1.25.

MORPURGO, C. Il libro Kohelcth. Padova, '98; 59 pp. L. 1.

PARKER, J. Does the Book of Daniel Emanate from Daniel the Prophet? *ITkR.*, O., '98, 794–8.

RASMUSSEN-LINDEGAARD, N. Profanhistorien i Daniel. Kritisk Studie. København: Madsen, '98; 84 pp. Kr. 2.25.

RIEDEL, W. Die älteste Auslegung des Hohenliedes. *ID.* Naumburg, '98; 41 pp.

SCHMID, B. Das Buch der Sprüche Salomons. Mit erläuternden Anmerkgn. Regensburg: Nat. Verlagsanstalt, '98; iv, 157 pp. M. 2.80.

WINTERFELD, E. v. Commentar über d. Buch Iob. 1. Tl.: Uebersetzung u. sprachl. Analyse. Anklam: Wolter, '98; 76 pp. M. 1.

APOCRYPHA.

HOGG, H. W. Another Edition of the Hebrew Ecclus. *AJSL.*, XV., 42–8.

KAUFFMANN, D. Notes to Sirach 43: 20 and 40: 12. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 159–62.

KRAUSS, S. Notes on Sirach. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 150–59.
1. The Name Sirach; 2. The Author; 3. Sayings of Sirach in Rabbinic Literature; 4. The Word תוחלית.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

DEISSMANN, A. Neuentdeckte Papyrusfragmente z. Geschichte d. griechischen Judenthums. *Theol. Litztg.*, '98, no. 23.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

DODS, M. Survey of Literature on the New Testament. *Exp.*, O., '98, 309–20.

GIGOT, F. E. Outlines of New Testament History. N. Y. & Chi.: Benziger, '98; 366 pp. $1.50.

SAUPE, M. Wo lagen Golgatha u. d. heil. Grab? *KM.*, O., '98.

TENZ, J. M. Golgotha or Calvary. *PEFQS.*, O., '98, 248–50.

ZAHN, TH. Einleitg. in das Neue Testament. 2. Bd. L.: Deichert, '98; iv, 656 pp. M. 13.50.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

SCHENKEL, B. Der älteste bekannte Text unserer vier Evangelien. *PrM.*, '98, 308–15.

BLASS, F. Grammar of New Testament Greek. Tr. by Thackeray. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; ix, 340 pp. $4.50.

BURTON, E. DEWITT. Syntax of the Moods and Tenses in New Testament Greek. 3d ed. Chi.: U. of C. Press; Ed.: Clark; 238 pp. 5s. 6d.

CARR, A. The Use of σκάνδαλον and σκανδαλίζειν in the New Testament. *Exp.*, N., '98, 343–51.

HEINE, G. Synonymik des neutestamentl. Griechisch. L.: Haberland, '98; xxiv, 222 pp. M. 4.

REINHOLD, H. De græcitate patrum apostolicorum librorumque apocryphorum novi testamenti quæstiones grammaticæ. Hl.: Niemeyer, '98; 114 pp. M. 2.80.
Dissertationes philologicæ Halenses, Vol. XIV., Pars I.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

BERRY, L. F. The Social Teachings of Jesus. *BS.*, '98, 717–29.

BRYANT, S. The Teaching of Christ on Life and Conduct. Lo.: Sonnenschein, '98; 100 pp. 2s. 6d.

CADÈNE, A. Le père Didon et sa vie de Jésus. *ID.* Montauban: Granié, '98; 51 pp.

DYKES, J. O. How Jesus Met Recrimination, John 8:48–51. *Exp.*, N., '98, 381–90.

GENBERG, J. Grunddragen af Jesu verksamhet. Stockholm: '98; 252 pp. Kr. 2.

GILARD, L. La sainteté de Jésus ou l'homme normal. III. *RThPh.*, '98, 405–38.

GORDON, J. Three Children of Galilee: a life of Christ for the young people. Lo.: Jarrold, '98; 292 pp.; ill. 3s. 6d.

HILGENFELD, A. Johannes u. Jesus nach J. Wellhausens Darstellung. *ZwTh.*, '98, 481–501.

KÖCK, J. Jesus Christus als Vorbild f. alle Erzieher. Langensalza: Beyer, '98; 31 pp. M. 0.50.

MALAN, C. La crainte que ressent le Seigneur Jésus à l'approche de la mort. *RThPh.*, '98, 439–52.

MALUSKY, R. Les rapports de Jésus avec sa famille durant son ministère public, d'après les synoptiques et le quatrième évangile. *ID.* P.: Nony, '98; 96 pp.

RAMSAY, W. H. Was Christ Born at Bethlehem? A study on the credibility of St. Luke. Lo.: Hodder; N. Y.: Putnam's, '98; 292 pp. 5s.

RESCH, A. Die Logia Jesu. Nach d. griech. u. hebr. Text wieder hergestellt. Ein Versuch. L.: Hinrichs', '98; xxxii, 301 pp. M. 10.

WALKER, N. L. Jesus Christ and His Surroundings. L.: Hodder, '98; 248 pp. 3s. 6d.

APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

CONE, O. Paul: the Man, the Missionary, and the Teacher. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xii, 475 pp. $2.

FRETTÉ, S. E. L'Apôtre saint Paul. P.: Lethielleux, '98; xv, 518 pp.

GOULBURN. Eight Sermons on St. John Baptist. Lo.: SPCK., '98; 118 pp. 1s. 6d.

HENSON, H. H. Apostolic Christianity: notes and inferences mainly based on St. Paul's epistle to the Corinthians. Lo.: Methuen, '98; 364 pp. 6s.

HOLTZMANN, O. Geschiedenis van den Nieuw-Testamentischen tijd. Uit het hoogd. vert. door J. Hartog. Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, '98; iv, 360 pp. f. 3.25.

RAPP, H. Der Apostel Petrus im Neuen Testament. *PrM.*, '98, 323–37.

SCHÜRER, E. Der Ethnarch des Königs Aretas (2 Kor. 11:32). *StKr.*, '99, 95–9.

THEOLOGY.

BONOMELLI, G. Gesù Cristo Dio-Uomo. Milano, '98. L. 3.

BRUCE, A. B. Messiahship as Conceived by Jesus. *BW.*, D., '98, 369–79.

BRUSTON, C. L'hypothèse du retour de Néron sous une forme nouvelle. *RThQR.*, '98, 606–12.

DALMAN, G. Messianische Texte aus d. nachkanonischen Litteratur. Für den akadem. Gebrauch gesammelt. [Aus: D., "Die Worte Jesu."] L.: Hinrichs', '98; 31 pp. M. 0.50.

GOULBURN, E. M. The Lord's Prayer. Lo.: Murray, '98; 310 pp. 6s.

POWER, P. B. Christ's Memory in Heaven. Lo.: SPCK., '98; 128 pp. 1s. 6d.

RIGGENBACH, E. Die christl. Vollkommenheit nach der Schrift. Barmen: Wupperthaler Traktat-Gesellsch., '98; 48 pp. M. 0.80.

SCHAEFER, R. Gottesreich u. Weltreich nach d. Neuen Testament. *NkZ.*, O., '98, 809–30.

SCHMIEDEL, P. Bezeichnet Jesus d. Menschen als solchen durch Menschensohn? *PrM.*, 291–308.

SUTHERLAND, A. The Kingdom of God, and Problems of To-day: lectures delivered before the Biblical Department of Vanderbilt University. Nashville: Publ. House of M. E. Church, South, '98; xx, 240 pp. $1.

CRITICISM.

HOERSCHELMANN, W. Das Verhältniss Jesu zum Vater nach den Synoptikern. *M. & N. Ev. Kir. in Russl.*, Vol. 54, My. & Je., '98.

HOLTZMANN, H. Über d. sog. prakt. Auslegg. d. Neuen Testamentes. *PrM.*, '98, 283–91.

MÜLLER, J. Das persönliche Christentum der Paulinischen Gemeinden nach seiner Entstehg. untersucht. I. Tl. L.: Hinrichs', '98; v, 306 pp. M. 6.

REDPATH, H. A. Delivering to Satan (1 Cor. 5:3–5; 1 Tim. 1:20). *Exp.*, O., '98, 287–90.

RIDLEY, W. D. The Revelation of the Son of Man to Nathanael. *Exp.*, N., '98, 336–43.

RISCHE, B. Welche Grundgedanken gibt uns d. Neue Test. f. d. Verfassung form d. Kirche? *NkZ.*, S., '98, 7

SCHLATTER, A. Erläuterungen z. Neuen Testament. 6. & 2. Tl. Calw u. St.: Vereinsbuchh., '98.

6. Das Evangelium Johannes, ausgelegt f. Bibelleser, 370 pp., M. 2.25.—2. Der Hebräerbrief, ausgelegt, etc., 272 pp., M. 1.50.

WEBER, V. Paulus war nur einmal in Galatien vor dem Galaterbrief. *Kath.*, S., '98.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

DICKMANN, R. Die Herrlichkeit des einen Evangeliums in seiner vierfachen Gestalt. Braunschweig: Wollermann, '98; 30 pp. M. 0.30.
Veröffentlichungen des Bibelbundes. No. 5.

ECK, S. Der Verfasser des Johannesevangeliums. *Preuss. Jahrbb.*, O., '98, 25–45.

GREGORY, C. R. "And They Went Out One by One" (John 7:53—8:11). *BW.*, N., '98, 303–6.

HILGENFELD, A. Der Eingang der Apostelgeschichte. *ZwTh.*, '98, 619–25.

KNABENHAUER, J. Commentarius in quatuor s. evangelia domini n. Iesu Christo. IV. Evangelium sec. Ioannem. vii, 592 pp. M. 9.
Cursus scripturæ sacræ auctoribus R. Cornely, I. Knabenhauer, F. de Hummelauer aliisque Soc. Iesu presbyteris. Commentariorum in Nov. Test. pars I, in libros historicos IV. P.: Lethielleux.

MATHEWS, S. The Origin of Acts 9:1–19. *BW.*, O., '98, 266–70.

MERX, A. Text u. Auslegung von Joh. 21:15–17. *PrM.*, '98, 154–60.

NÖSGEN. Die Rede des Stephanus. *NkZ.*, S., '98, 661–87.

ROSE, V. L'église primitive a-t-elle lu plus de quatre évangiles? *RB.*, '98, 494–510.

SCHLATTER, A. Die Parallelen in den Worten Jesu bei Johannes u. Matthäus. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; 72 pp. M. 1.
Beiträge z. Förderg. christl. Theologie, hrsg. v. A. Schlatter u. H. Cremer. II, 5.

SWETE, H. B. The Gospel according to St. Mark. The Greek text, with introduction, notes, and indices. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; cx, 412 pp. $3.75.

WIESEN. Das Gleichnis von den zehn Jungfrauen. *StKr.*, '99, 37–62.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

BARTON, GEO. A. The Apocalypse and Recent Criticism. *AJTh.*, '98, 776–801.

BEET, J. A. Difficult

BÜTTNER, F. Über die Entrückung der Heiligen, 1 Thess. 4:17. *NkZ.*, S., '98, 707–21.

GARROD, G. W. The Epistle to the Colossians. Analysis and examination

notes. Lo. & N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; vi, 176 pp. $1.25.

HORT, F. J. A. The First Epistle of St. Peter, 1—2:17. Greek text, introd. lecture, comment, and notes. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xvi, 188 pp. $1.75.

LABOURT, J. Notes d'exégèse sur Phil. 2:5-11. *RB.*, '98, 553-63.

MACMURCHY, A. K. The Epistle of Paul to Philemon. Lo.: Oliphant, '98; 208 pp. 3s. 6d.

RAMSAY, W. M. A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. *Exp.*, '98, O., 291-303; N., 321-36.
xxiv. Greek Law in Galatian Cities; xxv. The Metaphor in Rom. 4:11; xxvi. "Those of Faith;" xxvii. Gal. 3:15-18; xxviii. "Covenant" in the New Testament; xxix. The Argument in Gal. 3:16; xxx. Gal. 3:19-22; xxxi. The Mediator.

WAHLE, G. F. Die vier ersten biblischen Briefe des Apostels Paulus ihrem Inhalt u. Plan nach. L.: Deichert, '98; iv, 106 pp. M. 1.60.

WELCH, A. The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews and Other Papers. Ed. & Lo.: Oliphant, Anderson & Ferrier, '98; viii, 214 pp. 3s. 6d.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

AUGUSTINI, S. AURELII, Confessiones. Ad fidem codicum Lipsiensium et editionum antiquiorum recognitas ed. C. H. Bruder. Ed. ster. Carol. Tauchnitii. L.: Bredt, '98; xxi, 288 pp. M. 1.50.

AUGUSTINI, S. AURELII, Confessionum libri XIII. Ex recognitione P. Knöll. L.: Teubner, '98; iv, 348 pp. M. 2.70.

BELSER, J. Der Verfasser des Buches *de mortibus persecutorum*. III. *ThQ.*, '98, 547-96.

CASTELLI, R. Il poema di Claudio Claudiano e l'Omelia di S. Giovanni Crisostomo. Verona: Fratelli Drucker, '98. L. 2.

Codex diplomaticus Lusatiæ superioris II, enth. Urkunden des Oberlausitzer Hussitenkrieges u. der gleichzeit. die Sechslande angeh. Fehden. Gesammelt u. hrsg. v. R. Jecht. 3. Heft: umfassend die Jahre 1426-1428 (pp. 351-510). Görlitz: Tzschaschel, '98. M. 3.60.

CONYBEARE, FRED. C. The Dialogues of Athanasius and Zacchæus, and of Timothy and Aquila. Edited with 104 pp. Small 4to. 6s.
Anecdota Oxoniensia. Texts, Documents, and Extracts, chiefly from Manuscripts in the Bodleian and other Oxford Libraries. Classical series. Part VIII. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press; N. Y.: Frowde, '98.

The Armenian Canons of St. Sahak Catholicos of Armenia (390-439 A. D.). *AJTh.*, '98, 828-48.

——— The Testament of Solomon. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 1-45.

DAMASCIUS LE DIADOQUE. Problèmes et solutions touchant les premiers principes. Avec le tableau sommaire des doctrines des Chaldéens, de Michel Psellus. Trad. pour la 1re fois et accompagnés de commentaires et d'un index très développé, par A. E. Chaignet. Tome III. P.: Leroux, '98. Complete in 3 vols. f. 36.

DIEKAMP, F. Hippolytos von Theben. Texte u. Untersuchungen. Münster: Aschendorff, '98, vi, lxx, 177 pp. M. 6.50.

ERNST. Wann u. wo wurde der *liber de rebaptismate* verfasst? 1. *Hist. Jahrb. d. Gorres-Gesellsch.*, XIX., no. 3.

FRANCHI DE CAVALIERI, PIO. Gli atti dei ss. Montano, Lucio e compagni. Recensione del testo ed introduzione sulle sue relazioni con la Passio s. Perpetuae. vii, 120 pp. M. 4.
8. Suppl.-Hft. of *RQ.*; Fr.: Herder in Komm.

FREISEN, J. Liber agendarum ecclesie et diocesis Sleszwicensis. Katholisches Ritualbuch der Diözese Schleswig im Mittelalter. Hrsg. m. histor. Einleitg. Paderborn: Junfermann, '98; xxxi, 160 pp. and illustr. M. 5.

FRITZ, W. Die Briefe des Bischofs Synesius von Kyrene. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Atticismus im 4. u. 5. Jahrh. L.: Teubner, '98; v, 230 pp. M. 8.

GERHARDI, D. JOA. Homiliæ XXVI seu meditationes breves diebus dominicis atque festis accommodatæ. E manuscriptis Gerhardinis ab illustrissima bibliotheca gothana asservatis primum ed. Geo. Berbig. L.: Deichert, '98; viii, 43 pp. M. 1.
Vol. III., no. 5
Theologie u. de
u. R. Seeberg.

HARRIS, J. R. The Homeric Centones and the Acts of Pilate. Lo., '98. 5s.

HONTERUS, JOH. Ausgewählte Schriften. Hrsg. v. O. Netoliczka. Mit Textabbildgn. u. 1 Karte v. Siebenbürgen. W.: Graeser, '98; xxvi, 212 pp. M. 4.

HOPPE, H. De sermone Tertullianeo quæstiones selectæ. *ID.* Marburg: '98; 85 pp.

KRUSCH, BR. Zur Afralegende u. z. Martyrologium Hieronymianum. Eine Entgegnung. *Arch. d. Gesellsch. f. ältere deu. Gesch.-Kunde*, XXIV., no. 1.

MIGNE, J. P. Patrologiæ cursus completus. Series Græca. T. 129. P.: Garnier frères et Migne, '98; 743 pp. Euthymius Zygabenus, Commentarius in quatuor Evangelia, Tom. 2.

MORIN, G. Les sources non identifiées de l'homéliaire de Paul Diacre. *RBd.*, '98, 400–403.

POIREL. Vincentii Peregrini, seu alio nomine Marii Mercatoris, Lirinensia commonitoria duo. Nancy: Berger-Levrault, '98; xii, 198 pp.

SACKUR, E. Sibyllinische Texte und Forschungen. Pseudomethodius, Adso u. die tiburtin. Sibylle. Hl., Niemeyer, '98; vii, 191 pp. M. 6.

SCHMIDT, C. Der Osterfestbrief d. Athanasius vom Jahre 367. *Nachr. d. k. Gesell. d. Wiss. z. Gött.*, phil.-hist. Kl., '98, 167–203.

CHRISTIAN ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BERGER, S. Les manuels pour l'illustration du Psautier au XVIII[e] siècle. Nogent-Le-Rotrou: Daupeley-Gouverneur, '98; 42 pp.

DEHIO, G., u. G. v. BEZOLD. Die kirchl. Baukunst des Abendlandes. Hist. u. system. dargestellt. II. Bd., 1. Hälfte. St.: Bergsträsser, '98; 248 pp. & illustr. With atlas. 7. Lfg. (48 plates, folio, in a map.) M. 30; atlas alone M. 24.

GREGORY, C. R. The Mâdaba Map. *BW.*, O., '98, 244–50.

HURLL, E. M. The Life of Our Lord in Art; with some account of the artistic treatment of the life of St. John the Baptist. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '98; xxii, 370 pp., illustr. $3.

LENOX, J. P. The Supreme Face of the Christ. Centuries. *BW.*, D., '98, 380–99.

MANCHOT, C. Der Christus Michelangelos in S. Maria sopra minerva in Rom. 38 pp. & 5 plates. M. 1.
No. 298 of: Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftlicher Vorträge. hrsg. von RUD. VIRCHOW. Neue Folge (XIII. Serie). Hamburg: Verlagsanstalt u. Druckerei.

MOMMERT, C. Die hl. Grabeskirche zu Jerusalem in ihrem urspr. Zustande. Mit 22 Abbildgn. im Texte u. 3 Kartenbeilagen. L.: Haberland, '98; viii, 256 pp. M. 5.50.

MUSSAFIA, A. Studien z. den mittelalterlichen Marienlegenden. V. W.: Gerold, '98; 74 pp. M. 1.70.
Aus: *Sitzungsber. d. k. Akad. d. Wiss.*

VILLANI, C. Epigrafe consolare ritrovata a S. Paolo. *Nuovo Bull. d. Arch. cristiana.* IV ½.

C. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

BÖCKER, G. Bibliographie der kirchengeschichtlichen Litteratur, vom 1. Jan. –1. Jl. '98. Appendix to *ZKG.*, XIX.

BORNEMANN, W. Historische u. praktische Theologie. Antrittsvorlesung. Basel: Reich, '98; 31 pp. M. 0.80.

CHEVALIER, U. L'abbaye de Silos. *UC.*, S., '98, 131–42.

HOFMANN, M. Die Stellung d. kathol. Kirche zum Zweikampf bis z. Concil von Trient. II. *ZkTh.*, '98, 601–42.

KUBITSCHEK, W. Zur Frage nach d. Aubreitg. des Christenthums in Pannonien. *Blätter d. Ver. f. Landesk. von Niederösterr.*, XXXI.

SÄGMÜLLER. Zur Thätigk. u. Stellg. der Kardinäle bis Papst Bonifaz VIII. *ThQ.*, '98, 596–614.

SHAHAN, TH. J. The Study of Church History. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, '98, 431–59.

THE EARLY PERIOD.

BOISSIER, G. La fin du paganisme. Étude sur les dernières luttes religieuses en Occident au IV[e] siècle. 2 vols. P.: Hachette, '98; pp. 399 & 356. f. 7.

JACKSON, B. St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna. Lo.: SPCK., '98; 78 pp. 1s.
Early Church Classics.

MARCHAL, G. Saint Jean Chrysostome (Antioche). P.: Poussielgue, '98; viii, 232 pp. f. 2.50.

WATERMAN, L. The Post-Apostolic Age. With an introduction by the

Right Rev. H. C. Porter. N. Y.: Scribner's, '98; xviii, 505 pp. $2.
Vol. II. of "Ten Epochs of Church History," ed. by John Fulton.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

ABBOTT, E. St. Thomas of Canterbury, his death and miracles. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98. 2 vols. xv, 333; vii, 326 pp.; illustr. $7.50.

BÖHMER, H. Kirche u. Staat in England u. der Normandie im 11. u. 12. Jahrhdt. L.: Dieterich, '98; 400 pp. M. 10.

BROUWERS, D. Christian Druthmar, écolâtre du IXe siècle de l'abbaye de Stavelot. *Bull. de la soc. verviétoise d'arch. et d'hist.*, '98, no. 3.

CARTELIERI, O. Abt Suger von Saint-Denis, 1081–1151. B.: Ebering, '98; xv, 191 pp. M. 5.
Historische Studien, veröffentlicht von Dr. E. Ebering. XI. Heft.

CLEMEN, O. Ein Ablassbrief von 1482. *ZKG.*, XIX., 360–61.

Georgias Gemistos Plethon. *Z.*, XIX., 265–92.

EICHNER, K. Agobard, Erzbischof v. Lyon. *ZwTh.*, '98, 526–88.

KNIPPING, R. Ungedruckte Urkunden der Erzbischöfe von Köln aus d. 12. u. 13. Jahrhdt. *Ann. d. hist. Ver. f. d. Niederrhein*, 65. Heft.

LEMPP, E. David v. Augsburg. Schriften aus d. Handschr. d. Münchener Hof- u. Staatsbibl. Cod. lat. 15,312. *ZKG.*, XIX., 340–60.

LUX, C. Papst Silvesters II. Einfluss auf d. Politik Kaiser Ottos III. Ein Beitrag z. Gesch. des 10. Jahrh. Br.: Müller & Seiffert, '98; vii, 82 pp. M. 1.60.

NORDEN, W. Der 4. Kreuzzug im Rahmen d. Beziehungen d. Abendlandes zu Byzanz. B.: Behr, '98; 108 pp. M. 2.50.

RÖHRICHT, R. Geschichte der Kreuzzüge im Umriss. Innsbruck: Wagner; iv, 273 pp. M. 3.60.

ROHR. Die Prophetie im letzten Jahrhundert vor der Reformation als Geschichtsquelle u. Geschichtsfaktor. II. *Hist. Jahrb. d. Görres-Ges.*, XIX., 3.

ROTH, F. W. E. Beiträge z. Mainzer Schriftstellergesch. des 15. u. 16. Jahrhdts. *Kath.*, O. & N., '98.

SPAHN, M. Der Magister Nikolaus Magni de Jawor (1355–1433). *Kath.*, N., '98.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

BRANDSTETTER, F. R. Kurbrandenburg. Unionsbestrebungen 1647–48. Ein Beitrag z. Gesch. des westfäl. Friedens. L.: Brandstetter, '98; viii, 66 pp. M. 1.20.

CHÉROT, H. François Ier et Henry VIII. à Boulogne-sur-Mer. *Ét.*, 5 O., '98, 106–13.

CLEMEN, O. Bemerkg. zu dem Schmähgedicht gegen die Bettelmönche. *ZKG.*, XIX., 365–6.

CONRAD, G. Der Hermsdorfer Kirchenvisitationsrezess des pomeranischen Bischofs Venediger vom 26. Juni 1568. *Altpreuss. Monatsschr.*, XXXV., 3/4.

DOSKER, H. E. John of Barneveldt, Martyr or Traitor? III. *PRR.*, O., '98, 561–609.

DUVAL-ARNAULD, L. Étienne Dolet. Une prétendu martyr de l'athéisme au XVIe siècle. La Chapelle-Montligeon: Notre-Dame-de-Montligeon, '98; 30 pp.

FORD, R. C. A Side-Light on Luther. *BS.*, '99, 114–19.

FREYTAG, H. Ein Empfehlungsbrief Philipp Melanthons für Josias Menius aus Stolp. *ZKG.*, XIX., 362–5,

FRIESS, G. E. Aufstand der Bauern in Niederösterreich am Schlusse des 16. Jahrhdt. *Blätter d. Ver. f. Landesk. von Niederösterr.*, XXXI.

HAUSSLEITER, J. Die geschichtl. Grundlage der letzen Unterredg. Luthers u. Melanchthons über den Abendmahlsstreit 1546. *NkZ.*, '98 831–54.

HIRSCHMANN, A. Das Religionsgespräch z. Regensburg im Jahre 1601. *ZkTh.*, '98, 643–88.

HÖFER, H. Zur Lebensgeschichte des Caesarius von Heisterbach. *Ann. d. hist. Ver. f. d. Niederrhein*, 65. Heft.

ISSLEIB, S. Moritz von Sachsen als protestant. Fürst. Hamburg: Verlagsanst. u. Druckerei, '98; 36 pp. M. 0.75.
Sammlung gemeinverständlicher wissenschaftl. Vorträge, hrsg. von RUDOLF VIRCHOW.

KALLMEIER, R. Caspar Borner in seiner Bedeutg. f. die Reformation u. f. die Leipziger Universität. L.: Gräfe, '98; 78 pp. M. 1.50.

KNOTT, R. Michel Stüeler. Ein Lebens- u. Sittenbild aus d. Zeit des 30-jähr. Krieges. *Progr.* Teplitz: Becker, '98; 37 pp. M. 0.50.

KÖHLER, W. Zu Luther's Wartburgspostille. *ZwTh.*, '98, 588–615.

MALZAC, M. Ignace de Loyola; essai de psychologie religieuse. *ID.* P.: Noblet, '98; 141 pp.

MEYER, C. Ein Kulturbild aus dem Reformationszeitalter. *Preuss. Jahrb.*, N., '98, 206–42.

MEYER, D. Margaretha Blarer. Eine Lichtgestalt aus d. Zeitalter d. Reformation. Zürich: Schulthess, '98; 30 pp. M. 0.60.

SEITZ, O. Die theol. Entwickelung des Urbanus Rhegius, speziell s. Verhältniss zu Luther u. zu Zwingli, in den Jahren 1521–1523. Gotha, '98; 74 pp.

TSCHACKERT, P. Ein neuer Beitrag zur Lebensgesch. des Reformators M. Antonius Corvinus. *ZKG.*, XIX., 329–39.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

BERLIÈRE, U. Quelques correspondants de Dom Calmet: Dom Olivier Légipont. *RBd.*, Ag., '98.

BESSE, J. M. Dom Fonteneau, bénédictin de la congrégation de Saint-Maur, 1705–78. *RBd.*, Ag., '98.

CABRAL, L. Vieira. Sa vie — son éloquence. *Et.*, 20 O., '98, 165–94.

DIX, M. A History of the Parish of Trinity Church in the City of New York. Pt. I.: to 1783. N. Y.: Putnam's, '98; xvi, 506 pp. $5

DUFOUR, E. Jacob Vernes, 1728–1791. Essai sur sa vie et sa controverse apologétique avec J. J. Rousseau. *ID.* Genève, '98; 119 pp.

DUHR, B. Ungedruckte Briefe z. Gesch. d. sogenannten Jesuitenkrieges in Paraguay. *ZkTh.*, '98, 689–708.

HASENCLEVER. Jacqueline Pascal. *DEBl.*, '98, 575–95.

HUBERT, E. La torture aux Pays-Bas-autrichiens pendant le 18e siècle. Son application, ses partisans, ses adversaires et son abolition. Étude historique. 176 pp.
Tome LV., 6, of: "Mémoires couronnés et mémoires des savants étrangers publiés par l'Académie de Belgique." Louvain, '98.

HUSSON, M. Vie de Nicolas Philbert, curé de Sedan, évêque constitutionel du département des Ardennes, 1724–1797. Sedan: Laroche, '98; 61 pp.

PIGGE, H. Die religiöse Toleranz Friedrichs des Grossen nach ihrer theoretischen u. prakt. Seite. Auf Grundlage der Quellen dargestellt. Mainz: Kirchheim, '98; vii, 419 pp. M. 4.

RENAUDIN, P. Un Bénédictin du XVIIe siècle: Dom de Laveyne, fondateur de la congrégation des sœurs de la charité de Nevers. *UC.*, O., '98, 161–80.

ROBINET. Le mouvement religieux à Paris pendant la Révolution (1789–1801). Tome 1: Préliminaires de la déchristianisation; septembre 1791–sept. 1793. P.: Quantin, '98. f. 7.50.
Collection de documents relatifs à l'histoire de Paris pendant la Révolution.

SACHSE, J. F. Genesis of the German Lutheran Church in Pennsylvania. V. *LChR.*, O., '98, 723–7.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BELLESHEIM, A. Prof. Pusey's Biographie. *Kath.*, S., '98.

BREMOND, H. Wiseman et les conversions d'Oxford. *Et.*, '98, 20 S., 721–44.

FARQUHAR, J. T. F. Bishop Seabury. Conclusion. *IThR.*, O., '98, 769–77.

HOFFMANN, C. Die Besitzergreifg. u. Verwerthg. d. Johanniterplatzes in Jerusalem, 1869–98. *M&NDP-V.*, '98, 73–80.

D. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

AUDEMARS, J. La souveraineté de Dieu dans l'*institution chrétienne* de Calvin. *ID.* Genève, '98; 112 pp.

GRANDERATH, TH. Zum tridentinischen u. vatikanischen Dekrete über d. Auslegg. d. hl. Schrift. *Kath.*, O. & N., '98.

[illegible] 2

Grundriss d. theol. Wissenschaften, bearb. v. ACHELIS, BAUMGARTEN, BENZINGER, etc.

KENNINCK, F. Le Jansenisme et le Calvinisme sur la réprobation. *IThR.*, O., '98, 804–12.

KÖNIG, K. Zwischen Gut u. Böse [Geschichte des Adiaphorons]. *PrM.*, '98, no. 9, 337–53.

LASSON, A. R. Seeberg's Dogmengeschichte. II. Thl. *Kath.*, N., '98.

LOISY, A. L'espérance messianique d'après Ernest Renan. *RHLR.*, '98, 385–406.

MULLER, P. J. De goodsleer der middeleeuwsche joden. Bijdrage tot de gesch. der leer aangaande God. Groningen: [illegible]

OTTO, R. Die Anschauung vom hl. Geiste bei Luther. Eine historisch-dogmatische Untersuchg. G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '98; v, 106 pp. M. 2.80.

PARAYRE, R, Les diverses phases de la méthode théologique. *UC.*, N., '98, 341–64.
Théologie patristique.

SEEBACH, E. Die Lehre von der bedingten Unsterblichkeit in ihrer Entstehung und geschichtl. Entwickelung. *ID.* Krefeld, '98; 88 pp.

SEITZ, O. Die Stellung d. Urbanus Rhegius im Abendmahlstreite. *ZKG.*, '98, 293–328.

SJÖHOLM, J. Hippolytus och modalismen. En dogm.-historisk undersökning. Akad. Afhandl. Lund: Gleerup, '98; 121 pp. Kr. 1.50,

STEINBECK, J. Das Verhältnis v. Theologie u. Erkenntnis-Theorie erörtert an den theolog. Erkenntnis-Theorieen v. A. Ritschl u. A. Sabatier. L.: Dörffling & Franke, '98; vii, 254 pp. M. 4.

TURMEL, J. Histoire de l'angélologie des temps apostoliques à la fin du V^e^ siècle. 2^e^ art. *RHLR.*, '98, 407–34.

WERNER, J. Dogmengeschichtl. Tabellen. Go.: Perthes, '98; 49 pp. M. 1.80.

ZEHNPFUND, R. Zur altprotestantischen Lehre *de usu legis*. *NkZ.*, '98, 688–706.

APOLOGETICS.

Apologetische Studien. Hrsg. von der Leo-Gesellschaft. 1. Bd. 2. Heft. W.: Mayer & Co., '98. M. 2.20.

2. COMMER, E. Die immerwährende Philosophie. Eine Skizze. vii, 128 pp.

BALTUS, U. Une apologie protestante de S. Thomas d'Aquin. *RBd.*, O., '98, 459–66.

BRADFORD, A. H. Does the World Need Christianity? *Ind.*, 15 Dec., '98.

HERZOG, J. Abwehr v. Sören Kierkegaards "Angriff auf die Christenheit." Schluss. *ZThK.*, '98, 341–81.

SCHANZ. Apologetik und Dogmatik. *ThQ.*, '99, 32–62.

ZÖCKLER, O. Dogmatik und Apologetik in Wechselwirkg. *BG.*, D., '98, 482–5.

POLEMICS.

BLAKE, S. L. The Place of a Miracle. *BS.*, '99, 12–25.

BOIS, H. Le surnaturel d'après M. Chapuis. *RThQR.*, '98, 613–74.

BOWEN, W. E. The Inspiration of the Church. *ET.*, O., '98, 29–33.

CARUS, P. God. With a discussion. *Mo.*, '98, 106–30.

DAUBANTON, F. E. Het voortbestaan van het menschelijk geslacht. Praeexistentianisme, Creatianisme, Traducianisme (Generatianisme). IV. *ThSt.*, '98, 267–90.

HULBERT, C. B. The Nature of the Divine Indwelling. *BS.*, Ja., '99, 78–99.

KÖLLING. Der Fundamentalartikel von den hochw. Sakramenten. *EKZ.*, '98, nos. 45 fol.

KOOY, J. R. VAN. De Dogmatiek van Dr. Bavinck. *ThT.*, '98, 559–604.

LAFON, L. Le miracle et "l'orthodoxie moderne." *RThQR.*, '98, 675–82.

LEPSIUS. Neuluther. Gegenreformation. *Reich Christi*, '98, no. 11.

On ALTHAUS: *Die Heilsbedeutung d. Taufe.*

——— Prof. Cremer über die Taufe. *Ibid.*

LINDSAY, J. Christianity and Idealism. *BS.*, Ja., '99, 61–77.

MATTER, A. Die christl. Lehre. Deutsch von G. Holtey-Weber. I. Bd. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; vii, 284 pp. M. 4.

MICHAUD, E. Caractéristique de l'église Romaine actuelle, à propos de ses doctrines eucharistiques. *IThR.*, O., '98, 778–93.

NOBLE, F. A. Warp and Woof. *BS.*, Ja., '99, 26–43.

SCHIAN. Der Begriff "Erfahrg. in der Dogmatik." *PrM.*, '98, no. 10.

THIEME, K. Eine kathol. Beleuchtg. d. Augsburgischen Konfession. Polem. Studie. L.: Dürr, '98; 44 pp. M. 0.80.

WOLF. Wort Gottes u. Erfahrg. in ihrem Verhältniss z. Heilsgewissheit. *EKZ.*, '98, nos. 47 fol.

SYMBOLICS.

O., '98, 659–94.

681–712.

WIESINGER. "Ich glaube an d. heiligen Geist." *NkZ.*, '98, 763–83.

ZAHN, TH. The Articles of the Apostles' Creed. *Exp.*, O., '98, 276–86.

xii. "The Forgiveness of Sins."

DOGMATICS.

BOWNE, B. P. The Christian Revelation. Cin.: Curts & Jennings, '98; 107 pp. $0.50.

BRADFORD, A. H. God — Interpreted by Fatherhood. *BW.*, O., '98, 230–43.

ECKLIN, W. Die Religion der verborgenen Gottinnigkeit. Basel: Kober, '98; 16 pp. M. 0.25.

FAYE, E. DE. L'espérance chrétienne. *RChr.*, O., '98, 279–83.

FOLLAND. Christ Come and Coming. Lo.: Stock, '98. 1s. 6d.

FOSTER, GEO. B. Kaftan's Dogmatik. *AJTh.*, II., '98, 802–27.

HALL, F. The Kenotic Theory Considered with Particular Reference to its Anglican Forms and Arguments. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; xviii, 244 pp. $1.50.

HERRMANN. Der wichtigste Gegensatz in der evgl. Theologie. *ChrW.*, '98, no. 38.

HOLTZHEUER, O. Zu d. luther. Dogmatik von A. v. Oettingen. *EKZ.*, '98, 42 fol.

HUTTON, R. E. The Soul Here and Hereafter. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; xviii, 258 pp. $1.50.

JALAGUIER, P. F. Fragments de théodicée. De la preuve cosmologique. II. *RChr.*, N., '98, 342–60.

JAMES, W. Human Immortality: two supposed objections to the doctrine. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '98; iii, 70 pp. $1.

JOHANNES, P. Die Rettg. der Menschen durch Christum, in neuer Weise aus der Schrift entwickelt. I. Thl.: Die objektive Seite. Meissen: Schlimpert, '98; iv, 402 pp. M. 3.60.

JOWETT, J. H. From Strength to Strength. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., '98; iii, 131 pp. $0.50.
Little Books on Religion: chapters on the strengthening of the will, the conscience, the heart, and the mind.

JUNGMANN, B. Institutiones theologiæ dogmaticæ specialis. Tractatus de novissimis. Ed. IV. Regensburg: Pustet, '98; 344 pp. M. 3.30.

KAFTAN, THDR. Der christl. Glaube im geistigen Leben der Gegenwart. 2. Aufl. Schleswig: Bergas; vii, 114 pp. M. 1.20.

"LAICUS, UTIS." Ueber das heilige Abendmahl. *KM.*, O. & N., '98.

LANGHORNE, W. H. Aids to Belief: studies on the divine origin of Christianity. Lo.: Stock, '98; 208 pp. 5s.

MACGREGOR, G. H. C. The Things of the Spirit; the teaching of the word of God about the spirit of God. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '98; 76 pp. $0.35.

MCKAY, G. P. Immortality on God's Terms: endless life in Christ the Lord. Lo.: Allenson, '98; 96 pp. 1s.

NÉGRE, A. Cursus theologiæ dogmaticæ. P.: Oudin, '98; 531 pp.

PIKE, G. R. The Divine Drama. The manifestation of God in the universe. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xvi, 378 pp.

PORRET, J. A. La vision du ciel ou la révélation de l'audelà. P.: Grassart, '98. f. 2.

PROCTOR, G. The Millennium. *Clergyman's Mag.*, N. & D., '98.
1. The Jewish Conception of the Day of the Lord, pp. 284 ff.; 2. Later Jewish and Early Christian Ideas of the Millennium, pp. 351 ff.

RAWSKI, P. De natura dogmatum catholicorum. Krakau: Gebethner, '98; iv, 202, & ii pp. M. 4.

REISCHLE, M. J. Kaftan's Dogmatik. *ThR.*, I., 533–46.

ROTTA, P. Il Sacramento della penitenza. Milano, '98; 68 pp. L. 1.25.

SCHMAUCK, TH. E. The Incarnation without the Atonement. *LChR.*, O., '98, 665–9.

——— The Unchangeableness of the Word. *Ibid.*, 710–15.

SCHMIDT, W. Dogmatische Fragen. *Theol. Litbl.*, '98, nos. 38 & 42.
On M. Kähler's *Dogmatische Zeitfragen.*

SCHOUPPE, FR. H. Die Lehre vom Fegfeuer, beleuchtet durch Thatsachen u. Privatoffenbarungen. Aus d. Franz. Brixen: Weger, '98; xii, 320 pp. M. 4.

SORG, J. D. heilige Eucharistie als Sakrament u. ihr Einfluss auf das sittliche Leben. *Kath.*, S., O., N., '98.

WATTERICH. The Passover of the New Covenant. A theological treatise. Transl. by White. Baden-Baden: Sommermeyer, '98; vii, 149 pp. M. 5.

WINTERBOTHAM, R. The Kingdom of Heaven Here and Hereafter. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; 266 pp. $1.

ETHICS.

ACHELIS, TH. Ethik. L.: Göschen, '98; 159 pp. M. 0.80.
Sammlung Göschen, no. 90.

BUSSY, I. J. DE. Inleiding tot de Zedekunde. Amsterdam: The Author, '98; iii, 176 pp.

CAPITAINE, G. De Origenis ethica. Münster: Aschendorff, '98; vii, 216 pp. M. 4.50.

EISLER. Zur ethischen Bewegung. Der Weg zum Frieden. L.: Wigand, '98; 107 pp. M. 1.50.

GÖPFERT, F. A. Moraltheologie. 3. Bd. Paderborn: Schöningh, '98; ix, 532 pp. M. 4; bd. M. 5.20.
Wissenschaftl. Handbibliothek. 1. Reihe. Theologische Lehr- u. Handbücher. XIV.

HERING. Sittlichkeit u. Religion. *DEBl.*, '98, no. 10.

KUYPER, H. H. De christelijke vrijheid. Kampen: Bos, '98; viii, 118 pp. f. 0.75.

LUTHHARDT, C. E. Kompendium der theol. Ethik. 2. Aufl. L.: Dörffling & Franke, '98; viii, 382 pp. M. 7.

ABBREVIATIONS.

Place of Publication: B. = Berlin; Bo. = Boston; Br. = Breslau; Chi. = Chicago; Cin. = Cincinnati; Ed. = Edinburgh; F. = Freiburg i. Br.; Fr. = Frankfurt a. M.; G. = Göttingen; Gi. = Giessen; Go. = Gotha; Gü. = Gütersloh; Hl. = Halle; Kö. = Königsberg; L. = Leipzig; Lo. = London; M. = Müncheu; N. Y. = New York; P. = Paris; Ph. = Philadelphia; St. = Stuttgart; Tü. = Tübingen; W. = Wien.

Prices: $ = dollar; M. = Mark; f. = franc; L. = lira; s. = shilling; d. = pence; fl. = florin. Prices quoted are usually for volumes bound in cloth in case of American and English books, in paper in the case of all others. Bd. = bound.

Months: Ja., F., Mr., Ap., My., Je., Jl., Ag., S., O., N., D.

PERIODICALS.

A. = Arena.
AC. = L'association catholique.
ACQ. = American Catholic Quarterly Review.
AER. = American Ecclesiastical Review.
AGPh. = Archiv f. d. Geschichte der Philosophie.
AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
AJTh. = American Journal of Theology.
AkKR. = Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht.
AMZ. = Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift.
ARW. = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
BAZ. = Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, München.
BBK. = Beiträge zur bayr. Kirchen-Gesch.
BG. = Beweis des Glaubens.
BS. = Bibliotheca Sacra.
BU. = Bibliotheque universelle.
BW. = Biblical World.
BZ. = Byzantinische Zeitschrift.
CR. = Contemporary Review.
ChOR. = Charity Organization Review.
ChQR. = Church Quart. Review.
ChR. = Charities Review.
ChrK. = Christliches Kunstblatt.
ChrL. = Christian Literature.
ChrQ. = Christian Quarterly.
ChrW. = Christliche Welt.
D-A ZTkK. = Deutsch-amerik. Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.
DEBl. = Deutsch-evangelische Blätter.
DR. = Deutsche Revue.
DZKR. = Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht.
EHR. = English Historical Review.
EKZ. = Evangelische Kirchenzeitung.
EMM. = Evangelisches Missions-Magazin.
ER. = Edinburgh Review.
Et. = Etudes.
ET. = Expository Times.
Exp. = Expositor.
F. = Forum.
FR. = Fortnightly Review.
GPr. = Gymnasialprogramm.
Hk. = Halte was du hast.
HN. = L'humanité nouvelle.
HR. = Homiletic Review.
HSR. = Hartford Sem. Record.
HZ. = Historische Zeitschrift.
IAQR. = Imperial Asiatic Quarterly Review.
ID. = Inaugural-Dissertation.
IER. = Indian Evang. Review.
IJE. = International Journal of Ethics.
Ind. = Independent.
ITkR. = Internat. Theol. Review.
JA. = Journal asiatique.
JBL. = Journal of Biblical Literature.
JM. = Monatsschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums.
JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.
JRAS. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
JTVI. = Journal of Trans. of Victoria Institute.
= Der Katholik, Zeitschr. f. kathol. Wissenschaft u. kirchl. Leben.
= Kirchl. Monatsschrift.
= Kyrklig Tidskrift.
= Katechetische Zeitschrift.
= Lutheran Church Review.
= Lutheran Quarterly.
= London Quarterly Review.
= Museon.
MA. = Mittheilungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, *z.g., Berlin, München.*
MCG. = Monatshefte der Comenius-Gesellschaft.
MGkK. = Monatsschrift f. Gottesdienst u. kirchl. Kunst.
Mi. = Mind.
MIM. = Monatsschrift für innere Mission.
M&N DP-V. = Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Mo. = Monist.
NA. = Nuova Anthologia.
Nath. = Nathanael.
NC. = Nineteenth Century.
NCR. = New Century Review.
NkZ. = Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift.
NW. = New World.
OLZ. = Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung.
Ou. = Outlook.
PEFQS. = Palestine Exploration Fund; Quarterly Statement.
PhM. = Philosophische Monatshefte.
PhR. = Philosophical Review.
PQ. = Presbyterian Quarterly.
Pr. = Protestant.
PrM. = Protestantische Monatshefte.
PRR. = Presbyterian and Reformed Review.
PSBA. = Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archæology.
QR. = Quarterly Review.
RAAO. = Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale.
RB. = Revue biblique.
RBd. = Revue bénédictine.
RChR. = Reformed Church Review.
RChr. = Revue chrétienne.
RChrS. = Revue de christianisme sociale.
RdM. = Revue des deux Mondes.
REJ. = Revue des études juives.
RHLR. = Revue d'histoire et de litérature religieuses.
RHR. = Revue de l'histoire des religions.
RQ. = Römische Quartalschrift f. christl. Alterthumskunde u. f. Kirchengeschichte.
RS. = Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'histoire ancienne.
RTh. = Revue théologique.
RThPh. = Revue de théologie et de philosophie.
RThQR. = Revue de théol. et des quest. relig.
SA. = Sitzungsberichte der Akad. d. Wiss. *e.g., Berlin, München,* etc.
StKr. = Theol. Studien und Kritiken.
StWV. = Stemmen voor Waarheid en Vrede.
ThQ. = Theologische Quartalschrift.
ThR. = Theologische Rundschau.
ThSt. = Theologische Studiën.
ThT. = Theologisch Tijdschrift.
UC. = L'Université catholique.
UPr. = Universitätsprogramm.
VwPh. = Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie.
WZKM. = Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes.
ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAeg. = Z. für aegyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde.
ZATW. = Z. für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG. = Z. d. Deutsch-Morgenl. Gesellsch.
ZDPV. = Z. d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
ZeRU. = Z. für den evangelischen Religions-Unterricht.
ZKG. = Z. f. Kirchengeschichte.
ZkTh. = Z. f. kathol. Theologie.
ZMR. = Z. f. Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft.
ZPhKr. = Z. f. Philosophie und philos. Kritik.
ZprTh. = Z. f. prakt. Theologie.
ZSchw. = Z. f. Theol. aus d. Schweiz.
ZTkK. = Z. f. Theologie u. Kirche.
ZwTh. = Z. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie.

THEOLOGICAL AND SEMITIC LITERATURE

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

TO THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, AND THE BIBLICAL WORLD

BY W. MUSS-ARNOLT

I. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

[REMARKS AND LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS, SEE P. XXXII.]

GENERAL.

ADAMS, W. M. The International Congress of the Papyri and Its Relation to Historic Research. *IAQR.*, VII., 127–33.

Bibliographie. *ZATW.*, XIX., 192–208.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Nouvelle inscription hébraïque et grecque relative à la limite de Gezer. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 686–94.

CONYBEARE, F. C., J. R. HARRIS, AND AGNES LEWIS. The Arabian Nights: Story of Ahikar, from the Syriac, Arabic, Armenian, and other versions. Cambr.: Univ. Press; N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 88, 162 pp. $6 *net.*
Cambridge Univ. Press series.

De Morgan's Discoveries in Persia. *Ind.*, 19 Ja., '99.

HEUZEY. Exposé sommaire du rapport de M. J. de Morgan sur les fouilles de Perse. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 670–82.

KOHUT, GEO. A. تَيمم; Prayers for Rain; a Turkish tale in the Midrash. *AJSL.*, XV., 105–13.

LIDZBARSKI, M. Handbuch der nordsemit. Epigraphik, nebst einer Auswahl nordsemit. Inschriften. 2 Tle. [I.: Text, xiv, 508 pp.; II.: 46 Tafeln u. 4 pp. Text.] Weimar & B.: Felber, '98. M. 30.

MACDONALD, D. B. The Interchange of Sibilants and Dentals in Semitic. *AJSL.*, XV., 100–104.

Mitteilungen d. vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft. 3. Jahrgg., 1898. B.: Peiser, '98.
H. 6. PEISER, F. E. Studien zur orientalischen Altertumskunde. II. 52 pp. M. 3.

MONTET, E. Quarterly Report on Semitic Studies and Orientalism. *IAQR.*, VII., 134–7.

NESTLE, E. The Story of Ahikar. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 276–7.

NIEBUHR, C. Zum histor. Ergebnis der Sendschirli-Texte. *OLZ.*, I., nos. 11 & 12.

ROUVIER, J. L'ère de Marathos de Phénice. *JA.*, N.–D., '98, 361–406.

WEBER, M. Article: Agrargeschichte. I. Agrarverhältnisse im Altertum. 2. *b*) Asiatischer Orient, im *Handw. d. Staatswiss.*, hrsg. von Conrad, Elster, Lexis, Loening. 2. Aufl. Bd. I. Jena, '98; pp. 61–6.

WINCKLER, H. Altoriental. Forschgn. 2. Reihe. I. Bd., H. 4; II. Bd., H. 1. L.: Pfeiffer, '98. M. 3 & M. 2.60.
4. Zeit u. Verfasser v. Kohelet.—Gog.—Psalm 22.—Zur Hamustu.—Aus d. Archiven v. Ninive. (Pp. iii, 143–92.)
1. Zur innern Politik im neubabylonischen Reiche.—Die Zeit der Herstellg. Judas.—Nehemias Reform.—Daniel und seine Freunde.—*Kebîr* im A. T. (Pp. 193–240.)

WÜNSCHE, A. Die morgenländ. Chidher-Elias-Legende. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 292.

ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN.

ARNOLT, W. MUSS-. A Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language. Part 8: Kašadu–Madā (pp. 449–512). B.: Reuther & Reichard; N. Y.: Lemcke & Büchner, '99. M. 5.

BALL, C. J. Babylonian Hieroglyphs. *PSBA.*, '98, XX., 296–8.

BUCHWALD, R. Nabuchodonosor II. von Babylon. Mit bes. Berücksichtigg. der Keilschriftforschung. *GPr.* Strelitz, '98; 20 pp.

Chabiri, The, in the Tell-El-Armarna Letters, according to Professor Haupt. *Ind.*, 12 Ja., '99.

DEDEKIND, A. Eine assyrische Keilinschrift im k. k. kunsthistorischen Hofmuseum. *WZKM.*, XII., 271–2.

HAMMURABI. The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi, King of Babylon, about B. C. 2200, to which are added a series of letters of other kings of the

first dynasty of Babylon. The original Babylonian texts, edited from the tablets in the British Museum, with English translations, summaries of contents, etc., by L. W. KING. Vol. I.: Introduction and Babylonian Texts. Lo.: Luzac, '98; lxviii, 134 plates of text & index. 21s.

HEUZEY, L. La construction du roi Our-Nina, notes complémentaires, d'après les découvertes de M. de Sarzec. *RAAO.*, V., 26–32.

HOMMEL, FR. The Babylonian Ideogram for "Image" and the Slate Palette from Hieraconopolis. *PSBA.*, XX., 291–5.

——— Yahveh in Early Babylonia. *ET.*, O., '98, 42.

Yahve, Ea, and Sin. *Ibid.*, D., '98, 144.

HÜSING, G. Iteration im Elamitischen. II. *OLZ.*, I., no 12.

JASTROW, MORRIS. Nebopolassar and the Temple to the Sun-God at Sippar. *AJSL.*, XV., 65–86.

LAGRANGE, M.-J. Les *Khabiri. RB.*, '99, 127–32.

MARX, V. Die Stellung der Frauen in Babylonien gemäss den neubabylonischen Kontracten aus der Zeit von Nebukadnezar bis Darius. *ID.* Breslau, '98; 32 pp.

MEISNER, B. Eine assyrische Abbildg. der hängenden Gärten der Semiramis. *WZKM.*, XII., 272–3.
Also see WINKLER, *OLZ.*, II., no. 2

MÜLLER, W. M. Das Sumur Rib-Addi's in einem ägypt. Text. *OLZ.*, I., no. 12.

RYLANDS, W. H. Hittite Inscriptions. *PSBA.*, XX., 263–6.

SAYCE, A. H. Assyriological Notes. *PSBA.*, XX., 250–62.

——— New Cuneiform Inscriptions. *ET.*, D., '98, 115–16.

STOSCH. Zur Tell-El-Amarna-Frage. *EKZ.*, '99, no. 1.

Sumerian Question, The. *ET.*, N., '98, 71–2.

SYRIAC.

BROCKELMANN, C. Zur syrischen Betonungs- u. Verslehre. *ZDMG.*, LII., 401–8.

BROOKS, E. W. Notes on the Syriac Chronicle of 846. *ZDMG.*, LII., 416–18.

GREGORII BAR-HEBRAEI, Abulfaragii, Mafriani Orientis, *Kithâbhâ Dhiyaunâ* seu liber columbae. Ed. G. CARDAHI. Roma: Loescher, '99; vii, 107 + iv pp. M. 6.40.

——— Nomocanon, ed. (syriace) P. BEDJAN. L.: Harrassowitz, '99; xiii, 551 pp. M. 22.50.

LABAREE, B. Maclean's Grammar of the Dialects of Vernacular Syriac. *AJSL.*, XV., 87–99.

MARGOLIOUTH, G. "The Palestinian Syriac Version." *ET.*, N., '98, 91.

NESTLE, E. "The Palestinian Syriac Version." *ET.*, O., '98, 47.

SMITH, J. P. A Compendious Syriac Dictionary. Founded upon the Thesaurus Syriacus of R. P. Smith. Part 2. Lo. & N. Y.: Frowde, '98. 8s. 6d. *net.*

WEIR, T.-H. L'Hexaméron de Jacques d'Édesse. *JA.*, N.-D., '98, 550–51.

ARAMAIC.

ABRAHAMS, I. An Aramaic Text of the Scroll of Antiochus. *JQR.*, XI., 291–9.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Inscription araméenne de Cappadoce. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 630–53.

NABATEAN.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. L'inscription nabatéenne de Kanatha. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '98, 597–605.

VINCENT, H. Les Nabatéens. *RB.*, '98, 567–88.

PALMYRENIAN.

CHABOT, J. B. Notes d'épigraphie et d'archéologie orientale. *JA.*, XII., Jl.–Ag., '98, 68–123.
III. Nouvelles inscriptions inédites de Palmyre.— IV. Observations sur quelques inscriptions palmyréniennes déjà publiées.

PHŒNICIAN.

BERGER, PH. L'inscription phénicienne d'Avignon. *RAAO.*, V., 1–10.

——— Inscription dédicatoire des sanctuaires d'Astarté et Tanit à Carthage. *Ibid.*, V., 11–25.

HIMYARITE.

MORDTMANN, J. H. Die himjarischen Inschriften von Kharibet-Se'oûd (Hal. 628–638). *ZDMG.*, LII., 393–400.

ARABIC.

BASSET, R. Histoire de la conquête d'Abbyssinie (16e siècle) par Chihab Ed-din Ahmed Ben Abd El Qader. Texte arabe. Fasc. II. P.: Leroux, '98. f. 4.
Publ. de l'École des lettres d'Alger., XIX., fasc. 2.

BROCKELMANN, C. Geschichte d. arab. Litteratur. Bd. 1. Weimar: Felber, '99; xii, 528 pp. M. 20.

CHARAF IL DÎN YAHYA IBN IL MAKARR IBN IL GI'ÂN. Kitâb il Tuhfa il Sanîya bi Asmâ il Bilâd il Masrîya. Av. préface de B. MORITZ. Caire, '98; L.: Harrassowitz; 271 pp.

Publications de la Biblioth. Khédiviale au Caire. Vol. 10.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Deux nouveaux lychnaria grec et arabe. *RB.*, '98,

DECOURDEMANCHE, J. A. Études sur les racines arabes, sanscrites et turques. P., '98; L.: Harrassowitz. M. 5.

HARTMANN, M. Die Arabistik—Reformvorschläge. *OLZ.*, I., no. 11.

——— Islamologie *Ibid.*, II., no. 1.

HEER, F. J. Die historischen u. geographischen Quellen in Jâqût's geographischem Wörterbuch. Strassb.: Trübner, '98; iv, 112 pp. M. 3.

HELLER, B. La version arabe et le commentaire des Proverbes par le Gaon Saadia. *REJ.*, XXXVII., 226–51.

HOMMEL, F. Eine wissenschaftl. Expedition nach Südarabien. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 240.

Also see GLASER'S Abwehr u. HOMMEL'S Antwort, *ibid.*, no. 251; and again GLASER, *ibid.*, no. 283.

Letters of Abu' L'Ala. Edited from the Leyden manuscript with the life of the author, by AL-DHAHABI, and with translation, notes, indices and biography, by D. S. MARGOLIOUTH, A.M. (= Anecdota Oxoniensia.) N. Y.: Frowde, '99. $3.75.

MITTWOCH, E. Proelia Arabum paganorum quomodo litteris tradita sint. B.: Mayer & Müller, '99. M. 1.50.

PAGÉS Y BELLOC, FR. Los tiempos del verbo árabe. Madrid, '97; L.: Harrassowitz; 76 pp. M. 2.50.

RECKENDORF, H. Die syntaktischen Verhältnisse des Arabischen. II. (letzter) Tl. Leiden: Buchh. u. Buchdr., vorm. E. J. Brill, '98; viii, 265–831 pp. M. 16 *net*.

SCHREINER, M. Beiträge zur Geschichte der theol. Bewegungen im Islâm. *ZDMG.*, LII., 463–510.

SEYBOLD, C. F. Glossarium latino-arabicum. 1. Hälfte. Weimar: Felber, '98; 128 pp.

15. Ergänzungsheft zu *ZA.*

Freitag's أدر "maiestas" und "bursa, saccus" aus d. arab. Wörterbuch zu streichen. *WZKM.*, XII., 274–6.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Heilmittelnamen der Araber. *WZKM.*, XII., 201–9.

——— An Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews. (Cont.) *JQR.*, XI., 305–43.

WEISSENBACH, J. F. Die arab. Nominalform *fi'âl*. M.: Lukaschik, '99; 110 pp. M. 5.

ETHIOPIC AND COPTIC.

Contendings of the Apostles, being the histories of the lives and martyrdoms and deaths of the twelve apostles and evangelists. Ethiopic text, now first edited from MSS. in the British Museum, with an English translation by E. A. WALLIS BUDGE. Vol. I.: Ethiopic Text. 1899. Cloth, 21s.

CRUM, W. E. A Coptic "Letter of Orders." *PSBA.*, XX., 270–76.

PLEYTE, W., & A. A. BOESER. Manuscrits coptes du musée d'antiquités des Pays-Bas à Leide. Leiden: Buchh. u. Druck., vorm. Brill, '98; vi, 490 pp. m. 2 Lichtdruck-Taf. M. 42.50.

PERSIAN AND TURKISH.

DOCTOR, S. B. The Student's Persian and English Dictionary, pronouncing, etymological and explanatory. 2d ed. Bombay, '98; L.: Harrassowitz; 560 pp. M. 9.

HOUTSMA, TH. Eine unbekannte Bearbeitg. des Marzbân-nâmeh. *ZDMG.*, LII., 359–92.

MANN, O. Quellenstudien zur Geschichte des Ahmed Sâh Durrânî, 1747–1773. (Cont.) *ZDMG.*, LII., 323–58.

MARQUART, J. Die Chronologie d. alttürkischen Inschriften. Mit e. Vorwort u. Anhang v. W. BANG. L.: Dieterich, '98; vii, 112 pp. M. 4.

RABBINICAL AND JUDAICA.

ABRAHAMS, I. "The Jewish Year." *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 64–91.

BACHER, W. Un livre d'histoire inconnu: דברי הימים בית שני. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 143–5.

BARNSTEIN, H. A Noteworthy Targum MS. in the British Museum. *JQR.*, XI., O., '98, 167–71.

BENTWICH, H. The Progress of Zionism. *FR.*, D., '98.

BRESLAUR, E. Sind originale Synagogen- u. Volks-Melodien bei den Juden geschichtlich nachweisbar? L.: Breitkopf & Härtel, '98; 76 pp. M. 1.

DANON, A. Documents et traditions sur Sabbataï Cevi et sa secte. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 103–10.

ELIESER, BEN. Die Judenfrage u. der socialistische Judenstaat. Bern: Steiger, '98; 68 pp. M. 1.

EPPENSTEIN, S. Un fragment du commentaire de Joseph Kimhi sur Job (ch. I et XXXIV, 17–XLII). *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 86–102.

FREUDENTHAL, M. Zum Jubiläum des ersten Talmuddruckes in Deutschland. B. & Fr.: Kauffmann, '98; 39 pp. Aus: *JM.* M. 1.25.

FURST, J. Notes lexicographiques. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 65–71.

GOTTHEIL, R. J. H. The Aims of Zionism. N. Y., '99; 21 pp. $0.10.
No. 1 of: Publications of the American Federation of Zionists.

GRÜNHUT, L. Sefer Ha-Likkutim. Sammlung älterer Midraschim u. wissenschaftlicher Abhandlungen. (In Hebrew.) 1. Thl. Fr.: Kauffmann, '98; 51 & 72 pp. M. 1.60.
a) Collectaneen aus Midrasch Haschkem mit Anmerkungen v. S. BUBER u. I. Löw; *b*) Midrasch al Ithallel nach e. Hs. edirt; *c*) Kritische Untersuchg. über Midrasch Tanchumah und Selamdenu.

KAUFMANN, D. I. L'élégie de Mosé Zacout sur Saül Morteira. II. Un élégie de David b. Aron ibn Houssein sur les souffrances des Juifs au Maroc en 1790. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 111–26.

KAYSERLING, M. Notes sur les Juifs d'Espagne. Les Juifs dans le royaume de Léon. *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 137–41.

KOHUT, A. Geschichte der deutschen Juden. Ein Hausbuch f. die jüdische Familie. Illustr. v. Th. Kutschmann. (In 10 Lfgn.) 1. Lfg. (pp. 1–84 & 6 plates). B.: Deutscher Verlag, '98. M. 2.

KRAUSS, S. Le traité talmudique "Dérech Ereç." (Fin.) *REJ.*, XXXVII., Jl.–S., '98, 45–64.

KRENGEL, J. Das Hausgerät in d. Mišnah. Tl. 1. Fr.: Kauffmann, '99; ii, 68 pp. M. 2.50.

KRONER, THDR. Geschichte der Juden von Esra bis z. Jetztzeit f. Volksschulen u. höhere Lehranstalten bearb. Fr.: Kauffmann, '98; viii, 151 pp. Bd. M. 1.

LAZARUS, N. R. Das jüdische Haus. 1. Bd. (2. [Titel-] Auflage d. Culturstudien über d. Judenthum.) B.: Duncker, '98 ('93); v, 322 pp. M. 4.

LUCAS, A. The Jewish Year. A collection of devotional poems for sabbaths and holidays throughout the year. Translated and composed. Lo. & N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xix, 187 pp. $1.

MÜLLER, D. H., u. J. SCHLOSSER. Die Haggadah v. Sarajevo. Eine spanisch jüdische Liederhandschrift des Mittelalters. Nebst einem Anh. v. Prof. D. Kaufmann. Mit 1 Frontispiz in Chromotypie, 38 Lichtdr.-Taf., 18 Textabbdgn. u. e. Atlas mit 35 (2 farb.) Taf. W.: Hölder, '98; v, 316 pp. M. 50.

ROSIN, D. Die Religionsphilosophie Abraham Ibn Esra's. *JM.*, S., O., & N., '98.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Die italienische Literatur d. Juden. *JM.*, S., O., N., D., '98; Ja., '99.

WOLFF, M. Bemerkgn. zu der Schrift Aḥwâl al-Kijâme. *ZDMG.*, LII., 418–25.

II. THEOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

ALLEN, A. V. G., AND OTHERS. The Message of Christ to Manhood: being the *William Belden Noble Lectures* for 1898. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '99; ix, 209 pp. $1.25.

Arbeiten, theologische, aus d. rheinischen wissenschaftl. Prediger-Verein. Hrsg. v. KAMPHAUSEN. N. F. Heft 2. F.: Mohr, '98; iii, 99 pp. M. 4.

BEAUMONT, G. DE. Le carnet d'un chrétien. *RChr.*, O. & N., '98, 298–303, 361–70.

BÖHME, E. 350 Jahre Jenaischer Theologie. Eine geschichtl. Skizze. Mit K. v. Hase's Bildnis. Jena: Rassmann, '98; 47 pp. M. 1.50.

BOUQUILLON, TH. Catholicity and Civilization. *Cath. Univ. Bull.*, IV., 467–80.

✓CHEYNE, T. K., AND BLACK, J. S. Encyclopædia biblica: a dictionary of the Bible. In 4 vols. Vol. 1. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98. $4.

DALTON, H. Indische Reisebriefe. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; 386 pp. M. 4.40.

DAVIS, J. D. A Dictionary of the Bible. Ph.: Presb. Board of Publ., '98; vi, 802 pp., ill., maps, plans. $2 *net.*

DORNER, A. Zur Charakteristik der gegenwärtigen Theologie. *PrM.*, '98, N. & D., 407–17, 467–79.

FARRAR, F. W. Great Books. N. Y.: Crowell & Co., '98; iii, 311 pp. $1.25.

FUNCKE, O. Allerlei Typen ungesunden Christentums. *BG.*, '99, 3–15.

GWATKIN, H. M. The Unrest of the Age. *ET.*, D., '98, 104–6.

HARPER, W. R. Shall the Theological Curriculum be Modified, and How? *AJTh.*, III., 45–66.

HASTIE, D. Theology as Science, and its Present Position and Prospects in the Reformed Church. Glasgow: MacLehose, '99; 114 pp. 2s.

HAUG, K. Die Frömmigk. d. Menschengeschlechts im Lichte d. Christentums. Eine religionswissenschaftliche Untersuchg. L.: Deichert, '98; vii, 336 pp. M. 4.50.

HOGAN, J. B. Clerical Studies. Bo.: Marlier, Callanan & Co., '98; xiii, 499 pp. $2.

Katholische Flugschriften zur Wehr u. Lehr'. B.: "Germania," '98. M. 0.10.
132. NOTT, H. Die katholische Heiligenverehrg., 52 pp.— 133. HAMMERSTEIN, L. v. Der mosaische Schöpfungsbericht u. andere Erzählungen des Alten Testamentes, 55 pp.

LAMERS, G. H. 1858–1898. Een terugblik. *ThSt.*, '98, 339–60.

LANGEN, J. Religion, Theologie, Kirchenpolitik. *IThR.*, '99, 19–39.

LÜLMANN, C. Theol. Wissenschaft u. ev. Kirche. *PrM.*, III., ('99), 27–30.

OORT, H. De godsdienstige en de maatschappelijke vraagstukken. *ThT.*, '99, 101–18.

OSBORN, J. L. The Ecclesiastical Outlook. *NCR.*, N., '98, 388–97.

PHILIPP, S. Vier skeptische Thesen. L.: Reisland, '98; 182 pp. M. 3.60.

REISCHLE, M. Kirchl. Lehre u. theologische Wissenschaft. *ThR.*, I., 619–28.

SPALDING, J. F. The World's Unrest and Its Remedy. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; 239 pp. $1.25.

WOODS, P. Guide to True Religion. Balto.: Murphy & Co., '98; iv, 301 pp. $1.

ZAHN, TH. Paganus. *NkZ.*, '99, 18–45.
Origin and history of the word.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ALBERT, B. Ueber individuelle u. soziale Erziehg. nach Schleiermacher. *ID.* Br., '98; 96 pp.

BALMFORTH, R. The Evolution of Christianity. Lo.: Sonnenschein, '98; 176 pp. 2s. 6d.

BORNSTEIN, P. Gottfr. Ploucquet's Erkenntnisstheorie und Metaphysik. *ID.* Potsdam, '98; 78 pp.

BRILLIANTOFF, A. The Influence of the Oriental Theology upon the Occidental. (In Russian.) St. Petersburg; L.: Harrassowitz, '98; 514 pp. M. 11.

DAMM, O. Schopenhauer's Ethik im Verhältnis z. seiner Erkenntnislehre u. Metaphysik. Eine Monographie. Annaberg: Graser, '98; 101 pp. M. 1.50.

DIMITROFF, A. Die psychologischen Grundlagen der Ethik J. G. Fichte's, aus ihrem Gesamtcharakter entwickelt. *ID.* Jena: Strobel; vii, 187 pp. M. 2.

DYROFF, A. Zur Ethik der alten Stoa. *AGPh.*, XI., no. 4; XII., no. 1.

EVERETT, C. C. "Beyond Good and Evil." A study of the philos. of Friedr. Nietzsche. *NW.*, D., '98, 684–703.

FELSCH. Erläuterungen zu Herbarts Ethik mit Berücksichtigg. der gegen sie erhobenen Einwendungen. Langensalza: Beyer, '98; xiv, 146 pp. M. 2.50.

FRENZEL, B. Der Associationsbegriff bei Leibnitz. *ID.* L.: Fock, '98; 109 pp. M. 2.

FREUDENTHAL, J. Die Lebensgesch. Spinoza's in Quellenschriften, Urkunden u. nichtamtlichen Nachrichten. L.: Veit, '98; xvi, 304 pp. M. 10.

GOLDSCHMIDT, L. Kant u. Helmholtz. Populärwiss. Studie. Hamburg: Voss, '98; xvi, 135 pp. M. 5.

GREGORY, D. S. Herbert Spencer, "Our Great Philosopher," *versus* the Known God. *PRR.*, '99, 98–129.

HARTMANN, F. Die Geheimlehre in der christl. Religion nach den Erklärungen v. Meister Eckhart. Neue [Umschlag-] Ausg. L.: Friedrich; vii, 226 pp. M. 2.
Bibliothek esoterischer Schriften, Bd. III. & IV.

JAKOBSKÖTTER, A. Die Psychologie Dieterich Tiedemann's. *ID.* Erlangen, '98; 139 pp.

KALINA, P. E. Fundament u. Einheit in Friedrich Nietzsche's Philosophie. L.: Friedrich, '98; vi, 124 pp. M. 2.

KRONENBERG, M. Moderne Philosophen. Porträts und Charakteristiken. M.

Hermann Lotze — F. A. Lange — V. Cousin — L. Feuerbach — M. Stirner.

LÜLMANN, C. Fichte's Anschauung vom Christenthum. *ZPhKr.*, N., '98.

MARX, M. Charles G. Leroy u. seine *Lettres philosophiques*. Ein Beitrag z. Geschichte d. vergl. Psychologie des XVIII. Jahrh. Str.: Singer, '98; viii, 99 pp. M. 2.

MICHAEL, O. Ludwig Richter in seiner Auffassung des Christenthums. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 198.

NIKOLTSCHOFF, W. Das Problem des Bösen bei Fichte. *ID.* Jena: F. Strobel, '98; 83 pp. M. 1.60.

PFANNKUCHE, A. Der Zweckbegriff bei Kant u. E. v. Hartmann u. s. Bedeutg. f. d. Theologie. *DEBl.*, '98, 596–612.

PRAECHTER, K. Zur Frage nach Lukians philosoph. Quellen. *AGPh.*, XI., no. 4.

SCHALKHAUSER, G. Aeneas von Gaza als Philosoph. *ID.* Erlangen, '98; 108 pp.

SCHMITT, E. H. Friedrich Nietzsche an der Grenzscheide zweier Weltalter. Versuch einer Beleuchtg. vom Standpunkte einer neuen Weltanschauung. L.: Janssen, '98; vii, 151 pp. M. 2.

SOLMI, E. Studii sulla filosofia naturale di Leonardo da Vinci. Genealogia e cosmologia. Modena, '98; 117 pp. L. 4.

STEGLICH, F. A. Ueber d. pädagogische Idee Friedrich Fröbels in ihrer philosophischen Begründg. durch Frohschammer. *ID.* Bern: Nydegger & Baumgart, '98; viii, 195 pp. M. 1.60.

TROBRIDGE, G. Swedenborg and Modern Thought. *NCR.*, N., '98, 379–87.

WILLARETH, O. Die Lehre vom Uebel bei Leibnitz, seiner Schule in Deutschland u. bei Kant. Strassburg: Schmidt, '98; v, 149 pp. M. 3.

WINTZER, W. Die natürl. Sittenlehre Ludwig Feuerbachs. Im Zusammenhange dargestellt u. beurteilt. L.: Fock, '98; vi, 40 pp. M. 1.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

Beiträge z. Ästhetik. Hrsg. v. LIPPS u. WERNER. Hamburg: Voss, '98.
VI. LIPPS, TH. Komik u. Humor; viii, 264 pp. M. 6.

BESANT, A. Die Geburt u. Entwicklung der Seele, eine theosophische Studie. Übers. v. L. DEINHARD. L.: Friedrich, '98; 62 pp. M. 1.

BRANDT, M. v. Die chinesische Philosophie u. der Staats-Confucianismus. St.: Strecker & Moser, '98; 121 pp. M. 2.

BUCHRUCKER, V. Die Irrwege des Subjektivismus. *NkZ.*, '99, 1–17.

ELIAS, R. The Tendency of Religion. Lo.: Chapman, '98; 230 pp. 3s. 6d.

ETERNOD, A. C. F. Les sources de la vie. Deux conférences. Avec 23 dessins et 5 tableaux. P.: Fischbacher, '98. f. 2.50.

GOMPERZ, H. Kritik des Hedonismus. Eine psychologisch-ethische Untersuchung. St.: Cotta, '98; vii, 121 pp. M. 2.40.

GRUPP, G. Die Glaubenswissenschaft als Wissenschaft. *ThQ.*, '98, 618–28.

HANNE, J. R. Teichmüller's neue Grundlegg. d. Philosophie. *PrM.*, III., ('99), 1–18.

HARTMANN, FRZ. Die Reïnkarnation oder Wiederverkörperung. Vortrag. L.: Friedrich, '98; 36 pp. M. 0.60.

HOFFMANN, A. Ueber den Egoismus. *PrM.*, D., '98, 447–66.

HÜBENER, J. Das Gefühl in seiner Eigenart u. Selbstständigk., mit besonderer Beziehg. auf Herbart u. Lotze. Eine psycholog. Untersuch. im pädagog. Interesse. Dresden: Bleyl & Kaemmerer, '98; viii, 139 pp. M. 2.80.

HUNTINGTON, W. R. Psyche: a study of the soul. N. Y.: Whittaker, '99; iv, 97 pp. $0.25.

KAMPERS. Die Idee von der Ablösung der Weltreiche in eschatologischer Beleuchtung. I. *Hist. Jahrb. d. Görres-Gesellsch.*, XIX., no. 3.

KNEIB, PH. Die Willensfreiheit und die innere Verantwortlichkeit. Mainz: Kirchheim, '98; xii, 173 pp. M. 1.20.

KOWALEWSKI, A. Über das Kausalitätsproblem. Eine philos. Studie. L.: Mutze, '98; ii, 121 pp. M. 2.60.

——— Prodromos, eine Kritik der erkenntnis-theoretischen Vernunft. *Ibid.*, '98; ii, 30 pp. M. 0.60.

KRAUSE, F. Das Leben d. menschlichen Seele und ihre Erziehung. Psychol.-pädagog. Briefe. 1. Tl.: Das Vorstellungs- u. das Denkleben. Dessau: Kahle, '98; 298 pp. M. 3.

KRIEG, M. Der Wille u. d. Freiheit in der neueren Philosophie. Eine philosophische Studie. F.: Mohr, '98; vii, 40 pp. M. 1.50.

LE BON, G. The Psychology of Peoples. Lo.: Unwin, '98; 256 pp. 6s.

——— Psychologie du socialisme. P.: Alcan, '99; vii, 502 pp. f. 7.50.

LEININGEN-BILLIGHEIM, C. Was ist Mystik? L.: Friedrich, '98; 127 pp. M. 1. Bibl. esoter. Schriften; Bd. V.

LENKELL, R. Durch d. Sprache z. Seele. Eine Anregg. z. Betrachtung d. Seelen-

frage in einem neuen Lichte. L.: Mutze, '98; v, 89 pp. M. 1.50.

LEWETZKI, S. Willensbildung. Ein Beitrag z. Lösg. der socialen Frage. B.: Selbstverlag, '98; 24 pp. M. 0.60.

LICHTENSTEIN, A. Die Macht d. Natur im geistigen Leben. Eine physiologisch-psycholog. Untersuchg. auf Grund v. Röm. 7, 14–25. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; iv, 127 pp. M. 2.

losophical criticism. *Mo.*, Ja., '99, 197–218.

PAJK, J. Praktische Philosophie. W.: Konegen, '98; vii, 180 pp. M. 3.

PFLEIDERER, O. Das Recht der Entwicklungstheorie in der Religionswissenschaft. *ZMR.*, '99, 4–11.

PORTALIÉ, E. La liberté et la conservation de l'énergie. *Et.*, 20 S., '98, 745–66.

ROBERTSON, JOHN M. Mr. Lang on the Origin of Religion. *FR.*, O., '98, 726–40. A Reply, by A. LANG, *ibid.*, 740–44.

ROCHOLL, R. Spiritualismus u. Realismus. *NkZ.*, '98, 784–808, 855–94.

SAMTLEBEN, G. Pantheistisches Christentum? *BG.*, N. & D., '98, 416–36, 469–81.

, R. C. On the Origin of L'[illegible]., O., '98, 433–4

SCHOELER, H. v. Kritik d. wissenschaftl. Erkenntnis. Eine vorurteilsfreie Weltanschauung. L.: Engelmann, '98; viii, 677 pp. M. 12.

SCHUBERT, R. Herbart's didaktische Anschauungen u. die Interpretationen der Konzentrationsidee. *ID.* L., '98; 62 pp.

SIMON, TH. Der Werth der Persönlichkeit u. die kathol. Kirche. *KM.*, O., '98.

SMITH, O. H. P. Evolution and Consciousness. *Mo.*, Ja., '99, 219–33.

TISSOT. A propos du subjectivisme. *RThPh.*, '99, 74–80.

WAGNER, F. Freiheit u. Gesetzmässigk. in den menschl. Willensakten. Eine philos. Abhdlg. Tü.: Laupp, '98; iii, 115 pp. M. 2.80.

WESTPHAL, C. Das Dilemma der Atomistik. Ein erster Beweis des Idealismus, nebst einer Skizze eines modernen Stils des idealist. Weltgebäudes. B.: Skopnik, '98; 35 pp. M. 0.60.

WOHLFAHRT. Ἰχθύς. Das reine Evangelium. Ein Ketzerbrief. L.: Friedrich, '98; 24 pp. M. 0.60.

*** Eine Philosophie für d. XX. Jahrhdt. B.: Skopnik, '98; 274 pp. M. 3.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

ANTONESEN, E. N. Beziehgn. zwischen Rechtswissenschaften und moderner Rechtsphilosophie. B., '98; 40 pp.

CAMPBELL, L. Religion in Greek Literature: sketch in outline. N. Y. & L.o.: Longmans, '98; 434 pp. 15s.

Naumann, '98; viii, 215 pp. M. 4; bd., M. 5.50.

ESCOTT, T. H. S. The Age of Faith and the Church of Fiction. *NCR.*, O., '98, 272–8.

FRANKE, A. Die Religion d. Menschheit od. d. natürl. Schöpfungsgesch. Eine neue Weltanschauung. Graz: Münster: Mickl, '99; v, v, 98 pp. M. 1.

GARIN, P. Spiritismus, und Religion und Wissenschaft. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 245.

HORINE, J. W. Christianity and Anti-Christianity. *LChR.*, '99, 85–93.

KAMPERS, F. Die Idee von der Ablösg. der Weltreiche in eschatologischer Beleuchtg. *Histor. Jahrb.*, '98, 423–46.

KEERL, K. Der feurig-flüssige Zustand des Erdinnern. *BG.*, O., '98, 361–84.

KEUCHEL, G. Goethe's Religion und Goethe's Faust. Riga: Jonck & Poliewsky, '98; vii, 333 pp. M. 6.

LEFRANC, A. Les idées religieuses de Marguérite de Navarre, d'après son œuvre poétique. (Les "Marguérites" et les "Dernières poésies.") P.: Fischbacher, '98. f. 5.

Extrait du *Bulletin de la société de l'histoire du protestantisme français.*

LOW, G. J. Evolution in Relation to Christian Thought. *Queen's Quart.*, O., '98, 85–97.

MANEN, W. C. VAN. Moderne Theologie en moderne richting. *ThT.*, '99, 1–14.

MCKENZIE, A. The Divine Force in the Life of the World. (*Lowell Institute Lectures.*) Bo.: Lamson, Wolffe & Co., '98; v, 334 pp. $1.50.

MINTON, H. C. Christianity and the Cosmic Philosophy. *PRR.*, '99, 1–24.

RYLANCE, J. H. Christian Rationalism. Essays on matter in debate between faith and unbelief. N. Y.: Whittaker, '98; 220 pp. $1.25.

SCHEFFLER, H. Das Schöpfungsvermögen u. d. Unmöglichkeit der Entstehg. des Menschen aus d. Thiere. Nebst

einer Kritik der Werke v. Darwin u. Haeckel. Braunschweig: Wegner, '98; iv, 152 pp. M. 3.60.

STEUDE, E. G. Die grösste Kulturmacht. (Das Christentum.) *BG.*, '98, 401–15.

- Die neueste Kundgebung Häckels. *Ibid.*, '99, 15–31.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY; RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

ADAMS, W. M. The Book of the Master; or, The Egyptian Doctrine of the Light Born of the Virgin Mother. Lo.: Murray, '98; 226 pp. 6s.

D'ALVIELLA, G. Les rites de la moisson et les commencements de l'agriculture. *RHR.*, Jl.–Ag., '98, 1–25.

BENSON, M., AND J. GOURLAY. The Temple of Mut in Asher: an account of the excavations of the temple and of the religious representations and objects found therein, as illustrating the history of Egypt and the main religious ideas of the Egyptians. Inscriptions and translations by PERCY E. NEWBERRY. Plans and illustrations. Lo.: Murray, '99; 408 pp. 21s.

BIXBY, J. T. Nanak and the Faith of the Shiks. *NW.*, D., '98, 704–22.

BLAU, L. Das altjüdische Zauberwesen. Strassburg: Trübner, '98; viii, 167 pp. M. 4.

BLOCHET, E. Études sur l'histoire religieuse de l'Iran. *RHR.*, Jl.–Ag., '98, 26–63.
I. De l'influence de la religion mazdéenne sur les croyances des peuples turcs.

BÜCHLER, A. La fête des Cabanes chez Plutarque et Tacite. *REJ.*, XXXVII., 181–202.

BURTON, SIR RICHARD F. The Jew, the Gypsy, and El Islam. Edited with a preface and brief notes by W. H. WILKINS. Chi. & N. Y.: Stone & Co., '98. $3.50 *net.*

COUVE, L. Bulletin archéologique de la religion grecque (1896–97). *RHR.*, S.–O., '98, 153–75.

CURTIN, J. Creation Myths of Primitive America: in relation to the religious history and mental development of mankind. Bo.: Little, Brown & Co., '98. $2.50.

DAVIES, T. W. Magic, Divination, and Demonology among the Hebrews and Their Neighbours, including an examination of biblical references and of the biblical terms. Lo.: Clarke & Co., '98; xvi, 132 pp. 3s. 6d.

DOTTIN, G. La religion des Gaulois. *RHR.*, S.–O., '98, 136–52.
A propos du récent ouvrage de M. ALEXANDRE BERTRAND.

DRÄSEKE, J. R. Seydel's Untersuchgn. über d. Verhältnis von Buddhalegende u. Leben Jesu. *ZwTh.*, '98, 502–14.

ELLINWOOD, F. F. Theosophy, Esoteric Buddhism, and Christian Science. *HR.*, Ja., '99, 15–20.

FIELDING, H. The Soul of a People: a study of Buddhism. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; viii, 363 pp. $4.

FORNEROD, A. La première religion de l'humanité. *RThPh.*, '98, 385–404.

HULBERT, H. W. The Philosophical Disintegration of Islam. *BS.*, '99, 44–60.

JACKSON, A. V. W. Zoroaster, the Prophet of Ancient Iran. N. Y.: Macmillan (for Columbia Univ. Press), '99; xxiv, 314 pp. & map. $3.

——— A Brief Note on the Amshaspands, or a Contribution to Zoroastrian Angelology. *ARW.*, I., 363–6.

——— Ormazd, or the Ancient Persian Idea of God. *Mo.*, Ja., '99, 161–78.

JONES, J. P. Hinduism and Christianity: a contrast. *BS.*, '98, 591–628.

KIND. Shantung u. Kiautschou. *ZMR.*, '98, 210–21.

LANG, A. Are Savage Gods Borrowed from Missionaries? *NC.*, Ja., '99.

LECLÈRE, A. Une version cambodgienne du jugement de Salomon. *RHR.*, S.–O., '98, 176–81.

LEGER, L. Études de mythologie slave; les divinités inférieures. *RHR.*, S.–O., '98, 123–35.

MACDONALD, K. S. Tiele's Science of Religion; a review. *IER.*, O., '98, 196–219.

MASPERO, G. Études de mythologie et d'archéologie égyptiennes. Vol. 3. P.: Leroux, '98; L.: Harrassowitz. M. 12.50.
Bibliothèque égyptol., Tom. 7.

MONGRÉ, P. Das Chaos in kosmischer Auslese. Ein erkenntniskrit. Versuch. L.: Naumann, '98; vi, 213 pp. M. 4.

MOULTON, J. H. Zoroastrian Influences on Judaism. *IER.*, O., '98, 129–42.

MÜLLER, F. M. Beiträge z. e. wissenschaftl. Mythologie. Aus d. Engl. v. Dr. H. Lüders. Vom Verf. durchgeseh. Ausg. 1. Bd. L.: Engelmann, '98; xxxii, 408 pp. M. 5.

NÖLDEKE, TH. "Gottesfurcht" bei den alten Arabern. *ARW.*, I., 361–3.

POLIVKA, G. Nachträge zur Polyphemsage. *ARW.*, I., 305–36, 378.

PRICE, E. D. The Story of Religions. Lo.: Newnes; N. Y.: M. F. Mansfield & Co., '98; iii, 228 pp. $0.75.

RHYS DAVIDS, T. W. The Theory of "Soul" in the Upanishads. *JRAS.*, '99, 71–88.

RORIK, S. Traité sur le fétiche Grœnlandais-Esquimau Tu-pi-lak. *M.*, '98, 407–17.

SCHEICHL, F. Der Islam u. die Duldung. Eine Studie. Linz: Mareis, '98; 39 pp. M. 0.80.

SCHNEIDER, D. B. Japanese Buddhism. *RQR.*, O., '98, 483–504.

SHASTRI, MAHAMAHOPADHYAYA HARAPRASAD. The Discovery of a First Century A. D. Buddhist MS. *IER.*, O., '98, 220–30.

SNELL, M. M. The Practical Value of the Science of Comparative Religion. *BW.*, F., '99, 88–93.

TIELE, C. P. Zur Frage nach dem Alter des Avesta. *ARW.*, I., 337–60.

VALBERT, G. Confucius et la morale chinoise. *R. des deux Mondes*, 1 D., '98.

WASER, O. Charon, Charun, Charos. Mythol.-archäolog. Monographie. B.: Weidmann, '98; vii, 158 pp. M. 5.

WILLIAMS, J. Religious Ideas of the Ancient Egyptians. *Westminster Rev.*, D., '98, 655–69.

WILLIAMS, T. The Earthquake, the Eclipse, and Brahman Imposture. *IER.*, O., '98, 162–8.

B. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BRIGGS, CH. A. The General Introduction to the Study of Holy Scripture. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xxii, 688 pp. $3.

Hastings Bible Dictionary. Vol. I. *AJTh.*, III., 84–98.

LEWIS, A. S. In the Shadow of Sinai: a story of travel and research from 1895 to 1897. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xvi, 261 pp.

MATHESON, G. The Bible Definition of Religion. Lo.: Clarke, '98; 86 pp. 1s.

PRAT, F. Histoire du livre dans l'antiquité. Étude d'archéologie et de critique bibliques. *Et.*, 20 O., '98, 195–214.

PRICE, IRA M. The University of Paris. Biblical workers in the theological faculty. *BW.*, Ja., F., '99, 7–15, 126.

SCHULZ, W. Beiträge zu dem Texte d. Vulgata aus spanischen Handschriften. *ZwTh.*, '99, 36–58.

WELLS, J. Bible Hospitality. *ET.*, N., '98, 62–5.

BRUNEAU, J. Recent Contributions to Biblical Theology. *AER.*, Mr., '99, 271–80.

CURTIS, E. L. The Outlook in Theology. *BS.*, Ja., '99, 1–11.

DOBSCHÜTZ, E. VON. Zwei Bibelhandschriften mit doppelter Schriftart. *Theol. Litztg.*, '99, no. 3.

DUPERRUT, F. Qu'est-ce que la Bible? *RChr.*, D., '98.

EGGER, F. Streiflichter üb. die "freiere" Bibelforschung. Brixen: Weger, '98; iv, 97 pp. M. 1.60.

HALEY, J. J. The Status and Prospects of the Higher Criticism. *ChrQ.*, Ja., '99, 21–37.

KATZENELSON, L. Die rituellen Reinheitsgesetze in der Bibel u. im Talmud. *JM.*, Ja., '99.

MACARTHUR, R. S. Bible Difficulties, and Their Alleviative Interpretations. N. Y.: Treat & Co., '98; 450 pp. $1.50.

MIELKE, G. Der gläubige Christ u. die bibl. Kritik. *KM.*, D., '98.

NESTLE, E. Rest and Comfort. *ET.* O., '98, 48.

ROLFFS. Wissensch. u. kirchl. Schriftauslegg. *ChrW.*, '98, no. 43.

ROOT, E. T. The Profit of the Many. The biblical doctrine and ethics of wealth. Chi. & N. Y.: Revell, '99; 321 pp. $1.25.

SCHAMBERG, J. F. The Nature of the Leprosy of the Bible. *BW.*, Mr., '99, 162–9.

SCHODDE, G. H. The Gain and the Loss in Modern Biblical Criticism. *HR.*, Ja., '99, 20–23.

SILVERSMITH, J. The Administration of Laws and Justice in Early Jewish and Christian Eras. From talmudic and post-biblical records. *BW.*, Mr., '99, 170–75.

B., A. Die heiligen Stätten in Palästina. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 221.

BIRCH, W. F. The Valley of Hinnom. *PEFQS.*, Ja., '99.

——— Pisgah. *Ibid.*, Ja., '99.

BLANCKENHORN, M. Noch einmal Sodom u. Gomorrha. *ZDPV.*, XXI., 65–83.

BLISS, F. J. First Report on the Excavations at Tell Zakariya. *PEFQS.*, Ja., '99.

BRÜNNOW, R. Reisebericht üb. Ostjordanland, Moab und Edom. *M&NDP-V.*, '98, 49–57, 81–7.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU. Nouvelle inscription à Gezer. *RB.*, '99, 109–17.

——— Notes on the *QS.*, O., '98. *PEFQS.*, Ja., '99.
P. 246, The inscr. of the crusades and the Arabic inscr. from Jaffa; p. 252, Greek inscr. from Syria.

GERMER-DURAND, R. P. Nouvelle exploration épigraphique de Gérasa. *RB.*, '99, 5–39.

Golgotha or Calvary? *Biblia*, N., '98, 198–200.
See also *BW.*, D., '98, 457.

GUTHE, H. Dscherasch od. Dscherāsch? *M&NDP-V.*, '98, 57–9.

HAUPT, C. E. Topography of Palestine. *LChR.*, '99, 121–6.

LAMMENS, H. Le climat syro-palestinien, autrefois et aujourd'hui. *Et.*, 20 S., '98, 767–90.

LEJOURNÉ, P.-M. A travers le Hauran. *RB.*, '98, 596–611.

MACALISTER, S. The Rock-Cuttings of Tell Zakariya. *PEFQS.*, Ja., '99.

RÖHRICHT, R. Marino Sanudo sen. als Kartograph Palästinas. *ZDPV.*, XXI., 84–126.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

BACHER, W. Bemerkungen (zu *ZATW.*, XVIII., 288, 289, 292; 249). *ZATW.*, XIX., 163–5.

BENNETT, W. H. Some Recent Old Testament Literature. *Exp.*, Mr., '99.

DAVIES, T. W. Strack's "Introduction to the Old Testament." *ET.*, N., '98, 67–9.

KAUTZSCH, E. Outline of History of Literature of O. T., with chronological tables for hist. of Israelites, and other aids. Repr. fr. Supplement to Transl. of O. T. Ed. by author. Transl. by John Taylor. Lo.: Williams & N., '98; N. Y.: Putnam's, '99; 264 pp. 6s. 6d.

MOULTON, R. G. The Modern Readers' Bible. *Children's ser.* Vol. 1: Bible Stories. Old Testament. With introd. and notes. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xii, 210 pp. $0.50.

LANGUAGE AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

BACHER, W. Zum Verständnisse d. Ausdruckes זָכָר לַדָּבָר. *ZATW.*, XIX., 166–8.

BARNES, W. E. The Meaning of שְׁלֹמִים. *ET.*, O., '98, 43–5.
See also BURN, J. H.; *ibid.*, Ja., '99, 188.

BÜCHLER, JACOB, LUDWIG, KÖNIG, v. GALL. Berichtiggn. zu Mandelkern's Concordanzen. *ZATW.*, XIX., 187–91.
Ibid., 183–6: MANDELKERN, *Pro Domo.*

CHEYNE, T. K. Two Disputed Hebrew Words in Familiar Passages. *ET.*, N., '98, 94–5.
בְּצֹר Job 22:24, 25; תּוֹעֲפוֹת Job 22:25.

——— Further Remarks on the Hebrew Word דָּגָל. *JQR.*, XI., 232–6.

——— Textual Criticism in the Service of Archæology. *ET.*, F., '99, 238–40; Mr., 284–6.
Deut. 33:19; 1 Sam. 15:7; 27:8; 1 Kings 10:11; 1 Chron. 29:2; 1 Sam. 1:6; 2 Sam. 12:26–31; 2 Kings 23:13; 2 Chron. 28:15; Ezek. 9:2; 38:12; Judg. 9:37; Zech. 11:2; Hab. 3:4; Ps. 81:8.

FRAENKEL, S. Zur Wurzel רצה. *ZATW.*, XIX., 181–4.

GOTTHEIL, R. J. H. On קוּשַׁיָהוּ and קִישִׁי. *JBL.*, XVII., 199–203.

GRAY, G. B. Nebo as an Element in Hebrew Proper Names: Machnadebai and Barnabas. *ET.*, F., '99, 232–4.

HOMMEL, F. The Etymology of יהוה. *ET.*, O., '98, 48.
See KÖNIG; *ibid.*, Ja., '99, 189–92.

——— Ben-ônî, Bin-yamîn. *ET.*, N., '98, 92.

LAMBERT, M. L'article dans la poésie hébraïque. *REJ.*, XXXVII., 203–15.

TOUZARD, J. De la conservation du texte hébreu, étude sur Isaïe, XXXVI.–XXXIX. (Suite.) *RB*, '99, 83–108.

BAUMANN, E. Die Verwendbarkeit der Pešita zum Buche Ijob f. d. Textkritik. (Forts.) *ZATW.*, XIX., 15–95.

BURKITT, F. C. Aquila.—Fragments of the Books of Kings, according to his translations. Without facs. 4to. Cambridge Univ. Press; Lo. & N. Y.: Frowde, '99. 2s. 6d.

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BATTEN, L. W. The Social Life of the Hebrews from Josiah to Ezra. II. *BW.*, Mr., '99, 150–61.

CHEYNE, T. K. Dr. Torrey on the Edomites. *JBL.*, XVII., 207–8.

CONDER, C. R. Notes on Antiquities of the Pentateuch. *PEFQS.*, Ja., '99.

HOMMEL, F. Das wahre Datum Abrahams und Moses. *NkZ.*, '98, 998–1003.

——— The True Date of Abraham and Moses. *ET.*, F. & Mr., '99, 210–12, 278.

INGRAHAM, J. H. The Throne of David: from the consecration of the shepherd of Bethlehem to the rebellion of Prince Absalom. Lo.: Hodder, '98; 390 pp. 1s. 6d.

KAUFMANN, D., & I. LÉVI. Le tombeau de Mardochée et d'Esther. *REJ.*, XXXVII., 303–5.

LAMMENS, H. Sur la frontière nord de la terre promise. *Et.*, 20 F., '99, 497–519.

MCCURDY, J. F. Cyrus. *HR.*, Ja., F., '99, 23–6, 124–7.

SAYCE, A. H. Early Israel and the Surrounding Nations. Lo.: Service, '98; 338 pp. 6s.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

ADENEY, W. F. The Story of King Josiah and the Lawbook. *BW.*, F., '99, 106–10.

BROWN, J. The Germ of Astruc's Theory. *ET.*, N., '98, 91–2.

BRÜNING. Der bibl. Schöpfungsbericht im Lichte der Naturwissenschaft. *BG.*, F., '99, 62–76.

CHEYNE, T. K. A Few O. T. Riddles. *ET.*, D., '98, 141–3.
Isa. 33: 17; Ps. 45: 2 [3]; Ezek. 8: 3, 5; 38: 2, 3; 39: 1; 1 Sam. 12: 3.

COOK, S. A. 1 Kings 10: 25 and Neh. 3: 19. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 279–81.

HOGG, H. W. "Dan to Beershaba": the literary history of the phrase and the historical problem. *Exp.*, D., '98, 411–21.

KÖNIG, E. Uzziah and Alexander (Mass. note at end of the Minor Prophets). *ET.*, F., '99, 255–7.

KRAUSS, S. Die Zahl der bibl. Völkerschaften. *ZATW.*, XIX., 1–14.

LIEBLEIN, J. L'exode des Hébreux. *PSBA.*, XX., 277–88; XXI., 53–67.

LIVINGSTON, DAVID. The Mosaic Account of the Creation: a series of 10 papers. *Clergyman's Mag.*, F.–D., '98.

LOISY, A. Le sanctuaire de Baal Peor. *RHLR.*, N.–D., '98, 502–7.

——— Le monstre Rahab et l'histoire biblique de la création. *JA.*, Jl.–A., '98, 44–67.

LOOFS, D. Die Schöpfungsgeschichte, der Sündenfall u. der Thurmbau zu Babel. F.: Mohr, '99. M. 0.80.
Hefte zur *Christl. Welt*, no. 39.

MARGIVAL, H. Richard Simon et la critique biblique au XVII^e^ siècle. viii: Rich. Simon polémiste. *RHLR.*, N.–D., '98, 508–32.

MICHELET, D. S. Israels Propheten als Träger der Offenbarg. Vortrag. Aus dem Norweg. Fr.: Mohr, '99; 40 pp. M. 0.60.

MOORE, W. W. The Period of Israelitish Sojourn in Egypt in the Light of Archæological Research. *PQ.*, XIII., 24–43.

MÜLLER, D. H. Strophenbau und Responsion. Neue Beiträge. W.: Hölder, '98; 87 pp. M. 2.60.

PERITZ, I. J. Woman in the Ancient Hebrew Cult. *JBL.*, XVII., 111–48.

PETERS, JOHN P. Archæology and Higher Criticism. *NW.*, VIII., 22–42.

POYNDER, A. Kirjath-arba, Judg. 1: 10. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 287.

RICHARDS, G. W. Prophet and Scientist. *RChR.*, O., '98, 446–59.

SAYCE, A. H. Recent Biblical Archæology. *ET.*, F. & Mr., '99, 201–4, 267–8.
On King's Letters of Hammurabi and the Name of Chedorla'omer; see Selbie, *ibid.*, Mr., 278–9.

SIMCOX, G. A. Purim, Tophet, Zobah, and Mispah. *PSBA.*, XX., 300–305.

SKIPWITH, G. H. Hebrew Tribal Names and the Primitive Traditions of Israel. *JQR.*, XI., 239–65.

ST. CLAIR, G. The Garden of Eden. *Biblia*, S., '98, 136–9.

STOSCH, G. Alttest. Studien. IV. Israels Heldenzeit. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; iii, 206 pp. M. 2.50.

WILDEBOER, G. Iets over de methode der Oud-Testamentische kritiek. *ThSt.*, '98, 291–305.

WRIGHT, G. F. Dr. Driver's Proof-Texts. *BS.*, Ja., '99, 140–47.

ZART. Die Naturbetrachtung im A. T. *DEBl.*, D., '98.

THEOLOGY.

DELITZSCH, F. Messianische Weissaggn. in geschichtlicher Folge. 2. Aufl. B.: Deutsche Buch- u. Tractat-Gesellsch., '98; viii, 184 pp. M. 3.60.

HÜHN, E. Die messianischen Weissagungen d. israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes. bis z. d. Targumim, historisch-kritisch untersucht u. erläutert; nebst Erörterung d. A. T. Citate u. Reminiszenzen im N.

T. F.: Mohr, '99; xiv, 165 pp. M. 3.60.
1. Tl.: Die messianischen Weissagungen des israelitisch-jüdischen Volkes.

KITTEL, R. Zur Theologie des Alten Testaments. L.: Hinrichs, '99; 31 pp. M. 0.70.
1. Das A. T. u. d. heutige Theologie. 2. Jesaja 53 u. der leidende Messias im Alten Testamente.

LANG, M. B. The Beatitudes of the 23d Psalm. *ET.*, O., '98, 46–7.

LEY, J. Die Bedeutg. d. "Ebed-Jahwe" im zweiten Teil des Propheten Jesaia mit Berücksichtigg. neuerer Forschgn. *StKr.*, '99, 163–205.

LIÉNARD, J. H. La religion des patriarches (étude d'histoire et de théologie bibliques). Cahors: Coueslant, '99; 87 pp.

LOISY, A. L'espérance messianique d'après Ernest Renan. *RHLR.*, '98, 385–406.

MARGOLIOUTH, G. The Earliest Religion of the Ancient Hebrews: a new theory. *CR.*, O., '98, 581–92.

MCLANE, W. W. The Natural History of Yahweh. *HR.*, F., '99, 119–23.

OETTLI. Jahve und Baal. *KM.*, D., '98.

POWELL, W. H. Tree of Life in the Midst of the Garden: story of man's fall and restoration. Addresses. Lo.: Parker, '98. 1s. 6d.

PRAT, E. La loi de Moïse. Les progrès. *Et.*, 5 O., '98, 29–56.

SIEBERT, O. Der Gedanke der Sündenvergebung bei den alttest. Propheten. *Manch. Gab. u. Ein Geist*, 38, Heft 4 & 5 (Ja. & F., '99).

WESTPHAL, A. L'élohisme. *RThQR.*, '99, 1–26.

WILDEBOER, G. Jahvedienst u. Volksreligion in Israel in ihrem gegenseit. Verhältnis. F.: Mohr, '99; 44 pp. M. 0.80.

THE LAW.

FLOURNOY, P. P. Discovery of the Kings. (Mentioned in Gen., chap. 14.) *PQ.*, XIII., 44–54.

GALL, V. Deuteronomium u. Deuteronomius. *ZATW.*, XIX., 173–7.

Great Text Commentary. The Great Texts of Genesis. *ET.*, '98–'99, O., 19–22; N., 73–5; D., 111–15; Ja., 161–4; F., 204–8; Mr., 260–64.
Gen. 1:1; 1:26; 3:15; 4:7; 4:9; 5:24.

KÖNIG, ED. The Unity of Deuteronomy. *ET.*, O. & D., '98, 16–19, 124–7; F., '99, 227–30.

LAGRANGE. St. Jérome et la tradition juive dans la Génèse. *RB.*, '98, 563–6.

PATON, L. B. The Original Form of Leviticus, chaps. 21 and 22. *JBL.*, XVII., 149–75.

POELS, H. De oorsprong van den Pentateuch. *De Katholiek*, D., '98.

ROBINSON, G. L. The Genesis of Deuteronomy. III. *Exp.*, F., '99, 151–60.

SAYCE, A. H. Archæological Commentary on Genesis. *ET.*, N., '98, 75–8; Ja., '99, 171–4.
Gen. 37:5–39:20; 40:1–57.

SMITH, H. P. A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Books of Samuel. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xxxix, 421 pp. $3 *net*.
The International Critical Commentary.

WARRING, C. B. *Tohu:* a historical and exegetical study of its meaning in Gen. 1:2. *BS.*, Ja., '99, 165–8.

THE PROPHETS.

BERTHOLET, A. Zu Jesaja 53. Ein Erklärungsversuch. F.: Mohr, '99; 32 pp. M. 0.75.

BLACK, A. "The Burden of Dumah." Isa. 21:11, 12. *Exp.*, Ja., '99.

BURROWS, W. O. Amos. With introduction, notes and map. Lo.: Rivingtons, '98; 90 pp. 1s. 6d.

CERSOY, P. L'apologue de la vigne au chapitre V^e^ d'Isaïe (vss. 1–7). *RB.*, '99, 40–49.

CONDAMIN, A. La forme chorale du chap. III. d'Habacuc. *RB.*, '99, 133–9.

DEINARD, S. N. Isaiah, Chap. 10:32. *AJSL.*, XV., 114–15.

GATES, OWEN H. Fulfilment of Prediction in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–48. *AJTh.*, III., 67–83.

GRAY, G. B. The Growth of the Prophetic Literature. *NW.*, VIII., 124–43.

KÖNIG, E. Deuterojesajanisches. Schluss. *NkZ.*, '98, 937–97.

MARTIN, G. C. Our Lord's Use of the Book of Hosea. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 281.

OTTLEY, R. L. Hebrew Prophets. Lo.: Rivingtons, '98; 128 pp. 1s.
Oxford Church Text-Books.

SEESEMANN, O. Israel u. Juda bei Amos u. Hosea, nebst e. Exkurs üb. Hos. 1–3. L.: Dieterich, '99; iv, 44 pp. M. 1.20.

VOS, G. The Modern Hypothesis and Recent Criticism of the Early Prophets: Isaiah. (Cont.) *PRR.*, '99, 70–97.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BARNES, W. E. A Study of Psalm 137. *Exp.*, Mr., '99, 205–9.

BÜCHLER, A. Zur Geschichte der Tempelmusik und der Tempelpsalmen. I. *ZATW.*, XIX., 96–133.

CHEYNE, T. K. Ps. 68, 28 & 31. *ZATW.*, XIX., 156–7.

CHEYNE, T. K. Note on Cant. 7:6. *JQR.*, XI., 237–8.

——— Has Amminadib in Canticles any Existence? *Exp.*, F., '99, 145–7.

FRAENKEL, S. Zum Buch Ezra. *ZATW.*, XIX., 178–80.

GRIMME. Metrisch-kritische Emendationen z. Buche Hiob. (Forts. u. Schluss.) *ThQ.*, '99, 112–18, 259–77.

HERZ, N. Job 19: 25–7. *ET.*, O., '98, 47–8. See SPENCE; *ibid.*, N., '98, 91.

HOMMEL, FR. Job 5:5. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 283–4.

KLOSTERMANN, E. Eine alte Rollenverteilg. zum Hohenliede. *ZATW.*, XIX., 158–62.

NESTLE, E. Ps. 103, 5. *ZATW.*, XIX., 182.

PARISOT, J. Exégèse musicale de quelques titres de Psaumes. *RB.*, '98, 589–95; '99, 117–23.

PRINCE, J. D. On Daniel 8:11, 12. *JBL.*, XVII., 203–4.

RIEDEL, W. Zur Redaktion d. Psalters. *ZATW.*, XIX., 169–72.

SIMCOX, G. A. Agur. *Exp.*, F., '99, 148–50.

VALETON, J. J. P. De 99ste psalm. *StWV.*, N., '98.

WAGNER, P. Über Psalmen u. Psalmenauslegung im christl. Altertum. *RQ.*, '98, 245–79.

WALKER, D. A. Note on Psalm 121:1. *JBL.*, XVII., 205–6.

APOCRYPHA.

BACHER, W. Four Quotations from the Hebrew Ben Sira. *JQR.*, XI., 344.

COSQUIN, E. Le Livre de Tobie et l'histoire du sage Ahikar. *RB.*, '99, 50–82.

LÉVY, I. Notes exégétiques sur un nouveau fragment de l'original hébreu de l'ecclésiastique. *REJ.*, XXXVII., 216–17.

MÉCHINEAU, L. Le texte hébreu de l'ecclésiastique et la critique sacrée. *Et.*, 20 F., '99, 451–77.

RABOISSON. Judith: la véracité du livre de ce nom devant les documents cunéiformes et les histoires d'Hérodote. Roma: typ. Polyglotta, '99; 396 pp. L. 12.

RESCH, G. Das hebr. Testamentum Naphthali. *StKr.*, '99, 206–35.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

COHN, L. Philo v. Alexandrien. *Neues Jahrb. f. d. klass. Altert.*, '98, 514–40.

PHILONIS ALEXANDRINI opera quae supersunt, ediderunt Leopold Cohn et Paul Wendland. Vol. III. Edidit W. B.: Reimer, '99; xxiv, 306 pp. M. 9.

SALTET, L. Philon le juif. *Rev. quest. hist.*, '99, 214–26.
On the basis of HERRIOT, *Philon le juif.*

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

ADENEY, W. F. Women of the N. T. Lo.: Service, '98; 288 pp. 3s. 6d.

BOUSSET, W. Zur Methodologie der Wissenschaft v. N. T. *ThR.*, II., 1–15.

FOTHERINGHAM, D. R. The N. T. Coinage. *ET.*, O., '98, 45–6.

HEINRICI, G. D. Entstehg. d. Neu. Testamentes. L.: Seele, '99; 25 pp. M. 0.30.
Hochschul-Vorträge, Heft 13.

LEPINE, J. F. The Ministers of Jesus Christ: a biblical study. N. Y. & Lo.: Longmans, '98; xiii, 260 pp. $1.75.

MERRIAM, A. R. Variety in Types of Conversion. *HSR.*, IX., 135–8.
A New Testament Study.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

GOODSPEED, E. J. The Newberry Gospels. *AJTh.*, III., 116–37.

KNÖS, V. Grecismer i 1883 års öfversättning af Nya Testamentet. Upsala: Schultz, '98; iv, 79 pp.

MONTGOMERY, W. On the Meaning of ἐπιλαμβάνεται in Heb. 2:16. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 284.

NESTLE, EB. κακὴν κακῶς, Matth. 21:41. *Byz. Zeitschr.*, VIII., no. 1.

RAMSAY, WM. M. The Western Text of Acts. *ET.*, N., '98, 95.
On TASKER; *ibid.*, O., '98.

SCHLÄGER, G. Das Wort κύριος in seiner Beziehung auf Gott oder Jesus Christus. (Schluss.) *ThT.*, '99, 15–53.

TASKER, J. G. The "Western" Text of the New Testament. *ET.*, O., '98, 27–8.

VAN RHIJN, C. H. De oudste bekende tekst van ouze Evangeliën. *ThSt.*, '98, 420–35.

KENNEDY, H. A.-A. The Old Latin Versions and Westcott-Hort's Theory of the Traditional Text of the New Testament. *ET.*, Ja., '99, 187–8.

SPENCER, F. A. The Four Gospels: a new translation, from the Greek text direct; with reference to the Vulgate and the ancient Syriac version. Preface

by JAMES, CARDINAL GIBBONS. N. Y.: Young, '98; x, 280 pp. $1.50.

Twentieth Century New Testament. A trans. into modern English made from the original Greek (Westcott & Hort's text). In 2 parts. Part 1: The Five Historical Books. Lo.: Mowbray House, '98; 262 pp. 1s. 6d.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

BEARDSLEE, C. S. Christ's Estimate of Himself. *HSR.*, IX., 41–65, 99–118.

BRÜCKNER, W. Die Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi. I. *PrM.*, F., '99, 41–7.

CANTON, W. The Nativity: an outline. *Exp.*, F., '99, 123–35.

CONATY, T. J. New Testament Studies: the principal events in the life of our Lord. N. Y. & Chi.: Benziger, '98; ill. $0.60.

DALMAN, G. Die Worte Jesu. Mit Berücksichtigg. des nachkanon.-jüdischen Schrifttums u. d. aram. Sprache erörtert. 1. Bd. Einltg. u. wicht. Begriffe. Nebst Anhang: Messianische Texte. L.: Hinrichs, '98; xv, 319 pp. M. 8.50.

DUPERRUT, F. La vie du Christ. *RChr.*, O., '98, 282–92.

FRANTZEN, W. Die "Leben Jesu"-Bewegg. seit Strauss. Dorpat: Karow, '98; 23 pp. M. 0.40.

FUNCKE, O. Der Christus d. Phantasie u. der bibl. Christus. Altenburg: Geibel, '99; 27 pp. M. 0.30.

HEYN, J. Die Satansidee Jesu. *Pr.*, '99, nos. 2, 3.

HILGENFELD, A. Noch ein Wort üb. d. Menschensohn. *ZwTh.*, '99, 149–51.

HÖHNE. Inwieweit u. wie bezeugen die neutestamentl. Briefe das Erdenleben Jesu? *BG.*, D., '98, 441–68.

HORTON, R. F. The Commandments of Jesus. Lo.: Isbister, '98; 384 pp. 6s.

HOTCHKIN, S. F. The Living Saviour. Ph.: Jacobs & Co., '98; ii, 181 pp. $0.50.

LÄNGIN, GEO. Der Christus der Gesch. u. sein Christentum. Der Gemeinde dargestellt. 2. Abthlg. L.: Wigand, '98; vii, 209 pp. M. 2.

LOISY, A. Les noces de Cana, Jean 2: 1–12. *RHLR.*, '99, 13–36.

PEYTON, W. W. The Resurrection: a study in the evolution of religion. *CR.*, Ja., '99.

PORRET, J. A. Jésus-Christ est-il ressuscité? *RThPh.*, '98, 481–532.

PHILIP, G. Union of the Divine and Human Natures in Christ. *ET.*, N., '98, 92–3.

ROHRBACH, P. Die Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi. B.: Reimer, '98; vii, 94 pp. M. 1.40.

SATTERLEE, H. Y. The Miraculous Birth of Our Lord. *Ind.*, 22 D., '98.

SCHMIDT, P. W. Die Geschichte Jesu. Erzählt. F.: Mohr, '99; viii, 175 pp. M. 3.

SÉJOURNÉ, PAUL-M. Le lieu de la dormation de la très sainte vierge. *RB.*, '99, 141–4.

TISSOT, J. J. Life of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Autograph ed. N. Y.: Doubleday & McClure, '98; 4 vols. $150. Ed. *de grande luxe*, 2 vols. $500.

WEBER, A. S. Christ's Person and Work and the Letters of Paul. *RChR.*, '99, 51–69.

WEED, G. L. A Life of Christ for the Young. Ph.: Jacobs, '98; 400 pp., ill. $0.50.

APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

ABBOTT, L. The Life and Letters of Paul the Apostle. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '98; xii, 332 pp. $1.50.

ASMUSSEN, P. Johannes d. Täufer. *PrM.*, '98, 418–27.

BARTON, GEO. A. The Spiritual Development of Paul. *NW.*, VIII., 111–23.

BELSER. Paulus in Athen im Sommer 50. *ThQ.*, '99, 63–88.

HARRIS, J. R. Epaphroditus, Scribe and Courier. *Exp.*, D., '98, 401–10.

MAURICE, F. St. John the Theologian. *LChR.*, '99, 102–6.

RAPP, H. Der Apostel Petrus im Neuen Testament. *PrM.*, '98, 323–36.

SCHMIEDEL, P. Die Gütergemeinschaft der ältesten Christenheit. *PrM.*, '98, 367–77.

SHEDD, E. C. Stephen's Defense before the Sanhedrin. *BW.*, F., '99, 94–101.

WARSCHAUER, J. Paul and the Jerusalem Church. *NW.*, D., '98, 722–49.

WEBER, V. D. Jahr d. Bekehrg. d. hl. Paulus. *Theol.-prakt. Monatschr.*, '98, 523–36.

WERNLE, P. Paulus als Heidenmissionar. F.: Mohr, '99; 36 pp. M. 0.75.

THEOLOGY.

BOARDMAN, GEO. D. The Kingdom (Basileia). An exegetical study. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; x, 348 pp. $2.

CAIE, N. M. The Lord's Supper. *ET.*, N., '98, 90–91.

FINDLAY, G. G. St. John's Creed. *Exp.*, F., '99, 81–96.
1 John 5:18–21.

LASSON, GEO. Der Begriff des Lebens bei Johannes. *KM.*, F., '99.

LÜTGERT, W. Die Johanneische Christologie. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; viii, 139 pp.
Beiträge z. Förderung christl. Theol. Hrsg. v. Schlatter & Cremer. Bd. III, Heft 1.

MILLIGAN, G. The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Ed.: Clark, '99; xx, 233 pp. 6s.

NESTLE, E. The Name 'Caiaphas.' *ET.*, Ja., '99, 185.

PATRICK. The Conservative Reaction in New Testament Criticism. Lo.: Blackwood & Sons, '98; 32 pp. 6d.

RAMSAY, W. M. Questions. *Exp.*, Ja., '99, 35–48.
New Testament passages interpreted.

VAN RHIJN, C. H. Varia. N.T.ische Persoonsnamen. *ThSt.*, '99, 80–84.
Boanerges, Mc. 3:17; Jakobus de kleine (Mc. 15:40); Barnabas (Acts 4:36); Σαῦλος ὁ καὶ Παῦλος (Acts 13:9); Ampliatus-Urbanus

TORREY, R. A. What the Bible Teaches on the Divinity of Christ. *LChR.*, '99, 151–9.

TRUXAL, A. E. The Church of the N. T. *RChR.*, '99, 1–16.

VINCENT, M. R. Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle. I. *AJTh.*, III., 107–16.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

BADHAM, F. P. Patristic Evidence as to the *Grundschrift* of the Acts of the Apostles. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 287–8.

BRAUN, TH. Die Dämonischen d. Neuen Testaments. *ZThK.*, '98, 494–533.

BURKITT, F. C. Chuza. *Exp.*, F., '99, 118–22.

GEBERT, G. Whatsoever is Born of God, Doth No Sin. *LChR.*, '99, 42–9.

HARSHA, WM. W. Did Christ Preach to Spirits in Hades? *PQ.*, XIII., 55–67.

HASTINGS, J. Paraclete: a Bible word study. *ET.*, Ja., '99, 169–71.

HAWKINS, T. C. Horæ synopticæ. Contributions to the study of the synoptic problem. Lo. & N. Y.: Frowde, '99; xvi, 183 pp. 7s. 6d.

HEITMÜLLER, W. Die Quellenfrage in d. Apostelgesch. *ThR.*, II. ('99), 47–58.

HILGENFELD, A. Das Apostelconcil nach s. urspr. Wortlaute. *ZwTh.*, '99, 138–49.

——— Die korinthische Zwischenreise u. der Viercapitelbrief des Paulus an die Korinther. *Ibid.*, 1–19.

JANNARIS, A. N. Misreadings and Misrenderings in the N. T. *Exp.*, D., '98, 422–32.
John 1:29; 18:37; Matt. 26:25; Mark 14:41; John 1:40f.

KESSELRING, H. Markus oder Matthäus? *v.*, '98, 246–50.

MACDONALD, D. Malchus' Ear. *ET.*, Ja., '99, 188.

SMITH, W. B. Harnack *versus* Harnack. *NW.*, D., '98, 648–62.

WEBER, V. Ist der Galaterbrief vor od. nach d. Apostelkonzil verfasst? *Theol.-prakt. Monatschr.*, '98, 151 ff.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

BARDE, E. Commentaire sur les actes des Apôtres. Lausanne: Bridel; P.: Fischbacher, '98; 592 pp. f. 12.

BLACK, A. The Leaven of Herod (Mark 8:15). *Exp.*, Mr., '99, 173–86.

BLASS, F. On Acts 15:34 and Chaps. 18 fol. *ET.*, N., '98, 88–90.

——— On Mark 12:42 and 15:16. *Ibid.*, Ja., '99, 185–7.

——— On Mark 12:42. *Ibid.*, Mr., '99, 286–7.

BURTON, E. D. The Purpose and Plan of the Gospel of John. *BW.*, '99, Ja. & F., 16–41, 102–5.

GILBERT, G. H. John, Chapter 1. *BW.*, Ja., '99, 42–6.

GOULD, E. P. John 4:43–54; 5:17–27; 6:1–14; 7:14, 28–37. *BW.*, F., '99, 113–14.

JÜLICHER, A. Die Gleichnisreden Jesu. II. Tl.: Auslegg. d. Gleichnisreden der 3 ersten Evangelien. F.: Mohr, '99; viii, 643 pp. M. 12.80.

LINDER, G. Das erste Kapitel des Johannesevangeliums als Leseprobe nach e. neuen Methode. *ZSchw.*, '98, 161–9.

NEIL, C. The Throng and the Touch. *ET.*, D., '98, 122–4.

NESTLE, E. Matth. 18:20. *ET.*, O., '98, 42.

——— Matth. 1:4, 5; Luke 3:32. *Ibid.*,

——— 'The Best Robe'. Luke 15:22. *Ibid.*, N., '98, 93–4.
Transl.: The Former Robe.

NESTLE, E. Acts 15:28. *ET.*, D., '98, 143-4.

RAMSAY, W. M. On Mark 12:42. *ET.*, F., '99, 232.

RYDER, W. H. Matthew 6:2, 5, 16; 11:16-19. *BW.*, F., '99, 115.

VÖLTER, J. E. Zu und aus den Evangelien. *ThT.*, '99, 119-51.

VOORHOEVE, H. W. A. Iets over Marc. 9:48. *ThSt.*, '98, 306-18.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

BARTLET, VERNON. "Mindful of the Poor" (Gal. 2:10). *Exp.*, Mr., '99, 218-25.

BEET, J. A. Difficult Passages in Romans. VIII.: The Reign of Law. *Exp.*, D., '98, 448-59.

BEET, W. E. The Crown of Life. Rev. 2:10. *ET.*, F., '99, 230-31.

Beiträge z. Förderung christl. Theologie. Hrsg. v. SCHLATTER & CREMER. II., 6. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98.
VOWINCKEL, E. Die Grundgedanken des Jakobus-Briefes verglichen mit den ersten Briefen d. Petrus und des Johannes.—DALMER, J. Zu 1 Petri 1:18, 19. vi, 87 pp. M. 1.20.

BRUCE, A. B. The Epistle to the Hebrews. The first apology for Christianity. An exegetical study. Ed.: T. & T. Clark; N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xii, 451 pp. $2.50 *net.*

GIBSON, J. M. Apocalyptic Sketches. *Exp.*, '99, Ja., 72-80; F., 136-44; Mr., 226-35.
i. The First and the Last and the Living One. ii. The Seven Ages.—iii. The Throne of God and of the Lamb. Rev., chaps. 4, 5.

GORE, C. An Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. Vol. I. (cont. chaps. i.-viii). N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; $1.50.

KENNEDY, H. A. A. The Historical Background of the Epistle to the Ephesians. *ET.*, O., '98, 22-4.

MOULE, H. C. G. Ephesian Studies. Chapters on the Epistle to the Ephesians. Nos. 8-11. *Clergyman's Mag.*, '98, S.-D., 129, 193, 257, 321.

MÜLLENSIEFEN, R. Wie sind 2 Kor. 13, 13 die 3 Teile des Segenswunsches inhaltlich auseinander zu halten u. miteinander zu verbinden? *StKr.*, '99, 254-66.

NESTLE, E. 1 Pet. 1:2. *ET.*, Ja., '99, 188-9.

——— 1 Pet. 1:21. *Ibid.*, F., '99, 237-8.

——— 1 Pet. 3:6. *Ibid.*, Mr., '99, 282-3.

——— A Parallel to Rom. 12:11. *Ibid.*, 284.

NIGLUTSCH, J. Brevis commentarius in S. Pauli apostoli epistolas ad Galatas et primam ad Corinthios usui s. theologiæ accommodatus. Trient: Seizer, '99; vi, 208 pp. M. 2.40.

NISIUS, J. B. Erklärung v. Phil. 2:5-11. *ZkTh.*, '99, 75-113.

RAMSAY, W. M. A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. *Exp.*, D., '98, 433-48; '99, Ja., 57-63; F., 97-109.
xxxii, Gal. 3:23-5; xxxiii, Gal. 3:26-30; xxxiv, The Infant Son and Heir (4:1-7); xxxv, The Rudiments of the World (4:3, 9); xxxvi, He Sent Forth His Son (4:4); xxxvii, The Address at Pisidian Antioch; xxxviii, The Argument from Law and Custom; xxxix, Was there a Letter from the Galatians? xl, Traces of the Galatian Letter; Addition to xl; xli, St. Paul's Visit to the Galatic Churches.

ROBERTSON, A. Studies in the Epistle to the Romans. *Exp.*, '99, Ja., 1-15; Mr., 187-204.
The Righteousness of God and the Righteousness of Faith.

RYDER, W. H. The Authorship of Romans, Chaps. 15 and 16. *JBL.*, XVII., 184-98.

SCHIELE, F. Die rabbinischen Parallelen zu 1 Kor. 15, 45-50. *ZwTh.*, '99, 20-31.

SIMMS, A. E. Second Peter and the Apocalypse of Peter. *Exp.*, D., '98, 460-71.

STECK, R. Die Konfession des Jakobusbriefes. *ZSchw.*, '98, 169-87.

THOM, A. 1 Pet. 2:7. *ET.*, F., '99, 234-5.

WEBER, V. Neue Erklärg. v. Gal. 2:1 ff. *Kath.*, '99, 45-64.

WENDLAND, P. Ein Wort d. Heraklit im Neuen Testament. [Aus: *SA.*, Berlin.] B.: Reimer in Komm., '98; 9 pp. M. 0.50.
The Proverb in 2 Pet. 2:22.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

ACHELIS, H. Neue Homilien des Athanasius, Basilius, Chrysostomus, Eusebius von Cäsarea in Cappadozien, Proklus von Cyzikus, und Theophilus von Alexandrien, in einer Londoner Papyrushandschrift des 8ten Jahrhdts. *Theol. Litztg.*, '98, no. 26.

BACON, B. W. An Emendation of the Papias Fragment. *JBL.*, XVII., 176-83.

BARTLETT, V. A New Fragment of Hermas. *Athenæum*, Oct. 8, '98.

BATIFFOL. Notes d'ancienne littérature chrétienne: Les souscriptions de Nicée. *RB.*, '99, 123-7.

BUTLER, D. C. Harnack's Chronology of Early Christian Literature. *Dubl. Rev.*, '99, 1–24.

CLEMEN, O. Die Lamentationes Petri. *ZKG.*, XIX., 431–48.

CONRAT, MAX. Der Novellenauszug de Ordine ecclesiastico. *Arch. d. Gesellsch. f. ältere deu. Gesch.-Kunde*, XXIV., no. 1.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, etc. Vol. 38. W.: Freytag, '99; xlviii, 480 pp. M. 15.60.
Itinera Hierosolymitana sæculi IV-VIII. Recensuit et commentario critico instruxit P. GEYER.

DAVIN, V. Les Actes de saint Dénys de Paris. Étude historique et critique. P.: Savaète, '98; 86 pp.

Doctrine of the Twelve Apostles. Trans. into English, with intro. and notes, by CH. BIGG. Lo.: SPCK., '98; 80 pp. 1s.
Early Church Classics.

DUCHESNE, L. A propos du martyrologe Hiéronymien. *Anal. Boll.*, XVII., 421–47.

ERNST, J. Wann und wo wurde der *liber de rebaptismate* verfasst? II. *Hist. Jahrb.*, '99, 4, 737–71.

EVAGRIUS. The Ecclesiastical History, with the scholia. Ed. by J. BIDEZ and PARMENTIER. Lo.: Methuen, '99. 10s.6d.
Byzantine Texts, ed. by J. B. BURY.

GHEYN, J. VAN DEN. La lettre du pape Anastase Ier à saint Venerius, évêque de Milan, sur la condamnation d'Origène. *RHLR.*, '99, 1–12.

GREGG, J. A. F. Catenæ. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 281–2.

Griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller, Die, der 3 ersten Jahrhdte. Hrsg. v. d. Kirchenväter-Commission der königl. preuss. Akademie d. Wiss. 2. u. 3. Bd. L.: Hinrichs, '99. M. 28.
2. ORIGENES' Werke. 1. Band. Die Schrift vom Martyrium. Buch I.–IV. gegen Celsus (xcii, 374 pp).—3. IDEM. 2. Bd. Buch V.–VII. gegen Celsus. Die Schrift vom Gebet (vii, 545 pp.). Hrsg. v. P. KOETSCHAU.

GRISELLE, E. Une œuvre inédite de Bossuet. Le "Catéchisme pour le Dauphin." *Et.*, 20 N., '98, 522–8.

HEILAND, K. Die Lutherdrucke der Erlanger Universitätsbibliothek aus den J. 1518–1523. L.: Harrassowitz, '98; v, 71 pp. M. 3.
Centralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, Beiheft XXI.

HELM, R. Der Bischof Fulgentius u. der Mythograph. *Rhein. Mus. f. Philologie*, LIV., 111–33.

INGOLD, A. M. P. Les manuscrits des anciennes maisons religieuses d'Alsace. P.: Picard, '98; 71 pp.

JACQUIER, E. Les sentences de Jésus découvertes à Behnesa. *UC.*, 15 F., '99, 161–83.

KETRZYNSKI, W. Ein ungedruckter Brief Melanchthons. *Altpreuss. Monatschr.*, '98, 481–2.

LADEUZE, P. Les diverses recensions de la vie de S. Pakhôme et leur dépendance mutuelle. *M.*, '98, 145, 269, 378.

LANDGRAF, G., u. C. WEYMAN. Novatians epistula de cibis Iudaicis. *Arch. f. Lat. Lexikogr.*, XI., 221–48.
Also published separately. L.: Teubner. M. 1.20.

LEJAY. Ancienne philologie chrétienne: Ouvrages généraux. *RHLR.*, '99, 84–92.

LINSENMAYER, A. Die Predigten des Franziskaners Joh. Pauli. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. d. Predigt am Ausgang des Mittelalters. *Hist. Jahrb. der Görres-Gesellsch.*, '99, XIX., 873–91.

M., J. L'*epistula Eucherii*, et le martyre de la légion thébéenne. *M.*, '98, 313, 448.

MEYER, K. Eine ungedruckte Urkunde Erzbischof Ruthard's von Mainz vom Jahre 1103. Mitgetheilt nach dem Kopialbuche des Klosters Ilfeld. *Z. des Ver. f. Thuring. Gesch.* X., 1.

MEYER, PH. Die theol. Litteratur der griechischen Kirche im 16. Jahrhdt. Mit e. allgem. Einleitg. L.: Dieterich, '99; xi, 179 pp. M. 4.
Studien zur Gesch. d. Theol. u. d. Kirche, III. Bd., Heft 6.

Monumenta Germaniæ historica inde ab a. Chr. *D* usque ad a. *MD*, edidit societas aperiendis fontibus rerum germanicarum medii ævi (neue Quart-Ausg.). Gestorum pontificum romanorum vol. I. Liber pontificalis. Part I. Edidit THDR. MOMMSEN. B.: Weidmann, '98; cxxxix, 295 pp. & 4 plates. M. 15.

MORIN, G. Le *De vita christiana* de l'évêque breton Fastidius et le livre de Pélage *Ad viduam*. *RBd.*, N., '98.

NESTLE, E. Catenæ. *ET.*, F., '99, 218–19.

NOORDTZIJ, M. Brieven en stukken uit het archief van Hendrik de Coek, 1827–42. *Ti. v. geref. Theol.*, VI., S., '98, 98–121.

OTTO, E. Die Schriften des ersten kursächsischen Oberhofpredigers Hoë von Höenegg, kritisch gesammelt u. geordnet. *ID.* Dresden, '98; 53 pp.

PFLUGK-HARTTUNG, J. v. Drei rheinische Papsturkunden, 1147–1152. *Arch. d. Gesellsch. f. ältere deu. Gesch.-Kunde*, XXIV., no. 1.

——— Unechte Urkunden des Johanniter-

ordens aus dem 12. u. 13. Jahrhundert. *Forschg. z. Brandenb. u. Preuss. Gesch.*, XI., no. 2.

POIDEBARD, A. Indices de christianisme dans les inscriptions trouvées à Trion en 1885 d'après des travaux récents. *UC.*, S., '98, 5–18.

POSTINA, A. Ein ungedruckter Text d. *vita* d. hl. Arbogast, Bischofs von Strassburg. *RQ.*, '98, 299–305.

RAMSAY, W. M. The Greek of the Early Church and the Pagan Ritual. *ET.*, O., N., & D., '98; Ja., F., '99; 9–13, 54–9, 107–11, 157–60, 208–10.

RENAUDIN, P. La littérature chrétienne de l'Égypte. *UC.*, '99, 15 Ja., 31–56.

SAGIĆ. Evangelium Dobromiri. Ein altmacedonisches Denkmal der kirchenslavischen Sprache d. 12. Jahrhunderts. Grammatisch u. krit. beleuchtet. *SA.*, Wien, phil.-hist. Classe, CXXXVIII., '97.

SCHENKL, H. Bibliotheca patrum Latinorum Britannica X. *SA.*, Wien, CXXXIX., '98.

SCHLIER, O. Die Thomasianischen Episteln. Ein Beitrag z. Einführg in dieselben. Lichtenfels: H. O. Schulze, '98; xi, 420 pp. M. 5.40.

STEARNS, W. N. A Manual of Patrology. With an introd. by J. H. THAYER. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xviii, 176 pp. $1.50.

TALMA, A. S. E. De oudste tractaten van Augustinus, IV. *ThSt.*, '98, 361–419.

Texte u. Untersuchgn. z. Gesch. der altchristl. Literatur. Hrsg v. O. VON GEBHARDT u. A. HARNACK. Neue Folge, II., Heft 3*a*, 3*b* u. 4; III., Heft 1 u. 2. L.: Hinrichs, '98–'99.

3*a*. STEINDORFF, GEO. Die Apocalypse d. Elias, eine unbekannte Apokalypse u. Bruchstücke der Sophonias-Apokalypse. Koptische Texte, Uebersetzg., Glossar. viii, 190 pp. mit 1 Doppeltafel in Lichtdruck. M. 6.50.—3*b*. WOBBERMIN, G. Altchristliche liturgische Stücke aus der Kirche Aegyptens, nebst e. dogmatischen Brief d. Bischofs Serapion v. Thmuis. —JEEP, L. Zur Ueberlieferung d. Philostorgius. 36 & 33 pp. M. 2.—4. GOLTZ, E. v. DER. Eine textkritische Arbeit des 10. bezw. 6. Jahrhdrts., hrsg. nach e. Kodex des Athosklosters Lawra. Mit e. Doppeltaf. in Lichtdr. v, 116 pp. M. 4.50. III. 1 & 2. DOBSCHÜTZ, E. v. Christusbilder. Untersuchungen z. christl. Legende. 1. Hälfte. Darstellung u. Belege. viii, ii, 294 & 335 pp. M. 20.

WEYMAN, C. Notes de littérature chrétienne. *RHLR.*, '98, 562–5; '99, 93–6.

CHRISTIAN ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BONHOFF, C. Aus Geschichte u. Kunst d. Christentums. *PrM.*, D., '98, 480–83.

BROUSSOLLE. L'art religieux aux salons de 1898. *UC.*, S., '98, 55–75.

——— La critique mystique et Fra Angelico. *Ibid.*, N., '98, 384–408.

BÜRKNER, R. Neues über d. protest. Kirchenbau. *MGkK.*, III., S., '98, 214–18.

BÜTTGENBACH, FRZ. Die kirchl. Kunst in Monographien, Skizzen und Kunstbildern. Aachen: Schweizer, '98; x, 204 pp. M. 20.

Church of the Holy Sepulchre. *Ind.*, 15 D., '98.

GINON, G. La sculpture Florentine au XIV^e^ siècle. *UC.*, D., '98, 578–93.

GLÖTZLE, L., UND A. KNÖPFLER. Das Vaterunser, im Geiste d. griechischen Evangelien-Handschrift in Rossano. L.: Giesecke & Devrient, '98; xvi, 154 pp., 14 ill. in text and 15 heliotype plates. M. 32.

HARTMANN, M. Der Muristan von 800–1500. *M&NDP-V.*, '98, 65–72.

KÜCHENTHAL, P. Die Mutter Gottes in der altdeutschen schönen Litteratur bis zu Ende des 13. Jahrh. Ein Beitrag z. deutschen Kulturgeschichte. L.: Fock, '98; 60 pp. M. 1.20.

LEVY, C. H. James Tissot and his Work. *Ou.*, 17 D., '98.

——— The Life of Jesus as Illustrated by James J. Tissot. *BW.*, F., '99, 69–78.

LUSCHAN, v. Die angebliche "Kreuzigg. Christi" im Palaste des Tiberius. *Globus*, Bd. 74, nos. 20/21.

MUNTZ, E. Leonardo Da Vinci; artist, thinker, and man of science; from the French. N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's, '98; 2 vols., ill. $15 *net*.

MUSSAFIA. Studien zu den mittelalterlichen Marien-Legenden. V. *SA.*, Wien, CXXXIX., '98.

SABATIER, A. Les portraits du Christ. *RChr.*, F., '99.

SIEBOURG, M. Ein gnostisches Goldamulet aus Gellep. (Mit Taf. u. Figur.) *Bonner Jahrbuch*, Heft 103.

STUHLFAUTH, G. Kritik einer Kritik. Ein kl. Beitrag z. christl. Archaeologie. L.: Fock, '99; 14 pp. M. 0.50.

V., H. Une église à Oumm er Rous. *RB.*, '98, 611–15.

WILPERT, J. Die Gewandg. d. Christen in d. ersten Jahrhunderten. Vornehmlich nach den Katakomben-Malereien dargestellt. Mit 22 Abbildgn. Köln: Bachem, '99; vi, 58 pp. M. 2.

ZIMMERMANN, TH. Der Christuskopf zu Kyburg. (Schluss.) *ChrK.*, '98, D.

C. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

Beiträge z. sächsischen Kirchengeschichte, hrsg. v. F. DIBELIUS u. TH. BRIEGER. 13. Heft (1898). L.: Barth, '99; iii, 220 pp. M. 3.50.

BLANCKMEISTER, F. Sächsische Kirchengeschichte. Dresden: F. Sturm, '98; x, 452 pp. M. 4.

BRUNING, H. H. Dust of Archives — a contribution to the history of French Protestantism. Translated from the French of LE TEMORGAGNE. *LChR.*, O., '98, 670–74.

CLIFFORD, J. Typical Christian Leaders. Lo.: H. Marshall, '98; 292 pp. 3s. 6d.

EHRHARD, A. Stellg. u. Aufgabe der Kirchengesch. in der Gegenwart. St.: Roth, '98; 42 pp. M. 1.

EYSENBLÄTTER, H. Die Klöster der Augustiner-Eremiten im Nordosten Deutschlands (Neumark, Pommern, Preussen). *Altpreuss. Monatsschr.*, Bd. 35, H. 5–6.

GEHRING, J. Die Sekten der russischen Kirche (1003–1897): Nach ihrem Ursprunge u. inneren Zusammenhange dargestellt. L.: Richter, '98; xii, 240 pp. M. 5.

GELZER, H. Sextus Julius Africanus u. d. byzantinische Chronographie. 2 Thl. 2. Abth. Nachträge. L.: Hinrichs, '98; iii, 247–500 pp. M. 2; complete, M. 12.

HOLME, L. R. The Extinction of the Christian Churches in North Africa. *Hulsean Prize Essay*, 1895. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; vi, 263 pp. $1.25.

NYE, G. H. F. Church History for the People: a reply. *CR.*, O., '98.
See J. H. ROUND'S answer: Church Defence; *ibid.*, N., '98.

SOHM, R. Kirchengesch. im Grundriss. 11. Aufl. L.: Ungleich, '98; viii, 218 pp. M. 3; bd., M. 4.

THOMA, A. Geschichte des Klosters Frauenalb. Ein Beitrag z. Kulturgesch. vor 7 Jahrhunderten. F.: Waetzel, '98; iii, 104 pp. u. 1 illustr. M. 1.60.

THE EARLY PERIOD.

ALLARD, P. L'épiscopat de Saint-Basile. *R. Quest. hist.*, Ja., '99, 31–56.

BENDER, D. Untersuchungen üb. Nemesius von Emesa. L., '98; 99 pp.

BERLIÈRE, U. Le cénobitisme pakhômien. *RBd.*, '98, 385–99.

BRATKE. Der Presbyter Johannes. *Theol. Litbl.*, '98, no. 50.

BRIGHT, W. Some Aspects of Primitive Church Life. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; vi, 268 pp. $1.75.

GEPPERT, FRZ. Die Quellen d. Kirchenhistorikers Socrates Scholasticus. L.: Dieterich, '98; 134 pp. M. 3.
Vol. III., no. 4, of: Studien z. Geschichte der Theologie u. der Kirche, hrsg. v. N. BONWETSCH u. R. SEEBERG.

GRÖSSLER, H. Der Sturz d. thüringischen Königreichs im Jahre 531 n. Chr. *Z. des Ver. f. Thüring. Gesch.*, XI., 1.

HEADLAM, A.C. Methods of Early Church History. *Engl. Hist. Rev.*, '99, 1–31.

Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. Hrsg. v. KNÖPFLER, SCHRÖRS, SDRALEK. IV., 3. Münster: Schöningh, '98.
3. BRAUN, O. De sancta Nicaena synodo. Syrische Texte des Maruta v. Maipherkat nach einer Handschrift der Propaganda zu Rom übersetzt. 128 pp. M. 2; Einzelpr. M. 2.80.

NES, H. M. VAN. De Eeuw der Overwinning. Bladzijden uit de kerkgeschiedenis der vierde eeuw. Rotterdam: Wenth & Birkhoff, '98.

ORR, J. Neglected Factors in the Study of the Early Progress of Christianity. *Morgan Lectures.* Lo.: Hodder; N. Y.: Armstrong, '99; ii, 235 pp. 1.50.

SCHLADEBACH, J. Basilius von Ancyra. Eine historisch-philosophische Studie *ID.* L., '98; 112 pp.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

BERGER, J. B. Die Einführg. d. Christenthums in den deutschen Ländern. Hrsg. v. der St. Josef-Bücherbruderschaft. Klagenfurt: A. Raunecker, '98; viii, 264 pp. u. 20 illustr. M. 1.

BRIGANTI, A. Il beato Egidio d'Assisi. Napoli: D'Auria, '98; 364 pp. L. 2.

CHARMASSE, A. DE. L'église d'Autun pendant la guerre de Cent-Ans (1358–1378). Autun: Dejussieu, '98; 137 pp.

CUTTS, E. L. Parish Priests and Their People in the Middle Ages in England. Lo.: SPCK., '98; 598 pp. 7s. 6d.

DEMEULDRE, P. Frère Jean Angeli; épisode des conflits entre le clergé séculier et le clergé régulier à Tournai. (1482–83). *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. royale de Belgique*, 5e bulletin.

ERNST, V. Die Biberacher Kirche vor der Reformation. *Württb. Vierteljahrsh. f. Landesgesch.*, VII.

EUBEL. Der vom Grafen Wilhelm von Jülich am 30. Januar 1332 dem Papste Johann XXII. geleistete Treueid. *Hist. Jahrb. d. Görres-Gesellsch.*, XIX., no. 3.

FICKER, G. A. Hauck's Kirchengesch. Deutschlands. *ThR.*, I., 579–89.

FRÉDERICQ, P. De secten der Geselaars en der Dansers in de Nederlanden tydens der 14 eeuw. *Mém. de l'académ. des sciences de Belgique*, T. LIII.; '98.

GLOSSNER, M. Savonarola als Apologet u. Philosoph. Eine philosophiegesch. Studie. Paderborn: Schöningh, '98; 124 pp. M. 2.60.
IV. Ergänzungsheft zu *Jahrb. f. Philosophie u. spekulat. Theologie.*

GRAUERT. Nikolaus II. Papstwahldekret und Simonieverbot. *Hist. Jahrb. d. Görres-Gesellsch.*, XIX., no. 4.

GRISAR, H. Geschichte Roms u. der Päpste im Mittelalter. Mit besonderer Berücksichtigg. v. Cultur u. Kunst nach Quellen dargestellt. (In 6 Bdn.) 1. Bd.: Rom beim Ausgang der antiken Welt. Nach d. schriftl. Quellen u. den Monumenten. Mit vielen histor. Abbildgn. u. Plänen. In 15 Lfgn. Lfg. 1 (x, 1–64 pp.). Fr.: Herder, '98. M. 1.60.

GUNDLACH, F. Hessen u. die Mainzer Stiftsfehde 1461–1463. *ID.* Marburg, '98; 62 pp.

GUTJAHR, F. S. Petrus Cantor Parisiensis. Sein Leben u. seine Schriften. Ein Beitrag zur Litteratur- u. Gelehrtengeschichte des 12. Jahrh. Auf Grund d. Nachlasses von Prof. Dr. O. Schmid bearb. Graz, Styria, '98; v, 72 pp. M. 1.80.

HACKE, C. B., GRAF V. Die Palliumverleihgn. bis 1143. Eine diplomatisch-hist. Untersuchung. Marburg: Elwert, '98; iv, 154 pp. M. 3.

HAUCK, A. Friedrich Barbarossa als Kirchenpolitiker. Rektoratsrede. L.: Edelmann, '98; 24 pp. M. 1.

HÉBERT, P. Un archevêque au XII^e^ siècle: Hugues III. d'Amiens, 1113–64. Besançon: Jacquin, '98; 47 pp.

HÜFFER, G. Korveier Studien. Quellenkritische Untersuchgn. z. Karolinger-Geschichte. Münster: Aschendorff, '98; x, 232 pp. M. 5.

KUNZE, P. Einiges über Tauler's Predigt, mit besonderem Hinweis auf Luther u. die Reformation. *Manch. Gaben u. Ein Geist*, 38. Bd., Heft 2 u. 3.

LANE-POOLE, S. Saladin and the Fall of the Kingdom of Jerusalem. N. Y.: Putnam's, '98; xxiv, 416 pp., ill., map.
Heroes of the Nations ser., no. 24. $1.50.

LÜHE, W. Hugo von Die und Lyon, Legat v. Gallien. *ID.* Br., '98; 169 pp.

MERCIER, J. By the King and Queen: a story of the dawn of religion in Britain. Lo.: Mowbray, '98; 150 pp. 2s.

MORIN, G. Walfroy et Wulphy. Note sur l'identité possible de deux personages. *Anal. Bolland.*, XVII., 307–13.

PAULSEN, P. Thomas à Kempis, sein Leben u. seine Schriften, vornehmlich die "Nachfolge Christi." L.: Ungleich, '98; 58 pp. M. 0.80.

Pauvres Dames, Les, de l'ordre de Sainte-Claire, ou les Clarisses, dans la cité lyonnaise, 1269–1501 et 1598–1898. Lyon: Paquet, '98; xx, 252 pp. & photogr.

PIERSON, A. T. Catharine of Siena; an ancient lay preacher: a story of sanctified womanhood and power in prayer. N. Y.: Funk & W., '98; 68 pp. $0.50.

RAWNSLEY, H. D. With Paul Sabatier at Assisi. *CR.*, O., '98, 505–18.

SANDER, F. Germania Sacra. *BAZ.*, 19. Ag., '98.
Willkomm für ALBERT HAUCK'S *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, II. Aufl.

SCHAEPMAN, H. J. St. Thomas van Aquino. Drie voorlezingen. Utrecht: J. R. van Roesum, '98; 103 pp. f. 1.

SCHIRMER. Militsch von Kremsier, der Vorläufer des Reformators Johannes Hus. *ITh.R.*, '99, 142–4.

SCHNEIDER. Das Kloster Weissenau in der Zeit Ludwigs des Baiern. *Württb. Vierteljahrsh. f. Landesgesch.*, VII.

SCHÖNGEN, M. Die Schule von Zwolle von ihren Anfängen bis zu dem Auftreten des Humanismus. *ID.* F., '98; ' pp.

SPECTATOR. Dritter, vierter u. fünfter Brief zur Centenariumsfeier Savonarola's. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 196, 222, 248.
= Kirchenpolitische Briefe, XXXIX., XL., XLI.

VERNET, F. Saint François d'Assise intime. *UC.*, N., D., '98, 321–40, 554–77.

Vie de saint Bruno, fondateur de l'ordre des Chartreux; par un religieux de la Grande Chartreuse. Montreuil-sur-Mer: Arnauné, '98; xvi, 684 pp.

Vita S. Alberti confessoris ordinis Carmelitarum. *Anal. Bolland.*, XVII., 317–36.

WORKMAN, H. B. The Church of the West in the Middle Ages. Vol. 1: From Gregory the Great to St. Bernard. Lo.: Kelly, '98; 328 pp. 2s. 6d.
Books for Bible Students.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

ALBRECHT, P. Eine Antwort Luthers vom 29. Aug. 1540 und ihre Veranlassung. *StKr.*, '98, 99–108.

Aus d. Zeit der Reformation. Vorträge. Festschrift z. Honterusfeier. Kronstadt: Zeidner, '98; ix, 435 pp. M. 3.

BETTINGHAUS, W. Z. Heimathskunde des Lüneburger Landes mit besond. Berücksicht. d. Klosters u. d. Gemeinde Wienhausen. II. Thl.: Von der Reformation bis zum Jahre 1855. Celle: Schulze, '98; 95 pp. M. 1.25.

BUCHWALD, G. Zu Luthers Briefwechsel. *StKr.*, '99, 108–18.

——— Luthers "Exhortationes post concionem." *Ibid.*, '99, 118–35.

BURKHARDT, P. Die Basler Täufer. Ein Beitrag z. schweiz. Reformationsgesch. Basel: Reich, '98; xi, 125 pp. M. 2.

DOSKER, H. E. John of Barneveldt, Martyr or Traitor. (Concl.) *PRR.*, '99, 120–39.

DOUMERGUE, E. Calvin le fondateur des libertés modernes. *RThQR.*, '98, 685–713.

EHSES, ST. Franz I. von Frankreich u. d. Konzilsfrage z. d. Jahren 1536–1539. *RQ.*, '98, 306–23.

FISCHER, E. Luthers 95 Thesen in neuer Beleuchtung. *KM.*, '99, no. 4.

Flugschriften aus der Reformationszeit. Hl.: Niemeyer, '99.
XIII. MURNER, TH.: An den grossmächtigsten u. durchlauchtigsten Adel deutscher Nation, 1520, hrsg. v. E. VOSS.— XIV. CRONBERG, H. v.: Schriften, hrsg. von E. KÜCK. = Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des XVI. u. XVII. Jahrh., no. 153–6. iv, 57; lix, 160 pp. and 1 facs. à M. 0.60.

FREYTAG, H. Die Beziehgn. Danzigs zu Wittenberg in der Zeit d. Reformation. *Z. Westpr. Gesch.-Ver.*, XXXVIII.

GÖRIGK, E. Die Einführg. d. Protestantismus in Hildesheim. *Kath.*, D., '98.

HÄBLER, K. Die Stellg. d. Fugger zum Kirchenstreite d. 16. Jhs. *Hist. Vierteljahrschr.*, '98, 473–510.

HARNACK. Die Bedeutg. d. Reformation innerh. d. allg. Religionsgesch. *ChrW.*, '99, nos. 1 f.

HAVE, J. VAN DER. Filips van Marnix van Sint Aldegonde. Utrecht: Kemink & Zoon, '98. fl. 0.35.

JOLY, H. Saint Ignace de Loyola. P.: Lecoffre, '99; vii, 230 pp. f. 2.

KEISER, G. Herleving van de studiën over Calvijn eude Fransch-Zwitscherse reformatie. *Tjdschr. v. geref. Theol.*, VI., 4, 213–41.

KÖHLER, W. Ein neuer Lutherbrief aus dem Jahre 1521. *StKr.*, '99, 135–9.

——— Eine Notiz aus Spalatins Briefen vom Jahre 1519. *Ibid.*, '99, 140–47.

KÖNNECKE, M. Die evgl. Kirchenvisitationen d. 16. Jahrhdts. in der Grafschaft Mansfeld. *Mansfelder Blätter*, XII.

KORODI, L. Die Honterus-Jubelfeier u. die sächsischen Vereinstage in Kronstadt, 19–23, VIII, 1898. Ein Festbericht. Kronstadt: Zeidner, '98; 114 pp. M. 1.

LAW, T. G. (edit.). Archpriest Controversy: documents relating to the dissensions of the Roman Catholic clergy, 1597–1602. Vol. II. N. Y. & Lo.: Longmans, Green & Co., '98. 10s.

MACKEY. St. Francis de Sales and the Formation of the Clergy. *AER.*, N., '98, 449–63.

MAILHET, A. Noël pendant les guerres de religion (1574, etc.). *RChr.*, '99, 36–47.

ROGGE, B. Illustrirte Geschichte der Reformation in Deutschland. Volkstümlich dargestellt. Dresden: Blasewitz, '98; xix, 527 pp. M. 8.25.

RUBENSOHN, M. Wolfgang Hunger, ein antiklerikaler Freisinger Kanzler aus d. Reformationszeit. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 243.

SCHLING, E. Die Kirchengesetzgebung unter Moritz von Sachsen 1544–1549, u. Georg von Anhalt. L.: Deichert, '98; v, 222 pp. M. 3.60.

Schriften des Vereins f. Reformationsgeschichte. Hl.: Niemeyer, '98. à M. 1.20.
59. KALKOFF, P. Briefe, Depeschen u. Berichte üb. Luther vom Wormser Reichstage 1521. Aus d. Engl., Ital. u. Span. übers. u. erläutert. viii, 95 pp.— 60. ROTH, F. Der Einfluss des Humanismus u. d. Reformation auf das gleichzeitige Erziehgs.- u. Schulwesen bis in d. ersten Jahrzehnte nach Melanchthons Tod. v, 106 pp.— 61. KAWERAU, G. Hieronymus Emser. Ein Lebensbild aus der Reformationsgeschichte, 132 pp. u. 1 Illustration.— 62. BAHLOW, F. Johann Knipstro, der erste Generalsuperintendent v. Pommern-Wolgast. S. Leben u. Wirken, aus Anlass seines 400-jähr. Geburtstages dargestellt. 75 pp. M. 1.20.— 63. KOLDE, TH. Das religiöse Leben in Erfurt beim Ausgange des Mittelalters. Ein Beitrag zur Vorgeschichte der Reformation. iii, 68 pp.

SCHUBART, F. W. Martin Luthers Name. *NkZ.*, '98, 1004–23.

SIMON, D. W. Johannes Mathesius. Ein Lebensbild aus der Reformationszeit. *LChR.*, O., '98, 688–95.

THEOPOLD, E. Die Reformation in Lippe 1500–1684. Lage: Welchert, '98; 44 pp. M. 0.50.

ZENDRINI, P. Italienische Protestanten aus dem 16. Jahrhundert. *BAZ.*, '98, nos. 231, 232.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

BACHELET, X.-M. LE. La question liguorienne. *Et.*, 5 & 20 Ja., '99, 65–82, 196–216.

BESSE, J. M. Dom Fonteneau, bénédictin de la congrégation de Saint-Maur, 1705–78. (Suite et fin.) *RBd.*, O., '98.

BLANCHET, J. P. G. Le clergé charentais pendant la révolution. Angoulême: Despujols, '98; 627 pp.

BLOESCH, E. Geschichte d. schweizerisch-reformierten Kirchen. Bd. I. Bern: Schmid & Francke, '98; iii, 500 pp. M. 9.

BURTON, J. B. The Scourge of God: a romance of religious persecution. N. Y.: Appleton, '98; vi, 321 pp. $1.

CAUCHIE, A. La Paix de Clément IX. (1668–69). I.: État de la question et bibliographie. *RHLR.*, '98, 481–501.

COURSON, R. DE. La persécution des catholiques en Angleterre. Un complot sous Charles II. P.: Firmin-Didot, '98; xii, 311 pp.

DELAPORTE, V. Une religieuse enseignante au lendemain de la révolution.—La fondatrice des *viseaux* (Mère Marie-Euphrasie). *Et.*, 5 & 20 N., '98, 312–37, 464–82.

DOUWEN, W. J. VAN. Socinianen en doopsgezinden, 1559–1626. Leiden: Doesburgh, '98; iv, 168 pp. fl. 1.50.

FILSJEAN, P. Antoine-Pierre 1er de Grammont, archevêque de Besançon (1615–1698): sa vie et son épiscopat. Besançon: Lanquetin-Tubergue, '98; ix, 256 pp., portr. & map.

GEE, H. Elizabethan Clergy and the Settlement of Religion, 1558–1564. Illustr., documents and lists. Lo. & N. Y.: Frowde, '98; 346 pp. 10s. 6d.

Geschichtsblätter des deutschen Hugenotten-Vereins. VII. Zehnt. 6.–10. Heft. Magdeburg: Heinrichshofen, '98.
6, 7. PARET: Gesch. d. reformirten Gemeinde Canstatt, Württemberg. 65 pp. M. 1.30.— 8. BONET-MAURY, G. D. französische reformirte Kirche zu Emmerich. 16 pp. M. 0.50.— 9. SCHÖTTLER, A. Die französische Kolonie in Münchberg. 19 pp. M. 0.40.— 10. TOLLIN, P. Urkunden zur Geschichte hugenottischer Gemeinden in Deutschland u. Register. v, 59 pp. M. 1.20.

HULL, W. The Lutheran Church in the Courts. Case of a New York congregation and its pastor. *LChR.*, '99, 35–41.

JACOBI, F. Das Thorner Blutgericht 1724 in polnisch-katholischer Auffassung. *Z. d. hist. Vereins f. d. Reg.-Bez. Marienwerder*, XXXVI.

JACOBS, ED. Johann Liborius Zimmermann u. d. pietistische Bewegg. in Wernigerode. *Z. d. Harz-Vereins*, XXXI.

Jesuit (The) Relations and Allied Documents: travels and explorations of the Jesuit missionaries in New France, 1610–1791. The original French, Latin, and Italian texts, with English translations and notes; edited by R. G. THWAITES. (In about 60 vols.) Vols. 21–34. Cleveland: Burrows Bros., '98. Each vol. $3.50 *net.*

JOYCE, G. C. Bishop Bull and the "Defensio Fidei Nicenæ." *IThR.*, '99, 95–103.

LEITNER, F. B. Leben des hl. Johannes Baptista de Rossi, Kanonikus zu St. Maria in Cosmedin in Rom. Regensburg: Nationale Verlagsanstalt, '98; viii, 358 pp. & 2 plates. M. 3.

LOSERTH, J. Die Gegenreformation in Salzburg unter dem Erzbischof Max Sittich, Grafen von Hohenembs (1612–14). Nach den Akten des Geh. Haus-, Hof- u. Staatsarchivs. *Mitth. d. Instituts f. österr. Gesch.-Forschg.*, '98, 676–96.

MICHAUD, E. La "Défense de l'église romaine" par Brébeuf (1664). *IThR.*, '99, 152–6.

MICHELINI, A. La teoria socialistica di un abate del secolo XVIII. Torino: Fratelli Bocca, '98; 100 pp. L. 1.50.

MOURRET, F. La vénérable Marie Rivier, fondatrice des sœurs de la Présentation de Marie de Bourg-Saint-Andéol (Ardèche) 1768–1838. Bruxelles: Brouwer, '98; xx, 463 pp. f. 5.

PRINSEN, J. Lz., J. Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus. Bijdrage tot de kennis van zijn leven. Gravenhage: M. Nijhoff, '98; iv, 155 pp. f. 2.25.

RABAUD, C. L'édit de Nantes et l'édit de Fontainebleau. *RChr.*, D., '98.

RICHTER, J. Aus dem kirchlichen u. Missionsleben Englands u. Schottlands. B.: Warneck, '98; 128 pp. M. 1.50.

SPENCE, H. D. M. The Church of England: a history for the people. Vol. 4: The Anglican Church. N. Y. & Lo.: Cassell, '98; 488 pp. 6s.

STOCK, ST. GEO. The Diary of the Bishop of Killalla, 1798. *FR.*, D., '98, 984–1001.

WHITE, F. O. Lives of the Elizabethan Bishops of the Anglican Church. Lo.: Skeffington, '98; 436 pp. 10s. 6d.

WOLF, G. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation. 1. Bd. 3. Abtlg. B.: Seehagen, '99; xvi, 509–789 pp. M. 9.

WOOD, M. The Story of a Saintly Bishop's Life: Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester, 1555–1626. N. Y. & Lo.: Longmans, '98; vi, 30 pp. $0.50.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

ABBOTT, L. Henry Drummond. *Ou.*, 28 Ja., '99.

APPEL, TH. The Life of Philip Schaff. *RChR.*, '99, 90–110.

BARAUD, A. Chrétiens et hommes célèbres au XIX^e siècle. 3^e série. Tours: Mame et fils, '98.

BARRIER, G. Un ami de Rome et du Pape au XIX^e siècle: Mgr. H. Sauvé, prélat de la maison de Sa Sainteté. 2 vols. P.: Lecoffre, '98. f. 12.

BEYSCHLAG, W. Aus meinem Leben. 2. Thl.: Erinnergn. u. Erfahrgn. d. reiferen Jahre. Hl.: Strien, '98–'99; vii, 723 pp. M. 10.

Bilder aus d. evang.-prot. Landeskirche des Grossherzogt. Baden. V. Heidelberg: Ev. Verlag, '98.

HOLTZMANN, H. J. Richard Rothe. Nebst 3 Beilagen (Rothe, Der Kampf zw. Glauben u. Unglauben an Jesum in den Herzen der Kinder unserer Zeit; Ueber kirchl. Lehrfreiheit; Durch welche Mittel können die der Kirche entfremdeten Glieder ihr wiedergewonnen werden ?). 48 pp. M. 0.80.

CHRÉTIEN, A. Une correspondance inédite de Lamennais. *IThR.*, '98, 812–20.

DELFOUR. Un Lamennais inconnu. *UC.*, S., '98, 19–38.

FRIEDRICH, J. Ignaz von Döllinger. Sein Leben, auf Grund des handschriftl. Nachlasses bearbeitet. 1. Teil, 1799–1837. M.: Beck, '98; x, 506 pp. M. 8.

See L. K. GOETZ in *BAZ.*, '98, no. 261.

GAILLARD, J. John Cougnard, professeur de théologie à l'Université de Genève 1821–1896. Notice biographique avec un portrait. P.: Fischbacher, '98. f. 1.50.

GOETZ, L. K. Leo XIII. Seine Studien- 18, no. 228.

HÖNIG, W. Richard Rothe. Sein Charakter, Leben u. Denken. Zur Feier seines 100. Geburtstages dargestellt. B.: Schwetschke, '98; vi, 227 pp. & 1 photo. M. 2.

HORTON, R. F. Robert William Dale. *CR.*, Ja., '99.

JOHNSTON, W. R. W. Dale. *ET.*, Ja., '99, 152–6.

KUYLENSTIERNA, O. Sören Kierkegaard, tänkaren och sanningssökaren. Stockholm: Bonnier, '98; 143 pp. Kr. 1.75.

LANGSDORFF, W. v. Adolph von Harless. Ein kirchl. Charakterbild. L.: Richter, '98; 175 pp. & 1 illustr. M. 5.

LAUCHERT, FR. Franz Anton Staudenmaier. (Schluss.) *IThR.*, '99, 115–41.

LECANUET, R. P. Montalembert. Tome II. La liberté d'enseignement (1835–50). P.: Poussielgue, '98; xi, 519 pp., & photo.

L'église catholique à la fin du XIX^e siècle. Livr. 1 et 2. Rome, '98. à f. 1.20.

LEITHOLD, F. Erinnerungen aus meinem Diakonissenleben. Nach ihren Aufzeichngn. bearb. von LOUISE FREIFRAU v. KETELHODT. L.: Deichert, '98; iv, 411 pp. & one plan. M. 5.

LÉMOUR, P. Une canonnière française dans le fleuve bleu. *Et.*, 5 & 20 N., 5 D., '98, 338–67, 483–95, 629–50.

MONSER, J. W. Canon Liddon. *ChrQ.*, '99, 64–73.

MÜLLER, F. M. Dean Liddell: as I knew him. *FR.*, Ja., '99.

QUIÉVREUX, C. Le paganisme au XIX^e siècle. 3^e vol. Le paganisme moderne; la morale néo-païenne. P.: Retaux, '98; xv, 378 pp.

ROSENBERG, P. A. Søren Kierkegaard; hans Liv, hans Personlighed og hans Forfatterskab. En Vejledning til Studiet af hans Værker. København: Schønberg, '98; 212 pp. Kr. 3.

[illegible] McClure, '98; 520 pp.

WENLEY, R. M. John Caird. '98, 619–37.

ZÖCKLER, O. Ein A. H. Francke des 19. Jahrhdts. *BG.*, O., '98, 385–94.

Georg Müller, Prediger u. Waisenhausvater in Bristol.

D. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

CHADWICK, J. W. Religious Ideals and Religious Unity. *NW.*, D., '98, 637–48.

HOLTZMANN, H. J. R. Rothe's Speculatives System. F.: Mohr, '98; xii, 269 pp. M. 5.60.

WOBBERMIN, G. Grundprobleme d. systemat. Theologie. B.: Duncker, '99; 43 pp. M. 1.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus. G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '98; x, 123 pp. M. 3.

KUTTER, H. Zur Entstehg. u. Bedeutg. d. christl. Dogmas. *ZSchw.*, '98, 213–17.

LINDSAY, J. Friedrich Daniel Ernst Schleiermacher: the representative theologian of the nineteenth century. *PRR.*, '99, 58–69.

MACKINTOSH, H. R. The Ritschlian Doctrine of Theoretical and Practical Knowledge. *AJTh.*, III., 22–44.

MARTIN, J.-B. Une manifestation théologique d'église de Lyon; l'adoptianisme et les archevêques Leidrat et Agobard. *UC.*, D., '98, 594–602.

SCHAUB, F. Die Eigentumslehre nach Thomas v. Aquin u. dem modernen Sozialismus mit besond. Berücksichtigg. der beiderseitigen Weltanschauungen. Gekrönte Preisschrift. F.: Herder, '98; xxiv, 446 pp. M. 6.

TURMEL, J. Histoire de l'angélologie des temps apostoliques à la fin du V^e^ siècle. 3^e^ art. *RHLR.*, '98, 533–52.

APOLOGETICS.

GREENE, W. B, The Metaphysics of Christian Apologetics. V.: Immortality. *PRR.*, '99, 25–57.

LÖBER, R. Wie Bruchstücke der Wahrheit in Irrtümer und Thorheiten sich verwandeln. *NkZ.*, '99, 44–91.

NIEBERGALL, FR. Die Wahrheit des Christentums. *ZThK.*, '98, 435–67.

ZÖCKLER, O. Dogmatik u. Apologetik in Wechselwirkg. *BG.*, Ja., '99, 32–7.

POLEMICS.

BLUMENTHAL, H. Der principielle Unterschied zw. d. ev. u. röm.-kath. Ethik. Hl.: Kaemmerer, '98; 23 pp. M. 0.60.

BUNKOFER, W. "Ex cathedra." Ernste christliche Gedanken über Roms Unrecht auf dem Lehrstuhl. Denkenden Christen gewidmet. Wertheim: E. Buchheim Nachf., '98; 48 pp. M. 0.40.

FEYERABEND, K. Katholizismus u. Protestantismus als Fortschrittsmächte. 76 pp. M. 1.20.
No. 172 of: Zeitfragen d. christl. Volkslebens; hrsg. v. E. FRHR. V. UNGERN-STERNBERG u. TH. WAHL. 23. Bd. 4. Heft. St.: Belser.

GOUGH, E. Spiritual Christianity *versus* Romanist, Anglican and Free Church Priestcraft. Lo.: Gay, '98. 2s. 6d.

HAPPEL, O. Katholisches u. protestantisches Christentum nach d. Auffassg. der alten katholischen Polemik, insbesondere des Martinus Becanus. Würzburg: Goebel, '98; 103 pp. M. 1.50.

SCHOELLER, R. Der Katholizismus als Prinzip d. Rückschrittes f. das Christentum u. d. Staat, sowie als Hemnis f. die Vernunft u. d. Wahrheitsgefühl. III., IV. *ZSchw.*, '98, 143–60, 193–212.

SYMBOLICS.

BESTMANN. Die 3 ökumen. Bekenntnisse. *Chr. Herold*, '98, no. 23.

GREEN, S. G. Christian Creed and the Creeds of Christendom. 7 lectures at Regent's Park College (*Angus Lectures, 1898*). N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xviii, 347 pp. $1.75.

KOELLING. Symbolische Darstellung d. Fundamentalartikel. *EKZ.*, '98, nos. 49, 50.

SMALL, C. H. Corner-Stones of Faith; or, The Origin and Characteristics of the Christian Denominations of the U. S. N. Y.: Treat & C., '98; 500 pp. $2.

STIMSON, H. A. The Apostles' Creed in the Light of Modern Discussion. Bo.: Pilgrim Press, '99; xii, 362 pp. $1.50.

DOGMATICS.

ABBOTT, L. Unconscious Following of Christ. *Ou.*, 24 D., '98.

——— God's Glory in Christ's Face. *Ibid.*, 31 Dec., '98.

——— The Spiritual Foundations of Faith. *Ibid.*, 28 Ja., '99.

ADENEY, W. F. The Transcendental Element in the Consciousness of Christ. *AJTh.*, III., 99–107.

BOIS, H. L'éternité de Dieu. *RThQR.*, '98, 714–34.

CLEMEN, C. Der Ursprung d. hl. Abendmahls. F.: Mohr, '98; 36 pp. M. 0.60.
Hefte zur *Christl. Welt*, no. 37.

CREMER, H. The Christian Doctrine of the Attributes of God. *LChR.*, '99, 94–101.

——— Wesen u. Wirken der Taufgnade. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; 20 pp. M. 0.30.

DAUBANTON, F. E. Het voortbestaan van het menschelijk geslacht, etc. V. *ThSt.*, '99, 1–19.

EMERY, L. Le miracle et le surnaturel. *RThPh.*, '98, 533–71.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. The Atonement. *IER.*, Ja., '99, 360–67.

FORNEROD, A. Péché et évolution. *RThPh.*, '99, 48–73.

FOSTER, R. V. Systematic Theology. Nashville: Cumberland Presbyterian Pub. House, '98; xxii, 868 pp. $3.50.

GIFFORD, W. The Fatherhood of God. *ET.*, Ja., '99, 188.

HÄRING, TH. Gäbe es Gewissheit des christl. Glaubens, wenn es geschichtl. Gewissh. von der Ungeschichtlichk. der Geschichte Jesu Christi gäbe? Mit besonderer Bezugnahme auf die Auferstehung. *ZThK.*, '98, 468–93.

HODGSON, J. M. Theologia pectoris. Outline of religious faith and doctrines

founded on intuition and experience. N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's, '98; 207 pp. $1.50.

JOYCE, J. A. On the Holy Trinity. *IER.*, Ja., '99, 300–313.

KIPP, J. Die Lehre v. d. heiligen Taufe. *KZ.*, II., 1 & 2.

KÖLLING. Die Trinitätslehre. *EKZ.*, '99, nos. 1 ff.

LILLEY, J. P. O Deus, ego amo te. *ET.*, N., '98, 88.

MALAN, C. La révélation intérieure qui precède la révélation extérieure ou historique. *RThQR.*, '98, 735–68.

MORTIMER, A. G. Catholic Faith and Practice: a manual of theology. Pt. II. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; lxix, 519 pp. $2.50.

MORTON, V. Thoughts on Hell: a study in eschatology. Lo.: Sands, '99; 148 pp. 2s.

ORR, J. The Archbishop's Charge: the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. *CR.*, D., '98, 779–97.

PARAYRE, R. L'évolution et le dogme d'après un livre récent. *UC.*, '99, 15 Ja., 92–117.
P. ZAHM. L'évolution et le dogme.

PAULSEN. Der christl. Glaube im geist. Leben d. Gegenwart. [Nach Kaftan.] *Chr. Herold*, '98, no. 23.

PRIMROSE, J. W. The Baptismal Formula. *PQ.*, XIII., 95–109.

SCHAEFFER, W. C. The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity as Related to the Religious Life of the Christian. *RChR.*, '99, 28–38.

SCHIAN, M. Der Begriff "Erfahrung" in der Dogmatik. *PrM.*, '98, 378–88.

SIMON, D. W. Reconciliation by Incarnation. Ed.: T. & T. Clark; N. Y.: Scribner's, '98; xxiii, 307 pp. $3.

STEINBERG, TH. Naturgesetz u. Wunder. *ZSchw.*, '98, 129–42.

TALMA, A. S. E. De gemeenschap der geloovigen met Christus. *StWV.*, D., '98.

THOMAS, J. B. The Paraclete. *HR.*, D., '98, Ja., '99.

TROWBRIDGE, J. Physical Science and Immortality. *Ind.*, 22 D., '98.

WALLACE, W. Lectures and Essays on Natural Theology and Ethics. Ed., Biogr., Intro. by E. CAIRD. Lo. & N. Y.: Frowde, '98; 606 pp. 12s. 6d.

ETHICS.

BACHMANN, PH. Die persönliche Heilserfahrg. des Christen u. ihre Bedeutg. f. den Glauben nach dem Zeugnisse der Apostel. Ein Beitrag z. neutestamentl. Theologie. L.: Deichert, '98; viii, 246 pp. M. 3.60.

DAVENPORT, J. S. Life in Christ. A spiritual essay. N. Y.: Whittaker, '98; iii, 30 pp. $0.15.

EHRENFELS, CHRN. v. System d. Welttheorie. II. Bd.: Grundzüge e. Ethik. L.: Reisland, '98; viii, 270 pp. M. 5.

ETTER, E. Evangelium und moderne Moral. *PrM.*, '98, 428–35.

FROMMEL, G. La morale chrétienne de M. J. Bovon. *RThPh.*, '99, 5–47.

GREEN, T. H. Prolegomena to Ethics. Ed. by A. C. BRADLEY. Lo.: Frowde, '99; 530 pp. 7s. 6d.

KÖSTLIN, J. Christliche Ethik. B.: Reuther & Reichard, '98; viii, 699 pp. M. 10; bd., M. 12.

LAZARUS, M. Die Ethik d. Judenthums. Fr.: Kauffmann, '98; xxv, 460 pp. M. 3.

MOORE, E. W. The Christ-Controlled Life; or, The Secret of Sanctity. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '98: 231 pp. $0.75.

MOSS, R. W. The Range of Christian Experience. *Fernley Lecture*, July, 1898. Lo.: C. H. Kelly, '98; 126 pp. 2s. 6d.

NASH, L. L. Spiritual Life; with an introd. by Bp. O. P. FITZGERALD. Nashville: Publ. House M. E. Church, South (Barbee & Smith), '98; ii, 203 pp. $0.75.

SULLIVAN, W. R. W. Morality as a Religion. Exposition of some first principles. Lo.: Sonnenschein, '98; 304 pp. 6s.

E. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

BRIDEL, PH. Quel est pour notre génération le chemin qui mène à Dieu? II. *RThPh.*, '98, 453–68.

CHASTAND. Le royaume de Dieu est-il réalisable ici-bas à notre époque? *RChrS.*, '98, no. 6.

ECKLIN, W. Die Religion der verborgenen Gottinnigkeit. Basel: Kober, '98; 16 pp. M. 0.25.

FOERSTER, E. Das Christentum d. Zeitgenossen. Eine Studie. *ZThK.*, '99, 1–96. Also published separately. F.: Mohr, '99. M. 1.50.

George Müller and his Prayers: by the author of "Evil and Evolution." *NCR.*, D., '98, 461–73.

GILLETT, A. L. High Standards of Ministerial Character. *HSR.*, IX., 19–34.

NEWBOLT, W. C. E. Religion. N. Y.: Longmans, '99; 301 pp.
The Oxford Library of Practical Theology.

PUSEY, E. B. Spiritual Letters. Ed. and prepared for publication by J. O. JOHNSTON and W. C. E. NEWBOLT. Lo. & N. Y.: Longmans, Green & Co., '99; 362 pp. $4.

RÖMPLER. Christozentrisch oder theozentrisch? *KZ.*, I., no. 12.

SCHULTZ, H. Das Christentum der ev. Kirche unserer Tage u. die religiöse Stimmung der ersten Gemeinde Jesu. *ChrW.*, '98, no. 44.

SMITH, G. S. The Victory over Sin and Death gained by the Son of God for his People. Ed.: Blackwood & S., '99; vi, 267 pp. 5s.

TISSOT, J. Das innerliche Leben muss vereinfacht u. wieder auf seine Grundlage zurückgeführt werden. Aus dem Franz. Regensburg: Nat. Verlagsanst., '98; xlvii, 330 pp. M. 3.80.

CHURCH POLITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

BATTEN S. Z. A Way out of Church Disunion. *BS.*, O., '98, 693–716.

COMPAS, V. L'église et le socialisme. Charleville: Assoc. ouvrière de l'impr., '98; 31 pp., 16mo. f. 0.25.

EBELING, H. Kirchenpolitik, Sozialismus, Staatspolitik im Lichte der Bibel. Zwickau: Herrmann, '98; 176 pp. M. 2.

EGGER, A. Der Clerus u. die Alkoholfrage. F.: Herder, '98; 40 pp. M 0.50.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Catholicism, Roman and Anglican. Lo.: Hodder & St.; N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xxiii, 481 pp. $2.

GÉRARDIN, J. Étude sur les bénéfices ecclésiastiques aux XVI^e et XVII^e siècle. *ID.* P.: Berger-Levrault et C^ie, '98; 171 pp.

MEILI, F. Rechtsgutachten über die Berechtigg. an Kirchenörtern. *ZSchw.*, '98, 218–32.

Religion in der Politik der Gegenwart. *Ibid.*, '98,

MEYER, E. Die Kirche u. d. moderne Zeit. Ansprache bei der Eröffnung d. sächs. kirchl. Konferenz in Chemnitz. L.: Wigand, '98; 25 pp. M. 0.40.

MOZKIN, L. Die Juden in Palästina. B.: Friedländer, '99; 45 pp. M. 0.60.

RUPP, W. The Problem of the Unchurched. *RChR.*, O., '98, 460–82.

SCHEICHER, Jos. 1848–1898: Kirchenpolitische Essays. W.: Fromme; 27 pp. M. 0.50.
Aus: *Correspondenz-Blatt f. den kathol. Clerus Oesterreichs.*

SELL, K. Landeskirche u. Freikirche nach ihrem Wert f. christl. ziehg. u. innere Mission. 382–405.

SODEUR. Die kirchenpolitischen Briefe in den Beilagen zur Allgem. Ztg. *DEBl.*, '98, no. 11.

SPECTATOR. Kirchenpolitische Briefe. XLII. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 278.
See also above, p. 36, col. 2.

TEICHMANN. Zur Beurteilung des Landeskirchentums. *ZprTh.*, '98, 319–43.

BÖHME, FRZ. Die sächsischen Kirchengesetze, betr. die Verfassg. der evang.-luther. Kirche u. die Verhältnisse der evang.-luther. Geistlichen. Mit erläut. Anmerkgn. u. Sachregister. L.: Rossberg, '98; ix, 243 pp. Bd., M. 3.60.

MARSEILLE, G. Studien z. kirchl. Politik des Pfalzgrafen Wolfgang Wilhelm von Neuburg. *ID.* Marburg, '98; 135 pp.

SANDAY, W. The Conception of Priesthood in the Early Church and in the Church of England: four sermons. Lo. & N. Y.: Longmans, '98; vii, 128 pp. $1.

SCHWARTZ, K. v. Die Entstehung der Synoden in der alten Kirche. *ID.* L., '98; 81 pp.

SKALSKY, G. A. Zur Gesch. der evgl. Kirchenverfassg. in Oesterreich (bis z. Toleranzpatent). Mit Benutzg. hand schr. Quellen. W.: Manz, '98; vi, 184 pp.

ZIEL, H. A. The Relation existing between Church and State in the Age of the Reformation. *LChR.*, '99, 17–34.

BESSON, J. Bulletin canonique. *Et.*, 20 S., 5 D., '98, 823–33, 694–701.
I. Actes du Saint-Siège. II. Publications nouvelles. III. Actes du Saint-Siège.

——— Les vœux de religion et la communauté libre. *Ibid.*, 5 O., '98, 87–92.

BOUDINHON, A. Sur l'histoire des indulgences à propos d'un livre récent.
On: Lea's History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church, Vol. III.

BRUNETIÈRE, F. Le catholicisme aux États-Unis. *Rev. d. 2 Mondes*, 1 N., '98.

BURNICHON, J. Le péril protestant. *Et.*, 5 F., '99, 386–90.

CHAMBOST, C. Actes récents du saint-siège. *UC.*, O., '98, 318–20.

Einfluss d. deutschen prot. Regierg. bei d. Bischofswahl. (Von einem Juristen.) *AkKR.*, LXXVIII., 4.

FEASEY, H. J. Monasticism: What is It? Forgotten chapter in the history of labor. Lo.: Sands, '98; 280 pp. 6s.

FORBES, J. Les catholiques et la liberté. *Et.*, 5 O., '98, 99–105.

GOETZ, L. K. Lazaristen u. Jesuiten. Ein Beitrag z. Charakteristik d. Lazaristen (Missionspriester) u. ihrer Verwandtschaft mit den Jesuiten. Go.: Perthes, '98; iv, 45 pp. M. 0.80.

HACKE, C. B. GRAF VON. Die Palliumverleihungen bis 1143. Eine diplomatisch-historische Untersuchung. *ID.* G., '98; 154 pp.

KOHLSCHMIDT, O. Lazaristen u. Jesuiten. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 280.

MCCABE, J. Life in a Modern Monastery. Lo.: Richards, '98; viii, 282 pp. 6s.

MILSAND, J. Le catholicisme et le mal de notre époque. P.: Fischbacher, '99; 168 pp.

RACHEL. Le mouvement catholique en Angleterre. *RChr.*, N., '98, 334–41.

RENAULD, E. Le péril protestant (essai d'histoire contemporaine). P.: Tolra, '99; 375 pp. f. 3.50.

SCHELBICKY, C. A. Die Inquisition u. ihre Gegner. Gratz: Moser, '98; 78 pp. M. 0.16.
Moser's Sammlung zeitgemässer Broschüren. Heft 11.

SIMON, TH. Der Werth der Persönlichkeit u. d. kathol. Kirche. (Schluss.) *KM.*, N., '98.

STIEGLER. Dispensation u. Dispensationswesen in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelg. *AkKR.*, LXXXIII., 4.

TISSOT, D. Catholicisme de l'église d'Orient. *RThQR.*, '98, 557–76.

TOMASETH, H. J. Die Register und Sekretäre Urban's V. u. Gregor's XI. *Mitth. d. Inst. f. österr. Gesch.-Forschg.*, XIX., 3.

TOURNEBIZE, F. La réplique du Patriarche de Constantinople à Léon XIII.—Ses griefs contre l'église romaine. *Et.*, 5 & 20 N., '98, 368–91, 496–521.

TSCHACKERT, P. Jesuitische Miscellen. *ZKG.*, XIX., 367–71.
1. Zur Frage nach d. Verhältnis des Jesuitenordens zum Protestantismus. — 2. Noch einmal "Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel."

ZIMMERMANN, D. B. Der Priester-Cölibat u. seine Bedeutg. f. Kirche u. Gesellschaft. Kempten: Kösel, '98; xii, 172 pp. M. 1.20.

MIRBT, C. Die preussische Gesandtschaft am Hofe des Papstes. L.: Buchh. d. evgl. Bds., '98; 64 pp. M. 1.

PORSCH. Das preussische Gesetz betr. d. Diensteinkommen d. kathol. Pfarrer. Mainz: Kirchheim, '98; 88 pp. M. 1.

HOLL, K. Über d. griech. Mönchtum. *Preuss. Jahrbb.*, D., '98, 407–24.

KIRÉEFF, A. Der Altkatholizismus u. d. polnische Frage. *ITkR.*, '99, 12–18.

LANGEN, J. Kampf u. Friede z. gleicher Zeit. *Ibid.*, O., '98, 713–49.

MICHAUD, E. La théologie ancienne-catholique, ses caractères, et son but. *Ibid.*, '99, 40–65.

——— Anciens-catholiques et protestants. *Ibid.*, 66–94.

MÜLLER, J. Der Reformkatholicismus, die Religion der Zukunft. Für die Gebildeten aller Bekenntnisse dargestellt. Würzburg: Göbel, '99; viii, 102 pp. M. 1.50.

BRIDENBAUGH, S. R. The Scope and Limitations of Organization within the Church. *RChR.*, '99, 17–27.

CHARBONNEL, V. L'Américanisme ou les "dangers" d'un néo-protestantisme dans l'église catholique. *RChr.*, O., '98, 241–68.

Flugschriften des ev. Bundes. Hrsg. vom Vorstand d. Bundes. 155.–158. Heft. L.: Buchh. d. ev. Bundes, '98.
155. Aus den Verhandlgn. der XI. General-Versammlung des ev. Bundes zu Magdeburg vom 3. bis 6. X 1898. WINTZINGERODE-BODENSTEIN, GRAF VON, Eröffnungsrede bei der XI Generalversammlg. 8 pp. M. 0.10.—156. Dasselbe. MEYER, Die Sammlung der Evangelischen. 24 pp. M. 0.20.—157. Dasselbe. DÖBLIN, Festpredigt; HERDIECKERHOFF, R. Die Stellung der ultramontanen Presse zu Kaiser u. Reich. 19 pp. M. 0.15.—158. Dasselbe. SCHOLZ, Die Selbsthülfe des deutschen Protestantismus gegen Rom. Ansprache. — HIEBER, Schlussansprache, geh. am 5. X. 16 pp. M. 0.15.

GUERLAC, O. French Protestantism. *Ind.*, 29 Ja., '99.

KING, B. The Ruling Elder: his place and work, and his relation to the synagogue. Lo.: Nutt, '98. 2s. 6d.

LORENZ, O. Vorschläge eines positiven Theologen zur Hebg. des kirchl. Lebens. *PrM.*, '98, 389–96.

NIEMANN, A. Der Johanniterorden. Seine Bedeutg. f. d. christl. Liebesthätigk. in alter u. neuer Zeit. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; 39 pp. M. 0.60.

Protestantisches Mönchtum. St.: Geiger, '98; 24 pp. M. 0.40.

RIEKER, KARL. Staat u. Kirche nach luther., reformirter, moderner Anschauung. *Hist. Vierteljs.-Schr.*, III., no. 3.

BARRY, ALFRED. What is Ritualism? *CR.*, N., '98.

COSBY, S. A. A Plea for a Free Church of England in the New Century. *Westm. Rev.*, D., '98, 670–87.

DEANE, F. H. On Reform of Convocation and the Establishment of Representative Church Government. *NCR.*, O., '98, 289–95.

FORSYTH. Sacramentalism the True Remedy of Sacerdotalism. *Exp.*, O., '98, 262–75.

HINSDALE, B. A. Mr. Gladstone and High Church Puritans. *ChrQ.*, Ja., '99, 38–50.

JESSOPP, A. The Clergy and the Laity: an apologia. *NC.*, N., '98.

LIAS. The 39 Articles of the Church of England. *IThR.*, '99, 144–51.

MAITLAND, F. W. Roman Canon Law in the Church of England. 6 essays. Lo.: Methuen, '98; 192 pp. 7s. 6d.

PEEK, F. Sacerdotalism. *CR.*, Ja., '99.

PRÉLOT, H. Gladstone et la transformation de l'état anglais. *Et.*, 5 & 20 O., '98, 5–28, 215–40.

ROGERS, A. Men and Movements in the English Church. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; ix, 374 pp. $1.50.

WIMBORNE, C. The Ritualist Conspiracy. *NC.*, O., '98.

BISHOP, J. W. The Christian Year in its Relation to the Christian Life. Lo.: Stock, '98. 5s.

CHÉROT, H. Le jubilé de la fête des morts à Cluny. *Et.*, 20 O., '98, 241–4.

CONYBEARE, F. C. The History of Christmas. *AJTh.*, III., 1–21.

FRANKE. Zur Geschichte u. Beurtheilung d. Todtensonntags. *Hh.*, O., '98.

GEISSINGER, D. H. The Significance and Cyclical Completeness of the Christian Year. *LChR.*, O., '98, 639–46.

THURSTON, H. Christmas and the Christian Calendar. *AER.*, D., '98, 561–76; Ja., '99, 19–32.

GUBERNATIS, A. DE. Il patriarcato di Gerusalemme e la custodia di Terrasanta. *NA.*, 16 N., '98.

PRÉLOT, H. Le protectorat de la France sur les chrétiens d'Orient. *Et.*, 20 N., 5 D., '98, 433–63, 651–79.

RIECKS. D. franz. Protektorat i. Morgenlande. *Allg. kons. Monatsschr.*, F., '99.

*** La politique allemande et le protectorat des missions catholiques. *Rev. d. 2 Mondes*, 1 S., '98.

HOMILETICS AND CATECHETICS.

ALLIHN, H. Der mündl. Vortrag u. die Gebärdensprache d. evangel. Predigers. Ein Handbuch z. Selbstunterricht f. angeh. Geistliche. L.: Ungleich, '98; iv, 404 pp. M. 6.

BERGMANN, W. Studien zu e. kritischen Sichtung der südgallischen Predigtliteratur des 5. u. 6. Jahrh. 1. Tl.: Der handschriftl. bezeugte Nachlass des Faustus v. Reji. L.: Dieterich, '98; viii, 331 pp. M. 7.
Vol. 1, no. 4, of: Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie u. d. Kirche, hrsg. v. N. BONWETSCH u. R. SEEBERG.

DIEGEL. Beiträge zu einer Homiletik aus Volks- u. Gemeinde-Mund. II. *Hh.*, XXII., H. 1 & 2.

FAUNCE, W. H. P. Expository Preaching. III. *BW.*, N., '98, 320–26.

GEHRCKE. Zur homiletischen Behandlg. d. Gleichnisreden. *ZprTh.*, '99, no. 1.

JOHNSON, FR. Sermon Outline, criticism. *BW.*, N., '98, 339–40.

M. M. The Power and Training of the Pulpit. *Queen's Quarterly*, VI., 161–72.

PATTISON, T. H. The Making of the Sermon; for the class-room and the study. Ph.: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., '98; x, 392 pp. $1.50.

SCHIAN. Die lutherische Homiletik in der 2. Hälfte des 16. Jahrhdt. *StKr.*, '99, 62–94.

STOSCH. Der pastoraltheologische Ertrag der Bergpredigt. Vorlesungen auf d. Weferlinger theologischen Kursus. B.: Wiegandt & Grieben, '98; 29 pp. M. 0.60.

THOMPSON, A. C. Ministerial Pronunciation. *HSR.*, IX., N., '98, 4–18.

TIELEMANN, TH. Ueber methodische Predigtmeditation. *Manch. Gaben u. Ein Geist*, O., '98.

TUCKER, W. J. The Making and the Unmaking of the Preacher: Lectures on the Lyman Beecher foundation, Yale University, 1898. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '98; iv, 224 pp. $1.50.

AHREND, P. Was lässt sich aus Luthers Art u. Anweisungen f. d. Erklärg. im Religionsunterricht unserer höheren Schulen lernen? *ZeRU.*, X., 37–50.

BOECKH. Die sozialen Probleme der Gegenwart im Katechismusunterricht. *KZ.*, II., 2.

BRUNNER, J. N. Didaktik u. Methodik der kathol. Religionslehre. [Aus: Dr. Baumeister's "Handbuch d. Erziehgs.- u. Unterrichtslehre f. höhere Schulen."] M.: Beck, '98; 65 pp. M. 1.20.

BURGES, R. Our Sunday Schools: their achievements and possibilities. *IER.*, O., '98, 142–61.

CLASEN, L. Die Aufgabe d. Confirmandenunterrichts. *DÉBl.*, '98, 661–74.

COHRS, F. Zur Katechese am Ende des Mittelalters. *ZprTh.*, '98, 289–309.

DECOPPET, A. Catéchisme populaire. P.: Berger-Levrault, '98. f. 0.75.

DIX, F. Neuere Geschichte der Schulbibel. Dresden: Meinhold, '98; iv, 43 pp. M. 0.75.
I. Gesch. des sächs. Schulbibelstreites, 1845–76. II. Gesch. der Schulbibel, 1876–98. Ergänzg. u. Fortsetzg. der Gesch. der Schulbibel desselben Verfassers.

ECKERT, A. Der erziehende Religionsunterricht in Schule u. Kirche. B.: Reuther & R., '98; viii, 195 pp. M. 2.60.

GOODWIN, E. B. The Bible as a Factor in the Education of Children. *AER.*, N., '98, 500–510.

HENRY, H. T. A New Method of Teaching History. *AER.*, N., '98, 471–82.

HUGHES, H. P. A New Catechism. *CR.*, Ja., '99.

KOCK, J. Jesus Christus als Vorbild f. alle Erzieher. Langensalza: Beyer, '98; 31 pp. M. 0.50.

LARSEN, H. M. Jesus u. die Religionsgeschichte. Aus dem Dän. von G. STERZEL. F.: Mohr, '98; 32 pp. M. 0.60.

MCKINNEY, A. H. The Bible-School. A manual for Sunday-school workers. N. Y.: Lentilhon & Co., '98; 206 pp.
Handbooks for Practical Workers in Church and Philanthropy, ed. by S. M. JACKSON.

MELTZER, H. Alttestamentliches Lesebuch. Für den Schulgebrauch bearb. Dresden: Bleyl & Kaemmerer, '98; viii, 199 pp. M. 0.80.

MUZZEY, D. S. In Harnack's Seminar. *BW.*, F., '99, 111–12.

NATORP, P. Sozialpädagogik. Theorie der Willenserziehg. auf der Grundlage der Gemeinschaft. St.: Frommann, '98; viii, 352 pp. M. 6.

NOÏKOW, P. M. Das Aktivitätsprinzip in der Pädagogik Jean Jacques Rousseau's. *ID.* L., '98; 160 pp.

Pädagogische Abhandlgn. Neue Folge. Hrsg. v. W. BARTHOLOMÄUS. II. Bd., 9. Heft; III. Bd., 4. Heft. Bielefeld: Helmich, '98.
BUDDE, K. Die Theorie des Seelenvermögens nach Kant, Herbart, Lotze u. Beneke. 12 pp. M. 0.40. — SCHRÖDER, W. Schuldirektor Bangs Reformvorschlag f. d. unterrichtliche Behandlung des Lebens Jesu. 15 pp. M. 0.40.

PLOHN, J. Materialien z. Religionsunterrichte f. Volks- u. Bürgerschulen. W. & Fr.: Kauffmann, '98; 39 pp. M. 0.55.

——— Materialien zum bibl. Geschichtsunterrichte f. die Hand des Lehrers. *Ibid.*, '98; vii, 101 pp. M. 1.50.

SATTIG. Was kann d. Religionsunterricht d. höheren Schulen thun, um die aus ihnen hervorgehende Jugend gegen die Einflüsse widerchristl. u. glaubensfeindl. Richtungen zu festigen? *ZeRU.*, X., 23–37.

SCHMID, U. R. Einiges aus d. Gebiete der Schule, der Kirche u. des Staates f. den wahren Fortschritt der Zeit. Nachgelassene Schrift. Jena: Pohle, '98; x, 38 pp. & photo. M. 1.

LITURGICS AND HYMNOLOGY.

ACHELIS, E. C. A Liturgical Curiosity. *LChR.*, '99, 67–84.

BELFOUR, E. The Public Worship of the Jews, and its Influence on the Christian Service. *LChR.*, '99, 50–56.

BRAUN, J. Die pontificalen Gewänder d. Abendlandes nach ihrer gesch. Entwicklg. Mit 27 in d. Text gedruckten Abbildgn. u. 1 Taf. F.: Herder, '98; vii, 191 pp. M. 2.80.
Stimmen aus Maria-Laach. Ergänzungshefte, no. 73.

BRONISCH. A Lutheran Service from the Second Half of the 17th Century. *LChR.*, '99, 107–10.

BUDDE, K. Aus d. amerik. Kultusleben. *MGkK.*, '98, 319–22.

BUSS, E. Was lässt sich thun z. liturgischen Bereicherung unseres evangel. Gottesdienstes? *MGkK.*, '98, 356–63.

CHEVALIER, U. La renaissance des études liturgiques. *UC.*, N., '98, 429–65.

FUNK, F. X. Die Liturgie d. äthiopischen Kirchenordnung. *ThQ.*, '98, 513–47.

GIEHLOW, C. Kritische Darstellung der Forschungen üb. die Entstehungsgesch. des Gebetsbuchs Maximilian I. B., '98; 65 pp.

JOST, W. Hältst du den Sonntag? Bielefeld: Siedhoff, '98; 40 pp. M. 0.20.

LELIÈVRE, M. Les réunions de prière. *RChr.*, S. & O., '98.

LÜHR, K. Bemerkgn. u. Vorschläge z. evgl. Festtags- u. Abendmahlsliturgie. (Schluss.) *MGkK.*, III., S., '98, 198–200.

MALTZEW, A. v. Begräbniss-Ritus und einige specielle u. alterthüml. Gottesdienste der orthodox kathol. Kirche d. Morgenlandes. Deutsch u. slavisch unter Berücksichtigung des griech. Urtextes. B.: Siegismund, '98; cxxix, 444, 471 pp. M. 12.

MARX. Konfirmation u. höhere Schule. *ZeRU.*, X., 2–22.

PARGOIRE, J. Prime et complies. II. Complies. *RHLR.*, '98, 456–67.
1. Complies et M. Batiffol; 2. Complies et Dom Plaine; 3. Complies et Dom Baeumer.

PRATT, W. S. Some Liturgical Contradictions. *HSR.*, IX, 139–49.

REED, D. L. The Sphere of the Choir in the Rendering of the Service. *LChR.*, O., '98, 675–87.

RIETSCHEL, G. Glossen z. d. Ordnung d. Hauptgottesdienstes nach der Agende der sächs. Landeskirche. *UPr.* L.: Edelmann, '98; 70 pp. M. 2.

ROBINSON, J. A. Liturgical Echoes in Polycarp's Prayer. *Exp.*, Ja., '99, 63–72.

SAYCE, A. H. Prayers for the Dead. *ET.*, D., '98, 143.

TAUNTON, E. L. Horæ liturgicæ. II. *AER.*, D., '98, 614–24.

TORHORST. Züge von d. gottesdienstl. Leben e. ref. Gemeinde. *MGkK.*, III., S., '98, 195–8.

WEBER, P. Offene Kirchen und kirchl. Kunst. *MGkK.*, '98, 285–92.

WISSIG, G. Wie schmücken wir unsere Kirchen würdig aus? Vortrag. L.: Meyer, '98; 14 pp. M. 0.25.

BARRY, A. The Anglican Communion as it Is; its growth and constitution. *ITkR.*, '98, 756–68.

CHAPMAN, MRS. THEO. Confession. *NC.*, N., '98.

CORNILS, M. Welche Deutg. d. Absolution ist d. lutherische? *ZprTh.*, '98, 309–19.

DE LONG, J. F. The Place of the General Confession of Sin in the Order of Divine Service. *RChR.*, '98, 531–46.

DREWS, P. Die Form der Krankenkommunion i. Churfürstentum Sachsen 1531. *MGkK.*, III., S., '98, 211–14.

FREISEN, J. Katholischer Taufritus der Diöcese Schleswig im Mittel-Alter. *ThQ.*, '99, 1–31.

JODER, J. CHR. Das Beichtvateramt in Frauenklöstern. *AkKR.*, LXXVIII., 21.

SCHMITZ, H. J. Die Bussbücher u. d. kanonische Bussverfahren. Nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt. Die Bussbücher u. d. Bussdisciplin d. Kirche. II. Bd. Düsseldorf: Schwann, '98; xii, 741 pp. M. 30.

SMEND, J. Der Kampf um die Signierg. d. Abendmahlselemente. *MGkK.*, III., S., '98, 205–11.

ALBRECHT, O. Noch e. Wort zu Luthers deutschem Glorialied. *MGkK.*, '98, 353–6.

Analecta hymnica medii aevi, hrsg. v. C. BLUME u. G. M. DREVES. L.: Reisland, '98.
XXIX. Dictamina, pia. Reimgebete u. Leselieder des Mittelalters. 2. Folge. Aus handschriftl. Gebetbüchern hrsg. v. C. BLUME. 239 pp. M. 7.50. — XXX. Dasselbe. 3. Folge. Stunden- u. Glossen-Lieder, hrsg. v. GUIDO MARIA DREVES, S. J. 311 pp. M. 9.50.— XXXI. Dasselbe. 4. Folge. Aus Handschriften u. Wiegendrucken, hrsg. v. C. BLUME. 218 pp. M. 7.

"ASAPH." Letter to a Pastor on Church Music. *HSR.*, IX., N., '98, 35–40.

CAMPBELL, D. Hymns and Hymnmakers. N. Y.: imported by Scribner's, '98; 195 pp. $0.75 *net.*

GEYER. Ist das Lied "All Ehr u. Lob soll Gottes sein" v. Luther gedichtet? *MGkK.*, III., S., '98, 220–26.

SPITTA, FR. Die Lieder der Konstanzer Reformation. III. Johannes Zwick. *MGkK.*, '98, 323–32.

VETTER. Nerses Schnorhali's Kirchenlieder. *ThQ.*, '99, 89–111.

SERMONIC LITERATURE.

BANKS, L. A. The Unexpected Christ: a series of evangelistic sermons. N. Y.: Ketcham, ['98]; ii, 328 pp. $1.50.

CAIRD, J. University Sermons Preached before the University of Glasgow, 1873–1898. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; vii, 402 pp. $2.25.

DAVIES, J. L. Spiritual Apprehension: sermons and papers. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; xii, 354 pp. $1.75.

GREER, D. H. Visions: Sunday morning sermons at St. Bartholomew's, New York. N. Y.: Whittaker, '98; iv, 282 pp. $1.50.

HORT, F. J. A. Cambridge, and other sermons. N. Y.: Macmillan, '98; ix, 278 pp. $1.75.

KALTHOFF, A. An der Wende d. Jahrhunderts. Kanzelreden üb. d. sozialen Kämpfe unserer Zeit. B.: Schwetschke, '98; vii, 286 pp. M. 3; bd., M. 4.

LEFROY, W. The Immortality of Memory, and other sermons. Lo.: Marshall, '98; 252 pp. 3s. 6d.

LITTLE, W. J. K. The Perfect Life. Sermons. N. Y.: Longmans, '98; xi, 368 pp. $2.

MARTYN, H. J. For Christ and for Truth. Lo.: Williams & Norgate, '98; 238 pp. 5s.

MEYER, F. B. Blessed are Ye: talks on the Beatitudes. N. Y.: Whittaker, '98; 142 pp. $0.75.

SAVAGE, M. J. Our Unitarian Gospel. Bo.: Ellis, '98; v, 282 pp. $1.

SHEPARDSON, D. The Suffering Saviour, and other sermons. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '98; 144 pp. $0.75.

VALENTINE, M. Christian Truth and Life: Sermons. Ph.: Luth. Publ. Soc., '98; viii, 358 pp. $1.50.

MISSIONS.

GRUNDEMANN, R. Missions-Studien u. -Kritiken. 2. Reihe. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98; xii, 252 pp. M. 3.60.

HOLTZMANN, H. Christliche Geschichtsbetrachtg. im Lichte d. Mission. Vortrag. B.: Haack; 14 pp. M. 0.30.

SCHOTT, W. Die christl. Mission u. der soziale Fortschritt. II. *AMZ.*, D., '98.

BUSCHMANN, E. Diakonie u. Gemeinde in ihrer gesegneten Wechselwirkung. Vortrag. Braunschweig: Neumeyer, '98; 24 pp. M. 0.50.

Fünfzig Jahre innere Mission. *BAZ.*, '98, no. 252.

HERTZBERG, A. v. Ein Wort wider die Evangelisation. Fr.: Harnecker, '98; 15 pp. M. 0.40.

LAMPRECHT. Die Stellg. der Kirche zu d. modernen Evangelisationsbestrebgn. Ein Wort zur Verständigg. *Pastoralblätter*, O., '98.

SCHACK, A. Den indre Mission som kirkelig Fremtoning. København: Lehmann & Stage, '98; 42 pp. Kr. 0.50.

SEIDEL, L. Wichern u. die innere Mission. *NkZ.*, '98, 745–62.

WURSTER. Das Jubiläum der Innern Mission. *Allg. konserv. M. f. d. christl. Deutschl.*, S., '98.

BADER, W. Die syrische Kirche in Südindien. *EMM.*, O., N., D., '98.

BRADFORD, A. H. The Missionary Outlook. *BW.*, F., '99, 79–87.

CHETTLE, W. A. The Attitude of the European Churches in India toward Work amongst Natives. *IER.*, Ja., '99, 257–68.

DRUMMOND, H. The Problem of Foreign Missions. *Exp.*, Ja., '99, 16–35.

Geschichte der deutschen evgl. Kirche u. Mission im Heiligen Lande. Ein Vademekum für die Pilgerfahrt zur Einweihung d. Erlöserkirche in Jerusalem. Von einem Mitarbeiter. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '98. M. 2.

GOUVERNEUR, J. Correspondance des missions—Troubles en Chine. *Et.*, 5 O., '98, 93–9.

GRACEY, A. R. Eminent Missionary Women; introd. notes by Mrs. J. COOK and S. L. KEEN. N. Y.: Eaton & Mains, '98; xi, 215 pp. $0.85.

PATON, J. G. John G. Paton, Missionary to the Hebrides: an autobiography edited by his brother. Vol. 3 (1886–97). Chi.: Revell, '98; 99 pp. $0.50.

ROO, P. DE. The Apostle St. Thomas in America. *AER.*, '99, Ja., 1–18.

SCHNEIDER, D. B. The Missionary Problem in Japan. *RChR.*, '99, 70–89.

SHASTRI, VAMADEO. The Theological Situation in India. *FR.*, O., '98.

SPEER, R. E. Missions and Politics in Asia: Students' lectures on missions. Chi.: Revell, '98; 271 pp. $1.

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIALISM.

CADY, G. L. Sentimental Sociology. *BS.*, '99, 100–114.

GÖHRE, P. The Evangelical-Social Movement in Germany, its History and its Aims. Transl. by J. E. K. SHUTTLEWORTH. Lo.: Ideal Publ. Union, '98; 236 pp. 2s.

HEATH, R. The Church and Social Democracy in Germany. *CR.*, O., '98.

LORIMER, G. C. Christianity and the Social State. Ph.: Am. Bapt. Publ. Soc., '98; xviii, 488 pp. $2.

MERRILL, C. C. The Christian Conception of Wealth. *BS.*, '99, 148–59.

REICHESBERG, N. Die Sociologie, die sociale Frage u. der sogen. Rechtssocialismus. Auseinandersetzung mit Prof. Ludw. Stein. Bern: Steiger, '98; 131 pp. M. 2.50.

SABATIER, M. L'église et le travail manuel. P.: Bloud & Barral, '98; 63 pp.

SÖDERBLOM, N. Die Religion u. die soziale Entwicklung. Vortrag. F.: Mohr, '98; iii, 96 pp. M. 1.60.

TOPINARD, P. The Social Problem. *Mo.*, O., '98, 63–100.

Zeitfragen des christl. Volkslebens. Hrsg. v. E. v. UNGERN-STERNBERG u. TH. WAHL. 173. & 175. Heft. St.: Belser.
173. SCHILLER, JUL. Die Frauenbewegung in christlicher Beleuchtung. 31 pp. M. 0.60.—175. MASSOW, C. v. Die soziale Frage vom konservat. Standpunkt. 47 pp. M. 0.80.

ABBREVIATIONS.

Place of Publication: B. = Berlin; Bo. = Boston; Br. = Breslau; Chi. = Chicago; Cin. = Cincinnati; Ed. = Edinburgh; F. = Freiburg i. Br.; Fr. = Frankfurt a. M.; G. = Göttingen; Gi. = Giessen; Go. = Gotha; Gü. = Gütersloh; Hl. = Halle; Kö. = Königsberg; L. = Leipzig; Lo. = London; M. = München; N. Y. = New York; P. = Paris; Ph. = Philadelphia; St. = Stuttgart; Str. = Strassburg; Tü. = Tübingen; W. = Wien.

Prices: $ = dollar; M. = Mark; f. = franc; L. = llra; s. = shilling; d. = pence; fl. = florin. Prices quoted are usually for volumes bound in cloth in case of American and English books, in paper in the case of all others. Bd. = bound.

Months: Ja., F., Mr., Ap., My., Je., Jl., Ag., S., O., N., D.

PERIODICALS.

A. = Arena.
AC. = L'association catholique.
ACQ. = American Catholic Quarterly Review.
AER. = American Ecclesiastical Review.
AGPh. = Archiv f. d. Geschichte der Philosophie.
AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
AJTh. = American Journal of Theology.
AkKR. = Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht.
AMZ. = Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift.
ARW. = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
BAZ. = Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, München.
BBK. = Beiträge zur bayr. Kirchen-Gesch.
BG. = Beweis des Glaubens.
BS. = Bibliotheca Sacra.
BU. = Bibliothèque universelle.
BW. = Biblical World.
BZ. = Byzantinische Zeitschrift.
CR. = Contemporary Review.
ChOR. = Charity Organization Review.
ChQR. = Church Quart. Review.
ChR. = Charities Review.
ChrK. = Christliches Kunstblatt.
ChrL. = Christian Literature.
ChrQ. = Christian Quarterly.
ChrW. = Christliche Welt.
D-A ZThK. } = Deutsch-amerik. Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.
DEBl. = Deutsch-evangelische Blätter.
DR. = Deutsche Revue.
DZKR. = Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht.
EHR. = English Historical Review.
EKZ. = Evangelische Kirchenzeitung.
EMM. = Evangelisches Missions-Magazin.
ER. = Edinburgh Review.
Et. = Études.
ET. = Expository Times.
Exp. = Expositor.
F. = Forum.
FR. = Fortnightly Review.
GPr. = Gymnasialprogramm.
Hk. = Halte was du hast.
HN. = L'humanité nouvelle.
HR. = Homiletic Review.
HSR. = Hartford Sem. Record.
HZ. = Historische Zeitschrift.
IAQR. = Imperial Asiatic Quarterly Review.
ID. = Inaugural-Dissertation.
IER. = Indian Evang. Review.
IJE. = International Journal of Ethics.
Ind. = Independent.
ITkR. = Internat. Theol. Review.
JA. = Journal asiatique.
JBL. = Journal of Biblical Literature.
JM. = Monatsschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums.
JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.
JRAS. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
JTVI. = Journal of Trans. of Victoria Institute.
Kath. = Der Katholik, Zeitschr. f. kathol. Wissenschaft u. kirchl. Leben.
KM. = Kirchl. Monatsschrift.
KT. = Kyrklig Tidskrift.
KZ. = Katechetische Zeitschrift.
LChR. = Lutheran Church Review.
LQ. = Lutheran Quarterly.
LQR. = London Quarterly Review.
M. = Muséon.
MA. = Mittheilungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, *e.g.*, *Berlin, München.*
MCG. = Monatshefte der Comenius-Gesellschaft.
MGKK. = Monatsschrift f. Gottesdienst u. kirchl. Kunst.
Mi. = Mind.
MIM. = Monatsschrift für innere Mission.
M&N DP-V. } = Mitthellungen und Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Mo. = Monist.
NA. = Nuova Anthologia.
Nath. = Nathanael.
NC. = Nineteenth Century.
NCR. = New Century Review.
NkZ. = Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift.
NW. = New World.
OLZ. = Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung.
Ou. = Outlook.
PEFQS. = Palestine Exploration Fund; Quarterly Statement.
PhM. = Philosophische Monatshefte.
PhR. = Philosophical Review.
PQ. = Presbyterian Quarterly.
Pr. = Protestant.
PrM. = Protestantische Monatshefte.
PRR. = Presbyterian and Reformed Review.
PSBA. = Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archæology.
QR. = Quarterly Review.
RAAO. = Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale.
RB. = Revue biblique.
RBd. = Revue bénédictine.
RCHR. = Reformed Church Review.
RChr. = Revue chrétienne.
RChrS. = Revue de christianisme sociale.
RdM. = Revue des deux Mondes.
REJ. = Revue des études juives.
RHLR. = Revue d'histoire et de litérature religieuses.
RHR. = Revue de l'histoire des religions.
RQ. = Römische Quartalschrift f. christl. Alterthumskunde u. f. Kirchengeschichte.
RS. = Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'histoire ancienne.
RTh. = Revue théologique.
RThPh. = Revue de théologie et de philosophie.
RThQR. = Revue de théol. et des quest. relig.
SA. = Sitzungsberichte der Akad. d. Wiss. *e. g., Berlin, München*, etc.
StKr. = Theol. Studien und Kritiken.
StWV. = Stemmen voor Waarheid en Vrede.
ThQ. = Theologische Quartalschrift.
ThR. = Theologische Rundschau.
ThSt. = Theologische Studiën.
ThT. = Theologisch Tijdschrift.
UC. = L'Université catholique.
UPr. = Universitätsprogramm.
VwPh. = Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie
WZKM. = Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes
ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAeg. = Z. für aegyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde.
ZATW. = Z. für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG. = Z. d. Deutsch-Morgenl. Gesellsch.
ZDPV. = Z. d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
ZeRU. = Z. für den evangelischen Religions-Unterricht.
ZKG. = Z. f. Kirchengeschichte.
ZkTh. = Z. f. kathol. Theologie.
ZMR. = Z. f. Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft.
ZPhKr. = Z. f. Philosophie und philos. Kritik.
ZprTh. = Z. f. prakt. Theologie.
ZSchw. = Z. f. Theol. aus d. Schweiz.
ZThK. = Z. f. Theologie u. Kirche.
ZwTh. = Z. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie.

THEOLOGICAL AND SEMITIC LITERATURE

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

TO THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, AND THE BIBLICAL WORLD

BY W. MUSS-ARNOLT

I. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

[REMARKS AND LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS, SEE P. XXXII.]

GENERAL.

BELCK, W., und C. F. LEHMANN. Bericht üb. e. Forschungsreise durch Armenien. *SA.* B., '99; no. vii; 5 pp. M. 0.50.

——— Briefe an C. Bezold. *ZA.*, XIII., 307–22.

BESWICK, S. Builders of the Pyramids. Who were they? *Biblia*, Apr., '99.

CHARNOCK, R. S. Oriental Linguistics in Commerce. *IAQR.*, Apr., '99.

DAVIDS, T. W. RHYS. Early Commerce between India and Babylon. *JRAS.*, Apr., '99, 432–3.

Deutsche Wissenschaft in Ägypten u. in Mesopotamien. *Berl. philol. Woch.*, '99, no. 7.

HEUZEY, L. Égypte ou Chaldée. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.*, '99, 60–70.

HOMMEL, F. Gesch. des alten Morgenlandes. 2. Aufl. (Sammlg. Göschen, no. 43). L.: Göschen, '99; 168 pp. M. 0.80.

MAHAFFY, J. P. A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. With illustr. N. Y.: Imported by Scribner's, '99; xiii, 261 pp. $2.25 *net.*

MILNE, J. G. A History of Egypt under Roman Rule. With numerous illustr. N. Y.: Imported by Scribner's, '98; xiii, 262 pp. $2.25 *net.*

Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft. 3. Jahrgang, 1898, Heft 7. 4. Jahrgg., 1899, Heft 1. B.: Peiser.
HÜSING, G. Elamische Studien. I. 42 pp. & 1 Taf. M. 2.40.—MORDTMANN, J. Palmyrenisches. 50 pp. M. 4.

MONTET, E. Quarterly Report of Semitic Studies and Orientalism. *IAQR.*, Apr., '99.

MOOR, FL. DE. La Dynastie Déjocide. Une contribution à l'histoire de Médie. *M.*, Mr., '99, 5–26.

MÜLLER, W. M. Semitische Eigennamen in ägypt. Umschrift. *OLZ.*, II., no. 4.

——— Discoveries in the Necropolis of Thebes. *Ind.*, 6 Apr., '99.

Orientalische Bibliographie, hrsg. von L. SCHERMAN. XII., 1. Halbjahrsheft. B.: Reuther & Reichard, '99, pp. 1–147. Complete, M. 10.

SAYCE, A. H. A New Egyptian King; the predecessor of Kheops (plate). *PSBA.*, XXI., 108–10.

——— Some Old Empire Inscriptions from El-Kab (plate). *Ibid.*, 111–14.

SELBIE, J. A. Was Tyre Taken by Nebuchadrezzar? *ET.*, My., '99, 378–9.

SOCIN, A. Die Siloahinschrift zum Gebrauch bei akadem. Vorlesungen. Neugezeichnet u. hrsg. 4 pp. & 1 plate. F.: Mohr, '99. M. 0.60.

SPIEGELBERG. Varia. *Rec. Trav.*, XXI., 39–55.
מִצְרַיִם from מֵיצוֹר = Egypt. *mtr* = wall; etc., etc.

STUCKEN, ED. Astralmythen der Hebräer, Babylonier u. Aegypter. Religionsgeschichtl. Untersuchungen. 3. Tl.: Jakob. (Pp. 127–87.) L.: Pfeiffer, '99. M. 6.40.

WELLHAUSEN, J. Skizzen u. Vorarbeiten. 6. Heft. B.: Reimer, '99; viii, 260 pp. M. 8.
1. Prolegomena z. ältesten Geschichte d. Islams. —2. Verschiedenes.

ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN.

Babylonian Chronological Tablet. *Ind.*, 16 Mr., '99, 786.
On Sayce's article in *PSBA.*, XXI., 10–22.

BACHER, W. Eine alte Erwähnung d. babylon. Keilinschriften. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 114.

BILLERBECK, A. Zur Topographie Niniveh's. *OLZ.*, II., no. 3.

BOISSIER, A. Deux fables assyriennes (K 3456, and 81–2–4, 294). *PSBA.*, XXI., 34–48.

BOISSIER, A. Notes d'Assyriologie. *RS.*, '99, 49–53, 131–6.

——— Notes sur un monument babylonien se rapportant à l'extispicine. Genève, '99; 12 pp.

BOSCAWEN, S. W. ST. CHAD. The Chaldean City God. *Bab. Or. Rec.*, Apr., '99.

BROCKELMANN, C. Ein assyr. Lehnwort (*kmaxk*^{c} = qimaxxu) im Armenischen. *ZA.*, XIII., 327–8.

DELITZSCH, F. Zur juristischen Litteratur Babyloniens. *BA.*, IV., 78–87.

DELITZSCH, F., & J. A. KNUDTZON. Briefe Hammurabi's an Sin-idinnam. Mit 2 autogr. Tafeln. *Ibid.*, 88–100.

FOY, W. Beiträge z. Erklärung der susischen Achaemenideninschriften. Forts. *ZDMG.*, LII., 564–605.

HALÉVY, J. La naissance du sumérien. *RS.*, VII., 158–66.
Reprint of 3 letters of J. Oppert of 1853, 1854.

HARPER, R. F. Assyriological Notes. V. *AJSL.*, XV., 129–44.
A. K 898, K 8402, K 924, K 8375, K 1012, K 1061.—*B.* 83-1-18, 2 [H. 391]; Rm 67 [H. 348]; K 532 [H. 109]; K 576 [H. 110].—*C.* Review of Arnolt, *Concise Dictionary of the Assyrian Language*, Parts VII & VIII.

HILPRECHT, H. V. Sanherib Constantinopel. *ZA.*, XIII., 322–5.
The memorial slab, publ. in I R. 43–44, is lost.

HOMMEL, F. Assyriological Notes. *PSBA.*, XXI., 115–39.

HÜSING, G. Iteration im Elamischen. III. *OLZ.*, II., no. 4.

——— Kyaxares. *Ibid.*, II., no. 5.

——— Der Ugnu-Stein. *Ibid.*, II., no. 5.

JASTROW, M., JR. Adrahasis und Parnapištim. *ZA.*, XIII., 288–300.

JOHNSTON, CHR. Explanation of an Assyrian crux interpretum. *Am. Jour. Philology*, XIX., 384–8.
xûlu = road.

J(OHNS), C. M. W. Adar and sartu. *PSBA.*, XXI., 79–80.

——— Assyriological Notes. *Ibid.*, XXI., 140–41.

——— The Official Title Lu-su-pa-meš. *Ibid.*, XXI., 173–4.

KNUDTZON, J. A. Ergebnisse e. Collation d. El-Amarna-Tafeln. *BA.*, IV., 101–54.

MARGOLIOUTH, G. Hebrew-Babylonian Affinities. Lo.: Nutt, '99; 20 pp. 1s.

MARX, V. Die Stellung d. Frauen in Babylonien gemäss den Kontrakten aus d. Zeit von Nebukadnezar bis Darius (604–485). *BA.*, IV., 1–77.

MEISSNER, B. Nachschrift zu: Eine assyr. Abbildung der hängenden Gärten der Semiramis. — Amraphel — Immeru. *WZKM.*, XII., 364.

MENGEDOHT, H. W. The Black Obelisk: Transliterated and translated. *Bab. Or. Rec.*, Mr. & Apr., '99.

MÜLLER, E. Das Ende Assyriens. *ZA.*, XIII., 325–7.

MÜLLER, W. M. Zu den ägypt. Wörtern von Amarna 294. *OLZ.*, II., no. 4.

——— Zur Lachischtafel. *Ibid.*, II., no. 3.

OEFELE, F. Das Denguefieber, d. Krankheit d. Ištar in d. Hölle. *Ibid.*, II., no. 3.

OPPERT, J. Das assyr. Landrecht. *ZA.*, XIII., 243–76.

——— Hie und da. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 93–7.

PEISER, F. E. Die Lachiš-Tafel. *OLZ.*, II., no. 1.

PINCHES, THEOPH. G. Some Early Babylonian Contract-Tablets or Legal Documents. II. *JRAS.*, '99, 103–20.

——— A New Babylonian King of the Period of the First Dynasty of Babylon; with incidental references to Immerum and Anmanila. — Major Mockler-Ferryman's Tablet giving the Names of Temple-Overseers. — An Interesting Cylinder-Seal. *PSBA.*, XXI., 158–63, 164–7, 168–9.

PRICE, I. M. Recent Theories on the Origin of the Cuneiform Writing. *AJSL.*, XV., 145–56.

PRINCE, J. D. Assyrian Prepositional Usage. *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 1–11.

SAYCE, A. H. The New Babylonian Chronological Tablet (Bu. 91-3-9, 284). *PSBA.*, XXI., 10–22.

——— Contract from the Country of Khana (Pl. xxxii of Thureau-Dangin, Tablettes cunéiformes inédites). *Ibid.*, 22–4.

——— An Early Babylonian Document Relating to the Shuhites (Bu. 88-5-12, 5). *Ibid.*, 24–5.

SCHEIL, V. Notes d'épigraphie etc., no. xlii: Gudéa sur les cylindres cachets; xliii, Sandan-Adar. *Rec. Trav.*, XXI., 26–30.

WINCKLER, H. Zur *Lakish*tafel. *OLZ.*, II., no. 2, F., '99.

ZIMMERN, H. Lebensbrot und Lebenswasser im Babylonischen und in der Bibel. *ARW.*, II., 165–76.

——— Zu den Weihinschriften der Kassiten-Könige. *ZA.*, XIII., 302–4.

——— Über Bäcker und Mundschenk im Altsemitischen. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 115–19.

CONDER, C. L. New Hittite Texts. *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 163.

HOMMEL, F. The Still Undeciphered Hittite Inscription. *ET.*, My., '99, 367-71; Je., 423-4.
See JENSEN, *ibid.*, Je., '99, 405-11, 424-5.

JENSEN, P. The Undeciphered Hittite Inscription. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 304-10.
Against SAYCE, *ibid.*, D., '98, 115 fol.

MESSERSCHMIDT, L. E. unveröffentlichte Hethitische Inschrift. *OLZ.*, II., no. 2.

RAMSAY, W. M. Hittite Decipherment. *ET.*, My., '99, 384.
Against JENSEN, *ibid.*, Apr., 304.

SAYCE, A. H. Hittite Decipherment. *Ibid.*, My., '99, 384.

SYRIAC.

BROCKELMANN, C. Syrische Grammatik, mit Litteratur, Chrestomathie und Glossar. N. Y.: Lemcke & Büchner, '99; xiii, 190 pp. $2.35.

DUVAL, R. La littérature syriaque. P.: Lecoffre, '99; xv, 426 pp. f. 3.50.
Anciennes littératures chrétiennes, Vol. II.

GOTTHEIL, R. Contributions to Syriac Folk-Medicine. *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 186-205.

——— A Christian Bahira Legend. I. *ZA.*, XIII., 189-242.

GRIMME, H. Nochmals z. syrischen Betonungs- und Verslehre. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 102-13.

NAGY, A. Una versione Syriaca unedita degli Analytici d'Aristotele. *Rendiconti dei Lincei*, Serie Quinta; VII., pt. 2.

NAU, F. La légende inédite des fils de Jonadab, fils de Réchab, et les îles fortunées. *RS.*, '99, 54-75, 136-40.

——— Les fils de Jonadab, fils de Réchab, et les îles fortunées (Histoire de Zozime). Texte syriaque de Jacques d'Edesse. Publié avec une traduction française de Sévère Sabokt, écrit au VII^e siècle d'après des sources grecques et publié pour la première fois d'après un MS. de Berlin (Coll. Petermann, no. 37). *JA.*, Ja.-F., '99.

POGNON, H. Inscriptions mandaïtes des coupes de Khouabir. Texte, traduction et commentaire. 2^e partie; pp. 105-232. P.: Welter, '99.

PRAETORIUS, F. Notiz zur syr. Metrik. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 113.

ARAMAIC.

SCHULTZE, M. Grammatik d. aramäischen Muttersprache Jesu. B.: Calvary, '99; iv, 87 pp. M. 2.40.

SAMARITAN.

WATSON, W. SCOTT. A Samaritan Manuscript of the Hebrew Pentateuch written A. H. 35. *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 173-9.

PALMYRENIAN.

COOK, S. A. Some Recent Palmyrene Inscriptions (2 plates). *PSBA.*, XXI., 68-78.

——— Palmyrene Inscriptions. *Ibid.*, XXI., 170-72.

MORDTMANN, J. Zu den palmyrenischen Inschriften des Dr. A. Musil. *ZA.*, XIII., 179-88.

SCHEIL, V. Une inscription palmyrénienne. *Rec. Trav.*, XXI., 30.

PHŒNICIAN.

BÉRARD, V. Les Phéniciens et les poèmes homériques. I. *RHR.*, '99, Mr.-Apr., 173-228.

BERGER, PH., et R. CAGNAT. L'inscription trilingue d'Henchir Alouin. *Compt. rend. de l'Acad. des inscr.* P., '99, 48-56.
Latin, Greek, Phœnician.

DELATTRE, P. Lettre sur les fouilles de Carthage. *Ibid.*, '99, 93-106.

LIDZBARSKI, M. Zu *Rîp šaramana*. *ZA.*, XIII., 328.

ARABIC.

ACHELIS, TH. Mohammed's Lehre. *BAZ.*, 18 F., '99, no. 41.

AL-HIRNIG, Sœur de Tarafah. Diwan. Ed. d'après le MS. de la biblioth. Khédivale et publ. avec des comment. par L. CHEÏKHO. Beyrouth, '99; L.: Harrassowitz; 24 pp. M. 2.

ALI, AMEER. The Influence of Women

N. Y.: Putnam, '99; xxv, 206 pp.

DERENBOURG, H. Nâbiga Dhobyânî inédit d'après le MS. Arabe 65 de la collection Schefer. *JA.*, Ja.-F., '99.

FRAENKEL, S. Bemerkungen zu Al Kisâi's Tractat über die Sprachfehler. *ZA.*, XIII., 304-7.

GAUDEL, M. Les premières invasions arabes dans l'Afrique du nord (21-100 H. = 651-718 A. D.). I. Le pays et les habitants. Les conquérants. *JA.*, Ja.-F., '99.

GAUDEFROY-DEMOMBYNES, M. Ibn Khaldoun, Histoire des Benou'l-Ahmar,

rois de Grenade. *JA.*, '98, S.-O., 309–60; N.-D., 407–63.

GEYER, R. Zu den Gedichten des Ḥâtim al-Ṭâ'î. *WZKM.*, XII., 308–18.

HALÉVY, J. Les Arabes dans les inscriptions sabéennes. *RS.*, VII., 146–58.

HARTMANN, M. Die *gam'yjet ta'lym kull wiläd masr* (Gesellschaft für den Unterricht der ägyptischen Jugend). *ZA.*, XIII., 277–87.

HAVA, J. G. Arabic-English Dictionary. Beyrouth; L.: Harrassowitz, '99; xiv, 909 pp. M. 18.

HOMMEL, F. Eine katabanische Inschrift. *ZDMG.*, LIII., '98–102.

IBN SA'ÎD. Kitâb al Mugrib fî Hulâ al-Magrib. Buch IV. Gesch. d. Ihšîden u. Fustâtenische Biographien. Textausg. nach der orig. einzig vorhand. Hs. zu Kairo u. deutsche Bearbeit. mit Anmerkgn. u. Registern, nebst e. Auszug aus al-Kindîs Ta'rîh Micr, v. K. L. TALLQVIST. Leiden: Buchh. u. Druckerei, vormals Brill, '99. M. 17.50.

Dasselbe. Der Text allein, ohne die deutsche Bearbeitg. u. den Auszug aus al-Kindîs Ta'rîh Micr. M. 10.

KERN, F. Innisâ'U-L-'Âlimât v. Muhammad Bey 'Osmân Galâl. Neuarabische Bearbeitg. v. Molière's Femmes savantes. Transc., übers. u. eingel., u. m. e. Glossar versehen. L.: Harrassowitz, '99; 152 pp. M. 4.

KROPF, L. L. The Mohammadan Calendar. *JRAS.*, '99, 142–4.

MACDONALD, D. B. The Life of al-Ghazzâlî, with special reference to his religious experiences and opinions. *Jour. Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 70–132.

PERITZ, M. Zwei alte arab. Uebersetzungen d. Buches Ruth. *JM.*, F.-Je., '99.

PRAETORIUS, F. Bemerkungen zu den beiden grossen Inschriften vom Dammbruch zu Marib. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 1–24.

SCHREINER, M. Beiträge zur Gesch. d. theologischen Bewegungen im Islâm. *ZDMG.*, LII., 513–63; LIII., 51–88.
iii. Der Sûfismus u. seine Ursprünge. iv. Die dogmatischen Ansichten der alten Imâme. v. Taqi al-din Ibn Tejmija. vi. Ibn al-Ahdad und 'Omar b. Chalîl al-Tunisi.

SOCIN, A. Key to the Translation of the English Exercises in the Arabic Grammar. N. Y.: Lemcke & Büchner, '99; 12 pp. $0.60.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. An Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews. I. Cont. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 480–89.

——— Heilmittelnamen d. Araber. Forts. *WZKM.*, XII., 319–34.

ZMIGRODSKI, M. v. Geschichte d. Baukunst der Araber und d. Bauweise der Mauren in Spanien. *ID.* Heidelberg, '99; 91 pp.

TUNISIAN.

HARTMANN, M. Tunisien, Tripolitanien und der Sudan. *OLZ.*, II., no. 3.

ETHIOPIC AND COPTIC.

LITTMANN, A. Das Verbum der Tigresprache. I. *ZA.*, XIII., 133–78.

MONDON-VIDAILHET, C. Grammaire de langue abyssine (amharique). P., '98; L.: Harrassowitz; xxiv, 301 pp. M. 9.

PERRUCHON, J. Notes pour l'histoire d'Éthiopie. *RS.*, '99, 76–88, 166–77.

——— Aperçu grammatical de la langue amharique ou amarinna comparée avec l'éthiopien. I. *M.*, Mr., '99, 74–90.

SPIEGELBERG. Koptische Miscellen. *Rec. des Trav.*, XXI., 21–3.

PERSIAN AND TURKISH.

BEVERIDGE, H. More Light on 'Omar Khayâm. *JRAS.*, '99, 135–9.

BROWNE, E. G. The Sources of Dawlatshâh; with some remarks on the materials available for a literary history of Persia, and an excursus on Bârbad and Rûdagî. *Ibid.*, '99, 37–70.

——— Yet More Light on 'Umar-i-Khayyâm. *Ibid.*, 409–20.

HARTMANN, M. Der "alttürkische Volks- und Sittenroman von Saijid Baṭṭâl. *OLZ.*, II., no. 4.

HORN, P. Persian Manuscript Attributed to Fakhru'ddîn Râzî. *JRAS.*, '99, 424.

HÜBSCHMANN, H. Zur persischen Lautlehre. *Zeitschr. f. vergl. Sprachforschg.*, '99, Heft 2.

JACOB, G. Zur Grammatik des Vulgär-Türkischen. *ZDMG.*, LII., 695–729.

JUSTI, F. Zur Inschrift von Behistân. I., 63. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 89–92.

KARABACEK, J. Bemerkungen zu Kazwînî's Kosmographie. *WZKM.*, XII., 364–9.

MARQUART, J. Hist. Glossen zu d. alttürk. Inschriften. *WZKM.*, XII., 157–200.

NICHOLSON, R. A. A Persian Manuscript Attributed to Fakhru 'ddîn Râzî. *JRAS.*, '99, 17–36.

STACKELBERG, R. v. Bemerkgn. z. pers. Sagengeschichte. I.

RABBINICAL AND JUDAICA.

ABRAHAMS, I. Chapters on Jewish Literature. Ph.: Jew. Pub. Soc., '99; 275 pp. $1.75.

ADLER, E. N. Spanish Exiles at Constantinople. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 326–9.

BACHER, W. Le mot "Minim" dans le Talmud désigne-t-il quelquefois les chrétiens? *REJ.*, '99, XXXVIII., 38-47.

BANK, L. Rabbi Zeira et Rab Zeira. *Ibid.*, '99, 47–63.

BAUER, J. Un commencement d'insurrection au quartier juif d'Avignon au XVII^e siècle. *Ibid.*, '99, 123–36.

BLOCH, M. Les juifs et la prospérité publique à travers l'histoire. *Ibid.*, '99, xiv–li.

BRUCKER, J. L'antisémitisme et le moyen âge. *Et.*, 20 Ja., '99, 250–57.

COWLEY, A. Megillath Zutta. (Note on *JQR.*, VIII., 541 foll., and IX., 721.) *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 532.

FURST. Notes lexicographiques. Suite. *REJ.*, '99, XXXVIII., 64–73.

——— Le sens de לגרון לגרונא. *Ibid.*, '99, 140–42.

GINZBERG, L. Die Haggada bei den Kirchenvätern u. in d. apokryphischen Literatur. *JM.*, '98; D., Ja., F., Mr., Apr., '99,

GRÜNHUT, L. Sefer Ha-Likkutim. Sammlung älterer Midraschim u. wiss. Abhandlgn. 3. Thl. (In Hebrew.) Fr.: Kauffmann, '99. M. 2.
a. Midrasch Eser golijoth; *b.* Einiges über die Zeit Schimeon des Gerechten; *c.* Pirke Rabenu ha-Kadosch. Nach Handschriften und älteren Druckwerken edirt, mit Einleitung u. Quellennachweis nebst Anmerkgn. v. J. S. Halberstam.

Juden, die, im römischen Reiche. Geschildert von einem Deutschen. B.: Kufahl, '99; 47 pp. M. 1.

KAUFFMANN, D. Les cycles d'images du type allemand dans l'illustration ancienne de la Haggada. *REJ.*, '99, XXXVIII., 74–102.

LEVIAS, C. The Palestinian Vocalization. *AJSL.*, XV., 157–64.

MABON, CH. B. The Jew in English Poetry and Drama. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 411–30.

MARGOLIOUTH, G. The Writings of Abu'l-faraj Furkan ibn Asad. (XI cent.) *JQR.*, XI,, 187–215.

MONTAGU, L. H. Spiritual Possibilities of Judaism Today. *Ibid.*, XI., 216–31.

NEUBAUER, A. I. Pseudo-Josephus, Joseph Ben Gorion.—II. Yerachmeel Ben Shelomoh. *Ibid.*, Apr., '99, 355–86.

SIMON, O. J. Jews and Modern Thought. *Ibid.*, Apr., '99, 387–99.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Die italien. Literatur d. Juden. Forts. *JM.*, F.–My., '99.

WALDEN, J. W. Salvation is of the Jews. *PQ.*, Apr., '99, 298–312.

WEICHMANN, F. Das Schächten (das rituelle Schlachten bei den Juden). Mit Vorwort von Strack. L.: Hinrichs, '99; 48 pp. M. 0.60.
Schriften des "Institutum judaicum" zu Berlin, no. 25.

WIENER, L. The History of Yiddish Literature in the 19th Century. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xv, 402 pp. *$2 net.*

II. THEOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

AGRICOLA. Noch einmal Bekenntnisgebundenheit u. Lehrfreiheit. *Allg. Ev.-luth. KZ.*, '99, no. 10.

BAVINCK, H. Theologische school en vrije universiteit. Kampen: Bos, '99; 81 pp. f. 0.65.

DAWSON, G. E. The Study of Man as Related to Religious Work. *BW.*, Mr., '99.

DELFOUR. Du pouvoir spirituel au 19^e siècle. *UC.*, '99, no. 1.

ELIOT, C. W., HALL, C. C., HARRIS, G., and LITTLE, C. J. Modifications in the Theological Curriculum. *AJTh.*, '99, 331–40, 324–6, 340–43.

HART, J. Zukunftsland. I. Bd. Florence: Diederichs, '99; vii, 350 pp. M. 5.
Im Kampf um eine Weltanschauung. Der neue Gott. Ein Ausblick auf das kommende Jahrh.

Katholische Flugschriften zur Wehr u. Lehr'. Red. EDMUND EIRUND. B.: Germania, '99. Each, M. 0.10.
134. SCHULER, M. Shakespeare's Confession, 42 pp.—135. SCHÄFER. Der Vatican in seiner welthistorischen Bedeutung, 44 pp.

KING, H. C. Reconstruction in Theology. *AJTh.*, '99, 295–323.

MACFARLAND, C. S. George Adam

Smith and the Lyman Beecher Lectures. *Ou.*, 22 Apr., '99.

MACKENZIE, W. D. To One who Fears that He has Lost his Bible. *BW.*, Apr., '99.

MÉCHINEAU, L. Un avertissement de Rome à quelques critiques et exégètes catholiques. *Et.*, 5 Mr., '99.

ROLFFS, E. Die Theologie als Wissenschaft. F.: Mohr, '99; 32 pp. M. 0.60. Hefte zur *Christlichen Welt*, no. 38.

STRONG, A. H. Modifications in the Theological Curriculum. *AJTh.*, '99, 326–30.

Theological Education. *Ind.*, 6 Apr., '99.

Volksaufklärung. Kleine Handbibliothek z. Lehr u. Wehr f. Freunde der Wahrheit. Hrsg.: K. HERDACH. Warnsdorf: Opitz, '99. M. 0.08.
Freiheit, Gleichheit und Brüderlichkeit, oder Sozialdemokraten unter sich. Von Registrator.— Die Sklaverei u. d. Christenthum. 2. Aufl. 37 pp.

Vorträge der theologischen Conferenz zu Kiel. 1. Heft. Kiel: Marquardsen, '99; 56 pp. M. 1.
TITIUS. Luthers Grundanschauung vom Sittlichen, verglichen m. d. Kantischen.— DECKER. Wie kann d. neutest., eschatologische Hoffnung f. d. religiös-sittl. Leben unserer Zeit die rechte praktische Bedeutung gewinnen?

WOODBERRY, G. E. Heart of Man. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 329 pp. $1.25.
Taormina; A new defence of poetry; Democracy; The ride.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

Abhandlungen z. Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte. Hrsg. v. B. ERDMANN. H. 10 & 11. Hl.: Niemeyer, '99.
10. FREYTAG, W. Die Substanzenlehre Lockes. vii, 74 pp. M. 2.—11. MARVIN, W. T. Die Giltigkeit unserer Erkenntnis der objektiven Welt. vi, 96 pp. M. 2.40.

BAISSAC, J. Les origines de la religion. Nouvelle éd., 2 vols. P.: Alcan, '99; x, 301, 310 pp. f. 12.

BAKEWELL, C. M. The Teachings of Friedrich Nietzsche. *IJE.*, Apr., '99.

Berner Studien z. Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte. Hrsg. v. L. Stein. Bern: Steiger, '99.
XIII. GRAMZOG, O. Fr. E. Benekes Leben u. Philosophie. Auf Grund neuer Quellen kritisch dargestellt. vii, 284 pp. M. 2.50.

CARR, A. St. Paul's Attitude towards Greek Philosophy. *Exp.*, My., '99.

CHOLLET, A. La morale stoïcienne en face de la morale chrétienne. P.: Lethielleux, '99; xii, 284 pp. f. 3.50.

DELATOUR, H. Le réveil de la libre pensée de Bruxelles. *Raison*, '99.

DUTOIT, M. Antoine Fogazzaro, ses idées morales et religieuses. *RChr.*, My., '99.

FAREL, P. La religion, son origine et son histoire d'après M. Sabatier, *RThQR.*, '99, 121–42.

FISCHER, M. Schleiermacher. B.: Schwetschke, '99; xvi, 258 pp. M. 3.
Zum hundertjährigen Gedächtnis d. Reden über die Religion an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verächtern.

Frommann's Klassiker der Philosophie, hrsg. von R. Falkenberg. 7. & 8. Bd. St.: Frommann, '99.
7. PAULSEN, F. Immanuel Kant. Sein Leben u. seine Lehre. Mit Bildnis u. e. Briefe Kants a. d. J. 1792 (in Fksm.). 2. u. 3. Aufl. xvi, 407 pp. M. 4.—8. SEEBECK, H. Aristoteles. 142 pp. M. 1.75.

FROMMEL, O. Das Verhältnis v. mechanischer u. teleolog. Naturerklärung bei Kant und Lotze. *ID.* Erlangen: Blaesing, '99. M. 1.20.

FUCHS, G. F. Friedrich Nietzsche. Sein Leben u. seine Lehre mit besonderer Berücksichtigg. seiner Stellung zum Christentum. 2. Aufl. St.: Belser, '99; 41 pp. M. 0.80.
Zeitfragen des christl. Volkslebens, no. 168.

GREAVES, R. H. Matthew Arnold, Froude and Hume on Miracles. *IER.*, Apr., '99.

KAUFF, H. Die Kenntnisslehre des hl. Augustin u. ihr Verhältniss zur platonischen Philosophie. 1. Th.: Gewissheit u. Wahrheit. *GPr.* M.-Gladbach, '99; 20 pp.

KELLER, L. Die Akademien d. Platoniker im Altertum. Nebst Beiträgen z. Geschichte d. Platonismus in d. christl. Zeiten. B.: Gaertner, '99; 25 pp. M. 0.75.

KÜHNEMANN, E. Grundlehren d. Philosophie. Studien über Vorsokratiker, Sokrates u. Plato. B.: Spemann, '99; xiii, 478 pp. M. 7.

LÉVY-BRUHL, L. The Contemporary Movement in French Philosophy. *Mo.*, Apr., '99.

LICHTENBERGER, H. Die Philosophie F. Nietzsches, übers. von E. Förster-Nietzsche. Dresden: Reissner, '99; lxix, 216 pp. M. 4.

MACKINTOSH, R. From Comte to Benjamin Kidd. The appeal to biology or evolution for human guidance. N.Y.: Macmillan, '99; xxiii, 312 pp. $1.50.

MÖBIUS, P. J. Ueber Schopenhauer. L.: Barth, '99; iii, 264 pp. M. 4.50.

PETAVEL-OLIFF, E. Darwin et Jésus-Christ, étude sur l'évolutionnisme chrétienne. *RChr.*, F. & Mr., '99.

PFLEIDERER, O. Das Recht der Entwickelungstheorie in d. Religionswissenschaft. *ZMR.*, '99, 4–11.

PÖHNERT, K. Joh. Matth. Gesner u. sein Verhältnis zum Philanthropinismus u. Neuhumanismus. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. Pädagogik im XVIII. Jahrh. *ID.* L.: Gräfe, '99; vi, 129 pp. M. 2.

POLLOCK, F. Spinoza: His Life and Philosophy. 2d ed. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xxiv, 427 pp. $3.

RITSCHL, O. Zum Hundertjahrgedächtnis eines berühmten Buches. *ChrW.*, '99, nos. 12, 13, 14.
Schleiermachers *Reden über die Religion.*

SCHAEFER, FR. Georg Christoph Lichtenberg als Psychologe u. Menschenkenner. L.: Dieterich, '99; 52 pp. & 3 tables. M. 1.

SCHERER, C. C. Der biologisch-psychologische Gottesbeweis bei Hermann Samuel Reimarus. Eine philosophiegesch. Studie. Würzburg: Göbel, '99; iii, 22 pp. M. 0.50.

TIELE, C. P. Elements of the Science of Religion: being the *Gifford Lectures* delivered before the University of Edinburgh in 1896. Vol. 2. Ontological. N. Y.: Imp. by Scribner's, '99; 286 pp. $2 *net.*

TROILO, E. Il misticismo moderno. Torino: Fratelli Bocca, '99; 320 pp. L. 3.

WARTENBERG, M. Kants Theorie der Kausalität, mit besonderer Berücksichtigg. der Grundprincipien u. Theorie d. Erfahrg. Eine histor.-krit. Untersuchg. z. Erkenntnistheorie. L.: Haacke, '99; viii, 294 pp. M. 6.

WEERTS, J. H. TH. Vergleichende Untersuchung der Religionsphilosophie Kants u. Fichtes. *ID.* L.: Fock, '99; 32 pp. M. 1.

WIEBRECHT, R. Die Metaphysik Schopenhauers vom naturwissenschaftlichen Standpunkte aus betrachtet. *ID.* G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '99; 65 pp. M. 0.80.

WINTZER, W. Die ethischen Untersuchungen Ludwig Feuerbach's. *AGPh.*, XII., no. 2.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ARNAL, P. A. L'idée de l'absolu dans la philosophie et la théologie d'Emanuel Biedermann. *RThQR.*, '99, 155–80.

BANKS, J. S. Present Day Philosophy and Religion. *LQR.*, Apr., '99.

BARNES, S. G. Christianity and Pantheism. *HSR.*, IX., 119–34.

BENDER, W. Mythologie u. Metaphysik. Grundlinien e. Gesch. d. Weltanschauungen. 1. Bd.: Die Entstehg. d. Weltanschauungen im griech. Altertum. St.: Frommann, '99; vii, 288 pp. M. 4.

BOWLER, TH. The Ethics of Intellectual Life and Work. *IJE.*, Apr., '99.

DES CHÊNES, M. L'idée de Dieu et le matérialisme. P.: Dupont, '99; 51 pp.

FISCHER, B. Grundzüge d. Philosophie u. der Theosophie, populär u. f. gebildete Leser leichtfasslich dargestellt. L.: Schäfer, '99; viii, 220 pp. M. 4.50.

FISKE, J. Through Nature to God. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '99; xv, 194 pp. $1.

FLINT, J. F. Psychology for Preachers. *BW.*, My., '99.

FROBENIUS, L. Ideen über d. Entwicklg. d. primitiven Weltanschauung. *ARW.*, II., 64–85.

GÉRARD-VARET, L. L'ignorance et l'irréflexion. Essai de psychologie objective. P.: Alcan, '99. f. 5.

GREGORY, D. S. Herbert Spencer: "Our Great Philosopher" *versus* the Known God. *PRR.*, '99, 267–84.

GUTBERLET, C. Der Kampf um die Seele. Vorträge über die brennenden Fragen der modernen Psychologie. Mainz: Kirchheim, '99; viii, 501 pp. M. 7.

HARDY, E. Glaube u. Brauch od. Brauch u. Glaube? *ARW.*, II., 177–81.

HASHAGEN. Mod. relig. Theorien. *Allg. Ev.-luth. Kztg.*, '99, 9 fol.

HEINRICH, W. Zur Prinzipienfrage der Psychologie. Zürich: E. Speidel, '99; v, 74 pp. M. 2.

HELLE, M. Über Menschentum u. Zuchtstaat. Ein Anarchistenideal. Mainz: Verlagsanstalt, '99; 63 pp. M. 0.75.

HOFMANN, K. Das Räthsel d. Lebens u. die Versuche, es zu deuten. Graz: Leuschner & Lubensky, '99; 44 pp. M. 1.60.

HYSLOP, J. H. Immortality and Psychical Research. *NW.*, Je., '99, 255–71.

JAMES, W. Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals. N. Y.: Holt, '99; xii, 301 pp. $1.50.

LADD, G. T. A Theory of Reality. An essay in metaphysical system upon the basis of human cognitive experience. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xv, 556 pp. $4.

LIPPS, TH. Die ethischen Grundfragen. Hamburg: Voss, '99; iii, 308 pp. M. 5.

LOTZ, R. Die Philosophie u. d. Zweck d. Lebens. Athen: Barth & Hirst, '99; iii, 73 pp. M. 1.20.

LÜDEMANN, H. Die Vorherrschaft des Geistes. Religionsphilos. u. erkenntnisstheoret. Aperçus. B.: Eichblatt, '99; vii, 96 pp. M. 2.

LUTOSLAWSKI, W. Seelenmacht. L.: Engelmann, '99; xvi, 301 pp. M. 9.

MARTIN, L. J., und G. E. MÜLLER. Zur Analyse der Unterscheidungsempfind-

MEAD, C. M. Tendencies of Recent Theistic Thought. *HR.*, My., '99.

MESSER, M. Die moderne Seele. L.: Haacke, '99; vii, 123 pp. M. 2.50.

MILLER, D. S. "The Will to Believe," and the Duty to Doubt. *IJE.*, Ja., '99. Also see H. R. Marshall, *ibid.*, Apr., 359–73; and William Caldwell, pp. 373–8.

MIVART, ST. GEO. The New Psychology. *NC.*, F., '99.

MÜNSTERBERG, H. Psychology and Life. Bo.: Houghton, '99; xiv, 286 pp. $2.

PLANTIKO, O. Lebenszweck u. Lebensauffassg. *PrM.*, F., '99, 65–72.

PURRINGTON, W. A. "Christian Science," and its Legal Aspects. *North Am. Rev.*, Mr., '99, 345–61.

ROURE, L. Bulletin Philosophique. Revues françaises pendant l'année 1898. *Et.*, 5 Mr., '99, 675–92.
1. Le mouvement idéaliste; 2. Le problème de la foi religieuse; 3. La certitude de sens.

SAUNDERS, T. B. The Quest of Faith. Being notes on the current philosophy of religion. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; vi, 191 pp. $2.50.

SIMON, O. J. The Unity of the Religious Idea. *FR.*, Apr., '99.

STEINMANN, TH. Der Primat d. Religion im menschl. Geistesleben. L.: Jansa, '99; viii, 120 pp. M. 1.50.
Ber. d. theol. Seminariums d. Brüdergemeinde in Gnadenfeld v. d. Studienj. 1897/8 u. 1898/9.

WEIR, J. The Dawn of Reason; or, Mental Traits in the Lower Animals. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xiii, 234 pp. $1.25.

Grundzügen geistigen Lebens. Ethische u. psychol. Studien. B.: Gaertner, '99; iii, 141 pp. M. 2.80.
Philosophische Vorträge, hrsg. v. d. Philosoph. Gesellschaft zu Berlin. III. Folge. 7. Heft.

WOLLNY, F. Irrwege der Gegenwart. L.: Mutze, '99; 26 pp. M. 0.60.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

ANDERSON, N. L. The Recoil of Evolution's Assault upon Theology. A review of the "Argument to Design." *PrQ.*, Apr., '99, 268–80.

BAILEY, L. H. Evolution, Nature, and Religion. *Ind.*, 2 F., '99.

BEYSCHLAG, W. Protestantisches in Goethe. *DEBl.*, '99, XXIV., 4.

BOWNE, B. P. Secularism and Christianity. *MR.*, '99, 203–17.

.. Das Problem der Kultur.

FREYBE, A. Die wilde Jagd des Abfalls u. d. Pseudo-Evangelium d. modernen Zeitgeistes in Goethes Fausttragödie. *BG.*, '99, F., 49–61; Mr., 113–22; Apr., 153–63; My., 182–94.

GERHART, E. V. Limitations of the Scientific Method. *RChR.*, Apr., '99.

HUTTON, R. H. Aspects of Religious and Scientific Thought. Selected from the *Spectator*, and ed. by his niece. Lo. & N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 428 pp. $1.50.
The Eversley Series.

KENDALL, M. Pessimism and Thomas Hardy's Poems. *LQR.*, Apr., '99.

MACDONALD, K. S. Mr. Bulloram Mullick's Defence of Idolatry. *IER.*, Apr., '99, 385–96.

OEHNINGER, F. Christentum u. moderne Weltanschauung. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; iii, 127 pp. M. 1.60.

RABUS. Wiedergeburt u. Wissenschaft. *NkZ.*, '99, 219–56.

RICKERT, H. Kulturwissensch. u. Naturwissensch. F.: Mohr, '99; 71 pp. M. 1.40.

SABATIER, A. Religion and Modern Culture. *NW.*, VIII., 91–110.

SAMTLEBEN, G. Zwei Wege vom Wissen z. Religion zurück. *BG.*, F., '99, 77–87.

——— Der Himmel d. Wissenschaft u. d. Himmel d. Glaubens. *KM.*, F., '99.

SWANDER, J. I. Conservative Progress the Law of History. II. *RChR.*, Apr., '99.

VOIGT, G. Christentum u. Bildung. L.: Dürr, '99; 29 pp. M. 0.60.

COMPARATIVE THEOLOGY; RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

D'ALVIELLA, G. Un curieux problème de transmission symbolique. Les voues liturgiques de l'ancienne Égypte. *Bull. Académie Belg.*, XXXVI.

BARTH, A. Bulletin des religions de l'Inde. I. Védisme et l'ancien Brahmanisme. I. *RHR.*, Ja.–F., '99, 60–97.

BAUER, L. Abergläubisches unter den Arabern. *M&NDP-V.*, '99, 9–12.

BLODGET, H. The Worship of Heaven and Earth by the Emperor of China. *J. of Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 58–68.

Bouddhisme. Notes et bibliographie (1898). *M.*, Mr., '99, 97–100.

BOURCHANY, J.-M. Le Bouddha d'après sa légende et le Jésus des "évangiles." *UC.*, 15 Mr., '99, 335–58.

BROWN, ROBERT, JR. Researches into the Origin of the Primitive Constellations of the Greeks, Phœnicians, and Babylonians. Vol. I. Lo.: Williams & Norgate, '99; xvi, 361 pp. 10s. 6d.

CARUS, P. Yahveh and Manitou. *Mo.*, Apr., '99, 382–415.

GRASSERIE, RAOUL DE LA. Des religions comparées au point de vue sociologique. P.: Giard & Brière, '99; 396 pp. f. 7. Bibliothèque sociologique internationale, publiée sous la direction de M. René Worms.

FRASER, D. J. The Ethics of Prohibition. *IJE.*, Apr., '99, 350–58.

FRAZER, I. G. The Origin of Totemism. *FR.*, Apr., My., '99.

GASQUET, A. Le culte et les mystères de Mithra. *Rev. des 2 Mondes*, Apr., '99.

HILLEBRANDT, A. Vedische Mythologie. 2. Bd.: Uṣas. Agni. Rudra. Br.: Marcus, '99; iv, 254 pp. M. 12.

HÖFLER, M. Krankheitsdämonen. *ARW.*, II., 86–164.

HOPKINS, E. W. How Gods are Made in India. *NW.*, VIII., 75–90.

KELLER. Untersuchungen üb. d. Judices Sacri Palatii Lateranensis. *DZKR.*, IX., 1.

KELLOGG, S. H. A Handbook of Comparative Religion. Ph.: The Presb. Board of Publ., '99; viii, 179 pp. $0.75.

LÉGER, L. Études des mythologie slave. Suite. *RHR.*, J.–F., '99, 1–17.

LOTZ, R. Ormuzd und Ahriman. Die ethische Frage im Lichte d. dualistisch-idealistischen Weltanschauung. Athen: Barth & Hirst, '99; iv, 339 pp. M. 5.

MCCORKLE, W. P. An Old Enemy with Two New Faces. *PQ.*, Apr., '99, 281–97. Teachings of Mrs. Eddy and Madame Blavatsky compared with early heresies.

OLDENBERG, H. Buddhistische Studien. *ZDMG.*, LII., 613–94.

PERDRIZET, P. Le dieu Thrace Zbelthiourdos. *R. ét. anc.*, '99, 23–6.

RAYNAUD, G. Le dieu aztec de la guerre. Dernier article. *RHR.*, '99, 18–5^

"Religionswissenschaft" ou "Religionsgeschichte." *M.*, Mr., '99, 91–7. A propos d'une nouvelle revue: *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.*

RICHARDS, GEO. W. The Changes in the Conception of the Supernatural as Affected by the Progress of Scientific Knowledge. *RChR.*, Apr., '99, 173–89.

ROSSBACH, V. Das Sacrarium des Heius in Messana. *Rhein. Mus. f. Philol.*, LIV., 277–84.

SELBY, H. M. Prometheus. *NW.*, VIII., 66–74.

SIGNE RINK. Traité sur le fétiche groenlandais-Esquimau Tu pi-lak. *M.*, Mr., '99, 37–42.

STRONG, D. M. Metaphysic of Christianity and Buddhism: a symphony. Lo.: Watts, '99; 144 pp. 2s. 6d.

STUCKEN, E. Astralmythen d. Hebraeer, Babylonier und Aegypter. Religionsgeschichtliche Untersuchgn. III. Teil: Jakob. L.: Pfeiffer; pp. 127–87. M. 6.40.

TOY, C. H. Taboo and Morality. *J. Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 151–6.

WAGNER, G. Die heidnischen Kulturreligionen u. d. Fetischismus. Heidelb.: Winter, '99; vii, 127 pp. M. 2.40.

WASER, O. Danaos und die Danaiden. *ARW.*, II., 47–63.

WELS, W. Die Nothwendigkeit e. neuen, fünften Religions-Systems (Welsentum). Hagen: Risel, '99; 31 pp. M. 0.50.

ZIELINSKI, T. Die Orestessage u. die Rechtfertigungsidee. *Neue Jahrbb. f. klass. Altert.*, '99, nos. 1, 2, 3.

B. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BERTRAND, C. M. Le livre de Dieu, de sa puissance, et de l'humanité par la divinité même. Saint-Malo, '99; 95 pp.

BROISE, R.-M. DE LA. La sainte vierge et les livres sapientiaux. *Ét.*, 5 My., '99, 289–311.

Dictionary of the Bible, A. Dealing with its language, literature, and contents (including the biblical theology). Ed. by J. HASTINGS, assisted by J. A. SELBIE. Vol. II. Feign(n) Kinsman. N. Y.: Scribner's; Ed.: T. & T. Clark, '99; xv, 870 pp. & map. $7.

FALK, F. Exeget. Arbeiten d. Mainzer Jesuiten. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 366–70.

MACKIE, G. M. Bible Manners and Customs. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '99; 175 pp. $1.

SIMON, J. Chronique biblique. *RHLR.*, '99, 166–92.

WELLS, J. Some Exegetical Studies. *ET.*, My., '99, 366–7.

BALDENSPERGER, P. J. Woman in the East. *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 132–60.

BUTTENWIESER, M. The Bearings of Egyptology on the Bible and Early History of Israel. Cin., '99; 12 pp.

DEWART, E. H. Can Any but Expert Linguists Judge the Theories of the "Higher Critics"? *HR.*, My., '99.

DITTMAR, W. Vetus Testamentum in novo. Die alttestamentl. Parallelen d. Neuen Testaments, im Wortlaut d. Urtexte u. der Septuaginta zusammengestellt. 1. Hälfte: Evangel. u. Apostelgeschichte. G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '99; vii, 139 pp. M. 3.60.

GOULD, E. P. The Bible in Higher Institutions of Learning. *MR.*, '99, 84–94.

KATZENELSON, L. Die rituellen Reinheitsgesetze in d. Bibel u. im Talmud. *JM.*, F., Mr., Apr., '99.

KYLE, M. G. The Value of the Spade in Biblical Criticism. *Biblia*, Mr., '99.

PERRY, A. T. The Preëminence of the Bible as a Book. *HSR.*, My., '99, 183–209.

THOMPSON, A. C. Misquotation of Scripture. *Ibid.*, 210–22.

VOELKNER, W. Eine psychologische Erklärung d. in der Bibel geschilderten Besessenheit. *D-AZThK.*, XX., 1–9.

BRAENDLI, G. Warum u. wie Luther d. deutschen Volke eine deutsche Bibel geschaffen hat. *D-AZThK.*, XX., 20-25.

FALK, F. Die Mainzer Bibeldrucke. *Kath.*, Apr., '99.

Heimath, Die, der vatikan. Bibelhandschrift. *Allg. Ev.-luth. KZ.*, '99, no. 13.

HOARE, H. W. The English Bible from Henry VIII. to James I. *NC.*, Apr., '99.

PICK, B. Bible Versions for the Philippines. *Ind.*, 2 Mr., '99.

BLISS, F. J. Excavations at Jerusalem. N. Y.: New Amsterdam Book Co., '99; 374 pp. $4 *net.*

——— Second Report on the Excavations at Tell Zakarîya. *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 89–111.

DEVERETT, F. H. My Tour in Palestine and Syria. Illus. Route map & plan of Jerusalem. Lo.: Eyre & Sp., '99; 286 pp. 5s.

GAUTIER, L. The Wells of Beersheba. *ET.*, '99, Apr., 328; Je., 429.

GEIKIE, C. Holy Land and the Bible: Scripture illustr. gathered in Palestine. 400 orig. illustr. Lo. & N. Y.: Cassell, '99; 960 pp. 7s. 6d.

LAMMENS, H. Sur la frontière nord de la terre promise. Fin. *Et.*, 5 Mr., '99, 601–21.

SAYCE, A. H. Recent Archæological Discoveries. *Et.*, Apr., '99, 332.

SCHUMACHER. Unsere Arbeiten im Ostjordanlande. III. *M&NDP-V.*, '99, 1–6, 17–23.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

ABBOTT, L. Hebrew Prophets and American Problems. *Out.*, 22, 29 Apr.; 6, 13, 20, 27 My.; 10, 17, 24 Je., '99.

STAERK, W. Studien zur Religions- u. Sprachgesch. d. Alten Testam. 1. Heft. B.: Reimer, '99; vi, 96 pp. M. 3.
I. Prolegomena zu e. Gesch. d. israel. Vätersage. II. Zur Gesch. d. hebr. Volksnamen.

LANGUAGE AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

BEVAN, A. The Hebrew Words אָדָן, אֲדָר and אֶדֶר. *Jour. of Phil.*, '99, 300–302.

CHEYNE, T. K. Biblical Studies. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 400–407.
The Use of the Hebrew Word נִצָּרוֹן. II. The Text of Cant. 7:3, 5–7.

GESENIUS, W. Hebr. u. aram. Handwörterbuch üb. d. A. T., bearb. v. F. BUHL. 13. Aufl. L.: Vogel, '99; xii, 1030 pp. M. 18.

RUBEN, P. Strophic Forms in the Bible. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 431–79.

WEIR, TH. H. A Short History of the Hebrew Text of the O. T. L.: Williams & Norgate, '99; xiv, 149 pp.

EZEKIEL, The Book of the Prophet. A new English translation. With explanatory notes and pictorial illustr. By C. H. TOY. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., '99; x, 200 pp.
The Sacred Books of the Old and New Testaments, Part 12, edited by PAUL HAUPT.

JOSHUA, The Book of. A new English translation. With explanatory notes and pictorial illustrations. By W. H. BENNETT. N. Y.: Dodd, Mead & Co., '99; viii, 94 pp. $1.25 *net.*
The Sacred Books of the Old and New Testaments, Part 6, edited by PAUL HAUPT.

MÜRKENS, G. Untersuchungen über das altengl. Exoduslied. *Bonner Beitr. z. Anglistik*, II., '99, 62–117.

NESTLE, E. Zur Rekonstruction d. Septuaginta. *Philologus*, LVIII., 121–32.

Old Testament in Greek according to the LXX. Ed. by H. B. SWETE. Vol. 3. 2d ed. Lo.: Clay; N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 922 pp. 7s. 6d.

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

ADENEY, W. F. The Story of Moses in [illegible] Abrahams Leben u. Bedeutung f. das Reich Gottes nach Auffassg. d. ält. Haggada. *Nath.*, XV., 2.

BURDICK, L. D. The Stela of Merenptah. *Biblia*, My., '99.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, C. A Newly Discovered Hebrew and Greek Inscription relating to the Boundary of Gezer. *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 118–26.

CONDER, C. L. Notes on the Antiquities of the Books of Joshua and Judges. *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 161–3.

DEIBER, FR. A. La stèle de Mineptah et Israel. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 267–77.

ETOC, G. Le Lecanora esculenta et la Manne des Hébreux. Le Mans: Monnoyer, '99.

FONCK, L. Zur Israel-Inschrift Merneptah's. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 377–8.

GREGG, A. J. Note on Gibeon, Nob, Bezek, and the High-Level Aqueduct to Jerusalem. *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 128–30.

HANAUER, J. E. Ruins of the Herodian Jericho. *Ibid.*, 127–8.

HERNER, S. Den mosaiska tiden. Undersökning af hvad som är mosaiskt i dekalogerna och förbundsboken. Lund: E. Malmström, '99; iii, 304 pp.
Lunds Universitets Årsskrift. Bd. 35. Afdeln 2, no. 2.

JASTROW, MORRIS. Dust, Earth and Ashes as Symbols of Mourning among the Ancient Hebrews. *J. Am. Or. Soc.*, XX., 133–50.

KENT, CH. F. A History of the Jewish People, during the Babylonian, Persian, and Greek Periods. With maps & charts. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xx, 380 pp.

KÖBERLE, J. Die Tempelsänger im Alten Testament. Ein Versuch z. israelit. u. jüd. Cultusgesch. Erlangen: Junge, '99; viii, 205 pp. M. 3.

KÖNIG, E. Zur Gesch. Israels. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, no. 17.
On Cornill's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel.*

MEILI, F. Zur Charakteristik d. Königs Ahab. *ZSchw.*, '99, 17–23.

NIKEL, J. Zerubabel, seine angebl. Erhebg. u. sein Sturz. *Kath.*, '98, no. 11.

OFFORD, J. *Yansem* on the Meneptah Stele (perh. = *Yanum* of Josh. 15:53). *PSBA.*, XXI., 142.

ROHRBACH, P. Megiddo. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 16.

SAYCE, A. H. The Antediluvian Patriarchs. *ET.*, My., '99, 352–4.

J. Am. Or. Soc., XX.,

VINCENT, H. Un hypogée juif. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 297–304.

WHYTE, A. Bible Characters: Ahithophel to Nehemiah. Ed.: Oliphant, '99; 242 pp. 3s. 6d.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

BEECHER, W. J. Old Testament Books *versus* their Sources. *BS.*, '99, 209–22.

CARTER, W. L. Pharaoh's Butler and the Cup. *ET.*, My., '99, 379.
Ad ET., Ja., '99, p. 171.

FONCK, L. Kritik u. Tradition im A. T. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 262–81.

HEUDUCK. Die bibl. Urgesch. Gen. 1–11. *EKZ.*, '99, [illegible]

KIRWAN, J. E. C. DE. La localisation du déluge et les Péripéties de la question. P., '99; 45 pp.

LODS, A. Quelques mots sur le mosaisme. *RChr.*, My., '99.

MARGIVAL, H. Richard Simon et la critique biblique au XVII^e siècle. IX. Richard Simon et Jean Le Clerc. *RHLR.*, '99, 123–39.

OETTLI, S. Das Königsideal des Alten Testaments. Greifswald: Abel, '99; 26 pp. M. 0.80.
Festreden der Universität Greifswald, no. 7.

PATON, L. B. The Dependence of the Prophets upon History. II. *BW.*, Apr., '99, 231–43.

ST. CLAIR, G. The Date and Meaning of Creation. *Biblia*, Mr., '99.

SOARES, TH. G. The Import of the Chronicles as a Piece of Religio-Historical Literature. *AJTh.*, '99, 251–74.

VOS, G. The Modern Hypothesis and Recent Criticism of the Early Prophets: Micah. *PRR.*, '99, 285–317.

WHATHAM, A. E. Were the Israelites Ever Polytheists? *BW.*, My., '99, 293–307.

THEOLOGY.

BUDDE, K. The Religion of the Hebrews in Pre-exile Days. N. Y.: Putnam's, '99.

HOONACKER, A. VAN. Le sacerdoce lévitique: dans la loi et dans l'histoire des Hébreux. Louvain: Istas, '99; 465 pp. f. 10.

——— Les prêtres et les lévites dans le livre d'Ezéchiel. *RB.*, '99, 177–205.

HUMMELAUER, F. v. Das vormosaische Priesterthum in Israel. Vergleichende Studie zu Exodus u. 1 Chron. 2–8. F.: Herder, '99; vii, 106 pp. M. 3.

SMITH, W. W. The Words of the Covenant, the Ten Commandments, their Far-reaching Nature. *HR.*, My., '99.

THE LAW.

EHRLICH, A. B. Mikrâ ki-Pheschutô (die Schrift nach ihrem Wortlaut). Scholien u. krit. Bemerkungen zu d. hl. Schriften d. Hebräer. 1. Thl.: Der Pentateuch (in Hebräisch). B.: Poppelauer, '99; x, 385 pp. M. 10.

Great Text Commentary. The Great Texts of Genesis. *ET.*, '99, Apr., 317–20; My., 354–6; Je., 402–5.
Gen. 12: 1–3; 12: 10–12; 22: 1, 2.

MCKEE, W. P. Transient and Permanent Elements in Deuteronomy. *BW.*, Apr., '99, 249–51.

ROBINSON, GEORGE L. The Genesis of Deuteronomy. *Exp.*, Apr., '99, 271–95; My., 356–71.
IV. The Laws Peculiar to Deuteronomy. V. Conclusion.

STEUERNAGEL, C. Der jehovistische Bericht über d. Bundesschluss am Sinai. (Ex. 19–24; 31, 18—34, 28.) *StKr.*, '99, 319–49.

THE PROPHETS.

BARNES, W. E. The Devotional Reading of Isaiah. *Exp.*, Apr., '99, 311–17.

BECK, J. C. Erklärung d. Propheten Nahum u. Zephanja, nebst einem prophetischen Totalbild der Zukunft. Hrsg. von Gutscher u. Lindenmeyer. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; vi, 168 pp. M. 2.50.

BENZINGER, I. Die Bücher d. Könige, erklärt. Mit 9 Abbildgn. im Text, Plan d. alten Jerusalem, u. einer Geschichtstabelle. F.: Mohr, '99; xxiii, 216 pp. M. 5.
Kurzer Handkommentar zum Alten Testament . . . . hrsg. v. K. Marti. Lieferung 7.

CARHART, C. L. The Potsherd in Isaiah 45: 9. *BW.*, Apr., '99, 252–5.

CHEYNE, T. K. On Kings 10: 25, and Other Passages. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 330.
Job 20: 24; 39: 21; Isa. 22: 8; Ezek. 39: 9 fol.; Ps. 140*a*; Neh. 3: 19: 1 Kings 10: 25; 2 Chr. 9: 24.

DÄCHSEL, E. A. Zur richtigen Auffassg. d. von d. Verwerfung d. ersten israelit. Königs Saul handelnden Stellen: 1 Sam. 13 u. 15. *KZ.*, 11., no. 4.

DEINARD, S. N. Notes on Isaiah, chap. 7. *AJSL.*, XV., 165–7.

GOODWIN, E. B. The Old Testament "Song of Hannah," 1 Sam. 2: 1–10. A critical study. Washington, '99; 14 pp.
Repr. from *Cath. Univ. Bulletin*, Apr., '99.

HALÉVY, J. Recherches bibliques: L'auteur sacerdotal et les prophètes. *RS.*, VII., 1–19, 97–130.
Les Grands Prophètes: Isaïe 1er.

HENDRIX, E. R. Isaiah as a City Preacher. *MR.*, '99, 163–77.

HOLZHEY, C. Das Buch der Könige (Reg. III, IV). Untersuchung s. Bestandteile u. s. litterarischen u. gesch. Charakters. M.: Lentner, '99; viii, 63 pp. M. 1.40.

KENNEDY, J. The Book of Jonah. *Bab. Or. Rec.*, Apr., '99.

KÖNIG, ED. Ueber Cersoys Studie über d. Gleichniss vom Weinberg, Jes. 5, 1–7. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, no. 10.

OTTLEY, R. L. The Hebrew Prophets. Lo.: Rivingtons, '99; 128 pp. 1s.
Oxford Church Text Book.

PERATHONER, A. Brevis in Isaiam prophetam commentarius, quem usui clericorum in seminario Tridentino accommodavit. Trient: Seiser, '99; iv, 228 pp. M. 3.

QUARLES, J. A. Jephthah's Vow. Judg. 11: 29–40. *HR.*, Apr., '99, 352–4.

SELBIE, J. A. The International Critical Commentary on 'Samuel.' *ET.*, My., '99, 358–60.

SELLIN. Jeremia von Anatot. *NkZ.*, '99, 257–86.

TOUZARD, J. Isaïe 11: 2–3*a*, et les sept dons du Saint-Esprit. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 249–66.

WORTMAN, D. Isaiah 7: 9 *HR.*, Je., '99.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BEVAN, A. Notes on Job 3: 5. *Jour. of Phil.*, '99, 303–5.

CHEYNE, T. K. Studies in the Criticism of the Psalms. *Exp.*, '99, Apr., 252–63; My., 334–44.
Ps. 39.

——— On Job. 5 : 5 and Other Passages. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 336.
Job 5 : 5; Ps. 45 : 11; 81 : 4; Am. 8 : 9.

——— More Critical Gleanings in Job. *Ibid.*, My., '99, 380–83.
3 : 4, 5; 5 : 3; 7 : 1, 17, 18, 15–16, 17; 13 : 12*b*, 15; 20 : 7, 23; 26 : 5; 28 : 18; 30 : 18.

COOK, A. S. The Articles of Dress in Dan. 3 : 31. *Jour. of Phil.*, '99, 306–16.

GIBSON, E. C. S. The Book of Job. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 236 pp. 6s.
Vol. 1 of: "Oxford Commentaries."

GREVE, J. Koheleth, der Prediger Salomo. Ein apologet. Vortrag. Braunschw.: Wollermann, '99; 86 pp. M. 1.
Veröffentlichungen des Bibelbundes, no. 6.

HERBST, F. Warum leide ich? Betrachtungen üb. d. Gesch. Hiobs. Barmen: Wupperthaler Traktat-Gesellsch., '99; iv, 150 pp. M. 1.20.

ISAACS, H. Mal. 2 : 11; Ps. 69:5. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 526.

LINDER, K. Zur Komposition d. Buches Hiob. *ZSchw.*, '99, 41–50.

MACDONALD, D. B. Job and Muslim Cosmography. *AJSL.*, XV., 168–9.

PETERS, N. Zu Ps. 24 u. 15. XXIII., 364–5.

RIESSLER, P. Das Buch Daniel. Textkrit. Untersuchung. St.: Roth, '99; vii, 56 pp. M. 2.

TYLER, TH. Some Observations on Job 11 : 6. *JQR.*, Apr., '99, 529–32.

ZENNER, J. K. Psalm 8. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 371–4.

APOCRYPHA.

BÜCHLER, A. Encore quelques notes sur le nouveau fragment de l'ecclésiastique. *REJ.*, '99, XXXVIII., 137–40.

HERKENNE, H. De veteris latinæ ecclesiastici, capitibus i–xliii, una cum notis ex eiusdem libri translationibus æthiopica, armeniaca, copticis, latina altera, syro-hexaplari depromptis. L.: Hinrichs, '99; viii, 268 pp. M. 7.

MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. The Origin of the "Original Hebrew" of Ecclesiasticus. Lo.: Parker, '99; 20 pp.

MÉCHINEAU, L. Le texte hébreu de l'ecclésiastique et l'exégèse. *Et.*, 20 Apr., '99, 170–97.

REINACH, TH. Un conte babylonien dans la littérature juive: Le roman d'Akhikhar. *REJ.*, '99, XXXVIII., 1–13.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

CLÉRISSAC, P. H. De saint Paul à Jésus-Christ. P.: Plon, '99. f. 3.

GLAISTER, R. Christ's Sympathy in Life's Commonplace. *ET.*, My., '99, 360–63.

HOEDEMAKER, PH. Het ambt van Johannes den Dooper. *Troffel en Zwaard*, '99, 21–33.

JACQUIER, E. Travaux récents sur le recensement de Quirinius. *UC.*, 15 Apr., '99, 607–14.

SATTERLEE, H. Y. New Testament Churchmanship and the Principles upon which it was Founded. N. Y.: Longmans, '99; xxx, 280 pp. $1.50.

ZAHN, TH. Die Dormitio Sanctæ Virginis u. das Haus d. Johannes Markus. *NkZ.*, My., '99, 377–429.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

ARNAUD, E. Essai sur le caractère de la langue grecque du Nouveau Testament. *RThQR.*, '99, 143–54.

BRYSON, ADA. Recent Literature on the Text of the New Testament. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 294–300.

Codex Bezæ Cantabrigiensis. A facsimile edition of the Greek and Latin MS. of the four gospels and Acts of the Apostles, preserved in the Cambridge University Library, and generally known as Codex Bezæ or Codex D. 2 vols. Cambridge: Univ. Press, '99; 830 pp. £12 *net.*

Greek Concordance to the New Testament. By W. F. MOULTON and A. S. GREEN. 2d ed. Ed.: Clark, '99; 1044 pp. 26s. *net.*

LEWIS, A. S., and M. D. GIBSON. The Palestinian Syriac Lectionary of the Gospels. Re-edited from 2 Sinai MSS. and from P. de Lagarde's edition of the "Evangeliarium Hierosolymitarum." Lo.: Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., '99; lxxii, 320 pp.

Testamentum, novum, græce. Præsertim in usum studiosorum recognovit et brevibus annotationibus instruxit J. M. S. BALJON. Vol. II. (pp. 321–731). Groningen: Wolters, '99. M. 6.50.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

BANG, S. Das Leben Jesu in historisch-pragmatischer Darstellung. (In 2 Tln.)

I. Tl. L.: Wunderlich, '99; xii, 156+ xx pp. M. 1.20.

BEBBER, VAN. Zur Frage nach d. Dauer des öffentl. Lehramtes Jesu. *Kath.*, Mr., '99.

BOYS-SMITH, E. P. The Day of the Crucifixion. *ET.*, My., '99, 383–4.

BRÜCKNER, W. Die Berichte über die Auferstehung Jesu Christi. *PrM.*, '99, Mr., 96–110; Apr., 153–9.

BRÜLL, A. Jesus vor Annas. *Kath.*, Mr., '99.

BURKHARDT, G. D. Auferstehg. d. Herrn u. seine Erscheinungen. G.: Vandenhoeck & R., '99; iv, 288 pp. M. 2.80.

EMDE, R. Jesus von Nazareth — Prophet oder Messias? Osnabrück: Hoppenrath, '99; 31 pp. M. 0.50.

EWALD, P. Wer war Jesus? L.: Deichert, '99; 36 pp. M. 0.60.

FÜRER, C. E. Der Prozess wider Jesum in den wechselnden Phasen seines Verlaufes. *BG.*, Mr., '99, 89–112.

GARVIE, A. E. The Temptation of Christ. *ET.*, '99, Apr., 301–3; My., 356–8; Je., 419–21.

GRIMM, J. Das Leben Jesu. Nach d. 4 Evangelien dargestellt. 7. Bd.: Gesch. d. Leidens Jesu. (2. Bd.) Unter Benützung d. Vorarbeiten von J. Grimm, bearb. v. J. ZAHN. Regensb.: Pustet, '99; xiv, 653 pp. M. 5.

HADORN. Der geschichtliche Christus. *ZSchw.*, '99, 50–59.

KORFF, TH. Zur Auferstehung Jesu Christi. *BG.*, Apr., '99, 125–52.
See STEUDE, *ibid.*, Je., '99, 213–30.

LAMB, F. J. Value to Faith of the Trial of Jesus. *BS.*, '99, 223–40.

LASSON, G. Christi Tod. *KM.*, Mr., '99.

LÉMANN, A. Satan contra Jésus. *UC.*, 15 Apr., '99, 504–32.

MARCHANT, J. Theories of the Resurrection of Jesus Christ? Lo.: Williams & N., '99; 134 pp. 2s. *net.*

MASTERMAN, E. W. G. Was Our Lord Crucified on the 14th or 15th of Nisan? *ET.*, Apr., '99, 315–17.

MONOD, W. Tertia die resurrexit. *RChr.*, '99, 241–52.

PATERSON, W. R. The Irony of Jesus. *Mo.*, Apr., '99, 345–58.

PORRET, J. A. Jésus-Christ est-il ressuscité? P.: Delessert, '99. f. 1.50.

ROSE, F. R. Études évangeliques: La conception surnaturelle de Jésus. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 206–31.

SCHICK, C. Through which Gate did Jesus Make his Triumphal Entry into Jerusalem? *QSPEF.*, Apr., '99, 112–16.

SÖDERBLOM, N. Jesu bergspredikan. En undersökning. Stockholm: Haeggström, '99; 192 pp. Kr. 3.50.

THOMSEN. Geburtsjahr Christi. *Allg. Kons. Monatsschr.*, '99, no. 4.

WILSON, H. The Third Day: the Resurrection a proof of Christianity. Lo.: Church Shop, '99; 72 pp. 1s. *net.*

APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

ARNAUD, S. Simon le Cyrénéen. *Nouv. Rev.*, XXI., 3.

BARTLET, J. V. The Apostolic Age. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99. $2 *net.*
Epochs of Church History.

BOLLAND, G. J. P. J. Petrus en Rome. Een verloog voor roomsche landgenooten. Leiden: Adriani, '99.

CORT, C. Pentecost — the Birthday of the New Testament Church. *RChR.*, Apr., '99, 227–36.

DAHLMANN, A. König Herodes u. seine Familie. *D-AZThK.*, XX., 10–19.

GILBERT, G. H. The Student's Life of Paul. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; x, 279 pp. $1.25 *net.*

GOEBEL, S. Johannes d. Täufer, Dichtung u. Wahrheit. *BG.*, My., '99, 165–81.

LASSON, G. Die älteste Christenheit. Betrachtungen üb. d. apostol. Geschichte. I. Bd.: Die Grundzüge d. Kirche. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; xii, 408 pp. M. 4.80.

——— Ueber die Bekehrung d. Paulus. *Hefte z. evg. Weltansch.*, '99, I., 1; iii, 35 pp. M. 0.50.

LEWIS, WM. M. St. Paul's Defense before King Agrippa, in Relation to the Epistle to the Hebrews. *BW.*, Apr., '99, 244–8.

SLOTEMAKER DE BRUINE, J. R. Een nieuw boek voer den N. T.-ischen Tijd. *ThSt.*, '99, 114–30.
On Holtzmann's *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.*

VALETON, I. M. J. Hierosolyma Capta. *Mnemosyne*, '99, nos. 1 and 2.
In criticism of Schürer's *Geschichte d. jüd. Volkes*, 3. Aufl.

VAN DYKE, H. The Many-Sided Apostle Paul. *Ou.*, 18 Mr., '99.

WEBER, O. Die Zeit d. zweiten Jerusalemreise d. bekehrten Paulus. *Theol.-prakt. Monatsschr.*, '99, 93–101, 186–91.

ZAHN, TH. Die Wanderungen d. Apostels Johannes. *NkZ.*, '99, 191–218.

THEOLOGY.

BOSWORTH, E. I. The Damascus Vision and Paul's Theology. *BS.*, '99, 278–300.

FRIEDLÄNDER, M. L'anti-Messiah. *REJ.*, '99, XXXVIII., 14–37.
Mainly on Bousset, *Der Antichrist*; and sections of Gunkel, *Chaos u. Schöpfung.*

LICHTENSTEIN, A. Des Apostels Paulus Überlieferung von d. Einsetzung d. hl. Abendmahles (1 Kor. 11 : 23 f.) nach ihrem litterarischen u. bibl.-theol. Verhältnis zu d. synopt. Berichten. B.: Warneck, '99; iii, 68 pp. M. 1.50.

RUPP, W. Christ's Parousia. *RChR.*, Apr., '99, 241–51.

SIMON. Gottesgeist u. Menschengeist bei Paulus. *Hefte z. evgl. Weltansch.*, I., 5. M. 0.50.

SLADECZEK, H. Paulinische Lehre über d. Moralsubjekt. Als anthropologische Vorschule zur Moraltheologie des hl. Apostels Paulus. Regensburg: Nat.-Verlagsanst., '99; xi, 336 pp. M. 4.

STEVENS, GEO. B. The Theology of the New Testament. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xvi, 617 pp. $2.50 *net.*
International Theological Library.

WATSON, J. The Doctrines of Grace. *Exp.*, Apr., '99, 241–52; My., 321–33.
2. Repentance; 3. Forgiveness.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

BERLE, A. A. Modern Interpretations of the Gospel Life. Bo.: Pilgrim Press, '99; 328 pp. $2.

BISHOP, W. F. In the Name of God, Amen. *PQ.*, Apr., '99, 339–44.

BRINEY, J. B. Paul's Natural Man (1 Cor. 2 : 14). *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 251–3.

CLEMEN, CARL. The "Speaking with Tongues" of the Early Christians. *ET.*, My., '99, 344–52.

EVEREST, H. W. Argument or Interpretation? (Gal. 3:10). *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 253–4.

Evolution of the Crucifix 1 Cor. 1 : 18. *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 254–6.

JANNARIS, A. N. Misreadings and Misrenderings in the New Testament. *Exp.*, Apr., '99, 296–310.
Errors of Interpretation.

THUDICHUM, FR. Kirchl. Fälschungen. II. Der Brief an die Hebräer. B.: Schwetschke, '99; pp. 90–165. M. 1.

ZAHN, TH. Natur u. Kunst im Neuen Testament. *NkZ.*, '99, 287–312.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

BARNARD, P. M. Notes on Acts 1 : 19 ff. *Exp.*, Apr., '99, 317–20.

CALMES, TH. Comment se sont formés les évangiles; la question synoptique; l'évangile de saint Jean. P.: Bloud et Barral, '99; 63 pp.

——— Le prologue du quatrième évangile et la doctrine de l'incarnation. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 232–48.

CHAJES, H. P. Markus-Studien. B.: Schwetschke, '99; viii, 78 pp. M. 2.

DECHENT, H. Zur Auslegung der Stelle Joh. 19 : 35. *StKr.*, '99, 446–67.

GERHART, E. V. Relative Authority of the Gospels. *AJTh.*, III., '99, 275–94.

GILBERT, G. H. An Important Unnoticed Argument in John, chap. 17. *BW.*, My., '99, 308–11.

GRAEFE, F. Die Doppelausgabe der Schriften des Lukas. *Hefte z. evgl. Weltansch.*, I., 6; 20 pp. M. 0.30.

HARNACK, A. Das Aposteldecret (Acts 15 : 29) u. die Blass'sche Hypothese. *SA.*, Berlin, Mr., '99, 150–77.
Publ. separately. B.: Reimer, '99; 27 pp. M. 1.

HEITMÜLLER, W. Die Quellenfrage in d. Apostelgesch. (1886–1898). II., III. *ThR.*, II., 83–94, 127–40.

JUKES, A. The Characteristic Differences of the Four Gospels, considered as revealing various relations of the Lord Jesus Christ. Chi. & N. Y.: Revell, '99; 163 pp. $0.75.

LINDER, G. Principe qui a présidé à l'ordonnance de l'évangile selon S. Jean. *RThPh.*, '99, 190–94.

LOISY, A. Les vendeurs du temple, Jean II, 13–25. *RHLR.*, 140–60.

MOORE, D. Family Influence in the Gospel of Matthew. *PRR.*, '99, 324–30.

PALMER, J. Gospel Problems and their Solution. Inquiry into the origin of the four gospels. L.: Allenson, '99; 412 pp. 3s. 6d.

RAMSAY, W. M. On Mark 12 : 42. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 336.

SAYOUS, R. Étude exégétique sur Matthieu 13 : 1–17. *ID.* P.: Noblet, '99; 47 pp.

STIGLMAYR, J. Johannes 2 : 4. *Kath.*, Apr., '99.

VITEAU, J. Notes critiques sur l'évangile de saint Matthieu et de saint Marc. *Rev. de philol.*, Ja., '99, 53–67.

WAGNER, C. Ceux qui pleurent (Matth. 5 : 4). Étude évangélique. *RChr.*, Mr., '99.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

BARBOUR, J. H. The Structure and Teaching of the Apocalypse. *BW.*, My., '99, 316–25.

BATIFFOL, P. De l'attribution de l'épître aux Hébreux à saint Barnabé. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 278–83.

Drei ersten Briefe aus der ersten röm. Gefangenschaft des Apostels Paulus. *Allg. Ev.-luth. KZ.*, '99, no. 14.

ERMONI, V. Les épîtres aux Corinthiens et la critique. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 283–9.

GIBSON, J. M. Apocalyptic Sketches. *Exp.*, '99, Apr., 263–71; My., 379–88; , 457–65.
. The Sev
VI. The Sunclad Woman and her Enemies.

KÖGEL, J. Die Verborgenheit Jesu als des Messias, das Problem d. Hebräerbriefes. *UPr.* Greifswald, '99; 68 pp.

LOMAN'S Nalatenschap, mitgegeven door W. C. van Manen en H. N. Meyboom. I. De brief aan de Galatiërs. Groningen: Wolkers, '99; viii, 207 pp. M. 5.

ROBERTSON, A.
to the Romans

STRANGE, C. Instructions on the Revelation of St. John, the Divine. N. Y.: Longmans, '99; xx, 331 pp.

TIEFENTHAL, F. S. De versione versus 2[1] Apacalypseos. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 295–6.

Wisdom of John, commonly called the First Epistle General of John. (Transl.) *IER.*, Apr., '99, 418–24.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

BRINKMANN, A. Die apokryphen Fragen d. Bartholomaeus. *Rhein. Mus. f. Philol.*, LIV., 93–110.

CARREZ, L. Deux nouveaux écrits de Saint Pierre Fourier. *Et.*, 20 Apr. '99, 252–61.

Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum latinorum, etc. Vol. 40. W.: Freytag, '99; xix, 660 pp. M. 19.80.
AUGUSTINI, A. De civitate dei libri XXII. Recensuit et commentario critico instruxit E. HOFFMANN. Vol. I, libri I–XIII.

COX, W. A. St. Chrysostom, Hom. XIII. in Ephes., p. 830. *Class. Rev.*, Mr., '99, 135.

CRUTTWELL, C. T. A Literary History of Early Christianity, including the Fathers and the chief heretical writers of the ante-Nicene period, for the use of students and general readers. N. Y.: Imp. by Scribner's, '99; 2 vols. $6 *net.*

DIXON, CH. Eerstelingen van den oogst. Schetsen uit het begin der reformatie te Utrecht, 1521–6. Nijkerk: Callenbach, '99; 152 pp. fl. 0.80.

DOORN, A. Het tractaat "Cur Deus Homo." *Ti. voor geref. Theol.*, VI., 5, 277–92.

DOPSCH, A. Die Ebersheimer Urkundenfälschgn. u. e. bisher unbeachtet. Dienstrecht aus d. 12. Jahrh. *Mitth. d. Inst. f. öst. Geschichtsforsch.*, XIX., 577–614.

Ecclesiæ occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima canonum et conciliorum græcarum, interpretationes latinæ Edidit C. H. TURNER. Fasci Primi Pars Prior. Canones Apostolorum Nicænorum Patrum Subscriptiones. Oxford: Clarendon Press, '99. 7os. 6d.

ELLIS, R. On the *Octavius* of Minucius Felix and Firmicus *De errore profanarum religionum. Jour. Phil.*, '99, 197–202.

ENDRES, J. A. Korrespondenz der Mauriner mit d. Emmeranern u. Beziehgn. d. letzteren zu den wiss. Beweggn. d. 18. Jahrhdts. St.: Roth, '99; 103 pp. M. 3.

FAULHABER, M. Die Propheten-Catenen nach röm. Handschriften. F.: Herder, '99; xv, 219 pp. M. 6.
"Biblische Studien," hrsg. v. BARDENHEWER, Bd. IV., Heft 2 & 3.

FISHER, F. H. Ignatius *ad Romanos. ET.*, My., '99, 379–80.

FLEMING, D. H. The Sum of Saving Knowledge. *PRR.*, '99, 318–23.

HALL, E. H. Papias and His Contemporaries. A study of religious thought in the second century. Bo.: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., '99; 314 pp. $1.25.

HOMOLLE, TH. Le corpus inscriptionum græcarum christianarum. *Berl. phil. Woch.*, '99, no. 12.

HORCIČKA, A. Eine Handschrift des Klosters Ostrow aus dem Jahre 1403. *Mitth. d. Ver. f. Gesch. d. Deutsch. in Böhmen*, XXXVII., no. 3.

KAIBEL, G. Cassius Longinus und die Schrift περὶ ὕψους. *Hermes*, '99, 107–32.

KAWERAU, G. Ueber eine angebl. verschollene Spottschrift gegen Eck. *BBK.*, '99, 128–34.

KLEIN, E. Aus der Schatzkammer hl. Väter. 3. Heft. B.: Berl. Stadtmission, '99. M. 0.30.
3. Ignatiusbriefe. I. Uebers. 24 pp.

KNOEPFLER, A. Walafridi Strabonis liber de exordiis et incrementis quarundam in observationibus ecclesiasticis rerum. Textum recensuit. Adnotationibus historicis et exegeticis illustravit. Introductionem et indicem addidit. Ed. altera. M.: Lentner, '99; xx, 114 pp. M. 1.40.
Veröffentlichungen aus d. kirchenhistor. Seminar München, no. 1.

KRUSCH, B. Zur Afralegende und zum Martyrologium Hieronymianum. Eine Entgegnung. *N. Arch. d. Gesellsch. f. ält. deu. Geschichtsk.*, XXIV., 287–337.

KURTZ, E. Zwei griechische Texte üb. die hl. Theophano, Gemahlin Kaisers Leo VI. L.: Voss, '99,; xi, 75 pp. M. 2.
Aus: Mémoires de l'Acad. imp. des sciences de St. Pétersbourg.

LEJAY, P. Les traités attribués à Adam de Saint-Victor.

Liber de rebaptismate, Zum. *ZkTh.*, XXIII. 376.

LOSERTH, J. Acten u. Correspondenzen z. Gesch. d. Gegenreformation in Innerösterreich unter Erzherzog Karl II. (1578–1590). W.: Gerold, '99; xcvi, 747 pp. M. 11.60.

MORIN, G. Le testament de S. Césaire d'Arles et la critique de M. Br. Krusch. *RBd.*, '99, 3, 97–112.

NESTLE, E. Eine neue Handschrift von Buch 1–6 d. apostolischen Constitutionen. *Theol. Litstg.*, '99, no. 7.

RAMSAY, W. M. Finding the Two Greatest Christian Inscriptions. *Sund. School Times*, My., '99, 13.
The Avircius inscription, and the one found in Autun, France, 1839.

ROBERTS, W. R. Longinus on the Sublime. The Greek text edited after the Paris MS. with introduction, translation, facsimiles and appendices. Cambridge: Univ. Press; N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xi, 288 pp. & 2 facsimiles. 9s.

ROTH, J. W. E. Beiträge zur Mainzer Schriftstellergeschichte des 15. u. 16. Jahrhunderts. *Kath.*, '98, no. 11.

Texte u. Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. altchristl. Literatur. Hrsg. v. O. v. GEBHARDT u. A. HARNACK. N.–F., Bd.)9.
GEBHARDT, O. Die Todestage d. Apostel Paulus Petrus u. ihre röm. Denkmäler; kritische Untersuchungen.—HARNACK, A. Der Ketzer-Katalog des Bischofs Maruta v. Maipherkat.—GOETZ, K. G. Der alte Anfang u. die urspr. Form v. Cyprian's Schrift *ad Donatum*. iv, 138, 17 + 16 pp. M. 5.50.

TROEGER, G. Die Zusammenfügung in Pseudo-Longinus Schrift περὶ ὕψους. *Blätter f. das Gymnas.-Schulwesen*. XXX., 241–8.

TURNER, C. H. Ecclesiæ occidentalis monumenta iuris antiquissima; fasciculi primi pars prior. Oxford: Clarendon Press; Lo. & N. Y.: Frowde, '99. 10s. 6d.

WARFIELD, B. B. The Literary History of Calvin's Institutes. *PRR.*, '99, 193–219.

WILHELM, F. Die Schriften des Jordanus von Osnabrück. *Mitth. d. Inst. f. öst. Geschichtsforsch.*, XIX., 615–76.

ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BERGNER, H. Die Entstehung d. Gothik. *MGkK.*, '99, Ja., 17–20.

DALTON, H. Über evgl. Kirchenbau m. besond. Bezug auf Berlin. B.: Warneck, '99; 86 pp. M. 0.75.

FOSSEY, J. Monographie de la cathédrale d'Évreux. P.: Picard, '99; vii, 224 pp. f. 25.

GRADMANN, E. Noch einmal d. Christuskopf auf Kyburg. *ChrK.*, F., '99.

HAMPTON, K. O. The Face of Christ in Art. *Ou.*, 1 Apr., '99.

HASENCLEVER, A. Der Christus Michel-Angelo's in S. Maria Sopra Minerva in Rom. *PrM.*, '99, 160–65.

HEUSER, H. J. The Baptistery (with ill.). *AER.*, My., '99, 449–53.

HOFF, H. PH. Die Passionsdarstellungen Albrecht Dürers. Heidelberg: Emmerling, '99; v, 133 pp. M. 2.20.

KRALIK, R. v. Die soziale Bedeutg. der christl. Kunst. [Aus: *Die Wahrheit.*] M.: Abt, '99. M. 0.30.

MAÎTRE, L. Une église carolingienne à Saint-Philbert de Grandlieu. Caen: Delesques, '99; 41 pp.

SCHWEITZER, H. Die mittelalterl. Grabdenkmäler mit figürl. Darstellungen in den Neckargegenden v. Heidelberg bis Heilbronn. *ID.* Heidelberg, '99; 35 pp.

SPITTA, F. Das evgl. Gotteshaus u. die Kunst. *MGkK.*, Ja., '99.

C. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

Ali, Ameer. A Short History of the Saracens. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xix, 638 pp. $3.

BERTRAM, A. Gesch. d. Bisth. Hildesheim. 1. Bd. Mit 5 Tafeln u. 133 Abbildungen im Text. Hildesheim: Sax, 99; xvi, 522 pp. M. 8.

BÖCKER, G. Bibliographie der kirchengeschichtl. Litteratur. (Jl., '98–Ja., '99.) *ZKG.*, XX.

BORKOWSKI, H. Mitteilgn. a. d. reichsburggräflich Dohna'schen Archive zu Schlobitten(Ostpr.) *ZKG.*, XIX., 453-63.

COMBA, E. Histoire des Vaudois. Nouv. éd. complète av. cartes géograph. et gravures. Introduction. Florence: Claudienne, '98; xvi, 208 pp.

EVANS, A. J. Primer of Free Church History. Lo.: Allenson, '99; 152 pp. 3s. 6d.

HORE, A. H. Eighteen Centuries of the Orthodox Greek Church. Lo.: Parker; N. Y.: Young & Co., '99; 714 pp. $6.

JOHNSTONE, C. L. Christian and Jewish Pilgrims to the Holy Land. Lo.: Church Newspaper Co., '99; 114 pp. 2s. 6d.

Klerikale Geschichtsfälschungen in Polen. *BAZ.*, 24 F., '99, no. 46.

KURTZ, J. H. Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch. f. Studierende. 13. Aufl. Besorgt v. N. BONWETSCH u. P. TSCHACKERT. 4 Tle. in 2 Bdn. L.: Neumann, '99. M. 16.80.

LANGEN. Des Dominikaners Ptolomäus von Lucca "Neue Kirchengeschichte." *IThR.*, '99, 290–302.

MÉNÉGOZ, E. Du rapport entre l'histoire sainte et la foi religieuse. *RChr.*, F., '99.

MÖLLER, W. Lehrbuch d. Kirchengesch. 1. Bd.: Die alte Kirche. 2. Aufl. Neubearb. v. H. SCHUBERT. 2. Abth. (pp. 273–464). F.: Mohr. M. 4.
Sammlung theol. Lehrbücher.

PFLUGK-HARTTUNG, I. v. Die Anfänge d. Johanniter Herrenmeisterthums. *Hist. Vierteljahrschr.*, '99, II., no. 2.

——— Die inneren Verhältnisse d. Johanniterordens in Deutschlands, bes. im östlichen Niederdeutschland (bis zum Beginne der Herrenmeisterwürde). *ZKG.*, XX., 1–18.

POLEK, J. Die Lippowaner in der Bukowina. II. Religion u. Kirchenwesen. Czernowitz: Pardini, '99; 84 pp. M. 2.

THE EARLY PERIOD.

ALESSIO, F. Storia di San Bernardo da Siena e del suo tempo. Mondovi: Graziano, '99; 494 pp. L. 3.50.

ALLARD, P. Saint Basile. P.: Lecoffre, '99; iii, 208 pp. f. 2.

ALLIER, R. Saint Ambroise et l'intolérance cléricale. *RChr.*, Mr., '99.

BROGLIE, DUC DE. Saint Ambroise (340–397). P.: Lecoffre, '99; 202 pp. f. 2.

GAY, R. P. Les martyrs aux arènes, ou les fils du belluaire. Dernières convulsions du paganisme à Rome. P.: Bussière, '99; 255 pp.

GLOVER, T. R. Julian. *Queen's Quart.*, '99, 245–69.

GREGORY, D. S. Caedmon, the First Great English Poet. *BS.*, '99, 341–57.

GUIRAUD, J. Saint Dominique. P.: Lecoffre, '99; 216 pp. f. 2.

LANGEN. Nochmals die Schule des Hierotheus. *IThR.*, '99, 367–73.

MCGIFFERT, A. C. The Study of Early Church History. *NW.*, Mr., '99, 1–21.

MICHAUD, E. Le pape St. Gélase et le Monophysisme eucharistique. *IThR.*, '99, 303–9.

MORIN, G. L'Ambrosiaster et le juif converti Isaac, contemporain du pape Damase. *RHLR.*, '99, 97–122.

NÜRNBERGER. Die römische Synode v. Jahre 743. *AkKR.*, LXXIX., 30–54.

PARGOIRE, R. P. Les débuts du monachisme à Constantinople. *R. Quest. Hist.*, Ja., '99, 67–143.
Also publ. as pamphlet, Besançon: Jacquin, '99; 79 pp.

PATIN, A. Apollonius Martyr, der Skoteinologe. *AGPh.*, XII., no. 2.

REVILLOUT, E. Le concile de Nicée, d'après les textes coptes et les diverses collections canoniques. II vol. Dissert. critique. P.: Maisonneuve, '99; 626 pp. f. 25.

RIVINGTON, L. The Roman Primacy, A. D. 430–51. N. Y.: Longmans, '99.

WEIS, J. E. Die Christenverfolgungen u. ihre Ursachen. M.: Lentner, '99; xii, 179 pp. M. 2.40.
Veröffentlichungen aus d. kirchenhistor. Seminar, München, no. 2.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

CHRISTEN, B. Leben d. hl. Franciscus v. Assisi. Innsbruck: Rauch, '99; viii, 366 pp. u. 24 Tafeln. M. 4.

DELLA GIOVANNA, J. Intorno alla più antica leggenda di S. Francesco d'Assisi. *Giov. stor. d. litt. Ital.*, '99, 63–76.

FOURNIER, P. Joachim de Flore et le *liber de vera philosophia*. *RHLR.*, '99, 37–65.

FURRER, K. Ein Jerusalem- u. Sinaipilger aus Zürich im 15. Jahrh. Der Predigermönch Felix Schmidt. Zürich: Fäsi u. Beer, '99; 61 pp. M. 3.

GARREAU, L. L'état social de la France au temps des croisades. P.: Plon, '99. f. 7.50.

GHEYN, J. VAN DEN. Nicolas Maniacoria, correcteur de la Bible. Note sur le MS. 14031–3 de la Bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles. *RB.*, Apr., '99, 289–95.

HELM, R. Der Bischof Fulgentius u. d. Mythograph. *Rhein. Mus. f. Philol.*, LIV., 111–33.

HOENNICKE, G. Der Hospitalorden in d. 2. Hälfte d. 12. Jhs. *ZwTh.*, '99, 59–106.

HUBERT, H. Étude sur la formation des états de l'église. Les papes Grégoire II., Grégorire III., Zacharie et Etienne I. et leur relations avec les empereurs. *Rev. Hist.*, '99, 1–40.

JARDET, P. Saint Odilon, abbé de Cluny: sa vie, son temps, ses œuvres (962–1049). Lyon: Vitte, '99; 804 pp. & portrait.

LANGEN. Die unmittelbaren Nachfolger Innocenz' III. *ITkR.*, Apr., '99, 268–89.

LOYE, J. DE. Les archives de la chambre apostolique au XIV^e^ siècle. I^re^ partie. P.: Fontemoing, '99. f. 15.

MEYER, W. Die Anklagesätze des hl. Bernhard gegen Abaelard. *Nachr. d. k. Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen*, '98, no. 4.

MICHAEL, E. Deutsche Charitas im 13. Jahrh. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 201–25.

OTTO, H. Absetzung Adolfs von Nassau u. die röm. Kurie. *Hist. Vierteljahrschr.*, '99, no. 1.

PRIEBATSCH, F. Staat u. Kirche in der Mark Brandenburg am Ende d. Mittelalters. I. *ZKG.*, XIX., 397–430.

SPAHN, M. Der Magister Nikolaus Magni de Jawor. *Kath.*, '98, no. 11.

STAPPER, R. Papst Johannes XXI. Eine Monographie. Münster: Schöningh, '99; viii, 128 pp. M. 2.20.
Kirchengesch. Studien, hrsg. von Knöpfler, Schrörs, Sdralek, IV., 4.

SYMONS, A. The Poetry of Santa Teresa and San Juan de la Cruz. *CR.*, Apr., '99, 542–51.

VERNET, F. Saint François d'Assise intime. Lyon: Vitte, '99; 95 pp.

WEHRMANN, M. Bischof Arnold zu Camin, 1324–1330. *ZKG.*, XIX., 373–96.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

BAUR, A. Ueber den Ursprung der konfessionellen Spaltung in Deutschland. *PrM.*, III., '99, 19–26, 47–56.

BECK, J. R. v. Georg Blaurock u. die Anfänge des Anabaptismus in Graubündten u. Tirol. Aus dem Nachlasse, hrsg. v. J. LOSERTH. B.: Gaertner, '99; 30 pp. M. 0.75.
Vorträge u. Aufsätze aus der Comenius-Gesellschaft. 7. Jahrg. 1. u. 2. Stück.

CHURCH. S. H. Oliver Cromwell. A history. N. Y.: Putnam's, '99; xxiv, 524 pp. $6.

CLEMEN, D. Zwei Lutherworte, mitgeteilt aus der Zwickauer Ratsschulbibliothek. *StKr.*, '99, 266–7.

——— Miscellen zur Reformationsgesch. *StKr.*, '99, 268–81.

CRAEMER. Die Grabstätte d. Reformators Justus Jonas. *ChrK.*, Apr., '99.

DECKERT. Luther's Selbstmord, eine historisch erwiesene Thatsache. Vademekum f. Katholiken, die lutherisch werden wollen. W.: Kirsch, '99; 30 pp. M. 0.25.

DREWS, P. Die Reformbewegg. f. kirchl. Verfassung in Thüringen, 1546–51. *ZprTh.*, '99, 97–132.

——— Spalatiniana. Forts. *ZKG.*, XIX., 486–514.

EMERTON, E. Deriderius Erasmus. N. Y.: Putnam's, '99. $1.50.
Heroes of the Reformation.

EPITALIER, H. Les évêques Fréjus du 16^e^ à la fin du 18^e^ siècle. Draguignan: Latie, '99; 535 pp.

FRIEDENSBURG, W. Beiträge z. Briefwechsel der kathol. Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter. Forts. *ZKG.*, XIX., 473–85; XX., 59–94.

FRITSCHEL, G. J. Luther and Zwingli. *LChR.*, '99, 194–206.

GEYER, C. Kaspar Kantz. *BBK.*, '99, 101–27.

HAUSER, H. The French Reformation and the French People in the Sixteenth Century. *Am. Hist. Rev.*, '99, 217–27.

HAUSSLEITER, J. Miscellen. *ZKG.*, XIX., 464–70.
1. Die Promotionsrede Melanchthons zur Graduierung d. A. Winkler (1535); 2. Zu Bd. 18, 361–4.

HESS, D. Aus d. Briefwechsel zwischen Antistes Joh. Jakob Hess and Kaplan Ignatz Romer. *ZSchw.*, '99, 1–16

KAWERAU, G. Die Flugschr. Sepultura

Lutheri, 1538. *StKr.*, '99, 281 foll.
Ein Beitrag z. Geschichte des antinomistischen Streites.

KNOKE, K. Eine Auslegg. d. Vaterunsers aus d. Jahre 1522. *ZKG.*, XX., 19–36.

KOLDE, TH. Ein unbeachteter Brief an Luther und Melanchthon. *BBK.*, '99, 138–40.

KOLDEWEY, C. E. Johannes Monheim u. die Kölner. *ZwTh.*, '99, 106–38.

KÖSTER. Die Naumburger Kirchen- u. Schulordnung von *D.* Nic. Medler aus dem Jahre 1537. *N. Mitteil. a. d. Geb. hist.-ant. Forsch. d. thür.-sächs. Vereins*, XIX., 497–569.
ALBRECHT, O. Bemerkungen zu Medlers Naumburger Kirchenordnung vom Jahre 1537. *Ibid.*, 570–636.

Luther's Anschauungen über d. Besitz u. Armuth gegenüber dem mittelalterl. Armuthsideal. *Allg. Ev.-luth. KZ.*, '99, nos. 14, 15, 16.

MATHESIUS, J. Ausgewählte Werke. 3. Bd.: Luther's Leben in Predigten. Hrsg. etc., von G. Loesche. Mit 2 Portr. Prag: Calve, '99; xxiv, 563 pp. M. 4.
Bibliothek deutscher Schriftsteller aus Böhmen. 9. Bd.

MEINE, F. Die vermittelnde Stellung Joachims II. v. Brandenburg zu d. polit. u. religiösen Parteien seiner Zeit. *ID.* Lüneburg: Herold & Wahlstab, '99; 52 pp. M. 1.

MEISTER, A. Der Strassburger Kapitelstreit (1583–92). Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der Gegenreformation. Str.: Heitz, '99; xx, 428 pp. M. 14.

PAQUIER, J. L'université de Paris et l'humanisme au début du XVI^e^ siècle. Jerôme Aléandre. P.: 5 rue Saint-Simon, '99; 68 pp.

PAULUS, N. Johann Tetzel als Ablassprediger. Mainz: Kirchheim, '99; viii, 187 pp. M. 2.50.

PIKE, G. H. Oliver Cromwell and His Times: social, religious, and political life in the seventeenth century. Lo.: Unwin, '99; 299 pp. 6s.

SALEMBIER, L. Le bienheureux Pierre Canisius. *R. des sciences ecclés.*, Ja., '99.

TSCHACKERT, P. Das "Oraculum Pontificium" über Luther u. Loyola. *ZKG.*, 515–16.
Nachtrag zu Bd. 19, 367 foll.

VARRENTRAPP, C. Zur Charakteristik Hermanns v. Wied, Bucers und Groppers. *ZKG.*, XX., 37–59.

VOGT. Briefe Bugenhagen's u. Runge's. Mitgeteilt von. *Bi Studien*, N. F., Bd. II.

WOLF, G. Eine neue Biographie d. Kurfürsten Moritz. *N. Arch. f. sächs. Gesch. u. Altk.*, XX., 46–71.

ZILLINGER, H. Die kulturgeschichtl. Bedeutg. Luthers. Dresden: Sturm, '99; 16 pp. M. 0.25.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

ALLAN, ETHAN. The Garrison Church: a sketch of the history of St. Thomas Parish, Garrison Forrest, Baltimore Co., Md., 1742–1852. Ed. by H. SMITH, with additional sketches. N. Y.: Pott, '99; 193 pp. $2.50 *net.*

BERLIÈRE, U. Le P. Placide Braun, d'Augsbourg (1756–1829). *RBd.*, Ja., '99, 1–13.

BUTLER, D. John Wesley and Geo. Whitefield in Scotland; or, the influence of Oxford methodism on Scottish religion. Ed.: Blackwood & Son, '99; 328 pp. 5s.

CHÉROT, H. La Fayette. *Et.*, 20 Mr., '99, 801–14.

——— Bossuet a-t-il été Janséniste? *Ibid.*, 5 My., '99, 384–98.

Clericus Emeritus. The Elizabethan Religious Compromise. Lo.: Liberty Review, '99. 6d.

DIETRICH, R. Die Hohenzollern u. der Protestantismus. Jena: Doebereiner, '99; 15 pp. M. 0.30.

DIFFENDERFFER, F. R. The Quaker and Palatine as Commonwealth Builders. *RChR.*, '99, 145–72.

FISCHER, E. L. Cardinal Consalvi. Lebens- u. Charakterbild des grossen Ministers Papst Pius' VII. Mit dem Bilde d. Cardinals. Mainz: Kirchheim, '99; xv, 350 pp. M. 4.

GOOD, J. I. History of the Reformed Church in the United States, 1725–92. Reading: Miller, '99; 701 pp.

HALLER. Der Einfluss Strassburgs auf d. Ulmer Katechismusliteratur. *ZprTh.*, '99, 132–7.

HOLL, K. Fürstbischof Jakob Fugger v. [illegible]

d. Reformation. Mit 4 Kunstbeilagen u. 95 authent. Abbildungen. Bielefeld: Velhagen & Klasing, '99. M. 3.

ritasverbandes, '99; xii, 295 pp. M. 3.60.
Studien aus dem Collegium Sapientae zu Freiburg im Breisgau, no. 1.

JACCARD, E. Paul Reboulet, 1655–1710. *RThPh.*, '99, 155–82.

Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents: travels and explorations of the Jesuit missionaries in New France, 1610–1791; the original French, Latin and Italian texts, with English translations and notes. Edited by R. S. THWAITES. Vols. 33–40 (1648–53). Cleveland: Barrows Bros., '99. Each vol. $3.50 *net.*

JUNKIN, W. F. The Covenanter in Early American History. *PQ.*, XIII., 127–46.

KAWERAU, G. Der "Reinigungseid" des Johannes Laski. *NkZ.*, My., '99, 430–41.

KIEM, M. Augustin Vigil Nagele, letzter Prälat d. Augustiner Chorherrenstiftes zu Gries bei Bozen (1790–1815) u. seine Zeit. Innsbruck: Vereinsbuchh., '99; vi, 197 pp. and one picture. M. 2.

KRÜGER, GEO. Die Pastoren im Fürstent. Ratzeburg seit d. Reformation. Schwerin: Bahn, '99; viii, 79 pp. M. 2.50.

MINGES, P. Beitrag z. pfälzischen Kirchengesch. d. 17. u. 18. Jahrh., speziell z. Gesch. des ehemal. kurpfälz. Oberamtes Kaiserslautern u. des ehemaligen Franciskaner Klosters daselbst. Speyer: Jäger, '99; iii, 32 pp. M. 1.

NAIRNE, A. Lancelot Andrews († 1626). *IThR.*, '99, 327–47.

PIERCE, T. R. A Review of Wesley's Journal. *MR.*, '99, 99–106.

Die Kolonien der Brüdergemeinde. Odessa: Berndt, '99; iv, 164 pp. M. 4.

É, F. Le cardinal de Bouillon, 1643–1715. P.: Hachette, '99; 248 pp. f. 5. Extrait d' "Annales de l'Académie de Mâcon."

ROI, J. DE LE. Isaak da Costa, der holl. Christ u. Dichter aus Israel. [Aus: *Nathanael.*] L.: Hinrichs, '99; 42 pp. M. 0.60. Schriften des Institutum judaicum in Berlin, no. 26.

ROUSSEL, A. Un évêque assermenté (1790–1802). Le Coz, évêque d'Ille-et-Vilaine, metropolitain du Nord Ouest. P.: Lethielleux, '99; xix, 566 pp.

SAFTIEN, K. Römische Propaganda in Hannover während d. Regierung Joh. Friedrich's (1665–1679). *Braunschweigisches Magazin*, IV., '98.

SOULLIER, J. Les Jésuites aux 17. et 18. siècles. D'après les documents recueillis par le P. R. Terret, de la même compagnie. Marseilles: Verdot, '99; vii, 215 pp.

STEWART, A. M, Origins of Scottish Presbytery. Hist. sketch. Ed.: Oliphant, '99; 46 pp. 1s. *net.*

WEHRMANN, M. Barnine von Werle, Propst in Stettin u. Camin. *Jahrbb. u. Jahresber. des Ver. f. Mecklenb. Gesch.*, LXIII.

WEIL, J. Nicolas Antoine. *REJ.*, XXXVII., 161–80.

THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

BAUER, H. Richard Rothe als akadem. Lehrer. F.: Mohr, '99; 39 pp. M. 0.75.

BENSON, Archbischop. The Life and Letters of. Edited by his Son. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99. 2 vols.

BOENISCH, B. Cardinal-Fürstbischof Melchior v. Diepenbrock Oppeln; Br.: Müller & Seiffert, '99; 144 pp. M. 0.25.

BROISE, R.-M. DE LA. Les travaux de M. l'abbé Delmont sur Bossuet. *Et.*, 20 Mr., '99, 815–25.

BURGER, K. Karl v. Buchrucker. *NkZ.*, '99, 361–76.

CRAWFORD, F. MARION. Leo XIII., *Ou.*, 1 Apr., '99.

CROPP, JOH. Richard Rothe als prakt. Theologe. *PrM.*, F., '99, 58–64.

DALE. Life of Dr. R. W. By his Son. N. Y.: Mead & Co., '99; x, 771 pp. $4 *net.*

DOELLINGER, IGNAZ V. Lettres inédites à M. le prof. Michaud (1 août 18[illegible] 30 Sept. 1874). *IThR.*, Apr., 233–55.

[illegible]
PrM., Mr., '99, 111–20.

FORSYTH, P. O. Dr. Dale.

FRIEDRICH, I. Ignaz v. Döllinger. 2. Tl.: Vom Ministerium Abel bis z. Ablauf der Frankfurter Zeit, 1837–1849. M.: Beck, '99; iv, 538 pp. M. 8.

GOETZ, L. K. Leo XIII. als Bischof von Perugia. *BAZ.*, 5, 6 Apr., '99, nos. 77, 78.

GORKOM, G. VAN. David Friedrich Strauss. *de Gids*, F., '99, 245–96.

HALL, NEWMAN. An Autobiography. With portrait and view of Christ Church, Westminster Bridge Road. Lo. & N.Y.: Cassell; 400 pp. 12s. 6d.

HOLZHAUSER, G. Zum Gedächtnis von Buchrucker. *NkZ.*, '99, 93–100.

KRAUSE, A. Gustav Glogau. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 15.

LANGEN, J. Zum 100-jährigen Geburtstage Ignaz v. Döllingers. *BAZ.*, 28 F., '99, no. 49.

MACKAY, A. M. The Late Professor Drummond and His Critics. *Exp.*, F., '99, 110–17.

MCSWEENEY, E. F. X. American Catholics and the Propagation of the Faith. *AER.*, Mr., '99, 225–43.

NIPPOLD, FR. Kleine Schriften z. inneren Geschichte d. Katholizismus. 1. Bd. Jena: Costenoble, '99. M. 10.
1. Aus dem letzten Jahrzehnt vor d. Vatikan. Konzil; vii, 566 pp.

OERTZEN, FR. VON. Heinrich Hansjakob. *ChrW.*, '99, nos. 12, 13.

PFLÜGER, P. Moritz v. Egydi. *ZSchw.*, '99, 33–40.

PIFRADER, J. Die bair. Illuminaten u. d. Clerus im Burggrafenamte Vintschgau während der Jahre 1806–9. Innsbr.: Vereins-Buchh.; iii, 182 pp. M. 1.80.

SPURGEON, C. H. Autobiography of. Vol. 2, 1854–1860. Ch. & N.Y.: Revell, '99; viii, 376 pp. $2.50.

TROELTSCH, E. Rich. Rothe. Gedächtnisrede. F.: Mohr, '99; 39 pp. M. 0.80.

VISCHER, V. Richard Rothe als prakt. Theologe. *Hk.*, F., '99.

——— Zur Erinnerung an R. Rothe. *DEBl.*, '99, 95–115.

D. SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

HÄRING, TH. Zur Verständigg. in der system. Theologie. Die Grundgedanken der Prinzipienlehre Professor H. Cremers. *ZThK.*, '99, 97–135.

MANCHOT, K. Das Dogma im Lichte d. Religionsphilosophie. *PrM.*, '99, 85–96.

MÉNÉGOZ, E. Du rapport entre l'histoire sainte et la foi religieuse. *RChr.*, '99, 81–104.

MICHAUD, E. Quelques sophismes théologiques. I. *IThR.*, '99, 310–26.
1. A propos de la doctrine des Pères. 2. Les "Proxima fidei." 3. La prétendue évolution du dogme et les formules dogmatiques.

PARAYRE, R. Les diverses phases de la méthode théologique. Théologie positive. *UC.*, 15 Mr., '99, 405–27.

Physionomie historique de la ogie positive. *Ibid.*, 15 Apr., '99, 582–606.

Politischer u. kirchlicher Liberalismus. *Prot.*, III., no. 13.

SOUBEN, J. L'esthétique du dogme chrétien. P.: Lethielleux, '99; xi, 348 pp. f. 3.50.

STUCKENBERG, H. W. Present Theological Tendencies. II. Criticism and Negation. *HR.*, Je., '99.

THOMAS, J. B. Recent Reconstructions in Theology. From the point of view of logic. *HR.*, Je., '99.

HISTORY OF THEOLOGY.

BOARDMAN, GEO. N. A History of New England Theology. N. Y.: Randolph, '99; 314 pp. $1.50.

BOSSERT, G. Zu den Missverständnissen über die Rechtfertigungslehre d. Johannes Brenz. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, nos. 14, 15.

EATON, D. Rothe's Speculative System. *ET.*, My., '99, 364–5.

JENSEN, C. Søren Kierkegaards religiøse Udvikling. Aarhus, '99; 316 pp. Kr. 3.50.

KAUFF, H. Die Kenntnisslehre des hl. Augustin u. ihr Verhältniss zur platon. Philosophie. 1. Thl.: Gewissheit und Wahrheit. *GPr.* M.-Gladbach, '99; 20 pp.

KENNINCK, F. Calvin sur la Réprobation. *IThR.*, '99, 376–9.
Réponse à M. Dunlop Moore.

KÜGELGEN, C. W. v. Die Rechtfertigungslehre des Johannes Brenz. L.: Deichert, '99; 40 pp. M. 0.60.

LAUDOWICZ, F. De doctrinis ad animarum præexistentiam atque metempsychosin spectantibus, quatenus in Iudæorum et Christianorum theologian vim quandam exercuerint, quæstiones. L.: Fock, '99; 73 pp. M. 1.50.

MEYER, W. Die Anklagesätze des hl. Bernhard gegen Abælard. *Gött. Gelehr. Nachr.*, '98, 397–468.
See also p. 67, col. 1.

MINTON, H. C. Jonathan Edwards, *PQ.*, XIII., 68–94.

MOORE, D. Jansenism and Calvinism Compared. *IThR.*, '99, 373–6.

PAULUS, N. Johann v. Paltz über Ablass u. Reue. *ZkTh.*, '99, 48–74.

PHILIP DE BARJEAU, J. De doctrina Apollinarii Laodiceni. *ID.* Toulouse: Chauvin, '99; 32 pp.

PUYOL, E. La doctrine du livre de imitatione Christi. P.: Retaux, '99; 652 pp.

RAUSCHEN, G. Die formale Seite der Apologien Justins. *ThQ.*, '99, 188–206.

RÉGNON, TH. DE. Études de théologie positive sur la sainte trinité. 3e série: Théories greques des processions divines. 2 vols. P.: Retaux, '99; v, 584 & 592 pp. f. 15.
Vols. III & IV completing the work.

SCHWALM, M.-B. L'inspiration du sens chrétien dans la théologie de Saint Thomas. *UC.*, 15 Apr., '99, 481–503.

STIGLMAYR, J. Die Eschatologie des Ps.-Dionysius. *ZkTh.*, '99, 1–21.

WANDEL, G. Einige Bemerkungen über d. Eckesche Buch: Die theolog. Schule A. Ritschls u. die ev. Kirche d. Gegenwart. *NkZ.*, '99, 313–42.

ZÖCKLER. Die Wurzel d. altchristlichen Gnosticismus. *EKZ.*, '99, no. 10.

APOLOGETICS.

AT. Les apologistes français au XIXe siècle. P.: Bloud et Barral, '99; xii, 460 pp.

DENIS, C. Esquisse d'une apologie philosophique du Christianisme dans les limites de la nature et de la révélation. P.: Alcan, '99; xx, 409 pp. f. 4.

The Metaphysics of ... getics. VI: The Super-..., '99, 237–66.

SIEGFRIED, F. P. Pascal's Pensées and "Modern Apologetics." *AER.*, F., '99, 113–23.

POLEMICS.

ARGANTEL, J. Les convertis célèbres du siècle dans le sacerdoce. Tours: Mame, '99; 239 pp.

SYMBOLICS.

BANG, J. P. Das Sakrament der Busse in d. Augsburger Konfession, Art. 11–12. *ZKG.*, XIX., 449–51.

——— Eine falsche Lesart in d. Torgauer Artikeln. *Ibid.*, 452.

BARRE, DE LA. La vie du dogme catholique: Autorité, évolution. P.: Lethielleux, '99. f. 3.50.
Cf. BAINOEL, J., in *Et.*, 5 My., '99, 369–83.

XVI., 4, Ja., '99, 242–57.
der Formula
ζ., 470–72.

BURN, A. E. Introduction to the Creeds and to the *Te Deum*. L.: Methuen, '99; 338 pp. 10s. 6d.

FUNK. Die Symbolstücke in d. aegypt. Kirchenordnung u. die Kanones Hippolyts. *ThQ.*, '99, 161–87.

GRANDERATH, TH. Zum tridentinischen u. vatikanischen Decrete über d. Auslegg. d. hl. Schrift. *Kath.*, '98, no. 11.

HILGENBERG. 6. Brief üb. d. Glaubensbekenntniss. Cassel: Hühn, '99; 69 pp. M. 0.50.

KÜNSTLE. Zur Geschichte d. Athanasianischen Symbolums. *Kath.*, Mr., '99.

PEARSON, J. Exposition of the Creed. New ed. 2 vols. Lo.: Griffith, '99; 600 pp. 2s.

STANGE, C. Über eine Stelle in d. Apologie. *NKZ.*, F., '99, 169–90.

WERBATUS, M. Die Augsburgische Konfession. Eine Uebersetzung d. latein. Textes der *confessio augustana*, unter Mitarbeit der Pastoren Th. Hoffmann u. A. Eckhardt. Riga: Hoerschelmann, '99; 46 pp. M. 0.80.

ZAHN, TH. The Apostles' Creed: a sketch of its history and an examination of its contents. Lo.: Hodder & St., '99; 238 pp. 5s.

DOGMATICS.

... ander & Son, '99; 126 pp. 2s.

Auferstandene Christus, Der. *Allg. Ev.-luth. KZ.*, '99, no. 13.

BALLARD, F. Dr. Petavel on Immortality. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 248–53.

BAVINCK, H. Gereformeerde Dogmatiek. Dl. III. Kampen: Bos, '99; ii. 572 pp. f. 5.40.

BEEBE, C. E. Defense of "Creed and Life," in reply to the "Church Quarterly Review," O., '98. Lo.: Simpkin, '99; 74 pp. 1s.

BELLORD, J. Meditations on Christian Dogma; with an introductory letter from the Archbishop of Westminster. 2 vols. St. Louis: Herder, '99; xiv, 732 pp. $2.50 *net.*

BENZ, F. Ewig oder zeitlich? 2. Aufl. Zürich: Schmidt, '99; 47 pp. M. 0.60.

BERTLING. Zehn Fragen üb. d. Wahrheit d. christl. Glaubens. L.: Hinrichs, '99; iv, 156 pp. M. 2.

BOIS, H. Le surnaturel. *RThQR.*, '99, 66–116, 188–248.

BOUFFIER, G. Les anges et l'immaculée conception. Avignon: Aubanel, '99.

BORNHÄUSER, K. Das Recht d. Bekenntnisses z. Auferstehg. d. Fleisches. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; 67 pp. M. 1.
Beiträge z. Förderg. christl. Theologie. Hrsg. v. Schlatter u. Cremer. 3. Jahrgg. Heft 2d.

BRAUER, A. Die Heiligungskraft des Blutes Jesu. Ein Wort z. Heiligungsbewegg. Go.: Schlossmann, '99; 12 pp. M. 0.20.

BRIGHT, W. The Law of Faith. Lo.: Gardner, '99; 350 pp. 6s.

CHOLLET, A. La notion de l'ordre P.: Lethielleux, '99. f. 3.

COOK, E. W. The Origin of Sin. N. Y.: Funk & W., '99; 384 pp. $1.50.

DAUBANTON, F. E. Het voortbestaan van het menschelijk geslacht, etc. VI. *ThSt.*, '99, 89–113.

DAWSON, J. W. The Second Advent: its preparations according to the apocalyptic foreview in Revelation xix, etc. *HR.*, My., '99.

DIDIO, CH. Der sittliche Gottesbeweis. *ID.* Würzburg: Goebel, '99; xviii, 230 pp. M. 2.30.

DÖRRIES. Das böse Gewissen. *ChrW.*, '99, 9 Mr.

——— Die Gottheit Jesu Christi. *Ibid.*, nos. 14, 15.

EGGER, F. Enchiridion theologiæ dogmaticæ generalis. 3d ed. Brixen: Weger, '99; xi, 677 pp. M. 7.20.

ELLICOTT, C. J. The Incarnation and the Inner Life. *ET.*, F., '99, 199.

EVEREST, H. W. God. *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 194–206.

FINDEL, J. G. Kirchenglaube u. Vernunftreligion od. Christentum Christi. 2. Aufl. L.: Findel, '99; vii, 56 pp. M. 1.20.

FOERSTER, ERICH. Das neue Dogma. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 11.
Rev. of Kaftan's *Dogmatik*.

FRANKE, A. Die Religion d. Menschheit oder die natürl. Schöpfungsgeschichte. Eine neue Weltanschauung für alle nach Wahrheit strebenden Menschen. Münster: Nickl, '99; v, 98 pp. M. 1.

GOTTSCHICK, J. Das Verhältnis von Diesseits u. Jenseits im Christentum. *ZThK.*, '99, 136–82.

HAMON, J. Au delà du tombeau. P.: Téqui, '99; viii, 329 pp. f. 3.

HOYLE, A. Depth and Power of the Christian Faith. Lo.: Kelly, '99; 196 pp. 1s. 6d.

HUG, G. J. Christus u. die Kirche in unserer Zeit. 2. Tl.: Christus in Men-

INGRAM, A. F. W. Banner of the Christian Faith. Lo.: Gardner, '99; 222 pp. 3s. 6d.

JOHNSON, J. The Angels. Lo.: Skeffington, '99; 118 pp. 2s. 6d.

JONES, E. G. Ascent through Christ: study of doctrine of redemption in the light of theory of evolution. Lo.: Bowden, '99; 498 pp. 7s. 6d.

KACHNIK, J. Die Auferstehg. im Lichte d. Offenbarung u. der Zukunft. Olmütz: Hölzel, '99; 48 pp. M. 1.10.

KAFTAN, J. Heilige Schrift u. kirchl. Bekenntnis in ihrem Verhältnis zu einander. L.: Wigand, '99; 29 pp. M. 0.40.

KAWERAN, G. Zum luth. Konsekrationsbegriff. *ZprTh.*, '99, 38–43.

KÜHN, E. Vom Glauben an Christus. Ein Wort z. Klärung. Hagen: Buchh. "Immanuel," '99; 16 pp. M. 0.15.

LEADBEATER, C. W. Christian Creed: its origin and signification. Lo.: Theos. Pub. Soc., '99; 110 pp. 1s. 6d.

LEROY, H. La foi et les intellectuels. *Et.*, 20 Mr., '99, 786–800.

LISCO, H. Das Bild Christi. Die Lehre von Christus, dem Sohn des Menschen, im Grundriss dargestellt. B.: Schneider, '99; 63 pp. M. 1.

LYTTELTON, A. T. Place of Miracles in Religion. Hulsean Lectures for 1891. Lo.: Murray, '99; 154 pp. 5s.

MEAD, C. M. Christ's View of the Divine Fatherhood. *HR.*, Apr., '99.

MINTON, H. C. Immanence and Grace. *HR.*, Je., '99.

MOELLER-BRUCK, A. Die Auferstehg. d. Lebens. B.: Schuster & Loeffler, '99. M. 0.50.

MORRISON, J. H. The Crown of Life. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 283.

MOULTON, W. F. The Communion of Saints. *LQR.*, Apr., '99.

MÜLLER, I. Formalobjekt der göttl. Erkenntnis u. *scientia media*. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 226–48.

NIEBERGALL, F. Gott in Christus. F.: Mohr, '99. M. 0.60.
No. 40 of: Hefte zur *Christlichen Welt*.

NISIUS, T. B. Kirchl. Lehrgewalt u. Schriftauslegg. *ZkTh.*, XXIII., 282–312.

HYDE, W. DEWITT. The Reorganization of the Faith. *NW.*, VIII., 43–55.

Misconceptions. Lo.: Stock, '99; 150 pp. 3s. 6d.

PHILIPPOT, A. Essai philosophique sur l'efficacité de la prière. *ID.* P.: Fischbacher, '99.

RABUS. Wiedergeburt u. Wissenschaft. *NkZ.*, '99, 139–68.

.FFS, E. Schuld u. Freiheit. *ZThK.*, K., 183–249.

W. Das Gebet zu Jesu. Schaffhausen: Meili, '99; 20 pp. M. 0.25.

SCHMIEDEL, P. W. Die neuesten Ansichten über d. Ursprung d. Abendmahles. *PrM.*, '99, 125–52.

SCHNEDERMANN, G. Einleitg. in d. christl. Glaubenslehre im Sinne der gegenwärtigen evgl.-lutherischen Kirche. (Der christl. Glaube im Sinne der gegenwärt. evangel.-luther. Kirche. I. Abtlg.) L.: Deichert, '99; xv, 222 pp. M. 3.60.

SCHNEIDER, C. Die Wissenschaft des Heils, dem christl. Herzen als Nahrung vorgelegt. 2 Teile. Regensburg: Coppenrath, '99; xxvi, 808 pp. M. 4.20.

SCHÖNHOLZER, G. Die Auferstehung. *ZSchw.*, '99, 24–33.

SCHULTZ, H. Der *Ordo salutis* in d. Dogmatik. *StKr.*, '99, 350–445.

P. . . . . du

cœur et celui de l'esprit. P.: Leve, '99; 49 pp.

SCHWARTZKOPFF, P. Das Leben nach d. Tode, sein Dasein u. seine Art. Braunschweig: Wollermann, '99; 85 pp. M. 1.

SCOFIELD, C. I. Plain Papers on the Holy Spirit. Chi.: Revell, '99. $0.35.

SEISS, J. A. Questions concerning Miracles. *LCQR.*, '99, 185–93.

SELBY, T. G. The Passover and the Lord's Supper. *Exp.*, Mr., '99, 210–17.

SORG, J. Die hl. Eucharistie als Sakrament und ihr Einfluss auf d. sittliche Leben. *Kath.*, '98, nos. 11 & 12.

SPENCE, R. M. The Lord's Supper. *ET.*, F., '99, 235.
Against Caie.

STEUDE. Der Anstoss d. Wunders. *BG.*, My., '99, 195–209.

TAMM, H. C. Das Wesen d. ev. Glaubens. B.: Schwetschke, '99; 195 pp. M. 3.

THIEME, K. Zur Lehre von d. Sünde. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, no. 18.

VISCHER, E. Religion und Kirche im Christentum. *ZThK.*, IX., 250.

WARFIELD, B. B. The Polemics of Infant Baptism. *PrQ.*, Apr., '99, 313–34.

WATSON, J. The Doctrines of Grace. *Exp.*, '99, Mr., 161; Apr., 241; My., 321; Je., 423.
The Grace of God; Repentance; Forgiveness; Regeneration.

WEISS, B. Gotteskindschaft und Gottesknechtschaft, d. beiden Seiten d. Heilsstandes in Schrift u. Predigt. *Hefte z. evgl. Weltansch.*, I., 3; iii, 18 pp. M. 0.30.

WELLS, J. Sacramental Hospitality. *ET.*, Mr., '99, 257–60.

*** Protestantische Äusserungen über d. hl. Abendmahl. *IThR.*, '99, 382–5.

ETHICS.

CREMER, E. Üb. d. christl. Vollkommenht. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; 40 pp. M. 0.80.
Beiträge z. Förderung christl. Theologie. 3. Jahrgg. Heft 2a.

DAVIDSON, W. L. Christian Ethics. (Guild Library.) Lo.: Black, '99; 154 pp. 1s. 6d.

DIDIOT, J. Morale surnaturelle spéciale. Vertu de religion. P.: Taffin-Lefort, '99; 564 pp.

DORNER, A. Katholisierende Neigungen in der protest. Ethik. *Preuss. Jahrbb.*, '99, 208–30.

Anschauungen d. Japaner. 65–78.

GRETILLAT, A. La morale chrétienne. II. Neuchâtel: Attinger; P.: Fischbacher, '99. fr. 8.50.
Exposé de théologie systématique. Vol. VI.

HARRACA, J. La foi morale. P.: Fischbacher, '99; 337 pp. f. 4.

——— Reflets de foi morale. P.: Fischbacher, '99; 167 pp. f. 2.50.

LIPPS, TH. Die ethischen Grundfragen. Hamburg: Voss, '99; 308 pp. M. 5.

MOHR, G. Christl. Weltanschauung auf biblischem Grunde. W.: Kirsch; Ulm: Kerler, '99; iv, 206 pp. M. 2.50.

NORTHCROFT, G. J. H. The Christian Interpretation of Life. *MR.*, '99, 178–202.

PAULSEN, F. A System of Ethics. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; xviii, 723 pp. $3 *net.*

SCHMIDT, F. Zur Geschichte d. Wortes "gut." *ID.* B.: Skopnik, '99; viii, 46 pp. M. 1.20.

TIGERT, J. J. Ethics: The Science of Duty. *MR.*, '99, 72–83, 246–51.

UNOLD, J. Zwecke u. Gesetze d. menschlich-sittlichen Handelns. *BAZ.*, '99, no. 59.

E. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY AND ALLIED SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

ABBOTT, L. The Mission of Christ's Church in a Commercial Metropolis. *Ou.*, 11 F., '99.

BAEWER, D. J. The Church in the Twentieth Century. *Ind.*, 27 Apr., '99.

BRUCE, A. B. To One who Finds Scientific Bible Study Hostile to Devotion. *BW.*, Je., '99.

CARNEGIE, W. H. Church Trouble and Common Sense: a plea for reason and responsibility. Lo.: Murray, '99; 134 pp. 2s. 6d.

CONANT, W. C. The Critical Test of the Church Today. *HR.*, Je., '99.

CREMER, H. Wozu verpflichten uns die Gottesverheissungen d. Herrn? 2. Aufl. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; 44 pp. M. 0.40.

CROTHERS, S. M. History a Teacher of Liberal Religion. *NW.*, Je., '99, 215–27.

DIKE, S. The Pastor and the Home. *HR.*, Je., '99.

DOLE, CH. F. The Reconstituted Church. *NW.*, VIII., 56–65.

Ecce Clerus; or, The Christian Minister in Many Lights, by a Student of the Times. N. Y.: Eaton & Mains, '99; ii, 341 pp. $1.50.

Evangelisation, Gemeinschaft, Heiligkeit in biblischer Beleuchtung. *Allg. Ev.-luth. KZ.*, '99, nos. 11, 12, 13.

FAYET, J. E. La république universelle démocratique et sociale de Jésus-Christ. P.: Dupont, '99; 64 pp. f. 1.

GREGORY, C. R. Religious Life in German Universities. *Ou.*, 25 Mr., '99.

HAARBECK, W. Offene Kirchen, tägl. Früh- u. Abendandachten. Eine dringende Pflicht d. evgl. Kirche. *MGkK.*, Mr., '99.

HECHLER, K. Modernes Christentum. L.: Baum, '99; 101 pp. M. 1.50.

HUNTINGTON, W. R. Four Keywords of Religion. N. Y.: Whittaker, '99; v, 109 pp. $0.25.

JUNKIN, GEO. New and Old Methods of Church Work. *HR.*, My., '99.

LANGLEY, A. S. The Crown of Life. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 332.

LÉCUYER. Le prêtre éducateur. P.: Lethielleux, '99. f. 3.

MARSHALL, L. Comparative Value of Long and Short Pastorates. *ChrQ.*, '99, 219–29.

MONTGOMERY, E. Actual Experience. *NW.*, Apr., '99, 359–81.

MOORE, E. C. Formal Reform. *NW.*, Je., '99, 201–14.

MOORE, W. T. The Three Churches. *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 145–93.

PFENNIGSDORF, E. Christus im modernen Geistesleben. Christl. Einführg. in die Geisteswelt d. Gegenwart. Dessau: Buchh. d. ev. Vereinshauses, '99; xiv, 265 pp. M. 3.50.

ROBERTSON, J. Christian Minister, his Aims and Methods. Lectures on Pastoral Theology at the four Scottish Universities, sessions 1897–8 & 1898–9. Ed.: Oliphant, '99; 184 pp. 3s. 6d.

SPECTATOR. Kirchenpolitische Briefe. XLV., XLVI. *BAZ.*, '99, nos. 50, 75; 1 Mr., 1 Apr.

STROMBERGER, C. Die geistl. Dichtg. in Hessen. N. F. Darmstadt: Waitz, '99; xi, 167 pp. M. 2.50.

TEMPLE, F. Helps to Godly Living. A book of devotional thoughts. Lo.: Stock, '99. 5s.

CHURCH POLITY AND ECCLESIASTICAL LAW.

ACHELIS. "Ich glaube an eine heilige, christl. Kirche," nach evgl. u. nach röm.-kathol. Auffassung. *Hk.*, F., '99.

BARTELLI, V. La polizia ecclesiastica nella legislazione carolingica. Roma: Loescher, '99; 116 pp. L. 2.

BEURDELEY, R. Les congrégations et communautés religieuses devant la loi. P.: Giard et Brière, '99. f. 5.

COOPER, J. The Church Catholic and National. Introductory lecture. Lo.: MacLehose, '99; 24 pp. 1s.

DALTON, H. Über ev. Kirchenbau mit besonderem Bezug auf Berlin. B.: Warneck, '99; 86 pp. M. 0.75.

ESMEIN, A. Les Ordalies dans l'église gallicane au IX^e siècle. Hincmar de Reims et ses contemporains. P.: Impr. nationale, '99; 45 pp.

FORREST, A. A. The Meaning of Heresy in Theological Development. *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 236–50.

HOLLWECK, J. Die kirchl. Strafgesetze. Zusammengestellt und commentirt. Mainz: Kirchheim, '99; xli, 386 pp. M. 10.

JUKES, A. The Law of the Offerings: considered as the appointed figure of

the various aspects of the offering of the body of Jesus Christ. Chi.: Revell, '99; 211 pp. $0.75.

WIRGMAN, A. T. Constitutional Authority of Bishops in the Catholic Church, illustr. by History and Canon Law of Undivided Church from Apostolic Age to Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. N. Y.: Longmans, '99; 308 pp. 6s.

WRIGHT, G. F. "Christian Scientists." *BS.*, '99, 374–81.

Zeitfragen d. christl. Volkslebens. Hrsg. von Ungern-Sternberg & Wahl. St.: Belser, '99.
177. HASSELL, U. VON. Christentum u. Heer. 52 pp. M. 1.

BACHELET, X.-M. Le Catholicisme et progrès. *ET.*, 5 Mr., '99, 622–45.

BENRATH, K. Die Ansiedelg. d. Jesuiten in Preussen. *DEBl.*, '99, XXIV., 4.

BERTHELET, G. Le futur pape. P.: Perrin, '99. f. 3.50.

BRAUN, C. Die Kirchenpolitik d. deutschen Katholiken seit dem Jahre 1848 in ihren Zielen u. Regeln. Mainz: Kirchheim, '99; 55 pp.

BURNICHON, J. Les collèges chrétiens — à propos de quelques critiques. *Et.*, 5 Apr., '99.

CHARBONNEL, V. Americanism *versus* Roman Catholicism. *Ou.*, 11 Mr., '99.

——— La fin de l'américanisme. *RChr.*, '99, 299–306.

CHRÉTIEN, A. Études sur le mouvement néo-thomiste: I. Léon XIII et Thomas d'Aquin. *IThR.*, '99, 348–59.

DILLON, E. J. Mr. Balfour's Plea for a Roman Catholic University. *CR.*, Mr., '99.

EHRHARD, A. Der katholische Student u. seine Ideale. *UPr.* W.: Mayer & Co., '99; 68 pp. M. 0.75.

FIAMINGO, G. M. The Policy of the Holy See. *CR.*, F., '99.

Flugschriften d. ev. Bundes. Hrsg. vom Vorstand d. Bundes. L.: Buchh. d. ev. Bundes, '99.
159. MÜLLER, G. Die röm. Propaganda in unseren afrikanischen Kolonien. M. 0.25.

GIBSON, W. An Outburst of Activity in the Roman Congregations. *NC.*, My., '99.

HARING, J. Der Rechts- u. Gesetzesbegriff in der kathol. Ethik u. modernen Jurisprudenz. Graz: Moser, '98; vii, 111 pp. M. 1.80.

HARTMUTH, F. Beiträge z. Lage der Katholiken in der Provinz Sachsen. Paderborn: Bonifacius-Druckerei, '99; 68 pp. M. 0.15.
Erfurter zwanglose Hefte, no. 1.

HEGLER, A. Katholizismus u. moderne Kultur. *ChrW.*, '99, nos. 16 foll.
Ein Rückblick auf den Fall Schell.

HEYDEMANN, O. Aus den Papieren des päpstlichen Nuntius Aleander. *GPr.* B., '99; 16 pp.

Il concordato tra il Primo Console e Pio VII negli anni 1800–1801. Negoziazione di Mgr. Spina a Parigi per il concordato. *Civ. Cattol.*, VI., Apr., '99, 129–46.

Lettre du souverain Pontife à son éminence le cardinal Gibbons. *Et.*, 5 Mr., '99, 646–64; also *UC.*, 15 Mr.; *AER.*, Apr., '99, 399–408.

NICHOLAS, W. The Proposed Roman Catholic University in Ireland. *LQR.*, Apr., '99.

PAULUS, N. Die Bewilligg. des Portiuncula-Ablasses. *Kath.*, F., '99, 97–124.

PHILIPPSON, M. Der Beginn d. Kulturkampfes. Aus Forckenbecks Briefen an seine Gemahlin. *DR.*, My., '99.

REICHMANN, M. "Der Zweck heiligt die Mittel." Entgegnung. *ZKG.*, XX., 95–102.
Against Tschakert.

SABATIER, A. La succession de Léon XIII. Le pape futur. *RChr.*, My., '99, 387–92.

SÄGMÜLLER. Die Entstehung. u. Entwicklung d. Kirchenbücher im kathol. Deutschland bis zur Mitte d. 18. Jahrh. *ThQ.*, '99, 200–58.

SALMON, G. The Irish University Question. *CR.*, Apr., '99.

SALTET, L. Le mouvement Schell. Un retour du libéralisme universitaire en Allemagne. *Bull. litt. ecclésiast.*, '99, no. 4, 101–16.

VEDDER, H. C. If the Pope should Die. *Ind.*, 13 Apr., '99.

Voces Catholicæ. Is a Catholic University Possible? *CR.*, My., '99.

BRÄUNLICH, P. Die neueste katholische Bewegg. z. Befreiung vom Papstthum. Ein thüringer Gruss an die deutsche Ostmark. 2. Aufl. M.: Lehmann, '99; iv, 56 pp. M. 0.60.

EBRAY, A. Le catholicisme réformiste. *RChr.*, Mr., '99.

MICHAUD, E. L'ancien-catholicisme. *RChr.*, '99, 253–67.

RICHTERICH, J. L'ancien-catholicisme jugé par un pasteur protestant. *IThR.*, '99, 360–66.

THIEL, J. J. VAN. Die Gültigkeit der Bischofsweihen in der altkatholischen Kirche von Utrecht. *IThR.*, Apr., '99, 256–67.

BATES, A. The Puritans. Lo.: Constable, '99; 423 pp.

BEATTIE, F. R. Genesis of the Westminster Assembly. *PrQ.*, Apr., '99, 189–205.

BONUS. Religiös oder "Politisch." Zur Deutsch-evgl. Bewegg. in Oesterreich. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 14.

BOURRIER. The Evangelical Movement among the French Clergy. *CR.*, My., '99.

Die "Evangelische Bewegung" in Oesterreich. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 10.

General Conference of the Lutheran Church of America in Philadelphia, a symposium. *LChR.*, '99, 255–314.

HARNACK, A. Thoughts on the Present Position of Protestantism. Transl. by T. B. SAUNDERS. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 64 pp. $1.10.

JOHNSON, H. Presbyterian Bulwarks of Liberty and Law. *PQ.*, XIII., 1–23.

KATZER, E. Salus ecclesiæ suprema lex! Beiträge zur Reform der evgl.-luther. Kirchenwesens in d. sächsischen Oberlausitz. L.: Dieterich, '99; viii, 162 pp. M. 2.

KOALL, H. Welche Schäden erwachsen d. evangel. deutschen Volke aus seiner religiösen Gleichgültigkeit, u. wie ist dem zu steuern? Dresden: Sturm, '99; 16 pp. M. 0.25.

LAPSLEY, R. A. The Doctrinal Issues Presented by the Case of Dr. M. H. Houston. *PQ.*, Apr., '99, 253–67.

MICHEL. Die rechte Stellg. d. Geistlichen in Württemberg. St.: Kohlhammer, '99; 129 pp. M. 2.

RANKIN, JAMES. Church Ideas in Scripture and Scotland. Lo. & Ed.: W. Blackwood, '99; 290 pp. 6s.

SACHSSE, E. Die Beweggn. in d. deutschen evangel. Kirche. Schluss. *Hh.*, F., '99.

SCHALL, E. Das moderne Papsttum in den Kirchen der Reformation. B.: Schwetschke, '99; xvi, 401 pp. M. 5.
ii. Meine Dienstentlassung in der ersten Instanz vor d. Disziplinarkammer in Braunschweig. Ein Beitrag aus d. Amtsleben zur Entwickelung d. protest. Kirchenrechts in Deutschland. *Moderne Vehmgerichte*, Heft 3.

SCHNELL, H. Die mecklenburgischen Kirchenordnungen. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. Entstehung unserer Landeskirche. I. *Jahrbb. u. Jahresber. des Ver. f. mecklenb. Geschichte*, LXIII.

SUMMERS, T. O. Anglican Articles Omitted from the Methodist Confession. *MR.*, '99, 95–9, 218–27, 364–75.

UHLHORN, FR. Der gegenwärtige Zustand d. evangel. Kirche u. ihre Ausgestaltg. f. die Zukunft. Hameln: Fuendeling, '99. M. 0.50.

VERNES, M. Ernest Renan et la question religieuse en France. *Rev. de Belgique*, 15 Mr., '99.

WATKINSON, W. L. The Mission of Methodism. *LQR.*, Apr., '99.

WICHERS, F. Eine luther. "Warnungstafel" in kathol. Beleuchtg. Antwort auf des Herrn Pastor Kellner aus Süpplingen "Wegweiser u. Warnungstafel." Hildesheim: Steffen, '99; 68 pp. M. 0.60.

WITZ, C. Die evgl. Kirchen augsb. u. helv. Bekenntnisses. W.: Stähelin, '99; vi, 208 pp. M. 3.

ARTHUR, G. The "Lawless" Clergy of "this Church and Realm." *NC.*, Apr., '99.

Conservative, A. The Revolt of the Clergy. *CR.*, Mr., '99, 323–7.

GORE, C. The English Church Union Declaration. *CR.*, Apr., '99.

HALIFAX, VISCOUNT. The Present Crisis in the Church of England. *NC.*, F., '99.

HAMMOND, J. Church and her Accusers at the Present Crisis: six addresses. Lo.: Skeffington, '99; 102 pp. 2s.

MACCOLL, M. The Reformation Settlement. Examined in the light of history and law. N. Y.: Longmans, '99; lxxviii, 565 pp. 7s. 6d. *net.*

OSBORN, J. L. The Ecclesiastical Outlook. II. *NCR.*, Mr., '99.

POWELL, H. C. Church Crisis, its Causes and its Opportunities: a letter to the Bishop of Salisbury. N. Y.: Longmans, '99. 1s. *net.*

RIGG, J. H. Oxford High Anglicanism and its Chief Leaders. Lo.: Kelly, '99. 7s. 6d.

ROBERTSON, E. The Church of England as by Law Established. *NC.*, My., '99.

ROGERS, J. G. The Present Church Crisis in England. *Ind.*, 16 Mr., '99.

——— Ceremonialism *vs.* Experimental Religion. *CR.*, F., '99.

ROGERS, J. G. The Nation and the Ritualists. *NC.*, Mr., '99, 341–57.

RUSSELL, E. W. E. Ritualism and Disestablishment. *NC.*, F., '99.

SMITH, GOLDWIN. Ritualism in England. *Self-Culture*, Apr., '99.

SMITH, R. B. The Crisis in the Church. *NC.*, Mr., '99, 358–67.

True Limits of Ritual in the Church. Ed. by R. LINKLATER. Lo. & N. Y.: Longmans, '99; 266 pp. 5s.

VERNON-HARCOURT, W. Lawlessness in the National Church. Lo. & N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; 566 pp. 1s.

WATSON, J. (Ian Maclaren). The Religious Situation in England. *No. Am. Rev.*, My., '99.

. . . . . Lawlessness in the Church. *FR.*, Apr., '99.

Anglikanisch-evangelische Bisthum in Jerusalem, Das. *BAZ.*, 15 F., '99.

EHRHARD, A. Die orientalische Kirchenfrage u. Oesterreichs Beruf in ihrer Lösung. St.: Roth, '99; 76 pp. M. 1.40.

HAUPT, E. Das protest. Bistum in Jerusalem. *DEBl.*, '99, 145–59.

HERTZOG. Evgl. Kultusstätten im Orient. *MGkK.*, Ja., '99.

DIETTERLE, J. Was kann von unserer Seite geschehen, um d. Sonntage seine soziale Bedeutg. zu sichern? Pirna: Diller, '99; 37 pp. M. 0.40.

FISCHER, L. Zur Geschichte d. Ordination. *StKr.*, '99, 236–53.

LATHROP, N. The Holy Scriptures and Divorce. *BS.*, '99, 266–77.

NICHOLS, J. H. The Title Law. *MR.*, '99, 316–20.

TORREY, R. A. Ought Christians to Keep the Sabbath? Chi. & N. Y.: Revell, '99; 45 pp. $0.10.

HOMILETICS AND CATECHETICS.

BLAIKIE, W. G. Great Preachers. *HR.*, My., '99.
iii. Richard Baxter.

BOY, M. Die katechetische Behandlg. d. Versöhnungslehre. *KZ.*, II., no. 3, 89-95.

BRANDELLE, G. A. Some Characteristics of the Swedish Sermon. *LChR.*, '99. 341–7.

CHAPPELL, E. B. Scientific Preaching. *MR.*, '99, 21–32.

GREGG, D. Joseph Parker as a Preacher. *HR.*, F., '99, 105–11.

KEPPLER, P. W. Die Adventsperikopen, exegetisch-homiletisch erklärt. F.: Herder, '99; v, 143 pp. M. 2.40.
"Biblische Studien," hrsg. v. Bardenhewer. Bd. IV., Heft 1.

MAURY, L. Prédication et Prédicateurs. Fin. *RThQR.*, '99, 27–65.

STORRS, R. S. The Future of the Protestant Pulpit. *Ind.*, 20 & 27 Apr., '99.

BRAREN, B. C. Der dritte Artikel unseres christl. Glaubens, ausgelegt für's christl. Haus. Breklum: Christl. Buchh., '99; 75 pp. M. 0.75.

DAWSON, GEO. E. Interest and the Material of Instruction. *BW.*, Je., '99.

GRÄTZ, O. Die Unzulässigkeit d. gegenwärtigen katechetischen Unterweisg. u. der Weg z. Abhilfe. *Dienet einander*, VII., Heft 5 & 6.

HARDELAND, THDR. Die katechetische Behandlung d. kleinen Katechismus *D.* M. Luthers im Geiste s. Verfassers, mit ausgeführten Unterredgn. B.: Reuther & Reichard, '99; vii, 320 pp. M. 3.60.

KNOKE, K. Aus einem Bericht Cuviers üb. d. Schulwesen in Nordwestdeutschland 1811. *NkZ.*, '99, 343–59.

KOLBE, S. Der Katechismusunterricht in Schule und Konfirmandenunterricht. *KZ.*, II., 95–101.

MELTZER, H. Bibl. Gesch., Schulbibel oder alttestam. Lesebuch? *Pädag. Stud.*, XX., 2.

PATTEN, A. B. The Religious Training of Children. *BW.*, My., '99, 312–15.

RICE, JOHN A. Paidology. *MR.*, '99, 252–71.

SCHUMANN, K. F. Bibel u. Volksschule. L.: Wigand, '99; 27 pp. M. 0.40.

SPEER, P. Der Abschluss d. Katechismus-Unterrichts. Magdeburg: Schallehn, '99; 111 pp. M. 2.20.

TARRANT, W. G. The New Evangelical Catechism. *NW.*, Je., '99, 343–58.

THALHOFER, F. X. Entwicklg. d. kathol. Katechismus in Deutschland v. Canisius bis Deharbe. Histor.-krit. dargelegt. F.: Herder; St. Louis: B. Herder, '99; vi, 246 pp. $1.10.

BELFOUR, E. The Rite of Confirmation in the Jewish and the Christian Church. *LChR.*, '99, 231–7.

CLASSEN, W. Zur Erziehg. d. konfirmirten männlichen Jugend in d. Grossstadt. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 13.

EHLERS. Reform d. Konfirmationshandlg. *ZeRU.*, '99, no. 2.

SCHINDLER, FR. Kritischer Wegweiser durch die Litteratur des Konfirmandenunterrichts u. der öffentl. Christenlehre, sowie durch die einschlägige Litteratur d. Religionsunterrichts auf d. Oberstufe d. Volksschule (1879–98). St.: Greiner & Pfeiffer, '98; xvi, 82 pp. M. 2.

TEICHMANN. Reform d. gegenw. Konfirmationspraxis. *ZeRU.*, '99, no. 2.

LITURGICS AND HYMNOLOGY.

BUDDE, K. Aus d. amerik. Kultusleben. *MGkK.*, '99, 34–41.

CLARKE, H. W. The Confessional in the Church of England. Lo.: Author, '99; 80 pp. 2s.

——— Romanism without the Pope in the Church of England. Lo.: Author, '99; 216 pp. 4s. 6d.

Consecration of a Church, Altar and Tank according to the Ritual of the Coptic-Jacobite Church. With note by the Bishop of Salisbury. *PSBA.*, XXI., 86–107.
Described from a MS. of the fourteenth century, presented to the Bishop of Salisbury by the Patriarch of Alexandria.

DUCASSE, C. Des moyens pratiques de relever le culte domestique. *RChr.*, My., '99.

FOXLEY, J. Lessons from the Mass. *CR.*, F., '99.
1. Confession and Absolution. 2. Ritual and Organisation. 3. Signs and Things Signified. 4. Eucharistic Adoration.

FRANZ, A. Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Messe im deutschen Mittelalter. *Kath.*, F., Mr., Apr., My., '99.

HEUSER, H. J. The Paschal Celebration in Former Times. *AER.*, Apr., '99, 337–41.

KAUFMANN, K. Der Laienkelch in der kath. Kirche d. Abendlandes. *PrM.* F., '99, 73–4.

Prayers for the Dead. *ET.*, F., '99, 235–7.
Three short papers by B. WHITEFORD, G. B. BROWN, A. PLUMMER.

PROOST, R. Le comput pascal. *RBd.*, Ja., Apr., '99.

SCHUURBECQUE-BOEIJE, M. J. Het gezond verstand op godsdienstig gebied. *ThSt.*, '99, 20–49.

SOMMER, C. Das Recht der Agende in s. geschichtl. Entwicklg. Schleswig: Bergas, '99; 62 pp. M. 1.20.

Analecta hymnica medii ævi, hrsg. von C. BLUME u. G. M. DREVES. L.: Reisland, '99.
xxxii. Dictamina pia. 5. Folge. Hrsg. v. G. M. DREVES. 238 pp. M. 7.50.

BACHMANN, F. Don Lorenzo Perosi u. die neueste Entwicklg. kathol. Kirchenmusik. *BAZ.*, 18 F., '99, no. 41.

BROWNLIE, J. The Hymns and Hymn Writers of the Church Hymnary. Lo.: Frowde, '99. 3s. 6d.

CONVERSE, C. C. How can the New (Church) Music Profit Most from the Old? *HR.*, Apr., '99, 296–302.

HOFFMANN, G. Die Rabenaasstrophe. Br.: Evgl. Buchh., '99; 47 pp. M. 0.50.

HUPP, O. Ein Missale speciale, Vorläufer des Psalteriums von 1457. Regensburg, '99; 30 pp. & facs. M. 5.

KENT, W. H. The Liturgical Books of the Russian Church. *Dubl. Rev.*, '99, 78–106.

KRAUS, E. F. The Gradual. *LChR.*, '99, 224–30.

MAGISTRETTI, M. La liturgia della chiesa milanese nel sec. IV. Milano: S. Guiseppe, '99; 216 pp. L. 4.

MÖHLER, A. Die griechische, griech.-röm., u. altchristl.-lat. Musik. Ein Beitrag z. Gesch. des gregorian. Chorals. F.: Herder, '99; xxiii, 88 pp. M. 5.
9. Suppl.-Heft to *RQ.*

NELLE. Rinckart u. das Lied Hallelujah, Lob, Preis u. Ehr'. *MGkK.*, '99, 43–51.

PRÜFER, A. Der Leipziger Thomaskantor Johann Hermann Schein u. seine Bedeutg. f. die kirchl. Tonkunst d. 17. Jahrh. *MGkK.*, Ja., '99.

RAMER, A. L. The Liturgical Development between Gregory the Great and the Reformation. *LChR.*, '99, 214–23.

SACHSSE. Die evgl. Kirche u. die Musik. *Hh.*, '99, Heft 6.

STEPHAN, H. v. Luther als Musiker. Bielefeld: Siedhoff, '99; 43 pp. M. 0.40.

TAUNTON, E. L. The History and Growth of Church Music. N. Y.: Import. by Scribner's, '99; 131 pp. $0.50.

WEGENER, J. Das erste Wittenberger Gemeindegesangbuch. *MGkK.*, '99, 7–10.

WEIMAR, G. Über Choralrhythmus. Gi.: Ricker, '99; iii, 78 pp. M. 1.60.

SERMONIC LITERATURE.

AITKEN, J. The Abiding Law: twelve addresses on the ten commandments. L.: Oliphant, '99; 192 pp. 2s. 6d.

BUTLER, H. M. University and Other Sermons. Historical and biographical. Cambr.: Macmillan & Bowes, '99; 362 pp. 5s.

GLASSFORD, D. T. The Passing of Jesus: addresses on the seven last words. Lo.: Mowbray, '99; 76 pp. 1s.

JOWETT, B. Sermons, Biographical and Miscellaneous. Ed. by W. H. Freemantle. Lo.: Murray; N. Y.: Import. by Scribner's, '99; 380 pp. $3.

MURRAY, A. The New Life. Chi. & N. Y.: Revell, '99; 240 pp. $0.50.

ROWE, J. T. (editor). Church's Message to Men: sermons in Borough of Chatham by Archbishop of Canterbury, Minor Canon Blackie, Canon Gore, Bishop Mylne, Dean Hole, Prof. Shuttleworth. Lo.: Skeffington, '99; 92 pp. 2s.

SCHRENK, E. Wen dürstet, der komme. 12 Reden. Elberfeld: Evg. Gesellsch., '99; iii, 239 pp. M. 1.20.

VAN DYKE, H. J. The Gospel of a World of Sin. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; ix, 192 pp. $1.25.

MISSIONS.

BAHLOW. Justinian von Weltz, d. Vorkämpfer d. evgl. Mission. *ZMR.*, '99, 33–44.

BURTON, N. S. Pastors and Missions. *HR.*, My., '99.

CULROSS, J., and J. TAYLOR. Founders and Pioneers of Modern Missions. Portraits, etc. Lo.: Stockwell, '99; 70 pp. 3s. 6d.

HAYNES, M. Modern Evangelism: problems and solution. Chi. & N. Y.: Revell, '99; 42 pp. $0.35.

Samaritaner, Der barmherzige. Zeitschr. zur Förderg. d. christl. Nächstenliebe. Hrsg. v. Deutschordens-Convente zu Lana. 1. Jahrg. 12 Nrn. Bozen: Auer & Co., '99. M. 2.80.

ATTERBURY, A. P. Settlement Work. *HR.*, Apr., '99, 312–15.

BONET-MAURY, G. La fédération universelle des étudiants chrétiens. *RChr.*, My., '99.

KOCH, L. Fra Grundtvigianismens og den indre Missions Tid, 1848–98. København: Gad, '99; 296 pp. Kr. 3.75.

KOLDE, TH. Die englische Heilsarmee. *NkZ.*, F., '99, 101–38.

LAURY, P. A. The Philosophy of Apostolic Missions. *LChR.*, '99, 238–48.

MORGAN, J. J. Christian Endeavor from a Scriptural Point of View. *ChrQ.*, Apr., '99, 207–18.

CHESTER, S. H. Lights and Shadows of Mission Work in the Far East: being the record of observations made during a visit to the southern Presbyterian missions in Japan, China, and Korea, in the year 1897. Richmond: Presb. Committee of Publ., '99; ii, 133 pp. $0.75.

COILLARD, F. Sur le Haut-Zambèse. Voyages et travaux de mission. P.: Berger-Levrault, '99; xxix, 695 pp. f. 8.

GRAHAM, J. A. Missionary Expansion since the Reformation Chi. & N. Y.: Revell, '99; 244 pp. $1.25.

LEHMPFUHL, H. Entwicklungsgang d. Methode der christl. Mission in China. *ZMRW.*, '99, 97–109.

MIRBT, C. Die Bedeutg. d. Pietismus f. die Heidenmission. *AMZ.*, Apr., '99.

NOBLE, F. P. The Redemption of Africa. A story of civilization. With bibliography, illustrations, maps, and statistical tables. 2 vols. Chi.: Revell, '99; xxv, 856 pp. $4.

OEHLER. Unsere heidenchristl. Gemeinden. *EMM.*, '99, 1–15.

OLTMANS, A. Home Preparation of the Foreign Missionary. *BW.*, Mr., '99, 185–91.

RAGEY, P. Les missions anglicanes. *UC.*, Apr. & My., '99, 533–57, 5–34.

SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIALISM.

BARTH, FR. Die Grundsätze d. Bergpredigt u. das Leben der Gegenwart. Basel: Reich, '99; 26 pp. M. 0.80.

DENNIS, J. S. Christian Missions and Social Progress. A sociological study of foreign missions. Vol. II. Chi.: Revell, '99; xxvi, 486 pp. $2.50 *net.*

ESMARCH, F. v. Ueber den Kampf der Humanität gegen die Schrecken des Krieges. *DR.*, Apr., My., '99.

GOLDSTEIN, F. Urchristentum u. Sozialdemokratie. Zürich: Schmidt, '99; iii, 191 pp. M. 3.

HILLIS, N. D. The Influence of Jesus Christ in Civilization. *BS.*, '99, 327–40.

KÖHLER, H. Sozialistische Irrlehren von der Entstehung d. Christentums u. ihre Widerlegg. L.: Hinrichs, '99; iv, 272 pp. M. 4.40.

MERRILL, C. C. The Christian Conception of Wealth. *BS.*, '99, 241–65.

ROPP, G. v. Sozialpolit. Bewegungen im Bauernstande vor dem Bauernkriege. Rektoratsrede. Marburg: Elwert, '99; 16 pp. M. 0.40.

SCHILLER, J. Sociale Thätigk. d. Geistlichkeit. *KM.*, '99, 235–43.

STUBBS, C. W. Charles Kingsley and the Christian Social Movement. Lo.: Blackie, '99; viii, 199 pp. 2s. 6d. Victorian Era series.

WINES, F. H. Sociology and Philanthropy. *Ind.*, 6 Apr., '99.

Place of Publication: B. = Berlin; Bo. = Boston; Br. = Breslau; Chi. = Chicago; Cin. = Cincinnati; Ed. = Edinburgh; F. = Freiburg i. Br.; Fr. = Frankfurt a. M.; G. = Göttingen; Gi. = Giessen; Go. = Gotha; Gü. = Gütersloh; Hl. = Halle; Kö. = Königsberg; L. = Leipzig; Lo. = London; M. = München; N. Y. = New York; P. = Paris; Ph. = Philadelphia; St. = Stuttgart; Str. = Strassburg; Tü. = Tübingen; W. = Wien.

Prices: $ = dollar; M. = Mark; f. = franc; L. = lira; s. = shilling; d. = pence; fl. = florin. Prices quoted are usually for volumes bound in cloth in case of American and English books, in paper in the case of all others. Bd. = bound.

Months: Ja., F., Mr., Ap., My., Je., Jl., Ag., S., O., N., D.

PERIODICALS.

A. = Arena.
AC. = L'association catholique.
ACQ. = American Catholic Quarterly Review.
AER. = American Ecclesiastical Review.
AGPh. = Archiv f. d. Geschichte der Philosophie.
AJSL. = American Journal of Semitic Languages and Literatures.
AJTh. = American Journal of Theology.
AkKR. = Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht.
AMZ. = Allgemeine Missions-Zeitschrift.
ARW. = Archiv für Religionswissenschaft.
BAZ. = Beilage zur Allgemeinen Zeitung, München.
BBK. = Beiträge zur bayr. Kirchen-Gesch.
BG. = Beweis des Glaubens.
BS. = Bibliotheca Sacra.
BU. = Bibliothèque universelle.
BW. = Biblical World.
BZ. = Byzantinische Zeitschrift.
CR. = Contemporary Review.
ChOR. = Charity Organization Review.
ChQR. = Church Quart. Review.
ChR. = Charities Review.
ChrK. = Christliches Kunstblatt.
ChrL. = Christian Literature.
ChrQ. = Christian Quarterly.
ChrW. = Christliche Welt.
D-A ZThK. = Deutsch-amerik. Zeitschrift f. Theologie u. Kirche.
DEBl. = Deutsch-evangelische Blätter.
DR. = Deutsche Revue.
DZKR. = Deutsche Zeitschrift für Kirchenrecht.
EHR. = English Historical Review.
EKZ. = Evangelische Kirchenzeitung.
EMM. = Evangelisches Missions-Magazin.
ER. = Edinburgh Review.
Et. = Études.
ET. = Expository Times.
Exp. = Expositor.
F. = Forum.
FR. = Fortnightly Review.
GPr. = Gymnasialprogramm.
Hh. = Halte was du hast.
HN. = L'humanité nouvelle.
HR. = Homiletic Review.
HSR. = Hartford Sem. Record.
HZ. = Historische Zeitschrift.
IAQR. = Imperial Asiatic Quarterly Review.
ID. = Inaugural-Dissertation.
IER. = Indian Evang. Review.
IJE. = International Journal of Ethics.
Ind. = Independent.
ITkR. = Internat. Theol. Review.
JA. = Journal asiatique.
JBL. = Journal of Biblical Literature.
JM. = Monatsschrift für Geschichte u. Wissenschaft des Judenthums.
JQR. = Jewish Quarterly Review.
JRAS. = Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.
JTVI. = Journal of Trans. of Victoria Institute.
Kath. = Der Katholik, Zeitschr. f. kathol. Wissenschaft u. kirchl. Leben.
KM. = Kirchl. Monatsschrift.
KT. = Kyrklig Tidskrift.
KZ. = Katechetische Zeitschrift.
LCkR. = Lutheran Church Review.
LQ. = Lutheran Quarterly.
LQR. = London Quarterly Review.
M. = Muséon.
MA. = Mittheilungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, *e.g., Berlin, München.*
MCG. = Monatshefte der Comenius-Gesellschaft.
MGK. = Monatsschrift f. Gottesdienst u. kirchl. Kunst.
Mi. = Mind.
MIM. = Monatsschrift für innere Mission.
M&N DP-V. = Mittheilungen und Nachrichten des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
Mo. = Monist.
NA. = Nuova Anthologia.
Nath. = Nathanael.
NC. = Nineteenth Century.
NCR. = New Century Review.
NkZ. = Neue kirchl. Zeitschrift.
NW. = New World.
OLZ. = Orientalistische Literatur-Zeitung.
Ou. = Outlook.
PEFQS. = Palestine Exploration Fund; Quarterly Statement.
PhM. = Philosophische Monatshefte.
PhR. = Philosophical Review.
PQ. = Presbyterian Quarterly.
Pr. = Protestant.
PrM. = Protestantische Monatshefte.
PRR. = Presbyterian and Reformed Review.
PSBA. = Proceedings of the Society of Bibl. Archæology.
QR. = Quarterly Review.
RAAO. = Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale.
RB. = Revue biblique.
RBd. = Revue bénédictine.
RCkR. = Reformed Church Review.
RChr. = Revue chrétienne.
RChrS. = Revue de christianisme sociale.
RdM. = Revue des deux Mondes.
REJ. = Revue des études juives.
RHLR. = Revue d'histoire et de litérature religieuses.
RHR. = Revue de l'histoire des religions.
RQ. = Römische Quartalschrift f. christl. Alterthumskunde u. f. Kirchengeschichte.
RS. = Revue sémitique d'épigraphie et d'histoire ancienne.
RTh. = Revue théologique.
RThPh. = Revue de théologie et de philosophie.
RThQR. = Revue de théol. et des quest. relig.
SA. = Sitzungsberichte der Akad. d. Wiss. *e.g., Berlin, München* etc.
StKr. = Theol. Studien und Kritiken.
StWV. = Stemmen voor Waarheid en Vrede.
ThQ. = Theologische Quartalschrift.
ThR. = Theologische Rundschau.
ThSt. = Theologische Studiën.
ThT. = Theologisch Tijdschrift.
UC. = L'Université catholique.
UPr. = Universitätsprogramm.
VwPh. = Vierteljahrsschrift für wissenschaftliche Philosophie
WZKM. = Wiener Zeitschrift für Kunde des Morgenlandes.
ZA. = Zeitschrift für Assyriologie.
ZAeg. = Z. für aegyptische Sprache u. Alterthumskunde.
ZATW. = Z. für alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
ZDMG. = Z. d. Deutsch-Morgenl. Gesellsch.
ZDPV. = Z. d. Deutschen Palästina-Vereins.
ZeRU. = Z. für den evangelischen Religionsunterricht.
ZKG. = Z. f. Kirchengeschichte.
ZkTh. = Z. f. kathol. Theologie.
ZMR. = Z. f. Missionskunde und Religionswissenschaft.
ZPhKr. = Z. f. Philosophie und philos. Kritik.
ZprTh. = Z. f. prakt. Theologie.
ZSchw. = Z. f. Theol. aus d. Schweiz.
ZThK. = Z. f. Theologie u. Kirche.
ZwTh. = Z. f. wissenschaftl. Theologie.

THEOLOGICAL AND SEMITIC LITERATURE

A BIBLIOGRAPHICAL SUPPLEMENT

TO THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF THEOLOGY, THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES, AND THE BIBLICAL WORLD

BY W. MUSS-ARNOLT

I. SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY

[REMARKS AND LISTS OF ABBREVIATIONS, SEE P. XXXII OF JULY, 1899]

GENERAL.

Actes de l'onzième congrès international des orientalistes (Paris, 1897). IV^e sect.: Hébreu, Phénicien, Araméen, Éthiopien, Assyrien. P.: Leroux, '99; 341 pp.

KRALL, JAK. Grundriss des altoriental. Gesch. I. Thl.: Bis auf Kyros. W.: Hölder, '99; vi, 199 pp. M. 5.

MONTET, E. Quarterly Report on Semitic Studies and Orientalism. *IAQR.*, Jl., '99, 136–41.

MÜLLER, W. M. Länder des äussersten Nordostens in ägyptischen Inschriften. *OLZ.*, II., 176–8.

NÖLDEKE, TH. Die semit. Sprachen. Eine Skizze. 2. Aufl. L.: Tauchnitz, '99; iii, 76 pp. M. 2.

WARREN, C. The Ancient Standards of Measure in the East. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 218–68.

WINCKLER, H. Altoriental. Forschungen. 2. Reihe. II. Bd. 2. Heft (12. der ganzen Folge). L.: Pfeiffer, '99. M. 4.40.
2. Die Zeit von Ezras Ankunft in Jerusalem.—Z. Gesch. d. alten Arabiens: v, Nebukadnezar u. Kedar; vi, Die arab. Kasdim.—Ko'a u. Scho'a.—Zum Buche Jona.—Z. Buche Judith.—Z. kleinasiatischen Geschichte.—Philokles, König der Sidonier.—Aus d. Archiv. v. Nineve.—Amēlu.—Zu den karthagisch-röm. Verträgen. (Pp. 241–320.)

——— Völker Vorder-Asiens. L.: Hinrichs', '99; 36 pp. M. 0.60.
Heft 1 of Jahrg. I. of: "Der alte Orient."

ASSYRIO-BABYLONIAN.

BOSCAWEN, W. ST. C. The Letters of Khammurabi. *Bab. Or. Rec.*, VIII., no. 9.

——— Babylonian Witchcraft. *Ibid.*

CRAIG, J. A. Astrological-Astronomical Texts. Copied from the original tablets in the British Museum and autographed. L.: Hinrichs', '99; ix, 95 pp. M. 30.
Vol. XIV. of: "Assyriologische Bibliothek," hrsg. v. F. Delitzsch u. Paul Haupt.

DÜRST, J. U. Die Kinder von Babylon, Assyrien u. Aegypten u. ihr Zusammenhang mit den Kindern der alten Welt. B.: Reimer, '99; 94 pp. M. 8.

HOWORTH, H. H. Some Unsolved Difficulties in Babylonian History. A series of queries. I. *Bab. Or. Rec.*, VIII., no. 9.

HÜSING, G. Šutruk-Nahhunte C und D. *OLZ.*, II., 178–80.

JASTROW, M., JR. Adam and Eve in Babylonian Literature. *AJSL.*, XV., 193–214.

JOHNS, C. H. W. The Chedorlaomer Tablets. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 523.

NIEBUHR, C. Die Amarna-Zeit. Ägypten u. Vorderasien um 1400 v. Chr. nach dem Thontafelfunde von El-Amarna. L.: Hinrichs', '99. M. 0.60.
Heft 2 of Jahrg. I. of: "Der alte Orient."

RAUCH, GEO. Aus den Ergebnissen der orientalischen Geschichtsforschg. Die Assyrer. 2. Heft: Die assyr. Cultur. *GPr.* Brünn: Winkler, '99; pp. 67–99. M. 0.80.

HOMMEL, F. The Hittite Inscriptions. 2d article. *ET.*, Jl., '99, 459–62.

JENSEN, P. The Hittite Inscriptions. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 501–4, 528.

RAMSAY, W. M. The Hittite Inscriptions. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 527.

SYRIAC.

NAU, F. Le traité sur l'astrolabe-plan de Sévère Sabokt, écrit au VII^e siècle d'après des sources grecques et publié pour la première fois d'après un MS. de Berlin (coll. Petermann, no. 37). (Fin.) *JA.*, Mr.–Apr., '99, 238–303.

SACHAU. Studie z. syr. Kirchenlitteratur der Damascener. *SA.*, Berlin, '99, nos. xxvi., xxvii.

ARAMAIC.

CLERMONT-GANNEAU, C. Notes on Inscription on Jar-Handle, and Weight. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 204–9.

[illegible] idiom contained in the Babylonian Talmud. III. *AJSL.*, XV., 224–43.

PALMYRENIAN.

CONDER, C. R. Palmyrene Inscriptions. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 269.

PHŒNICIAN.

BERGER, PH. Sur une forme particulière du *tod* dans l'inscription trilingue d'Henchir-Alaouin. *Compt. rend . . . Acad. des inscr.*, '99, 166–9.

——— Sur un rouleau de plomb avec inscription phénicienne trouvé à Carthage. *Ibid.*, 179–88.

GAUCKLER, P. Découvertes à Carthage. *Ibid.*, 156–65.

LANDAU, W. v. Die phönizischen Inschriften. L.: Pfeiffer, '99. M. 2.

ARABIC.

BAUER, L. Arab. Sprichwörter. *ZDPV.*, '99, 129–48.

CAUDEL, M. Les premières invasions arabes dans l'Afrique du nord (21–100 H. = 651–718 A. D.). (Suite.) *JA.*, Mr.–Apr., '99, 189–237.

CHAUVIN, V. Homère et les Mille et une nuits. Louvain, '99; 4 pp. f. 0.50.

DERENBOURG, H. Livre intitulé Laisa. IV. *AJSL.*, XV., 215–23.
Sur les exceptions de la langue arabe, par Ibn Khâloûya, dit Ibn Khalawaihi. Texte arabe publié d'après le manuscrit unique du British Museum.

KURZ, E. Spezialwörterbuch z. Qorân. Probeheft. Bern: Schmid & Francke, '99; iv, 12 pp. M. 1.

MARGOLIOUTH, G. Responses of Maimonides in the Original Arabic. *JQR.*, XI., 533–50.

MÜLLER, D. H. Südarabische Alterthümer im kunsthistorischen Hofmuseum. W.: Hölder, '99; folio; v, 95 pp., 28 Abbildgn. u. 14 Lichtdr.-Taf. L.: Harrassowitz. M. 15.

STEINSCHNEIDER, M. An Introduction to the Arabic Literature of the Jews. I. (Cont.) *JQR.*, XI., 585–625.

VAUX, C. DE. La destruction des philosophes par Al-Gazâli (transl.). *M.*, Je., '99, 143–57.

ETHIOPIC AND COPTIC.

Apocryphes, Les, éthiopiens. Traduits en français par René Basset. T. 9: Apocalypse d'Esdras. P.: Bibl. de la haute science, '99; 143 pp. f. 4.

ERMONI, V. L'ordinat copte. (Suite.) *Rev. de l'Orient chrét.*, '99, 104–15.

[illegible]NE, C. Liturgie copte alexandrine, dite de St. Basile. Trad. franç. P.: Picard, '99; 30 pp.

PERRUCHON, J. Aperçu grammatical de la langue amharique ou amarinna comparée avec l'éthiopien. (Cont.) *M.*, Je., '99, 195–202.

PERSIAN.

NICHOLSON, R. A. Persian MS. Attributed to Fakhru'ddîn Râzî, with a note on Risâlatu'b Ghufrân by Abû'l 'Alâ al-Ma'arrî and other MSS. in the same collection. *JRAS.*, '99, 669–73.

RABBINICAL AND JUDAICA.

BACHER, W. Die Agada d. palästinensischen Amoräer. 3. Bd.: Die letzten Amoräer d. hl. Landes (vom Anfange des 4. bis zum Anfange des 5. Jahrh.). Str.: Trübner, '99; xii, 803 pp. M. 12.

BUCHHOLTZ, A. Gesch. d. Juden in Riga bis z. Begründg. d. Rigaischen Hebräergemeinde im J. 1842. Riga: R. Kymmel's Sort., '99; iv, 161 pp. M. 3.60.

CARLEBACH, S. Geschichte d. Juden in Lübeck u. Moisling. Lübeck: Quitzow, '99; xi, 208; xviii pp. M. 3.50.

CART, L. De la prophétie par Maïmonide. Traduit sur le texte hébreu. *R'ThPh.*, '99, 197–214.

DEUTSCH, G. The National Movement amongst the Jews. *NW.*, Je., '99, 242–54.

GOLDSTEIN, J. Die Ethik d. Judentums. Mit einem Nachwort von Professor Nippold. *ZMR.*, '99, 161–6.

GOTTHEIL, R. The Zionist Movement. *No. Am. Rev.*, Ag., '99.

HALBERSTAM, S. J. Notes on Neubauer's Yerachmeel Ben Shelomoh. *JQR.*, '99, 355–86; *ibid.*, 697–9.

KIMHI, J. Un fragment de Joseph Kimhi sur Job. (chap. I et XXXIV, 17 à XLII). Publié par S. Eppenstein. P.: Durlacher, '98; 20 pp.

KÖNIG, E. Section 70 of the Dikdûkê ha-ṭe-amîm. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 333–6.

LAZARUS, J. Zionism. *NW.*, Je., '99, 228–41.

LEVIAS, C. The Justification of Zionism. Cincinnati, '99; 15 pp..

ROSENAK, L. Die Fortschritte der hebr. Sprachwissenschaft von Jehuda Chajjûg bis David Kimchi (X–XIII sæcl.). I. Tl. Fr.: Kauffmann, '99; viii, 47 pp. M. 2.

SCHECHTER, S. Geniza Specimens. A letter of Chushiel. *JQR.*, XI., 643–50.

WALTHER. Le Sionisme. *RChr.*, 1 Jl.,'99.

II. THEOLOGICAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. GENERAL AND INTRODUCTORY SUBJECTS.

GENERAL.

ARNAUD, E. Dictionnaire usuel de la doctrine et de la vie chrétienne en 372 articles. P.: Fischbacher, '99; xiii, 519 pp. f. 10.

Beiträge zur Förderg. christl. Theologie. Hrsg. v. A. Schlatter & H. Cremer 3. Jahrgang 1899. 3. Heft. Gü.: Bertelsmann.
3. WURM, P. Religionsgeschichtl. Parallelen z. A. T.—BLASS, F. Textkritische Bemerkungen zu Markus. 93 pp.

CHRIST, PAUL. Die Theologie als Wissenschaft. *PrM.*, '99, 234–40.

CLAPPERTON, J. A. Ten to One, and Other Papers. Lo.: Kelly, '99; 128 pp. 1s.

DEVAUX, A. Quelques publications récentes sur la liberté d'enseignement. *UC.*, My., '99, 139–48.

DUNGAN, D. R. The Greatest Religious Teachers Compared with Jesus. *ChrQ.*, '99, 289–305.

Flugschriften d. evgl. Bundes. L.: C. Braun, '99.
163. MEYER, F. Die evgl. Bewegg. in Oesterreich. M. 0.20.—164. GEBHARDT, E. Die Entwicklung d. kath. Ordenswesens in Schlesien in den letzten Jahrzehnten u die Lehre daraus. M. 0.20.—165. PFLEIDERER, O. Los von Rom. 13 pp. M. 0.20.

Hefte f. ev. Weltanschauung n. chr. Erkenntnis. Nos. 8–11. [Aus: *KM.*] Gross Lichterfelde-Berlin: Runge, '99.
8. KARIG, P. Irrenpflege einst u. jetzt. 16 pp. M. 0.30.—9. SEEBERG, R. Warum glauben wir an Christus? Ein Vortrag. 18 pp. M. 0.40. —10. PFEIFFER, F. Spurgeon als Kanzelredner. 22 pp. M. 0.40.—11. Streiflichter auf moderne Kunst u. Bildg., v. EREMITA. iii, 36 pp. M. 0.50.

Kathol. Flugschriften zur Wehr u. Lehr'. B.: Germania, '99.
136. NOTT, L. v. Die Verehrung d. Heiligenreliquien in d. kath. Kirche. 44 pp. M. 0.10.

LEE, G. S. The Printing Press and Personality. *NW.*, Je., '99, 315–25.

MÉNÉGOZ, E. Du rapport entre l'histoire sainte et la foi religieuse. P.: Fischbacher, '99; 28 pp.

STADE, B. Ausgewählte Reden u. Abhandlungen. Gi.: Ricker, '99; viii, 296 pp. M. 6.

Ueber die Lage d. evgl. Kirche Deutschlands. Die messianische Hoffnung im Psalter. Ueber die Aufgabe d. bibl. Theologie d. A. T. Die Entsthg. des Volkes Israel. Das Volk Javan. Der Text d. Berichtes über Salomos Bauten (1 Kö. 5-7). Anmerkungen zu 2 Kö. 10–14; 15–21. Beiträge zur Pentateuchkritik.

VALETON. Die Voraussetzg. d. Theologie u. ihre Wissenschaftlichkeit. *Hh.*, Je.,'99.

ZÖCKLER, O. Vom theol. Studium in Nordamerika. *EKZ.*, '99, nos. 25 f.

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

ARNAL, P. A. L'idée de l'absolu dans la philosophie et la théologie d'Emanuel Biedermann. (Fin.) *RThQR.*, '99, 313–30.

Berner Studien z. Philosophie u. ihrer Geschichte. Hrsg. von L. Stein. Bern: Steiger, '99.
XIV LEFKOVITS, M. Die Staatslehre auf Kantischer Grundlage. 74 pp. M. 1.75.

BLEIBTREU, K. Von Robespierre zu Buddha. L.: Friedrich, '99; iii, 301 pp. M. 5.

Boëthius, The Religion of. *Calcutta Rev.*, Apr., '99, 356–74.

BONUS. Nietzsche u. Lagarde. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 24.

BORMANN, W. Der Schotte Hume, ein physiopsychischer Zeuge des Transcendenten im 19. Jahrh. L.: Mutze, '99; v, 92 pp. M. 2.

BRUNNHOFER, H. Giordano Brunos Lehre vom Kleinsten als Quelle der prästabilierten Harmonie des Leibniz. L.: Strauch, '99; 63 pp. M. 1.20.

CHRÉTIEN, A. Études sur le mouvement néo-thomiste. II. *ThR.*, Jl., '99, 544-53.

DEUSSEN, P. Allgemeine Gesch. d. Philosophie m. besond. Berücksichtigg. d. Religionen. Bd. I. 2. Abtlg.: Die Philosophie d. Upanishad. L.: Brockhaus, '99; xii, 368 pp. M. 9.

DUBOIS, J. Spencer et le principe de la morale. P.: Fischbacher, '99; xiii, 332 pp.

DUPRAT, G. L. La théorie du πνεῦμα chez Aristote. *AGPh.*, XII., Heft 3.

GOEBEL, H., und E. ANTRIM. Friedrich Nietzsche's Uebermensch. *Mo.*, Jl., '99, 563–72.

GÖRLAND, A. Aristoteles u. die Mathematik. Marb.: Elwert, '99; viii, 211 pp. M. 4.50.

GRABMANN, M. Der Genius d. Schriften d. hl. Thomas u. die Gottesidee. *Jahrb. Phil. u. Spec. Theol.*, '99, 408–43.

GREGORY, D. S. Herbert Spencer, "Our Great Philosopher," *versus* the Known God. II. *PRR.*, Jl., '99, 413–40.

HERTLING, G. v. Descartes' Beziehungen zur Scholastik. II. *SA.*, München, '99, I., 3–36.

HOLLMANN, G. Prolegomena z. Genesis d. Religionsphilosophie Kants. *ID.* Hl., '99; 40 pp.

JERUSALEM, W. Einleitg. in die Philosophie. W.: Braumüller, '99; viii, 189 pp. M. 3.

KRALIK, R. Sokrates: nach den Überliefergn. seiner Schule dargestellt. W.:

N, O. Friedrich
christl. Philosophie. *NkZ.*, '99, 582-602.

PAPE, G. Lotzes religiöse Weltanschauung. B.: Skopnik, '99; 94 pp. M. 1.50.

PAULSEN, F. Kant d. Philosoph d. Protestantismus. F.: Mohr, '99; 40 pp. M. 0.60.

PETERSON, J. B. Kant's Theory of the "Forms of Thought." *BS.*, Jl., '99, 440–54.

RAPPAPORT, S. Spinoza u. Schopenhauer. Eine kritisch-histor. Untersuchg. m. Berücksichtigg. d. unedierten Schopenhauerschen Nachlasses dargestellt. B.: Gaertner, '99; v, 148 pp. M. 3.

VEECK, O. Paul de Lagarde's Anschauungen über Religion u. Kirchenwesen. I. *PrM.*, '99, 225–34.

VOLKMANN, F. Schillers Philosophie. B.: Rühe, '99; 31 pp. M. 0.60.

WATERMANN, W. B. The Ethics of Kants Lectures on the Philosophical Theory of Religion. *Kantstud.*, '99, 415 foll.

WYZEWA, T. DE. Documens nouveaux sur Frédéric Nietzsche. *Rev. d. 2 Mondes*, 15 Jl., '99.

PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION.

BARROWS, J. H. The Abiding Realities of Religion. *BS.*, Jl., '99, 543–60.

BERTAULD, P. A. Positivisme et philosophie scientifique. P.: Alcan, '99; iii, 218 pp. f. 2.50.

BESANT, ANNIE. Die sieben Principien oder Grundteile des Menschen. L.: Friedrich, '99; viii, 160 pp. M. 1. Bibliothek esoter. Schriften, Bd. VI.

BLÖHBAUM, E. Christus redivivus. I. Die Voraussetzgn. aller Wissenschaft. B.: Schwetschke, '99; xi, 209 pp. M. 3.

BORNEMANN. Pastor Ewalds Vorlesungen über Pestalozzis Methode d. Bildg. zur Sittlichkeit und zur Religiosität. *Rhein. Bl. f. Erzieh. u. Unterr.*, '99, 193–222.

BRODBECK, A. Kraft u. Geist! Eine Streitschrift gegen den unhaltbaren Schein-Monismus Prof. Häckel's u. Genossen. L.: Strauch, '99; 32 pp. M. 1.

CARUS, P. Immorality as a Philosophical Principle. A study of the philosophy of Friedrich Nietzsche. *Mo.*, Jl., '99, 572–616.

CHAMBERLAIN, A. M. Modern Phases of Unbelief. *ChrQ.*, '99, 325–37.

"Christian Science," The Origin of. [illegible] *Mag.*, My., '99.

[illegible] Series. T.: Leclerc et Oudin, '99. f. 3.50.

DENNERT, E. Ein gewichtiges Urteil über den heutigen Stand des Darwinismus. *BG.*, Je., '99, 240.
On A. Goette's article in the *Umschau*, 1899, no. 5.

DUNKMANN, K. Das Problem d. Freiheit in der gegenwärtigen Philosophie u. das Postulat d. Theologie. Hl.: Niemeyer, '99; viii, 92 pp. M. 2.

DUPRAT, L. L'instabilité mentale. Essai sur les données de la psychopathologie. P.: Alcan, '99. f. 5.

FAREL, P. La religion d'après M. Sabatier, son origine et son histoire. (Fin.) *RThQR.*, '99, 249–68.

GENUNG, GEO. F. Personality from the Monistic Point of View. *AJTh.*, III., 473–98.

GEYSER, J. Das philosophische Gottesproblem in seinen wichtigsten Auffassungen. B.: Hanstein, '99; viii, 291 pp. M. 3.80.

GRAEFF, I. E. Christian Ideas the Dominant Force in the World. *RChR.*, '99, 368–77.

HALL, W. T. Mental Philosophy in Relation to the Study of Theology. *BSt.*, Jl., '99.

HANSPAUL, F. Die Seelentheorie u. die Gesetze d. natürlichen Egoismus u. der Anpassung. B.: Duncker, '99; xvi, 292 pp. M. 5.

HEUSINGER, G. Das Geheimnis d. Lebens oder die Lehre vom Glück. L.: Mutze, '99; iii, 36 pp. M. 0.60.

HILLER, H. C. Heresies; or, Agnostic Theism, Ethics, Sociology, and Metaphysics. Vol. I. Lo,: Richards, '99; 352 pp. 5s.

LEBIUS, R. Die Religion d. Zukunft u. der Kern aller Religionen. Bamberg: Handelsdruckerei, '99; 62 pp. M. 0.50.

LIEBMANN, O. Gedanken und Thatsachen. Philosophische Abhandlngn., Aphorismen u. Studien. 2. u. 3. Heft. Str.: Trübner, '99: iii, 133–300: 301–316 pp. M. 3.20.

LINTRADE, K. Der Mensch als Weltwesen u. Erdenbürger. 1. Zur Selbsterkenntniss. 2. Gemeinsinn im wirthschaftl. Leben. L.: Elischer Nachf., '99; 46 pp. M. 0.80.

LUTOSLAWSKI, W. Ueber die Grundvoraussetzungen u. Consequenzen der individualistischen Weltanschauung. *ID.* Helsingfors: Edlund, '99; iii, 88 pp. M. 1.25.

MACALISTER, A. Anthropology and Christianity. *LQR.*, Jl., '99.

MARCUS, E. Die exacte Aufdeckung d. Fundamentes d. Sittlichkeit u. Religion u. die Konstruktion der Welt aus den Elementen des Kant. Eine Erhebg. d. Kritik der reinen u. prakt. Vernunft zum Range d. Naturwissenschaft. L.: Haacke, '99; xxxi, 240+161 pp. M. 8.

MATHESON, G. The Bible Definition of Religion. Chi.: Revell, '99; 53 pp. $0.30.

MOFFAT, J. The Responsibility of Self-Assertion; a study in two characters. *ET.*, Jl., '99, 445–9.

Moral u. Leben. Beitrag z. Religions- u. Sittenlehre von einem Nichttheologen. B.: Deubner, '99; 60 pp. M. 0.80.

MORGAN, C. L. Biology and Metaphysics. *Mo.*, Jl., '99, 538–62.

NICHOLS, TH. Morality: Intuitive and Imperative. *PR.*, Jl., '99, 511–32.

NILSEN, M. Zur Religion. Ein Wort z. Verständigung an die Gebildeten unter ihren Verehrern u. Verächtern. Hamburg: Digel, '99; 42 pp. M. 1.50.

OTTO, A. Hemmungen des Christentums. Gegner u. Orthodoxien. 1. Heft. B.: Schwetschke, '99; xi, 109 pp. M. 1.25.

PHILLIPS, W. B. The Origin of Spiritualism. *Ind.*, 8 Jl., '99.

PURRINGTON, W. A. The Case against Christian Science. *No. Am. Rev.*, Ag., '99.

ROBERTSON, J. M. A Short History of Free Thought, Ancient and Modern. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xv, 447 pp. $3.

ROCHOLL, A. *Altiora quaero.* Drei Kapitel über Spiritualismus u. Realismus. L.: Deichert, '99; v, 94 pp. M. 1.60.

SCHIEDT, R. C. On the Transmission of Newly Acquired Habits. *RChR.*, '99, 310–20.

SHARP, C. M. Modern Socialism and the Teaching of Jesus. *ChrQ.*, '99, 387–98.

SPIELBERG, O. Die Moral der freien

STRATTON, G. M. The Psychological Evidence for Theism. *NW.*, Je., '99, 326–42.

THURY, M. La preuve cosmologique de l'existence de Dieu. *RChr.*, Je., '99.

TIGERT, J. J. An Idealist's Prescription for Modern Materialism. *MR.*, My.–Je., '99, 421–8.

WARD, J. Naturalism and Agnosticism. 2 vols. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xvii, 302; xiii, 294 pp. $4 *net.*
The *Gifford Lectures*, delivered before the University of Aberdeen in the years 1896–8.

WERNER, O. Die Menschheit. Gedanken über ihre religiöse, kulturelle u. ethn. Entwickelg. L.: Haberland, '99; iii, 260 pp. M. 3.50.

WHITMAN, C. O. Myths in Animal Psychology. *Mo.*, Jl., '99, 524–37.

ZÖCKLER, O. H. Schefflers Kritik des Darwinismus. *BG.*, Je., '99, 230–39.

RELIGION AND SCIENCE, ART, ETC.

BORNEMANN, W. Die Allegorie in Kunst, Wissenschaft u. Kirche. F.: Mohr, '99; 55 pp. M. 1.

EDWARDS, W. E. Victor Cousin; and the True, the Beautiful, and the Good. *MR.*, My.–Je., '99, 349–63.

FOVEAU DE COURMELLES. L'esprit scientifique contemporain. P.: Fasquelle, '99. f. 3.50.

IRVINE, D. Parsifal and Wagner's Christianity. N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's, '99; 418 pp. $2.40.

LA BARRE, DE. L'ordre de la nature et le miracle. P.: Bloud et Barral, '99; 63 pp.

LUZZATTI, L. Scienza e fede. *NA.*, Je. 16, '99.

PFISTER, O. Modernes Antichristentum, antimodernes Christentum u. das Evangelium Jesu. *ZSchw.*, '99, 97–115.

SELL, K. Goethes Stellg. zu Religion u. Christentum. F.: Mohr, '99; iv, 104 pp. M. 1.80.

STEIN, E. Können wir angesichts der modernen Geistesbildung mit gutem Gewissen d. Standpunkt d. bibl. Christentums vertreten? Düsseldorf: Schaffnit, '99; 19 pp. M. 0.20.

ZIEGLER, TH. Glauben u. Wissen. Str.: Heitz, '99; 31 pp. M. 0.80.

ZINI, ZINO. Leo Tolstoi e la litteratura evangelica del 19. secolo. *NA.*, Je., '99.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION; RELIGIOUS SYSTEMS.

AUDOLLENT, A. Bulletin archéologique de la religion romaine. Année 1897. *RHR.*, Mr.–Apr., '99, 261–77.

BERTRAND, A. Nos origines. III.: La religion des Gaulois, les Druides et le Druidisme. P.: Leroux, '99; xi, 417 pp. f. 10.

BOWDEN, E. M. Jainism: a chat with Raja Sivaprasad. *NC.*, Je., '99.

CHADWICK, H. M. The Cult of Othin: essay in ancient religion of the North. Cambr.: Univ. Press, '99. 2s. 6d.

Congrès international d'histoire des religions en 1900. *RHR.*, Mr.–Apr., '99, 279–82.

CUMONT, F. Textes et monuments figurés relatifs aux mystères de Mithra. I. Brussels, '99; 136 pp.

DAHLMANN, J. Mahābhārata-Studien. Abhdlgn. z. altind. Litteratur- u. Kulturkunde. I.: Genesis d. Mahābhārata. B.: Dames, '99; xxxiv, 290 pp. M. 15.

DUFOURCQ, A. Comment, dans l'empire romain, les foules ont-elles passé des religions locales à la religion universelle, le christianisme? *RHLR.*, '99, 239–69.

FAIRBAIRN, A. M. Religion in India. *CR.*, Je., '99.

HANNE, J. R. C. P. Tiele's Einleitung in die Religionswissenschaft. *PrM.*, '99, 202–10.

HARDY, E. Eine buddhistische Bearbeitung der Krsna-Sage. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 25–50.

LANG, A. Mr. Frazer's Theory of Totemism. *FR.*, Je., '99.

LYALL, A. C. Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social. 2d ser. N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's, '99; 394 pp. $3.60.

SCHEICHL, F. Der Buddhismus u. d. Duldung. Linz: Mareis, '99; 32 pp. M. 0.80.

SÖDERBLOM, N. Les Fravashis. Étude sur les traces qui subsistent dans le mazdéisme d'une ancienne conception sur la survivance des morts. I. *RHR.*, Mr.–Apr., '99, 229–60.

SPEYER, J. S. Buddhas Todesjahr nach dem Avadānaśataka. *ZDMG.*, LIII., 120–24.

SPINNER. Zur buddhistischen Eschatologie. *ZMR.*, '99, 193–204.

TOURNIER, F. Notes sur les temples païens de furvière à l'époque romaine. *UC.*, Jl., '99, 361–92.

USENER, H. Religionsgeschichtl. Untersuchgn. 3. Tl.: Die Sintfluthsagen. Bonn: Cohen, '99; x, 279 pp. M. 8.

WEST, E. W. Notes on Zarathustra's Doctrine regarding the Soul. *JRAS.*, Jl., '99, 605–12.

B. EXEGETICAL THEOLOGY.

OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT.

BARNES, J. A. The Evolution of a Reference Bible. *LQR.*, Jl., '99.

CORNELY, R. Synopses omnium librorum sacrorum utriusque testamenti, quas ex sua "Introductione spec. in vet. et nov. testamentum" excerpsit, retractavit, complevit. P.: Lethielleux, '99; viii, 463 pp. f. 6.

DIGGLE, J. W. Holy Hatred. *Exp.*, Je., '99.

KEENER, J. C. Studies of Bible Truths. Nashville: Barbee & Smith, '99; xv, 239 pp. $1.

LEADER, H. What is the Bible? *RChR.*, '99, 352–67.

RANKIN, J. E. The Influence of the Bible upon the Human Intellect. *BS.*, Jl., '99, 415–39.

Theologischer Jahresbericht, hrsg. von H. Holtzmann u. G. Krüger. 18. Bd., enthaltend die Literatur d. Jahres 1898. B.: Schwetschke, '99. Complete, M. 20.
1. Exegese, bearb. von SIEGFRIED u. HOLTZMANN, 190 pp.

THOMAS, J. Mélanges d'histoire et de littérature religieuse. P.: Lecoffre, '99; xxxi, 345 pp.

BEARDSLEE, J. W. The Bible among the Nations: a study of the great translators. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '99; 226 pp. $1.

CLAPPERTON, J. A. Pitfalls in Bible English. Lo.: Kelly, '99; viii, 126 pp. Books for Bible Students, ed. by A. E. Gregory.

CORSSEN, P. Bericht üb. d. lateinischen Bibelübersetzungen. *Jahresber. üb. d. Fortschr. d. class. Altertw.*, '99.

FELDMAN, A. The Bible in Neo-Hebraic Poetry. *JQR.*, XI., 569–84.

LE BLANT, E. Les commentaires des livres saints et les artistes chrétiens des premiers siècles. P.: Klincksieck, '99; 20 pp.

RAHLFS, A. Alter u. Heimat der vaticanischen Bibelhandschrift. *Nachr. Gött. Ges. d. Wiss.*, '99, I., 72–80.

BALL, C. J. Light from the East; or, The Witness of the Monuments. An introduction to the study of biblical archæology. With a new comparative list of the proper names of the Bible. Lo.: Eyre & Spottiswoode, '99; N. Y.: E. & B. Young; 380 pp. $6.

HOGARTH, D. G., (editor). Authority and Archæology. Sacred and Profane. N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's. '99; 456 pp. $5. i. Hebrew Authority, by S. R. DRIVER (1–152); [illegible] Greece, by D. G. HOGARTH (220–53); 3. Historic Greece, by E. A. GARDNER (254–95); 4. The Roman World, by F. HAVERFIELD (296–334); iii. Christian Authority, by A. C. HEADLAM (335–422).

NICOL, TH. Archæology and the Bible. The *Croall Lectures* for 1898. Ed.: Blackwood, '99; xii, 333 pp. 9s. *net.*

SAYCE, A. H. Recent Biblical Archæology. *ET.*, '99, Jl., 470–71; Ag., 510. 1. Ball's *Witness of the Monuments;* 2. Belck & Lehmann's discoveries in Armenia; 3. Winckler's *Die Völker Vorderasiens.*

BRUNEAU, J. Recent Contributions to Biblical Criticism and Theology. *AER.*, Ag., '99.

BRUNER, F. M. The Chronology of the Bible. *ChrQ.*, '99, 353–65.

MAGNIER. Critique d'une nouvelle exégèse critique. P.: Lethielleux, '99; 91 pp.

NISIUS, J. B. Über das Verhältnis der kirchl. Lehrgewalt z. Schriftauslegung. *ZkTh.*, '99, 282–311.

PORTER, F. C. Prophecy and the Apocalypse. *BW.*, Jl., '99, 36–41.

SPRAGUE, D. Scientific Method and its Application to the Bible. *Appleton's Pop. Sci. Mon.*, Jl., '99.

TERRY, M. S Biblical Doctrine of Human Sinfulness. *MR.*, My.–Je., '99, 337–48.

WARFIELD, B. B. "It Says:" "Scripture Says:" "God Says." *PRR.*, Jl., '99, 472–510.

BLISS, F. J. Third Report of the Excavations at Tell Zakarîya. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 170–88.

——— First Report of the Excavations at Tell-es-sâfi. *Ibid.*, 188–99.

MSNDPV. '99, 23–9.

FURRER, K. Nochmals Gerasa am See Gennezareth. *ZDPV.*, '99, 184–6.

LAGRANGE, M.-J. Lettre à M. Clermont-Ganneau sur l'emplacement de la ville biblique de Gezer. *Compt. rend . . . . Acad des inscr.*, '99, 247–51 (with several plates).

SAYCE, A. H. Note on the Objects Discovered by Dr. Bliss at Tell Zakarîya. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 210–13.

THE OLD TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

ABBOTT, LYMAN. Hebrew Prophets and American Problems. *Ou.*, Jl. 1, 8, 15, 22, 29, etc.

CAVEN, WM. Our Attitude towards the Old Testament. *BSt.*, Jl, '99.

MOORE, D. Dr. W. H. Green of Princeton. *ET.*, Je., '99, 426–9.

——— Critics and Apologists. *PRR.*, Jl., '99, 533–42.
Against Steuernagel and Selbie, *ET.*, F., '99.

STEUERNAGEL, C. Dr. W. H. Green of Princeton; a reply to Dunlop Moore. *ET.*, Jl., '99, 476–80.
Also note by SELBIE, against Moore. *Ibid.*, 410.

LANGUAGE AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

ADLER, E. N. A Hebrew MS. Illustrated by Giotto. *JQR.*, XI., 679–82.

BACHER, W. Notes on the Critique of the Text of the Targum of the Prophets. *JQR.*, XI., 651–6.

BOMBE, P. Über den Gebrauch d. Tempora im Hebr., besds. in den Büchern Samuelis. *GPr.* Friedberg, '99; 10 pp.

CHEYNE, T. K. Gleanings in Biblical Criticism. *JQR.*, XI., Jl., '99, 561–5. Judg. 5:1, 6; Cant. 1:13; 3:6–11; Hos. 3:4; 4:5.

CORSSEN, P. Zwei neue Fragmente d. Weingartener Prophetenhandschrift nebst einer Untersuchung über das

Verhältnis d. Weingartener u. Würzb. Prophetenhandschrift. B.: Weidmann, '99; vi, 51 pp. M. 3.

HARRIS, J. RENDEL. The Double Text of Tobit. Contribution toward a critical inquiry. *AJTh.*, III., 541–54.

KRAUS, S. "Euilat" in the LXX. *JQR.*, XI., 675–9.

MONTVAILLANT, A. DE. Poètes bibliques mis en vers français. T. 2. P.: Fischbacher, '99; 427 pp.

NESTLE, E. Zur Bibliographie d. hebr. Sprachenkunde. *Centr.-Bl. f. Bibliothekswesen*, XVI., 5.

GEOGRAPHY, HISTORY, AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

ABRAHAMS, I. Professor Schürer on Life under the Jewish Law. *JQR.*, XI., 626–42.

BIRCH, W. F. Scheme for Finding the Sepulchres of David. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 273–6.

BROWN, R. H. The Land of Goshen and the Exodus. Lo.: Stanford, '99; 86 pp., 2 maps & 4 plates. 5s.

CHEYNE, T. K. Balaam's Pethor and the Land of Muçri. *OLZ.*, II., no. 5.

——— The N. Arabian Land of Muçri in Early Hebrew Tradition. *JQR.*, XI., 551–60.

——— Das religiöse Leben d. Juden n. d. Exil. Gi.: Ricker, '99; xii, 264 pp. M. 5.

DAVIS, J. D. Belshazzar's Ancestry. *BSt.*, Jl., '99.

FÉNÉLON, VICOMTE F. DE SALIGNAC. Note on the Site of the Temple. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 272.

GORDON, E. C. The Restoration of Israel from the Babylonian Exile. *BSt.*, My., '99.

HARPER, R. F. Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon. *BW.*, Jl., '99, 3–12.

HARPER, W. R. The Jews in Babylon. *BW.*, Ag., '99.

——— The Return of the Jews from Exile. *Ibid.*, S., '99.

HOMMEL, F. Was Tyre Taken by Nebuchadrezzar? *ET.*, Ag., '99. 520.

HULL, E. Where is Mt. Sinai? (With a map and sketches.) *JTVI.*, XXXI., 139–48.
Remarks by Sir C. W. Wilson, Prof. A. H. Sayce, etc.

JOHNS, C. H. W. The Biblical Account of Sennacherib's Murder. *PSBA.*, XXI., 174–5.

KENT, C. F. The Social Life of the Jews between 444 and 160 B. C. *BW.*, Je., '99.

MATHEWS, S. Antiochus Epiphanes and the Jewish State. *BW.*, Jl., '99, 13–26.

NORDAU, M. Israel among the Nations. *No. Am. Rev.*, Je., '99.

ROBINSON, GEO. L. The Last Days of Old Jerusalem. *BW.*, Ag., '99.

SCHICK, C. Contribution to the Study of the Ancient City Walls of Jerusalem. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 215–18.

SCHMIDT, E. Solomon's Temple. *BW.*, S., '99.

SOARES, TH. G. Ezekiel's Temple. *BW.*, Ag., '99.

SODEN, H. v. Palästina und seine Geschichte. 6 Vorträge. Mit 2 Karten u. 1 Plan v. Jerusalem. iv, 112 pp.
"Aus Natur und Geisterwelt." Bd. 6. L.: Teubner. M. 0.90.

STEWART, R. L. The Land of Israël: a text-book on the physical and historical geography of the Holy Land, embodying the results of recent research. N. Y. & Chi.: Revell, '99; 352 pp. $1.50.

ZELLER, E. Zur Vorgeschichte d. Christenthums, Essener und Orphiker. *ZwTh.*, '99, 195–269.

INSPIRATION AND CRITICISM.

BADGER, W. C. The Standing Still of the Sun upon Gibeon. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 270–71

CHEYNE, T. K. Something Better than "Husks." *Exp.*, Jl., '99.
Study of the word "husk" in the O. T.

——— Some Critical Difficulties in the Chapters on Balaam. *ET.*, Je., '99, 399–402.

——— The Land of Cabul, 1 Kings 9: 10–28. *PSBA.*, XXI., 177–9.

DÖLLER, J. Rhythmus, Metrik u. Strophik in d. biblisch-hebräischen Poesie, systematisch dargestellt. Paderborn: Schöningh, '99; vii, 100 pp. M. 2.40.

GAMBER, S. Le livre de la "Genèse" dans la poésie latine au V^e^ siècle. P.: Fontemoing, '99; xvi, 264 pp.

HALÉVY, J. Le marriage d'Osée. *JA.*, Mr.–Apr., '99, 356–9.

——— La date du Déluge d'après les textes principaux. *Ibid.*, 353–6.

HENDRIX, E. R. The Prophet as a Spokesman of God. *MR.*, My.–Je., '99, 323–36.

MAGGILIVRAY, M. The Hymns of the Hebrews. *Queen's Quart.*, Jl., '99, 20–32.

MATTHES, J. C. De begrippen *rein* en *onrein* in het O. T. *ThT.*, '99, 293–319.

OFFORD, JOSEPH. Ashteroth-Karnaim. *PSBA.*, XXI., 173–4.

ROBINSON, GEO. L. The Decalogue and Criticism; or, The Place of the Decalogue in the Development of Hebrew Religion. Chi.: McCormick Theol. Sem., '99; 35 pp.

THEOLOGY.

BAUR, P. Gott als Vater im Alten Testament. Eine biblisch-theol. Untersuchg. *StKr.*, '99, 483–507.

BERTHOLET, A. Die israelitischen Vorstellungen vom Zustand nach dem Tode. F.: Mohr, '99; 31 pp. M. 0.80.

CALDESAIGUES, E. La prière dans la religion de Jehovah. Ses antecédents; son histoire. *ID.* Cahors: Coueslant, '99; 95 pp.

CHEYNE, T. K. Professor Hommel on Hos. 5:11, with a Suggestion on Baasha. *ET.*, My., '99, 375.

COOK, S. A. The Divine Name Ša in the O. T. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 525–6.

HOMMEL, FR. A New Divine Name in the Old Testament. *ET.*, Apr., '99, 329.
Hos. 5:11 read: "because Ephraim followed willingly the god Ẓaw."

JOHNS, C. H. W. The God Mani. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 526–7.

KITTEL, R. Profetie u. Weissagg. L.: Hinrichs', '99; 25 pp. M. 0.50.

KÖNIG, E. Hosea 5:11*b* and the Moon's Light. *ET.*, My., '99, 376–8.
Against Hommel, *ibid.*, Apr., '99.

KRUGER, F. H. La foi d'Habacuc. *RChr.*, Jl., '99.

LAGRANGE, M.-J. The Revealed Name of the Divine Name. *AER.*, Je., '99.

SCHMIDT, C. Die Entwickelung d. alttestamentl. Opferidee. *GPr.* Br., '99.

SOARES, T. G. The Religious Idea of Judaism from Ezra to the Maccabees. *BW.*, Je., '99.

STRACK, H. L. Zur alttestamentl. Theologie. V. & VI. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, nos. 19, 20.

WILDEBOER, G. Culte de Jahvé et religion populaire en Israël dans leurs rapports réciproques. *RThPh.*, '99, 238–66.

THE LAW.

BOX, G. H. Genesis 4:7 and 3:16. *ET.*, Je., '99, 425–6.

CHEYNE, T. K. Gen. 4:7; 3:16 and 4:1. *ET.*, Jl., '99, 476.

Great Text Commentary. The Great Texts of Genesis. *ET.*, Jl.–Ag., '99.
Gen. 25:34; 28:15, 16.

PROBY, W. H. B. Note on the 12 Stones from the Jordan, Josh. 4:9. *PEFQS.*, Jl., '99, 273.

SAYCE, A. H. An Archæological Commentary on Genesis. *ET.*, Je., '99, 418–19.
Gen. 42:6—45:19.

THE PROPHETS.

BUDDE, K. The So-called "Ebed-Yahweh Songs," and the Meaning of the Term "Servant of Yahweh" in Isaiah, Chaps. 40–55. *AJTh.*, III., 499–540.

CHAJES, H. P. Proverbien-Studien. Zu der sog. Salomonischen Sammlung, Cap. x–xxii:16. B.: Schwetschke, '99; vii, 45 pp. M. 1.60.

CHEYNE, T. K. Critical Gleanings from 1 Samuel. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 520–22.

——— Gleanings in the Books of Kings. *Ibid.*, Je., '99, 429.

CURTIS, E. L. The Messages of Ezekiel to the Human Heart. *BW.*, Ag., '99.

DURAND, A. La vierge-mère et l'Emmanuel. (Isa., chaps. 7–10.) *UC.*, 15 Je., '99.

JENSEN, J. K. Ryge, Jesaja, Cap. 1–12, oversat af F. Buhl, indledet og forklaret. København: Gyldendal, '99; 98 pp. Kr. 1.50.

JOHNS, C. H. W. Isaiah 45:12. (Meni: that number.) *ET.*, Je., '99, 423.

KÖNIG, ED. The Exiles' Book of Consolation. Contained in Isa. 40–66. A critical and exegetical study. Ed.: Clark; N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; 226 pp. 3s. 6d.

MCPHEETERS, W. M. The Books of the Twelve Minor Prophets. *PQ.*, Jl., '99, 427–52.
Review article of Geo. Adam Smith's Commentary.

NESTLE, E. Isa. 65:11. *ET.*, Jl., '99, 475.

NETELER, B. Das 3. u. das 4. Buch der Könige der Vulgata u. des Urtextes übers. u. erklärt. Münster: Theissing, '99; viii, 338 pp. M. 6.

OMAN, J. The Text of the Minor Prophets. *PRR.*, Jl., '99, 441–71.

SLATER, J. R. Individuality and Solidarity, as Developed by Jeremiah and Ezekiel. *BW.*, S., '99.

THE HAGIOGRAPHA.

BEECHER, W. J. Daniel 12:2, 3. *BW.*, Jl., '99, 54–7.

BLACK, A. The 23d Psalm. *Exp.*, Jl., '99.

CHAPMAN, M. B. The Book of Daniel. *MR.*, Jl.–Ag., '99, 561–8.

CHEYNE, T. K. "He hath set the world in their heart." Eccles. 3:11. *ET.*, Je., '99, 422.

COOKE, J. H. Job, an Appreciation. *Biblia*, Jl., '99.

CRAIG, J. A. A Study of Job and the Jewish Theory of Suffering. *Mo.*, Jl., '99, 481–523.

DUHM, B. Die Psalmen erklärt. F.: Mohr, '99; xxxii, 312 pp. M. 5; Einzelpr. M. 6.
Kurzer Hand-Comm. z. A. T., hrsg. von K. Marti, Liefg. 8.

FREDERIKSEN, V. C. Ein Vorschlag zu Ps. 110, 3*b*. *StKr.*, '99, 626.

KAUFMANN, M. Was Koheleth a Sceptic? *Exp.*, My., '99, 389–400.

KUIPER, A. K. De integriteit van het boek Prediker. *Th T.*, My., '99, 197–225.

LEIMDÖRFER, D. Zur Kritik des Buches "Esther." Fr.: Kauffmann, '99; 15 pp. M. 0.50.

PRICE, I. M. The Book of Daniel. *BW.*, Jl., '99, 27–35.

PRINCE, J. D. A Critical Commentary on the Book of Daniel. Designed especially for students of the English Bible. N. Y.: Scribner's, '99; viii, 270 pp. $2.

TERRY, MILTON S. Religious Lessons in the Book of Daniel. *BW.*, Jl., '99, 50-54.

APOCRYPHA.

BOWMAN, J. C. The Apocrypha in the Light of Biblical Criticism. *RChR.*, '99, 289–309.

KÖNIG, E. Professor Margoliouth and the "Original Hebrew" of Ecclesiasticus. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 512–16.

MARGOLIOUTH, D. S. The Hebrew Ecclesiasticus. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 528.

HELLENISTIC LITERATURE.

COHN, L. Einteilung u. Chronologie d. Schriften Philos. L.: Dietrich, '99; 52 pp. M. 1.30.

DREXLER, W. Zu Philo, De posteritate Caini, § 161. *Philologus*, LVIII., 316-17.

PHILONIS ALEXANDRINI opera quae supersunt. Recogn. L. Cohn et Paul Wendland. Ed. minor. Vol. III. B.: Reimer, '99; x, 290 pp. M. 2.

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

GENERAL.

ABBOTT, L. Paul's Gospel for America. *Ou.*, 20 My., '99.

DODS, M. Survey of Recent English Literature on the New Testament. *Exp.*, Jl., '99.

GODET, F. Introduction au nouveau testament. Partie 1: Les trois premiers évangiles. 3e livraison. Neuchâtel: Attinger frères, '99.

WATSON, J. Philo and the New Testament. *Queen's Quart.*, Jl., '99, 33–50.

GRAMMAR AND TEXT; TRANSLATIONS.

BLASS, F. Textkritische Bemerkgn. zu Markus. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99.
III., 3*b*, of: Beiträge zur Förderung christl. Theologie.

Contributions to Biblical and Patristic Literature. Ed. by J. Armitage Robinson. Cambridge: Univ. Press, '99.
V., no. 4: Codex Purpureus Petropolitanus. The text of codex N of the gospels, edited with an introduction and an appendix by H. S. CRONIN; lxiv, 108 pp. 5s. *net.*

COTTON, J. S. An Early MS. of St. John's Gospel. *Biblia*, Je., '99.

DICK, K. Der schriftstellerische Plural bei Paulus. *ID.* Hl., '99; 56 pp.

FIELD, F. Notes on the Translation of the New Testament: being the Otium Norvicense (pars tertia). Lo.: Clay, '99; xvii, 268 pp. 7s. 6d. *net.*

GIBSON, MARGARET D. An Arabic Version of the Acts of the Apostles and the Catholic Epistles. From an 8th or 9th cent. MS. in the Convent of St. Catharine on Mt. Sinai. With a treatise on the triune nature of God, and translation, from the same codex. (= *Studia Sinaitica, no. vii.*) Lo.: Clay & Sons, '99; N. Y.: Macmillan; pp. viii, 108 (text) & 60 (appendix); 1 facsimile. 7s. 6d. *net.*

HARNACK, A. Über d. ursprüngl. Text Act. Apost. 11:27, 28. B.: Reimer, '99; 12 pp. M. 0.50.

HILGENFELD, A. Acta apostolorum graece et latine secundum antiquissimos testes edidit; actus apostolorum extra canonem receptum et adnotationes ad textum et argumentum actuum apostolorum addidit. B.: Reimer, '99; xv, 310 pp. M. 9.

PECKHAM, G. A. On the New Testament Usage of πιστεύω and βαπτίζω. *ChrQ.*, '99, 415–16.

Texte u. Untersuchungen z. Gesch. d. altchristl Literatur. Hrsg. v. Gebhardt u. Harnack. N. F., Bd. IV., 2. L.: Hinrichs', '99. M. 8.

B. Weiss. Textkritik der vier Evangelien. vi, 246 pp.

APOSTOLIC HISTORY.

Zöckler, O. Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; 99 pp. M. 1.40.
Handreichg. z. Vertiefung christl. Erkenntnis. Hrsg. v. J. Möller u. W. Zöllner.

LIFE OF CHRIST.

Beyschlag, W. Die neueste Zurechtlegg. d. Auferstehungsberichte. *StKr.*, '99, 507–39.

Döderlein. Wann stieg Christus zur Hölle hinab? *Korresphbl. f. d. ev.-luth. Geistl. in Bayern*, '99, no. 24.

Garvie, A. E. The Temptation of Christ. IV., V. *ET.*, Jl.–Ag., '99.

Innes, A. T. The Trial of Jesus Christ: a legal monograph. Ed.: Clark, '99; N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's; 124 pp. $1.

——— The Trials of Jesus Christ. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 522–3.

Jesus, ein Mensch, nicht Gottes Sohn. Ein Fehdebrief wider das falsche Christentum. Dem Andenken an Moritz v. Egidy. Zürich: Schmidt, '99; viii, 60 pp. M. 0.80.

Lisco, H. Das Bild Christi. Die Lehre von Christus, dem Sohn des Menschen im Grundriss dargestellt. B.: Schneider, '99; 63 pp. M. 1.

Malan, C. I. La personnalité divine de Jésus-Christ ressentie par ce qu'il y a de divin dans la vie actuelle de l'homme déchu. II. L'élément de vie divine qui subsiste dans l'homme déchu. *RThPh.*, '99, 267–72.

Moore, W. T. Jesus, the Great Teacher. *ChrQ.*, '99, 366–86.

Nerling, F. Die Versuchg. Jesu Christi, des Sohnes Gottes, durch Satanas in d. Wüste. *M. & N. f. d. evgl. Kirche in Russl.*, XXII., 49–104.

Ollivier, M. J. Les amitiés de Jésus, simple étude. Édition populaire. P.: Roger et Chernoviz, '99; xxii, 487 pp. f. 4.

Pègues, Th. Jésus-Christ dans l'évangile. 2 vols. P.: Lethielleux, '99. f. 9.

Rosegger. Wie ich mir die Persönlichkeit Jesu denke. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 22.

Samtleben, G. Die Gewissheit d. Auferstehung Jesu. *BG.*, Jl., '99, 265–77.

Stroh, E. A. Das messianische Selbstzeugnis Jesu nach d. 3 ersten Evangelien. Marb.: Elwert, '99; 24 pp. M. 0.40.

Walker, Th. Jesus u. das A. T. in ihrer gegenseitigen Bezeugung. 2 Vorträge. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; viii, 132 pp. M. 1.80.

White, N. J. D. The Appearance of the Risen Lord to Individuals. *Exp.*, Jl., '99.

Zange, F. Das Kreuz im Erlösungsplane Jesu. Langensalza: Beyer, '99; 43 pp. M. 0.60.

THEOLOGY.

Alexander, S. A. The Christianity of St. Paul. Lo. & N. Y.: Longmans, '99; 224 pp. 4s. 6d.

Eaton, D. Professor Dalman on "The Son of Man." *ET.*, Jl., '99, 438–49.

Kilpatrick, T. B. Christian Character: study in New Testament morality. Ed.: Clark, '99; 310 pp. 2s. 6d.

Knight, H. J. C. On the Relation of the Discourses of Our Lord Recorded in S. John iii and vi, to the Institution of the Two Sacraments. *Exp.*, Jl., '99.

Vincent, Marvin R. Some Aspects of Paul's Theology in the Philippian Epistle. II. *AJTh.*, III., 570–77.

HERMENEUTICS AND CRITICISM.

Barrows, S. J. Mythical and Legendary Elements in the N. T. *NW.*, Je., '99, 272–98.

Bryson, Ada. New Testament Criticism. The Present State of the Problem. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 487–92.

Canton, W. The Star of the Magi. *Exp.*, Je., '99.

Carr, A. The Use of Pagan Ethical Terms in the N. T. *Exp.*, Je., '99.

Linder, G. Der Bericht üb. d. Apostelkonzil nach neuer Leseweise. *ZSchw.*, '99, 116–20.

Margival, H. Richard Simon et la critique biblique au XVII^e siècle. 10^e art.: Les travaux de R. Simon sur le nouveau testament. *RHLR.*, '99, 193-216.

Mommert. Die Dormitio (sanctae virginis) und das deutsche Grundstück auf dem traditionellen Zion. *ZDPV.*, '99, 149–83.

Nestle, E. Three Proper Names in the New Testament. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 527.

Steinmetz, R. Die Entstehung d. neutestamentl. Kanons nach Godet. *NkZ.*, Jl., '99, 519–42.

Watson, John. The Doctrines of Grace. *Exp.*, Jl., '99.
5. The vicarious sacrifice of Jesus Christ.

WELLS, J. Some Exegetical Studies. *ET.*, '99.
i. Beholding, Jl., 473-5. ii. The Sacred Art of Contemplation, Ag., 492-4.

ZAHN, TH. Die Dormitio Sanctae Virginis u. das Haus des Johannes Markus. L.: Deichert, '99; 56 pp. M. 0.80.

GOSPELS AND ACTS.

BACON, B. W. John 19:17—20:20. *BW.*, Je., '99.

LOON, J. VAN. Historische of mythologische behandeling van de "Evangelische geschiedenis"? *ThT.*, My., '99, 226-66.

MEYER, A. Die Behandlung d. johanneischen Frage im letzten Jahrzehnt. I. *ThR.*, II., 255-63.

NESTLE, EB. Matthew 21:15, 16. *ET.*, Ag., '99, 525.

REVLAENDER, M. Gethsemane. Beiträge zum Verständnis der neuen Passions-Evangelien. Gü.: Bertelsmann, '99; vii, 46 pp. M. 0.60.

SEYDL, E. Alttestamentl. Parallele zu Ap.-Gesch. 12, 17. *Kath.*, Je., '99.

SOLTAU, W. Eine Lücke d. synopt. Forschg. L.: Dietrich, '99; 47 pp. M. 1.20.

TOLSTOY, LEO. How to Read the Gospels. *Ind.*, 1 Je., '99.

BRÖSE, E. Zur Auslegung von Röm. 1:3-4. *NkZ.*, '99, 562-73.

CAMERON, R. The First Epistle of John; or, God Revealed in Life, Light, and Love. Ph.: Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc., '99; 288 pp. $1.25.

ENDEMANN, K. Dr. W. Koelling u. 1 Joh. 5, 7, 8. *NkZ.*, '99, 574-81.

FEINE, P. Eph. 2:14-16. *StKr.*, '99, 540-74.

HARTMANN, P. Das Verhältnis des Galaterbriefes zum 2ten Korintherbrief. *ZwTh.*, '99, 187-94.

HOFFMANN, H. Das tausendjähr. Reich. Versuch einer Auslegung von Offenb. Joh. 20:1-10. Hl.: Mühlmann, '99; 20 pp. M. 0.30.

NESTLE, E. On the Address of the Epistle to the Hebrews. *ET.*, Je., '99, 422.

NORDIN, H. J. Aposteln Paulus och de sexuella frågorna enligt första Korinterbrefvet. En exegetisk-etisk studie. Upsala: Lundequistska bokh., '99; 88 pp. Kr. 0.60.

PETERS, W. Der Richter ist vor d. Thür! Auslegg. d. Offenbarung St. Johannis. Zwickau: Herrmann, '99; v, 415 pp. M. 4.

PRAT, F. Comment lire saint Paul? [illegible]

der, '99; xii, 208 pp. M. 3.80.
Strassburger theol. Studien, hrsg. v. Ehrhard & Müller. Bd. III., Heft 2 & 3.

WERNLE, P. Die synoptische Frage. F.: Mohr, '99; xii, 256 pp. M. 4.50.

WETZEL, G. Die Echtheit u. Glaubwürdigkeit des Evang. Johannis, auf's neue untersucht u. verteidigt. 1. Tl.: Die Echtheit. L.: Wallmann, '99; iv, 186 pp. M. 3.

EPISTLES AND REVELATION.

ASKWITH, E. H. The Epistle to the Galatians. An essay on its destination and date. With an appendix on the visit to Jerusalem recorded in chap. 2. N. Y.: Macmillan, '99; xx, 153 pp. $1.50.

BERLAGE, H. P. 2 Cor. 5:18-21. *ThT.*, Jl., '99, 319-31.

ship of the Epistle to th
Exp., My., '99.

——— A Historical Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians. *Exp.*, Jl., '99.
xlii. Cause of the first Galatian visit; xliii. The thorn in the flesh; xliv. The allegory of Hagar and Sarah (4:21-31); xlv. The conclusion (5:1); xlvi. Personal recapitulation (5:2-12).

SIMCOX, G. A. Hebr., chap. 13; 2 Tim., chap. 4. *ET.*, Je., '99, 430-32.

SODEN, H. VON. Hebräerbrief, Briefe des Petrus, Jakobus, Judas. 3te Aufl. F.: Mohr, '99. M. 4.
Bd. III., 2. Abth., of: Hand-Commentar z. N. T.

VOWINCKEL, E. Die Grundgedanken d. Jakobusbriefes verglichen mit d. ersten Briefen des Petrus u. Johannes. *ID.* Greifswald, '99; 74 pp.

WIESINGER, P. Der Gedankengg. des 1. Johannesbriefes. *StKr.*, '99, 575-81.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE; ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

CHRISTIAN LITERATURE.

BARNARD, M. Clement of Alexandria's Biblical Text. Cambr.: Univ. Press, '99; xix, 64 pp. 4s.
Text and Studies. Ed. by J. A. Robinson. V., no. 5.

BONNET, M. Notes sur les Actes d'Appolonias. *Anal. Boll.*, XVIII., 1.

BOUCAUD, G. Un philosophe chrétien au second siècle: Saint Justin et sa première apologie. *UC.*, My., '99, 77-102.

BOUILLET. Un manuscrit inconnu du liber miraculorum sanctae fidei. Nogent-le-Rotiou: Daupeley-Gouverneur, '99; 15 pp.

FALK, F. Der Mainzer Vulgata-Druck von 1609. *Kath.*, My., '99.

FLOURNOY, P. P. The Apology of Aristides as a Witness for the N. T. *BSt.*, My., Je., '99.

FUNK. Die Einheit des Hirten des Hermas. *ThQ.*, '99, 321–59.

GRANDMAISON, L. DE. Études d'ancienne littérature chrétienne. *Ét.*, 5 Je., '99.

GREGORY, CASPAR RENÉ. The Essay "Contra Novatianum." *AJTh.*, III., 566–70.

GRISELLE, E. Quelques manuscrits de Saint François de Sales. *Rev. sc. eccl.*, My., '99, 418–42.

HITCHCOCK, F. R. M. Clement of Alexandria. (Fathers for English Readers.) Lo.: SPCK., '99; 280 pp. 3s.

KLEIN, E. Aus der Schatzkammer hl. Väter. 4. Heft. B.: Berl. Stadtmission, '99. M. 0.30.
4. Die Lehre d. zwölf Apostel übersetzt. 20 pp.

KOETSCHAU, P. Kritische Bemerkungen zu meiner Origenes-Ausgabe. Entgegnung auf die Kritik von Dr. Paul Wendland im *Gött. Gelehrt. Anz.*, '99, no. 4. M. 0.50.

KRAFFT, A. Les Carlovingiennes. La passion de Jésus-Christ. (Texte roman, origine latine et traduction.) Le Cantique humain, avec musique et gravure. P.: Leroux. '99; xi, 60 pp. f. 3.

LEVINSON, A. Thomas Ebendorfer's "Liber pontificum." *Mittheil. des Instit. f. österr. Geschichtsforschg.*, XX., 1.

MAYOR, J. B. Notulae criticae in Clementis Alexandrini Protrepticum. *Philologus*, LVIII., 266–80.

NEUMANN, K. J. Ein neues Bruchstück aus Kaiser Julians Büchern gegen die Christen. *Theol. Litztg.*, My. 13, '99.

Παπαδόπουλος-Κεραμεύς, 'Α. Πατριαρχικοὶ κατάλογοι. (1453–1636). *BZ.*, '99, 392–401.

PARKER, J. The Works of Dionysius the Areopagite. II. The Heavenly Hierarchy and the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy. Now first translated into English, from the original Greek. Lo.: Parker, '99; xx, 168 pp.

PIETSCHMANN, R. Theodorus Tabennesiota u. die sahidische Übersetzg. des Osterfestbriefes des Athanasius vom Jahre 367. *Nachr. Gött. Ges. Wiss.*, '99, 1., 87–104.

——— Apophthegmata patrum boheirisch. *Ibid.*, 36–48.

Select Library of Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers of the Christian Church. II. Series. Transl. into English with proleg. and explanatory notes. Vol. IX. St. Hilary of Poitiers and John of Damascus. N. Y.; Scribner's, '99. $4.
Vol. IX. St. Hilary of Poitiers, Select Works; transl. by E. W. WATSON & L. PULLAN; ed. by W. Sanday; viii, xcvi, 258 pp.—John of Damascus' Exposition of the Orthodox Faith; transl by S. D. F. SALMOND; viii, 106 pp.

TAYLOR, C. The Oxyrhynchus Logia and the Apocryphal Gospels. Clarendon Press; Lo.: Frowde, '99; 114 pp. 2s. 6d.

WENDLAND, P. Die Textconstitution d. Schrift Hippolyt's über den Antichrist nebst einem Anhang über die Ἐκλογαὶ des Prokop. *Hermes*, XXXIV., 412–27.

ZAHN, TH. Der "Ambrosiaster" u. der Proselyt Isaak. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, no. 27.

ART AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

BRÖCKER, V. Die Baukunst im Dienste kathol. Reformgedanken u. jesuitischer Propaganda. *MGkK.*, Je., '99.

KELLER, L. Die röm. Akademie u. die altchristl. Katakomben im Zeitalter d. Renaissance. *MCG.*, '99, 65-100. M. 0.75.

NESTLE, E. Der Maulbronner Bronce-Kruzifixus. *ChrK.*, My., '99.

SCHULTEN, A. Die Mosaikkarte von Madaba. *BAZ.*, '99, no. 36.

SCOTT, L. The Cathedral Builders: a story of a great masonic guild. N. Y.: imp. by Scribner's, '99; xiii, 435 pp. $6.

C. HISTORICAL THEOLOGY.

GENERAL.

CHRISTIE, F. A. The Influence of the Social Question on the Genesis of Christianity. *NW.*, Jl., '99, 299–314.

COSTE, A. Saint Aphrodise, apôtre de Béziers, et son église à travers les âges. Béziers: Sapte, '99; lii, 342 pp. f. 7.50.

KRUSCH, B. Zur Florians- und Lupus-Legende. Eine Entgegnung. *N. Arch. d. Ges. f. ält. deu. Geschichtsk.*, '99, 533–70.

PFLUGK HARTTUNG, I. v. Die innern Verhältnisse des Johanniterordens in Deutschland, bes. im östlichen Niederdeutschland (bis z. Beginne d. Herrenmeisterwürde). (Schluss.) *ZKG.*, XX., 132–58.

SANDAY, W. On Methods of Historical Study. *ET.*, Je., 432.
Against editorial remarks, *ibid.*, My., 340–42.

WITT, F. Quellen u. Bearbeitungen der schleswig holsteinischen Kirchengesch. System. u. chronologisch zusammengestellt. Kiel: Eckardt, '99; xiii, 255 pp. M. 4.
Publikationen des Vereins f. schleswig-holstein. Kirchengesch. I. Reihe (grosse Schriften), 1. Heft.

THE EARLY PERIOD.

BIEHLER. Augustins Kampf wider den Neuplatonismus mit Beziehg. auf die gegenwärt. spiritistisch-theosophische Bewegg. (1546). *NkZ.*, '99, 467–503.

GÖRRES, F. König Rekared der Katholische, 586–601 A. D. *ZwTh.*, '99, 270–322.

KRÜGER, G. Wer war Pseudo-Dionysios? *BZ.*, '99, 302–5.

Leçons d'histoire ecclésiastique. T. 1er: l'antiquité chrétienne. Bayeux, '99; 366 pp.

SALTET, L. Étude critique. La passion de Sainte Foy et le Saint Caprais. *Bull. lit. eccl.*, Je., '99.

VAILHÉ, S. L'érection du patriarchat de Jérusalem 451. *R. de l'Orient chrét.*, '99, 44–57.

VAN DEN GHEYN, J. La lettre du pape Anastase 1er à S. Venerius, évêque de Milan, sur la condamnation d'Origène. Macon: Protat, '99; 16 pp.

THE MEDIÆVAL PERIOD.

BÖHMER, H. Kirche u. Staat in England u. in der Normandie im XI. u. XII. Jahrh. Eine histor. Studie. L.: Dieterich, '99; xii, 498 pp. M. 12.

BRESSLAU, H. Eine Urkunde d. Bischofs Adalger von Worms vom Jahre 1044. *N. Arch. d. Ges. f. ält. deu. Geschichtsk.*, XXIV., H. 2.

CHEETHAM, S. A Sketch of Mediæval Church History. Lo.: SPCK., '99; 128 pp. 1s. 6d.

CHÉRANCÉ, L. Saint Bonaventure (1221–1274). P.: Poussielgue, '99; xviii, 230 pp.

DANKMAR, G. L. Curiosa aus d. Teufelsperiode d. Mittelalters. *Psych. Stud.*, '99, 263–71, 331–6.

DEL LUNGO, J. Da Bonifazio VIII ad Arrigo VII. Pagine di storia fiorentina per la vita di Dante. Milano: Hoepli, '99; 482 pp. L. 5.

FRANZ, A. Die Strafe d. Pilgermörder in mittelalterl. Legenden. *Hist. pol. Bl. f. d. kathol. Deutschl.*, '99, 708–26.

GALLETTI, A. Fra Giordano da Pisa predicatore del sec. XIV. *Gior. stor. di let. Ital.*, '99, 193–264.

GRISAR, H. Analecta Romana. Dissertazioni, testi, monumenti dell' arte, riguardanti principalmente la storia di Roma e dei Papi nel medio evo. Vol. I. Roma: Desclée, Lefebure & Cie., '99. L. 15.

GUALANO, E. Paulus Papa III nella storia di Parma. Parma: Battei, '99; 114 pp. L. 2.

GUNDEL, A. Noch einmal die Wege Adalberts von Prag im Preussenlande. *Altpreuss. Monatsschr.*, XXXVI., 1/2.

GUNDLACH, F. Hessen u. die Mainzer Stiftsfehde, 1461–1463. Mit einem Anhang von Urkunden u. Aktenstücken. Marb.: Elwert; iv, 160 pp. M. 3.60.

HAMPE, K. Briefe zur Gesch. des 13. Jahrh. aus einer Durhamer Handschrift. *N. Arch. d. Ges. f. ält. deutsche Geschichtsk.*, '99, 503–32.

HERRE, H. Die Hussitenverhandlungen auf dem Pressburger Reichstage vom April 1429. *Quell. u. Forsch. aus ital. Archiven*, II., 2.

HORN, E. Saint Étienne, roi apostolique de Hongrie. P.: Lecoffre, '99; viii, 200 pp. f. 2.

KOCH, H. Vincentius von Lerinum u. Marius Mercator. *ThQ.*, '99, 396–433.

LANGEN, J. Die unmittelbaren Nachfolger Innocenz' III. (Schluss.) *ITh R.*, Jl., '99, 465–93.

LEVILLAIN, L. Deux diplômes d'Hugues Capet en faveur de l'abbaye de Corbie (487). P.: Bouillon, '99; 16 pp.

MIASKOWSKI, C. Beiträge z. Krakauer Theologengesch. des 15. Jahrhts. Aus Breslauer Handschr. *Jahrb. f. Phil. u. spec. Theol.*, '99, 479–99.

PRIEBATSCH, F. Staat u. Kirche in der Mark Brandenburg am Ende d. Mittelalters. II. *ZKG.*, XX., 159–85.
iv, Bischofswahlen; v, Beziehungen zu den Nachbarbischöfen; vi, Die Politik d. märkischen Bischöfe.

RÖHRICH. Die Teilung d. Diözese Ermland zwischen dem deutschen Orden u. dem ermländischen Bischofe. *Z. f. Gesch. u. Alt.-Kunde Ermlands*, XII., 2.

STIGLMAYR, J. Die Streitschrift des Prokopius von Gaza gegen den Neuplatoniker Proklos. *BZ.*, '99, 263–301.

WERMINGHOFF, A. Verzeichniss der Akten fränkischer Synoden, von 742–834. *Neu. Arch. d. Ges. f. ält. deu. Geschk.*, XXIV., H. 2.

ZÖCKLER, O. Zur lateinischen Mystik des ausgehenden Mittelalters. *Theol. Litbl.*, '99, no. 28.

THE REFORMATION PERIOD.

ALLAN, F. Luther at Eisenach and the Wartburg. *MR.*, Jl.-Ag., '99, 510–30.

AREZIO, L. La politica della Santa Sede rispetto alla Valtellina dal concordato d'Avignone alla morte di Gregorio XV (12 nov. 1522—8 jugl. 1623), con molti documenti inediti. Parma: Pellegrini, '99; 100 pp.

BASTIDE, L. La réforme dans les environs de Patay. *Bull. hist. et lit.*, Je., '99, 281–93.

BAYER, G. Johann Brenz, d. Reformator Württembergs. Preisgekr. Festschrift. St.: Kohlhammer, '99; 95 pp. M. 0.40.

BECKER, H. Luther's Beziehungen zu Zerbst. *StKr.*, '99, 582–609.

BERGER, A. E. Ursachen u. Ziele der deutschen Reformation. L.: C. Braun, '99; 39 pp. M. 0.50.

BEZOLD, FR. VON. Luthers Rückkehr von d. Wartburg. *ZKG.*, XX., 186–233.

BRUCKER, J. Un nouveau livre sur saint François de Sales. *Et.*, 5 Jl., '99.

CHÉROT, H. Saint François de Sales et la prédication au 17e siècle. *Et.*, 5 Jl.,'99.

CLEMEN, OTTO. Ein Lutherwort. *ZKG.*, XX., 240–41.

DEL GIUDICE, G. I tumulti del 1517 in Napoli pel Tribunale dell' Inquisizione. Napoli: M. d'Auria, '99; 182 pp. L. 3.

DOUMERGUE, E. Jean Calvin, les hommes et les choses de son temps. T. 1er: La jeunesse de Calvin. Lausanne: Bridel, '99; 650 pp. f. 30.

DREWS. Ein Originalbrief Luthers u. zwei Originalbriefe Melanchthons. *StKr.*, '99, 618–25.

DRUFFEL, A v. Monumenta Tridentina. Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Concils v. Trient 1546–7. M.: Franz, '99; vii + pp. 493–586. M. 3.
Bd. 1: Von der Sendung der Legaten nach Trient (März 1545) bis zum Beginn d. schmalkald. Krieges (Juni 1546). 5. Heft, My.-Je., 1546.

ELZE, TH. Luthers Reise nach Rom. B.: Duncker, '99; xi, 99 pp. M. 2.50.

ENDERS. Ein neu aufgefundener Brief Luthers an den gefangenen König Christian II. von Dänemark, 28. Sept. 1532. *ZKG.*, XX., 234–6.

ERGENZINGER, J. Anti-Deckert. Offener Brief an Herrn Pfarrer Dr. Deckert, Verfasser der Flugschrift "Luther's Selbstmord, eine historisch erwiesene Thatsache." W.: Stähelin, '99; 26 pp. M. 0.40.

FALK, F. Zur Biographie d. Frankfurter Reformatoren M. Ambach, J. Bernhaid u. Th. Sartorius. *Arch. f. Frankfurts Gesch.*, 3. Folge, Bd. 6.

FRÉDÉRICQ, P. La question des indulgences dans les Pays-Bas au commencement du XVIe siècle. *Bull. de la classe des lettres de l'Acad. roy. de Belgique.*

FREYTAG, H. Die Beziehungen Danzig's zu Wittenberg in d. Zeit d. Reformation. *Z. d. westpreuss. Gesch.-V.*, 38, 1–138.

FRIEDENBURG, W. Beiträge zum Briefwechsel d. kathol. Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter. (Forts.) *ZKG.*, XX., 242–59.

GONNET, PH. Les derniers sermons de Saint François de Sales. *UC.*, 15 Je., '99.

HAUSER, H. Documents sur la réforme en Bourgogne. *Bull. hist. et lit.*, Je., '99, 300–317.

HAUSRATH, A. Luthers Thesenstreit. *N. Heidelb. Jahrb.*, '99, 181–247.

——— Luther als Dichter. *Ibid.*, 58–77.

HAUSSLEITER, J. Weitere Mitteilungen zur letzten Unterredung Luthers und Melanchthons üb. d. Abendmahlsstreit (1546). *NkZ.*, '99. 455–66.

ISSLEIB, S. Die Gefangennahme des Landgrafen Philipp von Hessen, 1547. Hamb: Verlagsanst., '99; 25 pp. M. 0.75.
"Sammlung gemeinverständl. wissenschaftl. Vorträge." N. F. XIV. Serie. Heft 315.

KAWERAU, G. Der Einfluss d. Reformation auf das religiöse u. sittliche Leben in Deutschland. L.: C. Braun, '99; 18 pp. M. 0.50.

KUPKE, G. Drei unbekannte Melanchthon-Briefe. *Quell. u. Forsch. aus ital. Archiven*, II., 2.

LEMMENS, L. Pater Augustin v. Alfeld († um 1532), ein Franziskaner aus den ersten Jahren der Glaubensspaltung in Deutschland. Fr.: Herder, '99; vii, 108 pp. M. 1.60.

Luther, der heilige. Nach seinen "Tischreden" gewürdigt u. herabgewürdigt von Dr. Lucifer. B.: Wrede, '99; 48 pp. M. 1.

PARISIUS, A. Matthias v. Jagew, Bischof v. Brandenburg. *DLBl.*, Jl., '99, 390–403.

PAULUS, N. Tetzel u. Oldecop. *Kath.*, Je., '99.

PAULUS, N. Conrad Treger, ein Augustiner d. 16. Jahrh. *Ibid.*, My.-Je., '99.

POLLEN, P. J. H. Johannes Cochläus an König Heinrich VIII. von England u. Thomas Morus. *RQ.*, '99, 43–59.

RETTIG, G. F. Die Krankheit d. Messe. Ein Beitrag z. Reformationsgeschichte d. Schweiz. Von N. Manuel. Wiederabdruck des 2. Teiles der als Beilage z. Oster-Pr. d. Kantonschule Bern anno 1862 erschienenen Broschüre. Schaffhausen: Schoch, '99; 27 pp. M. 0.30.

RICHTER, A. Über einige seltenere Reformations-Flugschriften aus d. Jahren 1523–1525. *GPr.* Hamburg: Herold, '99; ii, 44 pp. M. 1.50.

SCHMID, J. Des Cardinals u. Erzbischofs von Salzburg Matthäus Lang Verhalten zur Reformation. (Forts.) *Jahrb. d. Ges. f. d. Protest. in Oesterr.*, '99, 28–50.

SCHMIDT, W. Die Kirchen- u. Schulvisitation im Herzberger Kreise vom Jahre 1529 nebst Urkunden. *GPr.* B.: Gaertner, '99; 27 pp. M. 1.

SCHNELL, H. Die Einführung der Reformation in Mecklenburg. Güstrow: Opitz, '99; 73 pp. & illustr. M. 0.50.

——— Das Bekenntnis d. Herzogt. Mecklenburg, Kaiser Karl V. 1549 überreicht, nebst demjenigen des Landes Braunschweig-Lüneburg. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Augsburger Interims. B.: Süsserott, '99; 41 pp. M. 1.25.

SEEGER, O. Zur *Confessio Sigismundi. Realschul-Pr.* B.: Gaertner, '99; 40 pp.

SELL, K. Luthers Einfluss auf d. polit. Geschichte Deutschlands. L.: C. Braun, '99; 22 pp. M. 0.50.

SIELEK, F. Bartholomäus Ringwaldt. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Fr.: Andres, '99; 48 pp. M. 0.60.

TIDEMAN, B. De oorsprong van Loyola's geestelijke oefeningen enz. *ThT.*, Jl., '99, 332–40.

TSCHACKERT, P. Erläutergn. zu Luthers Briefwechsel mit der Stadt Göttingen, nebst einem ungedruckten Briefe des Lic. Basilius Schumann, Pfarrers zu Rogäsen in Sachsen, vom 5. Januar 1531. *ZKG.*, XX., 237–40.

THE MODERN PERIOD.

BARDOT, G. Quomodo explanandum sit instrumenti pacis Monasteriensis caput LXXXVII quod inscribitur: Teneatur rex christianissimus. *ID.* Grenoble: Drevet, '99; 62 pp.

HISTORY OF MONASTICISM.

BELLESHEIM, A. Don Luigi Tosti, Benediktiner auf Montecassino. *Kath.*, F., '99, 136–55.

BENRATH, K. Die Ansiedelg. d. Jesuiten in Braunschweig 1565 ff. *Z. d. westpreuss. Gesch.-Ver.*, '99, 1–106.

BESSE, J. M. L'enseignement ascétique dans les premiers monastères orientaux. I. *RBd.*, '99, 14–24, 76–86.

BONAVENTURE, M. Aperçu historique sur l'ordre des Frères Mineurs. *R. des sciences eccl.*, Ja., '99.

BORNEMANN. Die erste Klostergründg. *ChrW.*, '99, no. 11.

BROUSSILLON, B. DE. Cartulaire de l'abbaye de Saint-Aubin d'Angers (ordre de Saint Benoît). T. 2.: Chartes complémentaires (808–1200). Angers: Lachèse, '99; 428 pp.

CLAUSSE, G. Les origines bénédictines (Subiaco, Mont-Cassin, Monte-Olivieto). P.: Leroux, '99; 239 pp.

DELAPORTE, V. Le monastère des Oiseaux. Les origines — la première supérieure, 1811–1863. P.: Retaux, '99. f. 5.

KERN, R. Das Pirminskloster Amorbach. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte d. Klosters u. der irisch-schottischen Missionsarbeit im Odenwald zur Zeit der röm. Invasion durch Bonifacius. *Allg. cons. Monatsschr.*, My., '99, 463–76.

LADEUZE, P. Étude sur le cénobitisme pakhomien pendant le IV^e siècle et la première moitié du V^e. *ID.* Louvain: Van Linthout, '99; ix, 390 pp. f. 7.50.

LEIDINGER, G. Fundationes monasteriorum Bavariae. *N. Arch. d. Ges. f. ält. deutsche Geschichtsk.*, '99, 671–717.

PÜCKERT, W. Aniane u. Gellone. Diplomatisch-kritische Untersuchungen z. Geschichte der Reformen d. Benedictinerordens im 9. u. 10. Jahrhundert. L.: Hinrichs', '99; 318 pp. M. 8.

RICHTER, P. Die Schriftsteller der Benediktinerabtei Maria-Laach. *Westdeutsche Z. f. Gesch. u. Kunst*, XVII., Heft 1 u. 4.

SCHIWIETZ. Das ägyptische Mönchtum im 4. Jahrh. (Forts.) *AkKR.*, LXXIX., '99, no. 1, 68–77; no. 2, 272–90.

SCHMIDT, L. Beiträge d. wissenschaftl. Studien in sächs. Klöstern. *Neu. Arch. f. sächs. Gesch.*, XVIII., 201 ff.; XX., 1 ff.

TANGL, M. Die Fuldaer Privilegienfrage. *Mitth. d. Inst. f. österr. Gesch.-Forschg.*, '99, 193–252.