

sees; but in the shape of chastisement falling on the sinful people itself—a dispensation of judgment out of which Israel, as the prophet hopes, will emerge morally renewed and prepared to receive its true king and to fulfil its part as 'the

kingdom of priests' among the multitudes of mankind. How vain these wishes of the patriot prophet were, so far as they concerned the near and national future, Manasseh's reign was destined to prove.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Nestoriana.¹

It is a misfortune, not only to a writer himself, but to those who come after him and wish to ascertain his teaching accurately, when his works are reported to posterity only through the medium of an opponent. This is the case, almost entirely, with Nestorius. His writings were diligently destroyed by order of the Emperor Theodosius, and we have therefore now to seek for them in those of his adversaries. But even with the best will in the world to be truthful, a controversial writer is apt to misrepresent his adversary; and none would willingly content himself with an opponent's version of his teaching. No politician would allow his aims and objects to be put before the country by those of the opposite camp. When, then, we have to depend upon Cyril of Alexandria and other orthodox writers for our knowledge of what Nestorius said and taught, we have reason for some hesitation whether in all cases we have got quite the right version. We have more cause for trusting Marius Mercator, perhaps, as though an orthodox writer and the friend of Augustine he was not engaged in direct controversy with Nestorius. He was a diligent translator of Greek works, and rendered into Latin thirteen discourses of Nestorius (with other relative matter) and twelve chapters of Nestorian doctrine; these translations were made known first by the learned Jesuit Garnier in 1673.

Scholars will be much indebted to Professor Loofs for this admirable collection of Nestorius' works. In an ample introduction of 164 pages he describes the sources from which he draws.

¹ *Nestoriana; Die Fragmente des Nestorius.* Gesammelt untersucht und herausgegeben von Dr. Friedrich Loofs, mit Beiträgen von Stanley A. Cook, M.A., und Dr. Georg Kampffmeyer. Halle: Max Niemayer, 1905. 8vo, pp. x, 407. Price M.15, in paper covers.

Besides Cyril and Marius, he uses the Acts of the Council of Ephesus, the so-called 'Synodicon,' 'Arnobius Junior,' Eusebius of Dorylæum, Cassian, Evagrius, and other writers, orthodox, Nestorian, and Monophysite. He then gives the texts, some in the original Greek, some in Latin and Syriac translations, and adds three excellent indexes. It is a little remarkable that so little trace of Nestorius' writings is to be found in Nestorian authors, though the most famous of them, Ebedjesus, who lived in the fourteenth century, knew many of his works which are now lost. Perhaps some quotations may yet be found, as so many Nestorian manuscripts are as yet unpublished, and even, though lying on the shelves of our libraries, unread by European scholars. But the reason for the smallness of the remains of Nestorius to be found among these writers is probably that there was no personal connexion between the heretical patriarch of Constantinople and the independent Church of the Persian Empire, the only bond of union being through the fugitives into Persia after the condemnation of Nestorianism in the Roman Empire. It is noteworthy that the Nestorian *Sunhadhus*, or Book of Canon Law, does not quote Nestorius as one of its authorities, though one would have expected that it would (apocryphally) have ascribed many of its enactments to him. Curiously enough it does quote the Council of Chalcedon. The so-called 'Liturgy of Nestorius,' still used by the Nestorians on certain days of the year, is doubtless not the work of that writer, as Dr. Loofs truly observes (p. 5). This would appear from many considerations, notably from the fact that it belongs to a type of liturgy entirely different from that to which Nestorius was accustomed; and a smaller proof may be deduced from the book now under review, for the Words of our Lord in that Liturgy are quite different from those which we find in

a fragment of a sermon of Nestorius (Loofs, p. 229).

Dr. Loofs has no great opinion of Nestorius' intellectual power, though he thinks him an honest man, and has a still worse opinion of his great opponent, Cyril. Probably the charitable view held by the ecclesiastical historian Socrates is not far wrong, that Nestorius was an ignorant and obstinate man, who did not understand how deep were the mysteries with which he was dealing. He did not carry out his teaching to its logical result, and, as one might expect, was not always consistent. The controversy, however, was a vital one, whether or not Nestorius was himself as great a heretic as the orthodox considered him to be. It was no mere question whether Theotokos was or was not a suitable title for the Virgin Mother. For Nestorianism really of necessity involved the doctrine that the Incarnation consisted only of a partnership or conjunction (*συνάφεια*, Loofs *passim*) between God and man. The point of the controversy was whether the Person whom Mary bore was or was not any other than God the Son. Nestorius would acknowledge only that the Son of Mary was accompanied by the Logos. He exaggerated the distinction between Christ's two natures. He has the merit of insisting on our Lord's real humanity, as against Apollinarius; but in effect he asserts two Christs.

A few quotations may be given from Dr. Loofs' book to illustrate Nestorius' favourite expressions. He said that the Son of Mary was the 'organ' or 'instrument' of God the Word: 'Mary did not bear the Godhead but bore a man, the inseparable instrument of the Divinity' (p. 205); ['The Virgin bore] the manhood, the organ of the Godhead of God the Word' (p. 247); 'She bore a man who was the organ of the Godhead' (p. 252). But probably we must not press *ἄνθρωπος* as being 'a man' here, but as equivalent to 'human nature,' as even in some orthodox writers of the time. Another favourite figure was that of a 'vesture': 'The Lord of all put on our nature, the vesture of Deity, the inseparable garment of the Divine substance' (p. 298). But the most common metaphor is that 'Mary bore the temple of God the Word,' which will be found again and again in this book. These phrases, which are still found in the liturgical and other books of the Nestorians, are not in themselves erroneous; they were prejudiced by being used by Nestorius, but one of

them at least is in common use among ourselves when we sing at Christmas, 'Veiled in flesh the Godhead see.' With regard to the name Theotokos, one instance of Nestorius' argument may be given. It was announced beforehand, he says, by the angels about the Baptist 'that the babe would be filled with the Holy Ghost from his mother's womb, and this blessed Baptist was born having the Holy Ghost. What then? Do you call Elizabeth *πνευματοτόκος*?' (Loofs, p. 352). This shows that Nestorius entirely misunderstood the whole point of the controversy, and goes far to confirm Socrates' opinion of him.

The interest of the volume is of necessity almost entirely Christological. But one saying of Nestorius about the Eucharist may be quoted: 'Christ is typically crucified, being slain with the sword of the priestly prayer' (Loofs, p. 241). This shows that the Eucharistic consecration was held in Nestorius' day to be effected by a *prayer*, and not by the declaratory words, 'This is my body,' etc.

We must again express the gratitude of students of Christian doctrine to Dr. Loofs for his laborious and admirable work.

A. J. MACLEAN.

Inverness.

Comparative Religion.

It is universally admitted by competent authorities that the best manual for the History of Religions is Chantepie de la Saussaye's *Lehrbuch der Religionsgeschichte*. Not long ago we had the pleasure of intimating the appearance of a French edition of this great work. And now comes a third German edition (2 vols.; Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr; London: Williams & Norgate; price £1, 4s., bound, £1, 9s.), which exhibits throughout traces of a very complete and careful revision. We think to serve the interests of students of Comparative Religion best by describing the contents and arrangement of these two volumes.

The Introduction discusses the Science of Religion and examines various systems of classifying the Religions of the world. Then begins the treatment of the different branches of the subject, in which de la Saussaye has been fortunate in obtaining the co-operation of the greatest living experts. First, 'Die sogenannten Naturvölker'

are dealt with by the editor and Dr. Thomas Achelis. Here we make acquaintance with the religions of African and American savages, and of South Sea Islanders and Mongolians. We pass next to 'The Chinese,' a theme which has been entrusted to the very competent pen of Professor J. J. M. de Groot, who groups his material under the three heads of Confucianism, Taoism, and Buddhism. The following section, 'The Japanese,' is one to which many will turn with special interest to hear what Professor R. Lange has to say about Japanese Buddhism, and about that Shintoism which exercises so strong a hold upon our allies in the Far East. The great subject of Egyptian Religion has been entrusted to Oberbibliothekar H. O. Lange; while the whole of the Semitic peoples of Western Asia (including Babylonians and Assyrians, Canaanites, Syrians and Phœnicians) have been undertaken by Dr. F. Jeremias. The section on the Religion of Israel, which in the previous edition earned from so competent a judge as Professor Kautzsch (see Hastings' *D.B.*, extra vol. p. 732b) the commendation of being 'amongst the best parts of the work,' is left in the hands of Professor Valetton; while Professor Houtsma is entrusted with the great subject of Islam. This ends the first volume.

The second volume introduces us to the Indo-Germanic peoples. The very comprehensive subject of 'Die Inder' is undertaken by Professor Ed. Lehmann, who discourses successively on the Vedic and Brahmanic Religion, Jainism, Buddhism, Hinduism. The same writer deals with Persian Religion, including the pre-Zoroastrian period. Coming nearer home, the Religions of Greece and Rome are dealt with in sections which owe much to the careful revision, and at times entirely new treatment, of Professor Holwerda, of Leiden. Finally, we have de la Saussaye's own treatment of Germanic and Slav Religions. Each volume, we may add, has a sufficient Index appended to it.

Readers of Frazer's *Golden Bough* will remember his discussion of the Babylonian festival of the Sacæa (ii. 24 f., iii. 150 ff.). A special interest belongs to this festival owing to the light which its forms have been supposed to throw upon our Lord's treatment by the soldiers of Pilate, and upon other incidents of His trial and crucifixion. This subject is handled in an interesting pamphlet,

Jesus und das Sacænopfer, by Lic. Hans Vollmer (Giessen: J. Ricker; price 60 pf.).

Dr. O. Schrader, of Jena, has published an extremely interesting tractate entitled *Totenhochzeit*. The special aim of the writer is to explain the Attic custom of placing upon the tomb of one who had died unmarried, a *lutrophorus*, a symbol of marriage. The key to this practice he discovers in traditional Slav funeral customs, into which the symbolic representation of a whole nuptial ceremony enters as an important element. The little book is full of curious information (Jena: H. Costenoble; price 80 pf.).

The Old Testament.

THE series known as 'Strack-Zöckler's Kurzfasser Kommentar' has been enriched by a second edition of Strack's *Genesis* (Munich: C. H. Beck; price M.3.50). The standpoint of the author is moderately conservative. In this new edition he has felt compelled to advance somewhat in regard to the analysis of 'sources,' while still protesting against a hyper-criticism. An interesting feature in the preface is the dignified and, many will feel, convincing reply of Professor Strack to the charge of having in his previous edition made undue and unacknowledged use of Dillmann's commentary.

Le Livre d'Isaïe, a critical translation, with notes, by Professor Albert Condamin, S.J. (Paris: V. Lecoffre; price 8 fr.), is another evidence of the extent to which the present critical movement has affected every branch of the Christian Church. Of late we have received not a few thoroughly modern commentaries from Roman Catholic scholars. Readers of the *Revue Biblique* need no introduction to Professor Condamin. For the critical notes and the occasional excursions (such as that on the Suffering Servant) scattered throughout the volume every student will feel grateful, whatever may be their view of the leading characteristic of the book. This consists in applying, throughout, the strophic theory of Zenner. The author shows abundant confidence in reconstructing the original text and in reducing each prophecy to a poem, and undoubtedly in some parts of Isaiah the results achieved may be plausibly urged as evidence that Professor Condamin is on the right track. Be that as it may, there is a great deal in his com-

mentary from which theologians of every school will derive help. We shall await with interest his promised *Introd. au Livre d'Isaïe*, in which the critical principles that underlie the present work will be fully expounded.

Cornill's *Einleit. in das A.T.* has always been a favourite with us, and we rejoice to see that it has reached a fifth edition. The book discusses the canonical books only, a separate Introduction, which will be awaited with interest, to the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha having been entrusted to Professor Gunkel. In his preface Dr. Cornill deals in a spirited fashion with Professor Hommel's *Anc. Heb. Tradition*. The *Einleitung* is published by J. C. B. Mohr (obtainable from Williams & Norgate), and costs 5s. net.

Dr. G. Bonaccorsi has done well to publish his *Questioni Bibliche* (Bologna: Tipografia Pontificia Mareggiani), which deals with three subjects: 'La Volgata al Concilio di Trento,' 'La Storicità dell'Esateuco,' 'L'interpretazione della Scrittura, secondo la dottrina cattolica.' The book might be called a plea for critical freedom within the Roman Catholic Church. It is the work of one who is at once a devout Catholic and a sympathizer with modern scholarship. We wish him and his fellow-pioneers in this field all success.

In *Kanonisch und Apokryph: ein Kapitel aus der Geschichte des alttest. Kanons* (Leipzig: A. Deichert; price M.2) Lic. Dr. G. Hölcher discusses the rise of the notion of canonization of sacred writings, the date when this process was accomplished, and the principles and motives that guided its carrying out. The author, while doing full justice to the significance of the threefold O.T. division—Torah, Prophets, Writings,—declines to recognize here three stages in the work of canonizing. The latter conception he cannot find prior to the first century B.C. The book is well worth study. By the way, we miss, among the English authorities cited, any reference to Bishop Ryle's admirable work on *The Canon of the O.T.*

The New Testament.

THE *Kommentar zum N.T.*, edited by Professor Zahn and published by A. Deichert, Leipzig, has lately been enriched by Professor P. Ewald's 'Die

Briefe des Paulus an die Epheser, Kolosser, und Philemon' (price M.8.50). Upon any chronological system these three Epistles are very closely connected in point of time as they are in contents. Our author examines the rival claims of Rome and Caesarea to be the birthplace of the letters, and decides in favour of the former. The motive and aim of the Epistles to Philemon and to the Colossians are not difficult to discover, although there is room for some difference of opinion as to the precise character of the 'Colossian heresy.' It is different with Ephesians, whose general character and impersonal tone have always been a difficulty to those who have accepted Ephesus as the special destination of the Epistle. It is of course well known that the words ἐν Ἐφέσῳ which appear in the T.R. of Eph 1¹, are not genuine, and various hypotheses have been formed to account for their presence, such as that the Epistle was meant to be a circular letter, and that a blank space was left for the name of a particular church to be inserted. It is somewhat strange, upon that theory, that no MS. has survived with a different entry from ἐν Ἐφέσῳ. Professor Ewald would account for the present state of the text in a different way. The words τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὐδῶν καὶ πιστοῖς, which are intolerably harsh when standing alone, and which leave something to be desired, even when ἐν Ἐφέσῳ is inserted after οὐδῶν, may be a corruption of τοῖς ἀγαπητοῖς οὐδῶν καὶ πιστοῖς, an address which would suit admirably a circular letter. The addition by which it was sought to remove the harshness that ensued by the corruption of the text, would be natural enough if the autograph letter remained finally in the possession of the Ephesian Church, to which it may have been handed over by Tychicus when he ended his circular tour at that city. Of course we are here in the realm of conjecture, but some of Professor Ewald's conjectures have a plausibility that amounts almost to demonstration.

After examining the minor question of the order in which the Epistles were written, and pronouncing Ephesians prior to Colossians, our author proceeds to investigate their genuineness. The external and internal evidence, the vocabulary, the style, the syntax are all subjected to close examination, with results that will be most gratifying to those who have been accustomed to accept the Pauline authorship. We may note, by the way, that Professor Ewald thinks it not improbable that

Ephesians is the only general Epistle which St. Paul wrote with his own hand. The assumption that this was the case also with Galatians appears to rest upon a misapplication of Gal 6¹¹ to the whole letter.

The commentary proper will be found to be of the very best, and will obtain a high place in the admirable series to which it belongs.

Dr. Adolf Müller, in his preface to *Geschichtskerne in den Evangelien* (Giessen: J. Ricker; price M.3), protests against the secondary place that is often assigned to the Fourth Gospel as a source of information as to the life of Christ. Its inferiority especially to St. Mark's Gospel, in this respect, is frequently emphasized. But is even Mark 'historical' in the modern sense of the term? It may be much earlier than John, but it is late enough to rob it of the character of contemporary evidence. And is it possible to deny to it any more than to John a didactic rather than a purely biographical character? Dr. Müller insists, above all, on the necessity of keeping in mind, in all our studies of the Gospels, that Eastern methods and points of view differ greatly from our own. In the volume before us our author extracts the 'Geschichtskerne' from the Gospels of Matthew and Mark, and shows incidentally how similar results may be obtained from the Third and Fourth Gospels, between which he discovers a more intimate connexion than is usually recognized.

In *Die Apostelgeschichte im Lichte der neueren text-, quellen- und historisch-kritischen Forschungen* (Giessen: J. Ricker; price M.1.30) Dr. Carl Clemen gives a bird's-eye view of the results of the most recent investigations of the Book of Acts, which during the last fifteen years has been one of the most closely studied books of the New Testament. In the field of textual criticism he finds that Blass's theory of the priority of the β -text has failed to establish itself. After noting the generally accepted views as to the 'sources,' Dr. Clemen passes to what will be of most interest to many of our readers, the historicity of the Acts. He finds that continued examination of the book has led to a much higher estimate of its historical value than used to be the fashion in many quarters.

The title, *Religion oder Reich Gottes* (Leipzig:

J. C. Hinrichs; price M.3), scarcely prepares the reader for what he gets from H. Lhotsky, which is simply a popularly written and very readable history of the early days of the Christian Church, as told in the Acts of the Apostles.

The authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews is generally regarded as a *res judicata* on the negative side. Whether written by Apollo or Barnabas or Priscilla and Aquila, it was *not written by Paul*—such is the practically unanimous verdict of modern scholarship. Yet there are voices still raised in defence of the Pauline authorship, and one of the latest and most learned of these is that of Dr. Bartholomäus Heigl, who, in his 'Habilitationsschrift,' entitled *Verfasser und Adresse des Briefes an die Hebräer* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herdersche Verlagsbuchhandlung; price M.5), goes very thoroughly into the question once more, and finds reason to conclude that the author of the letter was St. Paul, and its destination the church at Jerusalem. While the author's treatise has by no means convinced us of the truth of his thesis, while, indeed, the apparent success of his arguments and the ease with which he repels objections, whether ancient or modern, are themselves calculated to awaken suspicion, we feel deeply grateful to him for the complete survey of the whole field which he provides, and for the admirable tone in which he conducts the controversy. His book will prove invaluable as containing a complete account of all that can be said *pro* or *con* the Pauline authorship, and as a repertory of all the opinions that have been held regarding the authorship, the destination, and the aim of the Epistle.

Eschatology.

THE importance of this subject and the ability of the work before us entitle Dr. Paul Volz's *Jüdische Eschatologie von Daniel bis Akiba* (Tübingen: Mohr; price M.7) to a separate heading.

As 'eschatology' is used in a perplexing variety of senses, Volz very properly starts with explaining that he understands by the term the doctrine of the last things as far as these concern a whole body, whether the nation of Israel or the world. To speak of the eschatology of the *individual* is a contradiction in terms. His treatise has therefore nothing to do with Jewish beliefs regarding death and the lot of the individual thereafter,

qua individual. He next explains how the strange complex of contents in the various Jewish eschatological writings, and the presence in the same writing of conceptions derived from different periods and even contradictory of each other, make it impossible to trace the development of Jewish eschatology by merely determining and following the chronological order of the sources. At the same time he recognizes the necessity of exhibiting the eschatological contents of each separate writing as a whole, and this is done in sec. 2 ff. Then in sec. 30 ff. the events and conditions that are entitled to the name 'eschatological' are examined in order, and the relevant passages from the whole literature are referred to. He finds it impossible to separate sharply between hopes and beliefs that concerned the Jewish nation and those that had for their subject mankind in general; or between hopes of an earthly and a supra-earthly felicity. Our author regards it as a cardinal error to suppose that the eschatological literature of Judaism viewed the drama in which the Jewish people were to play their part as merely the prelude to a consummation affecting the whole world.

At the very commencement Dr. Volz draws with a few master strokes the characteristic features of Apocalyptic, and then analyses the contents of this literature, beginning with Daniel and ending with Akiba. The next section of the book exhibits the development that may be traced in eschatological opinions during this period. Then comes what might be called the systematic exposition of the subject, where such notable expressions as 'the End,' 'the Day of the Lord,' 'the Messiah,' 'the Judgment,' 'Salvation,' etc., are taken up and illustrated copiously from the sources. The book closes with an excellent General Index and a full Index of Texts.

We have said enough to indicate the conception and the method of this great work. An acquaintance with Jewish eschatology is being more and more recognized as indispensable for the proper understanding of the New Testament, and Dr. Volz may be safely followed as a guide through this large and somewhat difficult territory. He keeps closely to his subject, he commands an interesting style, and he does not weary the reader with footnotes and constant references approving or otherwise to the views of other men. In this independent straightforward fashion he goes direct to the goal, and inspires confidence in those that follow him.

Greek Patristics.

STEADY progress continues to be made with the great series, entitled 'Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller,' issued under the auspices of the Königl. Preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaften, and published by Mr. J. C. Hinrichs, of Leipzig. We have before us the issue entitled *Koptisch-Gnostische Schriften*, prepared by Lic. Dr. Carl Schmidt, of Berlin. It contains the *Pistis Sophia*, the two books of *Jeû*, and an ancient Gnostic work of anonymous authorship and without a title (price, M.13.50). A second volume will contain three hitherto unpublished works from the Codex Berolinensis: the *Evangelium Mariae*, *Apocryphon Johannis*, and *Sophia Jesu Christi*.

The first Gnostic work in the present volume is contained in the Coptic Codex Askewianus, named after Dr. Askew, who, towards the end of the eighteenth century, sold it to the British Museum, where it still remains. Up till now we have had the Latin, French, and English translations of the *Pistis Sophia*, by Schwartz, Amélineau, and Mead (published in 1851, 1895, and 1896 respectively). Dr. Schmidt, who has carefully examined the original, now presents it to scholars for the first time in a German dress. The Codex, which has been copied from an older MS. by two hands, he is inclined to assign to the fifth century. The title, *Pistis Sophia*, although retained for the sake of convenience, is pronounced a misnomer; a preferable designation would be *Τεύχη τοῦ Σωτήρος*. The work itself, which is a translation from a Greek original, used to be attributed to Valentinus, but this view is now largely abandoned. The place and date of the writing are next examined.

The Books of *Jeû*, that mysterious being, 'the overseer of the Light,' is derived from the Codex Brucianus, named after its discoverer, the famous traveller, James Bruce. This MS. passed in 1842, by purchase, to the Bodleian Library in Oxford. These books, whose contents are so curious and possessed of so much interest to the student of Early Church History, are dated by Dr. Schmidt as early as the first half of the third century. He would assign much the same date to the untitled and anonymous writing (referred to above), which, like the other two, had its birthplace in Egypt.

The translation of these three Gnostic works, which occupies 367 pages, is followed by three very carefully prepared Indexes: (1) an Index of

Passages cited from (a) the O.T., (b) the N.T., (c) extra-canonical writings; (2) an Index of Greek terms; (3) an Index of Names and Subjects.

These Indexes will greatly augment the value and facilitate the use of this interesting volume of a magnificent series.

Apostolic Arithmetic.

A PAULINE WORD-STUDY.

BY THE REV. W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, B.D., PRINCIPAL OF WYCLIFFE HALL, OXFORD.

ONE of the characteristic words of the Apostle Paul is λογίζομαι. It occurs twenty-nine times (apart from Old Testament quotations) in his Epistles (eleven times in Ro 4 alone), and only three times elsewhere in the New Testament. The root meaning under all its applications is 'to reckon.' It is 'a metaphor from accounts,' and implies a setting down on the credit or debit side (Sanday and Headlam on Ro 4^s). St. Paul uses it in several connexions to illustrate and enforce the arithmetic of Christian truth and of its opposites.

I. THE ARITHMETIC OF HUMAN SIN.

Ro 2^s: 'But dost thou reckon this (λογίζῃ), O man, that thou wilt entirely escape (ἐκ) the judgement of God?'

The Apostle points out to the self-righteous and proud Jew that his method of calculation is inaccurate, and therefore misleading, and that if he continues to reckon by this computation the result will be disastrous. Inaccurate arithmetic is fatal, whether in the commerce of earth or of heaven.

II. THE ARITHMETIC OF SOVEREIGN GRACE.

Ro 4^s: 'Abraham believed God, and it was reckoned (ἐλογίσθη) to him unto righteousness.'

Ro 4^s: 'His faith is being reckoned (λογίζεται) unto righteousness.'

Ro 4^s: 'The blessedness of the man to whom God is reckoning (λογίζεται) righteousness apart from works.'

Ro 4^s: 'Blessed is the man the Lord will by no means reckon (οὐ μὴ λογίσῃται).'

Ro 4^s: 'Faith was reckoned (ἐλογίσθη) to Abraham unto righteousness.'

Ro 4¹¹: 'With a view to the reckoning (τὸ λογισθῆναι) to them the righteousness.'

Ro 4²²: 'Wherefore (i.e. because "strong in faith," v.²¹) it was reckoned (ἐλογίσθη) to him unto righteousness.'

Ro 4²⁴: 'On account of us, to whom it is about to be continually reckoned (λογίζεσθαι).'

2 Co 5¹⁹: 'God was in Christ reconciling the world to Himself, not reckoning (λογιζόμενος) to them their trespasses.'

The references above to Abraham show that God 'placed to his credit' the attitude of faith in Himself. This response of the soul (ἐπίστευσε τῷ Θεῷ) was accepted with a view (εἰς) to his becoming possessed of that righteousness which God alone can bestow on guilty man. God's condescending acceptance of faith in Him as the channel of righteousness is an act of sovereign grace. He 'puts this to our credit' in the book of His mercy and grace. He does not wish (μὴ, 2 Co 5¹⁹) to reckon our trespasses and put *them* to our account, but wills rather to reckon our faith (Ro 4). Only Divine grace could do this.

Most modern writers render εἰς δικαιοσύνην as though it were equivalent to ὡς or ἀντί, as though God reckoned Abraham's faith *as* righteousness, i.e. as its equivalent. But righteousness, properly speaking, is the actual fulfilment of Divine requirement, and not the mere promise and potency of it. Faith cannot be the equivalent of righteousness in this sense, and it would be a far too serious modification, or, rather, transformation, of the Pauline Gospel to say that God sees in our faith the germ of what we shall become, and therefore justifies us by anticipation. Haldane's view seems, on the whole, the best, that εἰς should be interpreted as in Ro 1¹⁶ 3²² and 10¹⁰, and rendered by an ellipse: *with a view to the receiving of righteousness* (cf. Note in Orr's *Christian View* on 'The Germ-Theory of Justification.')

III. THE ARITHMETIC OF INSCRUTABLE WISDOM.

Ro 9^s: 'That is, the children of the flesh, these are not children of God; but the children