

fourth" becomes apparent in a regenerated "son of God."

And, yet more wonderfully, the chapter on 'The Raising of the Dead' opens in this way: 'But for the persistence of perverse ideas upon the subject, it would be needless to assert that "the resurrection of (or from) the dead" implies neither the stimulation into conscious activity of a cast-off body of mortality, nor the readjustment of such a body to the ultra-physical part of us at some "last day." The expression implies, and solely so, the unfolding and re-rising of individual human consciousness until that consciousness gradually outgrows its present inhibitions and illusions, and, with the ingarnered fruits of its experience, rejoins its source in Omniscience and remains continually

fixed therein and united therewith; itself and its "Father" becoming one.'

The author has a fine easy command of language, and the publisher has offered the essays in a most attractive volume.

The volume of the *Free Church Year Book* for 1914 is as pleasant reading, as spiritually edifying, and altogether as ably edited as any of its predecessors; and then it contains all the information. The very first thing in it is a great uplift. It is the address of the retiring President, the Rev. Alexander Connell, M.A., B.D., on 'The Supremacy and Freedom of the Spirit.' The volume is issued by the National Free Church Council (2s. 6d. net).

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Divine Names in the Pentateuch.¹

DR. KÖNIG'S name is not unknown to readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. Among the older Hebraists of Germany he occupies a position in many ways unique. There are few branches of Old Testament scholarship to which he has not made solid and valuable contributions. In philology, in criticism, in history, and in Biblical theology, his work is distinguished by a massive erudition, and an indefatigable thoroughness of research which leaves no stone unturned under which a truth or even a fallacy may lurk. As a theologian his standpoint is distinctly positive and conservative. He is profoundly convinced of the supernatural origin and character of the religion of Israel, and has resolutely opposed all speculations which would efface the difference between it and the other religions of mankind. One of his earliest writings, published thirty years ago, closed with this remarkable sentence: 'I will make it impossible (*ich will verhindern*) that irreverence towards the Holy One of Israel should come to be the order of the day in Old Testament science.' These strong and characteristic words have always seemed to the present reviewer to strike the key-

note of König's lifework. Yet this laborious, independent, conservatively minded scholar has been one of the most unflinching upholders of the documentary theory of the Pentateuch. He is a living refutation of the calumny that the modern criticism of the Old Testament was cradled in infidelity, and owes its hold on men's minds to a secret or open aversion to the idea of a supernatural revelation.

In this closely printed volume of over one hundred pages Professor König deals with a recent development of textual criticism which claims for that elementary discipline the deciding vote in the Pentateuchal controversy. The accepted division of the Pentateuch into different documents rests, it is maintained, on an unsound and untested textual basis. The whole case for the critical theory depends on the distinctive use of the names *Yahwe* (LORD) and *Elohim* (God) in the Hebrew text of Genesis; and this Hebrew text is so incorrect—especially as regards the divine names—that conclusions founded on it can only mislead. And, indeed, it is obvious that if *both* these propositions could be made good the edifice of modern Pentateuch criticism would dissolve like the baseless fabric of a vision. But here its assailants imagine a vain thing. Their first contention is so devoid of truth that all their labour to prove the second is at best putting

¹ *Die moderne Pentateuchkritik und ihre neueste Bekämpfung.* By Eduard König, D.D. Leipzig, 1914.

money into a bag with holes. Still, it is undoubtedly of some importance to know whether the money thus industriously laid by is good coin or counterfeit; and this is the question to which König's investigation is mainly directed. In other words, is the Massoretic text as unreliable as the new school of textual critics try to make out? König's answer is an emphatic and comprehensive negative. The detailed discussion is devoted chiefly to the work of Johannes Dahse, who is universally regarded as the most scholarly representative of the movement that seeks to undermine literary by textual criticism. König has no difficulty in showing that a great deal of the evidence marshalled by Dahse against the soundness of the Massoretic text is not merely inconclusive, but absolutely irrelevant. He shows, as several others have done before him, that the hypotheses put forward by Dahse to explain the variations in the divine names in the Hebrew and Greek and other texts are both arbitrary and fantastic in themselves, and are utterly inadequate to account for the actual distribution of the names. But he goes further, and charges Dahse with the very error which he himself regards as the *prōton pseudos* of the higher criticism, namely, the neglect of a preliminary verification of the text with which one operates. König is in the fortunate position of being able to refer to earlier writings of his own in which he has carefully examined the credentials of the Hebrew and Greek texts, and has produced many evidences of the minute fidelity of the former and the loose inaccuracy of the latter. There is no indication, he points out, that any similar investigation has ever been undertaken by Dahse. His work proceeds on an unscientific partiality for the Septuagint against the Massoretic text, and—one may add without injustice—for that form of Septuagint text which deviates most from the Hebrew.

No one will expect that this elaborate and fair-minded work will be the last word in the controversy. But the result, as it appears to us, is a strong vindication of the procedure followed by the so-called 'higher' critics in the analysis of the Pentateuch, and a very complete exposure of the pretensions advanced in the name of 'lower' or textual criticism.—We have noticed one or two slips in the argument. On p. 51, and again on p. 52, König, by a very excusable oversight, seems to have missed the connexion of

Dahse's reasoning. On p. 80, L (a Greek uncial) is mistaken for the 'Lucianic' recension of the Septuagint.

JOHN SKINNER.

Cambridge.

New Books.

Dom Germain Morin is the French Nestle. He is intensely interested in accuracy, accuracy in the minutest things, and in minute things generally. He has just published a volume of contributions which he has made to the literature and the history of the first twelve centuries. The title of the volume is *Études, Textes, Découvertes* (Oxford: Parker & Co.; 10s. net). It belongs to the second series of the well-known 'Anecdota Maredsolana.'

With his usual thoroughness Dom Morin has written a bibliographical introduction to the volume, which offers a bird's-eye view of its contents. That introduction deals with no fewer than one hundred and fourteen items. The principal contents, however, are (1) an unpublished treatise belonging to the fourth century, the *De Similitudine Carnis Peccati* of Bishop Pacian of Barcelona; (2) an unpublished Priscillianist treatise on the Trinity, found in a manuscript at Laon. Dom Morin says that his attention was drawn to this manuscript by Mr. C. H. Turner of Oxford; (3) the Inscription of Clematius, a mosaic in the church of S. Ursula at Cologne; (4) the existing remains of the preaching of Jerome; (5) two unpublished discourses of Augustine; and (6) writings attributed to Arnobius, with an account of Arnobius himself and the work he did. Perhaps even that bare list will be sufficient to attract readers to this product of the very best Roman Catholic scholarship.

Messrs. Herder have published a new edition, enlarged and amended, of the *Enchiridion Patristicum* of M. J. Rouët de Journel, S.J. The early issue of a second edition shows that the book must have served its purpose of bringing into the hands of students all the best passages of the Fathers and Early Church Doctors (9s.).

Messrs. Bauermeister are the publishers in this country of the late Professor von Soden's books.

They have issued the short edition of his Greek New Testament, which contains the text and condensed apparatus. The title is simply *Griechisches Neues Testament* (4s. 3d.). Let it be remembered that this is the text which Professor Moffatt has chosen to translate into English for his recent edition of the New Testament.

Messrs. Bauermeister have also issued, for Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, *Synoptische Tafeln zu den drei älteren Evangelien*, by Professor Johannes

Weiss, and *Über die Pastoralbriefe*, by Dr. Hans Helmut Mayer (3s.).

But a more recent and much more important volume by Johannes Weiss, also imported by Messrs. Bauermeister, is the first volume of *Das Urchristentum* (7s. 9d.). It contains the first three books of a history of Apostolic Christianity, in which, however, doctrine gets a far more prominent place than it usually does in histories. This volume is taken up mainly with St. Paul.

Contributions and Comments.

Reincarnation

(Matthew xi. 14 and John ix. 2).

THESE two texts are often quoted by Theosophists as affording Scriptural proof of the theory of Reincarnation.

The incident of the blind man suggests that the disciples accepted this theory—otherwise there would be no point in their question, 'Who did sin, etc.?' A man born blind could have sinned only in a previous existence, if his blindness was a punishment for sin.

In Asia to-day most people believe in reincarnation: so universal is the belief in China that even adherents of Christianity who have renounced this belief frequently use language which implies it, e.g. a father in scolding an unruly child will exclaim, 'What have I done that you should be foisted on me?'—meaning, 'What sin have I committed in a previous existence, to incur the penalty of having you born into my family?'

Hence the disciples *may* have been voicing a popular theory without expressing their own considered opinion in the matter.

Jesus in His reply gives no decision one way or the other.

The passage in Mt. throws further light on His attitude. That John the Baptist was a reincarnation of Elijah is widely held by Theosophists to-day. They even claim our Lord's authority in support of this contention.

But what Jesus says is this, 'If ye are willing to receive it, this is Elijah which is to come.'

We regard these words, 'If ye are willing to receive it,' as important. Christ virtually says, 'If

you will not mistake my meaning—if you will not conclude, as I know you possibly will, that I am referring to a reincarnation. That is not my meaning. I mean that this is one who comes in the spirit and power of Elijah' (see Lk 1¹⁷).

Hence we conclude that Jesus was aware of the popular belief and knew that His disciples were influenced by it, but He deliberately refrained from approving or condemning it. S. BAND.

Sunderland
(formerly Wu-king-fu, S. China).

'Thou art the Son of God' (John i. 49).

COMMENTATORS have found great difficulty in accounting for the use of the title 'Son of God' by Nathanael. How came he to use it at all? Some suggest that it is derived from Ps 2⁷, 'Thou art my Son.'

But does not 1³⁴ supply a clue to the real explanation? There we find John the Baptist saying, 'I have borne witness that this is the Son of God.' So much Bishop Westcott has seen.

This, however, only puts the difficulty a step further back. How came John the Baptist to know that Christ was the Son of God? The answer is not far to seek. He knew because he had heard the voice from heaven, 'This is my beloved Son.' He could not have doubted for a moment that the voice was the voice of God Himself. God Himself bore witness from heaven in the hearing of St. John the Baptist that Christ was His Son, His beloved Son.